

URBANDALE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MINUTES

March 18, 2019

The Urbandale Planning and Zoning Commission met in regular session on Monday, March 18, 2019, at the Urbandale City Hall, 3600 86th Street. Chairperson Paul Pick called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Commissioners present were Jeff Hatfield, Lesa Quinn, Joan Racki, Paul Pick, Wayne Van Heuvelen, Lee Hollatz, Judy Ralston-Hansen, and Marcus Galante. Staff members present were Kristi Bales, Community Development Manager/Chief Planner, Sheena Nuetzman, Planner I, and Cheryl Vander Linden, Administrative Specialist.

The first item on the agenda was approval of the minutes of the March 4, 2019 meeting. Ms. Racki moved, and it was seconded by Quinn, to approve the March 4, 2019 meeting minutes. On roll call; Ayes: Hatfield, Racki, Quinn, Van Heuvelen, Ralston-Hanse, Galante, Pick; Passes: Hollatz; Nays: none. Motion carried.

The next item on the agenda was the public hearing on the “Heritage Park Lots 2 and 3” Amendment to the Planned Unit Development Master Plan, 12001-12061 Hickman Road. Mr. Pick said, if there were no objections, he would dispense with reading the following official publication:

Case No. 010-2008-02.01.04

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

Notice is hereby given that the Urbandale Planning & Zoning Commission will hold a public hearing in the Urbandale City Hall, 3600-86th Street, Urbandale, Iowa at 6:00 p.m. on Monday, March 18, 2019, to consider a petition from C. Richard Stark, Jr., Manager of S & S Heritage Park, LLC, owner, to amend the “Heritage Park” Planned Unit Development Master Plan for the following legally described property:

Lots 2 and 3, Heritage Park Plat 1, an Official Plat, now included in and forming a part of the City of Urbandale, Polk County, Iowa.

The properties are locally known as 12001 and 12061 Hickman Road. The amendment to the Planned Unit Development Master Plan is requested to allow Child Day Care Services as a permitted use. More information on this proposed amendment can be obtained at the Department of Community Development, 3600-86th Street, Urbandale, Iowa between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. All interested parties either for or against this proposed amendment will be heard at the time and place set forth above.

There were no objections to the official notice as published.

Ms. Nuetzman said this request pertains to Lots 2 and 3 in the “Heritage Park” development. Plat 1 consists of 11 lots which are served by two full movement access points onto Hickman Road. The two vacant lots, with a total of 3.93 acres in size, are located at the west end of the development between the Lifetime Athletic parcel and the Mister Car Wash and Kum & Go parcels. The City Council approved the “Heritage Park” P.U.D. in 2008 and the “Heritage Park Plat 1” Final Plat in 2013.

The petitioner is seeking approval of an amendment to the P.U.D. Master Plan to allow Child Day Care Services as a permitted use on all of Lot 3. A conceptual site plan for the daycare shows approximately 35 feet of the eastern portion of Lot 2 to be transferred to Lot 3 for additional parking and detention that is needed. A Plat of Survey is required for this transfer so Lot 2 is included in this amendment as it has not yet been transferred. If this amendment is approved, a separate site plan will be required for review and approval prior to construction. A previous P.U.D. amendment for Lots 2 and 3 was approved on May 23, 2017 to allow for parking as a principal use on the property, however a site plan was never submitted.

The proposed amendment to the P.U.D. appears to be reasonable and appropriate, given the existing land uses permitted in the P.U.D. and the existing commercial land uses along Hickman Road.

The subject property is adjacent on all sides to the same “Heritage Park” P.U.D. The two lots will be accessed by the private internal drive serving the Heritage Park development. Adjoining uses are Lifetime Athletic Fitness to the north, the Kum & Go Convenience Store and Mister Carwash to the south and the Stew Hansen Auto Dealership to the west.

