Purpose of Development Committee:
To enable the City Council to discuss and evaluate in greater detail these specific issues that directly impact the physical, social, and economic vibrancy of the City of Cedar Rapids.

City Council Committee Members:
Council member Monica Vernon, Chair
Council member Pat Shey
Council member Susie Weinacht
- Mayor Ron Corbett is an ex-officio member of all Council Committees per City Charter Section 2.06.

Agenda:
- Approval of Minutes – June 17, 2015

- Recommendation Items:
  1. Cedar Lake
     Jennifer Pratt
     Community Development

- Informational Items:
  1. Main Street Update
     Jennifer Pruden
     Community Development
  2. 11th Avenue and 3rd Street Public Safety
     Matt Myers
     Traffic Engineering
  3. NewBo Parking Signage
     Jennifer Pratt
     Community Development
  4. Housing Access and Affordability
     Paula Mitchell/Anne Russett
     Community Development

- Public Comment
The meeting was brought to order at 4:08 p.m.

Present: Council members Vernon (Chair) and Weinacht. Staff members present: Jennifer Pratt, Community Development Director; Paula Mitchell, Housing and Redevelopment Manager; Kirsty Sanchez, Community Development Planner; Anne Russett, Community Development Planner; Seth Gunnerson, Community Development Planner; and Anne Kroll, Community Development Administrative Assistant.

Council members Weinacht and Vernon approved the minutes from May 20, 2015 with unanimous consent.

**Informational Items:**

1. **Housing Access and Affordability**
   Paula Mitchell, Housing and Redevelopment Manager, shared existing programs that the City has in place to support affordable housing.
   - Owner Occupied Rehab – 45 homes/year
   - Lead Hazard Control Grant – pre-1978 homes
   - First Time Homebuyer – 60 homebuyers/year
   - ROOTs – 800+ new homes through 2016
   - Multi-Family New Construction – 600+ new units
   - Matching funds for State incentive programs (LIHTC, Workforce Housing Tax Credit)

Anne Russett, Community Development Planner, shared some potential regulatory incentives.

A. **Housing Affordability**
   - Voluntary Policies:
     - Density bonuses: Allowance of increased densities for qualified, income-restricted projects.
     - Parking reductions: Allowance of reduced parking standards for qualified, income-restricted projects.
     - Incentives: Allowance of certain incentives for qualified, income-restricted projects, such as waivers or modifications to setbacks, building height, and lot size.

B. **Housing Choice**
   - Second Units:
     - Dwelling unit either attached to or located on the same lot as an existing single-family residence.
• Joint Live/Work Units:
  – Joint live and work units are a type of housing that consists of both living space and work space.
• Small Lot Subdivisions:
  – Division of land that creates smaller fee-simple, residential lots.
  – For the City of Cedar Rapids this means the allowance of a single-family lot that is less than 4,200 square feet.

C. Housing Access
• Reasonable Accommodations:
  – Policy and procedure for persons with disabilities to request reasonable accommodation from land use and zoning requirements when those requirements are a barrier to equal housing access.
  – Examples include:
    • Allowance of a wheelchair ramp within a side-yard setback
    • Relief from fence height restrictions to allow greater privacy and use of the outdoor space
    • Reduction in parking based on the number of residents who drive

Council member Vernon asked about the Lead Hazard Control Grant. Ms. Mitchell stated that the program provides assistance to homeowners to stabilize or fully abate the lead paint. In the entitlement programs, if the property is built before 1978, lead paint is assumed and all chipping and peeling paint issues are addressed. For the grant, there is a partnership with Linn County and they will send an assessor out to test the paint. Any exposed soil surfaces will be addressed also.

Council member Vernon spoke about the density bonus and some of the issues with people thinking density is negative. Increasing density is a good thing because it is going to show more people on the sidewalks and show more activity. Ms. Russett stated that height limits and maximum densities reduce the number of units, so the more units, less parking, and higher buildings help to make affordable housing projects financially feasible. Council member Vernon likes the idea of incentives for hiding parking underneath the building. Council member Weinacht stated that we need to be cognizant of the fact that density is seen as a negative. There was an issue in the Wellington Heights area that too much density has led to a public safety issue. Jennifer Pratt, Community Development, stated that Wellington Heights and the infrastructure were built for single-family housing. Density was built in a neighborhood that did not have the infrastructure to support it. The density bonus is good for a planned area to avoid the issues when a neighborhood is converted into a different use. Ms. Russett stated that in moving forward with any of these there will be coordination with neighborhood associations and property owners.

