The Urbandale Planning and Zoning Commission met in regular session on Monday, February 17, 2020, at the Urbandale City Hall, 3600 86th Street. Chairperson Wayne Van Heuvelen called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Commissioners present were Jeff Hatfield, Lesa Quinn, Paul Pick, Julie Roethler, Wayne Van Heuvelen, Lee Hollatz, and Marcus Galante. Staff members present were Kristi Bales, Community Development Manager/Chief Planner, Annika Schilke, Planner II, and Cheryl Vander Linden, Administrative Specialist.

The first item on the agenda was approval of the minutes of the February 3, 2020 meeting. Mr. Pick moved, and it was seconded by Roethler, to approve the February 3, 2020 meeting minutes. On roll call; Ayes: Pick, Roethler, Hollatz, Quinn, Van Heuvelen; Passes: Hatfield, Galante. Nays: none. Motion carried.

The next item on the agenda was the public hearing on the “Waterford Landing” Amendment to the P.U.D. Master Plan, 167th Street and Waterford Road, Case No. 010-2005-02.03.06.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said we are going to continue it until the next meeting, per the request of the applicant.

Ms. Bales said Hubbell has requested a continuance until March 2, and has notified the citizens who have been interested. We had an e-mail from another citizen and I let her know this afternoon that it had been continued to March 2. So we’ve tried to get the word out as much as possible.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said official notice has been published. Is there any objection to the notice? There was none.

Mr. Hatfield moved, and it was seconded by Quinn, to continue the public hearing on the “Waterford Landing” Amendment to the P.U.D. Master Plan, Case No. 010-2005-02.03.06, until the March 2, 2020 meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission. On roll call; Ayes: Hatfield, Quinn, Pick, Hollatz, Roethler, Galante, Van Heuvelen; Nays: none. Passes: none. Motion carried.

Mr. Van Heuvelen asked is anybody here that would like to address the Commission, at this point, on this particular issue? There was no one.

The next item on the agenda was the public hearing on the “Crossroads Business Park-Tuscany Village” Amendment to the P.U.D. Master Plan, Case No. 010-1994-02.03.10, 3821 and 3881 121st Street. Mr. Van Heuvelen said, if there was no objection, he would dispense with reading the following 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 5:30 p.m. on Monday, February 17, 2020, to consider a petition from Tuscany Village Center LC and AJM Properties LLC, owners, to amend the “Crossroads Business Park” Planned Unit Development Master Plan for the following legally described property:

Lots 1 and 4 in Tuscany Village Center Plat 1, an Official Plat, now included in and forming a part of the City of Urbandale, Polk County, Iowa. Subject to easements and restrictions of record.

The properties are locally known as 3821 and 3881 121st Street and are located north of the intersection of Douglas Avenue and 121st Street. Each property has an existing building and parking lot. An amendment to the Planned Unit Development Master Plan is requested to allow the two properties to be administered together for the purposes of calculating and providing parking to serve businesses located on both properties; and to allow pet day care services and a private indoor dog park as permitted uses on only Lot 4, Tuscany Village Center Plat 1 (locally known as 3881 121st Street).

Information on the proposed amendments to the “Crossroads Business Park” P.U.D. Master Plan 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 the proposed amendment will be heard at the time and place set forth above.

There were no objections to the official notice as published.

Ms. Schilke said this request includes a portion of the existing “Crossroads Business Park I” P.U.D. Master Plan area, and includes Lots 1 and 4 of Tuscany Village Center Plat 1, addressed as 3821-3857 and 3881-3921 121st Street. Each property has an existing building and associated parking facilities. This request includes two separate amendments.

The first amendment is a request to allow the two properties to be administered together for the purposes of calculating and providing parking to serve businesses located on both properties. Both parcels provide on-site parking in excess of the typical 5 spaces per 1000 square feet of floor area, so that higher-parking uses such as restaurants can be accommodated. However, restaurants have clustered in the southern building occupying a large portion of the available square footage resulting in the minimum
parking requirements being near or exceeding what is available (depending on the other building tenants), which has restricted growth of successful businesses on that property. The owner has suggested that administering the two properties together would be sensible, allowing like-businesses to cluster together, and using the available parking across both sites to serve all businesses. Cross-parking agreements are currently in place as part of the covenants, which allow customers to park on either property. Therefore, the barrier to the proposed amendment is the zoning ordinance requirement that 100% of the minimum required parking be provided on-site. As the properties are adjacent, owned by the same entity, and were developed together, the proposed amendment appears to meet the spirit and intent of the zoning ordinance requirement while taking advantage of the master planning process that went into developing this property.