In general, the property drains to the eastward to a drainageway that eventually runs southeasterly along the Love’s Travel Plaza and into Walnut Creek. The property is located in the West Des Moines School District.

Ms. Nuetzman said Staff recommends approval of an amendment to the P.U.D. Master Plan Standards to allow Child Day Care Services as a permitted use.

Ms. Ralston-Hansen asked what is it approved to have on the lot right now?

Ms. Nuetzman said the parking lot, like I said in May 2017, but we haven’t seen the site plan. They just needed some overflow parking.

Ms. Ralston-Hansen said it’s a very busy access road. Extremely busy!

Mr. Pick said as this is a public hearing, the Commission will hear comments from both proponents and opponents of this amendment. First we’ll hear from proponents.

There was no one who wished to speak in favor. Mr. Pick then asked for any opponents who wished to speak. Seeing no one, Mr. Hatfield moved, and it was seconded by Van Heuvelen, to close the public hearing. On roll call; Ayes: Hatfield, Van Heuvelen, Quinn, Racki, Ralston-Hansen, Hollatz, Galante, Pick; Nays: none. Passes: none. Motion carried.

Mr. Van Heuvelen asked any comments from people who received notice?

Ms. Nuetzman said we haven't received any comments, no.

Mr. Hatfield said I've been voting the same way for ten years, so I might as well go on record now. Until they have plans to rebuild the I-35/80 bridge, widen Hickman, I think there are traffic concerns. Traffic from the Kum and Go, carwash, and a daycare, I think, is too much for that street. So, I'll do my protest vote and you can do what you want to do.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said I don't blame you one bit, that is a traffic concern.

Ms. Ralston-Hansen said I will agree with Mr. Hatfield on his one. I travel that road a lot and with the car wash now, it is incredibly busy. It's unsafe.

Mr. Hatfield said I've seen cars in the street, waiting for the car wash. In my opinion, 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. traffic make that road unpassable for vehicles those hours of the day. Hotels, Lifetime, are busy at all times, it's not 8:00 and 5:00. It's not anything against a day care use, per say, it's a day care on that site. There are other sites in town that would be great. I just think it's a traffic concern until we can figure out how to widen that road, which might be a decade or two.

Mr. Van Heuvelen asked what is the prognosis on widening the road, fixing the traffic around there? Nothing is scheduled?

Ms. Nuetzman said no, nothing is scheduled.

Mr. Van Heuvelen asked are you getting comments from other businesses such as Menard's and other places? I know they're in Clive, but nonetheless, is this a joint problem that we have with Clive?

Ms. Nuetzman said not that I know of. I don't know if Ms. Bales has something else?

Ms. Bales said I'm sure it's on IDOT's radar screen.

Mr. Hatfield said but they'd literally have to replace the bridge on I-35 and widen that, because it's a structural problem right now. The structural problem is you can't fit the lanes between the columns. Dave McKay showed something to me, maybe he could

bring that to City Council, but it was a couple of years ago, saying how the traffic has degraded and it's down to like, I'm going to summarize what he said, it's in poor condition right now, as far as traffic. Not the physical concrete, but the traffic flow is poor. So I think we're just adding stress upon stress.

Mr. Galante said I agree with those comments. Until somebody else can show me data better than our intuition. I see it every day. I agree with your comments.

Mr. Van Heuvelen asked do we punish this user when obviously they aren't the total problem here?

Mr. Hatfield said my hands are clean because I've done this for 10 years. So if I bring someone along with me, fine. If you stay on the other side and vote how you want. I'm not a rabble-rouser, I've just been consistent for 10 years. I saw this 10 years ago and it finally took 10 years to happen. I don't think it was really terrible 2 years ago but I think it's getting pretty bad, the more we add to it.

Ms. Racki asked Ms. Bales do you know the last time any study was done of the traffic levels on Hickman, which is a state highway, so I don't know how that fits in to potential funding, related to the city and the state.

