

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

Date: August 21, 2019	Matt Converse, Chairperson	2020
	Carlton Basmajian, Vice Chairperson	2020
Call to Order: 7:00 PM	Ruth Hulstrom	2021
	Jon Emery	2021
Place: Ames City Hall Council Chambers	Carol Spencer	2021
	Anuprit Minhas	2022
Adjournment: 8:42 PM	Doug Ragaller	2022
	[*Absent]	

MAJOR TOPICS DISCUSSED:

1. Preliminary Plat for Iowa State University Research Park Phase III, 4th Addition (3898 University Boulevard and 3499 So. Riverside Drive)
2. Major Site Development Plan for 3413 and 3425 Aurora Avenue
3. Zoning Text Amendment for Bicycle Parking Standards
4. Ames Comprehensive Plan 2040 Scenarios Discussion

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

MOTION: (Ragaller / Spencer) to approve the Agenda for the meeting of August 21, 2019.

MOTION PASSED: (6 - 1) Abstain Emery

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF AUGUST 7, 2019:

MOTION: (Minhas /Hulstrom) to approve the Minutes of the meeting of August 7, 2019.

MOTION PASSED: (7 - 0)

PUBLIC FORUM: None

PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY RESEARCH PARK PHASE III, 4TH ADDITION (3898 UNIVERSITY BOULEVARD AND 3499 SO. RIVERSIDE DRIVE)

Director Kelly Diekmann presented the Staff Report. The City has already done some of the improvements such as water and sewer, with street paving projects to be completed in the future.

Ruth Hulstrom asked if there was a trail to the north. Mr. Diekmann stated that there isn't currently a trail there but it is in the bicycle and pedestrian plan improvements. There are some

private properties between the north part of Phase II of the Research Park and this location. Eventually the gap will be closed but not at this time.

Carlton Basmajian questioned if the trail to the Tedesco Center cuts through this parcel. Mr. Diekmann explained that this was a change from the Master Plan. It was decided to connect that trail at this time along the boundary of lot 11. There would also be a sanitary sewer easement at that same location along that lot.

There was no further discussion by the Commission.

MOTION: (Emery/ Ragaller) to accept Alternative #1, which states:

The Planning and Zoning Commission can recommend that the City Council approve the Preliminary Plat for Iowa State University Research Park Phase 4, 1st Addition as consistent with the rezoning master plan and development standards of Chapter 23 of the Ames Municipal Code with conditions to update the Preliminary Plat Title and labeling.

MOTION PASSED: (7 - 0)

PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE MAJOR SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR 3413 AND 3425 AURORA AVENUE

Director Diekmann presented the Staff Report about the last two lots to be developed in this area. This project is very similar to the buildings that were recently approved to the north.

Ms. Hulstrom asked if there is visitor parking. Mr. Diekmann said there is no distinguishing between owners or visitors for parking. The parking ratio is generated by the number of bedrooms. There is no assigned parking so nothing to distinguish between visitors or owners and there would be some public parking on the street.

Ms. Hulstrom also questioned the screening around the trash bins. Questioned what type of material the composite material was and the longevity of this material. Mr. Diekmann explained that it is a synthetic material that has the appearance of a wood board and would last as long or longer than wood material. There are no specific design material requirements for trash enclosures. It can be either landscaping or an F2 fence, which is a fully obscuring fence system. It could be wood, a composite, or masonry. It cannot be chain link with slats. It must be an opaque material to meet the standards. Ms. Hulstrom asked the applicant, Justin Dodge about the longevity of the composite material. Mr. Dodge responded that it would last as long if not longer than wood. Mr. Diekmann explained that this material is not the masonite composite made from a paper product but more of a synthetic similar to the Trex® decking material.

Jon Emery asked if the garages would be matching the other garages in this area that have been previously discussed. Mr. Dodge stated that the two lots to the north are beautiful buildings and they have received many comments. Thus they will be replicating that look. They think the same property owners that purchased the other two buildings will buy these also. Mr. Diekmann stated that the architectural style will be similar to the two buildings just to the north that are more traditionally styled. The landscaping will follow the code with the ten foot buffer on the garage side.

MOTION: (Ragaller/Spencer) to accept Alternative #1, which states:

The Planning and Zoning Commission can recommend that the City Council approve the Major Site Development Plan for the proposed 8-unit apartment buildings, located at 3413 and 3425 Aurora Avenue.

