

**MINUTES
CITY OF AMES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

Date: September 2, 2015	Debra Lee, Chairperson	2018
	Rob Bowers, Vice Chairperson	2018
Call to Order: 7:00 PM	Yvonne Wannemuehler	2018
	Julie Gould	2016
Place: Ames City Hall Council Chambers	John Tillo	2016
	Carlton Basmajian	2017
Adjournment: 9:05 PM	*Matthew Converse	2017
	[*Absent]	

MAJOR TOPICS DISCUSSED:

1. Public Hearing for the Land Use Policy Plan Minor Amendment for 101, 105, 107 and 205 South Wilmoth Avenue and 3316 Lincoln Way (Breckenridge North Parcel)
 2. Public Hearing for the Preliminary Plat for 5400 Grant Avenue
-

CALL TO ORDER: Debra Lee, Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

MOTION: (Wannemuehler/Tillo) to approve the Agenda for the meeting of September 2, 2015

MOTION PASSED: (5-0)

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF August 5, 2015:

MOTION: (Basmajian/Tillo) to approve the Minutes of the meeting of August 5, 2015

MOTION PASSED: (5-0)

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF August 19, 2015:

MOTION: (Bowers/Wannemuehler) to approve the Minutes of the meeting of August 19, 2015

MOTION PASSED: (5-0)

PUBLIC FORUM: There were no public comments.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE LAND USE POLICY PLAN MINOR AMENDMENT FOR 101, 105, 107, AND 205 SOUTH WILMOTH AVENUE AND 3316 LINCOLN WAY (BRECKENRIDGE NORTH PARCEL)

Kelly Diekmann, Director of Planning and Housing, reviewed the five subject properties on a location map. He explained that the proposed LUPP amendment recommended by staff would change the site, currently shown in the Future Land Use Map as a low-density area, to a mix of commercial buildings along Lincoln Way and high-density housing in the rear of the site.

Julie Gould arrived at 7:03 PM.

Staff's recommendation is the result of a settlement agreement requiring mixed use commercial development along Lincoln Way. According to Mr. Diekmann, two options meet the settlement agreement expectations: Residential High Density zoning and Highway Oriented Commercial zoning with a mixed use overlay. Staff is recommending one way of meeting the requirement of mixed use with high-density housing in the rear of the site. Mr. Diekmann explained that staff views this as a broad application of the LUPP, with intentional vagueness about boundaries and the extent of commercial development along Lincoln Way, i.e., it expresses a general intent for commercial development along Lincoln Way with high-density housing along South Wilmoth Avenue, with no precise delineation of building locations, site development, or future zoning.

Mr. Diekmann explained that the Land Use Map shows the subject area zoning as Residential Low Density, with the exception of a parcel corner that fronts onto Lincoln Way with Residential High Density zoning. This property owner is located in the area that would be affected by the amendment but is not participating in the process. Mr. Diekmann clarified that the proposed land use designation change does not necessitate a zoning change for existing RH-zoned properties.

Staff believes its recommended approach best meets the intent of the settlement agreement by allowing for mixed use along Lincoln Way and preserving the remaining area for apartment development, Mr. Diekmann reported. He added that the subject site scores well on the RH checklist in terms of Lincoln Way being a transportation corridor and a major spine to get to services and employment. He stated that based on both the RH checklist and LUPP, staff regards the proposed LUPP amendment as the best approach for redesignating the land.

Mr. Diekmann noted a letter dated September 1, 2015, from Robert Dotson, trustee for property directly north (across Lincoln Way) from the subject site. In his written remarks, Mr. Dotson expressed support for the recommended LUPP amendment, primarily because the owner may seek redevelopment of their property in the future, in place of existing single family residences.

After clarifying for Ms. Lee that this process is City-initiated, without an applicant, Mr. Diekmann advised the Commission that it could take public comments.