The second amendment is a request to add pet day care services and a private indoor dog park as permitted uses, on only Lot 4, Tuscany Village Center Plat 1 (3881-3921 121st Street). The owner of a local chain of pet-related businesses, known as Stylin’ Paws Salon has expressed interest in opening a new branch of the business in the northern building. The primary service offered at this location would be dog day-stay (also known as doggy day care), along with ancillary services that include an indoor private dog park, and some limited overnight boarding. While some related pet services would currently be allowed in this P.U.D., the pet day care and the indoor dog park would need to be added to the P.U.D. master plan as permitted uses for the proposed business to proceed.

Surrounding properties to the north and west are also part of the “Crossroads Business Park I” Planned Unit Development Master Plan. Property to the south, across Douglas Avenue, is zoned “A-2” Estate Residential and is part of the Living History Farms property.

Ms. Schilke said Staff recommends approval of an amendment to the P.U.D. Master Plan to allow Lot 1 and Lot 4 to be administered together for the purposes of calculating and providing parking to serve businesses located on both properties, subject to the following conditions:

1) This amendment shall apply only as long as cross-parking agreements are maintained and enforced allowing customers for either property to park on the other.

2) Total parking spaces available across both sites must remain in excess of the minimum requirements specified by the Urbandale Zoning Ordinance.

3) Additional spaces will be required to be constructed should the Zoning Administrator find a parking problem to exist as evidenced by parking spilling over into nearby properties or streets, or vehicles parked in circulation aisles,
loading spaces, landscape areas, or other locations not designed and designated for parking.

Staff also recommends approval of an amendment to the P.U.D. Master Plan to allow pet day care services and a private indoor dog park as permitted uses, on Lot 4 Tuscany Village Center Plat 1, subject to the following conditions:

1) The entire operation must be conducted inside the building, except for small outdoor dog-runs for brief and supervised outdoor breaks.

2) A maximum of 20 dogs may be housed at any one time on an overnight basis.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said so even though there are two amendments, they’re kind of related, as I understand it, because the dog day care center probably would take less parking than a restaurant?

Ms. Schilke said correct, yes. They’ve come up at the same time because they’re related, but they’re not necessarily dependent. You could certainly take only one or the other, but we’ve recommended that you would do both.

Mr. Hatfield said so there are two issues before us; one is the parking, taking two buildings and making basically one property for parking. Number two would be the use of a doggy day care type service.

Ms. Schilke said correct. And Staff has recommended approval of both of those items, just subject to the conditions that are listed in the Staff report.

Ms. Roethler said I’m assuming for the day care, there would be some outdoor kennels added somewhere?

Ms. Schilke said likely there would be one or maybe two small outdoor runs. I’m going to discuss this in-depth with the tenant. Likely, there would be a few hundred square feet, maybe one on the east side of the building and one on the west side of the building, or maybe just one of those, depending on what their interior layout would require and what we work out with what’s acceptable to Staff. Those would be only for brief supervised outdoor breaks for the dogs, not for extended time outside.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said the property immediately to the east of the north building that would be the truck stop?

Ms. Schilke said yes, that’s correct. The fire station is to the north. There are some storage units on the west side.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said as this is a public hearing, the Commission will hear comments from both proponents and opponents of this proposed amendment. First, we will hear from anyone who wishes to speak in favor. We’ll have opportunities to speak for those
opposed in a minute.

Mr. Mike Macri, CBRE Hubbell Commercial, 6900 Westown Parkway, West Des Moines, said I'm representing Stylin' Paws that is looking to go into the second building. I also have, obviously, a familial relationship with the property owners of Tuscany Village Center LC. Both amendments that are in front of you tonight are to address two separate issues. One has been kind of longstanding with the property, of issues with parking and how that is jointed. And the second is hopefully to move a fantastic tenant into a new building into the center. Scott and Sherri with Stylin' Paws are here tonight as well. I would encourage you to check out any of their locations here in town so you can see what they're offering and bringing. Thank you very much.

