

**COMMISSION ACTION FORM**

**DATE PREPARED:** September 28, 2012

**REQUESTED ACTION:** Ames Land Use Policy Plan and Urban Fringe Land Use Framework Map Amendment

**SUBJECT PROPERTY:** Athen property west of George Washington Carver Avenue lying west of Northridge Heights

**CURRENT LAND USE DESIGNATION:** Priority Transitional Residential, Natural Area

**PROPOSED LAND USE DESIGNATION:** Urban Residential

**CURRENT ZONING:** Story County, A1 Agricultural

**APPROX. ACREAGE:** 140.64 gross acres

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** James and Phyllis Athen, Ricky Madson  
3601 GW Carver Avenue  
Ames, IA 50010

**APPLICANT:** Hunziker Land Development Company, LLC  
105 S. 16<sup>th</sup> Street  
Ames, IA 50010

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

**Request and Referral:** Chuck Winkleblack, representing the applicant, seeks to develop the Athen property for a senior living center, comprising senior housing, assisted living and skilled care. In addition, areas would be made available for residential housing. Mr. Winkleblack is requesting the designation of the subject property as Urban Residential on the Urban Fringe Plan and inclusion of the subject site as an Allowable Growth Area in the Land Use Policy Plan. The Urban Residential designation identifies those areas of the Ames Urban Fringe that are likely to be annexed and developed in the near to medium term. The Allowable Growth Area designation of the LUPP mirrors that intent. At the March 6, 2012 meeting, the City Council determined the request to be a major amendment and referred the item to staff. A map of the Athen property is shown on Appendix A.

**Land Use Policy Plan and Ames Urban Fringe Plan:** The Ames Urban Fringe Plan designates this site as Priority Transitional Residential with the Natural Area designation over the western portion. A map of the existing Urban Fringe Designation is shown in Appendix B. The Priority Transitional Residential designation allows for residential development under County zoning rules. However, it requires that development be done to

urban densities (a minimum of 3.75 dwelling units per acre). It does not allow for access to City water and sanitary sewer but requires any infrastructure to be designed and built so that it can be accommodated by the City if it is annexed in the future.

The site is not in an Allowable Growth Area of the Land Use Policy Plan. In 2008, it was considered for inclusion within the North Growth Area for purposes of the Targeted Growth Study. However, due to the unknown ability of extending sanitary sewer service to this area, it was ultimately excluded from the North Growth Area. A map of the Allowable Growth Areas is included in Appendix C.

To accommodate the proposed annexation and development of the site, the Ames Land Use Policy Plan would need to recognize this as an Allowable Growth Area. In addition, the site would need to be designated as Urban Residential in the Ames Urban Fringe Plan. The Policies of the Natural Area and Urban Residential designations are included in Appendix D.

**Zoning:** The subject site is currently zoned A-1 by the County. This zoning designation would not allow for development except for single-family homes on 35 acres. To accommodate the proposed use under County zoning would require a change of zone to a designation consistent with the Priority Transitional Residential designation of the Ames Urban Fringe Plan.

**Applicant's Statement:** The applicant's Narrative for LUPP Change is included in Appendix E.

**Amendment Process:** The Land Use Policy Plan describes the process for major amendments. Following the referral by the City Council, City staff conducted an Open House on June 21 to introduce the request to interested persons. Approximately 20 people attended that meeting to hear details of the request and to ask questions on the proposed project.

On June 28, a workshop was held to allow interested person the opportunity to identify issues and to seek further information. About fifteen persons attended and raised a number of issues. These are described in the analysis below.

On September 10, a second workshop was held to report back to interested persons. Again, about fifteen people were in attendance. A panel of City staff was able to provide further information on specific issues and information that was requested at the first workshop.

At this Planning and Zoning Commission meeting, the Commission is asked to prepare options to present to the City Council. These options will then be taken to the City Council for a determination whether they meet the original parameters of the referred request. The options will return to the Commission as a final draft and to conduct the required public hearing. The City Council would then conduct a public hearing. The Council would not take action at that meeting would at a subsequent one.

