AGENDA
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Thursday, April 9, 2015 @ 3:00 PM
City Hall Council Chambers
101 First Street SE, Cedar Rapids, IA 52401

Call Meeting to Order

Roll Call

A. Approval of the Minutes

B. Adoption of the Agenda

C. Action Items

1. Case Name: 203 16th Avenue SE (Conditional Use)
   Consideration of a Conditional Use for Outdoor Service Area in a C-3, Regional Commercial Zone District as requested by Kick Stand Pub & Grub (Applicant) and West Side Wolf Pack II LLC (Titleholder)
   Case No: COND-016240-2015; Case Manager: Dave Houg

2. Case Name: 2010 Sylvia Avenue NE (Conditional Use)
   Consideration of a Conditional Use for Outdoor Service Area in a C-3, Regional Commercial Zone District as requested by The Broken Spoke Restaurant (Applicant) and D & S Building Co (Titleholder)
   Case No: COND-016503-2015; Case Manager: Dave Houg

3. Case Name: Northtowne Market First Addition (Preliminary Plat)
   Consideration of a Major Preliminary Plat in a PUD-1, Planned Unit Development One Zone District at 1103 and 1201 Blairs Ferry Road NE as requested by Hunter Companies, LLC (Applicant/Titleholder)
   Case No: PRPT-016433-2015; Case Manager: Vern Zakostelecky
4. **Case Name: 8005 C Avenue NE (Extension)**

   Consideration of a request to extend the expiration date of May 3, 2015 until May 3, 2016 for the approved Preliminary Site Development Plan for the proposed Hy-Vee Store west of C Avenue NE, south of East Main Street and north of Sheffield Drive NE requested by Hy-Vee, Inc.  
   **Case No: PSDP-016997-2015; Case Manager: Vern Zakostelecky**

D. **New Business**

1. Consideration regarding conformity of the proposed Amendment No. 2 to the Council Street Urban Renewal Area Plan with the City’s Comprehensive Plan
2. Consideration regarding conformity of the proposed Amendment No. 4 to the Southwest Consolidated Urban Renewal Area Plan with the City’s Comprehensive Plan
3. Consideration regarding conformity of the proposed Amendment No. 2 to the Village Urban Renewal Area Plan with the City’s Comprehensive Plan
4. Consideration regarding conformity of the proposed Amendment No. 4 to the Technology Park Urban Renewal Area Plan with the City’s Comprehensive Plan
5. Consideration regarding conformity of the proposed Amendment No. 2 to the Rockwell Collins Urban Renewal Area Plan with the City’s Comprehensive Plan
6. Consideration regarding conformity of the proposed Amendment No. 6 to the Consolidated Central Urban Renewal Area Plan with the City’s Comprehensive Plan
7. Consideration regarding conformity of the proposed Amendment No. 3 to the Central Urban Renewal Area Plan with the City’s Comprehensive Plan  
   **Planner: Kirsty Sanchez**

8. Consideration of an Ordinance to establish a Design Review Overlay District for the MedQuarter Self-Supporting Municipal Improvement District (SSMID)  
   **Planner: Seth Gunnerson**
Call Meeting to Order

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

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

Approval of the Minutes

Commissioner Overland called for any additions or corrections to the minutes. Commissioner Overland stated with no additions or corrections, the February 26, 2015 Minutes stand approved.
Adoption of the Agenda

Commissioner Overland called for any additions or corrections to the agenda. Commissioner Overland stated with no additions or corrections, the agenda stands approved. Commissioner Overland stated that due to a conflicting meeting for Planner Sanchez, the New Business item would be presented first.

New Business

a. Consideration of a proposed Amendment No. 3 to the Amended and Restated Urban Renewal Plan for the Consolidated Technology Park Urban Renewal Area (Kirsty Sanchez). CIP/DID #OB615106

Ms. Sanchez stated the City Council has initiated proceedings to consider the expansion of the Consolidated Technology Park Urban Renewal Area Plan. The proposed Urban Renewal Area is generally located southeast of the intersection of Interstate 380 and U.S. Highway 30 in the City of Cedar Rapids. This district is intended to stimulate private investment through planning and providing sufficient land for new and expanding private development and to achieve a well-balanced diversified economy. The proposed Amendment will allow the City to 1) grade, install sidewalk, and install sidewalk ramps along Kirkwood Boulevard in front of Kirkwood Community College; and 2) address current and future traffic congestion near Prairie Point Middle School by evaluating roadway needs as well as providing road reconstruction, sidewalks, culvert extensions, pedestrian signals, and possibly signalized intersections or roundabouts at the school entrances.