MOTION PASSED: (7 - 0)

ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT FOR BICYCLE PARKING STANDARDS

Director Diekmann presented the Bicycle Parking Standards staff report. There would be small minor adjustments made in the code to allow for the bicycle parking. Staff requests a recommendation from the Commission for incentives to businesses to provide bike parking and that the allowances for the locations are appropriate and that the ratio of credit is appropriate for what is being provided. City Council will then consider the Commission's recommendation.

Ms. Hulstrom questioned under number three in the Staff Report what the criteria would be for the reduction in parking spaces. Mr. Diekmann stated that the intent of the incentive was that a business could not have no parking. So for example if you needed five parking spaces you couldn't go down to zero. So the Commission would need to be comfortable with allowing the staff to have discretion on the allowances of the number of parking spaces reduced for bike parking.

Mr. Emery asked if this was to be allowed in the entire City. Mr. Diekmann stated that this was for any commercial property and would not apply to residential property.

Anuprit Minhas asked for clarification as to the distance of the bike parking to the customer entrance. Mr. Diekmann stated the staff thought 150 feet was a reasonable distance for access to the entryways. The incentive was to have the spaces close enough to be convenient.

Ms. Minhas questioned if the bike parking systems would be allowed on city-owned land or public right-of-way. Mr. Diekmann stated that it would be unlikely that the City would allow for an encroachment permit on City property for a private bike rack system. The City would not want to give parking credits to land that the private entity doesn't control. This standard only speaks to privately owned properties to reduce their vehicle parking.

Calton Basmajian questioned how 1:4 ratio was decided. Mr. Diekmann said that you can take out one parking space to allow for at least four bikes. Dr. Carol Spencer asked if this was benchmarked against any other city. Mr. Diekmann said that they looked at Cedar Rapids, Iowa City and Des Moines. Not all give incentives or credits some make it mandatory or a combination of the two. The standard that the staff suggests is in the middle for a ratio and a 3' by 5' area is common for adequate bicycle parking.

Mr. Basmajian asked for a visual representation for 150 feet. Mr. Diekmann explained that every double loaded aisle of parking is approximately 62 feet. So 150' would be similar to two double loaded aisles of parking.

Ms. Hulstrom asked if the owners could attach bike parking to the building to reduce their parking requirements. Mr. Diekmann stated that the bike parking isn't required to be in the

parking lot and some cases would make more sense to have it by the main entrance on the side. Some owners may not have wide enough walkways to allow for the bike parking systems up by the building so they wanted to allow for the parking to be in the lots. Owners will have to submit a site plan and indicate what type of bike system they will use and it will have to be approved.

Mr. Emery shared a concern that six months out of the year bike parking may not be usable and the reduction in parking may be a disruption. Mr. Basmajian stated that many people ride all year round. Mr. Diekmann said that the number of spaces shouldn't be a disruption which is why it was capped at five spaces. The Commission needs to know the Director would have the discretion to decide how many parking spaces would be allowed and will entail, for the most part the smaller non-conforming sites.

Chairperson Matt Converse, questioned if the Lincoln Way Starbucks could reduce their site parking for bike parking with this scenario. Mr. Diekmann stated that if by code 20 spaces were required and you wanted to go down to 16 it would be approved. It's when you are not already meeting parking code requirements, like a non-conforming site that only has six spaces and should have 20 that there is a real question. That decision will be made on a case by case basis after review of the site. If a project meets the minimum zoning for parking then asks for credit to reduce their parking for bike parking that will be approved every time.

Dr. Spencer stated that in a commercial situation the owner won't reduce the parking to disturb their business. This amendment is the maximum allowed and doesn't mandate that it must be done. Mr. Diekmann said there may be rare cases where a business owner would give up their parking to have overflow go to an adjacent parking lot or street parking. This affects older sites that are non-conforming that want to reduce parking to add bike parking.

Mr. Emery asked if this will affect the handicap ratio parking. Mr. Diekmann stated that the ratio of accessible parking spaces is based on the number of parking provided. Essentially 2% of your vehicle parking has to be accessible spaces under ADA. So there could be a reduction of accessible spaces by one at the lowest end. The most impact to ADA spaces is one space. Conversation continued about ADA required parking.