Below is a synopsis of the issues that were raised and addressed at the two workshops. This narrative describes the issues that were raised, the staff responses, and possible approaches to consider as the Commission develops alternatives.

## **ANALYSIS:**

### **A. TRAFFIC**

Questions were raised about the capacity of George Washington Carver Avenue to accommodate the expected traffic from this new development, in addition to the increased traffic as Northridge Heights continues to build out. The City traffic engineer responded by noting that the 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan took this development density into account when it projected future traffic demand in the City. The segment of George Washington Carver Avenue affected by this proposed subdivision is not shown in the LRTP as having a need for capacity improvements. Minor safety and/or functional roadway improvements, such as turn lanes into or out of the site, may be identified during the Traffic Impact Study.

Questions were also raised concerning the impact on intersections, speed and bicycle/car interactions. The traffic engineer responded to these by stating that a Traffic Impact Study will determine estimated traffic for the proposed development and identify what site-specific improvements may be needed. The study will also help the City and developer determine the type, number, and location of the main access points on to George Washington Carver Avenue. Because George Washington Carver Avenue functions as an arterial street, there will be no access from individual lots onto this road. Access will be granted only to public streets.

Speed is, admittedly, an issue along this stretch of George Washington Carver Avenue as the rural traffic transitions into a more urban setting. As development occurs along this portion of the road, speed will moderate to account for the increased traffic and turning movements. Unless the City or the developer is willing or able to dramatically change either the geometry of the road and its respective intersections, not much can be done until further development occurs to change this section into a more urban setting. From a safety sight distance standpoint there is plenty of visibility along this stretch of the road. The speed, however, is a quality of life issue; one that will take some investment into the corridor before it can be improved. The City Council would need to determine if this is, in fact, a policy issue and who is responsible for any solutions.

The ability of this corridor to safely accommodate bicycles will depend on improvements that would be identified following the Traffic Impact Study. The design of any specific improvement would depend on the anticipated traffic movements that the Study anticipates. But, in general, there may need to be a combination of signs and pavements markings along with lights and, in the most severe case (usually determined by operating speed), some physical improvement such as medians, raised crossings, speed tables, etc.

Concerned participants raised the issue of cut-through traffic, that is, the traffic leaving this proposed development and taking local streets to Stange Road to get to points south or east rather than taking George Washington Carver Avenue. Cut-through traffic

is usually due to an arterial road being over capacity and free movement of traffic degrades with the result that local roads are more attractive to drivers due to their reduced trip time to a particular destination. Since there is adequate capacity on this road to serve projected growth to 2035, it is not anticipated that cut-through traffic would manifest itself.

The existing noise from traffic on George Washington Carver Avenue was raised and was questioned whether this would be exacerbated by increased traffic from this proposed development. Noise is closely related to speed as engine noise, engine braking, and tire whine all increase as speed increases. As speed will naturally decrease as traffic and development turn this rural section into a more urban setting, so too will noise decrease. Although the noise from individual vehicles will decrease in decibels, the total number of vehicles will increase and may not reduce overall noise levels.

Considerations for Alternatives: A Traffic Impact Study will be done at the time of development of this site. At that time, any improvements that are site specific for this development will be identified. As the capacity of the roadway is not in question, the Study will focus on the safety impacts associated with the development and the how to mitigate any impacts to the quality of life of existing and future residents of this area.

#### B. SANITARY SEWER

The City has had concerns about the sanitary sewer system in this area. The City's sanitary sewer consultant has identified a possible capacity issue in the trunk line that serves the Northridge, Northridge Heights, and Somerset areas. This trunk line would also serve the subject site. There remain unanswered questions as to the extent of the restriction in the capacity and what the costs are of the many potential solutions to the capacity issue.

Considerations for Alternatives: At the time of this writing, a recommended option for providing sanitary sewer capacity to this site is not yet available. This is a critical issue for annexation, however it should be noted that multiple solutions are feasible. At issue is who would pay for the selected fix and what the timing of undertaking the fix is. This decision will need to be made by the City Council prior to any final decision on the requested LUPP amendment.

