The Urbandale Planning and Zoning Commission met in regular session on Monday, March 2, 2020, at the Urbandale Public Library, 3520 86th Street. Chairperson Wayne Van Heuvelen called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Commissioners present were Jeff Hatfield, Paul Pick, Lee Hollatz, Julie Roethler, Wayne Van Heuvelen, Joan Racki, 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 February 17, 2020, meeting. Mr. Pick moved, and it was seconded by Hatfield, to approve the February 17, 2020 meeting minutes. On roll call; Ayes: Pick, Hatfield, Roethler, Hollatz, Van Heuvelen, Galante; Passes: Racki. Nays: none. Motion carried.

The next item on the agenda was the continuation of 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.

Ms. Bales said the northern portion of the “Waterford Landing” development is located in the northeast corner of the intersection of 170th Street and Waterford Road. The City Council approved a zone change to “P.U.D.” in 2005 which included land on the north and south sides of Waterford Road. Since then, amendments have been approved for changes in minimum lot width and street layout, with the most recent amendment allowing a city-owned fueling station, vehicle repair facility, and salt storage building, along with outside storage as permitted uses.

The petitioner is seeking approval of amendments to the “Waterford Landing” P.U.D. Master Plan to allow additional types of housing on approximately 23 acres in the southwest portion of the development along the north side of Waterford Road. A previous proposal for villas and two-family townhomes (“bi-attached”) was presented in 2018 but that proposal was later withdrawn and no final action was taken by the City Council (Case No. 010-2005-02.03.05).

Per the current P.U.D. Master Plan, the portion of the Waterford Landing development north of Waterford Road allows a mix of 60’, 70’, 75’ and 80’ wide lots. The petitioner is seeking approval to allow approximately 38 units (19 buildings) of attached two-family townhomes (“bi-attached”), approximately 68 attached townhomes (3 to 5 attached units per building), and approximately 17 single-family detached lots (“villas”) as follows:

- The two-family townhomes (“bi-attached”) are proposed to have a minimum 40’ lot width, 30’ front yard, 5’ side yards (minimum 10’ building separation and 0’ on the common line), 25’ rear yard setback for lots east of 168th Street and 5’ rear
yard setbacks for lots west of 168th Street with the provision of a 35’ wide outlot on the western project boundary. The minimum lot size would be 4,750 square feet.

- The detached single-family lots would be constructed as detached residential dwellings ("villas") with a minimum lot width of 44 feet. The applicant proposes a 30’ front yard; 35’ rear yard for lots fronting on 167th Street, otherwise a 25’ rear yard; and 5’ on each side yard (except when abutting the side yard of an adjoining single-family non-villa unit the side yard shall be 8’). The minimum lot size would be 5,500 square feet.
- The attached townhomes with 3 to 5 attached units would have a minimum lot width of 20 feet. The applicant proposes a 25’ front yard on a public street and a 20’ front yard setback on the two private streets with a 30’ setback along 167th and 168th Streets; 10’ rear yard (minimum 30’ building separation); and 5’ side yard (minimum 10’ building separation and 0’ on the common line). The minimum lot size would be 2,000 square feet.

167th Street, 168th Street and Walnut Meadows Drive are proposed as public streets with sidewalks on both sides. Two east-west streets that serve only the attached 3 to 5-unit townhomes (Goldenrod Drive and Bentwood Drive) are proposed as private streets with sidewalks on one side. All sidewalks must be a minimum of 5 feet wide. Each residence has a minimum two-car garage.

A 50’ landscape setback is required along Waterford Road. The setback shall include a berm with a minimum average height of 4 feet and a mixture of trees and shrubs. A 20’ landscape setback will be required in the rear yards of the detached single-family lots ("villas") that front along 167th Street.

The proposed amendment to the P.U.D. Master Plan appears to be reasonable and appropriate, given the current approval of a mixture of small and large lots, the construction of the city’s new fueling station to the west, and only a slight increase in the overall density of the Waterford Landing development. An increased rear yard and a 20’ landscape setback for the villas that front onto 167th Street will also provide some additional separation and screening to the existing larger houses built by the same developer in the original part of the Waterford Landing development. Originally, this development was approved for 196 single-family lots, which would be increased to 205 lots with this amendment. If this amendment is approved, a revised preliminary plat and a site plan are required for review and approval.

Waterford Road has recently been widened with a four-lane cross-section with turn lanes along the southern frontage of this property. The widened cross-section ends approximately 200 feet east of 170th Street and then narrows back to a two-lane pavement to tie into 170th Street. The timeframe for the reconstruction and widening of 170th Street, from Meredith Drive to Waterford Road, is 2022. The timeframe for the reconstruction and widening of 170th Street, north of Waterford Road is unknown.
Water service will be from a 16" line along Waterford Road. Sanitary sewer service will be provided from a main that runs along Walnut Creek, north of the Waterford Landing development.

Properties adjacent to the north and east are part of the same P.U.D. Master Plan and are planned for future single-family residences. Property adjacent to the west is part of the same P.U.D. Master Plan and is the new location of the City of Urbandale’s fueling station (currently under construction). Property across Waterford Road to the south is the commercial portion of the “Highland Meadows” P.U.D. Master Plan. The property is in the Waukee School District.

Staff recommends approval of the amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and to the “Waterford Landing” P.U.D. Master Plan to allow: approximately 38 units of attached two-family townhomes ("bi-attached"); approximately 68 attached townhomes (3 to 5 attached units per building); and approximately 17 single-family detached lots ("villas") in accordance with the attached, revised P.U.D. Master Plan.

Ms. Bales said there is a requirement for a 20-foot landscape in these rear yards in back, and then the traditional 50-foot landscape buffer is required along Waterford Road. It’s part of the current PUD. The berm and the plantings are required along Waterford Road and that didn’t change. Staff is recommending approval of the request to the Comprehensive Plan and the PUD Master Plan with those design specifications that I’ve highlighted more specifically. They are all in your staff report.
Ms. Bales said Steve Mosely from Hubbell Realty is here, Doug Salzgaver from ERG is here as well to answer any specific questions you might have. I believe there might be some citizens, as well. Everybody should have received an e-mail from me. We had one e-mail from a neighbor with concerns. It’s printed here. If you didn’t get a chance to read it before, Ms. Racki has it hand. You’ll also recall when there was going to be a public hearing a few weeks ago, I had sent a pack of about 8 or 9 e-mails of opposition and concern. Those were before this revision. They tried to address that a little bit. But certainly concerns about density, concerns about the difference in what they were told as buyers, all of that some of the running themes you saw still in that e-mail that came through today. I won’t speak to specifics, but the generalities are there. I’ll take any questions you may have, otherwise I’ll turn it over to the developer and go from there.

Mr. Pick said so the landscape buffer on the back of the single family ones – what’s the requested landscape buffer requirements? What’s it going to look like or what’s going to be required?

Ms. Bales said the way the PUD reads right now, it is a combination of trees, with an emphasis on coniferous so that everything doesn’t disappear in the fall, and some shrubs. So it doesn’t require a berm necessarily, we haven’t gotten to that level of detail with the stormwater swale that sometimes comes in the rear so we don’t want that in the 20-foot landscape buffer. But it’s a combination of trees and shrubs with an emphasis on coniferous, is how that reads. We’ve used that landscape buffer in a couple of different places, one of the more recent ones being the Waterford Creek South development a little bit to the east on Waterford Road, where it had the larger lots that were kind of in the original style of the Coyote Ridge development. And then it transitioned to those smaller, individual lots. And then it transitioned into the attached 4-plexes. But we did make that requirement for a landscape screen. It isn’t typical necessarily from single family to single family, but we did require it back there and we are making the same request here.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said I noticed that you used the term “what they call villas” when you talk about the villas. What’s the distinction or why did you use that term?

