CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
Thursday, April 25, 2013  
3:00 PM  
City Hall Council Chambers  
101 First Street SE, Cedar Rapids, IA 52401

AGENDA

• Opening Statement  
• Roll Call  
• Approval of the Minutes  
• Adoption of the Agenda

CONSENT AGENDA

Note: The following items will be approved by one motion without separate discussion unless City Planning Commission requests an item be removed to be considered separately. Any interested party may also request such individual consideration for an item by indicating that request to the Commission Chair prior to the motion and vote on the Consent Agenda.

1. Case Name: Evergreen Business Park Addition (Major Preliminary Plat)
   
   Approval time extension for the Major Preliminary Plat, for property north of Walford Road between 6th Street SW and I-380 as requested by Hughes System, Inc. / Dwight Hughes (Applicant/Titleholder).
   
   Case No. 93-11-050 & Case No. PRPT-002139-2013 Case Manager: Vern Zakostelecky

REGULAR AGENDA

1. Case Name: Northwest Corner of 76th Avenue & C Street SW (FLUMA and Rezoning)
   
   a) Request for an amendment to the Future Land Use Map in the City’s Comprehensive Plan from Office to Commercial as requested by Jim Hobart (Applicant) and Kirkwood Community College (Titleholder).
   
   Case No. FLUMA-001734-2013 Case Manager: Vern Zakostelecky
b) Recommendation for approval of a rezoning from A, Agriculture Zone District to C-3, Regional Commercial Zone District requested by Jim Hobart (Applicant) and Kirkwood Community College (Titleholder).

**Case No: RZNE-001733-2013  Case Manager: Vern Zakostelecky**

2. **Case Name:** 2112 J Street SW & Adjoining Vacant Parcel (Rezoning)

Recommendation for approval of a rezoning from R-3D, Two Family Residence Zone District to RMF-1, Multiple Family Residence Zone District as requested by Alan Fisher (Applicant/Titleholder).

**Case No: RZNE-001737-2013  Case Manager: Vern Zakostelecky**

3. **Case Name:** 1115 Prairie Rose Drive SW (Preliminary Site Development Plan)

Recommendation for approval of a Preliminary Site Development Plan for property at 1115 Prairie Rose Drive SW and zoned RMF-1, Multiple Family Residence Zone District as requested by Marin Combs Custom Homes (Applicant) and Jerry’s Homes (Titleholder).

**Case No: PSDP-001480-2013  Case Manager: Vern Zakostelecky**

- **Old Business**

1. Proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendments to Chapter 32 of the Municipal Code, the Zoning Ordinance to Regulate Delayed Deposit Service Uses (commonly known as “Payday Lenders”).

2. Discussion and recommendation on eliminating the current Zoning Ordinance PUD-O, Planned Unit Development Overlay District and adoption of the PUD-1, Planned Unit Development Zone District and PUD-2, Planned Unit Development Zone District.

- **Training Opportunities**

- **Announcements**
CPC Date: April 25, 2013
To: City Planning Commission
From: Development Services Department

Owner: Walford Road Holdings, LLC

Request: Evergreen Business Park Addition
Time Extension for Major Preliminary Plat

CASE NO: PRPT-002139-2013 & Case No. 93-11-050

Case Manager: Vern Zakostelecky

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The City received a request to extend the expiration date for the approved Major Preliminary Plat, Evergreen Business Park Addition, on April 9, 2013. The request was from Walford Road Holdings, LLC, owners of the property within the Preliminary Plat located north of Walford Road SW between 6th Street SW and I-380. The Preliminary Plat was approved by City Planning Commission Resolution No. CPC-93-033, on June 28, 2011. Preliminary plats expire after 2-years if a final plat for all or a portion of the property is not approved and recorded within the 2-years. No final plats have been recorded for this property and the Preliminary Plat will expire on June 28th of this year. Subsection 31.04.(f), of the City Subdivision Ordinance allows for a request by the property owner to extend the expiration date by one year provided the request is made prior to the preliminary plat approval expiring. Said Subsection gives the City Planning Commission the authority to provide an extension, based on review and recommendation by the City Project Review Group. The Project Review Group recommends the extension be granted. If City Planning Commission agrees with the Project Review Group recommendation the extension would be granted by a favorable Commission vote on a resolution.
MAJOR PRELIMINARY PLAT
EVERGREEN BUSINESS PARK ADDITION TO
CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

Zoning

RECCES

SITE LOCATION MAP

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

SHEET INDEX

DRAFT DIGITAL

APPLICATION

DATE SUBMITTED

DATE REVISED

MAJOR PRELIMINARY PLAT
EVERGREEN BUSINESS PARK ADDITION TO
CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA

Schnoor Bonifazi

REVISIONS

DRAWN BY TREV HICKMAN

SIGNED FOR APPROVAL

PROJECT NO.