Ms. Bales said I don't. And I think whoever mentioned Dave McKay from a couple of years was talking about the level of service, I think that was probably his phrase that he used, when he talked about degrading.

Mr. Hatfield said he was talking about traffic, he sent a 5 or 6 page report that the State had done.

Ms. Bales said so I don't know about the last study or anything like that. We've got work planned at 128th and Hickman next year, but I don't of DOT's plans for any of that interchange.

Ms. Racki asked there's nothing in the Capital Improvement Program?

Ms. Bales said not for Hickman here. There is for Hickman at 128th, and all of that reconfiguration.

Ms. Racki said which is further west.

Ms. Bales said yes, which is another spot where traffic needs to be alleviated a little bit. So I don't the DOT's schedule for this intersection.

Ms. Quinn asked do you think some of the clients that go into this area will be working out, so they'll drop their kids off and then work out? Do you see what I mean?

Ms. Racki said there's day care at the fitness center, so I would guess this is for people who are working in the general area.

Ms. Quinn asked it's not full time?

Mr. Mike Cunningham, Buyers Realty, 2820 149th Street, Urbandale, said I represent the developer. I was asked by the day care developer to attend the meeting. So the plan is to build a Primrose School. It's a high-end day care. Lifetime Fitness does have day care but it's only for while you're working out for a limited period of time. This would be a full-time day care facility, so drop them off in the morning, pick them up in the evening, for people that have a job. And they do like the location because we feel that a lot of people that work out, it's convenient, you can drop your kids off, do your workout before or after work, on your way home. And I think with what the P.U.D. allows, there are a lot heavier uses that we could put on that parcel besides this. I think a day care is probably pretty light traffic compared to a pharmacy or somebody that's going to have trips all the time.

Mr. Van Heuvelen asked would you explain that, I mean what you're saying? This is an amendment, we're asking to put a day care center, but for example, if a pharmacy would request to go here, it's already allowed.

Mr. Cunningham said yes, we can do all kinds of stuff within your P.U.D. Day care wasn't an approved use, for some reason. I'm not sure why. We feel it's a nice amenity.

Mr. Pick said I think there could be heavier users that are allowed in the existing P.U.D.

Mr. Cunningham said yes. We could do a grocery store.

Mr. Hollatz said I guess it might be hard to speculate how much outside traffic it's going to bring from people that don't already travel that corridor maybe. I'm just thinking just the amount of families that are already working there, and travel that road all the time, might be the ones utilizing it.

Mr. Cunningham said I would think so. I mean, convenience is a big part of day care.

Mr. Hollatz said there could be someone traveling on 35-80 that might be on their way to work, I guess, that wouldn't typically exit that area.

Mr. Pick asked do you know what the capacity of the day care will be?

Mr. Cunningham said I think it's anywhere from 187 to 212, and 22 to 30 employees.

Ms. Racki asked what are the projected hours of operation?

Mr. Cunningham said my guess is 6:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., what a typical day care would be. The nice thing is you have a traffic signal. There are some other day cares that are extremely difficult to get in and out of along Hickman Road.

Ms. Quinn asked would that cause any problems, there's another day care on 128th, and that's pretty close, right? Would that be something that we would take into consideration?

Mr. Pick said no, that's individual day care's business plan. What competition is close to them, we're not going to regulate that.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said I certainly salute Mr. Hatfield for his clairvoyance from many years in saying this is going to be a real problem, because it is a real problem. But I don't know if we want to punish this particular user. And I think, as it's been pointed out, other users with more intense traffic issues, probably could come in here without even having a public hearing. And furthermore, I don't think that anybody, if they want to use this particular facility, they're not going to go out of their way to get involved in this Hickman stretch of road here. It's probably going to be people who already are using Hickman that are going to be using this child care center. So, as much as I admire Mr. Hatfield for his foresight, I'm going to be voting in favor of this use.