Mr. Pick asked are you all right with the Staff recommendations?

Mr. Macri said yes.

Mr. Van Heuvelen asked if anyone else either in favor or opposed wished to address the Commission? Seeing no one, Mr. Hatfield moved and it was seconded by Roethler, to close the public hearing. On roll call; Ayes: Hatfield, Roethler, Pick, Hollatz, Quinn, Galante, Van Heuvelen; Nays: none. Passes: none. Motion carried.

Mr. Hatfield said on the parking, the Urban Town Center across the street and Cobblestone Market, those are several buildings. Are they calculated as one building or as several different buildings?

Ms. Schilke said almost nowhere in town would we have multiple parcels that we're calculating all together.

Mr. Hatfield said but specifically the Urban Town Center?

Ms. Schilke said specifically Urban Town Center no, for sure, is not. And Cobblestone, it's a slightly more complex question because they're been through the Board of Adjustment a couple of times, but mostly that is also calculated each individually. But when they were looking at that site as a whole, they included some components from all three parcels, I think.

Mr. Hatfield said so that's more of a hybrid. I was just trying to think if there was some similar building that we could hang our hat on, and say it's already been done.

Ms. Schilke said I handle primarily the cases that go before the Board of Adjustment, and so those are again adjustments to the way we do the parking calculation. It is not uncommon for that board to look at a site as a whole. I can't think off the top of my head of another case where we've done it as part of the up-front zoning, but this is a little bit more of an elegant way to do it, compared to that.
Mr. Pick said and the site has been over-parked since its inception. It’s five per thousand, we’re already at six stalls per thousand, so there has already been excess parking for the facilities even when they were independent, so I don’t think it creates any issue there.

Ms. Schilke said yes.

Mr. Pick moved, and it was seconded by Hatfield, to approve the “Crossroads Business Park-Tuscany Village” Amendment to the P.U.D. Master Plan, on the parking component, subject to Staff recommendations. On roll call; Ayes: Pick, Hatfield, Hollatz, Roethler, Quinn, Galante, Van Heuvelen; Nays: none. Passes: none. Motion carried.

Mr. Hatfield said Stylin’ Paws seems like a good use, especially with the truck stop next door.

Mr. Hatfield moved, and it was seconded by Roethler, to approve the “Crossroads Business Park-Tuscany Village” Amendment to the P.U.D. Master Plan, on the use of Stylin’ Paws Salon, subject to Staff recommendations. On roll call; Ayes: Hatfield, Roethler, Pick, Hollatz, Quinn, Galante, Van Heuvelen; Nays: none. Passes: none. Motion carried.

The next item on the agenda was a public hearing on the “Etchen Property” Amendment to the P.U.D. Master Plan, Case No. 010-2000-02.09.02, 4601 and 4701 NW Urbandale Drive. Mr. Van Heuvelen said, as this is a public hearing, if there were no objections he would dispense with reading the following official publication:

**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 5:30 p.m. on Monday, February 17, 2020, to consider a petition from Mr. Andy Hodges, Senior Vice President, Signature Real Estate Services, Manager of Meredith Pointe, LLC, owner, to amend the “Etchen Property” Planned Unit Development Master Plan for the following legally described property:

Lots 2 and 3 in Meredith Pointe Business Park, an Official Plat, now included in and forming a part of the City of Urbandale, Polk County, Iowa. Subject to easements and restrictions of record.

The properties are locally known as 4601 and 4701 NW Urbandale Drive and are
located at the northeast corner of Meredith Drive and NW Urbandale Drive. The amendment to the Planned Unit Development Master Plan is requested to allow the wholesale distribution of brick, stone, and related construction materials. More information on the 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 the 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 Signature Real Estate Services pertains to Lots 2 and 3 of the “Meredith Pointe Business Park” development, located in the northeast corner of the intersection of Meredith Drive and NW Urbandale Drive. Lot 2 and Lot 3 are 8.01 acres and 5.86 acres respectively and are locally addressed as 4601 NW Urbandale Drive and 4701 NW Urbandale Drive. The City Council approved the “Meredith Pointe Business Park” Site Plan on August 28, 2018. Building permits have been issued and the buildings are nearing completion.

