1. Call meeting to order at 5:45 P.M.

2. Approval of Agenda

3. Approval of Minutes – October 10, 2016

4. Chairperson – Welcome of Guests

5. Public Comment – 3-minute limit for items not on the agenda (No action taken)

6. New Business
   a. Request from Diligent Warrior Run, LLC to approve the Preliminary Plat of the Warrior Run Estates Plat 2
   b. Request from Hubbell Properties to approve the Site Plan for Edencrest at the Legacy
   c. Discussion on potential amendments to the parkland dedication section of the City’s Subdivision Ordinance
   d. Discussion and recommendation on amendment to the City’s Urban Renewal Plan

7. Staff Development Update

8. Future Business Items
   a. Legacy 20 Final Plat
   b. Sign Ordinance Review
   c. Parkland Dedication Amendment
   d. R-F District Rezoning

9. Next Meeting Date: November 14, 2016

10. Adjournment
Call to order
The Regular Meeting of the Norwalk Planning and Zoning Commission was held at the Norwalk City Hall, 705 North Avenue, Monday, October 10, 2016. The meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m. by Chairperson Judy McConnell. Those present at roll call were, John Fraser, Elizabeth Thompson, Brandon Foldes, Jim Huse and Judy McConnell. Absent: Grant.

Present was City Council liaison Stephanie Riva.

Staff present included: Luke Parris, City Planner and Shelley Stravers, Development Services Assistant.

Approval of Agenda - 16-60
Motion by Foldes and seconded by Fraser to approve the agenda as presented. Approved 5-0.

Approval of Minutes - 16-61
Motion by Thompson and seconded by Foldes to approve the minutes from the September 12, 2016 meeting. Approved 5-0.

Chairperson McConnell welcomed guests present. With no one wishing to speak, the business portion of the meeting was opened.

New Business
Public Hearing and consideration of an amendment to the City’s Comprehensive Plan for the update to the Land Use Chapter - 16-62
Parris report in 2015 the City received numerous rezoning requests. The staff reviews of those rezoning requests included confirming conformance with the City’s Future Land Use Plan, which is a chapter of the City’s Comprehensive Plan. At the time, staff found that the requests were in conformance with the Future Land Use Plans, though questions were raised whether the plan accurately reflected the goals of the City.

Those concerns lead the City to contract with Confluence and Chris Shires to update the Land Use chapter of the Comprehensive Plan focused primarily on the Future Land Use component. Work began on the update in January of 2016 and over ten months several public meetings were held and a final draft was developed.

The update revises several of the City’s land use categories to provide clarification on the differences between the different densities of residential uses. The update also looks at the City’s subareas, which are special development districts. A new subarea was added along the 50th Avenue corridor as a second potential entry into the community with the City of West Des Moines’ Veteran’s Parkway project proceeding. The update provides several new policies to guide the development of the community, which includes a focus on new urbanism concepts.

Mr. Shires explained the notable changes are:

- Increased amount of low density residential
- New very low density residential category
- Decrease in high density residential and medium density residential
- New agricultural reserve category
- Sub Areas 2 and 3 as residential commercial flex
- Sub Area 2 shifted west
The public hearing was opened at 5:56 p.m.

Scott McMurray, United Properties, 4521 Fleur Drive, Des Moines asked the Commission if this is just going to be a guide, or will this be zoning that is set in stone? He would like to think that the owner of the land would be able to come and request a land use change on a parcel. Parris responded that this will be a guide for the City to use for the rezoning requests. The City needs some type of a legal plan guiding growth. If a request is made for rezoning, City officials have two options, to say no if it doesn’t match the Future Land Use Plan, or the plan can be revised which would include a comp plan amendment and then a rezoning.

McMurray understands that all cities have a Future Land Use Plan, but most take into consideration good projects brought forth. He just wants the Commission to understand there are a lot of large land owners in the City limits and they may not understand the City telling them how they can or can’t use their land. McMurray would like to see the City stay flexible. He doesn’t see much on the plan for high density where a good apartment project could be considered.

