

**MINUTES
CITY OF AMES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

Date: October 3, 2018	Matt Converse, Chairperson	2020
	Carlton Basmajian, Vice Chairperson	2020
Call to Order: 7:00 PM	*Anuprit Minhas	2019
	Doug Ragaller	2019
Place: Ames City Hall Council Chambers	Mindy Bryngelson	2021
	*Jon Emery	2021
Adjournment: 8:18 PM	Carol Spencer	2021
	[*Absent]	

MAJOR TOPICS DISCUSSED:

1. Public Hearing for the Preliminary Plat and Major Site Development Plan for 1404, 1405, and 1410 Buckeye Avenue
2. Public Hearing for an Amendment to the Major Site Development Plan for Green Hills PRD

CALL TO ORDER: Matt Converse, Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

MOTION: (Bryngelson/Ragaller) to approve the Agenda for the meeting of October 3, 2018.

MOTION PASSED: (5 - 0)

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 19, 2018:

MOTION: (Ragaller/Bryngelson) to approve the Minutes of the meeting of September 19, 2018.

MOTION PASSED: (4 - 0 - 1) (abstain: Converse)

PUBLIC FORUM: There were no public comments.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE PRELIMINARY PLAT AND MAJOR SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR 1404 1405 & 1410 BUCKEYE AVENUE

Julie Gould, Case Planner, presented to Commission an application for an integrated site plan which included concurrent approval of a preliminary plat and a site plan. The integrated site plan will, after the Commission meeting, go on to Council with Commission's recommendation. Ms. Gould stated that she believes that this is the first integrated site plan to seek approval.

The site is the old K-Mart building at 1404, 1405, and 1410 Buckeye Avenue. The site is approximately 14 acres. The developers are proposing 9 lots, 7 of which would be located on the K-Mart property. Their intention is to redesign the K-Mart building into 4 retail spaces that will have storefronts facing east. The rear of the building will be utilized as an interior climate

controlled storage facility. The storage facility will require an approval from the Zoning Board of Adjustment by way of a special use permit. The remaining two lots, located on Duff Avenue, are existing and undeveloped.

The purpose of an integrated site plan is to apply site plan regulations, such as setback and landscaping regulations to the site as a whole rather than an individual lot basis. Ms. Gould gave the example that this site is zoned Highway Oriented Commercial. The regulations of this zoning district, such as 15% open space requirement, would apply to the entire site and not just one lot. Additionally parking and drive access could be shared.

Ms. Gould continued with an explanation of how the preliminary plat and site plan approach infrastructure. A traffic study was done and no changes are required at this time. There is work planned on S 16th Street between Duff Avenue and Buckeye Avenue. City Traffic Staff stated that a left turn lane on Buckeye Avenue to Duff Avenue could possibly be needed after a full build-out. They are not requiring it at this time because the work to be done on S. 16th Street will most likely create a full median that would go past Buckeye Avenue so there would not be full-turn access to S. 16th Street. The scheduled date for work on this project is 2019. The only other change would be to straighten the S. 16th Street access drive to the West. This is not required by the City, but is at the applicant's request. It does have full-turn access, and would allow room for more parking spaces. In reference to public and City utilities, Ms. Gould stated that all utilities are currently present on the site. A small sewer main on the South side of Building B is the only public utility that will be added.

In regards to landscaping, Council approved a Plat of Survey which pulled some of the open area behind Staples and Movie Theater lot to the north, and added it to the K-Mart lot. Both sites meet the 15% open space requirement with this shift. The required amount to street tree requirements. Staff did point out that the street trees on both sides of Buckeye Avenue are presented in the right of way. The main landscaping discrepancy between Staff and the developer relates to the front yard grass and shrubs. Staff has reviewed the developer's proposal, but had a hard time deciphering the exact location and amount of shrubs. The calculations between the two are slightly different, but Ms. Gould believes there is an easy resolve.

Ms. Gould stated that the developer will most likely repair and reuse the current parking lot. There are a few areas where the developer will build additional parking spaces. The Code requires that the developer must provide the landscaping for only what is being added. The tree requirement in this instance is approximately 43 trees. Plans show that they exceed that requirement. There are other minor landscaping details that Staff believes can be worked out in time. They are listed as conditions of approval in the recommendation to Commission.

