AGENDA
CITY OF CEDAR FALLS, IOWA
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING WEDNESDAY, MARCH 09, 2022
5:30 PM AT CEDAR FALLS COMMUNITY CENTER, 528 MAIN STREET

## Call to Order and Roll Call

## Approval of Minutes

1. Planning and Zoning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes of February 23, 2022

## Public Comments

## Old Business

2. Zoning Text Amendment - Daycare Uses in the M-1 Light Industrial District (TA22-002)

Proposal: Amend the Zoning Code to allow daycare centers in the M-1 District
Previous discussion: February 23, 2022
Recommendation: Approval
P\&Z Action: Public hearing and make a recommendation to City Council
3. Amendment of RP Master Plan for Autumn Ridge Development

Location: South of W. 1st Street and West of Union Road
Applicant: BKND, Inc., Owner; CGA Engineering, Engineer
Previous discussion: November 24, 2020
Recommendation: Re-introduction and discussion
P\&Z Action: Discuss and continue to the next meeting
4. Preliminary Plat for Autumn Ridge 9th and 11th Additions (PP20-004)

Location: South of W. 1st Street and West of Union Road
Applicant: BKND, Inc., Owner; CGA Engineering, Engineer
Previous discussion: November 24, 2020
Recommendation: Re-introduction and discussion
P\&Z Action: Discussion and continue to the next meeting

## New Business

5. RP Site Plan Review - The Cove at Spruce Hills (Case \#SP21-013)

Location: North of Greenhill Road and east of Spruce Hills Drive and Prairie Parkway
Applicant: Brian Wingert (Developer); The Cove at Spruce Hills LLC (Owner);
Snyder \& Associates (Engineer)
Previous discussion: None
Recommendation: Introduction and discussion
P\&Z Action: Discuss and continue to the next meeting
6. MU Master Plan Amendment for Pinnacle Prairie Development

Location: South of Greenhill Road, between Bluebell Road and Prairie Parkway
Applicant: Western Home Communities
Previous discussion: None
Recommendation: Introduction and discussion
P\&Z Action: Discuss and continue to the next meeting

## Commission Updates

## Adjournment

Reminders:

* March 23 and April 13 - Planning \& Zoning Commission Meetings
* March 21 and April 4 - City Council Meetings


# Cedar Falls Planning and Zoning Commission Regular Meeting February 23, 2022 <br> In person and via videoconference <br> Cedar Falls, Iowa 


#### Abstract

MINUTES The Cedar Falls Planning and Zoning Commission met in regular session on February 23, 2022 at 5:30 p.m. at City Hall and via videoconference due to precautions necessary to prevent the spread of the COVID-19 virus. The following Commission members were present: Crisman, Hartley, Leeper, Lynch, Moser and Saul. Grybovych, Holst and Larson were absent. Karen Howard, Community Services Manager and Michelle Pezley, Planner III, were also present. 1.) Chair Leeper noted the Minutes from the February 9, 2022 regular meeting are presented. Ms. Lynch made a motion to approve the Minutes as presented. Ms. Saul seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously with 6 ayes (Crisman, Hartley, Leeper, Lynch, Moser and Saul), and 0 nays. 2.) The first item of business was a site plan review for 3717 Midway Drive. Chair Leeper introduced the item and Ms. Pezley provided background information. She explained that the review involves commercial property south of University Avenue and east of Cedar Heights Drive. Commercial site plan reviews within the C-2 District typically are not brought before the Commission, however the zoning ordinance states that mini-storage requires review by P\&Z and City Council. The applicant proposes to take an existing building (a car wash), remodel it and construct an addition at the back of the building, which will contain 30 self-service storage units. She noted that the drive to the north and the rear paved area will not be for customer use and will be signed accordingly, as the drive is too narrow to meet commercial standards as a two-way drive. Ms. Pezley discussed the changes to the building façade, enclosing the car wash bays with new building walls and windows. Staff recommends approval with any comments or direction from the Commission and conformance with all staff recommendations and technical requirements.


Gordy Sorensen, 1426 Lilac Lane, stated that the project is currently a carwash, where it is intended to add an addition on the back and have climate controlled storage. The small shop in the back will be solely for private use of the owner. The property is already zoned commercial.

Ms. Crisman feels that it is a good re-use of the building. Mr. Hartley stated that he feels it improves the look of the existing building as well.

Ms. Saul made a motion to approve the item. Ms. Crisman seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously with 6 ayes (Crisman, Hartley, Leeper, Lynch, Moser and Saul), and 0 nays.
3.) The next item for consideration by the Commission was a zoning text amendment for daycare uses in the M-1, Light Industrial District. Chair Leeper introduced the item and Ms. Howard provided background information. She explained that the City received an inquiry regarding an expansion of a daycare that is currently in the $\mathrm{M}-1$ district. After investigation it was found that the building was built in 1999 and the daycare was established sometime thereafter. However, daycare uses are not an allowed use in that district and the daycare has asked if there is a way to allow them to expand and continue to operate in that location. Upon analysis, there is a critical need for daycare services in the community. The City's Industrial and Technology

Parks are large centers of employment and there is a need for daycare services in locations convenient to employment centers.

Ms. Howard discussed a number of reasons that allowing daycare uses may not be problematic. She noted that the zone is intended for light industrial uses, not heavy industrial, so does not allow uses that create lots of dust, odors, noise, and other nuisances that might be found in a heavy industrial area. In addition to light industrial, the zone allows a variety of general commercial uses, such as restaurants and offices where people are likely to bring their children. She also noted that daycare uses are currently allowed if they are an accessory to an existing business, i.e. an in-house daycare. The specific daycare being discussed serves as a case study and she noted that there have been no issues of concern over the 20 years it has been operating.

Ms. Howard discussed some suggested standards to consider with regard to changing the ordinance. Staff recommends discussion of the petition to allow daycare uses in the M-1 District and setting a public hearing date for March 9 for formal consideration and recommendation to Council.

Ms. Lynch stated that she does feel that there is a need for daycares in the Cedar Valley and would like there to be more options for families in the area. Ms. Moser agreed.

Ms. Lynch made a motion to set a public hearing. Ms. Moser seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously with 6 ayes (Crisman, Hartley, Leeper, Lynch, Moser and Saul), and 0 nays.
4.) As there were no further comments, Ms. Lynch made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Saul seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously with 6 ayes (Crisman, Hartley, Leeper, Lynch, Moser and Saul), and 0 nays.

The meeting adjourned at 5:44 p.m.

Respectfully sybmitted,


Karen Howard
Community Services Manager


DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

City of Cedar Falls
220 Clay Street
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50613
Phone: 319-273-8606
Fax: 319-273-8610
www.cedarfalls.com
MEMORANDUM
Planning \& Community Services Division
TO: Planning \& Zoning Commission
FROM: Karen Howard, AICP, Planning \& Community Services Manager
DATE: March 3, 2022 (Public hearing)
SUBJECT: Zoning Code Text Amendment - Allowing Daycare in M1 District (TA22-002)

## Background

The City recently received an inquiry about expansion of an existing daycare center located on Nordic Drive in the M-1, Light Industrial District. After reviewing the zoning code to determine the standards and requirements for the proposed expansion, staff noticed that daycare uses are not an allowed use in the M1 Zoning District. The first item on the list of permitted uses in the M-1 District is "any use permitted in the C-3 District, except that no occupancy permit shall be issued for any dwelling, school, hospital, clinic, or other institution for human care, except where incidental to a permitted principal use. Apparently, when the daycare center was built in 1999 staff did not notice that "institutions for human care" were excluded from the M-1 Zoning District. Since the use was not allowed when it was established, it has no rights to continue or to expand. The owner's representative has submitted a letter (attached) requesting consideration of a zoning code text amendment to allow daycare centers in the M -1 Light Industrial District.

## Analysis

In the City's 2019-2023 Consolidated Plan, which characterizes the current needs in the community for housing, safe and livable neighborhoods, public services, and opportunities for employment, daycare services were listed as a critical need in the community. Convenient access to quality daycare is essential to support the workforce in Cedar Falls and to attract new employers. The City's industrial and technology parks are some of the largest employment centers in the community. Locating daycare centers in these areas helps to reduce travel times and provides more flexibility in work schedules.

Zoning ordinances, particularly older zoning ordinances, often focus on the separation of land uses; in this case separating industrial uses from certain other uses. However, staff finds there are a number of reasons that allowing daycare uses in the light industrial zone is unlikely to be a concern.

- The M-1 Zone already allows a wide variety of uses, including office, retail, fitness centers, restaurants and other uses where people may often bring their children.
- The M-1 Zone is a light industrial zone intended for clean industry. The ordinance states that "no use shall be permitted or maintained which by reason of its nature or manner of operation is or may become hazardous, noxious or offensive owing to the emission of odor, dust, smoke,
cinders, gas, fumes, noise, vibrations, refuse matter or water-carried waste." These standards will help prevent nuisances and unhealthy conditions for daycare centers.
- Market factors will discourage daycare uses from locating where clients are unlikely to bring their children.
- Daycare uses are already allowed if accessory to an existing business in the M1 District. In other words, any industrial use could have an in-house daycare.
- A daycare has been operating on this particular site in the M-1 District since 1999 without any issues of concern.


## Discussion of Solutions

In order to allow daycare centers in the M-1 Zone, the zoning ordinance must be amended. Reasonable standards must be established for a daycare center within the context of the M-1 Zone. Staff recommends that the following changes be considered:

- Amend paragraph (1)a. within Section 26-173, M-1 Light Industrial District, as follows (underlined text is new language. Other language remains the same):
(1) Principal permitted uses. Permitted principal uses are as follows:
a. Any use permitted in the C-3 district, except that no occupancy permit shall be issued for any dwelling, school, hospital, clinic or other institution for human care, except:
i. Where said use is incidental to a permitted principal use; and
ii. Daycare uses, with the following standards: Outdoor play areas shall not be located in the required front yard and must be set back a minimum of 10 feet from side and rear lot lines and fenced and screened from abutting properties with trees or shrubbery to achieve a continuous visual screen that at maturity reaches a minimum 6 feet in height.
- Add a row for daycare uses to the dimensional standards table in paragraph (5) of Section 26-173, as follows:

| Use | Front Yard <br> depth | Side yard <br> width | Rear yard <br> depth |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{\text { Daycare }}$ | $\underline{25 \text { feet }}$ | $\underline{10 \text { feet }}$ | $\underline{25 \text { feet }}$ |

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of the amendments to the Zoning Code outlined above.