Ms. Bales said I use that term because that’s their term. And for us, that’s more of a marketing term, not something that we’re going to have a plat, they can name it “villas”. But each of these lots are full, they aren’t postage stamp lots where the lot is exactly around or a foot around the base of the house. They’re individual lots that can be sold. They talked about having them as maintained by a townhome association and that’s why they use the word villas. But for us, it’s single family stand-alone lots that we’ll evaluate based on a preliminary plat.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said so the distinction being if they had a homeowners’ association, you would call them villas at that point? But these are freestanding homes that they’ll be responsible for lawn care, as well as exterior maintenance?
Ms. Bales said yes, so the way we’ve talked about, in like Radiant Point and Waterford Creek South, we don’t care who mows the lawn. So if they had postage stamps where the lot was exactly around the footprint of the house and then there was common ground between each of them, we’d probably use the word villas. But for us, these are stand-alone detached houses on their own individual saleable lot.

Mr. Pick said very similar to Waterford Landing at 142nd and Meredith?

Ms. Bales said yes. They’re smaller lots but they can be sold as lots.

Mr. Hatfield said Hubbell has a product at 128th right next to the gas station that we had the child day care center, and the people came in and talked to us about having a day care center there. Same thing.

Ms. Bales said that isn’t the same as this, that is the postage stamp lot.

Mr. Hatfield said oh, okay so a smaller lot.

Ms. Bales said this is more like Radiant Point and Waterford Creek South where they are individual lots, so setbacks are from property lines.

Ms. Roethler asked what are we transitioning from as far as lot width, like the current development at 166th Court and Walnut Meadows, are those like 70 foot minimum?

Ms. Bales said the current mix of Waterford Landing development allowed 60’s, 70’s, 75’s and 80’s. It was a whole range and a breakdown of lots. These are some of your wider ones here on the cul-de-sac, and you can see some of the narrower ones are up over in Plat 7. But they’re a bit wider. The larger lots of course on cul-de-sacs are bigger, but they do look narrower but that measurement is taken from the building setback line. But there’s a whole mixture of widths that are allowed in the existing development.

Ms. Roethler said and then the transition is to the villas, what was the minimum lot width?

Ms. Bales said the villas are 44 feet minimum.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said this is a public hearing, so the Commission will hear from both proponents and opponents of this proposed zoning change. He said first we will hear from the proponents.

Mr. Steve Mosely, Hubbell Realty, 6900 Westown Parkway, West Des Moines, said I’m here tonight to ask for your approval on the changes you can see before you. One thing I would like to point out is that on the north side of Bentwood Drive which is the northernmost private drive, the east-west drive, we have determined we can fit, instead
of a 4-plex and a 5-plex in that area on the north side of the road, we can fit three 3-plexes across that area so we can eliminate the 5-plex you see in that location and one 4-plex and get it to more desirable units. And so it doesn’t change the unit count of the development at all and that is the only change you would see up in that location. We have been working with some of the neighbors and had some discussions in regards to some of the layout in this area. Along the east side of the development, we talked about the possibility of berming in the landscape area. We aren’t far enough along to know whether or not that would actually cause a problem with drainage through those backyards. We also know that based on the width of that berm, that we would only get about 4 or 5 feet of height, so we think that we’re probably able to create a better type of screen using evergreen type of trees and shrubs in that area that will develop faster than say a berm with plant material on top of it. What we’re seeing in the metro area recently in the last few years, is that the draw is to go to the smaller lot sizes and smaller homes. We feel in this area it’s a good fit for the demand in this market and we would like to proceed with what you see before you right now.

Ms. Roethler asked what would you estimate the price range for the single family villas?

Mr. Moseley said the single family villas we currently have estimated at $275,000 to $350,000 depending on options that they take. One thing I should also point out on the villas, and everything in the development, it will be association-maintained. So even though they are freestanding homes they will be maintained by the association.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said when you say “maintained”, you’re talking about the lawn care, as well as exterior and roofs, sidewalks, everything?

Mr. Mosely said yes.

Mr. Van Heuvelen asked any of these going to be rented out at any point in time?

Mr. Mosely said no. We do have two houses that have been rented out east of this development and from checking with our staff, those two units have been rented, I think they were having a hard time selling both of those units so they put them up for rental. What we found out is that most rental houses in a development like this that we put out there are occupied by either somebody who wants to kind of try out the neighborhood before they would buy, or somebody who is building a house kind of in that area as a way to get their kids into that school region. And one thing that I found out today was that the average household income of the rental units in that area is $180,000 a year. And the people who tend to live in these units while they’re building another home tend to build larger homes than what they’re renting. So, right now we do not plan to do any rentals in this development. These are all “for sale” units.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said but it’s a possibility.

Mr. Mosely said it’s a possibility, but based on the rentals we’ve done in other locations,
they don’t rent. Most people either buy or move somewhere else.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said would it be safe to say, if it is a rental situation, and you’re saying it won’t be, but if it ever would be, it would be for an extremely short time? Your idea is maybe to rent it out for somebody who wants to get in the district for 6 months or a year, but it goes back on the market, it’s not a permanent rental?

Mr. Mosely said right. Yes, most of the time, like I said, the people that rent the single family homes, they end up buying them from us, for the most part. It’s a high percentage.

Ms. Racki said so I’m curious the reason that you’re proposing this change from what was originally planned, is because of what you’re seeing for demand in the market?

Mr. Mosely said yes.

Ms. Racki said okay, because one of the neighbors indicated to us in an e-mail the development to the east, which were the larger homes, apparently weren’t having trouble selling. I don’t know, I haven’t been out there.

Mr. Mosely said I don’t know, I can’t speak for those. I just know in all of our developments around the metro area, we’re having a longer period of time to sell single family homes in the lot sizes that we had there originally.

Ms. Racki asked so what square footage are you talking about? We know sort of what the lot sizes are, we know the price point. What about the square footage of the villas?

Mr. Mosely said I’m not sure if I have that information with me tonight. He asked Ms. Bales if that was in her staff report.

Ms. Bales said no, not the average square footage, but the villas, those standalone houses, we’ll treat them the same as we do a single family house which has a minimum based on whether it is a one story house, a one and a half, or a two story house. And those are in the PUD master plan. We don’t get into a basic square footage of the townhomes, anything that’s attached.

Ms. Racki said you must have an idea of what your average cost of construction is, and you told us these were $275,000 to $350,000, so you should be able to give us an estimate based on the cost per square foot of what size houses we’re looking at.

Mr. Mosely said I’m sorry, I don’t have that information with me. I’d probably be misquoting.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said I have one more question. I noticed in some correspondence from one of the neighbors that they were concerned about what’s next. If you close this,
in two years you’re going to be back in a few years and want to put apartment complexes in or something like that. What’s the trust factor here, that this is what you’re going to build and not ask for something else and come back in a year and a half, or two years or five years and change this again?

Mr. Mosely said right. We’re planning on starting this as soon as we have approvals. We started in 2005 on this overall development so by the time we got to this location, now we’re seeing a demand for smaller product. And so we’re going to start as soon as we get approvals and we don’t expect anything to change to where we’d want to make those changes in the next year or two, to build this out.

Mr. Van Heuvelen asked if anyone else was present who wished to speak in favor? Seeing no one, he asked for anyone opposed who wished to speak.