Council members Vernon and Weinacht both like the second units housing choice and think staff should look into that option.

For the joint live/work units, Ms. Russett added that the City allows this with the Home Occupation Permit, but this would be specifying that this type of housing would be allowed. Council member Vernon would like to see an incentive to get this type of housing going.

Council member Vernon is in favor of the small lot subdivisions and the affordable homeownership aspect.
Council member Weinacht spoke about having a housing development of tiny houses that are 500 square feet. Several groups have reached out about this type of housing. Council member Vernon asked that staff look up in the Building Code if 500 square feet is allowable.

2. DRTAC
Kirsty Sanchez, Community Development Planner, stated that there are four Overlay District and three of those are active. Those districts are Czech/Bohemia, Kingston Village, and the Ellis Boulevard Districts. Each of those districts has a committee that review building permits and site plans to provide recommendations on how the projects can better the character of the districts. The ordinance passed to make the MedQuarter Overlay District. Staff is working on a resolution establishing the composition of that committee. The Kingston and Ellis Overlay Districts have committee members appointed. The Czech/Bohemia District has been meeting since 2012 and has reviewed over fifty cases. They expressed an interest in updating the standards. The next step is to have an open house. After that, staff will make changes to the draft standards and present them to Development Committee and City Council.

Council member Weinacht asked about the make-up of the committees. Ms. Sanchez stated that there are different technical experts such as a licensed architect, an experienced developer in historical rehabilitation, or engineers and also stakeholders and property owners. Ms. Pratt stated that the MedQuater is different in that they have their own board; however there will be stakeholders included.

Council member Vernon asked if there are plans for signage for the entrance of the MedQuater. Ms. Sanchez stated that the MedQuater is working on that now. There will be four monument signs for the entrances of the District. Staff is working with Public Works for street signs with the MedQuater colors and logo.

Council member Vernon asked about parking signage in NewBo. Ms. Pratt stated that staff had a meeting with Park CR and Economic Alliance. Planners went out and looked at the area to find places for signage. Some strategies were worked out for signage including signs on overhead street lights. Staff will bring this item to the July Development Committee meeting. Council Member Vernon asked about a stop sign at 11th Avenue and 3rd Street. Ms. Pratt stated that Jen Winter is working on that and that staff will give an update at the July Development Committee meeting.

Council member Vernon would like to make sure that the Main Street Program is working with both the Czech Village and NewBo. Both of those neighborhoods are so important to Cedar Rapids and they need to be treated equally.

3. 3rd Street
Seth Gunnerson, Community Development Planner, shared an update of the 3rd Street Corridor. Actions to date:
• February 13, 2015 – Development Committee Update
• April 7, 2015 – Stakeholder Meeting
  – Review existing conditions
  – Ideas for 3rd Street
• May 13, 2015 – Stakeholder Meeting
  – Review ideas
  – Discuss next steps
Infrastructure and Streetscape Improvements
- Permanent Capital Improvement Projects
- Range from fixes to full-blown street reconstruction
- Funding from multiple sources

Next Steps:
- Gap Analysis
- Develop list of potential projects
- Prioritize for biggest impact and potential future budgeting:
  - Short-term (FY2017)
  - Longer Term

Street Activation Comments:
- Temporary use of the street
- Daily to seasonal displays
- Use by restaurants and retailers
- “Tactical Urbanism”
- Can be individual or group led projects

Next Steps:
- Process to allow use of street
  - “Sidewalk Toolkit”
- Facilitate discussion
- Encourage creativity

Council member Vernon stated that at MPO there was a discussion of glowing stones in the concrete. There will be a test on that this winter at Edgewood. That might be a great idea for 3rd Street. There also needs to be lights added to the gap area and they need to match the downtown side. Council member Vernon stated that these streets need to be developed with retail on the first floor of every building. Third Street should be the first street to do that. Ms. Pratt stated that this is an area that we can do next practices and taking it to the next level.