The City Council approved the rezoning of the property from “A-1" Agricultural Reserve District to “P.U.D.” Planned Unit Development District on November 28, 2000. Amendments to the P.U.D. Master Plan were approved by the City Council in 2018 to allow certain retail uses on Lot 2, to allow a right-in/right-out access onto NW Urbandale Drive, to increase the clear ceiling height, and to amend certain building material requirements.

The petitioner is seeking approval of another amendment to the P.U.D. Master Plan to allow the wholesale distribution of uses categorized as “Brick, Stone and Related Construction Materials” (Industry No. 5032 of the 1987 Standard Industrial Classification Manual). This category of business establishments are primarily engaged in the wholesale distribution of stone, brick, and clay products and would be allowed only at this location with the approval of a conditional use permit approved by the Urbandale Board of Adjustment.

Currently other conditional uses are included in this P.U.D. Master Plan where specific businesses can manufacture, process or assemble materials into finished products; and, be engaged in wholesale trade or warehousing. Those specific businesses currently allowed include bakery products, beverages, furniture and fixtures, drugs, and miscellaneous plastics products. This proposed use was not specifically identified in the current P.U.D. Master Plan. No manufacturing operation was included with this request and per the P.U.D. Master Plan, no outdoor storage is permitted.

Properties to the north and west are zoned “P.U.D.” and are part of the Urbandale Marketplace, Urbandale Marketplace II and Urbandale Marketplace III P.U.D. Master Plans. Property across Meredith Drive to the south is zoned “M-1” Planned Industrial District and “P.U.D.” for the townhomes in the Meredith Pointe P.U.D. Master Plan.
Property to the east is zoned “P.U.D.” and is part of the “Foxdale” P.U.D. Master Plan. The subject property is in the Johnston School District and drains easterly to a drainageway that runs into North Walnut Creek.

Ms. Bales said Staff recommends approval of the amendment to the P.U.D. Master Plan to include “Brick, Stone and Related Construction Materials” (Industry No. 5032 of the 1987 Standard Industrial Classification Manual) as a conditional use.

We did receive one e-mail of opposition. You saw that in your packet that came out last Friday. We have shared that with the applicant, as well, if he’d like to address anything specifically about their operations. And that’s why they brought several representatives with them here this evening.

Mr. Hollatz asked the outdoor storage was the only question that I had, and you’ve addressed that already.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said as this is a public hearing, the Commission will hear comments from both proponents and opponents of this proposed amendment to the PUD master plan. He said first we will hear from any proponents.

Mr. Andy Hodges, Signature Commercial Real Estate, 9500 University Avenue, West Des Moines, said thanks to the Commission for your time tonight. It’s always good to see you guys. Happy to answer any questions that you might have about the Meredith Pointe development, any updated questions or thoughts on this use. As Ms. Bales said, there are representatives here from Glen Gery to answer any specific questions about their daily operation. It is a mix of showroom, warehouse, retail, training. This will be one of their new masonry supply design studios. We’re certainly excited to be working with them and look forward to helping them do that.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said trucks coming in and out, will you be moving product?

Mr. Hodges said there will be some truck delivery and distribution from this site. I will add, they’re occupying 28,000 square feet so on this site plan, you can see they’ll occupy this radius part of the building, the corner piece here. They wanted to overlook the intersection. Of that 28,000 square feet, roughly 20,000 of it would be warehouse. The other 8,000 to 9,000 would be that retail showroom/design studio space.

Mr. Nick Bush, Glen Gery Brick, 101 Ashworth Road, West Des Moines, said as far as the trucking goes, there will be some on the back side of the building. The thing to remember for our business, kind of how it works, the majority of our product typically is delivered straight to the job site. So we don’t have house a lot of product under roof, as far as these big apartment projects going around. That will go straight from the brick manufacturer, whoever is manufacturing the material, straight to their job site. We will have some stock merchandise inside more for the local masonry use, maybe say tools, spec mix stuff, along those lines. But the bulk of the trucks never see our site, when it’s
all said and done.