Mr. Van Heuvelen moved, and it was seconded by Racki, to approve the "Heritage Park Lots 2 and 3" Amendment to the P.U.D. Master Plan. On roll call; Ayes: Van Heuvelen, Racki, Quinn, Hollatz, Pick; Passes: none. Nays: Hatfield, Ralston-Hansen, Galante. Motion carried.

The next item on the agenda was the public hearing on the "Walnut Ridge Business Park Plat 7 Lots 1 & 2" Amendment to the Planned Unit Development Master Plan, 11050 Douglas Avenue and 3701 111th Street. Mr. Pick said if there were no objections, he would dispense with reading the following official publication:

Case No. 010-2004-02.04.04

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

Notice is hereby given that the Urbandale Planning & Zoning Commission will hold a public hearing in the Urbandale City Hall, 3600-86th Street, Urbandale, Iowa at 6:00 p.m. on Monday, March 18, 2019, to consider a petition from William C. Knapp II, manager of K.C. Real Estate, L.C., owner, to amend the "Walnut Ridge Business Park Plat 7, Lots 1-4" Planned Unit Development Master Plan for the following legally described property:

Lots 1 and 2, Walnut Ridge Business Park Plat 7, an Official Plat, now included in and forming a part of the City of Urbandale, Polk County, Iowa.

The properties are locally known as 11050 Douglas Avenue and 3701 111th Street. The amendment to the Planned Unit Development Master Plan is requested to reduce the building setback line along the east and southeast property lines from 50 feet to 35 feet. More information on this proposed amendment can be obtained at the Department of Community Development, 3600-86th Street, Urbandale, Iowa between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. All interested parties either for or against this proposed amendment will be heard at the time and place set forth above.

There were no objections to the official notice as published.

Ms. Bales said this request from KC Real Estate, LC, owner, pertains to Lots 1 and 2 of "Walnut Ridge Business Park Plat 7" recorded in 2008. These two lots are part of the larger "Walnut Ridge Business Park Plat 7, Lots 1-4" P.U.D. Master Plan. Lot 1 and Lot 2 are 1.317 and 0.734 acre in size, respectively, and are currently vacant. Access to the parcels will be from 111th Street along the west side and from the Frontage Road along the east and southeast sides.

The owner is seeking an amendment to the P.U.D. Master Plan for Lots 1 and 2 to reduce the building setback line along the east and southeast property lines (along the Frontage Road) from 50 feet to 35 feet. While no site plan has been formally submitted, the owners are working through various layouts on the properties.

The P.U.D. Master Plan designates Lots 1 and 2 as the "Retail Commercial Area" which requires a 50' setback along a street. The lots are about 195' wide along their shared lot line; therefore, the current 50-foot setback requirement would leave 95 feet of buildable width on the lots. In comparison, other commercial zoning districts such as "C-G" General Commercial and "C-H" Highway Commercial require street setbacks of 20 feet and 30 feet, respectively.

Per the P.U.D. Master Plan, the buildings in the "Retail Commercial Area" are required to have a traditional architectural style with the predominant building material being brick and side and rear elevations are required to be comprised of the same materials and reasonable similar in character and quality. The P.U.D. Master Plans also requires parking be set back a minimum of 20 feet from any street and no outdoor storage is permitted.

The properties across Douglas Avenue are zoned "C-H" Highway Commercial and "C-P" Planned Commercial Park District. Across the Frontage Road are properties zoned "C-H" and one parcel that is part of the same PUD Master Plan. Across 111th Street are properties zoned "P.U.D." that are part of the "Walnut Ridge Business Park Plat 7, Lots 5-8" Planned Unit Development Master Plan.

The property drains to the southwest towards Living History Farms Creek. The property is located in the Urbandale School District.

Ms. Bales said Staff recommends approval of an amendment to the “Walnut Ridge Business Park Plat 7, Lots 1-4” P.U.D. Master Plan Standards for Lots 1 and 2 to decrease the building setback from 50 feet to 35 feet along the Frontage Road bordering the east and southeast sides of the lots.

