

**MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE AMES CITY COUNCIL
AND SPECIAL JOINT MEETING OF THE AMES CITY COUNCIL
AND PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AMES, IOWA

JUNE 16, 2009

The Ames City Council met in special session at 7:00 p.m. on the 16th day of June, 2009, in the City Council Chambers in City Hall, 515 Clark Avenue, pursuant to law with Mayor Ann Campbell presiding and the following Council members present: Doll, Goodman, Larson, Mahayni, Popken, and Rice. *Ex officio* Member Keppy was also present.

SECOND PASSAGE OF RENTAL HOUSING CODE: Moved by Goodman, seconded by Rice, to pass on second reading the Rental Housing Code.

Roll Call Vote: 6-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

SECOND PASSAGE OF ORDINANCE MAKING A ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT TO DEFINE “SPORTS PRACTICE FACILITIES” AND ESTABLISH REGULATIONS AND EXEMPTIONS FOR SAID USE: Moved by Larson, seconded by Rice, to pass on second reading an ordinance, making a zoning text amendment to define “sports practice facilities” and establish regulations and exemptions for said use.

Roll Call Vote: 6-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

Moved by Larson, seconded by Rice, to suspend the rules.

Roll Call Vote: 6-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

Moved by Larson, seconded by Rice, to pass on third reading ORDINANCE NO. 3993 making a zoning text amendment to define “sports practice facilities” and establish regulations and exemptions for said use.

Roll Call Vote: 6-0. Ordinance declared adopted unanimously, signed by the Mayor, and hereby made a portion of these minutes.

JOINT MEETING WITH PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION: Barnes, Beck, Cloud, Johnson, and Jons, representing the Planning & Zoning Commission, were present.

Planning and Housing Director Steve Osguthorpe introduced the Commission, and described that the Commission met with the City Council on February 17, 2009 to review the Commission’s proposed initiatives. He said discussion focused primarily on the Commission’s recommendation to do a holistic review of the Land Use Policy Plan (LUPP). The Council and the Commission agreed to meet again to review the assumptions, goals, and implementing strategies of the LUPP.

Mr. Osguthorpe said the Commission has met three times since February to review the goals and objectives of the LUPP. He said staff then condensed them down to a summary, which helped the Commission to better understand the broader purposes of the Plan.

The goals of the LUPP reviewed in the presentation included:

1. Planning and Management of Growth
2. Developable Area Provisions
3. Environmental-Friendliness
4. Sense of Place and Connectivity
5. Cost-effectiveness and Efficient Growth Pattern
6. Housing Opportunities Expansion
7. Mobility and Alternate Transportation
8. Downtown as a Central Place – Community Focal Point
9. Economic Expansion and Diversification
10. Cultural Heritage Preservation

The objectives and implementation methods were identified for each goal for better understanding.

Planning and Zoning Commission Chair Keith Barnes said the Commission has six recommendations. He told the Council the Plan relies on data regarding trends of the population, ISU enrollment, employment, housing, commercial land, industrial land, and area within the City limits. He said the Commission would like to see the data reviewed. He also said there should be a better definition in the Plan of the importance of Downtown and Campustown. Mr. Barnes told the Council the Plan does not currently address alternate forms of energy. He also discussed the importance of bike paths that link the community together, and the need for policies and programs to address the supply of housing for families with low or moderate incomes. Mr. Barnes said every member believes the Plan is a good plan, and the goals and objectives are on target. He said an overall vision that states a distinct desired outcome of the Plan is lacking, and having a vision would provide better guidance for implementing the Plan.

Commission Member Johnson said the goals, objectives, and implementation methods presented are what the Commission needs to make its decisions. He said the report staff prepared for the Commission is a model for moving forward, and has helped the Commission immensely. He said he is looking now at the connectivity of the pieces, not the questions that he has regarding the Plan. Mr. Johnson said in using the LUPP as a guiding principle, it would be helpful to have Campustown included.

Mr. Barnes agreed that Campustown needs to be included because it is unique, in that it is close to the ISU campus, but encompasses more than college students, including a vibrant neighborhood.