Mr. Dan Giesinger, 16515 Walnut Meadows Drive, said I live right adjacent to the proposal. Thank you for the opportunity to talk today. I’ll start with a little background. We moved here to this development in May of 2018 after living in the Lower Beaver area for 15 years or so. We really loved that community but we were looking for a step up. We didn’t have a need to move but we had the means to, so we took our time and were very picky about where we moved to. We searched a long time to find the right lot, the right home. We passed on a lot of houses due to things like lot size, features, lack of privacy, etc. Our home clicked all the boxes for us, daylight lot, quiet neighborhood, the location out there worked well for us. We take pride in our house and frequently tell others how much we love our Brothers Construction home. Like most buyers, we’ve made a long-term decision. We plan to be there for decades, or at least a decade. We didn’t make any compromises in our purchase. Like many of our neighbors, we spent a lot of time doing our research. I know this because I’ve talked to all of my neighbors in the course of this proposal. I’m the one who sent the petition. I’ve talked to everybody in the 165th Street area and they all share my same concerns. I can tell you unanimously that I didn’t speak to anyone that didn’t share concerns about things like congestion, traffic, noise, changing the character. We all found our experiences were pretty similar when purchasing our house and making the decision. We asked for and received things like plat designs that showed single family homes in the area, not multi-family units. We were provided covenants that showed a certain quality of house to be built, things like hardy plank siding. People who were purchasing directly from Hubbell were told a variety of things about the value of the homes to be built in the area. Some of those folks I’m sure will speak to you here today. But as we can see from proposals as far back as July 2018, Hubbell was already planning to rezone this. So while they were advertising and telling us things like large single family homes, large home sites, some things like privacy, views and green space, were in their advertising, peaceful setting, they were at the same time planning something completely different. Those are obviously qualities a buyer wants. Those were qualities we wanted when we moved there. And now it’s being changed completely. So, gone are the single family large lots, we’re trying to fit in as many homes as possible. Instead of privacy, we’re adding congestion, noise, no place to park for all those cars. The views they advertise will be
rows of tightly-packed homes. There’s no green space in the proposal, like they advertise. The variety will be whatever Hubbell builds. No other builders likely, and what they can’t sell, I think, we’ll see go to Two Rivers Rental, their subsidiary, which we already have in our neighborhood. We already have rental homes. We’re all wondering why. Were they unwilling to inform their sales people that they were planning to rezone or did they just lie to us outright? They’ve already started making changes last summer, adding homes with vinyl siding, smaller footprints, they quit selling lots to other builders in the neighborhood and instead have built houses so they can sell them as rentals or rent them out. We moved here recently, had the option to move or stay in a multi-family community, or a villa or a condo, but we moved here looking for quiet upscale community with homes that we value. The City of Urbandale also places a value on high-end residential neighborhoods in its comprehensive plans. “High end residential homes increase the diversity of housing stock and provide a highly positive image beneficial to the community.” It also noted in the comprehensive plan that areas west of the interstate with high levels of natural amenities, such as ours, are conducive to the development of such housing. Hubbell’s proposal not only forces a neighborhood we don’t want, but they are ensuring that like-minded buyers like us will stay away. Nobody is looking to build an executive home next to a four-plex or rows of congested properties and parking. They won’t choose noise and traffic, nor will they choose proximity to rental properties with tenants and landlords who cannot share the commitment to home ownership and upkeep. Changes like this should not come at the expense of those who have already invested. Zoning should be planned far in advance and not forced upon residents. Urbandale does need all kinds of housing but it should be thoughtful, and also should include areas for step up housing like ours. If the City doesn’t respect our community and our investment, the market will build elsewhere. In conclusion, I’d like to state that the people I have spoken to are very angry but not unreasonable. While most would prefer single family housing, my feeling is we are willing to work toward a compromise. We have suggested items like a transition from single family to multi-family and I’m happy to see that some things like buffers have been considered, if not some of our other suggestions. If the City absolutely feels that this is the ideal location, the ideal plat for multi-family homes, we ask to be included in the discussions. Through letters, petitions, and being here tonight, we’re doing our part. We’ve repeatedly shared our concerns with the committee, with Hubbell, and met with Mr. Franklin. Unfortunately, we don’t feel like our concerns have been considered and mostly ignored. Three months later, there has not been a real effort to acknowledge our concerns. They have our money and I don’t feel like they care about our community. The zoning meeting format exists so that our voices can be heard. We are unanimous in asking the committee to hold the developer accountable for the impact they have on the residents who have already invested their families in Urbandale. We ask that the committee deny the proposal and ask Hubbell to work with us for a solution that works for everyone. We chose to live here and would love to stay here. Thank you.

Mr. Van Heuvelen asked have they moved at all on your meetings? Because I think there have been several meetings with the neighbors. Have they made any adjustments?
Mr. Giesinger said I’m hearing the buffer. I know a couple of people were concerned about their back yards, people that are on the bottom of the cul-de-sac there. And some of them are in the meeting and you’ll get a chance to talk to them. That’s the only concession I’m aware of. From the first proposal to the second proposal, all they did was add more units. We expressed our concerns, we wrote our letters. The second amendment had more units, it was just packed with more units so that was pretty insulting to us. The buffer would help some, it’s not going to help everyone. In my backyard there’s a drain that stretches all the way towards the creek, so I don’t know that anybody would be able to plant anything there anyway. From what I see, once we start the villas here, the next thing that’s going to happen is they’re going to stretch all the way down to whatever that road is that stretches to the north. So we’re all going to end up with a back yard full of villas instead of the single family homes that we were expecting when we moved here.

Mr. Van Heuvelen asked if anybody else wished to address the Commission? He said if you’re going to say the same thing, I think we’re all listening attentively but if you have some new information, I think we’d all like to hear it.

Mr. Don Hunerdosse, 16601 Walnut Meadows Drive, said my lot is the pie shaped lot that’s blank right next to the other lots.

Ms. Bales asked next to Mr. Giesinger’s?

Mr. Hunerdosse said yes. We were very careful, like was said before, about planning our lot for where we wanted to stay. We saw the information on the Planning and Zoning Commission on how you wanted some higher-end housing in Urbandale, which helped us make our decision on where we were going to build. We started building in 2017 and we finished about 2 years ago today, and moved in. Again, we were very particular on what we wanted. My concern here is when we first looked at our lot, there were supposed to be five larger lot houses right next to my home. As you can see now, there are seven, so that’s very concerning to me. We have over a $450,000 house which is going to be right next to seven lots. They’re going to be smaller sized houses, so also concerned about re-sale. We planned on staying there for a while but I’m sure, if this goes through, I don’t see us staying here very long.

Mr. Evan Sersland, 5408 166th Court, said our lot is lot #27, I believe. When we bought our house in 2018, it was our first home, we had just gotten married. What attracted us to the neighborhood was the cul-de-sac, the families, we just had a really good vibe about everything. The original plan that we saw, we would have one back yard behind us with one house. Now we have four, four houses in our backyard which is completely different from what we envisioned and what we thought. I’m going to be honest with you, we’ve already talked about looking. If this all goes through, we’re looking to move. It was the biggest purchase in both of our lives and I feel like we kind of got duped.
Ms. Kelly Parkin, 5400 166th Court, said not to repeat everything that’s already been thoughtfully said. My concern is just with general congestion in the area. We went from single family to multi-family here. My understanding from meeting with Mr. Franklin is the plat to the north which was also was supposed to be single family, is also going to be multi-family. And then talking with people we know in the City, just south of Waterford, on the corner of Waterford and Alice’s Road, is also going to be multi-family. I’m just wondering how much congestion can one neck of the wood put up with? Have there been traffic studies? The elementary school is just south of the intersection there and you’re going to have eventually, once they get 170th Street widened with sidewalks, you’re going to have kids walking, biking, to school, with three big chunks of high density multi-family traffic to go along with it. And that certainly is not what we, when we bought our lot in 2016, it was not at all what we were told was going to happen. The covenants we were shown are completely different now. It’s just the whole trust factor with Hubbell. What are they going to do next to us? There’s just no reliability. They were selling to other builders, now they’re not. We just don’t have a lot of high confidence in our neighborhood and I don’t see a lot of people staying, and I see a lot of problems selling.

Mr. Ryan Bailey, 5519 165th Street, said I’m not going to regurgitate what everyone else said. We’re here to speak for the people, your job is to listen to the people and go up the chain. As everyone said, we were promised one thing. Things have changed dramatically for us. I understand you guys’ position as city representatives is to collect tax money, generate revenue. If that’s with this or without this, the land’s going to sell. $180,000 is what the average income is. People are going to buy the lots, if that’s with Hubbell or if Hubbell would release them to other companies to build single family that they originally proposed back in 2005. If you look just to the east of us in Coyote Ridge, they’re building houses very comparable to the ones that currently exist there. So for them to say that the market is changing, I guess I would like a little more background on some of the data where they’re getting that from. That’s about all I really have to say. Once again, the people are behind us, speaking for what we want. This is our community, and we want you guys to hold Hubbell accountable for what they originally proposed to us. Thank you.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said maybe you have the answer to this and maybe you don’t. There’s a petition circulating. What percentage of the people in your neighborhood signed that petition?