Mr. Galante asked can you restate what’s taking place on the east side of this picture?

Mr. Hodges said that’s another 77,000 square foot flex building. It’s all front load, so that was pushed to the furthest east property line. All the activity in that building would occur on the west side of it. Right now we’re working with three or four tenants, at LOI stage. No users in that building quite yet. Building 2, all the dock and drive access would be on this east side. This far east building, all the action would be on the west side of that building. It’s all front load. There’s 12 by 12 drive-in doors on the front side of that building.

Mr. Galante asked do you have a sense of what it looks like, do you have a picture of that?

Mr. Hodges said I did not bring an elevation of the building, no.

Mr. Pick said that’s not in question tonight.

Mr. Galante said I was just curious. Do you have anything that’s like this around town right now, that you could point to?

Mr. Hodges asked in use?

Mr. Galante said yes, in use.

Mr. Hodges said they have a couple of their operations, one in West Des Moines and one in Urbandale, that they’re consolidating.

Mr. Hodges showed them a photo. That would be the front of the east building. You can see the drive in doors there and then this is the front side of Building 2, which they would be going in. They would be occupying this part of the building here. That’s not completely accurate because it’s more of a radius now.

Mr. Galante said I was just trying to picture it.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said another question on the trucks, will they be daytime only for truck activity?

Mr. Bush said correct. Our office is open from 8:00 to 4:30, so yes, it would be just strictly daytime use. If anybody is dropping off, picking up, stuff along those lines, Monday through Friday.

Mr. Van Heuvelen asked semis, straight trucks?
Mr. Bush said both vans and flatbeds could potentially be going in, correct.

Mr. Van Heuvelen asked care to comment on the noise level?

Mr. Bush said the office I worked at in the past on Hickman, I can tell you, I could never hear anything from my office. It’s just standard trucks and they’re in and out pretty quick. We’re pretty efficient with getting product on and off trucks.

Mr. Hodges said from an owner’s standpoint, we don’t see activity here being any more than what, say, API does now. API is an 80,000 square foot warehouse. They have tractor trailers in there all day, in and out of there all day.

Mr. Van Heuvelen asked if anyone else wanted to speak in favor. Then he asked for any opposed.

Mr. Robert Hagey, 10628 Sharon Circle, Urbandale, said speaking on behalf of The Townhomes of Foxdale Association, which is immediately to the east of this development, we wish to be on record as opposing this proposed zoning change to permit leasing the property for wholesale distribution of the stone and brick material for this 4601 and 4701 Meredith Drive development. It’s the position of our Townhomes of Foxdale Homeowners Association that leasing to a tenant such as this would significantly increase large truck traffic on both 100th Street/Sutton Drive coming off of the interstate and on Meredith Drive, causing significant damage to the roadway. We’ve seen a substantial increase in truck traffic already, ever since 100th Street opened up as an exit. It’s no longer a quiet part of town. There’s a lot of traffic there. Additionally, increased noise level will negatively impact the adjacent residential properties both on Meredith Drive and to the east, our development. He said the developers know quite well what type of businesses are permitted by the established zoning regulations. These same developers were clear in all the preliminary presentations prior to the initial zoning approval who their intended tenants would be and what types of businesses that we as nearby residents in the City of Urbandale as a whole could anticipate at this location. Now come along some of the first proposed tenants and ask for substantive changes begs the question, what next, and then will they be requesting more, and more, and more changes? We respectfully request your denial of this request.

Mr. Hatfield asked was there a vote of your townhome association, or is that a personal position?

Mr. Hagey said this is our Board of Directors.

Mr. Dale Rupp, 10632 Sharon Circle, Urbandale, said we moved in there a couple of years ago, before they had started the development. Very nice townhome, very quiet, everything else. Within several months, they started the construction of that. All last year, we didn’t have a quiet time at all. There was just noise after noise after noise of construction. Now this is brought to the Urbandale here, and it’s like Mr. Hagey said,
what's next? You give an inch, they take a mile. Are you going to open up Pandora’s Box then? That’s why I’m opposed to it.