The State Code of Iowa requires that prior to City Council adoption of an Urban Renewal Area, the Urban Renewal Plan be referred to the City Planning Commission for review and recommendation “as to its conformity with the general plan for the development of the municipality as a whole.”

The action requested from Planning Commission at this time is to make a finding regarding the consistency of the proposed Amendment No. 3 to the Consolidated Technology Park Urban Renewal Plan with the Comprehensive Plan. In addition to City Planning Commission review, the City consulted with affected taxing agencies on March 18, 2015. All comments received will be presented to City Council for consideration during the public hearing scheduled for March 24, 2015.

Commissioner Overland called for questions of Ms. Sanchez. No questions were presented.

Commissioner Overland called for members of the public who wished to speak. No members of the public were present on this item.

Commissioner Overland called for a motion. Commissioner Blank made a motion to approve the rezoning from I-1, Light Industrial Zone District to C-2, Community Commercial Zone District. Commissioner Pankey seconded the motion.

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

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

1. Case Name: 400 12th Avenue SE (Preliminary Site Development Plan)

   Consideration of a Preliminary Site Development Plan in a C-3, Regional Commercial Zone District as requested by Depot Development Group, LLC (Applicant) and City of Cedar Rapids (Titleholder)

   Case No: PSDP-016101-2015; Case Manager: Chris Strecker

   Mr. Strecker stated the property is currently undeveloped and contains several vacant parcels. The applicant, Depot Development Group, LLC is applying for Preliminary Site Development Plan approval to allow development of a four building mixed use development including commercial, office, and residential uses. The property, which was a brownfield clean-up site is owned by the City of Cedar Rapids. City Council solicited proposals for redevelopment of this in-fill site and Depot Development Group, LLC was chosen as the preferred developer. The property is in the Czech-Bohemia (CB-O) Overlay District and design elements have been reviewed by the Districts Design Review Technical Advisory Committee (DRTAC). The applicant has also submitted a Major Preliminary Plat. The proposed plat will provide for future development of commercial, office, and residential uses.

   The proposed uses and development are consistent with the intent and purposes of EnvisionCR, the Comprehensive Plan and the Czech-Bohemia (CB-O) Overlay District. The proposed development area is shown as “Urban High Intensity” on the Future Land Use Map in the Comprehensive Plan. Based on the contemplated uses the request is in accord with the FLUM and the City’s Comprehensive Plan. The development will also comply with all other applicable codes, regulations and approvals. Mr. Strecker provided a Location Map, Aerial Photo, Preliminary Plat, Preliminary Site Development Plan as well as Renderings of the site.

   Commissioner Overland called for questions of Mr. Strecker.

   Commissioner Dahlby asked what criteria made this “Urban High Intensity”? Mr. Zakostelecky stated that since this is truly a mixed use development where people can live, work and play so to speak it is hard to meet the units per acre.

   Commissioner Knox-Seymour asked who some of the retailer that would be there. Mr. Zakostelecky stated that question would have to be answered by the developer.

   Commissioner Blank asked what the target demographics for the apartments and the price point would be. Mr. Zakostelecky again stated that would be a question best answered by the developer.

   Commissioner Overland called for a representative of the applicant.

   Chad Pelley, Ahmann Companies, 1641 Boyson Square Drive, Hiawatha

   Commissioner Overland called for questions of the applicant.

   Mr. Pelley stated that they were working with two large office users and a business that would own, operate and live in the five story building. The types of retail will be such uses as
restaurants and retail sales. The retail is not in high demand at this time and mostly office users are interested in the area. The condo demographics are higher end and the remaining will be market rate. The construction quality will drive that rate.

Commissioner Dahlby asked if there was street access. Mr. Pelley stated that the buildings will be along 12th Avenue and there will be access on 12th Avenue, 11th Avenue SE and 10th Avenue SE. The triangular parcel will be for Horizons to do urban gardening and the produce will be sold at the market.

Commissioner Dahlby asked if the parking lot would be permeable. Mr. Pelley stated the ground water is high in this area, so permeable paving is not being considered.

