AGENDA
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Thursday, July 31, 2014 @ 3:00 PM
City Hall Council Chambers
101 First Street SE, Cedar Rapids, IA 52401

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

1. Case Name: 6340 Muirfield Drive SW (Rezoning)

   Consideration of a Rezoning from C-MU, Commercial Mixed Use Zone District to O-S, Office/Service Zone District as requested by Kids Inc. (Applicant) and Abode Construction Inc. (Titleholder)
   *Case No: RZNE-011223-2014; Case Manager: Vern Zakostelecky*

2. Case Name: 201 1st Street SE (Preliminary Site Development Plan)

   Consideration of a Preliminary Site Development Plan in a C-4, Central Business Zone District, as requested by Cedar Real Estate Group III, LLC (Applicant) and City of Cedar Rapids (Titleholder)
   *Case No: PSDP-011467-2014; Case Manager: Joe Mailander*

3. Case Name: 2015 J Street SW (Rezoning)

   Consideration of a Rezoning from R-3, Single Family Residence Zone District to R-3D, Two Family Residence Zone District as requested by Robert J. Burrell (Applicant/Titleholder)
   *Case No: RZNE-011471-2014; Case Manager: Vern Zakostelecky*
4. Case Name: 435 8th Avenue SW, 1238 10th Street NW, 1116 K Street SW and 809 E Avenue NW (Rezoning)

Consideration of a Rezoning from R-3, Single Family Residence Zone District, RMF-1, Multiple Family Residence Zone District and RMF-2, Multiple Family Residence Zone District to R-TN, Traditional Neighborhood Residence Zone District as requested by City of Cedar Rapids (Applicant) and City of Cedar Rapids and Michael and Lindsey Meier (Titleholders)

Case No: RZNE-011893-2014; Case Manager: Vern Zakostelecky

5. Case Name: 1016 2nd Street SW, 1100 K Street SW, 1104 K Street and 1108 K Street SW (Rezoning)

Consideration of a Rezoning from R-3, Single Family Residence Zone District to RMF-2, Multiple Family Residence Zone District as requested by City of Cedar Rapids (Applicant/Titleholder)

Case No: RZNE-011919-2014; Case Manager: Vern Zakostelecky

New Business

- Chapter 32 Update: Sandwich Board Signs
MINUTES OF
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Thursday, July 10, 2014 @ 3:00 p.m.

Cedar Rapids City Hall Council Chambers, 101 First Street SE

Members Present: Scott Overland, Chair
Jim Halverson, Vice – Chair
Carletta Knox-Seymour
Richard Pankey
Kim King

Members Absent: Virginia Wilts
Samantha Dahlby

DSD Staff: Joe Mailander, Manager
Vern Zakostelecky, Planner
Dave Houg, Plats & Zoning Conditions Coordinator

CD Staff: Seth Gunnerson, Planner
Jeff Hintz, Planner
Betty Sheets, Administrative Assistant

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m.

Opening statements were presented stating the protocol of the meeting and the purpose of the City Planning Commission.

Roll call was answered with five (5) Commissioners present.

Commissioner Overland called for any additions or corrections to the minutes. Commissioner Overland stated with no additions or corrections, the June 19, 2014 Minutes stand approved.

Commissioner Overland called for any additions or corrections to the agenda.

Commissioner Overland stated that for the record the applicants request for a communication tower was postponed to a future meeting until they had a chance to meet with the neighborhood. The City of Cedar Rapids through City staff is reviewing the communication tower regulations as it relates to FCC law and a review of that ordinance will be brought before the City Planning Commission in the future. Commissioner Overland stated with that correction, the agenda stands approved.
1. Case Name: 3215 Johnson Avenue NW (Conditional Use) – Postponed to future meeting

Consideration of a Conditional Use for a Communications Tower in a R-2, Single Family Residential Zone District and C-2, Community Commercial Zone District as requested by SBA Towers V, LLC (Applicant) and TSS Holdings LLC (Titleholder)

Case No: COND-010689-2014; Case Manager: Dave Houg

2. Case Name: 3300 1st Avenue NE (Conditional Use)

Consideration of a Conditional Use for an Outdoor Service Area in a C-3, Regional Commercial Zone District as requested by Gary Rozek (Applicant) and James and Alya Aossey (Titleholders)

Case No: COND-010919-2014; Case Manager: Dave Houg

Mr. Houg stated this was a request for an Outdoor Service Area in a C-3 zone district for the Starlite Room Tavern at 3300 1st Avenue NE. Mr. Houg presented general information about the site, an aerial photo, location/zoning map, Preliminary Development Site Plan, Patio layout, street view as well as recommended conditions. Mr. Houg stated that if approved by the City Planning Commission, the Board of Adjustments will consider the request at its meeting on July 14, 2014.