Ms. Gould next presented the site and building layout. The proposed building will be adding an additional 77,000 square feet in retail and restaurant use. When calculating the parking, Staff did so with the assumption that the special use permit would be approved by the Zoning Board of Adjustment. If this remains true, the site meets the parking requirements. In the event it does not, the site would then fall short. The developer had expressed that the project as whole is contingent on the approval of the storage space. In regards to the restaurant parking. Staff could not calculate that at this time due to there being no floor plans or secured tenants. They decided to treat them as sit-down restaurants which require 9 spaces per 1,000. At this time, the site is 66 spaces short based on these calculations. Staff has made a condition in the

recommendation to put a note in the plat stating that, if the storage space is not approved, the parking requirements would shift in regards to the retail versus restaurant space.

In terms of building elevation, the special use permit has specific requirements and design guidelines associated with the storage use. Those will be addressed with the special use permit. The building right now has six overhead doors. The developer only plans to use two overhead doors. The remaining overhead doors will be replaced by windows and a pedestrian entrance. The building plans are fairly standard in design. Staff wanted to point out that the additional buildings being built will have their backs to the public right of way. Staff noted that the façade on these is long and suggested methods in terms of landscape and design to address this issue. They do not have specific building design requirements for this particular circumstance, but there is a condition in the major site plan that allows Planning and Zoning Commission and Council to give considerations to matters such as building materials.

Staff did put a condition on to one building on the site. Building D currently has a restaurant drive-through. The proposed plans do not specify the exact location of its pick-up window. Staff recommended that the window be on the east end of the building and the order board be on the south end of the building. If a drive ends up going in this building, this recommendation would prevent stacking into the parking lot. The City's Electric, Fire, and Public Works are still awaiting unanswered comments for this site's storm water management.

Carl Basmajian asked Ms. Gould for some clarification on the parking space calculation. Ms. Gould stated that Staff did make the assumption in this situation that the storage use would be approved. The developer has expressed that the approval of this is important to the site. She added that there currently are no tenants, so the size of the space and parking could fluctuate.

Mr. Basmajian asked for clarification if the all the new building would have their backs to the right of way. Ms. Gould confirmed that is correct. Mr. Basmajian asked about the location of the access points. Ms. Gould stated that the site would be using the existing access points. She also addressed two other conditions previously unmentioned. One was the having high screening since it is adjacent to Residential Zoning. The current plans meet this requirement. The second condition was in regards to the parapets on the front façade. They were much taller than the current building structure so they wanted to assure that they were uniform to the current structure.

Matt Converse asked if the applicant would like to speak on the project. They did not have anything to add, but would answer questions. Mr. Basmajian asked the applicant on their position with the parking situation. The applicant was grateful for the Staff's assistance on getting the plan out before the special use permit. He added that the project isn't financially feasible without the storage. It is does not pass, they will drop the project.

Mr. Converse asked if anyone else would like to speak on the issue. Yvonne Wannemeuhler, at 1518 Golden Aspen Drive, asked if staff could speak to the light of the storage unit side of the building. Ms. Gould stated they have not yet seen what they're officially proposing. That design will come about with the special use permit. There are light poles there currently, and plans show they intend to keep them. The developer will have to comply with the City's lighting cut-off requirement. Ms. Wannemeuhler asked if they anticipated more lighting. Ms. Gould reiterated that the lighting would be addressed in the special use permit when it is presented at the end of October. What is approved at that time will have to adhere to the City's lighting code.

Ms. Wannemeuhler asked for clarification on the presented diagram. She asked if a certain line was a fence or parking. Ms. Gould explained that it was a parking area.

Mr. Converse asked if Commission had any comments. Mr. Basmajian stated that he thought the City should just accept the amount of spaces current available on the site. He couldn't fathom that the site would need more parking spaces than it currently has.

Mr. Basmajian also added that Commission should make a recommendation that the building have some sort of embellishment or accents to the back of the buildings facing the right of way. This could make it more aesthetically pleasing to the public. The developer showed Commission a design of what their intentions were for right of way facing façades.

Mr. Basmajian asked if the signs shown in the design were lighted. The developer confirmed. The developer added that the designs shown were for a visual aid and not exactly what will be when it is complete.