Sharon Guber, 2931 Northwestern Avenue, stated that although the proposed amendment comes before Commission as a result of a settlement, she would encourage the Commission to view it outside of that context. In her opinion, the amendment does not work well with goals and criteria stated in the LUPP, including: managed growth that is sustainable, predictable, and assures quality of life; and greater compatibility among new and existing development. She used a number of location and zoning maps to illustrate her points.

Ms. Gruber offered an opposing perspective on numerous RH checklist components, arguing that development arising from the proposed amendment would: (1) fail to integrate into the existing neighborhood; (2) create an isolated project, not a new neighborhood; (3) contain significant features that may affect drainage and impact neighboring houses following the

creation of large, impermeable surfaces; (4) create additional noise and disturbance in the neighborhood; (5) fail to create needed housing types or variety of housing; (6) likely include insufficient landscape buffering between commercial and residential areas; (7) exacerbate the strain on existing public transportation schedules and capacity, as well as issues with roadway capacity and intersection operations; (8) heighten site access and safety concerns; (9) increase potential for storm water runoff problems; (10) increase demands placed on emergency response services; (11) fail to support prior neighborhood investments or create character, identity, or sense of place; and (12) potentially fail to deliver economic development or diversification of retail commercial as, in her view, occurred in the West Towne development.

Ms. Guber questioned how high density development would look in this area and its potential negative impact on adjacent property owners. She asked the Commission to consider whether LUPP amendment decisions should be made in isolation, and to consider if the LUPP is truly a plan that communicates direction for future development. Ms. Guber expressed concern about the future of other RL neighborhoods along Lincoln Way. She urged the Commission to recommend Alternative #2 to encourage the City Council to approve alternative land use designations than those proposed in the LUPP amendment presently before the Commission.

Lea Bartley, 112 South Wilmoth Avenue, stated she is disheartened because her neighborhood association worked hard to get RL zoning that is being changed one year later because of a lawsuit. She expects the proposed development will greatly impact her quality of life, as she already experiences incidents of vandalism and street parking shortages. She expects problems to grow exponentially and would like the area to maintain RL zoning.

Sarah Cady, 2812 Arbor Street, asked the Commission to revisit its 2014 discussions about the north parcel, when questions were raised regarding RL designation for the area because of its proximity to Lincoln Way. She recalled concern that the site was inappropriate for low-density residential housing and that mixed use was viewed as more beneficial to the neighborhood. Ms. Cady added that her neighborhood already contains a mixed use area at Sheldon Avenue and Lincoln Way, along with a number of large rental houses. Ms. Cady expressed her belief that the City had genuine desire for mixed use development prior to the Breckenridge settlement, and this is not just a means to make a lawsuit go away. Ms. Cady believes Ames must have density near campus to avoid sprawl, and it is best to have people close to campus in walkable neighborhoods, even though density can bring challenges to those who live in the area. She noted problems with street parking, high traffic volume, noise, and house parties as challenges residents face in her neighborhood, whether from higher-density housing or low-density housing with yards. She also noted population increase in Campustown from recent development of apartments and residence halls that add to the problems. Ms. Cady sees an opportunity within the settlement for preservation of natural areas, the creation of single family owner-occupied housing, and a plan to keep the majority of new higher density close to Lincoln Way. She said the City and the Commission have been thoughtful during the entire process and hopes the conversation can continue about the best opportunities for land use in her neighborhood.

Joanne Pfeiffer, 3318 Morningside Street, a neighborhood resident for over 30 years, said her remarks were based on her underlying desire to better the neighborhood based on residents' right to quality of life. She asked if the City has a business focus or a quality of life focus as it applies its RH checklist to the subject site. Ms. Pfeiffer focused on the specific language of two LUPP goals, and asked if the proposed amendment: (a) manages growth that is *sustainable, predictable, and assures quality of life*; and (b) furthers goals of the community to assure a more *healthy, safe, and attractive* environment. She asked the Commission to consider if the proposed amendment would bring quality of life, health, and safety to the neighborhood, and if the Commission members would want 422 additional students living in their neighborhood. She

urged the Commission to support Alternative #2 to encourage the City Council to approve alternative land use designations than those proposed in the LUPP amendment presently before the Commission.