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

Commissioner Overland called for a motion. Commissioner Blank made a motion to approve the Preliminary Site Development Plan 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.

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

2. Case Name: The Depot at Newbo Village First Addition (Preliminary Plat)

   Consideration of a Major Preliminary Plat for The Depot at Newbo Village First Addition at 400 12th Avenue SE in a C-3, Regional Commercial Zone District as requested by Depot Development Group, LLC (Applicant) and City of Cedar Rapids (Titleholder)
   
   Case No: PRPT-016102-2015; Case Manager: Vern Strecker

   Commissioner Overland called for a motion. Commissioner Dahlby made a motion to approve the Preliminary Plat in a C-3, Regional Commercial Zone District. Commissioner Blank seconded the motion.

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

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

3. Case Name: 5945 Rockwell Drive NE (Rezoning)

   Consideration of a Rezoning from O-S, Office/Service Zone District to C-2, Community Commercial Zone District as requested by Gerald R. Eganhouse and Gene E. Meger (Applicants/Titleholders)
   
   Case No: RZNE-016103-2015; Case Manager: Vern Zakostelecky

   Mr. Zakostelecky stated this is a request to rezone a vacant platted lot from office to commercial. Originally when the Target Super Store was built this lot was zoned O-S to provide a transition in zoning and use from the Target Store development to the west and the single-family residential development to the east. Recently the lot to the east of Rockwell Drive NE was
rezoned and developed with an office building. The property owners have been unable to market
the parcel for office. With the new office building between this parcel and the existing residential
development to the east there would be a buffer for the neighborhood should this lot be
developed commercial. Mr. Zakostelecky presented a Location Map, Aerial Photo, Zoning Map
and Street View.

Commissioner Overland called for questions of Mr. Zakostelecky.

Commissioner Dahlby asked if the direct access would be through the existing bank drive or a
new access. Mr. Zakostelecky stated that it would be a new drive and hopefully align with the
one across from the property.

Commissioner Overland asked if the existing berm landscaping that was there would be left
there. Mr. Zakostelecky stated that they would encourage the landscaping to be left there.

Commissioner Overland called for a representative of the applicant.

Doug Laird, Skogman Real Estate

Commissioner Overland called for questions of the applicant.

Mr. Laird stated that the applicant planned to leave the berm there except where the driveway
would have to go.

Commissioner Blank asked what kind of business would go there. Could there be a McDonald
there. Mr. Zakostelecky stated that it probably would not be a fast food restaurant but perhaps a
set down restaurant. Mr. Laird stated that it would probably be a neighborhood retail strip.

Commissioner Knox-Seymour asked if there was any opposition from neighbors. Mr. Laird
stated that he had not heard of any opposition.

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

Commissioner Overland called for a motion. Commissioner Knox-Seymour made a motion to
approve the rezoning from O-S, Office/Service Zone District to C-2, Community Commercial
Zone District. Commissioner Pankey seconded the motion.

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

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

4. Case Name: 818, 820 and 822 A Avenue NW (Rezoning)

Consideration of a Rezoning from RMF-1, Multiple Family Residence Zone District to I-1,
Light Industrial Zone District as requested by James M and Joan E. Hale, Jakobsen
Enterprises LLC and Edward E. and Barbara J. Holmes (Applicants/Titleholders)
Case No: RZNE-016138-2015; Case Manager: Dave Houg
Mr. Zakostelecky reported on behalf of Dave Houg and stated this is a request to rezone 3 residential properties to the I-1 Light Industrial Zone District to allow for future redevelopment. The property is currently zoned RMF-1, Multiple Family Residence Zone District and the proposal is to remove the structures in anticipation of future light industrial use. The property is identified as “Urban Medium-Intensity” on the City’s Future Land Use Map in EnvisionCR, the City’s Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Zakostelecky presented a Location Map and suggested that the property when cleared could possibly end up being light industrial type building and use. A Preliminary Site Plan will have to be brought back to the Planning Commission when something is proposed for the site.

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

Commissioner Dahlby stated under Section C in the staff report where it says Commercial Uses should have direct access to Arterial Street which is two blocks is interpreted as direct. Mr. Zakostelecky stated that 1st Avenue is two blocks away and whatever goes in their will not have a lot of traffic.

Commissioner Overland called for a representative of the applicant.

