

Mr. Kohout reviewed the memorandum with the Commission and reviewed the proposed changes with the Commission to the ordinance.

Vice-Chair Payne supports inclusion of architectural standards with the amendment proposed. She questioned the term “plat” and if that is in fact what is expected. Mr. Werger stated a plat with notations of setbacks and other items that may be modified from original zoning district standards are sought to be included by Staff with this ordinance amendment. Ms. Payne did not support inclusion of a drainage plan at two foot intervals and drain spout locations at five feet from property lines is too detailed for a PD plat. Mr. Werger confirmed for Ms. Payne an engineered plan is not sought with the plat and that the plat is all that is to be received to review a development. Mr. Werger supported keeping a basic drainage plan as a requirement as overall drainage can be a public concern with building considerations. There was discussion about what language could be warranted to ensure resulting drainage after development would not be a problem. Ms. Payne confirmed with Mr. Kohout a SWIPP plan would be required by the Iowa Department of Natural Resources as part of the construction process without the mention of this in the ordinance. Ms. Payne supports a two stage process of review where an initial approval of a plat and planned development would progress to a site plan to be reviewed and approved prior to issuing building permits. Ms. Payne gave the example of a project she worked on with the City of Waterloo, Iowa and encouraged staff to review the Waterloo model ordinance for guidance and language.

Mr. Dane does not support reducing PD district to five acres as ten acres is the better option as resulting development would be large enough to provide proper spacing between different commercial and differing densities of residential construction. Mr. Dane does not support items dealing with building setback lines, resulting grading plan, and resulting drainage plan as up-front costs to a developer as presented in the site plan requirements. Mr. Dane supports including these items as a natural progression of review, but not up-front.

Ms. Solheim supports a five acre minimum size as past Commission discussions on this matter supported that size to encourage more redevelopment of existing properties. She thinks two acres is too small and five acres would be following the spirit of the Comprehensive Land Use plan guidance in encouraging more mixed use housing where appropriate on the Future Land Use Map. She supports requiring site plan elements such as building setback lines, resulting grading plan, and resulting drainage plan up-front as the developer would have more confidence following preliminary approvals going forward on the direction a decision may be heading towards.

Ms. Olson discussed lot size requirements with respective residential zoning districts and supported the five acre size to promote more mixed use development.

There was discussion about how many units and scale of development could fit on five acres and ten acres amongst the Commission.

There was discussion about the recent PD amendment in 2017 for the Centennial Oaks development on the west side of 3rd St. SW and this lot size is a little over 10 acres. The Commission discussed simply rezoning this property versus amending the PD district which encompasses this property with example scenarios.

Mr. Bagelmann stated support of the 10 acre minimum lot size requirement as it may be easier to drop down to a five acre standard as opposed to increasing a lot size minimum from five to 10 acres, should that time come.

The Commission gave direction for staff to revise the ordinance and bring forth an edited amendment for the Commission to consider at their next regularly scheduled August meeting.

2. Review Zoning Ordinance Amendment to Districts and Boundaries titles in City Code Section 100.3.01.

City Staff is requesting the Commission to review and make a motion on the request to amending the City Code Section 100.3.01 to better reflect the inclusion of "R-1A" District into the Code with previous revisions. This is a clerical correction in nature.

Mr. Kohout reviewed the differing "R" district descriptions with the Commission and the omission of descriptions such as "Single Family", "Two Family", to refer to the "R-1" and "R-2" districts, as examples.

Mr. Dane supports including brief descriptions to better assist the public with understanding the zoning district classifications.

The Commission discussed including descriptions for all zoning district classifications and to bring back an edited amendment to consider at their next regularly scheduled August meeting.

3. Review and Comment on County Subdivision within Two Miles of City Limits.

As per Iowa State Code Section 354.9, and City Code Section 103.1.03, The City shall review and recommend on each subdivision plat through the Planning and Zoning Commission to the City Council.

The applicants are proposing to parcel off 4.59 acres, fronting onto the North side 210th St., also known as U.S. Business Highway 218, located approximately 0.8 miles west of the City Airport. The intent is to establish a new residential property. The City shows this area fronting onto 210th Street in the Future Comprehensive Land Use Map as "Commercial/Industrial", and a future City trail is planned on the north side of 210th Street. The property will be serviced by private well and septic tank services. There are no immediate plans to provide City services to the future "Parcel A".

Mr. Bagelmann stated concerns of the request as this area was designated in past Waverly comprehensive land use plans as future commercial and industrial area and a house would not fit in with the area. The site is in close proximity to the Waverly Airport and is aligned very closely to the designated departure and arrival corridors. He suggested this matter be shared with the Waverly Airport Commission to determine their input of a residence being established as proposed.

Mr. Kohout reviewed the Waverly Future Land Use Map with the Commission and showed the location to be within the commercial/industrial future land use area along the