COVER SHEET

1 OF 3

Digitally signed by Christine Butterfield
Date: 06/22/11 10:22:00

Chris Butterfield
STAFF REPORT TO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Future Land Use Map Amendment

CPC Date: April 25, 2013
To: City Planning Commission
From: Development Services Department

Applicant: Jim Hobart
Titleholder: Kirkwood Community College
Case Number: FLUMA-001734-2013
Location: Northwest corner of the intersection of 76th Avenue and C Street SW
Request: Future Land Use Map Amendment from Office to Commercial
Case Manager: Vern Zakostelecky, Development Services Department

This is to certify that the Development Services Department staff has examined the petition of Jim Hobart and Kirkwood Community College requesting an amendment to the Future Land Use Map in the City’s Comprehensive Plan from OFFICE to COMMERCIAL, for property located at the northwest corner of the intersection of 76th Avenue and C Street SW.

General Information:
The applicant has owned this property for a number of years and bought the property to allow development that would provide supportive uses to the College. The applicant wishes to rezone the property to initially allow development of a new call center and office facility for Ruffalo Cody. Ruffalo Cody current is in an office facility on the east side of the Kirkwood Campus and has out grown that facility. If this request is approved along with the rezoning application submitted, development of a new facility would begin this summer. Once vacant, Kirkwood College will use the existing office building for educational uses.

Future Land Use Map Amendment Request Findings:
Chapter IV.E., Policy 1.6.4. Of the Comprehensive Plan, which establishes the finding to be made in considering an amendment to the Future Land Use Map reads as follows:

Policy 1.6.4 That Future Land Use Plan establishes a land use pattern that will accommodate anticipated commercial and residential growth within the community. Exhibit IV-4 (see attached) summarizes the existing and planned land uses for the planning area (exclusive of other incorporated communities) and lists the forecasted demands for each category. Prior to amending the land uses on this exhibit, make findings that the proposed amendment:

1. Will be consistent with the Plan priorities;
2. Will be compatible with future land uses for the surrounding areas of the community;
3. Will not create a shortage of any particular type of residential or non-residential land; and
4. Will enhance the overall quality of life in the community.
Development Services staff has made the following conclusions for the above stated findings:

1. **Will be consistent with the Plan priorities**

The City’s Comprehensive Plan states the City needs to “maintain opportunities for growth and expansion of businesses, while retaining the viability and vitality of existing facilities”, and “The Plan should provide for a balance of residential, commercial and industrial development in areas where there are adequate opportunities to live, work and shop; there is sufficient access between uses; and facilities and services are adequate to meet demands.”

This area of the City is seeing considerable housing development and continued interest in office, commercial and industrial development. Rezoning this site to commercial will allow for development of commercial uses, which will support Kirkwood Community College and the existing and future residential, office, and industrial uses in the area.

The following policies of the Comprehensive Plan support this request:

- Providing sufficient land for anticipated growth. The plan should allocate sufficient land for residential, commercial and industrial growth. Land allocations should provide some excess to ensure market choice.
- Distribute retail, service, office, and business park development throughout the City to improve access from residential neighborhoods.
- Partner with public and private economic development interests to attract and retain high wage employment opportunities.

2. **Will be compatible with future land uses for surrounding areas of the community.**

The Future Land Map currently shows OFFICE for the subject property. The general area along with Kirkwood Community College includes a wide variety of uses such as low, medium, and high density residential, office, commercial and industrial. Since the Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 1999, the City has adopted a number of development design standards to assure mixes of uses can co-exist including the following:

- Landscape/buffering & screening standards.
- Urban Design Standards.
- Neighborhood Protections Standards.
- Exterior Lighting Standards.
- Enclosure standards.