Foldes expressed his concern for the reduction in medium and high density. He is concerned that Norwalk will become a single family suburban community and miss out on some of the other projects that can be quality projects even though they are a higher density.

Shires explained that there is flexibility and that this document will be changed over and over again. It might be reviewed on an annual basis to evaluate goals and make sure they are still being met with this document. This is a tool that the City can use to help plan for future infrastructure. Land use, sewer use and road use are all very important factors and this helps to try and look into the future for planning.

Shires noted that the elected officials were concerned about the amount of high density areas and voiced their concerns, which resulted in a reduction of those areas. Shires explained that more high density from a financial standpoint is healthy. Cities are going to need space for the millennials and retired folks to live.

McConnell and Foldes both noted that without apartments, the City will lose some of its vibrancy. If we conform to all single family, we are only focusing on the biggest population core right now and not planning for millennials and seniors for future housing.

The public hearing was closed at 6:10 p.m.

Motion by Huse and seconded by Thompson to approve the amendment to the City’s Comprehensive Plan for the update to the Land Use Chapter. Approved 5-0.

Public Hearing and consideration of an amendment to the City’s Comprehensive Plan to adopt the SubArea 1 Master Plan – 16-63

The City’s 2013 Comprehensive Plan identifies several subareas throughout the community that required additional planning and thought as to their future development. The first subarea, SubArea 1, is located in the center of the City on 600 acres of ground to the east of Highway 28. The Comprehensive Plan called for this area to include a newer, more welcoming downtown center with surrounding development that utilized new urbanism concepts to create a pedestrian friendly environment. In the fall of 2013, the City received a grant from the Des Moines Area MPO to develop a master plan for SubArea 1.
The grant money allowed the City to hire Chris Shires of Confluence to assist in the development of the SubArea 1 Master Plan. City staff teamed with Confluence on the project to provide additional resources while writing the plan. Confluence consultant team held individual meetings with each of the landowners within SubArea 1 to understand their desires and concerns for the development of their property. Public meetings were held in conjunction with the Land Use Plan to gather public input and final draft plan was developed.

The Master Plan includes a review of existing conditions, a land use plan for the 600 acres, a master plan of the site, vehicular and pedestrian circulation plans, design guidelines for buildings in the plan area, and a review of the public utilities needed to serve the site.

Primary focuses of the Master Plan was to create the newer downtown district while still preserving space for traditional commercial development along Highway 28. Additionally, the plan looked to provide ways to transition from existing industrial uses along Colonial Parkway to existing residential development to the north of Beardsley Street in the Echo Valley Development.

One item that Shires pointed out is at the last minute, a school was added to the plan. This school is shown located across from an industrial area. Huse doesn’t feel that is an ideal location. He is glad to see there is community involvement and the desire to plan for more schools. At the rate Norwalk is growing, there is definitely going to be a need for more schools. Shires explained that the area planned for a school could also be used for single or multifamily if a school was not put there.

Thompson expressed her concerns with medium density residential going up next to single family. She said that area would back up to her fence in her back yard and she does not want to see horizontal townhomes in her backyard. She feels this would hurt the resale values of the homes in that area. Shires explained that there was a lot of thought put into this. They needed a transition from the single family homes to the mixed use buildings that could possibly be three stories tall in the urban center. Townhome buffer between single family and mixed use is very common. The townhomes would not share a street, just serve as a transitioning tool.

Bob Olson, Olson & Associates, spoke regarding this transition. He said there would be a 30 foot buffer there and that it has proven when a quality product is put in for this transition that land values actually go up. He also informed Commission that when the project for the townhomes comes in front of the group, they would then have the opportunity to say yes or no.

Parris noted that these townhomes might have a lesser front setback, so that would put them even farther away from the fence line. The guidelines in this chapter are a lot higher standard than a townhome anywhere else in the City.

Thompson also questioned the two roundabouts on Highway 28 and how they are to help slow traffic down. Shires explained the physics of a roundabout and there is only so fast someone can go through a roundabout so it is evident that traffic will slow down. He noted that roundabouts are expensive on the front side, but they do end up saving money in the long run. A roundabout encourages walkability and would allow for a couple of places to cross Highway 28 safely.