Mr. Van Heuvelen asked if anyone else wanted to speak in opposition. Seeing no one, he said if proponents would like to address any of the concerns that had been mentioned, they could have a rebuttal time.

Mr. Hodges said the first issue in terms of uses, we worked extensively with the townhome association, we appreciated their time. We worked quite extensively with the City staff, but I think it’s hard for any developer to anticipate every use that’s out there. I think that’s why, when we did the P.U.D. with City staff, we went through that in detail and anticipated uses as best we could when we added some of these users. I think as Ms. Bales said, very similar type uses are already permitted as conditional uses in the P.U.D. It’s really hard to create an exhaustive list of every user that’s out there. In terms of noise, I think we did the best we could to mitigate that. That’s one reason too why we laid the site the way we did, pushing that property furthest to the east to kind of create that buffer for noise mitigation. We also did some additional landscaping to help with, again, the additional traffic from commercial development.

Mr. Joe Hansen, general counsel for Glen Gery, 501 4th Street, Sargent Bluff, Iowa, said one of the things that wasn’t mention by Mr. Hodges or Mr. Bush was how trucks would be loaded and what kind of traffic we see coming in and out of there. If you’ll notice on the photograph, the rear portion of that building, there are at least three back-up docks for semi trucks and then there are other docks that are drive-in docks. So it’s our intention right now that during business hours, if customers need to be loaded, they would drive into the facility, they would load inside, and then they would depart. So if there’s traffic noise related to loading and unloading forklifts and that kind of thing, that would all be done inside. So, the noise from that would be mitigated. Trucks that are being loaded and unloaded that back into the docks, I don’t believe they’re going to cause any noise other than them taking off and leaving. So, if anyone has any questions about that, the operations, I think we can answer some more of those things.

Mr. Van Heuvelen asked anyone else?

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

Mr. Hatfield said so right now, that property owner could lease to someone who manufactures glass. They could bring in stuff and they could cut all day long, and they could have a tenant who is a manufacturer.

Ms. Bales said I’m sure if glass is on the list.

Mr. Hatfield said well, they could make stuff, they could saw and assemble and screw.
Ms. Bales said yes. Manufacturing, processing, or assembly is allowed for those categories shown in the P.U.D. Master Plan.

Mr. Hatfield said and they could do wholesale warehousing, like they do at API. They could bring in trucks all day long as a permitted use.

Ms. Bales said yes, correct.

Mr. Hatfield said with this, there’s no outside storage, there’s no outside delivery, and most of the truck traffic is daytime and inside the building. Somebody could have made a case that this is wholesale warehousing of bricks.

Ms. Bales said so the warehousing component of bricks is included, storage of bricks. But there’s no manufacturing of bricks included with this. There’s a manufacturing component that’s allowed for some of the uses listed in here, but they’re not going to manufacture bricks. They’re going to receive bricks and store bricks. And they can’t drop pallets at the curb and hope that the forklift delivers and puts them inside throughout the day because that’s still considered outdoor storage. Because we don’t want a timeframe on it. It doesn’t say you’re allowed to have an hour’s worth of outdoor storage or three days, until you get it inside. It’s “no outdoor storage”, so there’s no drop and run kind of situation.

Mr. Hatfield said I wasn’t very specific with my question. So, right now wholesale warehousing is a permitted use in that area.

Ms. Bales said yes.

Mr. Hatfield said so basically they’re warehousing bricks and components and aggregate.

Ms. Bales said yes.

Mr. Hollatz said the difference in uses is zero.

Mr. Pick said they’re not manufacturing anything there.

Mr. Hatfield said right. And they could manufacture things in there if they wanted to manufacture whatever’s okay in the permitted uses of the manufacturing. But they’re not manufacturing, they’re taking trucks inside, dropping off bricks and aggregate and stone.

Ms. Bales said correct. So right now the permitted uses and general warehousing is here. General warehousing and storage of non-hazardous and non-toxic products are a permitted use.
Mr. Hatfield said to me, it’s just this is belts and suspenders on allowing them to put brick and aggregate into a building that has storage a use. It didn’t seem like a big difference. It’s not more traffic or more trucks than if they were storing paper.