## PLANNING \& ZONING COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Discussion 2/23/2022

The next item for consideration by the Commission was a zoning text amendment for daycare uses in the M-1, Light Industrial District. Chair Leeper introduced the item and Ms. Howard provided background information. She explained that the City received an inquiry regarding an expansion of a daycare that is currently in the M-1 district. After investigation it was found that the building was built in 1999 and the daycare was
established sometime thereafter. However, daycare uses are not an allowed use in that district and the daycare has asked if there is a way to allow them to expand and continue to operate in that location. Upon analysis, there is a critical need for daycare services in the community. The City's Industrial and Technology Parks are large centers of employment and there is a need for daycare services in locations convenient to employment centers.

Ms. Howard discussed a number of reasons that allowing daycare uses may not be problematic. She noted that the zone is intended for light industrial uses, not heavy industrial, so does not allow uses that create lots of dust, odors, noise, and other nuisances that might be found in a heavy industrial area. In addition to light industrial, the zone allows a variety of general commercial uses, such as restaurants and offices where people are likely to bring their children. She also noted that daycare uses are currently allowed if they are an accessory to an existing business, i.e. an in-house daycare. The specific daycare being discussed serves as a case study and she noted that there have been no issues of concern over the 20 years it has been operating.

Ms. Howard discussed some suggested standards to consider with regard to changing the ordinance. Staff recommends discussion of the petition to allow daycare uses in the $\mathrm{M}-1$ District and setting a public hearing date for March 9 for formal consideration and recommendation to Council.

Ms. Lynch stated that there is a need for daycare in the Cedar Valley and would like there to be more options for families in the area. Ms. Moser agreed.

Ms. Lynch made a motion to set a public hearing. Ms. Moser seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously with 6 ayes (Crisman, Hartley, Leeper, Lynch, Moser and Saul), and 0 nays.

Karen Howard
architecture \& planning
Planning \& Community Services Manager
City of Cedar Falls
220 Clay Street
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50613

Re: Community United Child Care Center Nordic Drive, Cedar Falls

Dear Karen,
Based on our recent conversations we would like to request that the city consider amending the current M-1 zoning district to allow for child care facilities. As we have discussed the existing Community United Care Center (CUCCC) on Nordic Drive has been a child care facility in the M-1 District for many decades as the building was used by Head Start providing child care at this location prior to CUCCC using it for their current child care facility. CUCCC would like to expand their building and services at this location to help address the shortage child care in our area.

CUCCC has just received grant funding from the state to expand their operations at this location. The grant does require some significant progress be made by June 30, 2022 so we would like to move forward as quickly as possible with an amendment if it is going to happen so that CUCCC can take advantage of the state grants.

Amending the $\mathrm{M}-1$ district to allow child care facilities will be a benefit to all the typical uses that occur in this district. Having child care available in this zoning is a convenience for workers and saves time and travel by having child care near by peoples place of work. The child care function in this zoning will not be a detriment to any of the other allowed uses in the $\mathrm{M}-1$ zoning. Child care providers being located in the $\mathrm{M}-1$ zoning is a distinct amenity to all in the area by providing a much needed service.

This would also give large employers in the area the ability to provide separate on site child care facilities that could also benefit their employee recruitment and retention.

We feel this a beneficial amendment to the $\mathrm{M}-1$ zoning district and request that you move forward with the processes necessary to amend the $\mathrm{M}-1$ zoning district to allow child care as an approved use.

Sincerely,
Align Architecture \& Planning, PLC

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

City of Cedar Falls<br>220 Clay Street<br>Cedar Falls, Iowa 50613<br>Phone: 319-273-8600<br>Fax: 319-273-8610<br>www.cedarfalls.com

MEMORANDUM
Planning \& Community Services Division
TO: Planning \& Zoning Commission
FROM: Jaydevsinh Atodaria (JD), City Planner I
Matthew Tolan, Civil Engineer II
DATE: March 3, 2022
SUBJECT: The Autumn Ridge Master Plan Amendment

## REQUEST: Request to approve revised Autumn Ridge Master Plan

PETITIONER: BKND, Inc., Owner; CGA Engineering, Engineer
LOCATION: West of Union Road and south of W. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street

## PROPOSAL

It is proposed to amend the RP master plan for the Autumn Ridge development, which was originally approved in 2001. The proposed change includes the revision from previously platted Autumn Ridge $8^{\text {th }}$ and $9^{\text {th }}$ Addition in 2013 with single family dwellings to a mixture of single family dwellings and one unit bi-attached dwellings, thus increasing the density of the area. The proposed changes will be done in two phases, Autumn Ridge $9^{\text {th }}$ and $11^{\text {th }}$ Additions, and will be the final area of development in Autumn Ridge. Since there have been a number of smaller changes over the years to the RP Plan, it is important to update the master plan for the entire development, so that it reflects changes made in previously platted areas.

## PREVIOUS DISCUSSION AT P\&Z

The applicant brought the master plan amendment to include Autumn Ridge $9^{\text {th }}$ Addition for review at the November $24^{\text {th }} 2020$ Planning and Zoning meeting. At that time the proposal was to develop the area with 95 units ( 60 duplex units and 35 single family units), increasing the number of proposed units from the approved 58 single family units. At the meeting, staff proposed several conditions of approval of the amendment, including:

- adding sidewalk along Union Road to comply with the subdivision code;
- seeking an alternative solution to reduce the number and width of driveways and curb cuts in order to develop pedestrian friendly community and provide more room for street trees, and on-street parking; and
- incorporating common usable open space/park space to comply with the intent of the original master plan and development agreement to provide usable open space for area residents per the subdivision code standards;

These issues were discussed by the Planning and Zoning Commission. The Commission indicated that some changes should be made to address the issues. Meeting minutes from the Planning and Zoning Commission are included at the end of the report to sum up the discussion at P\&Z, which also highlights several public comments. After the meeting, the developer put the development on hold while they worked through some of the issues. Staff made suggestions for locations for some usable open space. The developer indicated they did not want to burden the homeowner's association with maintenance of the open space, so staff approached the Parks and Recreation Commission in December of 2020 to discuss whether the City would consider accepting public park space in this area. The Parks and Recreation Commission agreed that public open space is needed in this area and indicated that the land dedicated would need to be located and graded and of a size that would provide usable neighborhood park space. The applicant now brings forward a revised master plan for this last area of development within Autumn Ridge for consideration, which is the first step necessary before approval of a preliminary plat for the area.

## BACKGROUND

Autumn Ridge subdivision along Union Road has developed over the past 20 years beginning with a series of retirement condos and patio homes along Autumn Ridge Road coupled with an expansion of single family dwellings along Paddington Drive, Berry Hill Road and Shocker Road. A recent expansion in the Autumn Ridge Subdivision includes some single family dwellings and duplexes along Thresher Court and last year six six-plexes were also approved along Autumn Lane (Autumn Ridge $10^{\text {th }}$ Addition), which are currently in construction phase. In total, the entire Autumn Ridge development consists of approximately 105 acres of land reserved for a mixture of residential homes from single family dwelling units, retirement units, and condominiums.

In 2013, the owner submitted and received approval of a preliminary plat for the remaining additions in the subdivision (see attached). However, the RP Plan and associated developmental procedures agreement were not updated at the time to reflect those changes. With this application, the developer has submitted a revised preliminary plat for Autumn Ridge $9^{\text {th }}$ and $11^{\text {th }}$ Additions, which includes areas that were previously shown on the

TIMELINE OF AUTUMN RIDGE DEVELOPMENT

preliminary plat as the $8^{\text {th }}$ and $9^{\text {th }}$ Additions located in the northern portion of the development. The RP master plan and the developmental procedures agreement must be updated to reflect these proposed changes, prior to approval of the new preliminary plats for Autumn Ridge $9^{\text {th }}$ and $11^{\text {th }}$ Additions. See image above highlighting the timeline of entire Autumn Ridge Development. For more details, the same image is also attached as an attachment to staff report.

For any proposed development that is not consistent with the approved RP master plan, an amendment is required to be approved by Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council. The proposed new master plan possesses significant change from the original master plan and development agreement in terms of density of residential units, common public space/amenities and street connections. Therefore, both the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council must first review and approve the revised RP master plan prior to the approval of the preliminary plat for Autumn Ridge $9^{\text {th }}$ and $11^{\text {th }}$ Addition in the northern part of the Autumn Ridge development.

ZONING
The purpose of the R-P Planned Residence District is to permit the establishment of multi-use and integrated use residential developments and to provide for the orderly planned growth of residential developments in larger tracts of land. The RP District allows flexibility in the types of dwellings, the lot sizes, building heights and setbacks. However, to ensure that the area is developed in an orderly manner, provides for efficient traffic circulation between neighborhoods, and includes the necessary infrastructure to meet the needs of the future residents, a master plan must be submitted with the rezoning, which is adopted through a developmental procedures agreement.

The entire Autumn Ridge development is about 105 acres and was rezoned to R-P, Planned Residential District from A-1, Agricultural Zoning District in 2001. As part of that rezoning, an RP master plan (shown below) along with a developmental procedures agreement was approved for the entire development area. The original master plan illustrates a mix of housing types, a proposed layout for the streets, and a 3 to 5 acre lake which would serve as both a storm water retention/detention facility for much of the 105 acre development and as shared community space and trails around the perimeter of the lake. These various elements were also identified in the developmental procedures agreement.


Over the past 20 years, Autumn Ridge has been developed in many phases with increasing density in some areas and reductions in others, altering street connections and changing the types of housing as per the developer's market strategy. There were amendments to the RP Plan in 2005 and 2006 to reflect changes south of the east-west drainage way (Autumn Ridge $2^{\text {nd }}, 3^{\text {rd }}$, and $4^{\text {th }}$ Additions). However, the RP master plan was not updated in 2013 when significant changes were made with the preliminary plat for the $5^{\text {th }}$ through $9^{\text {th }}$ Additions. In particular, the lake surrounded by shared amenity space and trails shown on the master plan and called for in the developmental procedures agreement was eliminated from the proposed development. Over the years, other significant variations from the original plan include the elimination of the street connection across the drainage way, and changes to the housing types and locations.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

The Master Plan exhibit submitted with the current revised application highlights the two remaining phases ( $9^{\text {th }}$ and $11^{\text {th }}$ ) in the subdivision in context with the rest of the development in Autumn Ridge. The updated RP master plan proposed by the developer is described below, with areas of change from the original plan highlighted and staff recommendations noted.