4. Highway 100 Update
Mr. Gunnerson stated that the first phase of the Highway 100 Extension is currently under construction and phase two will begin next year. This is a future growth area and there is a need to plan for future development. The Highway 100 Corridor Management Plan (CMP) is funded and developed by the Corridor MPO. The Plan is for future land use and necessary infrastructure. It will be compatible with EnvisionCR and other City plans and policies. The land use scenario that is going to be part of the Plan is called the hybrid scenario and it is based on public input. The public input was urbanism for commercial development and conservation focus in residential area. The Highway 100 CMP will provide costs and best practices recommendations for infrastructure needed to accommodate future growth.

Mr. Gunnerson stated that the next steps for the Highway 100 CMP are:
- July – Corridor MPO Policy Board adoption in
- August – Recommendation to adopt at Development Committee
- September – City Council adoption of Plan

Mr. Gunnerson stated that this is a plan that staff has worked on with Linn County and surrounding communities. The vast majority of the corridor is in an area that has been boxed in by annexation agreements with surrounding communities as the future of Cedar Rapids. There is not a lot of controversy over the final area.
Council members Weinacht and Vernon unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Anne Kroll, Administrative Assistant II
Community Development
To: City Council Development Committee  
From: Jennifer Pratt, Community Development and Planning Director  
Subject: Cedar Lake Public Engagement  
Date: July 15, 2015

Background:  
An active group of citizens have formed Friends of Cedar Lake to work toward creating community support to improve and protect Cedar Lake, the adjacent area, and its watershed by developing a plan to improve the lake’s water quality and enhance recreational opportunities.

On January 27, 2015, the City of Cedar Rapids entered into a Memorandum of Understanding to create the Cedar Lake Steering Committee. The other parties to the MOU are Friends of Cedar Lake, the Linn County Board of Supervisors, and Alliant Energy. The goal of the Committee is to develop a plan for future enhancement of Cedar Lake as an amenity for the community.

Update:  
The Cedar Lake Steering Committee has met every two to four weeks to explore options for additional recreational and development opportunities. Based on recent discussions with Environmental Protection Agency and Iowa Department of Natural Resource representatives, prior to obtaining environmental assessment and clean-up grants or determining long-term ownership issues, the community must address the fundamental question of “what is Cedar Lake?”

At the Cedar Lake Committee meeting on June 23, it was agreed that a community-wide outreach effort was needed to confirm the level of support and define the desired end-uses at Cedar Lake. City of Cedar Rapids representatives agreed to initiate this effort by preparing an outline for public engagement that can be reviewed by City Council consideration.

Recommendations:  
Begin the public engagement effort with the framework of the following:

- Current conditions and usage
- Parks & Recreation Master Plan
- Friends of Cedar Lake vision
- Storm water management issues
- Other possible uses?
Public Engagement Strategy:

July 15, 2015  Present draft Public Engagement strategy to the Cedar Rapids Development Committee for review and recommendation.

July 28, 2015  Cedar Rapids City Council consideration of resolution supporting the initiation of the Public Engagement strategy.

August/September  Friends of Cedar Lake completes their vision plan for Cedar Lake.

          Cedar Lake Steering Committee approves messaging and details for Public Engagement.

October  Conduct focus group discussions on end uses at Cedar Lake with groups such as the Moundview Neighborhood Association, Corridor Conservation Coalition, and adjacent property owners.

November  First Open House

December/January  Second Open House
To: City Council Development Committee  
From: Cari Pauli, P.E. through Matt Myers, P.E., City Traffic Engineer  
Subject: 3rd Street & 11th Avenue SE Intersection Review  
Date: July 8, 2015  

Background  
City Council requested review of the traffic control and safety accommodations at the intersection of 3rd Street and 11th Avenue SE. This intersection is located within the Czech Village/New Bohemia Main Street District. Since the 2008 flood, this area has been revitalized with the reestablishment of many restaurants, tourist destinations, and the addition of the NewBo City Market and other multiuse development. Currently, the annual average daily traffic (AADT) on 3rd Street SE is 5,000 vehicles per day. The AADT on 11th Avenue SE is about 600 vehicles per day. Future development is expected in the NewBo area which includes a multiuse building currently under construction on the northeast corner of the 3rd Street & 11th Avenue SE intersection as well as four more multiuse buildings proposed on the east side of the NewBo City Market, all of which will use 11th Avenue SE as one of the main accesses to the parking provided for these facilities. Additionally, row houses are currently under construction on 2nd Street SE directly west of this intersection. This development will likely increase vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic on this corridor.