Ms. Hulstrom asked what the other cities do to incentivize the parking. Mr. Basmajian questioned if a sliding scale had been considered. Mr. Diekmann stated that this was designed to keep it simple. Mr. Basmajian asked if the incentive could be for the much larger lots to offer more of an incentive. Mr. Diekmann said we were looking at the small sites rather than the large ones, the question becomes is it worth the intricacy to develop.

Mr. Emery asked if the Council brought this to question. Mr. Diekmann said that a Council member referred the issue to staff because Ames didn't have a bicycle parking ordinance. Mr. Emery questioned if anyone looked to see if we even have a need for bicycle parking. Staff was tasked to draft an ordinance based on incentives. Conversation ensued on the right number of spaces to offer as an incentive.

Mr. Emery questioned if anyone looked at whether there was a need for bike parking. Mr. Diekmann stated that we are not requiring bike parking but we are a community that wants to support complete street concepts and we are trying to build facilities that get people through town but don't have any predictable bike parking when you get to a location. This is an incentive, it is not a regulation. This would give people a place to secure their bicycle when they arrive at their destination. Businesses have asked for bicycle parking and the City hasn't been able to reduce their car parking to make this possible. As a community that is looking to be a

bicycling community, complete streets with walkable areas then there needs to be a predictable location to park your bike. This incentive will solve a problem that will continue to be an annoyance for bicyclists and will get worse without the ability for people to respond. New development is not an issue for parking, it is an issue with existing sites.

Ms. Minhas said it is a good problem to have that the businesses want to have bike parking rather than the City mandating it. Ms. Hulstrom stated the businesses are looking for a method in which to provide the bike parking. Conversation continued as to the appropriate number of spaces and how the ADA parking should be addressed.

Mr. Diekmann that this would be allowed on any site as an incentive it is not a requirement. We are encouraging people to provide bike parking. Mr. Diekmann shared that many cities were requiring it. Ms. Minhas stated that this seemed to be a good start to the process but shared concern about the ADA parking. Conversation continued about ADA parking. Mr. Diekmann noted ADA parking is required to be the closest spaces to the business.

MOTION: (Ragaller / Spencer) to accept Alternative #1, which states:

The Planning and Zoning Commission can recommend that the City Council adopt the proposed amendments regarding Bicycle Parking incentives.

MOTION PASSED: (7 - 0)

AMES COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2040 SCENARIOS DISCUSSION

Recap of the Workshop: We are planning for population of 1.5% growth rate over next 20 years so about 15,000 people. All scenarios are based on 15,000 people. There are four areas north, south, east and west. The constraint areas are ISU, floodways, and slope issues. RDG looked at gross land areas, which would include streets, parks, schools, etc. Currently we use net density. This is just a contextual presentation. Industrial areas are already assumed, the focus is on residential. The scenarios are to explore ideas and areas.

The north area south of 190th Street is already in the current plan and is being developed currently. We are looking at north of 190th for a growth area for the 2040 Plan. Pretty typical suburban area and will accommodate 15,000 people. Railroad track runs north south and we would have to look at grade separation because of the railroad. Growth is more along Highway 69 rather than GW Carver for traffic flow reasons. Certain areas on the map have planned areas for schools due to the growth considerations and will coordinate that with the school district. Currently there is no sewer north of 190th so that would be a significant cost. The City will have to be make a commitment to the infrastructure in any of these areas. Traffic will flow mostly through the city. Also, would need to look at another interchange from I-35.

East Industrial Park entrance will be accessible off of Highway 30 the DOT is already adding this interchange. This has a regional commercial center that would be built out. This would accommodate up to 20-25K people. A major sewer trunk would be needed due to the commercial and industrial anyway. An additional I-35 interchange would also be needed. There could be an extension of Riverside Road to accommodate traffic flow. Question from Mr. Emery about whether this area would be overbuilt already for the commercial use. Mr. Diekmann stated that this wouldn't be overbuilt. It is being built to support what is needed right now. If this is the direction in which is chosen there would need to be a separate trunk line directly to the plant.