Master Plan layout for Autumn Ridge $9^{\text {th }}$ and $11^{\text {th }}$ Additions:
The last remaining area of development for Autumn Ridge is located just south of W. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street and north of the east-west drainage way that separates the subject area from the developed portion of Autumn Ridge. This area will be accessed from both W. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street and Union Road. Wynnewood Drive would be extended westward from Union Road and streets would be stubbed
to the western boundary of the development to provide for future development to the west. The $9^{\text {th }}$ and $11^{\text {th }}$ Additions are planned to include 58 lots for single-unit bi-attached dwellings, 34 single-family lots and public park space. The area will be developed in two phases: Phase 1 will be Autumn Ridge $9^{\text {th }}$ Addition, which will include 45 lots ( 19 single family units and 26 single-unit bi-attached dwellings); and Phase 2 will be Autumn Ridge $11^{\text {th }}$ Addition, which will include 47 lots ( 15 single family units, 32 single-unit bi-attached dwellings and a little over one acre of public park space).

## Street Connectivity

While a street connection to the south was never realized with previous subdivision plats, the current proposal is well thought with provision of future street connection/access points to surrounding undeveloped areas, including a street stub (Braeburn Drive) to provide a connection to the undeveloped properties just north of the subdivision, a critical connection of Aronia Drive to $1^{\text {st }}$ Street, and two stubs going west with continuation of Wynnewood Drive and Channel Drive, to allow future development west of Autumn Ridge.

## Residential Density and Housing Types

The proposal includes an increase in density from the 2013 preliminary plat (see attached), as it only included proposal for 58 single family units whereas, the current proposal includes 34 single family units and 58 single-unit bi-attached dwellings. However, as shown in the submitted master plan exhibit, the overall density of the Autumn Ridge development is not changing as approved in 2001, since areas developed in the southern portion of the development are lower in density than originally proposed.

| Proposed Autumn Ridge Additions |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phases | No. of Lots | No. of Single-family <br> units | No. of single-unit bi- <br> attached dwellings |
| $9^{\text {th }}$ <br> Addition | 45 | 19 | 26 |
| $11^{\text {h }}$ <br> Addition | 47 | 15 | 32 |
| Total | $\mathbf{9 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 8}$ |

## Project Phasing:

The applicant proposes final platting the area in two phases: Autumn Ridge $9^{\text {th }}$ Addition in Phase 1, which is located in the northern section of the subdivision; and Autumn Ridge $11^{\text {th }}$ Addition in Phase 2. Staff notes that Phase 1 is topographically higher in elevation than Phase 2 which will require utilities to be installed through the Phase 2 area to serve Phase 1. This aspect will be discussed in more detail in the staff report for the preliminary plat.

## Street and Sidewalk Connections

Over 20 years of time, there have been many changes in the subdivision. Street connectivity is important to provide good access to properties, distribute traffic and reduce congestion and emergency response times, and to provide opportunities for future development on abutting properties. In addition, establishing pedestrian connections throughout neighborhoods promotes walkability and safe passage for pedestrians.

With a previous change to the RP Plan, the street connection across the drainage way was eliminated, which effectively separates the proposed $9^{\text {th }}$ and $11^{\text {th }}$ Addition, from the remainder of
the development to the south. While this street connection has been eliminated, there is still an opportunity to connect the northern and southern sections of the neighborhood with a sidewalk along Union Road. The developer will be adding the sidewalks both along the Union Road and $\mathrm{W} 1^{\text {st }}$ Street to comply by city's subdivision ordinance. As noted at the P\&Z meeting in November 2020, this will leave a small missing segment of the sidewalk along Union Road between Paddington Dr. and southern edge of proposed Autumn Ridge 11 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Addition. After discussions with the developer, the City has agreed to construct this segment as a capital improvement project, and it is now listed in the recently updated Capital Improvements Program (CIP).
While there are missing sidewalk segments in a number of areas within previous platted areas of Autumn Ridge, the subdivision code allows sidewalks to be installed as development occurs. Construction is ongoing in Autumn Ridge $6{ }^{\text {th }}$ Addition, Autumn Ridge $8^{\text {th }}$ Addition and Autumn Ridge $10^{\text {th }}$ Addition. Sidewalk segments will be constructed as homes are developed and will be required for the remaining areas as they are platted. City Staff notes the importance of following through on the commitment to install sidewalks as lots are developed to ensure better livability of the community.

As per City Code Section 20.5 - C-(10) and section 20.5 - C-(11), public sidewalks shall be installed at the time of new building construction on new or recently platted lots or within five years following final subdivision approval. The deed of dedication with the subdivision notes the same as well. City staff notes that the public sidewalks will be installed by the developer to continue allowing connected pedestrian movement across the subdivision to ensure walkability throughout the subdivision.

## Residential Density and Mix of Housing Types

The developer is proposing to increase the number of bi-attached dwellings and reduce some of the lot sizes for the single family units in the proposed Autumn Ridge ${ }^{\text {th }}$ and $11^{\text {th }}$ Addition in response to market demand. The City supports the idea of additional density and a variety of housing types to serve the needs of the community. The proposed master plan shows that the single family units are proposed along the perimeter of the development including the lots abutting Union Road, W. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street and along the western boundary of the development. The biattached units are proposed in the central section of the proposed $9^{\text {th }}$ and $11^{\text {th }}$ Additions.

Staff is supportive of the increased residential density. Providing a variety of housing types and sizes provide opportunities for people of all incomes and age groups to live in the community. For example, first time homebuyers, empty nesters, and retirees may find attached dwellings to be an attractive and affordable option to meet their needs. However, as currently proposed, all of the bi-attached units will have street-facing garages. This will result in an excessive number of driveway curb cuts (see attached driveway exhibit). With this many curb cuts, there will be little room for on-street parking, sidewalk continuity will be compromised and front yards will be largely paved. City Staff made a number of suggestions to the developer that could help alleviate this concern. The developer has indicated that they would like to move forward with the proposal with the street-facing garages, but to address the issue is proposing to add a clause in the developmental procedures agreement and deed of dedication stating that all lots equal to or less than 60 feet in width will be limited to maximum driveway width of 18 feet at the curb-line.

## Community Space/Shared usable open space:

As per the original development procedural agreement at the time of rezoning, a reserved open space for community was shown to be developed to enhance the livability of the entire neighborhood. Staff notes that as per City Code Section 20-6 (g), "all residential subdivisions
shall be so designed as to meet the neighborhood park and open space needs of its residents. Such needs may be met by dedication and acceptance of public park land/or by reservation by covenant of private open space." City staff believes that having a usable park space in the Autumn Ridge is important to the livability of the area and aligns with both the minimum subdivision standards and with the principles of the R-P, Planned Residence District.

While staff is not opposed to the elimination of the wet-bottomed retention stormwater basin (lake), elimination of the shared open space and amenities entirely is not recommended. In response, developer has included Outlot 1 in the proposed master plan, which is labeled as "Green Space or Park Space." The green space is proposed to be included in the second phase of development. This green space will need to be carefully graded and seeded to provide usable park space (more details about the proposed park space are included in the preliminary plat staff report). Staff also notes that the developer proposes a sidewalk connection to access the park space from the Union Road sidewalk, to provide easy accessibility to park space for all residents of Autumn Ridge, both north and south of the drainage way. This sidewalk connection will require the developer to collect and convey the previously established Union Road drainage ditch into a storm sewer pipe that will release southerly adjacent to the Union Road culvert structure. Additional grading will be done to tie the southerly limit of the park space into the existing stormwater detention facility.

Notification of Surrounding Property Owners:
City Staff sent a courtesy notice to the surrounding property owners on $1^{\text {st }}$ March 2022.

## OUTSTANDING ISSUES

A revision to the existing developmental procedures agreement will be required to make it consistent with the revision to the RP Master Plan. The agreement and the deed of dedication for the preliminary plat of Autumn Ridge $9^{\text {th }}$ and $11^{\text {th }}$ Additions must also be consistent. The applicant has submitted a rough draft of the agreement, which is under review by City staff and the City Attorney.

Staff is forwarding the proposal to amend the master plan for discussion, as any comments or suggestions for changes by the Commission may affect the provisions included in the developmental procedures agreement.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION
The introduction of this master plan amendment is for discussion and public comment. City staff recommends continuing the discussion to the next Planning and Zoning meeting.

## PLANNING \& ZONING COMMISSION

Previous Chair Holst noted that he would need to recuse himself from the item and passed discussion the item to Vice Chair Leeper. Vice Chair Leeper introduced the item and noted that at P\&Z
11/24/2020 the agenda items are all for public input and will not be voted on at this time. Mr. Atodaria provided background information explaining that the entire development is approximately 105 acres and has developed over a 20 year timeframe. An RP Master Plan was amended in 2001 and the entire area was rezoned from Agriculture to RP and there were five different areas created in the area. Mr. Atodaria showed a rendering of the development and explained the different kinds of development were planned for each area. There were other amendments made in 2005 and 2006 to reflect changes in the $2^{\text {nd }}, 3^{\text {rd }}$ and $4^{\text {th }}$ Additions. In 2013 the developer submitted a
preliminary plat for the $5^{\text {th }}, 6^{\text {th }}, 7^{\text {th }}, 8^{\text {th }}$ and $9^{\text {th }}$ Additions that included a proposed 31 lots in the $8^{\text {th }}$ Addition and 27 in the $9^{\text {th }}$, but the master plan was not updated at that time. He showed a rendering of the subdivision today and the breakdown of the 10 additions. He described the units that are proposed to be added to the $9^{\text {th }}$ and $10^{\text {th }}$ additions.

Mr. Atodaria discussed the amendments to the $9^{\text {th }}$ Addition, noting staff concerns with excessive paving along street frontages that would add congestion to the streets, diminish on-street parking, create less sidewalk continuity and reduce room for landscaped front yards or street trees. Staff has provided suggestions that could alleviate the excessive curb cuts, such as bi-attached units or townhomes with alley loaded garages or common driveway for attached units and limited the size to two car garages. Staff also has noted concerns with sidewalk connections along Union Road and community space/shared usable open space. Mr. Atodaria discussed suggestions provided by staff for these issues.

Mr. Atodaria then discussed the proposed amendment to the $10^{\text {th }}$ Addition and the number of units to be added in the area. He explained that staff has reviewed the master plan and recommends some changes to the Master Plan prior to approval. These include:

- Providing a usable open space to enhance the livability of community in the $9^{\text {th }}$ Addition, as was anticipated in the original master plan.
- Reduction of the number and size of proposed curb cuts for the proposed attached units in the $9^{\text {th }}$ Addition.
- Provision of a public sidewalk along Union Road from the $9^{\text {th }}$ Addition to Paddington Drive to comply with the subdivision code and deed of dedication requirements.

At this time, staff asked for comments and suggestions from the public and the Commission.