Mr. Basmajian asked for clarification on condition number 8 in the proposed plan. Ms. Gould explained that this condition states the parking space amount based on the square footage of restaurant space and if the storage is approved. It continues by stating if storage use is not approved things such as parking spaces and tenant sizes would have to change. This could mean lowering the amount of restaurant space. It is essentially describing the parking situation without using the numbers. The developer added this is for maximum restaurant space and parking, and there are no definitive tenants so they understand this could fluctuate.

Mr. Basmajian wondered if there was a way that tenant usage wouldn't have to be driven by restaurant space percentage. Ms. Gould stated that once everything is approved and building permits are issued, the property would have to comply with parking code unless they received a variance.

MOTION: (Bryngelson/Spencer) that the Planning and Zoning Commission act in accordance with Alternative #1, which is to recommend that the City Council approve the request for an Integrated Site Plan, which includes concurrent preliminary plat and Major Site Development Plan approval, for the properties at 1404, 1405, and 1410 Buckeye Avenue with the noted conditions.

MOTION PASSED: (5 - 0)

PUBLIC HEARING FOR AN AMENDMENT TO THE MAJOR SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR GREEN HILLS PRD

Justin Moore, Case Planner, presented to Commission an amendment to the major site development plan for the Green Hills Planning Residential District. Green Hills is a retirement care facility. Originally developed in 1979, the site has had several amendments over the years. The amendment proposed at this time to Commission involves an amenity addition to the residence tower, a small addition to the library, and to the vestibules within the complex. It also proposes a twin home to be built at the Southwest side of the site close to Hamilton Drive. The

amenity addition being proposed is the second phase of an amendment to a Major Site Plan that was originally proposed in 2014. Council approved an extension to its timeline in 2015.

Mr. Moore elaborated on the description of Planning Residential District. This kind of zoning allows for more innovative housing types. It allows designs that may not be accepted in other residential zoning types. Mr. Moore then presented the plan for the twin home. The twin home will come off of Hamilton Drive. This street is a private drive within the community's internal transportation network. The landscaping is a mix of deciduous and spruce trees that circle the home. The home meets all the required setbacks currently in place.

Mr. Moore then showed Commission the proposed plan for the amenity addition. This area has been gradually improving of the past three years because of the previously approved amendment in 2014. In terms of landscaping, the phasing has allowed for a variety of options. The proposal allows for an alternative design that still meets the intent of the PRD zoning. Mr. Moore then presented the elevations for the amenity addition. The façade is consistent with the current residential tower and nearby care facility.

Mr. Moore presented to the Commission elevations of the twin home. The parking for the home will be at the location. He also noted to the Commission that the twin home was not part of the phasing proposed in 2014.

Next, Mr. Moore addressed the conditions Staff had placed on their recommendations. These included final storm water calculations and the showing of a relocated water easement on the site plan near the amenity addition.

Mr. Basmajian asked for the square footage of the addition. Scott Renaud, at Fox Engineering, stated that the amenities and vestibule additions are roughly 9,500 square feet. The twin home, including the outside, development is 10,500 square feet.

Mr. Moore informed Commission that Staff received three inquiries from neighboring residence. He addressed one of the inquiries by noting that the twin home's location, previously a gardening area, is outside the Limited Development Zone. Mr. Basmajian asked if Limited Development Zones don't allow building. Mr. Moore confirmed it does not and there should be a 60 foot buffer.

Mr. Converse asked if the applicant was there to speak on item seven. Rod Copple, at 4938 Hemingway Drive, is the executive director of Green Hills. He gave Commission background on the community. Green Hills is an independent living, assisted living, and skilled nursing facility. Their focus on this proposal is on the independent living residence. Their community has a full-time grounds staff and it is important to the community that the amount of vegetation remains consistent with the property. Green Hills spends a great deal of time focusing on the landscaping plan to assure it exceeds the City's standards.

Mr. Copple next addressed the twin home. He stated that the twin home is of great interest to their plan and pointed out the parking and garage designs of the home and its neighboring housing structures. In addition to the parking, they also addressed the wetness on the West side of the property by adding additional bee hives to assist with this issue. They intend to take the downspouts and gutters of the new home straight to the storm sewer.