Mr. Pick said as this is a public hearing, the Commission will hear comments from both proponents and opponents of this proposed amendment.

Mr. Gerry Nugent, Knapp Properties, 5000 Westown Parkway, West Des Moines, said we agree with the Staff’s recommendation for approval. It is an odd-shaped parcel, partly because when 111th Street was relocated, we ended up with this teardrop shaped lot. And the setback to the east of us across the frontage road is 30 feet, so at 35, we’d be matching that. Although not a site plan, conceptually we’ve laid out a retail building on lot 1 and a potential multi-tenant building on lot 2. You can see that, with the setback at 50 feet, we’d have a little corner that we would have to deal with on the north part of the building on lot 1 and the east part of lot 2, to get what we think are commercially reasonable. So, really it’s pretty simple, we’re just asking to go to 35 from 50 that was in the original P.U.D.

Mr. Pick asked if anybody had any questions for Mr. Nugent? Seeing none, he asked for anybody opponents who wished to speak to come to the podium.

Mr. Tab Miller, Pre-Owned Solutions, 11010 Douglas Avenue, said we have the adjacent property across the street to the east. My question on it, and I see a little more now with having some proposed building sites and such, but correct me if I’m wrong, but the setbacks are generally set so that nobody becomes obscured, especially when you’re on frontage that’s on Douglas, of having visibility still. I’m just questioning what it’s going to look like when it’s done. Like I said, I’m not for or against it, I just don’t know what’s happening or what’s going in exactly. If it moves over closer, does that further obscure us? We’re kind of setback in a hole there, if you will. And I know we have development going on the east side of us. Visibility is what we paid for when we bought on Douglas, we thought we had the frontage. We were restricted and couldn’t get any variance on it, as far as the setback. In fact, when we went in originally, the parking lot in the front went forward another 15 feet, we had to move it back, take out concrete and actually move it back when we went in for the change of use. So, again, I’m not trying to thwart anything, I’m just trying to find out what’s going on and see how it does actually affect us, being we’re really the only business in the area that would be affected by anything, pro or con, on this. So I don’t have the ammunition right now to know if I’m for it or against it. Can anybody help with that?

Mr. Pick said we can ask Ms. Bales some questions. He said the setback from Douglas isn’t changing, it’s the setback from the side.

Ms. Bales said right. So, you’re correct, the setback from Douglas is 50 feet today and it will be 50 feet no matter what you decide today. I think one of the important things is

Mr. Miller's lot starts farther back. You can see that better in this aerial photo. His lot already starts farther back because the frontage road is part of the right-of-way, you can see that depth difference right now. It's a thinner black line, and it kind of lines up with just about the front of that building. So, the setback isn't necessarily about preserving visibility. The setback is for safety, it's for aesthetics, it's for making sure that there's enough room for parking and circulation, and that sort of thing. It's making sure buildings aren't too close so that they become a fire hazard. With them proposing two separate buildings, you'll actually have a bit of a line of sight through the two buildings. Whereas if it were one solid building, you might not have that. So he probably benefits from the two building scenario versus one larger building scenario. I know the property that's outlined here is higher along Douglas and then drops off as it goes to the south. That's why the detention pond that they're thinking about is down here. But I can't remember how that relates to the elevation on Mr. Miller's property, so I can't really talk about height or that sort of thing. But I do think he benefits from a two-building layout.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said you mentioned that this is retail. I'm going to guess that it's one-story as opposed to two-story?

Mr. Nugent said yes. I think there's a height maximum of 35 feet. As you can see, the right-of-way for Douglas is very large because our front lot line is this far off of the road. With 50 feet from that, it's a pretty good sight line to the intersection, even with this. It does fall quite a bit from the north to the south, which is where the detention would be.