Dennis Happel spoke about the lake detention that was taken out of the development early on as they felt that the uncontrolled runoff to the west on the farm ground would soon cause it to fall into disarray due to the siltation. During the review of Autumn Ridge $6^{\text {th }}$ and $7^{\text {th }}$ in 2016, it was taken out by City staff due to the large stormwater issue that needed to be addressed. The large stormwater detention that was put into those additions was to help curb the runoff issues being discussed. With regard to the sidewalk, it has gone through the approval of two plats for that area and at that time staff felt it did not need to be installed because of the large bike trail across the street. He stated that they are not opposed to putting the sidewalk in from across the $9^{\text {th }}$ Addition for a connection, but feels the City should be responsible for the rest. He discussed the parking issue that has been a concern and stated that there are other areas in town where similar concepts are used and there is not a problem with the on-street parking. They are trying to provide an affordable product for housing in the area and feel that adding an addition alley would create extra expense to the homeowners and costs for upkeep. They feel that housing mixture they have presented complements the area and is a good plan.

Jesse Meehan, 4305 Berry Hill, lives near the drainage ditch between the properties and stated that their houses were built with low water entry points and with FEMA remapping the area, residents are not able to refinance without getting flood
insurance. He believes that increasing the number of houses will create more runoff and problems. He asked if the duplex lots could potentially be single-family if that's what the owner prefers and if the houses were going to be "cookie cutter" and look the same. He would like to see some uniqueness in the area. He feels that if green space is proposed, it shouldn't be like the current green space. He also asked if the City is going to maintain a park if one is planned.

Doug Stanford, President of the Fieldstone Homeowners Association speaking for the Board of Directors, explained that a letter was presented to Stephanie Sheetz expressing their concerns with the project. He noted that they are concerned with the increased housing density in Autumn Ridge $9^{\text {th }}$ and the traffic issues on Union Road. They feel that the increased density will intensify the traffic congestion and feels that it may be time to consider some upgrades to Union Road. The Board is also concerned with potential stormwater runoff issues with the addition of new construction that could potentially damage a pond in the development.

Robert Zoulek, Autumn Ridge resident, asked how the developer will ensure that the elevations with the additional runoff will not worsen the current issues.

Lyle Simmons, asked what impact studies have been done and how can they find the information regarding the potential effects of this project.

Dennis Happel reiterated the planned housing units and explained that the stormwater issue was addressed in 2016 with the large detention area. It has been reviewed and the impact of these additional additions was addressed back in the planning of previous additions. He also stated that they will not be the only builder in the development so there should not be an issue with "cookie cutter" design. As for the traffic issues, the developer has provided all the access the city has asked for and explained that Union Road issues would be more of a city matter. He also noted that the damage to the pond was not a result of Autumn Ridge.

Adam Daters, CGA Engineers, added that the traffic engineer for the project did simulations that showed that there was very little impact from the traffic increase.

Cindy Luchtenberg, resident in the Autumn Ridge area, questioned the approval process of which builder can build in the addition. She stated concerns with the effect this project could have on their ability to hook up to city water and sewer and the costs involved.

Mr. Meehan feels that the detention pond will not help with the issues that could arise.

Willis Roberts noted that he feels there will be additional traffic flow problems based on the layout proposed.

Mr. Happel explained that the developer or the building committee approve the configuration and design of the homes to keep the character of the neighborhood intact. He discussed the planned housing in the garden home area and explained that those are not geared to be rentals. He stated that the runoff has been addressed and numerous studies have been done and that it will not be an issue. He also addressed the comment regarding sewer hookup and explained that they have no control over how it fits someone's property.

Amber Hines feels that the proposed housing does not match the character of the current neighborhoods.

Mr. Happel stated that they have mixed in multi-unit housing well in other areas of the neighborhoods and doesn't feel it will be an issue.

Mr. Schrad asked about the lot sizes proposed for duplexes. Ms. Howard explained that the lot line shown is for one side of the duplex as they are considered to be a "bi- attached" single-family dwellings, with each side on its own lot. Mr. Schrad also feels that there needs to be a park and asked if the City would take care of it. Planning staff spoke with the Parks Department and they would be amenable to looking at a proposal for a public park in that area.

Mr. Larson asked if there were any metrics used to decide that this one parcel needed to have a park or what motivated the decision. He was under the impression that this area was going to be more senior driven and wondered how that would serve that community. Ms. Howard explained that the park would service the whole Autumn Ridge neighborhood as opposed to just one addition. A park would also fill the need for open space requirements. Mr. Larson asked about the proposal process for a park. Ms. Howard explained that the developer would need to submit a plan and the Parks Department would review the proposal.

Vice Chair Leeper asked about stormwater setup for the area. Mr. Tolan explained that with this subdivision and subsequent subdivisions, regional detention was set up utilizing an existing culvert under Union Road and a secondary detention basin series. All detention for the entire area was already included in the 2012 study and has already been installed.

Ms. Saul stated she is concerned with all the paving and driveways with regard to walkability and safety and asked if there is a way to mitigate that. Mr. Larson asked about the maximum allowable width when curb cuts are directly abutting. Mr. Tolan provided information in response.

Vice Chair Leeper stated that he felt the developer should work with the City to address the concerns that have been expressed and then come back to the Commission after that.

Mr. Larson asked about the continuation of the sidewalk from the previous phases. He would like to know if there is a legal obligation to put the paths in. Ms. Howard stated that there is a requirement in the subdivision code that allows sidewalks to be put in post-development and requires it to be completed within five years of the completion of the plat. Mr. Larson asked a few more questions.

Vice Chair Leeper stated that he would like to hear more from the Commission to give some direction to the developer on whether they agree with the comments and recommendations from staff. Mr. Schrad stated that he agrees with the recommendations from staff but does recommend that the developer listen to the comments from neighbors. Mr. Larson felt the park and the sidewalk situations are important for further consideration. Ms. Saul and Ms. Lynch agreed.

The item was continued to the next meeting.

Discussion
03/09/2022

# Cedar Falls Planning and Zoning Commission <br> March 9, 2022 
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DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

City of Cedar Falls<br>220 Clay Street<br>Cedar Falls, Iowa 50613<br>Phone: 319-273-8600<br>Fax: 319-273-8610<br>www.cedarfalls.com

MEMORANDUM
Planning \& Community Services Division
TO: Planning \& Zoning Commission
FROM: Jaydevsinh Atodaria (JD), City Planner I
Matthew Tolan, Civil Engineer II
DATE: March 3, 2022
SUBJECT: The Autumn Ridge $9^{\text {th }}$ and $11^{\text {th }}$ Addition Preliminary Plat

REQUEST: To approve Autumn Ridge $9^{\text {th }}$ and $11^{\text {th }}$ Addition Preliminary Plat
PETITIONER: BKND, Inc., Owner; CGA Engineering, Engineer
LOCATION: The property is located west of Union Road and south of W. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street in Autumn Ridge Subdivision

## PROPOSAL

It is proposed to create 92 units, south of W. . $^{\text {st }}$ Street and west of Union road in the Autumn Ridge Subdivision. The proposed Subdivision of Autumn Ridge $9^{\text {th }}$ and $11^{\text {th }}$ addition includes development of 34 Single family units, 58 single-family bi-attached units and dedicating a public park space to City of Cedar Falls.

## PREVIOUS DISCUSSION AT P\&Z

The applicant brought the preliminary plat for Autumn Ridge $9^{\text {th }}$ Addition for review at November $24^{\text {th }}, 2020$ Planning and Zoning Meeting. At the time the proposal was to develop the area with 95 units ( 60 duplex units and 35 single family units), increasing the number of proposed units from the approved 58 single family units during the amendment of R-P master plan in 2013 for the Autumn Ridge subdivision. At the meeting, the preliminary plat was just introduced and city staff advised that approve the R-P master plan amendment would be required prior to approval of the preliminary plat. Because the master plan amendment was not approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission, no detailed discussion of the preliminary plat of Autumn Ridge $9^{\text {th }}$ addition was done except the initial introduction. This report provides a more detailed analysis of the current proposal for a preliminary plat for Autumn Ridge $9^{\text {th }}$ and $11^{\text {th }}$ Additions. It was divided into two Additions, since the development is proposed to be final platted in two phases.

## BACKGROUND

BKND, Inc. has submitted a preliminary plat for review, subject to approval of the amendment to the master plan. This preliminary plat encompasses the final area of development in Autumn Ridge. Autumn Ridge subdivision along Union Road has developed over the past 20 years beginning with a series of retirement condos and patio homes along the Autumn Ridge Road
coupled with an expansion of single family dwellings along Paddington Drive, Berry Hill Road and Shocker Road. A recent expansion in the Autumn Ridge Subdivision includes some single family dwellings and duplexes along Thresher Court and last year six six-plexes were also approved along Autumn Lane, which are currently in construction phase. In total, the entire Autumn Ridge development consists of approximately 105 acres of land reserved for a mixture of residential homes from single family dwelling units, retirement units, and condominiums. In 2013, the owner submitted and got approval of a preliminary plat for the remaining additions in the subdivision. However, there was no Master Plan amendment done at the time.

The developer now proposes to change the preliminary plat for the area shown on the 2013 preliminary plat as the $8^{\text {th }}$ and $9^{\text {th }}$ Additions. Since there has already been a final plat approved for an $8^{\text {th }}$ Addition and $10^{\text {th }}$ Addition, the subject area must be platted as the $9^{\text {th }}$ and $11^{\text {th }}$ Additions.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

## ZONING

The proposed Subdivision plat includes 92 lots on 22.75(approx.) acres of land which will be accessed from W. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street from the north and Union Road from the east. The property is zoned RP, Planned Residential which permits a variety of uses subject to an approved master development plan. In 2013 approved preliminary plat was approved for this area with 58 single family lots. As stated above, the applicant is requesting approval of a new preliminary plat of what was formerly approved as Autumn Ridge $8^{\text {th }}$ Addition and $9^{\text {th }}$ Addition. The proposed preliminary plat will reduce the number of single family lots from 58 to 34 with the remaining area proposed for 58 single-unit bi-attached dwellings, thereby changing the unit types and increasing the number of units.

The purpose of the R-P Planned Residence District is to permit the establishment of multi-use and integrated use residential developments and to provide for the orderly planned growth of residential developments in larger tracts of land. The RP District allows flexibility in the types of dwellings, the lot sizes, building heights and setbacks. However, to ensure that the area is developed in an orderly manner, provides for efficient traffic circulation between neighborhoods, and includes the necessary infrastructure to meet the needs of the future residents, a master plan must be submitted with the rezoning, which is adopted through a developmental procedures agreement. It is also intended that such planned residence districts be designed and developed in substantial conformity with the standards of the comprehensive plan and with recognized principals of civic design, land use planning and landscape architecture.