Kevin Kennedy, 4737 Mt Vernon Road SE said that the houses have been setting empty for several years and vandalized, not the most eye appealing area and try to rezone to put something else there eventually.

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

Commissioner Knox-Seymour asked if the removal of the buildings would happen as soon as possible. Mr. Kennedy said that they would be removed as soon as all the contracts to purchase were finalized.

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

Commissioner Overland called for a motion. Commissioner Knox-Seymour made a motion to approve the rezoning from RMF-1, Multiple Family Residence Zone District to I-1, Light Industrial Zone District to I-1, Light Industrial Zone District. Commissioner Blank seconded the motion.

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

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

5. Case Name: 931 Blairs Ferry Road NE (Rezoning)

Consideration of a Rezoning from I-1, Light Industrial Zone District to C-3, Regional Commercial Zone District as requested by Water Rock LLC (Applicants/Titleholders) Case No: RZNE-016174-2015; Case Manager: Dave Houg

Mr. Zakostelecky reported on behalf of Dave Houg and stated this is a request to rezone 7.56 acres to the C-3 Zoning District to allow the property to be re-developed commercially. The property is currently zoned I-1 and the proposed re-development plan is to allow a mix of
commercial and office/service uses. The property is identified as “Commercial” on the City’s Future Land Use Map in EnvisionCR, the City’s Comprehensive Plan. The land has been utilized as a warehouse/storage facility. The proposed uses will be a mix of retail and office space. The proposed development includes 281 on-site parking spaces. Mr. Zakostelecky presented a Location Map, Zoning Map, Site Development Plan, Schematic Site Plan and Renderings.

Commissioner Overland called for questions of Mr. Zakostelecky.

Commissioner Knox-Seymour asked for clarification regarding that transit was a high priority. Mr. Zakostelecky stated that this is on a bus route and on a proposed trail route and conducive to this project.

Commissioner Blank asked about the trail route if this could be placed as a condition because it is a continuation of the trail. Mr. Zakostelecky stated that they wanted to be a little flexible to achieve the goal of the trail and everyone is in agreement that the trail should be there.

Commissioner Dahlby asked what the width of the sidewalk on the Rockwell Drive side. Mr. Zakostelecky stated it is 6 feet wide. Commissioner Dahlby asked if an access could be provided other than the sidewalk.

Commissioner Dahlby asked about 2a “the development should include public or assembly space” but it is not proposed for this development, is that a negative that we should be looking at. Mr. Zakostelecky said from staff’s perspective the applicant should be providing a space for a patio area and bike racks.

Commissioner Overland called for a representative of the applicant.

Jacob Hahn, Anderson-Bogert Engineers, 790 11th Street Marion, Iowa stated that to address the public spaces his client would be able to provide patio area. At this time, retail will be on first floor and office on upper floors. Mr. Hahn also stated that they met with Rockwell and Linn County Trails earlier in the day and all parties seemed agreeable to the trail alignment.

Commissioner Overland called for questions of the applicant.

Commissioner Dahlby asked if they would be agreeable to access from the trail to the parking area. Mr. Hahn said yes.

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

Dennis and Mary Ream, 4217 Woods Mill Court, NE, have MD Ventures and are concerned that at the east end of the former railroad is a retention pond and a lot of water running in the pond and how the water will get from the parking to the retention pond. Who will maintain it? They had concerns regarding railroad tie wall to the west of them and worried about this wall deteriorating. Mr. Ream proposes to table this project until Water Rock has time to work out negotiations with Mr. Ream.

Commissioner Overland asked the applicant to return to answer the concerns.

Mr. Hahn stated that the storm run-off will be redirected to the detention basin on the east side of the property. The applicant will cut it down and put a swale in to direct stormwater runoff.
temporarily. The swale will be size sufficient enough to carry the 100 year stormwater flow. The basin will be privately owned and maintained to include the dry water basin and there will be monthly mowing maintenance.

Commissioner Pankey asked if installation of this detention basin will improve the water run off? Mr. Hahn said it definitely would. Especially for the Rockwell property to the south, the water would be redirected to the detention basin.

Mr. Hahn stated that the retaining wall could go away.

Commissioner Overland asked to explain the leased parking. Mr. Hahn said that he could not comment on that. Commissioner Overland it was out of the scope of the project.

Commissioner Overland asked if there was relocation of the sanitary sewer. Mr. Zakostelecky said the applicant is asking for City incentives to help develop this project. Discussions have happened to fund the relocation of the sewer.