Commissioner Overland called for questions of Mr. Houg. No questions were presented.

Commissioner Overland called for a representative of the applicant.

Sam Aossey, 3833 Riverside Drive NE and Gary Rozek, 3460 Cottage Grove Avenue SE stated that Lt. Deeds had visited the site for police department inspection and had expressed no concerns. The patio has 4 surveillance cameras and will be fully staffed.

Commissioner Overland called for questions of the applicant.

Commissioner Knox-Seymour asked what some of the other conditions were. Mr. Aossey stated that there was a condition for a higher fence, however with a fully staffed patio area; this was not required by the Police Department. Mr. Houg stated that higher staffing levels equals less fencing requirements.

Commissioner Overland called for members of the public who wished to speak. No member of the public was present.

Commissioner Overland called for a motion. Commissioner Halverson made a motion to approve the Conditional Use for an Outdoor Service area in a C-3, Regional Commercial Zone District. Commissioner Pankey seconded the motion.

Commissioner Overland called for discussion on the motion. No further discussion was held.

Commissioner Overland called for a vote on the motion. The motion passed unanimously with none opposed.
3. **Case Name: 3325 Center Point Road NE (Conditional Use)**
   Consideration of a Conditional Use for an Outdoor Service Area in a C-2, Community Commercial Zone District as requested by Richard Baxter (Applicant) and Robert E. Himes (Titleholder)
   Case No: COND-010943-2014; Case Manager: Dave Houg

Mr. Houg stated this was a request for an Outdoor Service Area in a C-2 zone district at 3325 Center Point Road NE for the site of the former Londoner Restaurant. Mr. Houg presented general information, an aerial photo, location/zoning map, street view, site development plan as well as conditions. Mr. Houg stated that if approved by the City Planning Commission, the Board of Adjustments will consider the request at its meeting on July 14, 2014.

Commissioner Overland called for questions of Mr. Houg.

Commissioner Pankey asked if there would be access to the patio from the parking lot. Mr. Houg stated that the applicant will provide an emergency egress, but wasn’t sure if entrance could be made from outside. Commissioner Pankey asked if the only ingress would be from the inside of the restaurant. Mr. Zakostelecky stated the requirement is that the applicant provides full time staff. If full time staff is not available, the only ingress/egress would be from the inside of the restaurant.

Commissioner Overland called for a representative of the applicant.

Ryan Evans, 2452 Deborah Drive SW said he was adding two emergency exits to the outside service area. He has contacted Lt. Deeds for an inspection.

Commissioner Overland called for questions of the applicant. No questions were presented.

Commissioner Overland called for members of the public who wished to speak.

Dave Nunemaker, 7806 Council Street NE asked when the Outdoor Service Area was expected to open. Commissioner Overland stated that if the Board of Adjustments approved the request on July 14, 2014 it would move forward shortly after that.

Commissioner Overland called for a motion. Commissioner King made a motion to approve the Conditional Use for an Outdoor Service Area in a C-3, Regional Commercial Zone District. Commissioner Knox-Seymour seconded the motion.

Commissioner Overland called for discussion on the motion. No further discussion was held.