#### C. STORM WATER

Several residents in the area questioned how storm water will be handled. City staff noted that any development and installation of public infrastructure (such as roads) would need to follow the City's storm water requirements. These include the submittal of a storm water management plan with the preliminary plat that identifies how runoff will be managed. The review of the storm water management plan is to ensure that the post-development runoff quantities do not exceed the pre-development amounts. In addition, the developer would also need to obtain a COSECSO permit and NPDES permit prior to construction and comply with regulations regarding erosion control during construction.

The City may be interested in any innovative approaches to storm water management that the developer would propose. For instance, the City has adopted a conservation

subdivision ordinance. This ordinance is mandatory in the Ada Hayden watershed but is optional in other developments. In addition, as buildings are developed, on-site bio-swales, rain gardens, and green infrastructure approaches offer acceptable methods of storm water management that the City can approve as part of the building development process. There is a vast array of approaches for low-impact development (LID).

Considerations for Alternatives: The City has a conservation subdivision that is mandatory in the Ada Hayden watershed but could be applied here. The standards of the conservation subdivision rely on preserving the natural drainage features of the site to reduce the impact of development on the landscape.

#### D. NATURAL RESOURCES

This broad category is further refined into subcategories related to the natural resources of the site.

*Natural Area and Norris Study:* The site consists of a flat flood plain along the west part of the subject site. The site rises about 50 vertical feet to the agricultural area west of GW Carver Avenue. The lower bottom land appears to be used for row crops, as does the upper flat land. The slopes are heavily wooded, with the wooded area extending not much beyond the top of the slopes.

Appendix F is an aerial photograph showing the existing ground cover and tree line. The Natural Area is overlain on the photograph.

Staff reviewed the “Norris Study,” done in 1994, which inventoried certain areas around the City to determine the extent of native vegetation and the degree to which invasive species can be found. Areas that were surveyed were given a letter grade (e.g., A, B, C, D, and S) to describe these resources. The study did not directly inventory this subject site. However, the Northridge area to the south of this subject site was given a grade of D for the woodland and a grade of B for the two identified prairies. The bottomland along Squaw Creek was given a grade of C.

The applicant notes that he does not intend to place development into the tree area. Rather, he seeks a change to the Natural Area to allow development up to the tree area.

Considerations for Alternatives: A Natural Area designation is placed over a portion of the subject site, including the flood plain of Squaw Creek and the steep slopes on the east bank. The Natural Area designation also extends into the existing bean field west of George Washington Carver Avenue. Under the policies of the Ames Urban Fringe Plan, no subdivision for residential purposes is allowed within the Natural Area. The applicant would like to develop up to the tree line. The Commission should develop an alternative that identifies to where the Natural Area extends. This alternative could a) retain the existing Natural Area, b) pull the Natural Area back to the tree line, or c) retain a buffer of, say, 50 to 100 feet that would protect the tree area (and its flora and fauna) from the human activities of the proposed development.

*Flood Plain:* Several participants asked about what the impact is on the flood plain of Squaw Creek. Staff provided to the participants (and now to the Commission) the

following primer of flood plain regulations. The bottomland of the subject site lies within the FEMA designated AE zone of Squaw Creek. This designation includes both the Floodway and the Floodway Fringe. The Floodway and Floodway Fringe are shown in Appendix G. In areas within the Floodway, most development is prohibited except for uses that do not impede the flow of floodwaters or contain structures that could be damaged or lead to loss of life. Fill cannot be brought into the site unless it can be demonstrated that it will not increase flood heights. Allowed uses include open space, trails, and parks. Other uses include golf courses and parking lots. Small shelters, such as a gazebo, could be allowed.

Within the Floodway Fringe, development can occur provided it is allowed by zoning and that it meets development standards. This normally requires that structures be elevated to three feet above the base flood elevation (100-year flood level). Fill can be brought into the site. A flood plain development permit must be approved by staff prior to any construction, grading, or development activities.