It was recommended to approve subject to the applicant working with the adjoining property owner to the east. It can then be delayed with City Council, but gets them further down the road so they can get started on the project.

Commissioner Overland called for a motion. Commissioner Pankey made a motion to approve the rezoning from I-1, Light Industrial Zone District to C-3, Regional Commercial Zone District with the stipulation that the owner of the property work with Mr. Ream to come up with a solution that is palatable for both so that the project is not held up. Commissioner Dahlby seconded the motion.

Commissioner Overland called for discussion on the motion.

Commissioner Blank is concerned with the retaining wall and the sewer line to be moved. Mr. Zakostelecky said if the sewer is moved it is not moved off Mr. Reams property so there may be a disruption until the work is done but the disruption would be minimal. The retaining wall would be cut down and the details will be done with the next step of the project on how it is redeveloped.

Commissioner Knox-Seymour stated that Mr. Ream is well considered in all of this. Mr. Zakostelecky stated that we like to see everyone be a good neighbor. Tabling only allows people to stall and drag their feet rather than move forward.

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

The meeting adjourned at 4:10pm

Respectfully Submitted,

Betty Sheets, Administrative Assistant
Community Development
STAFF REPORT TO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Conditional Use with a Preliminary Site Development Plan

CPC Date: April 9, 2015
To: City Planning Commission
From: Development Services Department
Applicant: Kick Stand Pub & Grub
Titleholder: West Side Wolf Pack, L.L.C.
Location: 203 16th Avenue SE
Request: Conditional Use approval for an Outdoor Service Area in a C-3, Regional Commercial Zone District
Case Number: COND-016240-2015
Case Manager: Dave Houg, Development Services Department

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

This is to certify that Development Services staff has examined the petition of Jake Hayden from Kick Stand Pub & Grub requesting a Conditional Use approval for an “Outdoor Service Area” for property owned by West Side Wolf Pack, L.L.C. at 203 16th Avenue SE and zoned C-3, Regional Commercial Zone District.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

This project involves the remodeling of a former service station for the “Kick Stand Pub & Grub.” The 1959 building was known as the “Montague Brothers Service Station” and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Appellant requests approval for an outdoor service area where alcohol can be served.

The site plan submitted shows the following characteristics:

- Total area of building: 1,249 s. f.
- Total size of proposed outdoor service area: seating for 80
- Total parking required: no additional (lies within the Core Area)
- Total parking provided: 6 off-street spaces

After careful review, the staff has prepared the following findings in accord with Section 32.02.030.D. of the Zoning Ordinance:
FINDINGS:

Section 32.02.030.D.9 of the Zoning Ordinance requires the City Planning Commission to review the application based on the following criteria:

1. That the conditional use applied for is permitted in the district within which the property is located.

   Staff Comments: The conditional use as requested is permitted within the C-3, Regional Commercial Zone District.

2. That the proposed use and development will be consistent with the intent and purpose of this Ordinance and with the Future Land Use Policy Plan and other elements of the Comprehensive Plan.

   Staff Comments: This location lies within a commercially-zoned corridor. This Conditional Use request for an outdoor service area has little potential to be disruptive to adjacent properties. The proposed site plan conforms to regulations established in Chapter 32 of the Municipal Code and the goals and objectives of the Future Land Use Map in City’s Comprehensive Plan.

3. That the proposed use and development will not have a substantial adverse effect upon adjacent property, and the character of the neighborhood, traffic conditions, parking, utility and service facilities, and other factors affecting the public health, safety, and welfare.

   Staff Comments: This property is surrounded by commercial development. As such, Staff does not feel this development will have a negative effect on adjacent properties or the character of the neighborhood.

4. That the proposed development or use will be located, designed, constructed and operated in such a manner that it will be compatible with the immediate neighborhood and will not interfere with the orderly use, development and improvement of surrounding property.

   Staff Comments: The outdoor service area is not expected to interfere with the use, development or improvement of surrounding properties.

5. That adequate measures have been or will be taken to assure adequate access designed to minimize traffic congestion and to assure adequate service by essential public services and facilities including utilities, storm water drainage, and similar facilities.

   Staff Comments: All services are currently available to serve the lot. The addition of an outdoor service area is not expected to have any impact or burden on City services or traffic.