Mr. Bailey said I would say the majority, easily three-fourths did.

Mr. Giesinger said I talked to 90%, and 100% signed it.

Mr. Bailey said even a gentleman who moved two houses down from me two months ago, I asked him when this was proposed what was promised to you. He bought a $500,000 house. Single family homes all around us. You can’t tell me that they didn’t know about this before they sold the house to him. That’s pretty deceiving, wouldn’t you
agree? That's all I have to say. It’s up to you guys, but look at the people, hear their voices.

Mr. Arthur Roeding, 5516 165th Street, said I’d be two houses down from the ones that are currently being rented, supposedly, which they’re not being rented. We’ve seen one car go in that driveway in the two months the sign’s been out in the yard to look at the house. If it’s been rented in the last 24 hours, then they may have rented it. But we all know how rentals work. You have one rental property, gives you a down payment, moves in tomorrow. Nobody’s moving those properties, because they’re rental houses, they’ve got vinyl siding. A little bit of background on me. I lived in Johnston for 8 years. Backed up to old 100th Street, that was a two-lane blacktopped road. Bought the house, asked the realtor what’s the plans in the area for development. No plans. We all know what now where 100th Street is at in Johnston. What’s behind my house? A high school, with a 4-lane road that was like a NASCAR track when they developed it. They flooded my house by not doing any kind of berms, no kind of run-off - didn’t care because my house got flooded. Yes, they reimbursed me for the damages, but the whole idea that when I buy a house, I set it up as a homestead. I want to live there forever. I don’t want to move three or four times in five or six years. I have three children, 6, 4, and 3, I want them to stay in the same school district, the same community, the same neighborhood friends. We don’t want them to bounce around and say let’s go 12 miles to visit your friends that you used to have four years ago that live in the same area now. That’s not our plan. We moved out in this area for two reasons, a little country atmosphere, a little bit away from the ruckus and the melee of high-end travel areas. We bought a $395,000 house. The realtor comes to our house, the Hubbell realtors come to our house, what’s the plan out back developing? Just like the sign guarantees you. We’ve all said promise, let’s talk about the guarantees. I was guaranteed similar developments behind my house. I wasn’t guaranteed, okay, you’re going to get some townhouses, “villas”. I’m in lawn care, that’s my profession. I know what a villa is and I know what a townhouse is. And I know the association doing the bill it does, and the association does the townhouses. We don’t want those lawn care companies in our neighborhood mowing townhouses. Because they mow them at night, don’t care about the clean-up, they don’t care about the overall manicuring of the area. They’re there to do one thing, get done as fast as they can and leave behind the trash so somebody else can take care of it. I know it, I’ve done it for 15 years. 23 years in the Marine Corp, 15 years in lawn care. I’ve seen it firsthand. I’m not talking about pictures or what I’ve heard, I’ve seen it with my own eyes. I go in behind the lawn care companies that do bad jobs to fix the properties that are bad, like we’re going to build out here. I hate to say it, but we are. We’ve seen the lawn care companies come in and mow the lots that Hubbell currently has in our area. 8:00 p.m. at night, mowing our houses in our neighborhood, vacant lots. We’ve called and said please tell them to come during normal business hours. I’m not saying come at 4:00 in the afternoon, but come within reason. I don’t want my kids outside playing in the back yard, me yelling at them to come in the house for dinner, yet they can’t hear us over a mower that’s running. It’s just overall the perspective of what we were sold on, what we were guaranteed and now what we’re being forced into. We understand that Urbandale’s a
place to grow, we want to stay here and grow with it. But we want to grow in the right aspects of our area. Like you said to Hubbell when he was up here, what guarantees or promises are you giving to the homeowners now to not develop something else later. He didn’t answer your question, he just told you what they’re going to build now. You asked him what the future was going to bring us after this was developed. He didn’t answer that question. I sat right back there and listened to him, all he said was what they’re going to do now. And you asked him what’s the next level, he didn’t answer that question. I’m sorry, but he didn’t. Replay the tape, he didn’t answer the question. People that don’t answer the question, you know what they’re doing? They’d dodging it. They’re avoiding the situation that they’re in. If you didn’t want to build high-end houses then you shouldn’t have started developing it in the first place. I didn’t buy a house for $400,000 to say okay, out back is going to be 180 in about 6 months. That’s not our plan. Our plan was to be here for 15 years. I’ve got plans for my own property. We were planning to put a pool in. If townhouses are going in behind my house, guess what we’re not doing. We’re not putting a pool in! Because you know what townhouses bring. I hate to say it but I’ve seen it – single parent multi-children families that can afford these houses because they don’t have to do any lawn care, they don’t have to do any snow removal, all they have to do is live in the house. They have no maintenance, so what better place to go to if you don’t have ability to do that stuff? Buy these houses and let the association take care of it for you. I’ve seen it! That’s not our plan here. Our plan wasn’t to do that. Our guarantee was to have the same kind of houses that we bought built there. But they’re not. According to this proposal, they’re not being built there. And all Hubbell wants to do is jam as many of them in there as they can. Ka-ching, ka-ching, ka-ching, that’s how I see it, we all see it. It’s all about the money to be made here. Let’s think about the reputation that they’re going to have around the community. I hope they don’t want that reputation of breaking guarantees. Their promises are out the window. There’s no promises, there were only guarantees of what we were supposed to get out here. That guarantee on the screen is gone, it’s not there. We can all see. It’s disappointing, extremely disappointing. To me and my family that I spent some hard-earned money to move out there to get this. It’s like going to a car dealership, getting a Cadillac, picking it out, going back a couple of days later and they give you a Pinto or a Honda. That’s what this is like. We were guaranteed and sold a bill of goods and now we’re being told switch, nope, sorry, that doesn’t work for our clients so now we’re going to do a different plan. Sorry it didn’t work for you, but we’re the ones that have got the money in the community, sir, we’re going to build what we need to build. We’ve got ways around this and as we all know, this meeting’s been planned and re-scheduled, planned and re-scheduled, planned and re-scheduled, what, four times? At least four times. Why not just do it the first time, if you’re that big and that great of a planner or developer, let’s not go back and forth 6, 7, 8 or 9 times. Let’s get it right the first time. If it doesn’t pass it doesn’t pass, move forward. I’m sorry. But it’s coming from here, that’s where this is coming from, my heart. That I want you to realize what you’re putting us into. We understand there’s got to be development in Urbandale, but let’s do it right for the people who are already there. Let’s not cheat somebody, like Johnston did to me. Let’s keep the people there that want to be there to stay there. That’s my concerns. I’m telling you the facts from A to Z, 1 to 10, there’s no fluffing it.
This proposal’s bad for the people that currently live there, we all know it is. We want it to be better. We’re not saying we’re against the plan, we just want it to be better. Better for us and for them, not just for them. We want the guarantee back that we were guaranteed when we bought our lot and our house. Any questions? Thank you for your time.

Mr. Van Heuvelen asked anyone else want to present any new information? Seeing no one, we offer a chance for rebuttal. He asked if Mr. Mosely would like to speak now.

