

ALTOONA PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

August 31, 2021

Altoona City Hall

Members Present in Person: Jill Pudenz, Scott Henry, Dan Narber, Josh Dunwoody, Erin Herbold-Swalwell, Steve Chase

Members Present Virtually: Michelle Sloan

Members Absent: None

Staff: John Shaw, Chad Quick, Marina Reasoner

Guests: Meeting was held in a virtual Zoom format and in-person; In-person guests included Brad Skinner, Don Timmins, Chris Thomason, Dave Hansen, David Fegley, and Matt Kray

Chairperson Dan Narber called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. Roll call was taken. All commissioners were present at roll call.

Prior to beginning the agenda, Narber introduced new member, Josh Dunwoody.

1. Consideration and recommendation of a preliminary plat for Prairie Vista Village Plat 2.

Nicole Neal (Civil Design Advantage) presented the request. The project area is 2.12 acres on the north side of the existing Prairie Vista Village. The current zoning is R-3. The proposed improvement to the site is a single-story, 32-unit memory care facility on the east portion. On the west side, there is a future independent living facility. Access to the site will be through the existing site on the south side with potential future access to the north and additional future access through the existing site on the south further to the west. There will be surface parking outside of the memory care facility. Storm water detention is currently provided off-site in an existing basin to the northeast. There's a future basin planned to the west. Sewer is in place along the southern edge of the property. There is landscaping throughout. Neal explained they will be extending the trail on the east side of the property, pulling it down to the south property line and extending it out to the west to connect to the public sidewalk. The building is designed to fit in with the residential style of the existing facility. It is comprised mostly of manufactured stone veneer, with manufactured wood-style lath and shingle siding. They have no objections to Staff comments. Henry asked if the Staff comments were the deficiencies. Neal affirmed. Shaw explained there were three applications before the Commission. With the site plan, there are a few items. They will have to apply to the Board of Adjustment, because even though they have a campus layout, they have to subdivide them out for financial reasons, and there will be setback issues.

Narber asked for any further questions or comments from Commissioners or from the public. With no public comments, Narber asked for a motion.

Motion by Pudenz, seconded by Herbold-Swalwell, for recommendation of a preliminary plat for Prairie Vista Village Plat 2, subject to deficiencies and legal documents.

Votes: Yes – Pudenz, Herbold-Swalwell, Sloan, Henry, Narber, Dunwoody, Chase. No - None. Abstain – None. Motion approved, 7-0-0.

2. Consideration and recommendation of a final plat for Prairie Vista Village Plat 2.

Shaw stated that they were still waiting on legal documents, so approval would need to be subject to the legal documents.

Motion by Henry, seconded by Chase, for recommendation of a final plat for Prairie Vista Village Plat 2, subject to any deficiencies.

Votes: Yes – Henry, Chase, Sloan, Pudenz, Narber, Dunwoody, Herbold-Swalwell. No - None. Abstain – None. Motion approved, 7-0-0.

3. Consideration and recommendation of a site plan for Maggie's Place.

Narber asked for any initial comments regarding the site plan. There were no further questions or comments from Commissioners.

Motion by Henry, seconded by Herbold-Swalwell, for recommendation of a site plan for Maggie's Place, subject to deficiencies.

Votes: Yes – Henry, Herbold-Swalwell, Sloan, Pudenz, Narber, Dunwoody, Chase. No - None. Abstain – None. Motion approved, 7-0-0.

4. Consideration and recommendation of a site plan for Adventureland Drive RV and Boat Storage.

Jason Ledden (Snyder & Associates) presented the request. The building will look similar to neighboring buildings. There will be an office building up front with three parking stalls. There is storm water management out front that drains to the regional detention basin to the east. There's sewer and water service on the site. Paving will provide storage for boats and RVs. There is landscaping on the interior as well. They agree to the deficiencies. Ledden explained that the fencing won't tie in with the storage units next door, but will extend just to there. It will be the same style fencing. The building is also intended to be sprinkled. Henry asked Shaw if there were any water issues to be concerned about. Shaw stated no. Henry asked if the parking were all cement. Ledden affirmed.

With no further questions or comments from Commissioners, Narber asked for a motion.

Motion by Herbold-Swalwell, seconded by Pudenz, for recommendation of a site plan for Adventureland Drive RV and Boat Storage, subject to deficiencies.

Votes: Yes – Herbold-Swalwell, Pudenz, Sloan, Henry, Narber, Dunwoody, Chase. No - None. Abstain – None. Motion approved, 7-0-0.

5. Consideration and recommendation of an ordinance amendment to add a new zoning district to Chapter 168 – M – 1A Commercial and Limited Light Industrial Business Park.