Mr. Hatfield said so I believe what Mr. Nugent said was if we reduced the east and the south from 50 to 35 feet, that would roughly match what the car dealership would be on the east. They're at 30 feet. So it's not like Mr. Miller has 50 feet and they're asking for something different right across the street. It's roughly the same, across the street.

Ms. Bales said it's the same, no more restrictive.

Mr. Miller said my question is it appears that there's an entrance down further to the south off of 114th and then it crosses over. Part of my concern is, too, having a raceway through there.

Mr. Pick said we're not proposing any site plan tonight. A site plan would have to come back before us for consideration. You would get notification of that.

Ms. Bales said he won't get notification because we don't notify for site plans unless you ask us specifically to do so. To answer your question, this access point here on 111th is set. The P.U.D. set that. All that planning went into place when the P.U.D. zoning first came through. So this one is set. We'll likely want the one straight across from that road that separates you to the south. We've been in conversations on this one, we don't know the final part of that yet. But that's the general proposal. That's what we've seen in concept, just not formally submitted yet. But the one on 111th is set.

Mr. Miller said I really don't have any problem with what it looks like.

Mr. Van Heuvelen moved, and it was seconded by Quinn, to close the public hearing. On roll call; Ayes: Van Heuvelen, Quinn, Hatfield, Racki, Ralston-Hansen, Hollatz, Galante, Pick; Nays: none. Passes: none. Motion carried.

Mr. Hatfield said it's pretty straightforward. Looks like they're going to match up all the driveways the way they should. I realize it's not a site plan, but it looks pretty logical. Still highly commercial and you're still on a very busy street.

Mr. Hatfield moved, and it was seconded by Racki, to approve the "Walnut Ridge Business Park Plat 7 Lots 1 and 2" Amendment to the P.U.D. Master Plan, subject to Staff recommendations. On roll call; Ayes: Hatfield, Racki, Quinn, Van Heuvelen, Ralston-Hansen, Hollatz, Galante, Pick; Nays: none. Passes: none. Motion carried.

The next item on the agenda was the "Royal Flooring at Heritage Park" Site Plan No. 012-2019-02.00 (11801 Hickman Road).

Ms. Nuetzman said this site plan proposes the construction of a multi-tenant retail building to include a flooring store, a health and wellness business and a restaurant on Lot 11 of "Heritage Park Plat 1". The parcel is currently 3.87 acres in size; however, a plat of survey has been submitted to transfer the south 30 feet to the lot to the south which will leave the site with 3.5 acres. There will be 132 feet of frontage on the private internal drive.

The proposed building totals approximately 25,146 square feet of gross floor area. The flooring store makes up about 19,617 square feet, which includes approximately 2,760 square feet of office space located on both the first and second floor. The single-story restaurant and health businesses are approximately 3,552 square feet and 2,036 square feet, respectively. The restaurant also proposes a 580 square foot patio in the rear of their space. A total of 140 parking spaces are required for this site on the basis of 15 spaces per 1,000 square feet for the restaurant and 5 spaces per 1,000 square feet for both the health business and flooring/appliance store uses. However, the Zoning Code allows the construction of up to 20% of the parking spaces to be temporarily undeveloped if they are not needed by the current occupants of the building. A total of 112 spaces, or 80% of the required 140 spaces, are being provided at this time. The plan also shows where up to an additional 66 parking spaces could be constructed should they be needed in the future.

The exterior materials are required to be predominately brick, as required by the P.U.D. Master Plan. Building accent materials include aluminum glass and hardi panels as well as a small amount of fiber cement and lap siding.

Access to the parcel will be from the private internal drive, which currently provides access to the other tenants within the "Heritage Park" development.

A minimum of 20% of the lot area is required to be maintained as open space and a minimum of 5% of the parking lot area is required to be landscaped. Trees and shrubs are to be provided at a minimum ratio of two trees and six shrubs for every 2,500 square feet of required open space. A 50-foot buffer yard is required along the north property line and a continuous row of shrubs or a berm with an average height of 3.5 feet is required along the private internal drive of Heritage Park.