Setbacks equal to what is required in the R-4 Zoning District are required around the perimeter of the RP District. Therefore, where lots back up to the perimeter of the development, the setback is 30 feet to match the rear yard setback in the R-4 Zone. There is only one instance where the side lot line abuts the RP District boundary, Lot 37 . For this lot, the R-4 side lot standard for single family unit of $10 \%$ of the lot width would apply. The perimeter setback of 30 feet requirement does not apply to the southern boundary of the $9^{\text {th }}$ Addition, as it does not abut a perimeter boundary of the RP District. The perimeter setback is shown on the Preliminary Plat, but staff notes that the same needs to be labeled as well. The deed of dedication, developmental procedures agreement along with the new revised Master Plan and preliminary plat will outline the minimum building setback standards for all lots in the subdivision. The lots as proposed satisfy minimum lot width and area criteria as specified in R-P, Planned Residential zoning district.

## SUBDIVISION PHASING

The proposed plat includes two phases (Autumn Ridge $9^{\text {th }}$ and $11^{\text {th }}$ Additions) which will be accessed from Union Road and W. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street. According to the phasing plan (attached), the development will proceed from north to south. When final plats are submitted, they must match the proposed phasing plan and will need to ensure that all infrastructure necessary to serve the specific final plat area will be constructed prior to approval.

Developer proposes thirty-four (34) single family units and fifty-eight (58) bi-attached units for the proposed addition. The development is phased in two phases as highlighted below.

| Proposed Autumn Ridge Additions |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phases | No. of Lots | No. of Single-family <br> units | No. of one unit bi- <br> attached units |
| $9^{\text {th }}$ | 45 | 19 | 26 |
| Addition | 47 | 15 | 32 |
| $11^{\text {h }}$ <br> Addition | $\mathbf{9 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 8}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{9 2}$ |  |  |

Details of the proposed single family lots:
Proposed preliminary plat will include 34 single family units, with developing 19 units in the first phase and 15 units in the second phase.

## Setbacks:

As per the R-P, Residential Planned zoning district, there is no minimum yard or height requirements except that the minimum yards, as specified in the R-4 residence district shall be provided around the boundaries of the planned residence district. The perimeter setbacks are described in the zoning section above. The developer proposes the following minimum setbacks for the development of single family units in the plat.

Minimum Front Yard setback $=20$ feet
Minimum Side Yard setback $=10 \%$ of Lot width (at 20 feet setback)
Minimum Rear Yard setback $=30$ feet
City staff finds that the setbacks will be appropriate for the development of proposed single family units. However, we note that the proposed single family lots along Aronia Drive are fairly shallow in depth. Shallow depth lots with rear drainage easements have caused some issues in other subdivisions. Homeowners often desire to fence their rear yards for privacy, but since fences are not allowed in drainage easements, the rear yard area may be smaller than homeowners anticipate. Home designs on these lots should be carefully chosen to ensure adequate rear yard space. City staff notes that the proposed setbacks should be mentioned in the deed of dedication.

## Lot size:

As per the R-P, Residential Planned zoning district, the lot area requirements in the single family units area of planned residence district shall be similar to the one mentioned in the R-4 Residence district.

|  |  |  |  |  | Side Yard Width ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Use | Lot <br> Area | Lot <br> Width | Lot <br> Area <br> per Unit | Front <br> Yard <br> Depth <br> 1 | Least on <br> Any One <br> Side | Minimum <br> Sum <br> of Both Sides | Rear <br> Yard <br> Depth |
| One- <br> unit | 6,000 <br> square <br> feet | 60 <br> feet | 6,000 <br> square <br> feet | 20 feet | $10 \%$ of lot <br> width | - | 30 <br> feet |

Proposed single family unit lot size varies from 6,596 sq.ft to 12,990 sq.ft in area, so meets this requirement of the RP District.

## Details of the proposed bi-attached lots:

Proposed preliminary plat will include 58 lots intended for single-unit bi-attached dwellings, developing 26 units in the first phase and 32 units in the second phase.

## Setbacks:

As per the R-P, Residential Planned zoning district, there is no minimum yard or height requirements except that the minimum yards, as specified in the $\mathrm{R}-4$ residence district shall be provided around the boundaries of the planned residence district. Developer proposes the following minimum setbacks for the development of the bi-attached lots in the plat.

Minimum Front Yard setback $=20$ feet
Minimum Side Yard setback $=20 \%$ of Lot width (at 20 feet setback)
Minimum Rear Yard setback $=30$ feet
City staff notes that the proposed setbacks should be mentioned in the deed of dedication.
Lot size:
As per the R-P, Residential Planned zoning district, the lot area requirements in the one unit biattached dwelling units area of planned residence district shall be similar to the one mentioned in the R-4 Residence district.

|  |  |  |  |  | Side Yard Width ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Use | Lot <br> Area | Lot <br> Width | Lot Area <br> per Unit | Front <br> Yard <br> Depth <br> 1 | Least on <br> Any One <br> Side | Minimum <br> Sum <br> of Both <br> Sides | Rear <br> Yard <br> Depth |
| One-unit bi- <br> attached <br> dwellings | 4,000 <br> square <br> feet | 30 <br> feet | 4,000 <br> square <br> feet | feet | 20 | $20 \%$ of <br> lot width |  |

Proposed single-unit bi-attached dwelling lot size varies from 5,878 sq.ft to 12,855 sq.ft in area, so meets the requirements of the RP District. City staff notes that the developer has provided two examples of type of unit that they will be implementing (see below), In general, for the narrower lots intended for bi-attached units, the designs will need to be carefully planned to ensure that minimum side setback requirements can be met.


City staff notes that the duplex units are all proposed with front-loaded garages. As described in the staff report for the RP Master Plan amendment, staff is concerned about the effect that so many driveways and curb cuts will have on the livability of the neighborhood, as there will be little room for on-street parking, street trees, or landscaped front yards. Driveway paving will cover a significant portion of the front yards and interrupt the sidewalk along the street.

The developer has indicated that they would like to move forward with the proposal and to address the issue of wider driveways and curb cuts, developer is proposing to add clause in the deed of dedication stating that all approaches and driveway in the development be no more than 18 feet wide at the front lot line. For lots with 3-car garages, driveways may then be flared out in a manner that meets the zoning code standards, so there is separation between the public sidewalk and any extended area beyond the 18 foot width. While staff is still concerned about this issue and the quality of the neighborhood streetscape it will produce, we are accepting of this solution.

## Public Sidewalks:

To provide for pedestrian circulation public sidewalks are required along the west side of Union Road bordering the eastern boundary of subdivision and south side of W $1^{\text {st }}$ Street bordering the northern boundary of subdivision. These sidewalks must be installed with the $9^{\text {th }}$ Addition. Public sidewalks, minimum 4 -feet in width, must also be constructed along all internal streets within the subdivision to provide for pedestrian circulation. A mid-block sidewalk connection will be constructed in the second phase of development ( $11^{\text {th }}$ Addition) between the Union Road sidewalk and Channel Drive to provide easy access for residents in the southern part of Autumn Ridge to the park that will be developed in the $11^{\text {th }}$ Addition.

## Community Space/Shared usable Open Space:

In the November 2020 staff report, staff recommended amending the preliminary plat to include a minimum of 2 acres of shared open space to meet the subdivision code requirement for open space and to comply with the spirit of the originally adopted RP Master Plan and developmental procedures agreement, as described in more detail in the staff report for the proposed amendment to the RP Master Plan. In response, developer has included Outlot 1 (1.15 acres),
which will be conveyed to the City of Cedar Falls to develop the area as a public park space. Outlot 1 will be developed in the second phase of development ( $11^{\text {th }}$ Addition). City staff notes that the proposed park space must be graded so that most of the area is usable. Outlot 1 slopes toward the drainageway to the south. In order to create relatively level usable park space, the southern and western edge of the Outlot will need to be more steeply sloped. The deed of dedication will need to outline the conditions under which the City will accept this area as public park space. In general, it must be graded and seeded according to City standards to provide level park space for City staff to maintain after acceptance and conveyance to City. Staff also notes that the developer will be adding a sidewalk connection to access the Park from the Union Road, to provide good public access to the park. This sidewalk connection will require the developer to collect and convey the previously established Union Road drainage ditch into a storm sewer pipe that will release southerly adjacent to the Union Road culvert structure. Additional grading will be done to tie the southerly limit of the park space into the existing stormwater detention facility.

Notification of Surrounding Property Owners:
City Staff sent a courtesy notice to the surrounding property owners on $1^{\text {st }}$ March 2022.
The applicant has submitted the deed of dedication, which has been attached with the packet for reference. City staff notes that the draft deed of dedication is still under review and hopes that all the needed changes will be made before the next Planning and Zoning meeting.

## TECHNICAL COMMENTS

Utilities - City technical staff, including Cedar Falls Utilities (CFU) personnel, noted that the water, electric, gas and communication services are available to the site. The developer is responsible for the construction of a properly sized water system from the existing 12" water mains on the east side of Union Road on Wynnewood Drive and the northwest end of Berry Hill Road in the easement to the north. Included in the installation are valves, fire hydrants and water service stubs for the new lots. Water main sizing and fire hydrant and valve placement locations will need to be finalized during water construction plan review. The developer is responsible for the cost of the streetlight installations required for any City streets.

Stormwater Management - City Staff has concerns over public comments regarding localized flooding adjacent to previously established basins. These concerns were reviewed by the developers engineer and provided staff with a written memorandum outlining the existing detention volumes and rates were still acceptable and within tolerance from the originally designed stormwater facility. Secondly, concerns were raised by staff regarding the current state of the existing drainage facility regarding the need to clear and grub the basin to restore its capacity. After review by the developer's engineer, the current drainage capacity is being met. However, the City will require that the drainage facility be cleared and grubbed in a manner acceptable to the City Engineer prior to any final plat approval. Lastly, concerns were made by adjacent property owners on the southerly side of the drainage facility and the preliminary floodplain maps. Staff acknowledges the widening of the flood boundaries; however the $9^{\text {th }}$ and $11^{\text {th }}$ Additions, the subject of this review, will not be constructed in a manner that will change the floodplain or affect the FEMA flood insurance rate maps.

The petitioner's engineer has previously submitted a storm water management plan to the City and it has been reviewed by the City Engineer. The City Engineer has determined that the plan meets the City's subdivision requirements and also finds that the design will improve the drainage pattern that has developed over the years on this undeveloped parcel of land.