The intersection of 3rd Street and 11th Avenue SE currently has two way stop control, stopping 11th Avenue SE for 3rd Street SE. The posted speed limit on 3rd Street SE is 25 mph and the posted speed limit on 11th Avenue SE is 25 mph. All four legs currently have one left/thru/right lane at their approaches to the intersection. The cross section of 3rd Street SE is 42 feet with two 9 foot parking lanes and two 12 foot travel lanes. Pedestrian crossings are located on both the north and south sides of the intersection with crossing widths of 32 feet. The pedestrian crossings are currently marked with transverse lines and include yield lines located 8 feet in advance of both crosswalks indicating the point at which vehicles must yield to pedestrians crossing the crosswalk. No pedestrian crossing signage is currently provided for either crosswalk.

Analysis  
An all-way stop warrant analysis utilizing conditions from the 2009 Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) was completed for the intersection of 3rd Street and 11th Avenue SE, which has traffic volume and crash history requirements for an all-way stop to be warranted. Turning movement volume counts were collected on Thursday, June 18, 2015 through Sunday, June 21, 2015. The intersection did not meet the volume requirement for the all-way stop warrant for the most heavily traveled of the four days the counts were collected.

The crash history condition of the warrant requires five or more reported crashes for the past 12 months which are correctable by the installation of an all-way stop. There were no reported...
crashes within the last 12 months; therefore, the crash history condition of the warrant is not met for this intersection.

The MUTCD specifies other criteria that may be considered with an engineering study to warrant installation of an all-way stop, including the need to control vehicle/pedestrian conflicts near locations that generate high pedestrian volumes and also a criterion for locations where road users, after stopping, cannot see conflicting traffic and are not able to negotiate the intersection unless conflicting cross traffic is also required to stop.

The existing configuration of the intersection with on-street parking provided along 3rd Street SE limits sight distance for vehicles stopped on 11th Avenue SE making a through or turn maneuver through the intersection. The existing sight distances along with the required sight distances as recommended by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) to make the corresponding maneuver through the intersection for a vehicle stopped on 11th Avenue SE at 15 feet back from the curb line are shown in Table 1 below:

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction on 11th Ave SE</th>
<th>Looking this direction on 3rd St SE</th>
<th>Existing Sight Distance</th>
<th>Required Sight Distance for corresponding maneuver from stop condition</th>
<th>Sufficient?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>129’</td>
<td>240’</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>136’</td>
<td>280’</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>139’</td>
<td>280’</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>129’</td>
<td>240’</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observations**

In order to obtain additional sight distance to maneuver through the intersection from a stop condition on 11th Avenue SE with vehicles parked on 3rd Street SE, vehicles are required to creep up into and beyond the unmarked crosswalks on both the east and west approaches of the intersection. This forces pedestrians to cross behind the stopped vehicle at the intersection, which can cause vehicle/pedestrian conflicts when motorists are turning off 3rd Street SE onto 11th Avenue SE and may not see the pedestrians crossing 11th Avenue SE. Additionally, motorists stopped on 11th Avenue SE are creeping up into the intersection trying to find an adequate gap to maneuver through the intersection and may not be alert of pedestrians waiting to cross 3rd Street SE who will likely use the same gap as the turning vehicles off 11th Avenue SE. This may result in additional vehicle/pedestrian conflict between the turning vehicles from 11th Avenue SE and the pedestrians crossing 3rd Street SE.

