

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MINUTES
City of Waverly, Iowa
City Council Chambers
June 1, 2017

A. Call to Order: 7:00pm

1. Members Present: Hank Bagelmann, Chairperson; Mary French; Lance Gritters; Adam Hagensick; Kate Payne, Vice Chairperson; Heidi Solheim

Members Absent: Richard Dane; David Huser; Kathy Olson

City Staff Present: Ben Kohout, Secretary; Bill Werger, Community Development Director; Edith Waldstein, City Council Liaison.

2. Approval of Agenda:

Motion By: Solheim

Seconded By: Payne

Move that the agenda be approved as printed.

Yes: 6

No: 0

Absent: 3

3. Approval of Previous Minutes:

Motion By: French

Seconded By: Solheim

Move that the minutes of the May 4, 2017 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting be approved.

Yes: 6

No: 0

Absent: 3

4. Communications:

- a) June 26, 2017 – PZ Commission presentation to Council

B. Public Hearings:

None

C. Regular Business:

1. Review PD Zoning District and Discuss potential amendments with Zoning Staff.

Chair Bagelmann stated City Staff is requesting the Commission to review a proposed Planned Development District ordinance amendment. In the City Comprehensive Plan, a goal is stated to provide for zoning amendments to encourage mixture of land uses and housing types. Staff is providing the Commission with a memorandum highlighting the proposed changes being recommended by Staff.

Mr. Kohout reviewed a memo with the Commission, which highlighted proposed changes to the PD District code language. Mr. Kohout requested input from the Commission on the proposed changes.

Mr. Bagelmann confirmed with Mr. Kohout the intent of changing the language is to make applying for a PD district more desirable for developers. Mr. Kohout stated he thinks five acres minimum, instead of the current ten acres minimum, should be proposed as this can provide for enough space for different land uses to be proposed within a site plan.

Mr. Werger reviewed City examples of PD districts today, which have the Waverly Hospital, condominiums and the Centennial Oaks subdivision plat. Mr. Werger stated the Centennial Oaks example best represents the PD district as it provides for differing densities of residential and commercial components identified on the plat. Mr. Werger thinks this is a good model to base future provisions off of. Mr. Werger stated improvements which could be considered by the Commission include providing for minimum site plan standards, and providing for already codified provisions for land uses to allow for the City Staff, the Planning Commission and City Council to better judge developments on, instead of being too flexible with standards.

Ms. French stated she supports the inclusion of minimum design standards with submittal of a PD development to better define cohesive design elements to the proposed development. Ms. French stated site plan requirements should be required so as to better define the expectations for future builders and or owners of properties once sold to them. She also gave the example if a developer would change in middle of development, there should be no question as to what the minimum expectations of the development are. She stated she likes the concept of utilizing current zoning district land use allowances and providing for densities of housing on plans.

There was discussion of providing for grouping of existing zoning district classifications such as R-1, R-1A, R-2, R-3, R-4, C-1 to better define allowable land uses when identified on a submitted planned development site plan. There was discussion that including such provisions may better define grouping of homes and predictability of future land usage. Providing for a collection of zoning districts, as outlined in the example, could serve to better define future proposed changes to the development and make it easier for the Commission and Council to act upon such proposed plan amendments.

There was also discussion about street width and on-street parking implications of differing land uses within developments and a desire of the Commission to define street width and parking provisions. The Commission stated establishing street widths with the respective residential zoning districts may be a good approach to keep and not allowing PD plans to vary these widths can be a good approach to better aid the designing of developments. The general consensus was that keeping a universal street width for public streets would be the best approach with a proposal.

Ms. Payne stated support of provisions providing for minimum site plan elements such as setbacks, home sites and lot configurations so as to better judge and evaluate proposed developments. Ms. Payne stated simply stating single family homes or multiple family home lots and no other information may not be enough information to judge the development plat on. Ms. Payne stated support of trying to find the balance of creating language which provides for minimum standards, but allows a proposal to come forward

which may be out of the ordinary and not contained within the other zoning district specifications. Ms. Payne stated support of ordinance language to define the PD district is not to by-pass current zoning regulations, but merely to allow for flexibility where a well-designed neighborhood should be able to be entertained by the City.

Mr. Kohout reviewed sample community codes with PD provisions. Mr. Kohout reviewed Pleasant Hill ordinance language with the Commission. Mr. Kohout stated support of the Pleasant Hill example, subtracting some elements of the ordinance which may not be applicable to the desires of Staff or the Commission.

Mr. Werger provided scenario examples with the Commission involving neighborhood commercial ventures and residential neighborhood style developments and discussed a need for a plan to consider potential impacts of allowing for such developments and a desire of Staff to create ordinance language to capture this information on a plat.

There was discussion of the potential frequency of a PD request before the Commission for review. The Commission thought a PD request would be infrequent, and supported a desire to update the Code language to better clarify the expectations of a planned development to better judge any proposal.

Mr. Bagelmann stated support of evaluating which potential commercial applications may be hard to allow for in a neighborhood settings and to propose language to prohibit certain commercial applications.

The Commission discussed timing of development and including provisions for treating changes to an approved PD development as a new application, to accommodate those property owners already invested in and living within the development and their interests. Mr. Werger stated support of requiring coming back to the Commission and Council if development has commenced and properties have been sold and/or built as their interest is seeing a plan that complements the new property owners' structures or land uses. Mr. Werger discussed a need to address a development that was approved and not started within a time period and left the matter of if a development has commenced to be reviewed further.

Ms. Waldstein reviewed a past action of the Council to amend the PD in Centennial Oaks for the west side of 3rd St. SW in 2016. She stated support of encouraging investment of developers and for the ordinance language to allow for a way for developers to get an approval sign of the City prior to investing significantly in a property.

City staff stated they will incorporate concepts from other Iowa community ordinances and will look at current ordinance language to see where to change the ordinance language to achieve the goals stated by the Commission. The staff stated a desire to bring language back to the Commission for review in July.

D. Old Business:

None

E. New Business:

None

F. Adjournment:

Motion By: Payne

Move that the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting be adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Ben Kohout, Secretary