Commissioner Overland called for a vote on the motion. The motion passed unanimously with none opposed.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 PM

Respectfully Submitted, Betty Sheets
Administrative Assistant
Community Development and Planning
STAFF REPORT TO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Rezoning Without Preliminary Site Development Plan

CPC Date: July 31, 2014
To: City Planning Commission
From: Development Services Department

Applicant: Kids, Inc.
Titleholder: Abode Construction, Inc.
Case Number: RZNE-011223-2014
Location: 6340 Muirfield Drive SW
Request: Rezoning from C-MU, Commercial Mixed Use Zone District to O-S, Office/Service Zone District
Case Manager: Vern Zakostelecky, Development Services Department

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The property is currently undeveloped and is zoned C-MU, Commercial Mixed Use Zone District. Although daycares are allowed in the C-MU Zoning District there is also a requirement to development housing in this District. The applicant has no plan for developing housing, so the O-S Zoning is the most appropriate zoning for this use. Kids, Inc. has an existing facility at 5821 C Street SW, which it has out grown. The proposal would rezone the northern portion of the lot for the proposed daycare and the southern portion will remain C-MU be marketed for mixed use development. The Preliminary Site Development Plan submitted includes the following proposed improvements:

- Total site area-155,068 s. f. (3.56 ac.)
- Total proposed building area-15,000 s. f.
- Total paved area-26,239 s. f.
- Total parking-45 spaces including 2 handicap spaces.
- Fenced in playground area on north & east sides of proposed building.
- Landscape buffering on north end of lot adjoining residential use to north.
- Two access drives from Muirfield Drive SW.
- Privately owned & maintained storm water management area at south end of lot.

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: The request rezoning is not required to correct a technical mistake in the existing zoning regulations.

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

Staff Comments: An amendment to the Future Land Use Map in the Comprehensive Plan was adopted changing the Future Land Use from High Density Residential to Commercial when the property was zoned to the C-MU Zoning District. Since the proposed rezoning is considered a rezoning to a less intense district the request is in accord with the Future Land Use Map and the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan.

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

Staff Comments: The property is currently undeveloped, but under the current zoning was approved for a commercial strip center with apartments above the ground floor. To the south are two four-plex apartments. To the north is a single-family residence with multiple accessory buildings, which is part of a farmstead. To the east is a combination of multi-family and single-family residential developed by the property owner of the subject property. The proposed use will generate moderate traffic during peak traffic hours that should not have an adverse impact on the neighborhood. The City Traffic Engineering Department has no issues or concerns. The proposed development will be an amenity to the neighborhood as it will provide daycare for residents and businesses in the general area. The proposed use will also have less of a negative impact on the residential uses than the former proposed use, a commercial strip center and apartments. Staff has received call from the neighborhood regarding this application, but no one has voice objection to the proposed use.

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 permitted in the O-S 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: To the extent possible, the proposed use will be designed to meet the City’s required design standards with regard to building design, storm water management, landscaping and other site design elements. The building will be single story in height and will be located on the C Street side of the property. The proposed amendment will continue to protect the existing neighborhood from nearby development at heights and densities that are out of scale.

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 that is already served by sanitary sewer,
storm sewer, water, gas, electricity, police and fire protection, and roads and transportation facilities are in place. Development of this property will not have a negative impact on the levels of service to the existing development in the general area.

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

   *Staff Comments:* The proposed Site Development Plan is consistent with the previously approved Preliminary Plan for the property. In fact, the proposed development is an improvement, since the building will be a single story building opposed to the two story building with commercial uses previously approved.

**RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS:**

If the City Planning Commission recommends approval of the proposed rezoning use, adoption of the following conditions as recommended by City Departments should be considered. The City Planning Commission may approve with additional conditions.

1. Design guidelines and standards as specified in Subsection 32.05.030.C. shall be met or a variance must be obtained.
2. No fence exceeding a height of 3 feet above ground level shall be erected within a required front yard without obtaining a variance.
3. A required side buffer-yard shall be provided where adjacent to Residential zone districts or a variance must be obtained.
4. Parking areas shall be screened from the adjoining public streets or a variance must be obtained.
5. That all structures exceeding 10,000 S.F. of gross floor area shall provide at least 1 off-street loading berth or a variance must be obtained.
6. All lighting shall be of a type, design and placement, and also be shielded in a manner to minimize impact on residential properties or uses adjacent to or immediately across the street.
7. Enclosures and/or screening shall be provided for all HVAC, trash, recycling, cardboard, mechanical equipment, and grease and similar service or support containers as per Subsection 32.05.030.A.7. of the Zoning Ordinance. The location and design of each enclosure shall be shown on the Administrative Site Plan and shall be approved prior to issuance of structural building permits. Preliminary building permits for site preparation, installation of utilities, and foundations may be issued prior to approval of the enclosure.
8. The property shall be platted per provisions of the Iowa State Code and Chapter 31, the City Subdivision Regulations.
9. That the south driveway be a shared driveway with the undeveloped portion of this lot to the south and that when the south portion of this property develops or Muirfield Drive SW is connected to the north the driveway shall be relocated to align with Scarlet Sage Drive SW.
LOT 1, HIDDEN SPRINGS FIRST ADDITION IN THE CITY OF CEDAR RAPIDS, LINN COUNTY, IOWA.
SAID PARCEL CONTAINING 3.56 ACRES, SUBJECT TO EASEMENTS AND RESTRICTIONS OF RECORD.
STAFF REPORT TO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Preliminary Site Development Plan