Following is a summary of the proposed stormwater management system:
A regional detention facility was constructed as a part of Autumn Ridge $5^{\text {th }}$ addition that utilized an existing culvert structure under Union Rd. The stormwater facilities are platted currently under Autumn Ridge $5^{\text {th }}$ Addition. However, the facility is sized to serve the additional area of Autumn Ridge $9^{\text {th }}$ and $11^{\text {th }}$ Additions. For Autumn Ridge $9^{\text {th }}$ and $11^{\text {th }}$ Additions, stormwater will be collected either in the street with intakes or captured by overland swales within protected drainage easements and will be conveyed to the regional detention area. Collection from street intakes will be captured and piped to the southern waterway previously established in Autumn Ridge $5^{\text {th }}$ Addition. Likewise, the overland drainage swales will convey rear-yard drainage swales into intakes to be collected by the storm sewer network.

During construction, it will be the responsibility of the developer to clear and grub around the existing detention facility by way of the established maintenance and repair agreement to ensure proper functionality. It will also be the developer's responsibility to develop and maintain a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan that will limit onsite erosion from construction related activities, as outline by City Code. Compliance with these requirements will help to reduce sedimentation within the stormwater facilities.

Sanitary Sewer - The sanitary sewer will be extended from an existing manhole located north of the existing Union Road culvert and along the West side of Union Road. The sanitary sewer will be extended northerly across Outlot 1, and then extended along the proposed street network to service each lot. The sanitary sewer will be extended to the limits of the plat on the westerly and northerly sides, per the City's subdivision ordinance in order to accommodate future growth.

## Concerns on Phasing

Staff is supportive of development starting on the north, so that street connections will be made to both Union Road and $1^{\text {st }}$ Street to provide good traffic circulation. However, staff notes that Autumn Ridge $9^{\text {th }}$ Addition in Phase 1 is topographically higher in elevation than Autumn Ridge $11^{\text {th }}$ in Phase 2 which will require utilities to be installed through the Phase 2 area to serve Phase 1. This will require that all the utilities including storm sewers and storm water channels and the sanitary sewer must be extended from existing infrastructure from the south to the Phase 1 area. Staff notes that with the phasing as proposed all the necessary infrastructure must be installed from the south as necessary to serve the needs of the $1^{\text {st }}$ Phase (Autumn Ridge $9^{\text {th }}$ Addition). An alternate phasing plan that would include within the $1^{\text {st }}$ Phase the eastern edge of the development (the north-south leg of Channel Drive and abutting lots, including Outlot 1, which contains extension of the sanitary sewer connection) is recommended. However, regardless of the phasing, a final plat will not be approved unless all infrastructure is installed to meet City standards to serve the area being developed. This requirement shall be detailed in the draft deed of dedication.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The introduction of this preliminary plat is for discussion and public comment. City staff recommends continuing the discussion to the next Planning and Zoning meeting.

PLANNING \& ZONING COMMISSION
Introduction\&
Discussion
03/09/2022

Cedar Falls Planning and Zoning Commission
March 9, 2022
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## DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

City of Cedar Falls<br>220 Clay Street<br>Cedar Falls, Iowa 50613<br>Phone: 319-273-8600<br>Fax: 319-273-8610<br>www.cedarfalls.com

MEMORANDUM
Planning \& Community Services Division
TO: Planning and Zoning Commission
FROM: Jaydevsinh Atodaria (JD), City Planner I
Luke Andreasen, PE, Principal Engineer
DATE: March 3, 2022
SUBJECT: RP District Site Plan for the Cove at Spruce Hills Townhomes (SP21-013)

REQUEST: RP Site Plan of the Cove at Spruce Hills Townhomes
PETITIONER: Brian Wingert (Developer); The Cove at Spruce Hills LLC (Owner); Snyder \& Associates, INC. (Engineer)

LOCATION: The 7-acre property is located north of Greenhill Road and east of Spruce Hills Drive

## PROPOSAL

The developer is proposing to build 30, 2-story townhome units within six buildings (4 five-unit townhome buildings, one four-unit townhome building, and one six-unit townhome building) on the last remaining undeveloped area of Heritage Hills Estates $2^{\text {nd }}$ Addition subdivision. The proposed development will be on Tract $F$ of Heritage Hills Estates $2^{\text {nd }}$ Addition subdivision, which was reserved for multi-family development as per the approved RP Master Plan for the area. The proposed six buildings will be accessed through the extension of Spruce Hill Drive to the east and Spruce Creek Drive running north-south, both of which would be private streets. As per the subdivision code, a tract can only be developed if the tract area is re-platted to create a developable parcel. It is anticipated that a minor plat will be forwarded to the Commission at the next meeting to establish the new lot for development. City staff notes that the proposed site plan cannot be approved before approval of the minor plat, but it is forwarded for introduction and discussion at this time.

## BACKGROUND

In the summer of 2004, the entire property of 19.12 acres (presently known as "Heritage Hills Estates Second Addition Subdivision") was rezoned to RP, Planned Residence District, for the construction of one and two-family residences, multifamily dwellings, and condominiums for a density not to exceed 4.47 dwelling units per acre. In the winter of 2014, the RP plan (see below and attached) was amended to change the centralized area of multi-family dwellings to singlefamily dwellings. This RP Master Plan reflected the proposed final subdivision plat and also established other proposed uses on the remaining acreage (i.e. multi-family and a commercial area). With the amendment, it was stated that the multifamily area will have a density ratio of no
more than 6.30 units per acre. Also, a clause stating that the commercial area highlighted may be converted to multifamily at a later date if the use proves to not be viable.


The preliminary plat for the Heritage Hills Estates Second Addition was approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on June 24, 2015 and the City Council on July 6, 2015.

In 2017, a final plat was approved, included the development of 17 lots, Tract B, C, D, Melendy Lane (Tract A), expansion of Spruce Hills Drive eastward and expansion of Prairie Parkway northward.

Last year, a site plan for Lot 17 of Heritage Hills Estates Second Addition was approved for the construction of three duplex residential structures, which was consistent with RP Plan. Now the last parcel, Tract F, is proposed for development. If the subject townhome project is approved and constructed on Tract F of Heritage Hills Estates Second Addition, the subdivision will be fully built out.

## ANALYSIS

## Zoning:

As noted above, the subject property is zoned RP, Planned Residential District and a portion of the property is also in the Highway Corridor and Greenbelt Overlay District. RP Districts are established with a comprehensive development plan. The RP District is a "mixed-use" type of zoning classification that allows the establishment of a mixture of residential types as well as some commercial uses to create a more diverse neighborhood. The proposed site plan of multiunit residential townhomes matches the RP master plan for the area.

As stated above, the subject parcel, Tract $F$, has an allowed residential density of no more than 6.30 units per acre or 44 dwelling units. The proposal of 30 residential townhome units within six multi-unit buildings meets both the land use and density requirements as specified in the development procedures agreement, which was developed with the RP Master plan for the area.

## Proposed Layout of the Development:

The RP Planned Residence District provides flexibility in establishing lot sizes, setbacks and general layout of the development, which then must be approved through the site plan review process. In this case, the development is proposed as a condominium regime with 30 units on one lot. All the streets and infrastructure will be private and maintained by a Homeowner's Association. The site layout is arranged with garages and pedestrian entries accessed from the private streets, but with attractive finished façades that face Greenhill Road and neighboring properties with doors leading to rear porches/patios. This design gives the impression of two front facades - one facing the private streets and one that faces the public street and neighboring properties.

The proposed site plan illustrates 25 foot front yard setbacks from the private street easement for all buildings along the Spruce Hills Drive and Spruce Creek Drive. The proposed six buildings are spaced at least 20 feet apart, which provides adequate open space between the buildings for privacy and provides breaks to reduce the monotony of facades. The buildings will be setback at least 30 feet from the lot line along Prairie Parkway to be consistent with the approved final plat of Heritage Hills Estates Second Addition and will also meet the 30 -foot required perimeter setback for the RP district. All the minimum required setbacks are provided.

All infrastructure will be private, so are delineated with private easements on the site plan and will also be recorded with the plat. A $45-f o o t ~ e a s e m e n t ~ w i l l ~ b e ~ e s t a b l i s h e d ~ f o r ~ t h e ~ p r i v a t e ~ s t r e e t s ~$ (Spruce Hills Drive and Spruce Creek Drive), which will narrow down from the 60 -foot public street right-of-way of Spruce Hills Drive as it enters the development. An easement for public access and emergency vehicle access will need to be established over the private streets with the plat. Other private easements will be delineated for the private storm sewer and sanitary sewer. CFU will require an easement for the water main that will be extended to serve this development. A 50 -foot public utility easement has already been established along E. Greenhill Road. In addition, the proposed site plan shows the 10-foot public utility easements in appropriate locations.

## Site Access:

The proposed development will be accessed through private streets, which will include the easterly extension of the Spruce Hills Drive to its intersection with another private street, Spruce Creek Drive, which runs north-south. The private streets are proposed to be 24 feet in width. Six parking stalls perpendicular to the roadway have also been included along Spruce Creek Drive to facilitate guest parking on the site, since there will not be much room for on-street parking with the multiple driveways and narrow street width. The proposed site plan includes sidewalks along the edge of the private streets to ensure pedestrian movements throughout the development. These will need to meet ADA requirements. Sidewalks meeting City standards will be required along all public street frontages, including Spruce Hills Drive, Melendy Lane, and Prairie Parkway.

City staff notes that private streets are discouraged as per the city's subdivision code for the following reasons:

- Private streets are often proposed in order to save space and cost with pavement depths and rights-of-way and street widths that do not meet City street standards. As a consequence, the City does not accept private streets as public improvements and all future maintenance cost falls to future owners/residents of the development, which can be a significant financial burden particularly once the pavement needs to replaced or reconstructed. If the homeowners association (HOA) hasn't been set up to collect enough funds over time for future maintenance costs, these areas may experience disinvestment in the future and homeowners often turn to the City for assistance when that occurs.
- Secondly, since the private streets are not built to City standards and dedicated to the City as public streets, the property owners or HOA will be responsible for services, such as garbage pick-up and snow removal.

Staff has noted these issues to the developer and indicated that the deed of dedication and owners declaration of covenants will need to be carefully drafted to make sure future buyers are aware of these costs and responsibilities. These documents will be reviewed with the minor plat. Provided these issues are clearly addressed in the subdivision documents, staff is accepting of the private streets in this particular case due to the unique site constraints. The parcel is bounded by wetlands and floodplain to the north and east and no street connection will be allowed to Greenhill Road, which is an arterial street. As a consequence the streets proposed will be dead end streets that will only serve this development and will not function for overall neighborhood traffic circulation. The developers are responding to the market for townhomes in the community. With the proposal for townhomes instead of a larger multi-family building that might take up less land area, it is more challenging to provide a connected street layout, such as a loop street.