Shires noted that the Commission is only voting on the land use part of the concept tonight.

Foldes asked where the park land is in the concept and would the school be considered park land? He feels the City needs to identify park land sooner rather than later on these concepts or it ends up going on the wayside.
Foldes also commented that too many people care more about zoning and should care more about the architectural standards of the area. People associate cheap apartments with high density and that doesn’t have to be the case at all if we pay attention to the architectural standards and have high quality products.

The public hearing was opened at 6:43 p.m.

Scott McMurray, United Properties, 4521 Fleur Drive, Des Moines, spoke to the Commission informing them that he sat through these meetings with Shires and Olson. He feels they’ve done a great job involving people in this process. As a developer, he wants the Commission to remember plans change and he would like to caution them on that. He would like to see as much flexibility as possible so that as the market drives development, developers can fit plans with the demand.

Olson agreed with McMurray and said that the SubArea 1 Master Plan is a living document and the market will dictate how it develops. But this document gives Norwalk some framework to start with. Flexibility is important.

Riva asked about the landscape guidelines. She said it wasn’t ever determined what the caliper of trees and the critical types that are required. Shires asked if this was something that would be just in SubArea 1 or city wide. Huse expressed concern with preserving current trees in the City and how we would go about doing that. Shires assured there are ways to do that.

Shires informed Commission that they would be voting on the design guidelines booklet and the SubArea 1 Master Plan. He feels this is an appropriate mix of land uses and when considering any planning in the future the City would use this as a guideline as to what is allowable there.

McMurray asked Parris if Southern Crossing would now not be allowable if this was accepted. Parris said that is already zoned for that, but if there was a request to change zoning, this document would be looked at for a guide. This plan is the legal framework to help the City with rezonings and is a necessary document for the City.

Shires noted that developers have the exact same condition today. If the zoning doesn’t match what they are wanting, they would need to request a rezoning of the area. This document gives you a starting point from which to judge a rezoning request.

McMurray stated he understands the City needing to have a land use plan, but now getting down to design standards is pretty nitty gritty. That’s more than just framework. The entire city has design standards, but this area has to specifically follow these design standards. He does not feel that leaves flexibility at all. He said everyone sitting in the seats say they will be flexible, but these seats will change and the City will lose development because the new people won’t understand that.

Shires changed wording on page 11 under Future Land Use Plans. The last sentence now reads, “Flexibility should be permitted to adjust and shift land uses to reflect refined development plans and engineered roadway plans.” He also offered for the Commission to change the southernmost Industrial Flex area to Office/Business Park. Commission discussed the changes as being positive changes.
The public hearing was closed at 7:18 p.m.

Motion by Huse and seconded by Foldes to approve the amendment to the City’s Comprehensive Plan to adopt the SubArea 1 Master Plan with amendments to flexibility statement on page 11 and changing the southernmost industrial flex designation to office/business park. Approved 4-1, Thompson voting nay.

**Public Hearing and consideration of an amendment to the City’s Comprehensive Plan for an update to Trails Section - 16-64**

Parris explained in 2014 the City received a grant from Prairie Meadows to review the trails component of the 2013 Comprehensive Plan with a specific focus on determining a preferred alternative to connect the community to the Great Western Trail. RDG Planning & Design was hired to review the location of trails in the City and development alternatives to connecting with the Great Western Trail. Ultimately, a draft trail plan was developed with a preferred connection along Beardsley and 50th Avenue to the Great Western Trail. The trail plan was reviewed by the Planning & Zoning Commission and the City Council, both of which had concerns over the location of a trail along Highway 28 and the plan for implementing the trail system.

Staff took the draft trail plan from RDG and modified it to remove trails that were seen as not feasible. Additionally, staff classified trails into those that currently exist, those identified in current city plans, and those proposed for future development. To assist with implementation, staff developed a second map that identified which entities would be responsible for the construction of the various trails. This primarily fell to City responsible trails along major corridors and developer responsible trails in undeveloped land throughout the City. Parris explained that developers would not have to necessarily place trails where we have them mapped out, but would have to somehow make the connections that are required in that development.