Mr. Mosely said I would like to address the items I’ve listed down here. As for no parking, all the units that are in this development are set up so that cars can park in the driveway and do not have to park on the street, so there’s adequate depth from garage to the street or the edge of the sidewalk so that they can park in front of their own units. We are not building to rent any of these products that you see on this development. We are not. I know there’s some discussion. We didn’t plan to rent the ones in the other neighborhood, either, but I’ve been told as of today, from our rental group, that they do not want to rent any of these out. So that will not be happening. The development to the north, I don’t know if it was at the loud meeting we had at the Hy-Vee, but we are not planning to change anything to the north of this development. We’re not planning to do multi-family up in that area right now. That’s what I’m told. Third party builders – a couple of years ago we made the decision as a company to stop selling third party lots to hold all those lots and build on them ourselves. What we realized is that that was a mistake because of lost revenue. So, as of last October, we started selling third party lots again and we have sold third parties in this development, and Crosshaven and Legacy in Ankeny, multiple places around the metro area. And we have the dedicated agent who’s marketing to third party builders for those lots. Also in Waukee we’ve sold lots. I can’t speak to any of the tabling of the meetings. When we submitted this development last fall, we actually had duplexes along the east side where there’s now single family villas. At the request of the City, we changed those to single family villas because the City felt that was an adequate transition to go from the single family lots to the higher density. So we did that as a way to transition according to the City’s request. It’s been tabled three times, which I think set it back four meetings, mostly at the request of the City. He said Ms. Bales, I don’t know if you can confirm that? We tabled multiple times so we could have discussions and try to revise the layouts so we could have setbacks and road configuration changes to get more public streets and to get bigger setbacks along the north-south roads. We tabled it once and because the meeting it would have had a public meeting at was Caucus night, it automatically got tabled to the next meeting. So we tabled it once and it got tabled for a month. So we were not kicking the can down the road to do anything deceptive, we were tabling in order to work on the layout to meet the request of the City in regards to setback and unit types along the eastern boundary. As for lawn service and mowing times, I can’t speak to that. I know I’ve got a neighbor who mows his yard with a floodlight on the front of his mower and it’s not a lawn service for him. It can happen in any neighborhood, but we can certainly talk to our mowing service and find out why they tend to mow late in this neighborhood. But I was unaware of that situation. I don’t think I have any other items.
He asked Ms. Bales if there was anything she wanted to add or to ask him about.

Ms. Bales said no.

Ms. Roethler said I have a question. Was it ever considered to keep the original plan, what people were expecting, and do a less drastic transition, so those would be the actual, instead of the villas, they would have the lots of at least 60 feet single family lots that people were expecting and do a less dramatic transition?

Mr. Mosely said I think there have been about four or five different layouts, as this has evolved. He asked Mr. Salzgaver if he wanted to speak to the transition issue. He said Mr. Salzgaver has been on the project a lot longer than I have. He asked have we ever had that as a layout?

Mr. Salzgaver indicated no.

Mr. Mosely said okay, we haven’t.

Ms. Racki said, following up on Ms. Roethler’s comment, I can tell you right now I’d be much more supportive if it didn’t jump from these larger lots to all of a sudden smaller ones, and the transition move further to the west. Because what the neighbors are indicating is that they were sold something based on something, and now you want to switch it in their backyards, basically. That’s what I’m hearing.

Mr. Mosely said right, one thing I can say is if we make those lots bigger and deeper where the villas are right now, that will push our north-south drive farther to the west. And I think we’re tied into a connection location along there. He asked Ms. Bales is that right?

Ms. Bales said the spacing is set.

Mr. Mosely said so I don’t know if physically we can make that work.

Ms. Racki said just speaking for myself, I would strongly encourage you to be a little more creative and look at that alternative which would, I think, make the neighbors much happier. I’m seeing heads nodding yes. And transition it more to the west and maybe fewer. You would end up with multi-family but not maybe as many. And to me what you’re saying about the need, I don’t know enough about the housing market in west Urbandale, but I can tell you right now, and we haven’t had a discussion, I will not vote in favor of this, the way it’s currently proposed.

Ms. Bales said if I can add one thing, the spacing is set, but the original proposal when it was single family, this didn’t connect to Waterford. So, if it connects to Waterford, it has to connect in a certain spot. But the original connection was a cul-de-sac that almost mirrored this part of the layout, and I think that’s what I heard somebody say.
Originally the 2005 version was this didn’t connect, to answer your question. I think it had a little bit of a curve to it but it didn’t connect. To answer Mr. Mosely’s question a little bit and that’s what I had to dig up, the October submittal as this sort of evolved over time to kind of back up what he said, at least with the timing, the October submittal originally had three 4-plexes here. And then I think the December submittal had the 2-plexes that you referenced. And then as Mr. Mosely met with neighbors, as the City heard that feedback, as we talked about Walnut Meadows being public not private as we talked about setbacks, that evolved. And that was some of the delay to draw up those different versions to see kind of what would stick in conversations with the neighbors, what would stick with the City, that design kept evolving. I’ll take your word on the three. One of the meetings we did skip was the caucus, because we promised the Commission on keeping that meeting short. And so I’m affirming what he said in that regard. But, yes, this is the third version of what we’ve seen that backs up to those single family, the larger existing platted lots. So, just to confirm that.

Mr. Hatfield said a pretty simple question, but one that has a big impact on me, do you think up until three or four months ago, Hubbell Homes was marketing this as a development that would mirror what they have? Do you think the sales people were saying that, or do you think these people are all fibbing?

Mr. Mosely said I think they’re probably saying exactly what they heard. Up to that time ago, it was slated to be single family.

Mr. Hatfield said you knew probably a year ago that this was going to come before us, that it was going to change the character.

Mr. Mosely said I don’t know for sure. I’ve only been with Hubbell since last year.

Mr. Galante asked any comments on the green space, whether it was planned or unplanned in any iterations that you presented or developed?

Mr. Mosely said no I don’t have a history on the green space through the development. I know we’ve got green space to the north of this development where there’s a power line easement. And we have along the western side where we have a drainageway, we have an outlot which is a drainageway along the back side of those units. But we don’t have dedicated open green space tracts like you would, say, at Glen Village in Waukee where it’s a conservation type community.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said I know a couple of the neighbors want to speak. Normally this concludes our public hearing, but if you have some idea in order to find the solution, we’ll let you address the Commission again briefly.

Mr. Dan Giesinger, 16515 Walnut Meadows Drive, said I was just going to point out that there was a July 2018 that you didn’t see, that Mr. Mosely actually provided to us, and it does have the top portion maintains single family. This is villas throughout the middle
section, with bi-attached to the west. For us that’s kind of a starting point.

Ms. Bales said if I could just add to what Mr. Giesinger said, this group did actually see that version. But that’s the version that was withdrawn before it went through Council finally. So, he’s correct in that, it was about 2 years ago. So I just wanted to confirm that.

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

Mr. Hatfield said a couple of thoughts. First of all, Ms. Racki and Ms. Roethler stole my thoughts! So, smaller lots are a priority of the City but what we’ve talked about in the past is “where appropriate”. And so that’s a fact. The west side of this plat is a fueling station for the City, that’s a fact. But there’s also probably the fact that the developer made some assertions up until a few months ago on what this character was going to be. The plat that we did see a couple of years ago was substantially different from this, with cul-de-sacs and single family. So the worst that these people could have thought they were going to get was 60-foot lots in their back yard. That was the absolute worst. And possibly 75 or 80 feet, that was what they expected. And so because the marketplace has changed or they can sell lots or whatever, this has gone from probably 60 to 70 foot lot sizes, single family houses behind them, to 44 feet unknown if they’re going to be rentals because rentals are permitted, aren’t marketed next door but they’re there. So the zoning was in place when these people bought it. When somebody said we’re here for tax generation, that’s the City’s side. We’re just citizens like you who own houses and I’ve been on this Commission for almost 21 years. It’s a fairness doctrine. You were there first, and this was the zoning. And it substantially flipped. It didn’t minorly flip, it majorly flipped, from houses that looked like yours on a cul-de-sac to 44-foot wide lots with little houses on them. So I would echo what some other people are saying is, if you honored the 60 or 70 foot lots in the back yards and then across the street there were 55 foot wide lots, and eventually they become townhouses two blocks away where there’s a fueling station, you know, I think that’s kind of reasonable because of the change in the character. I don’t think it’s reasonable to just change it on these people even though the City Staff supports it. I think it’s a terrible idea. I’m not pandering to you. If you came up and I thought you were crazy, I’d probably say something similar. The last part I would like to say is, I would be upset too if I had bought a house and this was happening to me, and I also think you are probably correct in being a little bit nervous about what’s going to the north because, as of a few months ago, the marketing material showed big houses in your back yard. So, you’re doing the right thing and you certainly have my vote on something like this.

Mr. Galante said I would just say something similar, which is that the sentiment we’ve heard tonight is just a reflection of how far off it is from baseline. And even physically it shows a lack of creativity, to mirror some of the other comments that have been made. Exactly as you described it, I feel like there could have been some concessions made
with residents to try and make this thing a little bit more attractive, a little bit more acceptable.