3. **Will not create a shortage of any particular type of residential or non-residential land.**

The development of commercial uses in this area could provide retail, restaurant and other commercial opportunities for citizens working and living in the area that current are limited or do not existing in the general area. The proposed land use change will not create a shortage of any particular land use type and conversely will provide for more diversity and choices in the general area.
4. **Will enhance the overall quality of life in the community.**

- The uses allowed in Commercial land use designation will be compatible with the surrounding area if adequate buffering and screening are provided, and the proposed development, if approved, will provide additional more convenient choices for the citizens living and working in the general area.
- The uses developed will have direct access to the transit system for residents who lack automobiles.
- The proposed land use amendment will provide for an increase in density and non-residential uses in a developing area, which is considered a positive “Smart Growth” development.

If the City Planning Commission determines that the requested land use is not appropriate for this location, based on inconsistency with the Comprehensive Plan, and does not agree with City staff’s conclusions on the required findings, the Commission should recommend denial of the proposed Future Land Use Map amendment to City Council.

Should the Commission determine that the proposed land use is appropriate; the Commission should make a recommendation to City Council to amend the Future Land Use Map designation from OFFICE to the requested COMMERCIAL land use designation.
STAFF REPORT TO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Rezoning with a Preliminary Site Development Plan for a Portion of the Site

CPC Date: April 25, 2013
To: City Planning Commission
From: Development Services Department

Applicant: Jim Hobart
Titleholder: Kirkwood Community College
Case Number: RZNE-001733-2013
Location: Northeast corner of the intersection of C Street and 76th Avenue SW
Request: Rezoning from O-S, Office/Service Zone District to C-3, Regional Commercial Zone District
Case Manager: Vern Zakostelecky, Development Services Department

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The property consists of 52.3 acres and the proposal is to split the property into 3-lots. The applicant has owned this property for a number of years and bought the property to allow development that would provide supportive uses/services to the College. The applicant wishes to rezone the property to initially allow development of a new call center and office facility for Ruffalo Cody. Ruffalo Cody current is in an office facility on the east side of the Kirkwood Campus and has outgrown that facility. If this request is approved along with the Future Land Use Map Amendment application submitted, development of a new facility would begin this summer. Once vacated, Kirkwood College will use the existing office building for education uses. The Preliminary Site Development Plan as submitted for the Ruffalo Cody site includes the following:

- Total area of the site-15.0 acres.
- Proposed building area-46,113 sq. ft.-1st floor & 45,718 sq. ft.-2nd floor.
- Future building expansion area-21,200 sq. ft.
- Vehicle Parking: 698 spaces (387 required).
- Future parking for expansion 225 spaces.
- Accesses to Center Point Rd. NE closest to 42nd St. NE will be closed.
- Access to the site 2 from Kirkwood Pkwy. (3rd for parking lot expansion) & 1 access from C St.
- Storm water retention at southwest corner of the site.
- Proposed trail to south & around retention pond.

Prior to development of the remaining parcel(s) an application for Preliminary Site Development Plan approval is required.
FINDINGS:

Section 32.02.030.C.5.e of the Zoning Ordinance requires the City Planning Commission to review the application based on the following criteria:

1. Whether the amendment is required to correct a technical mistake in the existing zoning regulations.

   *Staff Comments:* This amendment is not to correct a technical mistake on the existing Zoning Map.

2. Whether the amendment is consistent with the Future Land Use Policy Plan and other elements of the Comprehensive Plan.

   *Staff Comments:* The City’s Future Land Use Map shows the subject property as Office, but the application for rezoning is accompanied by a request to amend the Future Land Use Map to Commercial and if the FLUMA is approved the rezoning request will be in accord with the Future Land Use Map and the goals and objectives of the City’s Comprehensive Plan.

3. Whether the amendment is consistent with the characteristics of the surrounding area, including any changing conditions.

   *Staff Comments:* This area is a mix of low, medium, and high density residential, office, commercial, educational and industrial uses. If designed to meet or exceed the City’s design standards the proposed uses allowed in the C-3 Zoning District should be consistent with the general area.

4. Whether the property is suitable for all of the uses permitted in the proposed district.

   *Staff Comments:* The subject property is suitable for all uses be permitted in the C-3 Zoning District.

5. Whether the proposed amendment will protect existing neighborhoods from nearby development at heights and densities that are out of scale with the existing neighborhood.

   *Staff Comments:* The proposed development will need to meet or exceed the minimum City design standards including, but not limited to:

   - Landscape/buffering & screening standards.
   - Urban Design Standards.
   - Neighborhood Protections Standards.
   - Exterior Lighting Standards.
   - Enclosure standards.