**Conclusions/Recommendations**

We recommend the installation of an all-way stop sign at this location for the following reasons:

- The planned future development will increase vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian volumes at this intersection.
- The all way stop will accommodate both vehicular and pedestrian movements by simplifying the number of cognitive factors e.g. gaps, and parked cars to consider at the intersection.
- Pavement markings will be changed to accommodate the new traffic control such as stop bars and crosswalk markings.
- The all way stop provides improved access for all modes during special events.
To: City Council Development Committee  
From: Jennifer Pratt, Community Development and Planning Director  
Subject: Lot 44 Signage  
Date: July 15, 2015

Background:
At the July 15, 2015 Development Committee Meeting staff will provide an update on efforts to increase the visibility of public parking available in NewBo west of 2nd Street SE (commonly referred to as Lot 44). At recent City Council meetings there has been discussion about the need to better advertise the availability of parking in Lot 44, and that parking is free on nights and weekends at the lot. Planned construction in NewBo, such as the Depot development, will affect the availability of existing parking in the district, increasing the need to highlight public parking available in Lot 44.

In May staff surveyed the area around Lot 44 and developed recommended locations for signage. Staff recommended signs to both direct drivers to the parking lot, and better signage at the entrances to the lot to inform drivers at a distance when the parking is free.

Staff met with ParkCR and the Economic Alliance in June to discuss the project. ParkCR has developed the attached concept plan for signs to be placed in and around Lot 44.

Timeline and Next Steps:
ParkCR has ordered entrance signs for the lot which will highlight free night and weekend parking. These will be installed in the coming weeks.

Staff is reviewing locations and mounting options for directional signs. Once approved the signs can be fabricated and installed within 30 days.
FREE PARKING TODAY
To: City Council Development Committee  
From: Anne Russett and Paula Mitchell through Jennifer Pratt, Community Development and Planning Director  
Subject: Housing Affordability & Accessibility  
Date: July 15, 2015

Background
At the Development Committee’s June 17, 2015 meeting, the Community Development staff gave a presentation on issues related to housing affordability and accessibility. The staff discussed existing financial programs and incentives and outlined issues related to housing affordability, choice, and access. Options identified regarding regulatory incentives included density bonuses, waivers and modifications to development standards, and parking reductions. Regarding housing choice, the staff discussed second units, joint live/work units, and small lot subdivisions. During this discussion, the Development Committee requested that the staff explore the concept of “tiny houses”.

Micro-Housing - Overview of Concept
Generally speaking, micro-housing refers to housing units that are smaller than conventional unit sizes. These are sometimes individual dwelling units complete with kitchens and bathrooms; however, examples exist that include living arrangements with separate bathrooms and sleeping quarters, but communal kitchens. Similar to small lot subdivisions and second units, micro-housing units not only provide another housing option, but also are more likely to be affordable. In terms of affordability, the rental/sale price and utility costs are often lower due to the smaller unit size. Micro-housing also has potential environmental benefits. They utilize less energy, less building materials, and potentially less land if located on vacant, urban lots.

Chapter 32 – Zoning outlines a minimum floor area of 660 square feet for dwelling units. In certain instances, the minimum may be reduced to 500 square feet through a variance. Other chapters of the Cedar Rapids municipal code, such as Chapter 33 – Building and Chapter 37 – Fire may also have existing regulations that inhibit the development of micro-housing. Specifically, multi-family, efficiency units proposed below 220 square feet will face challenges, as will multi-family units proposed without individual kitchens and bathrooms. Although there is no minimum size requirement for single-family in the building code, other regulations may affect the size of the unit. Also, units must have fixed foundations and permanent utilities. A comprehensive analysis of the City’s municipal code, as well as coordination with building and fire officials, is necessary in order to fully identify all of the regulatory issues.

Although further research is required on best practices, examples of micro-housing exist across the country mainly as one of many solutions needed to address issues with housing affordability. Micro-unit apartments can provide an affordable option to individuals interested in less space, but living in areas close to transit, cultural amenities, and good and services. In addition, some cities are exploring using micro-housing units as potential housing for the homeless.
Conclusion
At the meeting on July 15, the staff will provide a brief presentation outlining the concept of micro-housing and provide some examples from other jurisdictions. Furthermore, as part of the comprehensive update to the City’s zoning code, there may be an opportunity to further explore potential regulatory barriers, other local regulations, and best practices related to micro-housing. In addition, the City is in the process of updating its housing analysis and there may be an opportunity to explore the market demand for smaller housing units.