Mr. Hatfield said I’m going to read this back for Mr. Giesinger, “the quality, the character, the noise, the congestion and possible rentals are concerning to us and we want to be reasonable but this is not reasonable.” I wrote that down just sort of as punch list notes.

Ms. Racki said I don’t have anything more to add than what I already said.

Mr. Hatfield moved, and it was seconded by Roethler, to deny the “Waterford Landing” Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and the P.U.D. Master Plan. On roll call; Ayes: Hatfield, Roethler, Pick, Galante, Hollatz, Racki, Van Heuvelen; Nays: none. Passes: none. Motion to deny carried.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said so it’s been denied. What that really means is they can go to City Council, it will be a “super majority” that they can overrule us, at this point. Given the comments today, and really some reasonable comments on the part of the neighbors, I would certainly ask that the developers meet with these neighbors again. They’ve said they’re reasonable – I see nodding heads – before you go to the Council, maybe you can get it through, I have no idea. But I hope that you meet with these neighbors again and come up with a suitable plan that’s agreeable to everybody. That concludes this matter.

The next item on the agenda was the “Urbandale Marketplace Plat 4” Final Plat (100th Street and Plum Drive).

Ms. Nuetzman said this final plat pertains to a portion of the property in the “Urbandale Marketplace Phase II” Planned Unit Development (P.U.D.) Master Plan area, located at the northwest corner of the intersection of 100th Street and Plum Drive. The property is located north of Plum Drive and totals 6.08 acres. The City Council approved the rezoning form “A-2” Estate Residential District to “P.U.D.” Planned Unit Development District on March 25, 2008, and a Preliminary Plat on January 14, 2020.

This plat proposes two lots with Lot 1 being 2.39 acres and Lot 2 being 3.69 acres. A site plan for a Kwik Star Convenience Store on Lot 1 has been submitted and is being reviewed. Lot 2 will not be developed at this time. An amendment to the P.U.D. was approved on October 8, 2019 to allow retail/commercial uses, including a Kwik Star Convenience Store, to be a permitted use. Access to the lots will be provided through shared ingress/egress easements as identified on the plat.

This property is currently zoned “P.U.D.”. Adjacent to the west and south is vacant land in the same P.U.D. To the east across 100th Street is vacant property zoned “A-1”
Agricultural Reserve District and to the north, adjacent to the interstate, is DOT right-of-way.

The property drains eastward towards North Walnut Creek and is located in the Johnston School District.

Ms. Nuetzman said Staff recommends approval of the Final Plat, subject to requiring the developer to:

1. Submit an Attorney’s Opinion and all other plat documents as found to be necessary for approval;

2. Revise the PUE at the corner of 100th Street and Plum Drive, only 10’ of PUE frontage on the street will be allowed, and it must be located along Plum Drive; add a note that no lot will have direct access to 100th Street; provide easement descriptions (received but will be routed with next review); provide sewer fee in the amount of $1,260; provide a bond for the sidewalk in the amount of $22,176.88;

Mr. Cory Marsh, Snyder & Associates, 2727 SW Snyder Boulevard, Ankeny, said here on behalf of the owner/developer, Temple Holdings. I don’t really have anything else to add. Just if you guys have any questions, I’d be happy to answer.

Mr. Hatfield asked are you okay with the two staff recommendations?

Mr. Marsh said yes, we’re working through the comments right now, doing revisions with the City.

Mr. Van Heuvelen asked so you’re good with the Staff recommendations?

Mr. Marsh said yes. Just a few comments there on the P.U.E.

Ms. Nuetzman said do you mean the PUE comment? That was an Engineering comment, I’ll let them handle that. I do know that we require 10 feet for frontage.

Mr. Marsh said yes. We’ll be working with them through that to address that comment.

Ms. Roethler moved and it was seconded by Racki, to approve the “Urbandale Marketplace Plat 4” Final Plat, subject to Staff recommendations. On roll call; Ayes: Roethler, Racki, Hatfield, Pick, Galante, Hollatz, Van Heuvelen; Nays: none. Passes: none. Motion carried.

The next item on the agenda was the “ALT Coast Fiber Hut” (2759 Parkside Circle) Site Plan No. 012-2005-04.01.
Ms. Bales said this site plan proposes the construction of an approximately 840 square foot utility building. This building will be located on a property owned by C&L Companies, just to the east of the existing C&L Companies building.

The proposed building will be manufactured of precast concrete. The building will house fiber-optic utility equipment, and once completed the facility will generally be unoccupied. The site will be inaccessible to the public, and locked at all times.

The property is zoned “M-1” Planned Industrial District. The parcel is approximately 11 acres in size, and the proposed project will likely impact less than 1 acre of the property.

Surrounding properties to the west, north, and southeast are also zoned “M-1” Planned Industrial District. Properties to the south are zoned “C-H” Highway Commercial District, and immediately adjacent to the east is right-of-way held by the Norfolk Southern Railway, with Coronado City Park on the far side and residential development beyond.

Ms. Bales said Staff recommends approval of the site plan, subject to the following requirements:

1. Revise to City of Urbandale datum; Add a legal description to the site plan along with acreage of parcel, acreage of site area, show separation distance between existing building and closest property line(s); Verify the data shown in the “Building and Site Data” tables, and ensure data matches across the plan sheets; Remove reference to barbed wire fence and verify proposed fence height; Show all existing on-site and off-site easements. Off-site easement documents will be required prior to approval of construction drawings.
2. Show erosion control measures. A standpipe will be required in the detention basin. Erosion control plan calls for “construction fence” instead of silt fence or silt sock, and does not provide protection on the downstream side of the disturbed area. Verify disturbed area does not require a GP2.
3. Preserve existing trees along eastern property line or provide a landscaping plan for approval if they cannot be preserved; If any exterior lighting is proposed provide a photometric plan for review; If any areas of the impacted site will be used to park or store vehicles of any kind, or if they will be used for vehicle access, circulation or maneuvering, amend the site plan to show that those areas shall be paved.
4. Provide a Stormwater Facility Maintenance Agreement for the detention basins per the Post Construction Stormwater Ordinance.
5. Drainage Memo: Verify that existing basin volumes and installed orifice meet requirements from 2005 report. Submit Drainage Report to stormwater@urbandale.org; a hard copy is not required.
6. At the time of the site as-built, provide signed calculations showing final basin volume calculations by the contour-area method, and provide a signed affidavit that the storm water detention facility has been constructed in substantial conformance with the approved plan and confirming installation of orifice plates.
Ms. Bales said it’s an out of town company and they did say no one would be at the P & Z meeting. And they didn’t have any concerns on the comments in the staff report.

Mr. Pick moved, and it was seconded by Hollatz, to approve the “ALT Coast Fiber Hut” Site Plan, subject to Staff recommendations. On roll call; Ayes: Pick, Hollatz, Hatfield, Roethler, Galante, Racki, Van Heuvelen; Nays: none. Passes: none. Motion carried.

The next item on the agenda was the “Glow Car Wash” (10950 Meredith Drive) Site Plan No. 012-2020-01.00.

Ms. Nuetzman said this site plan proposes the construction of a 5,346 square foot car wash building located at 10950 Meredith Drive. The site is located on Lot 1 of “Interstate Acres Plat 13” which was approved by City Council on January 15, 2008. The property was rezoned with conditions from “M-1” Light Industrial to “C-G” General Commercial in 1998.

The property has a total area of 1.25 acres, and approximately 315 feet of frontage on Meredith Drive and 210 feet of frontage on the private drive to the east. The site will be accessed by two drives off the private drive; the north access will be the main entrance for cars to go through the wash and they will exit the site using the south access.

The conditions of rezoning require the building to be predominately brick with an exception that walls not visible from the street may be concrete block or other material of higher quality. A total of 23 parking spaces are provided, one of which will be an accessible space. A minimum of 20 spaces are required by the Zoning Ordinance, on the basis of 1 space per employee plus 1 space for a manager plus spaces equaling 5 times the capacity of the wash.