Brian Torresi, Davis Brown Law Firm, 2605 Northridge Parkway, representing Breckenridge Group LLC, clarified that Breckenridge Group are not the applicant but rather the title holders for the parcel formerly known as the 'north parcel' as well as the three additional lots of 101, 105, and 107 South Wilmoth Avenue, purchased on July 30, 2015. He added that Iowa State University owns the south parcel as of August 26, 2015, reducing a 50 acre project to an 8 acre project. Mr. Torresi stated the LUPP amendment is the sole matter to be considered and asked the Commission to move Alternative #1 in accordance with staff's recommendation to designate the site as HOC/RH. He noted that the Commission questioned RL zoning in 2014, the only option provided by the LUPP at the time of Breckenridge Group's rezoning request. Mr. Torresi noted the settlement requires City compliance, and that the staff report identifies the north parcel as appropriate for LUPP designation in accordance with Alternative #1.

Catherine Scott, 1510 Roosevelt Avenue, stated her concern about the subject site's low RH checklist scores related to the possibility of creating a sense of identity. She encouraged thinking of it as a positive challenge to develop a sense of identity for the site, even with the understanding it likely must be high density. She stressed the issue is how to do high density better. In addition, Ms. Scott noted that the site would have one portion zoned HOC and another as RH, with the same owner. She hopes the project will be integrated, not two distinct projects. Ms. Scott added that this project will be a home for students for as long it exists, because the developer builds student housing. The location could be desirable for many types of residents, she said, but the units will be designed for students. Ms. Scott wants it to be a quality development with long-term desirability and a sense of being part of a larger neighborhood. In her view, communication and the right design could address these concerns.

Carlton Basmajian asked about the relationship of the proposed LUPP amendment on pending broad study of the Lincoln Way corridor and if decisions were being made now instead of later. Mr. Diekmann replied that the corridor study will ideally generate urban design, character, and architectural expectations for the allowances of mixed use zoning given to a particular property. He said the Commission does not presently have design guidelines or expectations about how to design appropriately for Lincoln Way. Mr. Basmajian expressed concern about the lack of design guidelines, saying that with good design the subject site could be dealt with effectively because this portion of Lincoln Way is right for mixed use development, provided it is done carefully with positive integration with existing development in the area. Assuming the land use designation proceeds, Mr. Diekmann said, when the site is zoned there will be a requirement for a major site plan going before both the Commission and then the City Council for approval. The site will not be developed with only staff review of a project.

Mr. Diekmann stated that in this case the applicant can request zoning because the settlement agreement does not indicate who must request zoning, just that it be adopted by the end of 2015. He said the applicant could also have their own interpretation of where commercial and high-density housing goes on this site. Mr. Diekmann advised the Commission that it may see an RH request that allows for mixed use along Lincoln Way, or it may see a straight HOC request that would have the mixed use overlay applied automatically. Mr. Diekmann added that the overlay is clear about staff's expectations for successful commercial development. Ms. Wannemuehler commented that staff seems to have clear ideas and details for what it wishes to see with mixed use overlay. Mr. Diekmann agreed and said the overlay is clear about how staff wishes to ensure successful commercial construction and avoid vacant space. He noted that

RH zoning requires a site plan review and that the overlay standards would be used to guide that decision-making process.

Debra Lee inquired about the anticipated density for the subject site, noting that the settlement agreement stipulates a maximum, and whether the density would be comparable to normally-allowed density or if special concessions were made for a higher level of density. Mr. Diekmann said it is more useful to discuss intensity, i.e., to measure bedrooms rather than units. For the subject site there would be 50 bedrooms per acre if developed to maximum level, placing it in the top 25-30 percent of apartment complex intensities. He noted it is possible to meet all RH standards with over 60-65 beds per acre without even having to build structured parking.