Base flood elevation along this stretch of Squaw Creek is about 911.5 feet (NGVD 29). The bottomland is relatively flat and lies at about 906 to 908 feet. The Floodway lies entirely on the bottomland while the Floodway Fringe extends part of the way up the side slopes. The upper level gently undulates and lies at an elevation of between 940 and 962 feet. There is a high spot along the edge of the tree line that rises to about 970 feet.

The applicant has stated that the slopes and the bottom area (floodplain) will not be developed. Instead, he anticipates retaining this area as open space with hiking trails through it.

Considerations for Alternatives: After annexation, the City's flood plain ordinance would apply to any area within the Floodway and Floodway Fringe. The Commission may consider alternatives that go beyond the restrictions described above.

*Archeological Resources:* City staff approached the Office of the State Archeologist in Iowa City to investigate whether any known archeological artifacts were found within the subject site. Within the subject site, the office has records of two archeological sites. The two sites are very small and consisted of surface findings. However, if there were a larger site with visible surface features, the state office believes that the archeologist would have discovered it. Unknown, however, is the extent of any unknown or underground archeological deposits.

Private development is not required to undergo a site survey or study unless federal funds are involved. If, during construction, the developer discovers archeological deposits or ruins, he or she is not required to collect, preserve or avoid them unless human remains are found.

Considerations for Alternatives: Any development of the site is not required to identify or preserve any archeological artifacts that may be found. Only if human remains are found would state law require protection of the area. The Commission may consider alternatives that require a site survey or study and the protection of any resources if

they are found. The Office of the State Archeologist has offered its resources to help develop a scope of study.

#### E. ECONOMIC IMPACTS

A number of participants at the workshops expressed interest in a number of issues that can broadly be defined as the economic impacts of the proposed annexation and development. These subcategories are described below.

*City Investment:* The City of Ames is considering whether to install sanitary sewer and water to serve the North Growth Area. A study is underway to determine the costs of these installations. While the City would pay for the installation of the infrastructure, the intent is to establish districts whereby the City would be repaid as residential development occurs. It would stand to reason that the City's payback would be delayed if other areas of residential development were to open up. Additional growth areas would compete with the North for new housing construction, thus diluting the rate of payback.

*Costs of Development in Allowable Growth Areas:* A 2008 study identified capital and infrastructure costs for growth to the North, Northwest, and Southwest. The total costs for growth in the Northwest were the least, while the Southwest was the greatest. Costs for growth to the North were greatest on a net developable acre basis. Based on the 2008 study, growth to the North would necessitate the development of a new fourth fire station. However, based on discussion on fire response time, a the use of performance measures, rather than a fixed response time goal, may allow for development without a fourth fire station. See Cost for Emergency Services, below.

*Impacts on School District Revenue:* This site is within the Gilbert School District, which will receive property tax revenue based on the taxable valuation of any development.

Considerations for Alternatives: Development of this area has a number of impacts regarding the potential payback of City investment and property tax collections by the City and by the Gilbert School District. These issues do not lend themselves to any particular alternative. However, the considerations of Appendix C of the LUPP (as noted below) are very important when discussing these issues.

#### F. COST FOR EMERGENCY SERVICES

This topic is important in considering the impact on public safety. It is also somewhat complicated as the City Council recently gave direction to the Fire Department to prepare a new approach to measuring response times and how development has an impact on them.

On April 24, 2012, City staff presented a report to the Council regarding the topic of emergency response times for the City of Ames. This report was in response to the City Council's decision to allow growth to the North, Northwest, and Southwest, in addition to discussions about expanding to 590<sup>th</sup> Street to the east. Based on the City's previous approach to measuring response times, many of these areas would be outside of the City's five minute travel response time goal (the goal was to cover 85% of the community within 5 minutes travel time from any station).