A parking and landscape setback of 20 feet is required along Meredith Drive in addition to a minimum of 15% of the lot to be maintained as open space.

Directly adjacent to the west is the Norfolk Southern Railroad right-of-way and across the railway to the west is property zoned “M-2” Business Park District. Adjacent to the east and south are vacant properties zoned “C-G” and owned by Knapp Properties. To the north is a vacant property in the Urbandale Marketplace III” P.U.D.

Staff recommends approval of the site plan, subject to the following requirements:

1. Revise site plan title to “Glow Car Wash”; verify that the exterior building materials on the east, west and north sides is predominately brick (a fired, clay product) or natural stone (concrete products made to look like brick or stone are not allowed); remove roofs/overhangs on pay kiosks that encroach into the building setback; remove all signage from kiosks canopies; no wall signage will be permitted on the west side of the property; shift the monument sign south out
of the 20' landscape setback (all signage will be reviewed under a sign permit application); label 20' building setback along the private drive; verify shrubs are at least 18” in height and add a column to the planting schedule showing the height of each plant; add a row of shrubs starting at the west end of the pay kiosks on the north side of the drive and around the curb to block vehicle headlights going into the carwash; add a row of shrubs along the north drive of the carwash exit; submit a lighting plan; provide a letter from MidAmerican Energy acknowledging improvements within the gas easement;

2. Remove references to the Private Drive as a “public street”; Sheet C2.1: Callout notes are cutoff on left edge of page; verify the purpose of the concrete flume on the north side of the building; Sheet C3.1: clarify overlapping text, revise “Topsoil Notes” #1 to 8” for depth of topsoil import; Sheet C4.1: show all inverts for all structures, some structures are missing an invert; Sheet 7.1: show inlet protection around ST-#B5, 12” Duraslot trench drain on west side of the car wash; provide 1/3 recycling for the car wash; 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 storm water detention facility has been constructed in substantial conformance with approved plan; 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 comments: submit drainage report to stormwater@urbandale.org; a hard copy is not required; update drainage report for the more recent 2007 Interstate Acres Plat 13 drainage calculations; provide an as-built survey verification that the existing regional basins meet the original design volumes and release rates (including undetained flows);

4. Provide the water connection fee at the time of the building permit (1.24 acres is $1,923.24 plus $100.00 construction of water totaling $2,023.24; provide water main reimbursement at the time of the building permit for Meredith Drive (317” @ $22.89/feet= $7,256.13.

Mr. Chuck Bishop, Bishop Engineering, 3501 104th Street, Urbandale, said I’m here tonight representing Glow Car Wash. We are fine with the Staff recommendations. The architect is revising the building elevations. I don’t know if you showed those or if you have those?

Ms. Nuetzman said yes, we have them.

Mr. Bishop said we’re revising them just for building materials. He’s basically got some stone veneer on the front. The main areas they have to do, this would be the Meredith side, you see around the windows, the gray area there, they have to look at that and see what kind of material that is. Right now it’s shown as EIFS, above the stone down
below on the bottom layer. They have to prove how predominantly brick it is, so they might have to add some stone or brick on the bottom. Other than that, we’re pretty open to the comments. The one area as you see on here on the pay stations, it shows some individual canopies over the pay stations. It’s the clearance bar that they put up so that if you’re not over 7 foot 2 inches, you can go through the car wash, or something like that. But they usually have the canopies like that. We’re going to go back and probably have to go through the Board of Adjustment because along Meredith, there’s actually a 50-foot setback even though in the C-G zoning, it’s only 20 feet required. But the two outside aisles, Staff is saying we can’t have the canopies in the building setback, even though they’re individual small canopies, it looks like this. It just has the clearance bar but it has the little canopy over it so you can see the pay station. So I think we’re going to have to go to the Board of Adjustment on that. We’ve been talking to Staff about the building setback because the building setback came across on the plat. It wasn’t a part of the zoning and it wasn’t part of when it got rezoned in 1998, it wasn’t any special condition to have a 50-foot setback along Meredith. But that’s what showed up on the original plat, Interstate Acres Plat 13. So, we’re looking at that, but other than that, we’re okay with Staff recommendations. Just wanted to let you know about the pay station canopies. We’re only allowed one that’s next to the building but other than that, the others are within that 50-foot minimum setback.

Ms. Nuetzman said it was platted as a 50-foot setback, that’s very typical of our arterial streets. That’s why it’s 50. So we had asked that they remove the two that were in the 50-foot setback. We are okay with just having the bar. We realize when cars enter the carwash, they need to understand if they can fit in there or not. So we were okay with the bar, just not a roof overhang. We don’t allow that sort of thing, it would be like an accessory structure in a building setback.

Mr. Galante moved, and it was seconded by Roethler, to approve the “Glow Car Wash” Site Plan, subject to staff recommendations. On roll call; Ayes: Galante, Roethler, Hatfield, Pick, Hollatz, Racki, Van Heuvelen; Nays: none. Passes: none. Motion carried.

The next item on the agenda was the “Lillis Lofts” (Merle Hay Mall Apartments) Site Plan No. 012-2020-02.00 (6313 Douglas Avenue).

Ms. Bales said this site plan proposes the construction of a three-story multi-family residential building with 43 units on Lot 1 of the proposed “Merle Hay-Aurora Place Plat 2”. On December 3, 2019, the City Council approved a rezoning from “C-G” General Commercial District to “P.U.D.” Planned Unit Development for approximately 1.73 acres of the overall 4.8-acre parcel. On February 11, 2020, the City Council approved the preliminary plat for “Merle Hay-Aurora Place Plat 2”. The final plat is currently under review and scheduled to be on the March 24, 2020 City Council, agenda.

The property does not have direct access onto Douglas Avenue and this site plan includes the re-routing of the internal access driveway serving the overall Merle Hay
Mall development. For multi-family residential development, the Zoning Ordinance requires 2.25 parking spaces for each multi-family dwelling unit having two or more bedrooms. For this project, 97 parking spaces are required. The site plan shows 58 on-site parking spaces and 52 off-site parking spaces on the Merle Hay Mall parking lot. Of the 110 parking spaces provided, at least five spaces must be designed as ADA accessible parking spaces.

The three-story building is proposed to be a combination of brick, vertical metal corrugated panels, and fiber cement, with the primary entrance on the building’s east side. However, metal walls of any kind are generally prohibited in Urbandale so the corrugated metal panels will need to be replaced with an acceptable material. All roof top and ground utility equipment is required to be screened from public ways and nearby residential areas. A trash enclosure is shown on the site plan.

A 20-foot landscape buffer setback and a 50-foot building setback are required along Douglas Avenue. Stormwater detention is proposed to be underground. Sanitary sewer will connect to an existing 8” main to the west and water service will be required to connect to the water main along the south side of Douglas Avenue. The Zoning Ordinance requires that a minimum of 15% of the lot be maintained as open space and a minimum of 5% of the parking lot be landscaped, in addition to the 20-foot landscape setback.

Property adjacent to the east is zoned “C-G” General Commercial District and includes the IHOP restaurant and the Merle Hay Mall. Property across Douglas Avenue and adjacent to the west fronting Douglas Avenue is zoned “C-N” Neighborhood Convenience District. Additional property adjacent to the northwest is zoned “R-3” Low-Density Multi-family District. The subject property is in the Urbandale School District and drains to the south towards Rocklyn Creek.

Ms. Bales said Staff recommends approval of the site plan, subject to the following requirements:

1. Prior to approval of the site plan, the “Merle Hay-Aurora Place Plat 2” must be recorded and then revise legal description to reflect recorded plat; resubmit building elevations replacing corrugated metal siding with approved building materials; provide correct phone number for developer and revise City of Urbandale Storm and Sanitary contact to 515-278-3950; revise access easement area for realigned mall access road to match site plan layout; remove references to all monument and blade signage (separate permit process required); add building setbacks to cover sheet and label on layout plan; provide lighting plan;; remove southernmost parking stalls from the 20’ landscape setback along Douglas Avenue and remove the northernmost stall on the western side of the on-site parking lot; verify trash enclosure is adequately sized; pedestrian crossing of internal mall access road goes from a ramp to a 6” curb – revise to match; add
dimension of setback from building to west property line; provide accessible route form the building to the public street or sidewalk.