John Tillo spoke about comments from the public regarding the LUPP and how its language applies to this particular proposal. He said it is important to understand that reasonable people may disagree on interpretation of LUPP terms, e.g., quality of life. He noted his appreciation for the objectivity of Ms. Cady in her thinking about the greater City. Mr. Tillo said he shares the view that high-density designation is appropriate along Lincoln Way, but he is also concerned about how it is done, as expressed by Ms. Scott. He added that there is safety in knowing the Commission will have a major site plan to consider, giving it a degree of input, but ultimately owners have property rights subject to the controls and regulations of the greater community. Mr. Tillo remarked that the LUPP goals can be interpreted differently. He understands the arguments made by residents opposed to the City's proposal, but also sees how the LUPP language can be taken another way. He believes 'sustainability' in this case is more focused on infill and creating appropriate density in areas adjoining Lincoln Way. As for compatibility with the area's character, another LUPP goal, Lincoln Way has been moving in the direction of mixed use for years. Mr. Tillo said his focus is on limiting sprawl and having appropriate growth in the right places, including intensification of a limited number of existing areas where infrastructure and public transportation already exists.

Mr. Tillo said it is important to consider the current proposal without considering a lawsuit. Mr. Torresi clarified that the lawsuit is settled.

Ms. Lee noted that she is trying to view the matter objectively as a LUPP amendment request without any knowledge of case history or other factors. She asked if this property owner went away and change was made, would the Commission potentially regret its decision. Ms. Lee added that she sees traffic as a concern, and that street access is something that is usually discussed. She noted the Commission will have an opportunity to weigh traffic considerations when it reviews a Major Site Plan. Mr. Diekmann indicated that staff does not expect further broad traffic studies on the area, just an examination of the effects of the potential development on Lincoln Way, driveway access, turning lane improvements, and access on South Wilmoth Avenue. He said those issues would certainly be part of a site plan review. He noted that all other utilities are present and projected to be able to serve the site. Verification will occur at site plan review.

Julie Gould expressed her overall agreement with the comments from Mr. Basmajian and Mr. Tillo, and her confidence that staff's recommendation is appropriate, as she agrees that RL zoning is inappropriate for the area. Ms. Gould would prefer to have design guidelines, as that would create more confidence about attractive design and the creation of a desirable area. She acknowledged those issues will all arise later with a site plan, although she said it is possible to have a different picture in the future if there were a different developer than today.

MOTION: (Gould/Tillo) to accept Alternative #1, which states: that the Planning and Zoning Commission recommends that the City Council **approve** an amendment to the LUPP Future Land Use Map to designate the area along Lincoln Way for the properties located at 101, 105, 107 and 205 South Wilmoth Avenue and 3316 Lincoln Way as Highway Oriented Commercial and the remaining area of the site designated as High Density Residential as shown in Attachment C, proposed LUPP Map.

Mr. Basmajian commented that it is unfortunate timing.

Ms. Lee added that as a long-time neighborhood advocate, she sympathizes with the neighbors and hopes they know from previous hearings that the Commission is concerned about quality of life and has heard their concerns. She noted that it is the neighborhood's efforts that in large measure greatly reduced the potential development impact on the area compared to what was originally proposed.

MOTION PASSED: (6-0)

PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR 5400 GRANT AVENUE

Ray Anderson, Case Planner, provided an overview of the subject site, noting that the City annexed the land in December 2013, and in August 2015 approved a rezoning request from Agriculture to Suburban Residential Low Density with a Master Plan. Mr. Anderson explained that the Preliminary Plat is the next step in the development process. This is the second project to request approval under the Conservation Subdivision standards, with Quarry Estates (located to the north) being the first, Mr. Anderson noted.