Since the applicant is requesting City financial participation, the proposed development has to be informally reviewed by City Council. Council reviewed the site plan and building renderings on March 26, 2013 and had no issues or concerns.
6. Whether facilities and services (including sewage and waste disposal, water, gas, electricity, police and fire protection, and roads and transportation, as applicable) will be available to serve the subject property while maintaining adequate levels of service to existing development.

*Staff Comments:* This parcel is located in an area developed or proposed for development and would have access to all necessary facilities and services without any issues. It should be noted that the Traffic Engineering Division of the Public Works Department has a requirement for a traffic impact study and has proved a scope for the study. The traffic impact study will need to be reviewed at the time of application for Administrative Site Plan approval and the applicant will be required to make the necessary improvements as defined in said study to address any traffic safety and congestion related issues.

7. The Site Development Plan is consistent with the previously approved Preliminary Plan for the property (if applicable).

*Staff Comments:* This provision does not applicable.

**RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS:**

1. PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF A FINAL CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY, the property owner shall be responsible to submit to the City a signed Agreement for Private Storm Water Detention. The City Public Works Department shall provide a copy of the Agreement form upon request by the property owner.

2. PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF A FINAL CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY, the property owner shall be responsible to construct 6’ wide concrete sidewalk along C Street SW adjoining this site. The City will reimburse the property owner for a 1’ wide portion of the 6’ wide sidewalk in accordance with City policy. The property owner shall construct 5’ wide concrete sidewalk along Kirkwood Parkway SW adjoining this site. The property owner shall construct the sidewalk improvements in accordance with City Standards, ADA requirements, and improvement plans accepted by the City Public Works Director/City Engineer.

3. That the property owner shall provide certification of the 100-year storm conveyance through the site without damage to structures due to the existing drainage swales.

4. Lighting fixtures shall be shielded in a manner that shall not direct illumination on adjacent residential properties, or on any public right-of-way as set forth in the Exterior Lighting Standards in Chapter 32, the Zoning Ordinance.

5. Sign permit applications must be submitted and approved and permits obtained prior to erection of signage as set forth in Chapter 32, the City Zoning Ordinance.

6. Dumpster enclosure(s) needs to be designed with full screen enclosure including gates as set forth in Chapter 32, the City Zoning Ordinance.

7. Landscaping, buffering, and screening needs to meet the standards set forth in Chapter 32, the City Zoning Ordinance.

8. The building design needs to meet the Large Scale Commercial building design standards as set forth in Chapter 32, the City Zoning Ordinance.

9. That future development under this rezoning action with exception of the Buffalo Cody Site shall be subject to the RSDP review process as set forth in Section 32.02.030.G. prior to issuance of building permit(s). Such Development shall meet all City development standards in effect at the time of plan submittal.
CURRENT LAND USE = OFFICE
PROPOSED LAND USE = COMMERCIAL

LOT 1
130 ACRES

LOT 2
100 ACRES

LOT 3
27.3 ACRES
PROJECT LOCATION MAP

The Public Highway

South 1/2 Section 15, Township 82-7, Line County, Iowa except

North 1/2 Section 14, Township 82-7, Line County, Iowa

EXACT DESCRIPTION:

DATE REVISED: APRIL 3, 2013
DATE REVISED: MARCH 13, 2013

PROPOSED ZONING: C-3
EXISTING ZONING: A
STAFF REPORT TO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Rezoning with a Preliminary Site Development Plan for a Portion of the Site

CPC Date: April 25, 2013
To: City Planning Commission
From: Development Services Department
Applicant: Alan Fisher
Titleholder: Alan Fisher
Case Number: RZNE-001737-2013
Location: 2112 J Street SW & Adjoining Vacant Parcel
Request: Rezoning from R-3D, Two Family Residence District and R-3, Single Family Residence Zone District to RMF-1, Multiple Family Residence Zone District
Case Manager: Vern Zakostelecky, Development Services Department

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
The property consists of two parcels. The property at 2112 J St. SW is developed with a duplex unit and has a split zoning with R-3 and R-3D Zoning. This parcel is considered legal non-conforming since the property does not meet the minimum lot area requirement and duplexes are not allowed in the R-3 Zoning District. The applicant wishes to construct another duplex on the vacant parcel, but under the R-3D Zoning District doesn’t meet the lot area requirement, so the property needs to be rezoned to the RMF-1 Zoning Classification. Since both parcels will have only two units each, there is no requirement for a Preliminary Site Development Plan at this time. A detailed site plan will need to be submitted for the vacant parcel at the time of application for a building permit. City staff is recommending a condition that would limit the development or redevelopment of one or both parcels to one or two family residential housing units.