Mr. Copple spoke about the amenities addition. It is attached to the facility's wellness center. This addition will add a community room, two meeting rooms, a classroom theater with stadium seating, and a future space for a salon and massage therapy.

Mr. Converse asked if anyone else would like to speak on the issue. Mark Stephenson, at 2337 Woodview Drive, spoke to the Commission about the original description of Limited Residential Zoning. Mr. Stephenson proposed that since Green Hills originally offered the 60 foot buffer incorporated with that type zoning, that they do so with the new twin home. He also requested that existing water drainages by dirt when building the new twin home. Lastly, Mr. Stephenson asked how the twin home's elevation relates to the houses on the neighboring street.

Mike Schmidt, at 2325 Woodview Dr., expressed his concern of Green Hills's communication to neighboring homes while they do construction. He stated his displeasure in the way Fox Engineering on how they handled the process of building a garage facing the neighboring properties. Mr. Schmidt showed Commission and Staff the area of concern and how he felt that the proposed plan does not meet the 60 foot buffer required by the Limited Development Zoning. He next read the original amendment from 1986 that defined Green Hill's vision. Mr. Schmidt also believed that their road doesn't have the correct payment to handle heavy construction.

Mr. Schmidt asked Staff about the short length of neighbors being informed about this proposal. Mr. Moore said the Staff is required to send out notices 7 days prior to the Commission meeting. The notices were sent in the appropriate amount of time. Mr. Moore couldn't speak for how long it takes for the mail to go to the home.

Brian Anderson, at 2412 Woodview Drive, addressed the Commission. He stated that he worked for Story Construction when the original development was being built. He gave a background on the development process. Mr. Anderson acknowledged neighboring homeowners' concerns that Green Hills's construction has destroyed their field tiles in the past and had not confirmed they are resolved. Mr. Anderson said, during the time he was working on a Green Hills project, it was explained that any field tiles affected must be replaced if they are damaged. He could not confirm or deny if this was done every time, but expressed this is why this may be a concern for neighboring residence.

Mr. Anderson asked why they chose to define the twin home as such, and not call it a duplex. Mr. Moore stated that was simply how it was proposed. There were no defining features that required the title. Mr. Anderson said, as a developer, he could support the twin home structure. As neighbor, he is not fond of the idea of the structure being built so close to his residence. He was also concerned about the lack outreach prior to the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. He requested, if this is approved, that neighbors have some input on the twin home development.

Mr. Basmajian asked what the setback is for the twin home. Mr. Moore presented a diagram of the twin home structure. He stated that it current exceeds the required 60 foot buffer. Mr. Basmajian then asked if the development area originally included that buffer. Mr. Moore stated, from Staff's understanding, the area being built upon did not fall into the Limited Development Zone. Mr. Basmajian asked if the structure then met all the required setbacks. Mr. Moore confirmed that it did.

Mr. Basmajian asked if additional screening may be in order. Mr. Moore said that Staff did look at landscaping and it does currently meet the requirements. It would be up to the Commission if they believe additional screening should be addressed. Mr. Moore showed the current landscaping plans. Mr. Anderson asked for this matter to be tabled so there could be a neighborhood discussion between Green Hills and the adjacent homeowners because he felt there is some discrepancy between the two parties in regards to landscaping designs shown to the Commission.

Mr. Basmajian stated it appears that Green Hills and the adjacent neighborhood should discuss with each other more thoroughly. Mr. Copple responded he is willing to talk with neighboring properties about their concerns. He would like to keep the project on pace.

MOTION (Rageller/Basmajian) for the City Council to approve the Major Site Development Plan amendment to the Green Hills Community Planned Residence District. with the recommendation for Green Hills to have a discussion with neighboring residence to find a potential solution to some of the drainage issues.

MOTION PASSES (3 - 0 - 2) (abstain: Bryngelson, Converse)

COMMISSION COMMENTS: Mr. Converse wanted to make Commission aware that the next meeting involved a large discussion on the Scenic Valley subdivision.

STAFF COMMENTS:


MOTION TO ADJOURN:

MOTION: (Rageller/Bryngelson) to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 8:18 PM.



Matt Converse, Chairperson
Planning & Zoning Commission



Ben Lievens, Recording Secretary
Department of Planning & Housing