Therefore, the Council requested that the emergency response time issue be revisited and that other cities be surveyed to determine how they are addressing this issue. All of the surveyed cities measured response time based on actual calls for service. As Ames has shifted away from a targeted growth strategy and is poised to grow in four directions; its current technique for measuring response time based on area covered no longer seems warranted. For purposes of informing the City Council of the possible impact of future land use decisions, the staff can now utilize more sophisticated GIS tools for planning purposes. This technique would allow staff to analyze response time patterns from existing developed areas in the city and project this information onto undeveloped areas that are being considered for annexation to better project anticipated response times from these new areas.

In addition, it should be noted that call volumes have intensified in certain types of occupancies over time in Ames. Particular types of development tend to have higher Fire Department service needs. These include areas of high-density residential, commercial areas, and medical, assisted living and/or nursing home facilities.

As new development occurs, response performance as measured by actual calls for service will at some point require that the City begin discussion of station location options. Until it becomes necessary to relocate and/or construct stations, the City Council can help mitigate the increasing demands on the Fire Department through land use choices.

A careful land use choice strategy was suggested for two reasons. A facility distant from a fire station will experience a longer time before rescue personnel can arrive, so facilities with more frequent needs will be served more effectively if they are closer. In addition, when emergency call volumes increase to the extent they have in Ames, the number of simultaneous calls increases. Frequent calls to locations far from fire stations will tend to increase the number of simultaneous calls, causing others in the community to wait longer for service.

Considerations for Alternatives: As noted above, the types of land uses will, over time, be a good predictor of emergency call demand. Senior living, assisted living, and skilled care facilities have a history of a high demand for services. While the developer has indicated that the facility will be fully sprinkled and have on-site nursing staff on a 24-hour basis, these mitigate only the first-response time. Calls will still need to be made to the facility, even though any fire may be partially suppressed by sprinklers and medical situations may be stabilized by on-site staff. The Commission may consider whether a limitation on the proposed uses is appropriate. Such a limitation, however, may result in the project not being built at this location.

#### G. ALTERNATIVE SITES

Many participants asked whether consideration was given to locate the proposed senior facility elsewhere. In addition, some asked whether the proposed single-family housing can be accommodated in existing Allowable Growth Areas.

The senior living center that is proposed consists of independent senior housing, assisted living and skilled care. These types of uses are allowed in the FS-RM (Suburban Residential Medium Density) and RM (Residential Medium Density) zones



by special use permit. These uses would also be allowed in the RH (High Density Residential) zone as a Permitted Use. The expected Land Use Policy Plan designation for this site, if it were annexed, would likely be Village/Suburban Residential. Such a designation would support a rezoning to FS-RM.

Sites in the existing identified Growth Areas of the Fringe Area that would accommodate the proposed uses include all of the North Growth Area, Northwest Growth Area, and Southwest Growth Area. Although annexation and development activity are not currently in the pipeline for the Northwest and Southwest, there is active interest in the North Growth Area. The Urban Fringe Plan designation of these areas as Urban Residential supports the LUPP designation of Village/Suburban Residential, allowing for the application of FS-RM zoning, allowing the proposed uses.

Sites within the existing City limits may be constrained due to the anticipated size of the proposed senior living project. However, several sites owned by the Ames Community School District have an LUPP designation that could justify zoning to accommodate these uses. These school sites include 2714-2806 George Washington Carver Avenue (on the west side of Somerset); 3915 Mortensen Road (the eastern portion of the middle school site fronting on State Avenue); and 2005 24<sup>th</sup> Street (the triangular parcel east of Somerset). The former Roosevelt School (1000 9<sup>th</sup> Street) and Wilson-Beardshear School (900 Carroll Avenue) are surrounded by UCRM (Urban Core Residential Medium Density). This zoning designation does not allow the proposed uses and are much smaller than the size needed for the senior living project.

Other vacant sites within the City that are zoned RH or FS-RM and may be of sufficient size include Ringgenberg development on Oakwood Road, land between Maricopa Drive and US 30, and land between S. 16<sup>th</sup> Street and US 30. Please note that staff has not approached any of the owners of these sites to determine whether they are available or at what cost. Neither can we state that they meet the specific needs of the developer.