6. That the proposed building, development, or use will comply with any additional standards imposed on it by provisions of this Ordinance for the district in which the property is located.
Staff Comments: The proposed development will comply with all additional standards from the Ordinance.

7. Whether, and to what extent, all reasonable steps possible have been, or will be, taken to minimize any potential adverse effects on the surrounding property through building design, site design, landscaping, and screening.

Staff Comments: The applicant will be responsible for compliance with the conditions and will take necessary steps as required by the City Zoning Ordinance to minimize any potential adverse impacts.

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

Staff comments: This item is not applicable.

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

Staff comments: The site development plan conforms to all applicable requirements of this Ordinance.

If the Commission determines to recommend approval of the proposed conditional use, adoption of the following conditions as recommended by staff should be considered:

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS:

1. That this site shall be developed in compliance with the provisions of the Flood Plain Management Ordinance.
2. Review of this proposal is required by the Czech Bohemia Overlay District Design Review Technical Advisory Committee.
3. The current project is not complete, and fencing and a gate must still be installed. The gate must meet all Fire Department regulations related to entry/egress points. The gate shall be used only as an emergency entry/egress route unless the outdoor service area is staffed continually during normal business hours.
4. The outdoor service area must have fencing. The fencing requirements, for an area with limited staffing, must be of sufficient height to deter the passing of alcoholic beverages over the top of the fence. The fence must also be designed in such a manner as to prohibit the passing of alcoholic beverages through it. The fencing requirements, for an outdoor service area that is staffed full time during normal business hours, can vary some from the above requirements. For those outdoor service areas, a specific fence design must be submitted and it will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.
5. The Police Department shall re-inspect the outdoor service area prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.
6. The enclosure for the dumpster will need be a full screen enclosure including the gates and preferably designed using the same building material as the principal building as per Subsection 32.05.030.A.7. of the Zoning Ordinance. Please note that chain link with privacy slats does not satisfy this requirement.
7. Signage is not being reviewed at this time. Sign permit applications must be submitted and approved and permits obtained prior to erection of signage (Subsection 32.06.020 & 32.06.030 is the sign regulation in the Zoning Ordinance).
I hereby certify that the portion of this technical submission described below was prepared by me or under my direct supervision and responsible charge. I am a duly registered architect under the laws of the state of Iowa.

Robert W. Peck  
Date: 2.26.2014

Registration number: 05326
Pages or sheets covered by this seal: Adl.0, Adl.1 and Adl.2
Floor Plan

OUTDOOR SEATING 867 SQ. FT. @ 15 SQ. FT. PER PERSON = 58

Change Occupant Load: Portion of the Building Code Review

Occupant Load - Table A1 to read as follows:

- Bar: 15 sq. ft. per person
- Outdoor seating area: 15 sq. ft. per person
- Kitchen at 200 sq. ft. per person
- Total building occupancy: 60

314 SQ. FT. @ 15 SQ. FT. PER PERSON = 21

KITCHEN

300 SQ. FT. @ 300 SQ. FT. PER PERSON = 1

PATH OF EGRESS

344 SQ. FT. @ 15 SQ. FT. PER PERSON = 23

WOMEN'S

MEN'S

KICK STAND BAR

203 14th Ave. SE, Cedar Rapids, IA
STAFF REPORT TO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Conditional Use with a Preliminary Site Development Plan

CPC Date: April 9, 2015
To: City Planning Commission
From: Development Services Department
Applicant: The Broken Spoke
Titleholder: D & S Building Company
Location: 2010 Sylvia Avenue NE
Request: Conditional Use approval for an Outdoor Service Area in a C-3, Regional Commercial Zone District
Case Number: COND-016503-2015
Case Manager: Dave Houg, Development Services Department

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

This is to certify that Development Services staff has examined the petition of The Broken Spoke requesting a Conditional Use approval for an “Outdoor Service Area” for property owned by D & S Building Company at 2010 Sylvia Avenue NE and zoned C-3, Regional Commercial Zone District.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

A deck was added to the rear of the building last fall. Appellant is now requesting approval for the service of alcohol on this deck.