2. Add landscaping to screen ground utility equipment; provide continuous row of shrubs to screen vehicles from Douglas Avenue and the internal mall access road; shift trees out of the 21’ western water easement and public easements; add column to Planting Schedule with minimum height of plantings (18” shrubs, 8’ overstory trees, 5’ for understory and coniferous trees); remove plantings from Planting Schedule that are not proposed to be used; verify 5% of the total parking area is landscaped;

3. Pay water connect fee of $2,721.29 at time of building permit; split the domestic off the fire line outside the building and valve separately; notes concerning water improvements should reference Urbandale Water Utility and Urbandale Water Utility specifications; label “No Parking/Fire Lane” signs at the fire apparatus turnaround on the south end of the building; provide a minimum 5’ clear space around fire hydrants and fire department connection for the fire sprinkler connection;

4. Provide on- and off-site easement legal descriptions; Legal descriptions for easement vacations to be submitted/approved prior to issuance of building permit; Comments on Easements: Label all proposed and existing easements and easement vacations on all sheets. Provide information on the horizontal and vertical separation between the building footing and the large storm manholes and the sanitary sewer line to the west of the building. We still have concerns that they are too close. Provide off-site public sanitary sewer easement for new pipe west of the building. Provide private sanitary sewer easement for IHOP service line. Access easement does not align with private drive and overlaps the building; if this is a proposed easement, relocate to new ring road, or if this is an existing easement, label with book and page and show vacation limits. Revise existing easement linework. Some areas are difficult to review where they overlap shaded areas. The Easement at Book 9093 Page 272 (the south 15’ of the property) is a Permanent Easement to the City of Urbandale, not a PUE. This easement covers the storm sewer and fountain at the west end of the property. Revise callouts for easement and extend easement across entire Douglas Avenue frontage. Remove the 20’ easement in the southwest corner of the property, it is not necessary.

5. Provide separate construction drawings for proposed public improvements. Include details on how existing structures will be repaired after removal of adjacent pipes; signed off-site easements are required prior to approval of the construction drawings; Sanitary Sewer: Verify that SUDAS and Urbandale Supplemental Specifications requirements are met. Provide calculations for proposed sanitary (several areas are less than 1% slope).
6. Provide an ADA compliant route to Douglas Avenue, including spot elevations and slopes. An ADA route is required for new housing to provide residents safe access to Douglas Avenue and the public sidewalk system; provide parking/wheel stops where sidewalk is depressed. Revise ADA accessible callout; only northernmost ADA stall is eligible for van accessibility due to the size of the access aisles. All non-ADA parking stalls required to be 9 feet wide.

7. Revise existing storm sewer linework west of proposed building. Linework doesn’t line up with proposed improvements; show existing IHOP storm sewer connection (for proposed 10’ private storm sewer easement); verify that overflow routes are provided for surface water catch basins; Sheet C3.1: Provide 8” of topsoil per SUDAS; Sheet C4.1: Callout adjustment of existing storm sewer manhole to the north east of the plat in the middle of the replaced pavement. Label all crossings of water, sanitary, and storm sewer pipes. The existing sanitary manhole west of the plat is missing an elevation for the west outflow. Show downspouts tie-in into storm sewer system; all roof drainage must be routed to detention; Sheet C7.1: Show silt fence around all intakes and inlets. Standpipes are required in the collection basins. Add note that slurry from sawing of concrete must be contained. Locate concrete washout a minimum of 50’ from nearest intake/inlet.

8. Provide a Stormwater Facility Maintenance Agreement for the underground detention basin per the Post Construction Stormwater Ordinance with the easement area labeled on the site plan (template provided by Comm. Development Dept.); at the time of the site as-built, provide signed affidavit that underground detention has been properly installed with the design capacity, the storm water detention facility has been constructed in substantial conformance with the approved plan, and confirming installation of orifice plates; provide signed Hold Harmless agreement for improvements in the public easements (document to be prepared by Comm. Dev. Dept.); Provide copy of NPDES Permit and SWPPP prior to any grading work. Submit NPDES and SWPPP to stormwater@urbandale.org; a hard copy is not necessary. Weekly inspection reports will also need to be submitted to this email address.

9. Comments on the Drainage Report: Submit Drainage Report to stormwater@urbandale.org; a hard copy is not required; All undetained areas need to be treated as undetained in the calculations. Areas that are completely undisturbed by this project may be excluded; provide callouts and construction/erosion control fencing in the plans to delineate areas not to be disturbed. Provide calculation for allowable release rate in the 2-year, 5-year, and 100-year storms. Provide calculations for the change in flow to the west, it appears that the grading will push runoff to the neighboring property west of the site? Verify numbers on drainage map, sum of proposed drainage area and undetained areas does not match size of existing drainage area. Provide storm
sewer size calculations. Provide intake calculations, including capacity and depth of ponding.

Mr. Van Heuvelen asked can you go back to the site plan please? Where’s that wall between the single family residences and the mall?

Ms. Bales said the wall stops at the south end of the right-of-way. So the wall’s not part of this project; the wall goes with the mall and won’t be continued down. And really it would be odd to screen multi-family from multi-family. They do show some landscaping kind of up in this area, but no wall will be carried down into this project area.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said they’ll have ample room to work on that wall should there be problems?

Ms. Bales said yes, the mall will have that responsibility.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said because I know there have been problems with that wall in the distant past.

Ms. Bales asked in terms of condition?

Mr. Van Heuvelen said yes.

Ms. Bales said I don’t know specifics. The wall ends right here, in fact you can almost see the edge of the shadow where it stops. So the site plan area stops right here, so it’s significantly farther away. The apartment project won’t be close to the wall or cut off that wall access, or anything like that.

Mr. Hatfield said I’m surprised no metal products. What is the City’s stance against metal?

Ms. Bales said we’re good with metal as accent panels, but not as a predominant building material. In fact, it’s fairly standard, through old P.U.D.’s and conditions of rezoning, that metal’s expressly prohibited in some of those comments from the past. And you’ve heard Mr. Franklin talk about the predominance and longevity of brick and wanting that to be a constant Urbandale product in new building materials.

Mr. Brad Kuehl, Bishop Engineering, 3501 104th Street, Urbandale, said Ms. Bales did a nice job of summarizing the project. I’m here to answer any questions you might have. We just got the comments on Friday, there’s a whole list of them and we’re working through them, I’ve worked through most of them already. We’re good with Staff’s recommendations and comments and don’t see any problems.

Mr. Galante moved, and it was seconded by Pick, to approve the “Lillis Lofts” Site Plan, subject to Staff recommendations. On roll call; Ayes: Galante, Pick, Hatfield, Roethler,
Hollatz, Racki, Van Heuvelen; Nays: none. Passes: none. Motion carried.

Regarding staff reports, Ms. Bales said we will have your meeting in two weeks. The first two cases on there, the public hearing and the preliminary plat and site plan all deal with the same property at 78th and Hickman. There’s a vacant parcel there. You’ll see the final plat for the site plan you just saw for those apartments. Item #4 is going to move off of there, and go back two weeks because they just made a change that Mr. Bishop delivered to me today. The Iowa Bankers Association is that site plan up on Northpark Drive. And then the Walnut Creek Regional Park is moving forward with that shelter and parking lot plans. We will also have your meeting on March 30. There is a public hearing for a rezoning going from A-2 to R-1S in kind of an unusual spot in the city, at 72nd and Goodman. One’s a vacant lot and one is a house that the developer is going to demolish, and take about 3 acres and make about 8 lots – so an infill project. So you’ll see that rezoning, you’ll see this preliminary and final plat and a site plan for the hotel when R & R did the PUD amendment for accesses on Plum Drive. That hotel site plan is coming in right next to the Hampton Inn. That’s what I know, so far. Thank you for being open and flexible with our revised setting here. I think we did the best we could.

The meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.