Adjacent to the west is the Lifetime Athletic facility, and to the south is a vacant lot both of which are a part of the same "Heritage Park" P.U.D. The Living History Farm property, zoned "A-2" Estate Residential District, is adjacent to the north, and to the east is Interstate 35/80.

The property drains to the south, via an existing drainageway that flows through the property and southeasterly along the Love's Travel Plaza and into Walnut Creek. The property is located in the West Des Moines School District.

Ms. Nuetzman said Staff recommends approval subject to requiring the developer to:

1. Revise Cover Sheet title to "Royal Flooring at Heritage Park Site Plan"; revise pages to scale (not printed as 1:40 scale); label building, parking and landscaping setbacks on Sheet 7; verify that mechanical equipment is screened from view on top of the buildings; label window vs panel on the exterior elevations; verify the location and functionality of the dumpster in its current location and provide elevations; submit a lighting plan; and verify that the trees along the north property boundary are no more than 13 feet on-center.
2. Revise City of Urbandale datum; show proposed easement for the detention basin; Sheet 4: grading Note #9 and #10 per SUDAS, provide 8" topsoil; Sheet 8: add note to refer to SWPPP for erosion control layout, provide spot elevations to verify elevation and width of top of berm and overflow (these elevations will be verified at the time of the site as-built); add a flume to the detention area; provide a Stormwater Facility Maintenance Agreement for the detention basins per the Post Construction Stormwater Ordinance; at the time of the site as-built, provide signed calculations showing basin volume calculations by the contour-area method, and provide a signed affidavit that the stormwater detention facility has been constructed in substantial conformance with the approved plan and confirming installation of the orifice plates; provide a copy of the NPDES Permit and SWPPP prior to any grading work, submit NPDES and SWPPP to stormwater@urbandale.org; weekly inspection reports will also need to be submitted to this email address.
3. Drainage Report: as noted in the plan submittal, the designer anticipates changing the basin, provide updated drainage maps with clearly labeled areas when the plan is revised; update the narrative to reflect the actual site conditions,

methods used, and the resulting values for this specific project, and remove extraneous information. For example, Section 2b should state the design year for the storm sewer, whether the basin is above ground or below ground, where it is located on site, and the immediate downstream connection for the basin release (i.e., it releases into the I-80/35 drainage ditch); section 2d: if this area is outside of the floodplain if this area is outside of the floodplain, the discussion of flood plain zones can be removed; section 2e: remove discussion not used in analysis (curve numbers, SCS method); provide a summary of values used in analysis, similar to SUDAS Table 2A-4.01; provide a summary of allowable release rate, similar to Table 2A-4.02. Section 3: provide specifics as to off-site flows, using a table similar to SUDAS 2G-1-B.3b; section 4 should discuss specific energy dissipation methods used onsite; section 5d: describe the proposed outlet and overflow weirs specific to this site, given values for elevation and size; section 6: list only those permits required with this site; for Urbandale pre-developed conditions, the "Meadow" condition should be used; provide a clear calculation for the proposed runoff coefficient; Appendix E, Modified Rational Method Pond Sizing: adjust allowable release rate for undetained runoff, verify the step in the storm duration, it appears that maximum 100-year volume occurs around 90 minutes. Currently, the spreadsheet uses the 5-year allowable release for the 2-year storm; the release in the 2-year storm cannot exceed the existing condition in the 2-year storm; provide calculations for intake capacity and ponding in parking lot, submit Drainage Report to stormwater@urbandale.org; a hard copy is not required.