CPC Date: July 2014
To: City Planning Commission
From: Development Services Department

Applicant: Cedar Real Estate Group III, LLC
Titleholder: City of Cedar Rapids
Case Number: PSDP-011467-2014
Location: 201 1st Street SE
Request: Preliminary Site Development approval for property zoned C-4, Central Business Zone District
Case Manager: Joe Mailander, Development Services Department

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The applicant is proposing the development of a new multi-story office building for CRST Center. The site is currently owned by the City and was the former site of the 1st Street Parking Ramp. The proposed building will be 12 stories and include a 4 level parking garage with 231 spaces, 8 stories of office space and commercial on the ground floor. The construction will also include a flood wall element and trail along the Cedar River side of the development.

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: There is no previously approved site plan for this site as it was developed with a City-owned parking ramp.

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

   Staff comments: The Preliminary Site Development Plan conforms to all applicable requirements of the City’s Zoning Ordinance and other applicable codes and regulations provided the conditions proposed by City staff are complied with.
RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS:

If the City Planning Commission recommends approval of the proposed Preliminary Site Development Plan, adoption of the following conditions as recommended by City Departments should be considered. The City Planning Commission may approve with additional conditions.

1. This site shall be developed in compliance with the provisions of the Flood Plain Management Ordinance.
2. No buildings or building overhangs shall encroach upon any portion of City ROW without obtaining appropriate City Council approval.
3. The property owner shall be responsible to submit to the City a signed Agreement for Private Storm Water Quality improvements on this site.
STAFF REPORT TO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Rezoning Without Preliminary Site Development Plan

CPC Date: July 31, 2014
To: City Planning Commission
From: Development Services Department

Applicant: Robert J. Burrell
Titleholder: Robert J. Burrell
Case Number: RZNE-011471-2014
Location: 2015 J Street SW
Request: Rezoning from R-3, Single Family Residence Zone District to R-3D, Two Family Residence Zone District
Case Manager: Vern Zakostelecky, Development Services Department

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The property is developed with a residential structure that was in the past used as a two-family dwelling unit. The property has not been used that way for over a period of one-year and has lost its legal non-conforming status. The applicant purchased the property under the assumption it could be used as a duplex, but in working with the Building Service Department on permits to remodel, found out the property could not be used as a duplex unless successfully rezoned. Since this is a rezoning to the R-3D Zoning District, a detailed site plan is not 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 to correct a mistake on the City Zoning Map. There are two dwelling unit on the property. Based on City Assessor’s information, the first unit was built in 1946 and then an attached unit was added in 1961. The Zoning Map mistakenly shows the property as R-3 when the correct zoning should be R-3D.

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

   *Staff Comments:* N/A.

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

   [Footnote: Further analysis on the surrounding area and any changes is presented here.]

[Continued on the next page...]

[Note: The document continues with further specifications and analysis relevant to the rezoning request.]
**Staff Comments:** The amendment is consistent with the surrounding neighborhood since there is a mix of single-family and duplexes in the general area.

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

   **Staff Comments:** The property has been identified as suitable for two-family residential.

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:** Not applicable since the structure is already in place.

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:** The parcel has access to all utilities and will not have a negative impact on the levels of services to existing development in the area.

**RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS:**

There are no City staff recommended conditions. City Planning Commission may approve with additional conditions if they recommend approval of the proposed rezoning.
STAFF REPORT TO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Rezoning Without Preliminary Site Development Plan

CPC Date: July 31, 2014
To: City Planning Commission
From: Development Services Department

Applicant: City of Cedar Rapids and Michael and Lindsey Meier
Titleholder: City of Cedar Rapids and Michael and Lindsey Meier
Case Number: RZNE-011893-2014
Location: 435 8th Avenue SW, 1238 10th Street NW, 1116 K Street SW and 809 E Avenue NW
Request: Rezoning from R-3, Single Family Residence Zone District, RMF-1 and RMF-2, Multiple Family Residence Zone District to R-TN, Traditional Neighborhood Residence Zone District
Case Manager: Vern Zakostelecky, Development Services Department

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

This is another round of properties brought before the City Planning Commission for rezoning. The property at 809 E Avenue NW is privately owned, but needs to be rezoned for the owner to close on the house. The house is developed as part of the ROOTs Program. The other 3 lots are City-owned and will be developed with single-family homes. These properties are being requested for rezoning to R-TN, Residential Traditional Neighborhood Zone District, in order to remove technical barriers to redevelopment.

It is anticipated that these properties will be developed as part of the City’s ROOTs Program. The Administrative Plan directed by City Council limited the program to infill within the Neighborhood Revitalization Area, the area outside the Construction/Study Area and Greenway as well as the 100-year floodplain. In addition, the City would utilize lots that are being acquired through the Voluntary Acquisition Program and provide those to developers at no cost in exchange for consideration of the reinvestment of new housing.

Rezoning:
The 4 properties being brought forward by a City-initiated rezoning are in areas of residential redevelopment identified through the Neighborhood Planning Process. These properties are zoned R-3, RMF-1 and RMF-2. As is the case with nearly all of the lots, the current zoning classification is not an appropriate match for the size and square footage of the lots making them legal non-conforming lots. The rezoning to the R-TN Zoning District will allow new housing to blend into the neighborhood context in terms of meeting setbacks of the neighborhood. In addition, it is important that there are no issues, such as the need for variances in current zoning or being legal non-conforming lots, which might create financing issues with lenders, future buyers or with homeowners.
insurance. The rezoning of the lots were established prior to the City’s adoption of the R-TN Zoning District, which was used in the Oakhill/Jackson Neighborhood as part of the City’s Housing and Neighborhood Development (HAND) Program. In mimicking the results that were achieved through the HAND Project, staff is initiating rezoning on all City-owned lots to the R-TN Zoning District prior to deeding of the properties to the identified developers for in-fill construction of new flood replacement housing. The attached map provided an overview of where the properties are located that are proposed for rezoning.

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:** The R-TN Zoning classification was created as part of the 2006 Cedar Rapids Zoning Ordinance to allow for greater flexibility in infill development on smaller parcels within the core of Cedar Rapids. The lots proposed for rezoning was previously developed with a single-family home which was legal, non-conforming in nature due to changed zoning standards over the years. This rezoning is proposed to make the lot developable without requiring a variance.

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

   **Staff Comments:** The rezoning is consistent with the Future Land Use Map and the 2009 Neighborhood Planning Process guidelines for post-flood redevelopment.

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

   **Staff Comments:** The proposed ROOTs homes are consistent with the type of housing currently located in these neighborhoods.

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

   **Staff Comments:** The properties have been identified as suitable for single-family home development.

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:** City staff believes the development of these lots will be in line with the historical size and scale of housing in the neighborhoods.

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:** No issues have been raised by City staff about providing services since the parcel has been previously developed.

No recommended City staff conditions.
SFNC Round 4 - Rezoning

Single Family Parcels to be Rezoned  Construction/Study Area  Greenway
STAFF REPORT TO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Rezoning Without Preliminary Site Development Plan

CPC Date: July 31, 2014
To: City Planning Commission
From: Development Services Department

Applicant: City of Cedar Rapids
Titleholder: City of Cedar Rapids
Case Number: RZNE-011919-2014
Location: 1016 2nd Street SW, 1100 K Street SW, 1104 K Street and 1108 K Street
Request: Rezoning from R-3, Single Family Residence Zone District to RMF-2, Multiple Family Residence Zone District
Case Manager: Vern Zakostelecky, Development Services Department

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

This is another round of City-owned properties brought before the City Planning Commission for rezoning. These properties are being requested for rezoning to RMF-2, Multiple Family Residence Zone District, in order to redevelop the parcels with a 5-unit townhouse structure.