In November, 2011, the City Council adopted an amendment to the Land Use Policy Plan that included, among other things, projections for population growth to the year 2030. The seven forecast models ranged from a low of 61,270 to a high of 72,771. The median forecast was for a population of 67,107.

The LUPP also identified the capacity of the land within the City and the Fringe to accommodate a growing population. Using standard urban development densities, the existing City and the Allowable Growth Areas of the North, Northwest, and Southwest, could accommodate a population of 83,372. In January, 2011, the current Allowable Growth Areas were identified after much analysis by staff and discussion of alternatives. The analysis and discussion at that time included whether this subject site should be included as North Growth Area C. The alternative selected by the City Council did not include this subject site (North Growth Area C).

Considerations for Alternatives: The Commission should consider whether the existing Allowable Growth Areas within the City are adequate to supply the housing demand in the near and medium term (to the year 2030). The City recently took a hard look at directions for growth and settled on the existing Allowable Growth Area strategy. Have

conditions changed dramatically or is more known now that would cause that decision to be changed?

## **ALTERNATIVES:**

Appendix C of the Land Use Policy Plan describes what considerations should be given when evaluating proposed amendments to the LUPP. These considerations should be kept in mind as the Commission works to develop alternatives to present to the City Council.

*When reviewing major and minor proposed amendments to the Land Use Policy Plan, consideration should be given to whether or not the proposed amendment is consistent with the Goals for a New Vision described in the Land Use Policy Plan. These goals, and the related objectives below each goal, should apply to review of both minor and major amendment. In addition to these, it is also helpful to consider for major amendments:*

- 1. City resources, including staff, budget, utilities, transportation, parks and/or schools, necessary to implement the proposed amendment.*
- 2. The City's ability to provide the full range of public facilities and services at the planned level of service, or if the proposal will consume public resources otherwise needed to support comprehensive plan implementation strategies.*
- 3. How the proposal relates to current land use allocations and growth projections that are the basis of the comprehensive plan.*
- 4. Compatibility of development allowed under the proposal amendment with neighboring land uses and surrounding neighborhoods, if applicable.*
- 5. Affects of the proposed amendment on historic resources or neighborhoods, or the City's general sense of place.*
- 6. The cumulative impacts of the proposed amendment, in combination with other proposed or recently approved amendments.*

A summary of the Goals for a New Vision from the Land Use Policy Plan is provided in Appendix H.

The Planning and Zoning Commission is asked to develop preliminary alternatives that will be presented to the City Council. The alternatives should be based on the considerations noted above and on staff's analysis of the various issues that were raised at the workshops. The City Council will have an opportunity to comment on the proposed amendment options and to determine if they are within the parameters that Council established for this major amendment process. The Council's comments are forwarded back to the Planning and Zoning Commission to help the Commission develop a formal draft of amendments for public input.


Considering to what extent the proposed map amendment to the Land Use Policy Plan and Urban Fringe Plan is consistent with the Goals and Objectives of the LUPP can lead to a broad range of possible decision alternatives. At one end of the range is to retain the status quo and deny the proposed changes. This alternative means the property would not be annexed into the City, although the development might still be possible under County regulations. However, any development would not have access to City water and sanitary sewer service.

At the other end of the range is to designate the entire area as Urban Residential and Allowable Growth Area. This would allow for the annexation and development of the entire 140 acres.

The Commission may propose other alternatives that address the Goals and Policies and the consideration criteria of the LUPP. The Commission should consider whether the inclusion of this subject property as an Allowable Growth Area is appropriate to meet the growth needs of the community. If so, the Commission can then consider what conditions or stipulations should be placed on the request to, again, meet the goals and policies of the City. The Commission may wish to develop alternatives that address the various issues identified during the workshops. The Commission may use a “smorgasbord” approach as it prepares any alternatives, picking and choosing from what City staff has suggested under each of the broad categories above. Or it may create alternatives to mitigate issues that escaped the attention of City staff and the workshop participants.