4. Separate domestic water and fire sprinkler water service lines with valves before entering the building and it should be master metered and backflow protected (Sheet 11); the rear/east walk door from Royal Flooring tenant space needs a hard surface walk to the parking or right-of-way; a separate building permit is required for retaining walls over 4 feet; split electric and fire sprinkler riser rooms; verify that materials for the fire apparatus access road can support at least a 75,000 pound fire apparatus; "No-Parking- Fire Lane" signs conforming to the Urbandale Fire Code shall be required along the fire apparatus road (exact locations to be determined during construction).
5. Pay the water hook-on fee of \$5,428.50 plus \$100 construction water (\$5,528.50); Sheet 6: General Utility Notes #24.1- do not bring wire to the surface at valves, attach wire at hydrants to a tracing wire receptacle; under water mains: all water should be installed according to Urbandale Water Utility Standard Specifications.

Mr. Hatfield said you're going to be shocked, because I don't think this will generate a lot of traffic. 87% of it is a flooring company that would be off-hours, or won't be at 8:00 and 5:00. So I wouldn't have a problem with a large flooring gallery that doesn't attract 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. business. So, I don't think it's a problem.

Mr. Hollatz asked what about truck traffic, deliveries in and out, morning construction delivery, etc.?

Mr. Hatfield said the cat's out of the bag. It doesn't say there's truck deliveries and stuff. I just think it's going to be off-hours.

Ms. Ralston-Hansen asked what is the delivery situation? Could you talk about that?

Ms. Nuetzman said there's proposed to be no warehouse, so I think that helps in that case.

Mr. Scott Sullivan, 33645 Bryn Shore Drive, Adel, said it's retail showroom only. There will be no warehouse, no deliveries, no installers picking up or coming out at all. It's just retail only. Johnny Kendall is the other owner, sitting over there. He asked him on a busy Saturday, what would you say we have for vehicles in the parking lot, which is our busiest day of the week?

Mr. Kendall said 20 to 25 vehicles.

Mr. Sullivan said it's minimal. We appreciate your consideration on that.

Ms. Ralston-Hansen said you're going to have a lot of roll-over traffic from Lifetime in your parking lot.

Mr. Sullivan said we figured that. We welcome it!

Mr. Pick asked are you okay with staff recommendations?

Mr. Sullivan said absolutely!

Ms. Quinn moved and it was seconded by Hatfield, to approve "Royal Flooring at Heritage Park" Site Plan, subject to Staff recommendations. On roll call; Ayes: Quinn, Hatfield, Racki, Van Heuvelen, Ralston-Hansen, Hollatz, Galante, Pick; Nays: none. Passes: none. Motion carried.

Regarding Staff reports, Ms. Bales said we will not have your meeting on April 1. We will have your meeting on April 15. We have a project proposal at the northwest corner of 128th Street and Meredith Drive. You'll recall that as the Schafer Property where they had that P.U.D. amendment, and they've taken down the barn and it looks a lot different there right now. So, we'll be talking about that corner, and anything else that comes in in the next day or two. No meeting on the 1st, we will meet on the 15th.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said I noticed in the Register they were talking about Valley West Mall is giving up the mall name and their plans are to make quite a change out at Valley West Mall. Has Merle Hay Mall indicated that they're going to look at some different

ideas, bring in some experts? Have there been any discussions?

Ms. Bales said no, there have not been any discussions.

Ms. Racki said following up on the discussion that occurred related to Hickman, could you find out from Dave McKay and report back, if there's a plan for an upcoming traffic study, has he had any discussions with the State Department of Transportation on additional lights, which would be in the traffic study? I don't know all of the components, and I don't travel it all the time but when I do, it's difficult. And part of it has to do with the backup on the left turn lanes. If that could somehow be solved, that would help. And you could then express, I think, the concern of the Commission and as there gets to be more development on the north side, well on both sides of Hickman, but obviously the north side is in Urbandale, that it's only going to get worse as there is more housing built out there, it's only getting worse. And what's the plan of the City and possibly the State Department of Transportation?

Ms. Bales said I will make a note and find out.

The meeting adjourned at 6:37 p.m.