It is anticipated that these properties will be combined and developed as part of the City’s ROOTs Program. The Administrative Plan directed by City Council limited the program to infill within the Neighborhood Revitalization Area, the area outside the Construction/Study Area and Greenway as well as the 100-year floodplain. In addition, the City would utilize lots that are being acquired through the Voluntary Acquisition Program and provide those to developers at no cost and in exchange for consideration of the reinvestment of new housing.

Rezoning:
The 4 properties being brought forward by a City-initiated rezoning are in areas of residential redevelopment identified through the Neighborhood Planning Process. These properties are zoned R-3. The current zoning classification is not an appropriate match for the size, square footage, and number of unit for the lots. The rezoning to the RMF-2 Zoning District will allow new townhome housing in the neighborhood. The attached map provided an overview of where the properties are located that are proposed for rezoning.

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:*
   
The request rezoning is not required to correct a technical mistake in the existing zoning regulations.

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

   *Staff Comments:*
   
The RMF-2 Zoning allow for multi-family housing and infill development on smaller parcels within the core of Cedar Rapids. The lots proposed for rezoning were previously developed with a single-family home. This rezoning is proposed to allow for a 5-unit townhouse structure at approximately the same height and density as the property in the surrounding neighborhood. The rezoning is consistent with the Future Land Use Map and the 2009 Neighborhood Planning Process guidelines for post-flood redevelopment.

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

   *Staff Comments:*
   
The proposed ROOTs townhomes are consistent with the housing density and height currently located in these neighborhoods. It should also be noted that the property is in the fringe of the residential housing in this area and located next to non-residential uses to the north and northeast. The proposed development will somewhat provide a buffer between these uses and the existing residential in the neighborhood.

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

   *Staff Comments:*
   
The properties have been identified as suitable for multi-family home development.

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:*
   
   Although the proposed development is attached housing, City staff believes the development of these lots will be in line with density, height and historical look of the housing in the neighborhoods. As is encouraged in the Comprehensive Plan and the Neighborhood Planning Process, this proposed development will provide a new housing choice in 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:*
   
   No issues have been raised by City staff about providing services since the parcels have been previously developed.
RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS:

If the City Planning Commission recommends approval of the proposed rezoning use, adoption of the following conditions as recommended by City Departments should be considered. The City Planning Commission may approve with additional conditions.

1. That future development under this rezoning action shall be subject to the PSDP 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.
2. Design guidelines and standards as specified in Subsection 32.05.030.C. shall be met or a variance must be obtained.
To: City Planning Commission  
From: Seth Gunnerson, Planner  
Subject: Chapter 32 Update: Sandwich Boards  
Date: July 31, 2014

**Sandwich Board (or A-Frame) Signs**

**Background**
The Sign Code within the Zoning Ordinance permits small portable A-frame signs, commonly called sandwich board signs, within the Downtown SSMID district. Staff has been made aware that several businesses in other core area neighborhoods, such as New Bohemia and Czech Village, have been placing these signs in front of their businesses.

Staff believes that these signs are appropriate in other core neighborhoods which are pedestrian in nature. When researching current permitting practices, staff has discovered that many signs located within the Downtown SSMID have not been issued a permit. Businesses are generally not aware of the requirements and place the signs outside their businesses believing it is permitted.

Staff is concerned that the current standards are difficult to enforce and that enforcing the current standards may discourage businesses from placing these signs outside. Staff also wants to develop a set of standards to educate businesses about appropriate placement.

**Recommendations:**
The following ordinance was recommended by the Development Committee on June 30th:

- **Eliminate permit requirement for Sandwich Board signs.** The City would no longer require an application and encroachment permit process for the placement of sandwich board signage.

- **Develop Placement Criteria.** The ordinance would be amended to establish criteria for the placement of sandwich board signs. Criteria would include maintaining a six foot clear space in the public sidewalk and not creating a traffic hazard. The City will work to educate businesses about where permissible locations are and notify the business if a violation is found.

- **Expand area where allowed.** Staff recommends expanding the area where sandwich boards are allowed to the identified “core” of the community. Sandwich board signs would be within 10 feet of the entrance to the business.

**Timeline and next steps**
Staff anticipates a Public Hearing on the proposed ordinance at City Council on August 26.