The public hearing was opened at 7:35 p.m.

The public hearing was closed at 7:35 p.m.

Motion by Thompson and seconded by Fraser to approve the amendment to the City’s Comprehensive Plan for an update to Trails Section. Approved 5-0.

**Request from United Properties to approve the Site Plan for Lot 3 of the Marketplace at Echo Valley - 16-65**

Parris explained this request is for the development of two multi-tenant buildings, each with space for four units. The site is zoned C-2 as part of the Echo Valley Community PUD. The development is on Lot 3 of the Marketplace at Echo Valley. The site would be developed in phases, with the southern building and parking lot being phase 1 and the northern building being phase 2. This is the first site plan in the Marketplace at Echo Valley.

Overall the site plan meets or exceeds the City’s requirements for development of a C-2 parcel. The applicant has requested a waiver of the requirement that a drive-thru queue line cannot block a designated parking space. It is staff opinion that this waiver should be granted as part of the site plan approval. The site is only required to provide 70 parking spaces, so staff is not concerned about creating spaces that are not usable. Additionally, any spaces blocked by the queue line would be at the end of the queue line, resulting in rare instances when a full queue line would block a space, which would be cleared rather quickly.
Staff also raised concerns over the temporary detention basin on Outlot Y. The developer proposed the following measures that addressed the concerns:

- Use the existing temporary basins as-is to meet the detention requirements for Lots 3 & 4.
- Calculations show the volume and detention required is equivalent to the volume provided in the temporary basins even though there is not a direct relationship of the drainage areas from the lots to each of the basins (volume is provided regardless of where the storm water is derived). No additional calculations are required as long as the following is done:
  1. United Properties will maintain these basins until other arrangements are made, i.e. development of Outlot Y.
  2. If Outlot Y is not developed within 10 years - United Properties shall convert these temporary basins into permanent detention basins.
  3. If Lots 1, 2 or 5 are developed before Outlot Y, they would need to prepare additional detention calculations and increase the temporary basin volumes or add additional temporary basins or convert to permanent basins.
  4. All temporary basins shall be converted to permanent detention basins that meet City requirements no later than October 2026.

Thompson expressed concern with the drive-thru queue and possibly getting backed up if it was a coffee shop.

Dean Rogair of CDA spoke to this matter. He said there are approximately six spots in the the drive-thru lane before it would get into the parking area. And the parking area that would be affected is the employee parking in the back of the building. There is also two ways to exit.

Scott McMurray, United Properties, 4521 Fleur Drive, Des Moines also commented that there will be connectivity between all the parking lots, so if you can’t get into one entrance due to a queue line, then you can just go to the next entrance.

Motion by Huse and seconded by Fraser to approve the Site Plan for Lot 3 of the Marketplace at Echo Valley with staff recommendations:

- That the parking requirement for drive-thru lanes blocking parking spaces is waived.
- That the final plat approval includes the necessary agreements to implement the developer solution to the temporary drainage basins.
- That the site development and building construction follow all City code regulations.
- That any significant modifications to the site plan be reviewed and approved by the Planning & Zoning Commission and City Council.

Approved 5-0.

Request from United Properties to approve the Site Plan for Mercy Clinic for Lot 4 of the Marketplace at Echo Valley - 16-66

Parris presented the request for the development of professional office buildings, which will be space for a Mercy Clinic. The site is zoned C-2 as part of the Echo Valley Community PUD. The development is Lot 4 of the Marketplace at Echo Valley. Overall the site plan meets or exceeds the City’s requirements for development of a C-2 Parcel. The staff raised concern again over the temporary detention basin on Outlot Y. The developer proposed the following measures that addressed the concerns:

- Use the existing temporary basins as-is to meet the detention requirements for Lots 3 & 4.
- Calculations show the volume and detention required is equivalent to the volume provided in the temporary basins even though there is not a direct relationship of the drainage areas
from the lots to each of the basins (volume is provided regardless of where the storm water is derived). No additional calculations are required as long as the following is done:

5. United Properties will maintain these basins until other arrangements are made, i.e. development of Outlot Y.
6. If Outlot Y is not developed within 10 years - United Properties shall convert these temporary basins into permanent detention basins.
7. If Lots 1, 2 or 5 are developed before Outlot Y, they would need to prepare additional detention calculations and increase the temporary basin volumes or add additional temporary basins or convert to permanent basins.
8. All temporary basins shall be converted to permanent detention basins that meet City requirements no later than October 2026.

Scott McMurray, United Properties, 4521 Fleur Drive, Des Moines noted this would be a four sided building that all sides look the same. The main entrance would be on the east side of the building to try and avoid ice and snow issues for patients. There will also be an entrance on the west side of the building.

Motion by Foldes and seconded by Huse to approve the Site Plan for Mercy Clinic for Lot 4 of the Marketplace at Echo Valley with staff recommendations:

- That the final plat approval includes the necessary agreements to implement the developer solution to the temporary drainage basins.
- That the site development and building construction follow all City code regulations.
- That any significant modifications to the site plan be reviewed and approved by the Planning & Zoning Commission and City Council.

Approved 5-0.

Discussion on parkland dedication requirements
The Commission decided to wait to discuss this topic at the next meeting.

Staff Development Update
Parris informed Commission that the September report for the Development Services Department is out. He also reported that he and Luke Nelson will be taking over the Planning & Economic Development Director duties until it is decided how to configure the department.

Future Business Items
None were discussed.

Next meeting Date - October 24, 2016.

Adjournment - 16-67
Motion by Huse and seconded by Foldes to adjourn the meeting at 8:01 p.m. Approved 5-0.

Judy McConnell, Vice Chairperson  Luke Parris, City Planner
REQUEST: Request from Diligent Warrior Run, LLC to approve the Preliminary Plat of the Warrior Run Estates Plat 2

MEETING DATE: October 24, 2016

STAFF CONTACT: Luke Parris, AICP
City Planner

APPLICANT(S): Diligent Warrior Run, LLC  Civil Engineering Consultants, Inc.
12119 Stratford Dr. Ste B  2400 86th St. Unit 12
Clive, Iowa 50325  Des Moines, Iowa 50322

GENERAL DESCRIPTION: This request would create 32 lots along the continuation Warrior Run Drive in the Warrior Run Estates development to the east of East 27th Street.

IMPACT ON NEIGHBORHOOD: The properties surrounding the new area are single-family homes in the County to the north, single-family homes to the south, and the Warrior Run Golf Course. There are two outlots to the west zoned for multi-family.

VEHICULAR & PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC: The plat shows the construction of two new streets. Warrior Run Drive provides a continuation of that street to the north and east. A stub street, East 29th Street connects Warrior Run Drive to Carpenter Street, an existing gravel road.

TRAIL PLAN: The plat includes standard 5’ sidewalks along the streets.

ZONING HISTORY FOR SITE AND IMMEDIATE VICINITY: This site is zoned in the R-1(70). Surrounding land is zoned R-1(70), R-3, and R-4 (with a restriction for only senior housing).

BUFFERS REQUIRED/NEEDED: Double frontage lots required a buffer easement along Carpenter Street.

DRAINAGE: Drainage for the residential lots overland and to the storm sewer system on the streets. The storm sewer system outlets to an offsite detention basin to the south on the golf course.

DEVELOPMENT HISTORY: Development of single family homes in the area began with Warrior Run Estates Plat 1 in 2015.

FLOODPLAIN: None of the proposed lots are located within a floodplain.
PARKLAND: The subdivision ordinance requires 783 square feet of parkland per single family dwelling unit. The development has 32 lots and is required to provide 0.58 acres of parkland, or the equivalent per Subdivision Regulations, to the City. No park is shown on site.

Staff is working with the developer to discuss options for meeting the City's parkland dedication requirement.