South, is the most compact land pattern, the density would be in a core area, similar to a Village Concept. The shape is based on an existing drainage basin thus made it the most compact area. The main issue in this area would be the need for an interchange and would have to be worked out with the DOT. There is an existing bridge so that would help with the cost. The other benefit is the Research Park would be in favor of this because of commuters for the existing businesses. The airport has a master plan and the runway expansion doesn't affect anything in this plan. More of a high density mix and more similar to the Village Concept. The water and sewer wouldn't be as much of an issue with this one as it is closer to existing facilities.

West B is an extension of the SW growth concept into Boone County. So to move into this area there would need to be a water and sewer extension. The growth would continue west and then north to Highway 30 and Lincoln Way. It is farm ground currently. Worle Creek would be a natural buffer as well as the oil pipeline on the southern edge. Good highway access. The housing types would be single family and village node. Would need one mile of sewer extended. Most of this area would be in the United Community School District. The City will work with existing County development as it is feasible.

West A development would be south of the railroad due to emergency response in a predictable timeframe. Centered on Lincoln Way north of Sunset Ridge. Boone County already has a lot of commercial and industrial area and there is no interest in annexing that development. Land would be available for housing to the north of Lincoln Way and west of County Line road. The layout is a different growth pattern because of the drainage issues. Traffic patterns into the City is a concern along Ontario and Lincoln Way with only two ways to get into the City. There may or may not be sewer capacity.

Mr. Diekmann showed the different sewer lines that would need to happen. All can be done, cost and timing are the two issues. Would need to choose which way to grow as each area needs significant infrastructure. Will learn more as the process continues to see if we develop into more than one area and how infill will happen.

Questions: Doug Ragaller questioned when the infill is being presented. Infill will go to Council the end of September beginning of October. Mr. Diekmann said Council would need to complete a vision and then set priorities based on the earlier feedback.

Mr. Emery asked if the east trunk line would be added already. Mr. Diekmann stated not the north-south one. Currently, it would run along Lincoln Way to connect back into the City that would serve a large area without jumping into the big investment. The same with the regional commercial area along 13th Street, there is a leg that can be extended to serve that area. Meaningful development would trigger another capacity improvement.

Mr. Emery stated that the sanitary sewer issue is over everything as far as the quickest development opportunity. Mr. Diekmann said it is necessary but isn't more important than traffic and water improvements, those also need to be considered. Sewer can be extended to the north, west or south without downstream capacity issues. East there could be some but would need the trunk line sooner rather than later. In terms of expediency, all areas are similar, it comes down to cost.

Ms. Minhas asked if the 15,000 is broken down by age or any other demographics. Mr. Diekmann stated that the 15,000 is non-student population. Student population is approximately 28,000 living in the City limits. Conversation was had regarding ISU enrollment and how those numbers are projected.

Mr. Emery questioned if the City handles all of ISU's water, sewer and power needs. Mr. Diekmann responded that yes the City handles the water and sewer and some of the power. ISU has their own power plant so they generate some of their own power depending on the location of the ISU facility.

Ms. Minhas asked about how the land patterns were being used and what determined the color variation of the areas. Mr. Diekmann responded that RDG was given professional artistic license to layout the growth areas and show what the densities would look like with these numbers in the different areas. They were not told how to devise the plan. Ms. Minhas explained that the City should think about the 15,000 with students and what the growth would look like in age and economic levels. Such as what the need might be for multi-family versus other needs. Mr. Diekmann stated that conversations about the housing needs versus just population are being addressed for each area but doesn't have that information today. Ms. Minhas also questioned if there would be scenarios with the infill and growth combinations.

Discussion about infill and growth for the 15,000 and different ways that could happen.

Mr. Emery asked if the proposed Healthy Life Center would make growth to the west more attractive. Mr. Diekmann said that they don't know if that would make it more attractive, it might but there are a lot of factors for building and why someone would want to buy a house in those locations. Mr. Diekmann also stated that this isn't a complete picture but is the beginning and may not be where the City goes at all. This just gives you an idea to begin education on what could be done in the future.

There will be future information on the Infill depending on timelines and how it is presented to City Council. There was an Open House for the Infill August 22 between 4:00-7:00 p.m. with RDG in the Council Chambers.

COMMISSION COMMENTS: None

STAFF COMMENTS: None

MOTION TO ADJOURN:

The meeting adjourned at 8:42 PM.



Matt Converse, Chairperson
Planning & Zoning Commission



Natalie Rekemeyer, Recording Secretary
Department of Planning & Housing