FINDINGS:

Section 32.02.030.C.5.e of the Zoning Ordinance requires the City Planning Commission to review the application based on the following criteria:

1. Whether the amendment is required to correct a technical mistake in the existing zoning regulations.

   Staff Comments: This amendment is not to correct a technical mistake on the existing Zoning Map.

2. Whether the amendment is consistent with the Future Land Use Policy Plan and other elements of the Comprehensive Plan.
Staff Comments: The City’s Future Land Use Map shows the subject property as Low Density Residential, but since one of the parcels is developed with a duplex and the vacant lot is zoned R-3D, Two Family Residence Zone District the requested zone change is in accord with the intended use of the property.

3. **Whether the amendment is consistent with the characteristics of the surrounding area, including any changing conditions.**

Staff Comments: This area is primarily low density residential uses, but duplexes are considered compatible and provide an alternative for housing choices for the area. If the proposed duplex is designed to be compatible with the existing housing in the area it should consistent with the characteristics of the surrounding area, including any changing conditions.

4. **Whether the property is suitable for all of the uses permitted in the proposed district.**

Staff Comments. The subject property is suitable for all uses be permitted in the RMF-1 Zoning District.

5. **Whether the proposed amendment will protect existing neighborhoods from nearby development at heights and densities that are out of scale with the existing neighborhood.**

Staff Comments: The proposed development will need to meet or exceed the minimum City design standards including a compatible housing design for the neighborhood.

6. **Whether facilities and services (including sewage and waste disposal, water, gas, electricity, police and fire protection, and roads and transportation, as applicable) will be available to serve the subject property while maintaining adequate levels of service to existing development.**

Staff Comments: This parcel is located in an in-fill older developed area and will have access to all necessary facilities and services without any issues.

7. **The Site Development Plan is consistent with the previously approved Preliminary Plan for the property (if applicable).**

Staff Comments: This provision is not applicable.

**RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS:**

1. PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF A FINAL CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY, the property owner shall be responsible to submit to the City a signed Concrete Pavement Petition and Assessment Agreement for future paving improvements in the alley adjoining this site. The City Public Works Department shall furnish the Agreement form upon request by the property owner.

2. The development or redevelopment of both parcels shall be limited to one or two family residential units.
Wilson Middle School, Iowa

Wilson Middle School is a school located in Linn County, IA at N41.95503° W91.66660° (NAD83) and at an elevation of 767 ft MSL. It can be seen on the USGS 1:24K topographic map Cedar Rapids South, IA.

Feature Type: School
Latitude: N41.95503° (NAD83 datum)
Longitude: W91.66660°
Elevation: 767 ft MSL
County: Linn County, Iowa

USGS 24K Map: Cedar Rapids South, IA
USGS 24K MRC: 41091H6

You can view this location or feature in our Topographic Map Viewer now.

Note: Coordinates displayed above are referenced to NAD83 datum.

Wilson MS = 787 A
St. Lucanita = 751 A

0 Vacant Lot SW approx. 765 A
STAFF REPORT TO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Preliminary Site Development Plan

CPC Date: April 25, 2013
To: City Planning Commission
From: Development Services Department

Applicant: Martin Combs Custom Homes
Titleholder: Jerry’s Homes
Case Number: PSDP-001480-2013
Location: 1115 Prairie Rose Drive SW
Request: Preliminary Site Development Plan approval for property zoned RMF-1, Multiple Family Residence Zone District
Case Manager: Vern Zakostelecky, Development Services Department

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
The site is currently undeveloped and the Preliminary Site Development Plan approved as part of the original rezoning request has expired and the plan for development of this site has change. The original approved plan was for an 8-unit apartment building. The applicant has received funds from the State of Iowa, Iowa Economic Development Authority as part of the Multi-Family New Construction Program to provide replacement housing lost as a result of the Flood of 2008. The proposed plan is to develop two-four unit row house apartment buildings on the site. The site plan as submitted includes the following:

- Total area of the site is 27,443 sq. ft.
- Proposed building area is 6,272 sq. ft.
- Proposed hard surface area is 3,905 sq. ft.
- Proposed open space is 17,268 sq. ft.
- Single access from Prairie Rose Dr. SW.
- Buffering and screening provided on east property line, but not required unless property to south develops as single family housing.