Mr. Pick said I think that all the deliveries are going to be during business hours, which is more than some properties could be said in Urbandale. And they’re going to load most of them internally inside the building.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said before this P.U.D. was created a couple of years ago when this was approved, would this use have been permitted at that point, before we designed this P.U.D.?

Ms. Bales said this specific use?

Mr. Van Heuvelen said yes.

Ms. Bales said no, it wasn’t allowed before. When they amended it, they added a lot of retail components.

Mr. Van Heuvelen asked when was it zoned prior to the P.U.D., I guess?

Ms. Bales said the first P.U.D. was in 2000, and it added, this list was already allowed in 2000. Permitted use for all of those lots. These conditional uses were already allowed. What came in new in 2018 was essentially what’s listed for Building B. These were the retail uses that were added - a little higher traffic kind of stuff. Still, they didn’t go as far as adding restaurants.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said but the warehousing component was always there.

Ms. Bales said yes.

Mr. Van Heuvelen asked back to 2000, the warehousing component was always there?

Ms. Bales said yes.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said before the townhomes were built to the east?

Ms. Bales said I don’t know when the townhomes were built.

Mr. Hatfield asked when were the townhouses built?

Mr. Hagey said they were built in 1992 or 1993, somewhere in there.

Ms. Bales said so this was after the townhouses then.
Mr. Van Heuvelen said but the P.U.D. did not add the warehouse component, it was on there before.

Ms. Bales said correct. The general warehouse, category 16, was on there before. This is more of a specific warehousing use. You'll remember this is the book we usually use, the Standard Industrial Classification. And so what it does is has broad categories, and then it breaks them down in more specifics. Their category of uses fits in a more specific category, it's like we allow some things but wasn't specifically identified as one of them, and so to have them considered being part of this, that specific use had to be proposed. That's the category we reference, that 5032.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said to address the “more and more” aspect of it, change is always difficult for sure. But I hope you see that if there is another request, it will be examined and it will be questioned, as well. It won't just automatically happen “more and more”. Every item that's going to be changed will come before the Commission and you of course will be receiving notice.

Mr. Pick asked are you okay with the Staff recommendations?

Mr. Hodges indicated that they were okay with them.

Mr. Hollatz moved, and it was seconded by Quinn, to approve the “Etchen Property” Amendment to the PUD Master Plan, subject to Staff recommendations. On roll call; Ayes; Hollatz, Quinn, Hatfield, Pick, Roethler, Galante, Van Heuvelen; Nays: none. Passes: none. Motion carried.

Regarding Staff reports, Ms. Bales said we will have your meeting in two weeks. We will likely be in a different location. This room is going to have a bit of a technology upgrade. We will likely be meeting over at the library, our City Clerk is checking reservation times and slots. We'll have signs on the door as well for everybody. And then we will have your meeting on March 16. I highlight that because it's going to be a long one and Spring Break is the week before.

Mr. Pick asked why will the 16th be long?

Ms. Bales said we have a few things going on. At 78th and Hickman Road where there’s a vacant lot, there will be a townhouse PUD amendment request, plat and site plan, for this parcel and this parcel. You will see the final plat for the apartment building in front of the Merle Hay Mall. The City will get the site plan for their shelter building in the Walnut Creek Regional Park. You'll recall a couple of years ago, we did the north shelter here off of Aurora, so this is the Walnut Creek Regional Trail system. When we first did it, we had a north and south shelter. And the proposals came in way too high. So then we did north only. What we’re going to do is, this year we'll do the parking lot and utilities and next year, we'll do the shelter building. That will be about right here.
Iowa Bankers is proposing a new building on Northpark. They will be here at 8901 Northpark. There’s a plat of survey to split this lot into two and a two-story office building here fronting on Northpark.

Mr. Van Heuvelen asked a retail banker?

Ms. Bales said no, Iowa Bankers Association. They’re seeking Class A office designation, so they will have some review by the architectural panel, that review committee, for building materials, floor plan, that sort of thing. So that will be on there as well.

Mr. Van Heuvelen asked where is Iowa Bankers at now?

Mr. Hatfield said 62nd and 86th in Johnston.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.