## Cedar Falls Planning and Zoning Commission Regular Meeting March 28, 2018 City Hall Council Chambers 220 Clay Street, Cedar Falls, Iowa

## **MINUTES**

The Cedar Falls Planning and Zoning Commission met in regular session on Wednesday, March 28, 2018 at 5:30 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers, 220 Clay Street, Cedar Falls, Iowa. Mr. Sturch introduced Karen Howard, Planning & Community Services Manager and had roll call. The following Commission members were present: Adkins, Arntson, Giarusso, Hartley, Holst, Leeper, Oberle, Saul and Wingert. Karen Howard, Community Services Manager, David Sturch, Planner III, Shane Graham, Planner II, and Iris Lehmann, Planner I, were also present.

- 1.) Chair Oberle noted the Minutes from the February 28, 2018 regular meeting are presented. Mr. Leeper made a motion to approve the Minutes as presented. Mr. Hartley seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously with 8 ayes (Adkins, Arntson, Giarusso, Hartley, Holst, Leeper, Saul and Wingert), 1 abstention (Oberle) and 0 nays.
- 2.) The first item of business was a HWY-1 District site plan review for the Holiday Inn & Suites/Conference Center. Chair Oberle introduced the item and Mr. Graham provided background information, noting that this item was initially discussed with the Commission on February 14, 2018. He explained that the property is zoned HWY-1 Commercial, and is located near the corner of West Ridgeway Avenue and Hudson Road. This use is permitted in this zoning district. Mr. Graham showed renderings of the site plan, displaying the proposed elements. He also discussed the signage plan, stormwater management plan and building design, showing changes in the design since the last meeting. Staff recommends approval subject to additional comments or direction from the Commission.

Ms. Saul noted that she likes the change in color and the canopy. Mr. Arntson asked about the roads and entry points.

Mr. Leeper made a motion to approve. Mr. Wingert seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously with 9 ayes (Adkins, Arntson, Giarusso, Hartley, Holst, Leeper, Oberle, Saul and Wingert) and 0 nays.

3.) The next item for consideration by the Commission was amendments to the Zoning Ordinance. Chair Oberle introduced the item and Mr. Sturch provided background information. He explained that potential changes to the ordinance were discussed in January and staff has looked at other towns and ordinances and gotten feedback from local groups with regard to those changes. He discussed the addition of new definitions for efficiency/studio units and mixed use buildings. It is also proposed to define residential dwelling units, ground level floor uses and parking behind the commercial space, as well as onsite parking requirements for residential users and consideration of off-premise parking. Exceptions to parking requirements are also being considered, as are parking ratios for efficiency and studio units. At this time, this item is being presented for discussion.

Eashaan VajPeyi, 3831 Convair Lane, spoke on behalf of himself and his client Brian Sires. He stated that it is his client's position that the changes appear to be proposed to allow certain developments that have thus far failed to meet the ordinances. They are changes that are not necessary to develop residential properties in these districts. He believes that site plans should conform to the code; the code shouldn't conform to the site plans. He feels that studio

units and one-bedroom units are no different in terms of the number of tenants and should have the same parking requirements. He also addressed an issue with Mr. Wingert being allowed to vote on site plans that involve Brent Dahlstrom's properties as they work so closely on, as he believes he cannot be impartial.

Ryan Kreiner, 4525 Quesada Court, spoke about the council partnership and their mission statement, which talks about urbanization and revitalization. He feels that restricting developers will restrict that belief.

Dr. Brian Sires, stated that he has rented apartments of all sizes and has found that people choose a location and then look for a price point. When college students come, they are often couples and rent depending on the price point. Couples will rent studio units as much as one-bedroom units, and these students have a high car use rate. He feels that this is going to create more of a parking problem if parking isn't accommodated better and the parking is changed in the ordinance to allow for less parking.

Mr. Holst asked for clarification on the parking requirements between the studio and one-bedroom units. Mr. Sturch explained that one-bedroom would require two spots and the studio would require one. Ms. Giarusso asked how staff came up with six hundred square feet for the studio units. Mr. Sturch noted that they compared with other communities and past ordinances. Mr. Oberle asked how parking was decided for the studio units. Mr. Sturch stated that staff looked at other communities and how they calculated their parking requirements. Ms. Saul had questions about the exceptions that are proposed.