Commission Member Beck said the data is from 1997 and needs to be looked at again, since times are different, and the trends could be different.

Commission Member Jons discussed Ames as a regional center and said regional issues should be considered.

Commission Member Cloud concurred with other Commission members, and said the goals are positive statements regarding the City moving forward and cannot be argued with. He said that in the ways the goals relate to one another, all goals must be considered with every project or application.

Mr. Osguthorpe discussed goals and objectives as good planning principles, but mundane without an applied vision. He said if Ames had an overarching vision, it would better separate Ames from other communities. Discussion ensued on Council's previous goal to "Brand Ames" and the possibility of creating a vision statement.

Council Member Rice said he is very excited about the Commission's recent work. He said many times there is a negative response from the LUPP because of applications to go outside of the Plan. He thanked the Commission for the time they spent reviewing the goals.

Mr. Cloud said the LUPP is not template for what to do, but what not to do, putting limits on things so that the character of Ames is not changed, but at the same time leaving room for options.

Council Member Larson asked why a regular procedure to review the Plan is not in place. Mr. Larson said he recently attended a workshop on LUPPs, and learned that many other university cities have firm policy in place to review their LUPP every five years. Discussion ensued regarding a regular review of the LUPP.

Mr. Johnson said he hoped that whatever the Council takes from this meeting, that any change be relevant to the data. He also said very few things will become as controversial if the LUPP is leaning toward a desired outcome or vision, which is not currently in place.

Mayor Campbell asked if the Commission had a preference on the order of their recommendations. Chair Barnes said he believed all six recommendations to be very important.

Mr. Cloud said to review the data could take much longer than anticipated because the numbers change substantially, and Ames is not similar to other communities. He said Ames needs its own criteria, and that criteria would have to be determined. Planner Jeff Benson said in researching the data, more questions will arise, therefore it could take more time than anticipated. Discussion ensued regarding other entities that would need to be brought into the discussion of data collection.

Ms. Beck said data may sometimes not match up. She gave an example regarding industrial land in Ames. She said by the data, there may be enough industrial land available, but it may not be in the right place. She said a full review of the LUPP could result in more than minor changes.

Chuck Winkleblack, 105 S. 16th Street, Ames, said some areas may need more work, such as the village concept. He said if the village concept will be the preferred form of development, the amendments for Somerset would need to be examined and made part of the Plan since those amendments were made only for Somerset. He also said real estate development is heavily based

on location. He said if industrial land or commercial land is sitting undeveloped, it is because the location is not first choice. He said he agrees with Ms. Beck that location should definitely be taken into consideration.

Mr. Cloud said last time the Commission met with the Council, the Commission had some issues with the goals of the Plan, and left with the thought that the LUPP needed thrown out. Now, the Commission members are in agreement that the goals are good, and if it can be agreed that they are still appropriate, then it is time to move forward.

Discussion ensued on the positive and negative aspects of having an overall vision.

City Manager Steve Schainker said first steps are needed. He suggested a status report on what it would take to update the data. He said a vision concept must be a community-wide effort. He said it would be a major step, and it would need to be determined who would take the lead.

Discussion ensued regarding the creation of the LUPP.

Mr. Schainker said staff will report to City Council on what it would take to update the data.

Mr. Johnson recommended a review of the LUPP similar to what the Commission has just done for all new members of the Planning and Zoning Commission. He said he also hoped a desire to create a vision that would encompass some dream of what the community wants Ames to become would result from this joint meeting.

COMMENTS: Moved by Doll, seconded by Goodman to refer to staff a request from Dan Culhane regarding sponsorship for Senator Charles Grassley's bi-annual ambassador tour visit to Ames on August 19, 2009.

Motion carried unanimously.

Moved by Doll, seconded by Goodman to refer to staff a letter from Sean Demaris regarding street closures for the Shrine Bowl Parade.

Motion carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT: The Special Meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Diane R. Voss, City Clerk

Ann H. Campbell, Mayor

Erin Thompson, Recording Secretary