Shaw presented the request. He stated it was a hybrid, heavy commercial/light industrial mix type of classification. There could be a very professional commercial front with flex office spaces, limited retail, showroom, or warehousing. The reason for the application is they are looking to the north side of Adventureland Drive, west of the Holiday Inn. It is similar to what is happening on the north side of the interstate in Bondurant. The idea is a planned industrial zone. It would have high ceiling space. Henry stated that he liked what he saw before him, but he thinks about the ones in the Grimes area along Hwy 141 that he doesn't like. He asked if we could make it look less like that. Shaw stated in Grimes, there's more of an industrial-industrial to high-end industrial. This is a work in progress. They are still trying to massage the intent of the commercial façade in front, including window expectations, faux glazing, and the illusion of multiple stories. Pudenz asked if other metro cities have this. Shaw said Chad researched and pulled different elements out of what he found. There's a number of different ways to do it. There may be covenants and different layers of conditional approval that

dictate what people see out there. Quick added that the developers did a lot of the legwork as well. They crafted some of it. They looked at Grimes and Urbandale. Places have Industrial PUDs, which was an option. This felt like the best fit, but there are different ways to go about it.

Brad Skinner explained that this use will mostly be used along the interstate corridor. There is no outside storage with this. If outside storage is desired, they'll have to go find an M-1 or M-2. Everything is indoors with this zone. He stated there were back and forth comments with staff about this. For instance, watercraft dealers might want an indoor show room. There may be entities with smaller products. It will have a professional-looking office front. The rear of the building will show the hybrid element—the docks, the overhead doors, etc. Neighboring business won't see the rear. Parking in front is not meant for storage. Skinner read through the letters of the proposal with the different principal uses. He suggested that if there are some that are being omitted from permitted principal uses, they be slid into permitted conditional uses, and let it go to the Board of Adjustment for their consideration. He is concerned about language in the section about the types of materials used in and around the building, as words like “substantial” are subjective.

Dave Hanson (Signature Commercial Real Estate) said he would answer any questions about product type. There is a wide variety of uses that would all integrate together. He showed preliminary elevations. Henry asked if there would be a vote, or if they were just looking for feedback. Shaw stated that other than massaging the uses or moving them within the ordinance, it's pretty close. He explained that although small watercraft may fit into a showroom, not many will fit indoors, and it's not very feasible to operate out of that space. There is a provision that refers back to the C-2 zoning uses. Pudenz had questions on the ones that were not allowed. Shaw stated that some do dirt work. There could also be parking restrictions, depending on the users. Contractors may have fleet trucks returning to the site, and there wouldn't be enough parking compared to next door that is just a showroom with limited retail. Pudenz asked about maximum or minimum square footage requirements. Shaw stated that parking is determined by the use or, on the light industrial side, by the number of employees. Discussion was held about parking. Shaw stated that they are looking north of the interstate as another area for this zoning. They looked at maps and discussed the potential for this zoning.

With no further comments, Narber asked for a motion.

Motion by Herbold-Swalwell, seconded by Pudenz, for recommendation of an ordinance amendment to add a new zoning district to Chapter 168 – M – 1A Commercial and Limited Light Industrial Business Park, subject to massaging the language.

Votes: Yes – Herbold-Swalwell, Pudenz, Sloan, Henry, Narber, Dunwoody, Chase. No - None. Abstain – None. Motion approved, 7-0-0.

6. Consideration and recommendation of an ordinance amendment to add a new zoning district to Chapter 168.02(4) to amend the minimum corner lot width in the R-1 Single-family Residential zoning district to 85 feet.

Shaw presented the request. There is a typo in the R-1 zoning regarding the corner lot width requirement. One part says 75 feet wide and a chart says 85 feet wide. Pudenz asked if houses were built with the 75-foot width. Shaw stated that it came up with Brook Ridge.

Motion by Henry, seconded by Dunwoody, for recommendation of an ordinance amendment to add a new zoning district to Chapter 168.02(4) to amend the minimum corner lot width in the R-1 Single-family Residential zoning district to 85 feet.

Votes: Yes – Henry, Dunwoody, Sloan, Pudenz, Narber, Herbold-Swalwell, Chase. No - Henry. Abstain – None. Motion approved, 7-0-0.

7. Minutes of the July 27, 2021 meeting.

Motion by Henry, seconded by Herbold-Swalwell, to approve the minutes.

Votes: Yes – Henry, Herbold-Swalwell, Sloan, Pudenz, Narber, Chase. No - None. Abstain – Dunwoody. Motion approved, 6-0-1.

8. Old Business.

Henry asked about the Honda dealership. Shaw said with a split vote of 3-2, Council approved the first reading. They said unanimously that they expected Honda to comply with the Prairie Crossing design requirements. Some of the language still has to be massaged. There has been nothing new as far as a development plan or site plan. Pudenz asked about the apartments on Adventureland Drive. Shaw said it was approved. They need to conduct a traffic study and work with neighbors. Henry asked if Adventureland would be made four-lane all the way through. Quick stated not until they get more money. The next project is 36th Ave. Herbold-Swalwell asked when 1st would be done. Quick said the north phase finishes next year. They may take a year off before the next phase. Shaw stated the biggest problem has been utilities.

9. New Business.

None

Motion by Henry, seconded by Herbold-Swalwell, to adjourn.

Votes: Yes – Henry, Herbold-Swalwell, Sloan, Pudenz, Narber, Dunwoody, Chase. No - None. Abstain – None. Motion approved, 7-0-0.

Meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m. Next regular meeting is September 28, 2021.

Respectfully submitted,
Jennifer Naylor
Office Assistant