Mr. Wingert asked if staff had any idea of what this new potential mixed use building might look like and where it would go. He feels that the vision of the local developers is critical as they know our community well. Mr. Holst stated that he wants to see commercial use preserved in commercial districts.

Mr. Leeper stated that he would take exception with the accusation that this group is playing favoritism with any person or group. They are trying to deal with the density issues the community is facing in an open process. He also stated that he understands Mr. Sires' point regarding equity between studio units and one bedroom units. He also asked about the proposed exceptions, particularly the section about three or fewer units on the upper floor with up to six units.

Ms. Sheetz stated that the proposal includes a more explicit requirement for parking for residential units in the C-3 district to provide more clarity in the code, which will prevent confusion on these types of mixed use projects moving forward. The changes to parking for the studio units would be citywide. Mr. Arntson asked what the difference would be between R-4 and the C-3 proposed parking requirements. Mr. Wingert asked if there are any current buildings that would fit the new criteria to use as an example.

Mr. Wingert wanted to put on the record that it there is no reason for him to abstain from this project.

Chair Oberle noted that this item will be continued as a public hearing on April 11. That will be the time for any input from developers and citizens.

4.) The Commission then considered Greenhill Village Townhomes Master Plan Amendment. Chair Oberle introduced the item and Ms. Lehmann provided background information. Mr. Wingert noted that he will abstain from this item. Ms. Lehmann explained that the site is located southeast of Greenhill and Hudson Roads and the applicant is proposing to amend the section of the Greenhill Village Master Plan to allow for higher residential density to be

developed, specifically townhomes. As this is a significant improvement, the amendment will need Planning and Zoning and City Council review and approval. Ms. Lehmann displayed and discussed the original and currently proposed Master Plan as well as the requests relation to the Future Land Use map for the city. In summary, the proposed amendment is consistent with both the Master Plan's overall goal and the type of use shown in the City's Future Land Use map. She discussed the concept plan that was submitted with the Master Plan amendment that will be used as a guide for the type of multi-family development approved for the area. Staff recommends approval of the Greenhill Village Master Plan amendment and submitted concept plan permitting the development of townhome style multi-unit dwellings at this location at a density of approximately 7.7 units per acre.

Mr. Holst verified that notifications were sent to the neighbors and he feels that this is a good transition for that area. Mr. Leeper agreed that the density makes sense.

Mr. Holst made a motion to approve. Mr. Arntson seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously with 8 ayes (Adkins, Arntson, Giarusso, Hartley, Holst, Leeper, Oberle and Saul), 1 abstention (Wingert) and 0 nays.

5.) The next item of business was Gateway Business Park at Cedar Falls I Final Plat. Chair Oberle introduced the item and Mr. Graham provided background information. He explained that the property is located near the corner of West Ridgeway Avenue and Hudson Road. He displayed a rendering of the final plat with different elements highlighted, as well as street connectivity. Staff recommends approval of the plat.

Mr. Arntson made a motion to approve. Mr. Saul seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously with 9 ayes (Adkins, Arntson, Giarusso, Hartley, Holst, Leeper, Oberle, Saul and Wingert) and 0 nays.

6.) The next item for consideration by the Commission was Western Home Communities Eighth Addition Preliminary Plat. Chair Oberle introduced the item and Mr. Sturch provided background information. He explained that the property is located in the Western Home South Main Street campus on Hyacinth and Caraway Lane. He showed the preliminary and final plats and provided plat details, noting that it complies with all requirements. Staff recommends approval of the plats. Mr. Holst noted that he has a conflict of interest and will abstain from the vote.

Ms. Adkins made a motion to approve. Mr. Wingert seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously with 8 ayes (Adkins, Arntson, Giarusso, Hartley, Leeper, Oberle Saul and Wingert), 1 abstention (Holst) and 0 nays.

7.) As there were no further comments, Mr. Hartley made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Holst seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously with 9 ayes (Adkins, Arntson, Giarusso, Hartley, Holst, Leeper, Oberle, Saul and Wingert) and 0 nays.

The meeting adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Howard

Community Services Manager

Joanne Goodrich Administrative Clerk

Joanne Goodrick