FINDINGS:
Section 32.02.030.C.5.e of the Zoning Ordinance requires the City Planning Commission to review the application based on the following criteria:
1. The Site Development Plan is consistent with the previously approved Preliminary Plans for the property (if applicable)

*Staff comments*: The approved Preliminary Site Development Plan expired, but the proposed site layout has the same number of units, but is a better design since it proposes row housing instead of a single apartment building.

2. The Site Development Plan conforms to all applicable requirements of this Ordinance.

*Staff comments*: The site development plan conforms to all applicable requirements of the City’s Zoning Ordinance, provided the buildings are designed to meet the requirements of the newly adopted Urban Design Standards and the IDEA Multi-Family New Construction design guidelines.

**RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS:**

1. The existing water services stubbed to the lot must be used or cut off at the main per Metro specifications.
2. The drive isle for the development will need to be designed to support the weight of the Solid Waste and Recycling Division vehicles.
3. **PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF A FINAL CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY,** the property owner shall be responsible to construct 4’ wide concrete sidewalk along Prairie Rose Drive SW adjoining this site. The property owner shall construct the sidewalk improvements in accordance with City Standards, ADA requirements, and improvement plans accepted by the City Public Works Director/City Engineer.
4. That if the property to the south is developed as Low Density Residential the property owners of the subject property will be required to provide screen fencing along the south property line.
5. The site and building design needs to meet the requirements of the City Ordinance “Multi-Family Residential Dwell” Subsection 32.05.030.D.
To: City Planning Commission  
From: Thomas Smith, Community Development  
Subject: Proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendments to Regulate Payday Lenders  
Date: April 25, 2013  

BACKGROUND:

Over the past few years, several Iowa communities have enacted stricter regulations to help protect citizens against delayed deposit service uses, more commonly known as payday lending institutions. Although the State of Iowa licenses and regulates the loans these stores market, the annual interest rate on a typical cash advance can reach over 400%. Other state legislatures have lowered the maximum interest rates on these types of loans to the double digits, but attempts to cap rates in Iowa have been unsuccessful. Cash-strapped consumers may become locked into repetitive borrowing cycles with these types of businesses, pushing individuals and families further into debt.

In October 2012, the City Council Development Committee reviewed a proposal to regulate payday lenders in Cedar Rapids and recommended the following option for full Council review:

- Limiting payday lenders to the C-2, Community Commercial Zone District as a conditional use only, and
- Requiring payday lenders to locate 1,000 feet away from any licensed childcare center, educational facility, parks or open space use, religious institution, and/or any other payday lending business.

Neighborhood leaders have indicated support for the proposed ordinance after expressing concerns to staff about payday lending institutions and the effects that they may have on community strength and stability.

There are currently no restrictions on payday lending institutions in any City ordinances.

BEST PRACTICES FOR PAYDAY LENDING INSTITUTIONS:

Within the past two years, Ames, Clive, Des Moines, Iowa City and West Des Moines have passed ordinances restricting the location of payday lending institutions. These cities have justified their restrictions based on the link between payday lending and the economic distress of individuals and neighborhoods in which these establishments locate. Ames, Clive and Iowa City use nearly the same terms and restrictions to regulate payday lenders:

1. Distance Separation: 1,000 ft from any child care center, educational facility, park or recreational facility, religious institution, or other delayed deposit service use.
2. Zoning: Limited to specific commercial or industrial zones as a conditional use.

Des Moines and West Des Moines have similar, but stricter, ordinances requiring a distance separation of one-half mile.