The site plan submitted shows the following characteristics:

- Total area of building: 11,244 s. f.
- Total size of proposed outdoor service area: seating for 49
- Total parking required: 70 off-street spaces
- Total parking provided: 64 spaces and a shared parking agreement (which allows a 25% reduction in overall parking)

After careful review, the staff has prepared the following findings in accord with Section 32.02.030.D. of the Zoning Ordinance:
FINDINGS:

Section 32.02.030.D.9 of the Zoning Ordinance requires the City Planning Commission to review the application based on the following criteria:

1. **That the conditional use applied for is permitted in the district within which the property is located.**

   *Staff Comments:* The conditional use as requested is permitted within the C-3, Regional Commercial District.

2. **That the proposed use and development will be consistent with the intent and purpose of this Ordinance and with the Future Land Use Policy Plan and other elements of the Comprehensive Plan.**

   *Staff Comments:* The proposed site plan conforms to regulations established in Chapter 32 of the Municipal Code and the goals and objectives of the Future Land Use Map in City’s Comprehensive Plan.

3. **That the proposed use and development will not have a substantial adverse effect upon adjacent property, and the character of the neighborhood, traffic conditions, parking, utility and service facilities, and other factors affecting the public health, safety, and welfare.**

   *Staff Comments:* The deck is situated behind the commercial structure and abuts a railroad right-of-way. Single-family dwellings are adjacent to the west of this site and screen fencing currently exists along the westerly lot line. This Conditional Use request for an outdoor service area has limited potential to be disruptive to adjacent properties. Additional parking spaces, if needed, are available on an adjacent lot.

4. **That the proposed development or use will be located, designed, constructed and operated in such a manner that it will be compatible with the immediate neighborhood and will not interfere with the orderly use, development and improvement of surrounding property.**

   *Staff Comments:* The isolated location of the outdoor service area is not expected to interfere with the use, development or improvement of surrounding properties.

5. **That adequate measures have been or will be taken to assure adequate access designed to minimize traffic congestion and to assure adequate service by essential public services and facilities including utilities, storm water drainage, and similar facilities.**

   *Staff Comments:* All services are currently available to serve the lot. The addition of an outdoor service area is not expected to have any impact or burden on City services or traffic.

6. **That the proposed building, development, or use will comply with any additional standards imposed on it by provisions of this Ordinance for the district in which the property is located.**
**Staff Comments:** The proposed development will comply with all additional standards from the Ordinance.

7. **Whether, and to what extent, all reasonable steps possible have been, or will be, taken to minimize any potential adverse effects on the surrounding property through building design, site design, landscaping, and screening.**

**Staff Comments:** The applicant will be responsible for compliance with the conditions and will take necessary steps as required by the City Zoning Ordinance to minimize any potential adverse impacts.

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

**Staff comments:** This item is not applicable.

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

**Staff comments:** The site development plan conforms to all applicable requirements of this Ordinance.

If the Commission determines to recommend approval of the proposed conditional use, adoption of the following conditions as recommended by staff should be considered:

**RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS:**

1. That the current project is not complete and fencing and a gate must still be installed. The gate must meet all Fire Department regulations related to entry/egress points. The gate shall be used only as an emergency entry/egress route unless the beer garden is staffed continually during normal business hours.
2. That the outdoor service area must have fencing. The fencing requirements, for an outdoor service area with limited staffing, must be of sufficient height to deter the passing of alcoholic beverages over the top of the fence. The fence must also be designed in such a manner as to prohibit the passing of alcoholic beverages through it. The fencing requirements, for an outdoor service area that is staffed full time during normal business hours, can vary some from the above requirements. For those outdoor service areas a specific fence design must be submitted and it will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.
3. That the Police Department shall re-inspect the outdoor service area PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF A CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY.
4. The enclosure for the dumpsters will need be a full screen enclosure including the gates and preferably designed using the same building material as the principal building as per Subsection 32.05.030.A.7. of the Zoning Ordinance. Please note that chain link with privacy slats does not satisfy this requirement.
5. Sign permit applications must be submitted and approved and permits obtained prior to erection of signage (Subsection 32.06.020 & 32.06.030 is the sign regulation in the Zoning Ordinance).
STAFF REPORT TO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Major Preliminary Plat

CPC Date: April 9, 2015
To: City Planning Commission
From: Development Services Department
Applicant: Hunter Companies, LLC
Titleholder: Hunter Companies, LLC
Plat Name: Northtowne Market First Addition
Location: 1103 and 1201 Blairs Ferry Road NE
Request: Consideration of a Major Preliminary Plat
Case Number: PRPT-016433-2015
Case Manager: Vern Zakostelecky

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The applicant, Hunter Companies, LLC is requesting approval of a Major Preliminary Plat for the former Nash Finch and Northwestern States Portland Cement facilities located at 1103 and 1201 Blairs Ferry Road NE respectively. The improvements on the site are in the process of being demolished and recycled for re-use. The property is currently zoned PUD-1, Planned Unit Development One Zone District. The proposal is to subdivide the property into 13 lots for future development of mixed use commercial/office spaces.