After reviewing the site on location and zoning maps, Mr. Anderson reported that the proposed Hayden's Crossing subdivision includes 20 lots for single family dwellings, each between 7,000- and 10,000 square feet. Audubon Drive, connected with Grant Avenue, will eventually extend through the parcel and continue as a loop through adjacent land to the north recently purchased by the developer. Mr. Anderson reviewed open areas for storm water detention, conservation, and buffering between the subdivision, Grant Avenue, and Ada Hayden Heritage Park. He noted five outlots along with conservation, public utility, and storm water detention and treatment easements. The net density calculations are 5.09 dwelling units per net acre, Mr. Anderson reported, exceeding the 3.75 minimum density required by FS-RL zoning. Staff has found the Preliminary Plat is consistent with the Master Plan and zoning agreement.

Offsite infrastructure improvements include street paving and utility installation to be completed in fall 2015, according to Mr. Anderson. Studies of natural and cultural resources completed for the site as part of the Conservation Subdivision regulations inventory found no significant native plant communities on the site, he noted. Native plantings will be established in the subdivision. Mr. Anderson said the developer plans for 33 percent of the subdivision to be dedicated to conservation, exceeding the required 25 percent minimum. In addition, 80 percent of the lots must abut open space, a minimum also exceeded by the developer.

A pedestrian trail connection is planned with the existing upland trail in Ada Hayden Heritage Park. Mr. Anderson reviewed how the trail would extend through Outlot A of the subdivision, cross Audubon Drive, and extend to the north boundary of Outlot B. The trail will match the crushed rock surface of the connecting trail in Ada Hayden Heritage Park, and will transition to a concrete walkway spanning the Hayden's Crossing subdivision.

Mr. Anderson reviewed plans for conservation buffers along the subdivision boundaries. The developer will provide 30- and 25-foot wide buffers in various locations, meeting or exceeding regulations. The required Conservation Subdivision maintenance plan was submitted to the Public Works Department and is under review. This maintenance plan would be implemented by the homeowners association, which also performs long-term outlot management, he explained.

As he reviewed street connections, Mr. Anderson said it is important to note that if the Grant Avenue/Audubon Drive intersection becomes an access point for future development west of Grant Avenue (i.e., Rose Prairie), the developer of Hayden's Crossing will be responsible for its share of turning lane improvement costs. This condition is to be documented in a Development Agreement and is also a condition of approval of the Preliminary Plat, Mr. Anderson stated.

For staff, the main consideration for street layout is the length of Audubon Drive and how its looped design conforms to Subdivision Code. Mr. Anderson stated that the developer believes the proposed street layout avoids creating an undesirable public street connection within the proposed lot layout, avoids additional grading, and avoids creating a cul-de-sac. Staff believes this case conforms to code but has noted its concern about connectivity with the long street.

In his review of storm water management, Mr. Anderson indicated that the major function of Outlot B is to take the majority of storm water runoff to a centralized area for treatment before it is released from the site. He noted there will also be some sheet flow runoff from Outlot A into Ada Hayden Heritage Park.

Mr. Anderson reported that staff recommends approval of the Preliminary Plat with the condition that the Developer will enter into a Developer's Agreement with the City to fund the developer's share of intersection improvement costs at Grant Avenue/Audubon Drive intersection.

Applicant, Justin Dodge, Hunziker Companies, 105 South 16th Street, stated that Hayden's Crossing satisfies criteria sought in conservation subdivisions, provides needed housing in the community, and is a low-impact development that would protect Ada Hayden Heritage Park with minimal grading. He noted work with the Parks and Recreation Department for volunteer tree removal and plans for tree planting and other landscaping. According to Mr. Dodge, Hayden's Crossing is the developer's first subdivision with post-construction storm water ordinance requirements for detention and cleaning on site. The developer is working with landscape architects to identify and design native vegetation to perform storm water filtration functions.