UTILITIES: WATER, SANITARY SEWER, STORM SEWER:
- An 8” water main is provided on the north side of Warrior Run Drive and on the west side of East 29th.
- Hydrants are shown along Warrior Run Drive with adequate coverage.
- An 8” sanitary sewer is provided on the south side of Warrior Run Drive and provides service to the 32 lots.
- A 15” storm sewer is along Warrior Run Drive and connects to an 24” storm sewer that carries storm water to the offsite detention basin.

RELATIONSHIP TO COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLAN: The future land use plan designates this location medium density residential.

STAFF ANALYSIS - ZONING ORDINANCE:
- The Preliminary Plat consists of 32 residential lots. The plat consists of 24.57 acres of land south. The residential lots vary in size measuring from 10,500 SF to 22,375 SF.

Streets shown will be dedicated to the City for street use upon approval of the Final Plat. The designated street right-of-way is 60 feet with a 28’ wide road on Warrior Run Drive and East 29th.

The proposed preliminary plat would be for any residential lots to be in the R-1(70) district with the following bulk regulations:
- Minimum lot area - 8,750 SF
- Minimum lot width - 70'
- Front Setback - 30'
- Side setback - 17’ total (min. 7’ one side)
- Rear setback - 35’
- Height - 35’

STAFF ANALYSIS - SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE: The Subdivision Ordinance requires that Preliminary Plat submissions details on lot design, street layout, sanitary sewer layout, water main layout, grading, and storm water management. All information has been submitted by the applicant.
Therefore, staff recommends that the request for the Preliminary Plat of Warrior Run Estates Plat 2 be approved with the following conditions:

• That the applicant provides all supporting documentation required within the Norwalk Subdivision Regulations.

• That any significant modifications to the final plat be reviewed and approved by the Planning & Zoning Commission and City Council.
REQUEST: Request from Hubbell Properties to approve the Site Plan for Edencrest at the Legacy

MEETING DATE: October 24, 2016

STAFF CONTACT: Luke Parris, AICP City Planner

APPLICANT(S): Hubbell Properties II, LC Civil Design Advantage, LLC
6900 Westown Parkway 34-5 SE Crossroads Dr. Suite G
West Des Moines, IA 50321 Grimes, IA 50111

GENERAL DESCRIPTION: This request is for the development of 60 unit assisted living facility. The site is zoned as part of the Legacy Planned Unit Development. An amendment to the PUD zoned this specific parcel as R-4 specifically for an assisted living facility.

IMPACT ON NEIGHBORHOOD: The site is to the north of the existing Legacy Landing apartment complex. To the east is vacant ground and to the west is existing single-family residential in the Legacy Pointe subdivision. The use is generally compatible with the surrounding residential uses.

VEHICULAR & PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC: The site has two access drives onto Cedar Street. Internally, the site provides an access drive the connects the parking areas to the driveways.

A 5’ city sidewalk is provided along Cedar Street. This will connect to the existing sidewalk to the south. A sidewalk is also required along Beardsley Street. The developer has requested to not build this sidewalk with the project due to potential expansion of Beardsley in the future. The Public Works Department has concurred with the developer that expansion of Beardsley could impact any sidewalk installed at this time. The developer has consented to signing a Petition and Waiver regarding the sidewalk. This will allow the City to build the sidewalk in the future and assess the owner of this site for the cost.

PARKING: The City’s parking standards require 1 parking space for every 4 units, 1 spot for each staff, and one spot for each doctor. The code would require 15 spots for the units. The developer indicates that there will be 13 staff at the facility. The code would require a total of 28 spots. The site provides 43 spots, 13 for staff and 30 for the units.
OPEN SPACE & LANDSCAPING:

The site provides the minimum of 25% of open space required by the PUD.

For landscaping, the site is required to provide 32 trees and 48 shrubs. The site provides 33 trees and 48 shrubs.

The PUD required a landscaped buffer on the west property line. That buffer is provided via 11 canopy trees and 26 evergreen trees.