S:\PLAN\_SHR\Council Boards Commissions\PZ\Commission Action Forms\LUPP Amendments\Athen LUPP-AUF amendment-10-03-12.docx

## Attachment A: Location Map






Attachment B: Ames Urban Fringe Plan  
Land Use Designations



**Attachment C: Allowable Growth Areas  
(Excerpt from Land Use Policy Plan)**



## **Attachment D: Land Use Policies (Excerpts from Ames Urban Fringe Plan)**

### **NATURAL AREAS (NA)**

Natural Areas are vital to the region. They provide habitat for wildlife, minimize storm water run-off, stabilize soils, modify climactic effects, provide for visual attractiveness, and serve some recreational purposes. This designation seeks to conserve such natural resources. This designation is intended to prevent development encroachment and encourage greater mitigation standards. A buffer or other mitigation device may be necessary to fully protect Natural Areas.

NA Policy 1: Natural Areas are composed of the following features and locales that intermingle with each other.

Environmentally Sensitive Areas – flood-prone areas, wetlands, water bodies, areas of steep slopes and sensitive soil conditions, and other designated areas that should be protected from detrimental impacts from other land uses.

Significant Natural Habitat -- areas surveyed and evaluated based on vegetation type and condition in the “Norris Study.” These Significant Natural Habitat Areas may also occur outside of the designated Natural Areas. In such locations, the underlying land use designation applies.

Parks and Open Spaces – facilities, land, and/or structured programs for a variety of public recreational opportunities. The term "Open Space" refers to primarily undeveloped areas; such areas are typically maintained and managed as natural areas for passive recreational uses.

Future Parks -- general areas where future parks are anticipated.

Greenways -- stream ways, parks, improved and unimproved trail systems, and open spaces that provide linkages that in effect create a continuous "greenway" or recreational system. Greenways provide recreational and open space linkages in both rural and urban areas.

Particular features and locales in the Natural Areas often are appropriately described by more than one of the above labels. This is a reflection of the multiple benefits of, and the diversity of landscapes represented in the areas designated Natural Areas. Regardless of type, Natural Areas are protected from negative land use impacts.

NA Policy 2: Prevent subdivisions for new non-farm residential development. However, Natural Areas may include farm and non-farm residences existing at the time of this Plan or remaining scattered building sites where farmstead homes once existed or homes on very large parcels of ground typical of the agricultural setting.

NA Policy 3: Mitigate negative impacts to Natural Areas, including, but not limited to: agricultural chemical application, animal confinement and feeding, agricultural irrigation, miscellaneous agricultural activities like manure and fuel storage, outdated and non-

functioning on-site wastewater systems, underground storage tanks, and nutrient-loaded urban stormwater run-off.

### **URBAN RESIDENTIAL (UR)**

This land use designation applies to areas reserved for future city growth. Residential land uses within Urban Residential designated areas are annexed and then developed at an urban density and with infrastructure and subdivision according to urban standards.

UR Policy 1: This land use designation includes residential use in "traditional" Village Residential Development with minimum average net density of 8 units per acre. It also includes conventional single-family/suburban residential development with minimum average net residential densities of 3.75 units per acre and conventional suburban/medium density residential development with minimum average net residential densities of 10 units per acre. When combined in a development or area, conventional suburban single-family and conventional suburban medium density residential developments should not exceed 5 dwelling units per net acre.

UR Policy 2: Require annexation by the city before land is developed or further subdivided.

UR Policy 3: Require urban infrastructure and subdivision standards, including urban right-of-way standards, urban street construction, urban sanitary and potable water systems and urban storm water management systems.

UR Policy 4: Require land development agreements with the city before land is developed or further subdivided.

UR Policy 5: Mitigate and manage stormwater run-off, soil erosion, and wastewater discharge according to IDNR and city standards.



## **Attachment E: Applicant's Narrative for LUPP Change**

Athen Farm LUPP change narrative

April 25, 2012

The applicant believes that this proposed change is consistent with the LUPP in that the land is contiguous with the current corporate limits. Little or no new infrastructure would be needed as a result of this project. It will provide another housing product within the city of Ames.