AVAILABLE OPTIONS:

On January 24, 2012, the City Planning Commission reviewed an initial proposal for a payday lending ordinance, but requested more information and options from staff before making a recommendation. The following options are available to implement, or not implement, a payday lending ordinance in Cedar Rapids:

1. Recommend no change to existing City ordinances. This means that payday lenders would have the freedom to locate or cluster in any City neighborhood or district without any limitations or restrictions.
2. Recommend regulation of payday lenders to a C-2 zone only as a conditional use, with a 1,000 foot distance separation between any two payday lenders. This would prevent payday lenders from easily clustering in any one City neighborhood or district.
3. Recommend regulation of payday lenders to a C-2 zone only as a conditional use, with a 1,000 foot distance separation between any payday lender and a religious use, park, daycare center, school, or any two payday lenders. This would prevent payday lenders from clustering in any one City neighborhood or district and effectively limit the number of payday lenders that could operate within City limits.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends allowing a delayed deposit service use as a conditional use in a single zoning district, the C-2, Community Commercial Zone District. This district is less commonly seen throughout the city, especially along major corridors of concern, such as 1st Avenue E, Williams Boulevard SW, and Edgewood Road. Additionally, a distance separation requirement of 1,000 feet should be required between two delayed deposit service uses, as well as sensitive uses such as childcare centers, schools, and religious institutions.

Implementing this option would put Cedar Rapids in line with the regulations of other cities in Iowa, which payday lending businesses are already familiar with. Using the state’s definition of delayed deposit service uses, which is commonly used by the other communities with payday lending ordinances, will also ensure consistency with state regulations and uniformity with the other communities.

The addition of the following language to City Code Chapter 32, the Zoning Ordinance, is being suggested to implement the staff recommendation:

32.09.020 - DEFINITIONS

51. Delayed Deposit Service Use: A Delayed Deposit Service Use is defined as an individual, group of individuals, partnership, association, corporation, or any other business unit or legal entity, who for a fee accepts a check dated subsequent to the date it was written or to a check dated on the date it was written and holds said check for a period of time prior to deposit or
presentment pursuant to an agreement with, or any representation made to, the maker of the check, whether express or implied. For the purposes of this title, “check” means a check, draft, share draft, or other instrument for the payment of money.

**Table 32.04-1 – PERMITTED USES**

Add “Delayed Deposit Service Uses” under the “Use” Column and indicate that this use is a conditional use in the C-2, Community Commercial Zone District by adding the abbreviation “C” under the “C-2” heading.

**32.04.030. – USE SPECIFIC STANDARDS**

11. *Delayed Deposit Service Uses in the C-2 Zone*

   a. The use is licensed by the State of Iowa; and
   b. The use will be located at least 1,000 feet from any property containing any existing licensed daycare center use, educational facility use, parks and open space use, or religious use; and
   c. The proposed use will be located at least 1,000 feet from any other delayed deposit service use.
To: City Planning Commission
From: Vern Zakoskeley, Development Services Department and Thomas Smith, Community Development Department
Subject: Proposed Amendments to the Planned Unit Development (PUD) Regulations
Date: April 25, 2013

This memo is to provide recommended changes and additions to the City’s Planned Unit Development (PUD) regulations. The PUD updates are intended to encourage more of the following in Cedar Rapids:

- Creation of large master-planned developments with high-quality design and amenities,
- More dynamic mixed-use developments with a combination of housing, commercial and retail uses, and
- Better development opportunities for infill sites with challenging environmental and/or space constraints.

Summary of Proposed Ordinance Amendments
Based on feedback from the Development Committee, City Planning Commission, the Development Community, and research of PUD best practices in other communities, the following matrix outlines proposed changes to the City’s Planned Unit Development regulations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate existing PUD-Overlay and create two stand-alone PUD Zoning Districts:</td>
<td>• Eliminates underlying zoning with specific boundaries, which usually changes over time due to market conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PUD-One Phase (PUD-O) Zone District - For single use or mixed use development sites to be developed in one phase.</td>
<td>• Allow uses in all standard zoning districts to promote master planning of mixed use development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PUD-Multiple Phase Zone District (PUD-M) - For large master planned mixed-use sites to be developed in multiple phases.</td>
<td>• Use to achieve goals of special districts &amp; corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement 3-Step PUD Approval Process:</td>
<td>• Use to provide flexibility/relief from standards to encourage development of in-fill sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concept Review - Informal application to start discussion on design elements &amp; request for modifications.</td>
<td>• Provides a clear path from start to finish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PUD Master Plan/Preliminary Plan - Part of the rezoning application.</td>
<td>• Provides better up-front planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PUD Final Site Plan - For phases of the master planned development or single phased development.</td>
<td>• Sets expectations for the applicant &amp; City Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Require draft of development agreement/covenants with Concept application to start negotiations at City staff &amp; CPC stages of process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### For PUD Site Plan Revisions:
- **CPC Approval** - If code modifications/variances not needed & in accord with intent of original approval.
- **Staff Approval** - If changes are minor and code modifications/variances not needed.
- **Save 4 to 6 weeks in the approval process.**
- **Reduce the number of items on City Council agendas.**