SIGNAGE:

No monument sign is shown on the site plan. The site elevations show a building sign on the front façade. The details of the signage will be handled through the City’s sign permit process.

ARCHITECTURAL STANDARDS:

The City’s architectural standards require that buildings in the R-4 district be composed of 40% class 1 or class 2 materials, no more than 60% class 3 and class 4 materials, with any class 4 materials being no more than 10%.

The site plan includes building elevations that identify materials to be used on the building façade.

- The east elevation includes 47% class 1 and class 2 materials and exceeds the code requirement.
- The west elevation includes 39% class 1 and class 2 materials and is slightly below the code requirement.
- The north and south elevations include 29% class 1 and class 2 materials and is below the code requirement.

When the PUD master plan amendment was submitted the developer included building elevations that they wanted adopted with the master plan amendment as a formal piece of the Legacy PUD. Staff review of the PUD amendment ordinance is inconclusive as to whether the building elevations were adopted as part of the PUD or not.

It is staff opinion that the architectural standards are in place to ensure quality, long lasting buildings with a cohesive design in the City of Norwalk. The staff review of the building elevations finds that the design is cohesive across all facades and that the design is not attempting to utilize lesser materials. It is staff opinion that the design meets the general intent of the architectural standards.

DRAINAGE:

The site includes an on-site system to collect storm water runoff from the parking and building. The storm water from
the site is detained in a basin on the north side of the site, south of Beardsley Street. The basin outlets to the north where storm water would then enter into the City storm sewer system.

**UTILITIES: WATER, SANITARY SEWER, STORM SEWER.**

Adequate services are provided to the site and detailed on the site plan.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Overall the site plan meets or exceeds the City's requirements for development of a R-4 Assisted Living Facility. As noted, certain building facades do not meet the specific required percentages for building materials. The developer is of the opinion that the PUD amendment locked in the building design via the elevations provided with the amendment. The intent of the City's architectural standards is to ensure long-lasting quality buildings are built in the City. It is the staff's opinion that the proposed design meets that intent.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Therefore, staff recommends that the request for the Site Plan for Edencrest at the Legacy be approved with the following conditions:

- That the site development and building construction follow all City code regulations.

- That any significant modifications to the site plan be reviewed and approved by the Planning & Zoning Commission and City Council.
Edencrest at The Legacy - Norwalk, Iowa

Schematic Elevations
CITY OF NORWALK
REPORT TO THE NORWALK PLANNING COMMISSION

ITEM: Discussion on parkland dedication requirements.

MEETING DATE: October 24, 2016

STAFF CONTACT: Luke Parris, AICP
City Planner

SUMMARY: At recent Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council meetings, the topic of parkland dedication and a park master plan have been discussed. The current subdivision ordinance spells out the parkland dedication process. In summary, the process is as follows:

- New residential developments are required to dedicate parkland to the City that is consistent with the City’s Comprehensive Plan and the City’s Comprehensive Park Plan.
- If land proposed for development includes a park identified in the City’s Plans, then the developer must show that park on their master plan or plat.
- If no park is proposed in the City’s Plans for the developed land, then the developer shall be required to do one, or a combination, of the following:
  - Dedicate land owned outside of the planned development, as long as it is land planned as a park in the City’s Plans.
  - Improve an existing City Park with the construction of park improvements, facilities, equipment, or trails, in an amount equal to the fair market value of the land needed to fulfill the parkland dedication requirement.
  - Provide a cash deposit for the implementation of park system in an amount equal to the fair market value of the land needed to fulfill the parkland dedication requirement.

For this process, the Subdivision Ordinance defines the fair market value of land as the value of the entire development, prior the initiation of construction of improvements to a subdivision. In other words, the fair market value is the cost of the undeveloped ground.
Current concerns with the current process are the lack of a defined parks plan and lack of guidance on determining the fair market value of the parkland dedication requirement. The City’s Comprehensive Plan does include a section on the parks system, but it only talks about future parks needs as the community grows and does not identify the location of parks. Past practice when determining the “fair market value” for the parkland dedication has been to take the purchase price the developer paid for the property and use it to determine a per acre fee. Recently, questions have been raised to if this cost is sufficient to develop our park system. We can use the recent Timber View subdivision as an example of how the current calculation would work (please note that Timber View dedicated parkland space within the development).