As per code, cul-de-sacs or dead-end streets are also discouraged, but if allowed they must not exceed 600 feet in length and must be designed to meet Fire Code regulations for emergency vehicle access and turn around. The City's Fire Division has reviewed the proposed development and finds it acceptable.

## Landscaping:

HCG Highway Corridor and Greenbelt Overlay Zoning District require the incorporation of landscaping standards to continue the orderly development of properties located within the HCG overlay district. Minimum required landscape area shall be 65 percent of the lot exclusive of buildings and the yard area be planted with combinations of trees and shrubs to achieve a minimum of 0.05 points per square foot of landscaped area. Additionally, a minimum of 0.75 points per linear foot of street frontage must be achieved in the Right-of-way area to meet street tree planting points. And the inclusion of screening along the lot line adjacent to the boundary to screen the development from major arterial roads. Following is the table that summarizes required and proposed landscaping improvements as per code.

| Site Landscaping |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Overall Lot area | $302.692 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$. |
| Total area of Building footprint on lot | $31,350 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$. |
| Total area exclusive of building footprint | $271,342 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$. |
| Min. landscaping points required | 8,819 points $\left(271,342^{*} 0.05\right)$ |
| Landscaping points proposed | 8,820 points $(4,480$ points - overstory trees, |


|  | 2400 points - evergreen trees, 1,020 points - <br> understory trees, and 920 points - shrubs $)$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Street Tree Planting | 0.75 points per linear foot of street frontage |
| Min, street tree planting points required | 447.75 points $\left(597 \mathrm{ft}{ }^{*} 0.75\right.$ points) |
| Required street tree planting points | 480 points $(6$ trees $)$ |
| Street tree planting points proposed | Parking lot screening (provided in the proposed site plan) |

Proposed landscaping plan meets city standards. A detailed landscaping plan has been attached for reference in the packet.

## Building Elevations:

The proposed site plan is to include six townhome buildings; four containing five units; one fourunit building, and one six-unit building. All the townhomes look identical to one another. The rear elevation snapshot below will be the one that will be visible from peripheral areas of the site, including from Greenhill Road, and the front elevation snapshot below will be visible from the private drives in the development. Building materials include the use of cultured stone (minimal), three shades of lap siding, three shades of wood shakes and asphalt roofing shingles. The shades of wood shakes and lap sidings are nicely balanced and complement each other.


Implications for future residents:
The proposed project to include multi-family residential development is all on private drives meaning that the city will not undertake any maintenance of private drives or sidewalks. Also city will not provide services, such as snow removal and garbage pick-up for the area. The cost of maintenance of streets, sidewalks, garbage removal and snow removal will be all on a homeowner's association, which will be established at the time of development. These items of
responsibility must be stated in the Owner's declaration of covenants and the deed of dedication.

## TECHNICAL COMMENTS

City technical staff, including Cedar Falls Utilities (CFU) personnel, has the following comments on the proposed site plan. All basic utility services are available to the site. The developer is responsible for the construction of a properly sized, privately owned, and maintained water system from the existing 12 -inch water main at the east end of Spruce Hills Drive. Water main sizing and fire hydrant and valve placement locations will need to be modified. This will be done as a part of the construction plan review. The developer is currently working with CFU personnel to address the comments. CFU also notes that the trees and other landscaping features proposed on the landscaping plan are within the utility easement area. And removal and replacement of the trees or any other landscaping located within these areas may be disturbed by utility maintenance, repair, or replacement is the responsibility of the property owner.

The City Engineering Division staff members have reviewed the plans and have found them acceptable. Since the roads, storm sewer, sanitary sewer, and most of the sidewalks are private infrastructure, engineering staff has minimal input on the construction plans. Due to the proximity of the project site to floodplain, it was agreed that the detention was designed for stormwater runoff quality control purposes only and not designed for full storage. The City will not be responsible for any maintenance on the private infrastructure including snow removal. The sidewalks that are in the public right-of-way must meet city standards including ADA compliance. The landowner will be responsible for clearing snow and maintaining the public sidewalk adjacent to the property, which is the same for all public sidewalks throughout the city.

Staff notes that the proposed project site needs to be platted to execute the proposed site plan, as currently the project site is termed as "Tract F" of Heritage Hills Estates 2 nd addition subdivision. As per subdivision code, any tracts can only be developed if the tract area is replatted to create a developable parcel. As noted above, the applicant is preparing a Minor Plat and staff anticipates that the minor plat will be on agenda for next Planning and Zoning Commission meeting for review, provided that applicant is able to resolve all comments received from the tech review meeting. Once the minor plat is approved, the site plan can be approved concurrently. City staff is working with the applicant on the deed of dedication/owner's statements, which outlines number of things that are being shared between future residents and state maintenance responsibility of common shared areas, including the private streets.

A courtesy notice informing about proposed site plan development to surrounding residents within 200 feet of the proposed project site was sent out on March $1^{\text {st }}, 2022$.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The introduction of this site plan is for discussion and public comment. City staff recommends continuing the discussion to the next Planning and Zoning meeting. Staff notes that the site plan cannot be approved prior to approval of the minor plat.
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## REZONING PLAT

a parcel of land located in the se $1 / 4$ Of Section 24, TOWNSHIP 89 NORTH, RANGE 14 WEST OF THE 5TH P.M., BLACK HAWK COUNTY, IOWA MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:
BEGINNING AT THE SE CORNER OF SAID SE $1 / 4$; THENCE N $89^{\circ} 49^{\prime} 56^{\prime \prime}$ W 1043.11 FEET; THENCE N 0010'04" E 170.02 FEET; THENCE N $16^{\circ} 27^{\prime} 51^{\prime \prime}$ E 62.51 FEET; THENCE N $00^{\circ} 44^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E} 567.25$ FEET; THENCE N 3812'31" E 399.78 FEET; THENCE S $51^{\circ} 50^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ E 384.90 FEET; THENCE S $34^{\circ} 49^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ E 305.78 FEET; THENCE S 65*13'30" E 323.10 FEET: THENCE S $00^{\circ} 02^{\prime} 25^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W} 490.10$ FEET, TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING, CONTAINING 19.249 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

REZONING REQUESTED BY: PRAIRIE DEVELOPMENT
CRAIG FAIRBANKS
5746 WESTMINSTER DRIVE CEDAR FALLS, IA 50613

Prepared by: VJ Engineering, 1501 Technology Parkway, Suite 100, Cedar Falls, IA 50613 (319-266-5829)
RESOLUTION NO. 18,930

## RESOLUTION ACCEPTING AND APPROVING R-P DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT SITE PLAN AND DEVELOPMENTAL PROCEDURES AGREEMENT

WHEREAS, an R-P District Development Site Plan, and a Developmental Procedures Agreement, attached hereto as Exhibits "A" and "B", have been submitted for acceptance and approval by the City Council of the City of Cedar Falls, Iowa.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CEDAR FALLS, IOWA, that the attached R-P Development Site Plan, and the Developmental Procedures Agreement, submitted for the property described as follows:

That part of the Southeast Quarter of Section 24, Township 89 North, Range 14 West of the Fifth Principal Meridian, Black Hawk County, Iowa, more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the Southeast corner of said Southeast Quarter; thence N89 $32^{\prime} 29^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W} 1043.08$ feet along the South line of said Southeast Quarter and the North right-of-way line of Greenhill Road; thence $\mathrm{N} 0^{\circ} 31^{\prime} 56^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E} 40.01$ feet to the Southeast corner of Heritage Hills Estates; thence $\mathrm{N}^{\circ} 26^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ E 130.21 feet along the East line of Heritage Hills Estates to the South right-of-way line of Spruce Hills Drive; thence N24 $49^{\prime} 23^{\prime \prime}$ E 65.87 feet to the North right-of-way line of Spruce Hills Drive; thence $\mathrm{N}^{\circ} 19^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E} 563.06$ feet along the East line of Heritage Hills Estates and Heritage Hills Estates First Addition; thence $\mathrm{N} 38^{\circ} 10^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E} 401.27$ feet along the Southeasterly line of Heritage Hills Estates First Addition to the Southwesterly line of Heritage 5th Addition; thence $\mathrm{S} 51^{\circ} 32^{\prime} 26^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E} 382.87$ feet along the Southwesterly line of Heritage 5th Addition; thence $\mathrm{S} 34^{\circ} 26^{\prime} 51^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E} 307.06$ feet along the Southwesterly line of Heritage 5th Addition; thence S65 ${ }^{\circ} 07^{\prime} 56^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E} 322.18$ feet along the Southwesterly line of Heritage 5th Addition to the West line of Briarwood Hills Fourth Addition; thence $\mathrm{S}^{\circ} 20^{\prime} 15^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E} 490.07$ feet along the West line of said Briarwood Hills Fourth Addition to the point of beginning, containing 19.126 acres, and is subject to easements and restrictions of record.
be, and the same are hereby accepted and approved, and the Mayor and City Clerk are hereby authorized and directed to certify a copy of this resolution to the County Recorder of Black Hawk County, Iowa.

INTRODUCED AND ADOPTED this $27^{\text {th }}$ day of Tanuar 4,2014


ATTEST:

Jennifer Rodenbeck, CPA, CPFO
Finance Manager/City Clerk

Prepared by Wendell J. Lupkes, L.S., VJ Engineering
1501 Technology Parkway, Ste. 100
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50613
EXHIBIT "B"

## DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURES AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT is entered into by and between the City of Cedar Falls, Iowa ("City") and Anfinson Properties, LLC (Anfinson) for the purpose of outlining the procedures to be followed for the development of certain land hereinafter described, and for allowing the City to proceed with the request for rezoning of the real estate made by Anfinson.