Mr. Dodge noted plans for two side-loading garages in Lots 15 and 16. He explained that with this design element, not all garages would face Audubon Drive, adding variety to the subdivision design and value to the lots. Noting staff's recommended pedestrian walkway through these lots, he said it seems unnecessary to add additional sidewalk next to an area already paved for driveways. He expects that trail users would naturally walk along an existing paved surface. Mr. Dodge and the developer are opposed to additional pavement to the side of the driveways and expect that pedestrians can navigate through an area with minimal traffic from two garages.

Debra Lee asked how the homeowners would know that their driveways are a public shared use path, and how members of the public would know they are welcome to use the path. Mr. Dodge replied that it would be like any other shared use path or sidewalk going through a property. Carlton Basmajian asked if it would be a road or a driveway. Mr. Dodge indicated it would be a driveway. Mr. Basmajian said that would technically be private property. Mr. Dodge responded that an easement would be put on that portion of the lots. John Tillo asked how the public path would be demarcated to make it clear that the public has the right and is invited to walk through

the space. Mr. Dodge thought public awareness of the shared path could be generated through word of mouth among residents, homeowners association oversight, or perhaps signage.

Ms. Lee remarked that the immediate question before the Commission is the requirement for an extra five feet of paving. Mr. Diekmann replied that the displayed graphic and the staff report show what staff supports. He described the area on Lots 15 and 16 as a shared driveway access easement that allows access to the storm water detention pond for maintenance by City or homeowners association crews. The sidewalk would be clearly distinct from the driveways and would look like a sidewalk. Mr. Diekmann reported that staff advised the developer that a separate sidewalk is necessary to complete the aesthetic of the area and to make it a visible, known walking environment to connect the trail through to the north. This paved path would have an easement over it for public pedestrian access, according to Mr. Diekmann.

Mr. Dodge replied that the developer's idea was to combine the driveway and the sidewalk into one paved area to minimize impervious surfaces. Yvonne Wannemuehler asked if bicycles and pedestrians had been anticipated, and added that it seems dangerous or awkward with cars backing out of garages. Mr. Dodge expects minimal traffic in between two garages. Julie Gould said she has no issue with the lot design and layout but found the developer's path idea to be unwelcoming and confusing for trail users without a separate sidewalk or a sign.

Ms. Wannemuehler asked why the developer placed side-loaded garages in that location. Mr. Dodge indicated the choice was made in response to staff comments regarding connectivity between the two streets. Mr. Diekmann explained that during the evolution of the site plan the debate was whether there should be a public street connection in that location, or an alley, an option staff discouraged. Both staff and the developer like side-loaded garages, leading to a progression of City expectations for acceptable design. Ms. Wannemuehler asked why it could not be a simple sidewalk. Mr. Diekmann said that would require front-loaded garages onto Audubon Drive with a normal walkway between two houses. Mr. Diekmann said what differs here is the developer and staff are trying to promote side-loaded garages. At the same time, staff believes the separate sidewalk is important because it denotes where pedestrians would be expected to walk. Mr. Basmajian asked if there are only two side-loaded garages in the entire development. Mr. Dodge said there would be more in the second phase of development, or four total. Ms. Wannemuehler said that the sidewalk is necessary for clarity for pedestrians.

Rob Bowers asked for clarification about the right of way for access to the storm water detention area. He said that would be a natural area to put additional concrete if it is already there for other access, noting it is undesirable to place additional concrete in a conservation area without good reason. Mr. Bowers wondered if there would be another way to demarcate a walking area without using additional concrete.

Ms. Gould asked about the total width of the driveway/sidewalk area being discussed. Mr. Diekmann said the walkway is five feet wide, and the driveway area is 24 feet wide, designed to be the width of a backup area behind a parking space.