Purchase Price of Timber View - $1,767,888 or $15,024 per acre  
Number of Timber View Single-Family Lots - 144 units  
Parkland Space Required - 144 units x 783 sf = 112,752 sf or 2.59 acres  
Fair Market Value of Parkland - 2.59 acres x $15,024 per acre = $38,888.57

Questions Considered by Council:

Does the City need to develop a new parks plan?  
- Council directed staff to research the potential cost of a comprehensive park plan and begin work on a draft RFP for the project.

Does the current calculation provide enough funds and should the calculation for fair market value for parkland dedication purposes be revised?  
- Council directed staff to research other city codes to understand how different communities handle dedication requirements and to consider any minor modifications to the parkland dedication requirements that would address the concerns while a comprehensive park plan is developed.

Summary of Other City Codes:

Staff has researched and summarized 5 municipalities in the metro to determine what those entities require when a developer doesn’t offer parkland dedication.

Urbandale: “If the City Council determines that a dedication of land is not feasible or practical within a new development, the developer shall construct or install park infrastructure improvements that are equal in value to that of the minimum land dedication, had a land dedication been accepted, within an existing or proposed city park that can serve the new development. The cash value of said land dedication
shall be determined by multiplying the total purchase price or cost of all the land in the proposed development by 10%. A developer may voluntarily choose to pay a fee to the city in the amount determined under this section, in lieu of constructing park infrastructure”.

Ankeny: “If parkland dedication is not possible, the developer may pay to the City a cash payment as hereinafter determined, which shall be placed in a special fund by the City and shall be used solely for the acquisition and/or development of park and recreational lands to serve the residents of the City. The payment in lieu of land shall be based on the fair market value of the acres of land in the development that otherwise would have been dedicated as a park site. There may be situations when a combination of land dedication and a contribution in lieu of land are both advisable when: Only a portion of the land to be developed is proposed as the location for a park site or A major part of the local park or recreational site has already been acquired and only a small portion of land is needed from the development to complete the site”.

Pleasant Hill & Johnston: “The developer may make a request to the Council that the developer be allowed to meet the requirements through other arrangements agreeable to the Council and the developer as long as such agreement provides equal value to the City in the form of a Development Agreement”.

West Des Moines: “As an alternative to dedication, any person filing a development application may provide jointly with other persons for the dedication of land in an amount at least equal to the amount required (per their dedication calculations) that the alternative jointly provided will provide for a park with a total land area of at least five (5) acres and be dedicated to the City. Any entity required to comply with this requirement may present an alternate plan to the park and recreation advisory board which shall make a recommendation to be presented to the plan and zoning commission, which will then go on to City Council to be approved or rejected. Any alternate proposal must directly and proportionately benefit the development. This subsection, however, does not authorize the payment of impact fees to the city in lieu of the land dedication requirements”.
ITEM: Discussion and recommendation on amendment to the City’s Urban Renewal Plan

MEETING DATE: October 24, 2016

STAFF CONTACT: Luke Parris, AICP
City Planner

SUMMARY: The City Council has set a hearing date of November 17th to hold a public hearing on proposed amendments to the City of Norwalk’s Urban Renewal Plan. The Urban Renewal Plan identifies areas in the community that are eligible to have TIF funds spent on projects within the boundary of the plan. Prior to the City Council public hearing, the Planning and Zoning Commission must review the requested proposal for conformance with the City’s plans.

The proposed amendments are to add the commercial ground in the North Shore PUD, commercial ground to the east of Highway 28 near the North Shore, and the Hughes Farm area of SubArea 1. The City’s Counsel is still finalizing the proposed plan amendment documents. Those documents will be provided prior to the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff has reviewed the proposed amendment and recommends that the Planning and Zoning Commission offer a favorable recommendation to the City Council.