### Anticipated Timeline for PUD Approvals:
- **PUD Approval** - Timeline for review & approval the same as a typical rezoning request (90 days).
- **Revised Plan Approval** - Timeline for review & approval, same as typical rezoning request (45 days).
- **No additional time for approvals to encourage the use of PUDs.**

### Enhancements vs. Modifications, Variances and/or Bonuses:
- Proposals to include a minimum number of enhancements to qualify for a PUD approval (see table below).
- **Clear expectation going into the process.**
- **Consistency in how applicants are treated.**
- **Assists staff, City Planning Commission & City Council in determining what’s being offered in terms of higher level of design.**
- **Sets the development standards for marketing purposes.**
- **Improved pedestrian access to & within developments.**
- **Higher level of design with more density, mixed uses & less parking.**
- **Allow for design exceptions for difficult in-fill sites.**
- **Protection of environmentally sensitive areas.**

### Potential Enhancements in Exchange for Bonuses & Variance/Modifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enhancements - Higher Level of Design</th>
<th>Modifications City Council Could Consider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Dedicated area(s) for open space, recreation areas, &amp; trails.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Maintenance agreement for open space, recreation areas, and trails.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Innovative storm water management design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Shared parking agreements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- LEED certified/energy efficient construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Parking lots to the rear or side of buildings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Covenants that restrict specific uses that would be detrimental to the development, surrounding area &amp; community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Preservation of environmentally sensitive &amp; natural areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Landscaping that exceeds minimum requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Density bonuses (1% increase in density for every .5% of overall parcel set aside for open space). Typical minimum open space requirement is 40% of overall parcel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reductions in setbacks, lot width, roadway/right-of-way width and parking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Next Steps and Timeline
In order to implement the proposed ordinances as soon as possible before the height of the
construction season, the following implementation schedule is proposed:
March 27th: Development Committee reviewed and recommended City staff proceed with
drafting ordinance amendment.
April 25th: City Planning Commission hearing and recommendation
May 14th: Motion setting a City Council public hearing
May 28th: Public hearing and three readings of the ordinance update

Background and Outreach
In April 2012 City staff presented information to the Development Committee on existing and
proposed PUD regulations and received feedback on what outcomes the updates should deliver.
The following issues and concerns were raised by the Committee:
- Develop a clear process to negotiate bonuses and/or variances from standards in exchange
for higher levels of design.
- Make the PUD process flexible and user friendly.
- Use PUDs to help achieve goals of special districts and corridors.
- Ensure pedestrian access to all commercial and mixed use developments.
- Encourage a higher level of design with more density and less parking.
- Use PUDs to master plan large areas and for individual sites.
- Use PUDs for infill sites to allow flexibility in standards tailored to individual site
constraints and character of surrounding area.

Staff presented a second PUD update at the Committee’s September 2012 meeting. The basic
outcome of that meeting was a recommendation to move forward with the following two types of
PUDs:
- PUD-1 Zone District for large master-planned mixed use sites to be developed in
multiple phases,
- PUD-2 Zone District for infill sites and/or smaller mixed-use developments to be
developed in a single phase.

In both of those districts, development bonuses would be awarded for projects that:
- Dedicate areas for open space, recreation areas and trails,
- Provide innovative storm water management design,
- Utilize shared parking agreements,
- Develop LEED certified buildings,
- Place parking lots out of view of main thoroughfares,
- Preserve environmentally sensitive areas,
- Build taller buildings, especially in the downtown and core areas, where appropriate.

Since September 2012, staff has sought input from members of the Development Community to
ensure that the proposed PUD process is clear, flexible and user friendly, as requested by the
Development Committee. Proposed changes were discussed with the Developer’s Council in late
2012. Following the Developer’s Council discussion, a group of development community
representatives began meeting regularly with staff to review and comment on drafts of the
regulations prior to final action by City Council. The updates being presented incorporate both
the interests of the Development Committee and the Development Community.

City staff is looking for comments and concerns regarding the proposed amendments and a
recommendation to forward to City Council.