Ms. Wannemuehler suggested painting white lines to mark the walkway area. Mr. Diekmann said he believes painting is not a good, lasting demarcation of the space. In his view, it is difficult to design a single surface area that feels like a driveway and a shared use pathway at the same time without creating an odd quasi-public sidewalk that would likely be assumed into someone's property, whereas a separate sidewalk would not disappear. Ms. Wannemuehler asked how a sidewalk would be separated from the 24-foot wide concrete driveway. Mr. Anderson replied that the suggested sidewalk easement is 10 feet wide, while the sidewalk itself is 5 feet wide. Mr. Bowers noted that what would normally be called 'parking' would exist

between the sidewalk and driveway areas. Mr. Anderson agreed this would be the case, except where the driveways cross over the walkway. Ms. Gould expressed concern that because homeowners change, paperwork gets lost, and easements might be omitted from documents, a separate, distinct sidewalk would be a better long-term option than a single strip of pavement.

Another concern for the developer, Mr. Dodge noted, is the shared expense for left turn lanes required when the Rose Prairie subdivision is developed. He noted that Hunziker does not know where Rose Prairie is in the development process—it could be built 6 months from now or 15 years from now, or could eventually even be a different developer. Mr. Dodge would like to see better definition of obligations, shared expenses, and the timeline for potential street intersection improvement expenses. Mr. Diekmann indicated there would be a signed agreement in place before the matter would go before the City Council. He said there is no status update to share for Rose Prairie at this point—no pending Preliminary Plat or anything to know where the connection will be. Mr. Diekmann said staff's minimum expectation for Hunziker is a security that would be held at least until platting of the north parcel, and that any time past that would need to be negotiated in the Developer Agreement.

Ms. Lee asked for clarification that Hunziker Companies purchased the adjacent property to the north. Mr. Dodge confirmed the purchase. He said the developer has a general layout for the 12 subject acres and knew they wanted to do something on the parcel to the north but did not yet own it. He indicated they will follow up with rezoning/Master Plan/Preliminary Plat for the other parcel shortly. Ms. Lee asked if all of the lots are for single family detached homes. Mr. Dodge reported that under the current configuration all lots are for single family detached homes; however, the Master Plan includes the option for doing single family attached homes as well.

Catherine Scott, 1510 Roosevelt Avenue, asked if Audubon Drive is planned as a public street. Mr. Anderson replied that Audubon Drive is a public street. Ms. Scott asked if the shared use path will be composed the same way as the path leading from Ada Hayden Heritage Park. Mr. Anderson reported that the trail would be made of crushed rock. Ms. Scott asked if it would be desirable to continue the trail as crushed rock or some form of permeable paving through the Hayden's Crossing subdivision instead of switching to concrete. Mr. Diekmann explained that trail paths are typically crushed rock because the Parks and Recreation Department does not maintain the trails in the wintertime. If the expectation is for pedestrian access during those months, then concrete or some other hard-surfaced material would be used. Connections to the park are crushed rock because of the lack of maintenance during the winter, he said.

Ms. Lee asked if there could be permeable surface sidewalks near the side-loaded garages. Mr. Diekmann replied that he did not immediately know what they would be. He said the subdivision is being designed for appropriate storm water mitigation and cleaning, that water would not drain from impervious surfaces into a ditch or into a drain emptying into a creek. With Low Impact Development, runoff would be controlled through vegetation and a detention area for cleaning and controlling storm water release. He does not see a five-foot sidewalk as troubling.

Mr. Tillo remarked that he debated proposing that the Commission add a condition requiring the developer to install a permeable paved trail path running through the Preliminary Plat. After hearing the discussion, however, he is satisfied that it is a small area and water management is designed in a way that runoff will be mitigated by natural filtration and cleaning. He added that it would be neat to impose a condition for installing permeable pavement, but he is comfortable with the existing proposal. Mr. Diekmann suggested considering usability and whether it is an all-year, all-weather surface for pedestrian use. Ms. Wannemuehler added that these are driveways that people will want to clear, which would be hard to do if gravel were present. Mr. Diekmann said snow removal requires a cementitious surface. Mr. Basmajian said permeable

paving systems exist for driveways. He thinks it is not the sidewalk but the larger driveway surfaces that will accelerate runoff. Mr. Diekmann replied that the permeable paving systems he is familiar with are not usually employed in single family driveways.