1. The real estate which is the subject of this agreement is legally described as:

That part of the Southeast Quarter of Section 24, Township 89 North, Range 14 West of the Fifth Principal Meridian, Black Hawk County, Iowa, more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the Southeast corner of said Southeast Quarter; thence N89³2'29"W 1043.08 feet along the South line of said Southeast Quarter and the North right-of-way line of Greenhill Road; thence $0^{\circ} 31^{\prime} 56^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E} 40.01$ feet to the Southeast corner of Heritage Hills Estates; thence N $0^{\circ} 26^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E} 130.21$ feet along the East line of Heritage Hills Estates to the South right-of-way line of Spruce Hills Drive; thence N $24^{\circ} 49^{\prime} 23^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E} 65.87$ feet to the North right-of-way line of Spruce Hills Drive; thence $0^{\circ} 19^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$ E 563.06 feet along the East line of Heritage Hills Estates and Heritage Hills Estates First Addition; thence N38 ${ }^{\circ} 10^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E} 401.27$ feet along the Southeasterly line of Heritage Hills Estates First Addition to the Southwesterly line of Heritage 5th Addition; thence S51 ${ }^{\circ} 32^{\prime 2} 26^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E} 382.87$ feet along the Southwesterly line of Heritage 5th Addition; thence S34 $26^{\prime} 51^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E} 306.99$ feet along the Southwesterly line of Heritage 5th Addition; thence $\mathrm{S} 65^{\circ} 07^{\prime} 344^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E} 322.24$ feet along the Southwesterly line of Heritage 5th Addition to the West line of Briarwood Hills Fourth Addition; thence $\mathrm{S}^{\circ}{ }^{\circ} 0^{\prime} 15^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E} 490.07$ feet along the West line of said Briarwood Hills Fourth Addition to the point of beginning, containing 19.126 acres, and is subject to easements and restrictions of record.
2. Anfinson desires to have the previously approved R-P Planned Residential Plan on the subject real estate amended in accordance with the zoning ordinances of the City.
3. Anfinson agrees that the real estate will be developed for use as one and two family residences, condominiums, multifamily dwellings, and commercial. Anfinson shall not exceed the density 4.59 units per acre on the requested R-P Site Plan Amendment for the 19.13 area of the total development area.
4. The multifamily area will have a density ratio of no more than 6.30 units per acre. The commercial area shown may be converted to multifamily at a later date if the use proves to not be a viable. Density for that area will not exceed 6.30 units per acres.
5. Anfinson further agrees that a Subdivision Plat will be submitted prior to the development of the real estate for the 16 platted lots which will satisfy
all ordinance requirements relating to street construction, sanitary sewer and storm sewer construction, and any and all other requirements imposed by the City with respect to approval of a Subdivision Plat.
6. The other multifamily and commercial areas will be submitted to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a site plan review as needed prior to construction.
7. No gas station and/or convenience store will be allowed as a commercial use within the R-P Site Plan.
8. Permitted use examples for the commercial area shall be as follows: Coffee shop, sales office, community center for the neighborhood.
9. Set aside fill, ie., topsoil and other compaction materials that are a normal part of the development process, will be set aside as designated on the agreed upon Swppp documents. This fill will be used to complete the final lot grading during the infrastructure construction process.

It is anticipated that there will not be any remaining fill as we believe we are still short of fill needs for the area. Should there be a surplus of dirt it will not remain in a stock pile condition longer than 18 months following the dedication of the streets to the city of Cedar Falls.

Dated this 315 day of Xhecempe, 2013

R-P Site Plan Amendment



 Nand
Exhibit "A"


Original R-P Site Plan (2004)




DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
City of Cedar Falls
220 Clay Street
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50613
Phone: 319-273-8600
Fax: 319-273-8610
www.cedarfalls.com

## MEMORANDUM

Planning \& Community Services Division
TO: Planning \& Zoning Commission
FROM: Thom Weintraut, AICP, Planning III
DATE: March 2, 2022
SUBJECT: Master Plan Amendment Request: Pinnacle Prairie Business Center North, Parcel ' B ', Lots 16, and 21-31 (Wild Rye Way)

REQUEST: To amend the Pinnacle Prairie Master Plan from Multi-Family and Mixed Use to Western Home.

PETITIONER: Western Home Communities
LOCATION: The north and south side of Wild Rye Way between Prairie Parkway and Bluebell Road

## PROPOSAL

Western Homes Communities has requested to amend the Pinnacle Prairie Master Plan to allow the construction of 19 two-family dwellings on two lots The applicant has submitted a concept plan for the area. The property is zoned MU Mixed Use Residential District which allows a wide range of residential use as well as "neighborhood commercial" types of uses, therefore a change to the underlying zoning will not be necessary. A request for a preliminary and final plat for the area will be coming forward to the Planning and Zoning Commission in the near future.

## BACKGROUND

In 2004, a Master Plan for Pinnacle Prairie was approved for approximately 620 acres. The subject property was part of an area of approximately 64 acres designated as mixed-use at the southeast corner of the intersection of S Main Street and Greenhill Road. The Mixed Use portion is outlined in black and the subject property in the amendment request is red (see right).


1

In 2015 the Master Plan was revised with the lots along the south side of Wild Rye Way designated as MultiFamily and the area north of Wild Rye Way as Mixed Use, which includes multi-family and townhome uses. The mixed use portion is outlined in black and the subject property in the amendment request is red (see right). This area was not changed in the recently approved update to the Master Plan in 2021.

## ANALYSIS

This area of development has had a


Western Home Communities mixed use land-use designation since 2004 and was amended in 2015 changing the lots south of Wild Rye Way to multi-family. The intent of mixed use is to provide a combination of neighborhood business uses to support a local residential population. Outside of the Fareway Market and Kwik-Star convenience store, most of the nonresidential development in the area has been office and medical uses. The area involved in the request has low visibility from Greenhill Road and limited visibility from Prairie Parkway, so may have limited viability for commercial development. Residential development in the community is in high demand, so changing the master plan to allow for additional residential development will help to meet the need and additional residents will provide support for the neighborhood-serving uses already located in the area.

The current Master Plan does allow multiple unit development; however, the amendment to the plan would allow Western Home Communities to continue the development with a housing type that appeals to many in the community and has proven to meet the needs and desires of market. The proposal will provide a cohesive and seamless transition within the development.

## Amendment to the Pinnacle Prairie Master Plan

In a larger MU District, such as Pinnacle Prairie, which encompasses more than 600 acres, build out takes years and portions of the master planned area may be sold to other developers, who will prepare detailed site plans for their portion of the development. Therefore, in practice, our expectation is that the master plan would address each of these elements generally, with the specific requirements met during subdivision review and site plan review for specific building sites once development is imminent.

Western Home Communities is proposing an amendment to the Pinnacle Prairie Master Plan to allow a multiple-dwelling condominium development of 19 units on two lots. The 2015 amendment to the master plan identified Western Home as a specific land use within the Pinnacle Prairie development. This area remained unchanged in the 2021 updated Master Plan (see attached). In 2016, the Pinnacle Prairie Design Guidelines incorporated guidelines for Western Home Community. The amendment to designate this area as "Western Home" will allow this development to use the guidelines that are in place for the Western Home property adjacent to the south.

There are a number of elements listed in the zoning code that are required to be addressed in the master plan. A majority of these have been addressed as part of the overall development; however, the following items should be examined specifically to this amendment:
(1) Building locations.
(2) Streets, drives, accessways.
(3) Pedestrian traffic plan, including sidewalks, bicycle paths.
(4) Architectural renderings of all sides of each building, including accessory structures.
(5) Residential recreation or park areas.

The proposal consists of two lots on each side of Wild Rye Way, one on the north side of the street with ten two-family dwellings and one on the south side with nine two-family dwellings. As with their other residential areas, Western Home Communities plans to retain ownership of the land. The design and layout of the proposed dwellings will be similar to and complement the existing Western Home Community. All of the dwellings will have driveway access to Bluebell Road or Wild Rye Way, which have been constructed; however, there are four units which will have a private, shared driveway/access to Wild Rye Way, in order to utilize the deeper lots originally platted for commercial development and to avoid individual driveway access to Prairie Parkway, a major street corridor. It should also be noted that driveways are placed at least 75 feet from the street intersections to provide for safer ingress and egress from these homes. The Coneflower Parkway Trail and the two sections of the Pinnacle Prairie Trail are adjacent to the proposed development, which provide good options for walking and biking for area residents.

The applicant has provided renderings of the proposed dwellings, which are similar to the product used in the Western Home Community. There are two models proposed, a plan with an extended garage and a plan with a three car garage (see next page).



Existing Dwellings
The current land uses shown on the Master Plan are for multi-family and mixed use both of which would allow residential use. This area has limited visibility from both Green Hill Road and Prairie Parkway and may have limited viability for commercial uses. The demand for residential development in the community is high and the proposed housing type appeals to many in the community. The proposed land use change to Western Home would allow the new development to integrate into the existing community using the design guidelines established for the Western Home Community.

## Technical Comments:

1. A preliminary and final plat will be required prior to any development within the planned area.
2. An amended Master Plan shall be provided before the public hearing at City Council.

## PUBLIC NOTICE

City staff has sent letters to the surrounding property owners notifying them of the Master Plan Amendment.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Community Development Department recommends that the Commission introduce the item for discussion, provide direction, and continue the discussion to the next meeting on March 23, 2022 meeting.
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Attachments: 2021 Pinnacle Prairie Master Plan
Proposed concept plan for "Western Home Community"
Proposed Architectural Renderings for Dwellings
Applicant's letter requesting rezoning


 4501 Prairie Parkway, Cedar Falls, IA 50613

Oster Partners



architecture \& planning

Karen Howard, AICP<br>Planning \& Community Services Manager<br>City of Cedar Falls<br>220 Clay Street<br>Cedar Falls, Iowa 50613

Re: Master Plan Amendment - Pinnacle Prairie<br>Western Home Communities Villas Phase 10

## Dear Karen,

We are requesting an amendment to the Pinnacle Prairie master plan to accommodate the proposed Western Home Communities Villas Phase 10 development. The Western Home has recently purchased this land on the northern border of their existing Pinnacle Prairie campus to expand their services in this area.

The requested amendment is for the lots on both the north and south side of Wild Rye Way between Bluebell Road on the west and Praire Parkway on the east. These lot are currently identified as multi-family on the south and mixed use on the north side of Wild Rye Way. The proposed amendment is to change the use of these lots to residential to accommodate the development of independent senior living duplex units as depicted in the attached master plan for that area.

The Western Home has completely filled the areas on the existing campus designated for duplex Villas and would like to extend the Villas to the north. There is great demand for these units that meet a significant need for senior housing in our community. The land to the south is Villas currently and this site plan will be a natural extension of the existing neighborhood. The new villas will generally be the same as the existing ones to the south with some incremental design changes. A couple renderings of the typical Villa design is attached to this submission for reference as well.

The existing land was originally designated for multi-housing and mixed use. There has not been much market demand for those uses. The use of this area for additional Western Home Villas will be compatible with all the surrounding uses. The additional population created in this area will only enhance the demand for the commercial services in this area and hopefully create more demand for commercial development on the remaining properties of this development.

Please let me know if you need any additional information regarding this master plan amendment for Pinnacle Prairie.

Sincerely,
Align Architecture \& Planning, PLC


Martin P. Holst, AIA

enclosures: Rezoning Application Form<br>Western Home 10th Addition Concept Plan<br>Western Home Villa Rendering Examples