The applicant believes that the LUPP should be changed to accommodate suburban residential development more in keeping with a metropolitan area than a rural development. We are running out of all types of land for residential development within the current corporate limits. One of the uses requires a large parcel of land to facilitate a senior housing project. There are no other parcels of land that could accommodate such a development in the Northern part of the community. Somerset and Taylor Glenn will be completely built out by the end of 2012. That will only leave Northridge Heights left to develop in the Northern part of the community and there are only 30 acres left in Northridge Heights to develop. It does not make any sense for us to sell 15 to 20 acres of the only remaining single family land for a senior project. The single family lot shortage is already far short of the near term needs.

The public would benefit by having some new types of housing products as well as adding another choice to the city's limited housing choices. There will also be significant increases to the tax base with the addition of this project. The senior housing project will be an initial investment of more than 12 million dollars. They would like to be under construction in the late summer or early fall of 2012.

The applicant believes that the widening to GW Carver that was done as a part of the Northridge Heights development will adequately handle the traffic generated by this project. If additional turning are required into the property, the developer understands that those turning lanes would be at the developer's expense.

Sanitary sewer remains a question and public works is in the process of having the flows measured so that the capacity can be calculated accurately. It is also our belief that if a problem exists in a short stretch of pipe in Moore Park that it can be remedied. A significant change to the sanitary sewer exists now since the land North of Northridge Heights that was planned to come through this area will now go to the East and not flow this direction. That was 155 acres of developable land, this project will create less than half of that number of developable acres.

The applicant believes that there is sufficient water capacity to handle the requirements of this project without having an adverse affect on the entire system for the city. The water tower is very close to this area so pressure and flow should not be a problem.

Storm sewer will be designed according to specifications provided by the city of Ames. This area is not in the Ada Hayden watershed.

This project will provide new types of housing as well as more inventories of the existing types of housing within the city. There will be numerous jobs created with the construction as well as an ongoing number of permanent jobs associated with the senior housing project.

## Attachment F: Ground Cover and Natural Area





## Attachment G: Flood Plain



**Attachment H: Goals For a New Vision  
(Excerpt from Land Use Policy Plan, Chapter 1)**

Goal No. 1. Recognizing that additional population and economic growth is likely, it is the goal of Ames to plan for and manage growth within the context of the community's capacity and preferences. It is the further goal of the community to manage its growth so that it is more sustainable, predictable and assures quality of life.

Goal No. 2. In preparing for the target population and employment growth, it is the goal of Ames to assure the adequate provision and availability of developable land. It is the further goal of the community to guide the character, location, and compatibility of growth with the area's natural resources and rural areas.

Goal No. 3. It is the goal of Ames to assure that it is an "environmentally-friendly" community and that all goals and objectives are integrated with this common goal. In continuing to serve as a concentrated area for human habitat and economic activity, Ames seeks to be compatible with its ecological systems in creating an environmentally sustainable community.

Goal No. 4. It is the goal of Ames to create a greater sense of place and connectivity, physically and psychologically, in building a neighborhood and overall community identity and spirit. It is the further goal of the community to assure a more healthy, safe, and attractive environment.

Goal No. 5. It is the goal of Ames to establish a cost-effective and efficient growth pattern for development in new areas and in a limited number of existing areas for intensification. It is a further goal of the community to link the timing of development with the installation of public infrastructure including utilities, multi-modal transportation system, parks and open space.

Goal No. 6. It is the goal of Ames to increase the supply of housing and to provide a wider range of housing choices.

Goal No. 7. It is the goal of Ames to provide greater mobility through more efficient use of personal automobiles and enhanced availability of an integrated system including alternative modes of transportation.

Goal No. 8. It is the goal of Ames to enhance the role of Downtown as a community focal point.

Goal No. 9. It is the goal of Ames to promote expansion and diversification of the economy in creating a base that is more self-sufficient and that is more sustainable with regard to the environment.

Goal No. 10. It is the goal of Ames to maintain and enhance its cultural heritage.