Mr. Tillo stated that he believes the developer's proposal is unique and he wants to encourage the developer's idea as an experiment. He contemplated moving to add a second condition to Alternative #1 to accept the applicant's proposal that no sidewalk be required between Lots 15 and 16 but that the applicant clearly demarcate the sidewalk easement area with lane markings. Mr. Basmajian asked if Mr. Tillo meant painting the driveway like a road. Mr. Tillo responded affirmatively. Mr. Diekmann said he is envisioning yellow stripes for 130 feet. Mr. Tillo said the critiques of the idea are fair but he does not like permeable surfaces and it would be preferable to him to avoid a five-foot strip of permeable surface running that distance.

Ms. Wannemuehler commented that she can envision this as being a very popular area for bicyclists once development is completed, although she believes it must be clearly labeled as a public use area. Mr. Diekmann clarified that this path segment will be for local neighborhood circulation, with the main shared use path located on the west side of Grant Avenue.

Ms. Lee inquired about monitoring storm water detention ponds and asked about cases where they do not function properly, or overflow, and who would correct the problems. Mr. Diekmann explained that design parameters are used to determine the flows detention areas are meant to contain, with overflows being possible with a larger storm event. According to Mr. Diekmann, the home owner's association is responsible for general maintenance of detention areas, with the City taking on significant maintenance needs, like dredging. He noted that maintenance plan annual reporting is required in conservation subdivisions, with the Public Works Department more involved in those cases. Mr. Dodge added that annual and other scheduled maintenance programs are designed by engineers. Mr. Diekmann also cited a developer bond for the detention facility for its development as well as its initial performance and operations. Ms. Lee said no one has experience with long-term maintenance at this point, but efforts have been made to outline the desired outcomes. Mr. Dodge said the engineers use their best guesses for the costs of treatment and maintenance.

Mr. Tillo asked if the developer is working with the City and an architect to identify native plant types. Mr. Dodge confirmed that the engineers are using landscape architects and that the City reviews and comments on those (vetted) plans.

MOTION: (Bowers/Wannemuehler) to accept Alternative #1, which states: that the Planning and Zoning Commission recommends that the City Council **approve** the Preliminary Plat for Hayden's Crossing at 5400 Grant Avenue, with the following condition: that the Developer will enter into a Developer's Agreement with the City of Ames to fund the pro rata share of costs for future intersection improvements necessary at the intersection of Grant Avenue and Audubon Drive.

Mr. Tillo indicated he would oppose the motion because he wants to see the experiment proposed by the applicant. He favors use of a demarcated pedestrian lane in Lots 15 and 16, while acknowledging that it would be unusual and could be confusing for people.

MOTION PASSED: (5-1; Nay: Tillo)

COMMISSION COMMENTS: Mr. Tillo said he appreciates the participation of engaged citizens, as it enables the Commission to be more informed and to do a better job of making decisions. Mr. Bowers commented about the importance and value of compromise, and noted how the involvement of many improves the process.

STAFF COMMENTS: Mr. Diekmann informed the Commission of a City Council workshop date on September 15, 2015 regarding Council's directive to staff to provide a review of short-term development needs. This interim review will serve as a preface for a comprehensive update to the LUPP to be developed in two to three years. At the September workshop, Council and staff will discuss staff's ideas about development in the next five to seven years and as well as identified gaps to address in the LUPP. Mr. Diekmann indicated these efforts should set the stage for work items coming before the Commission as either LUPP or zoning text amendment items. The Commission will be updated by Mr. Diekmann by early October.

MOTION TO ADJOURN:

MOTION: (Wannemuehler/Tillo) to adjourn the meeting.

MOTION PASSED: (6-0)

The meeting adjourned at 9:05 PM.

Debra Lee, Chairperson
Planning & Zoning Commission

Joseph C. Newman, Recording Secretary
Department of Planning & Housing