Since this project is still in the marketing phase there will most likely be changes to the proposed lot lines. These changes, if minor in nature would be dealt with at the time of final plat application.

The Preliminary Plat as submitted includes the following:

- Total site area is 24.59 acres.
- Total lots - 13.
- The easterly most lot will be an unbuildable lot.
- Existing green space - 4.43 acres, proposed - 5.11 acres.
- Accesses:
  - Three from Blairs Ferry Road NE
  - One from Council Street NE
  - Future access to Rockwell Drive NE
- Storm water management areas will be provided on a lot by lot basis.


FINDINGS:

The City Planning Commission shall review the application based on the following criteria:

1. **That the proposed use and development will be consistent with the intent and purposes of the Comprehensive Plan and other applicable codes and regulations.**

   Staff Comments: As part of the process and approval of the PUD-1 Zoning District a PUD “Master Plan” was approved by City Council. This Preliminary Plat is consistent with the “Master Plan” approved at the time of rezoning. The proposed use and development are consistent with the intent and purposes of the Comprehensive Plan. The development area is shown as “Urban High Intensity” on the Future Land Use Map in the City’s Comprehensive Plan. The proposed development is consistent with the goals and objective of the “Urban High Intensity” land use and will also comply with all other applicable codes, regulations and approvals.

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS:

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

1. All lots shall be provided frontage on an approved public or private street which is appropriately named.
2. That an agreement shall be recorded with the final plat providing for ownership, tax responsibility, maintenance, and liability for lettered lots.
3. **AS PART OF FINAL PLAT SUBMITTAL TO CITY COUNCIL,** the property owner shall be responsible to dedicate to the public additional street right-of-way along Blairs Ferry Road NE providing a minimum 50’ half width right-of-way for said street adjoining this site.
4. **AS PART OF FINAL PLAT SUBMITTAL TO CITY COUNCIL** the property owner shall be responsible to dedicate sanitary sewer easements for the existing sanitary sewer facilities located along the southern boundary of this site. The easement widths shall be based on the depth of the sewer facilities and as approved by the City.
5. The property owner is responsible to extend sanitary sewer to serve the development. If sewer extensions crossing private property are necessary to serve the subject property, as determined by the City, the property owner shall be responsible for the related costs including (but not limited to) planning and design of the sewer, acquisition of right-of-way and/or easements, construction, administration, inspection and other incidental costs.
6. The property owner is responsible to construct storm sewer facilities as required to service this site.
7. **PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF A FINAL CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY,** for the lot(s) through which overland conveyance of the 100-year storm event will occur, the property owner shall provide certification by a civil engineer licensed in the State of Iowa verifying the runoff from the 100-year storm event can be conveyed through the site without damage to building structures, OR, The property owner shall provide a certification by a Civil Engineer or Land Surveyor licensed in the State of Iowa the drainage way has been constructed in accordance with drainage plans approved by the City.
8. PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF A FINAL CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY, the property owner shall be responsible to construct concrete sidewalk along the public and private street frontages on and adjoining this site. The property owner shall construct the sidewalk improvements in accordance with City Standards and policy, ADA requirements, and improvement plans accepted by the City. The property owner may request deferral of the sidewalk installation requirement if in accordance with the sidewalk installation policy. If a deferral is requested, please submit a formal request with documentation verifying deferral eligibility (cross sections, drawings, etc.).

9. 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 Quality. The City shall provide a copy of the Agreement form upon request by the property owner.
CPC DATE: April 9, 2015
FROM: Development Services Department Report
TO: City Planning Commission
SUBJECT: Time Extension For Preliminary Site Development Plan
PREPARED BY: Vern Zakostelecky, City Zoning Administrator

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The Development Services Department received a request by Hall & Hall Engineers, Inc. on behalf of Hy-Vee, Inc. to extend the expiration date of the Preliminary Site Development Plan for the property located at 8005 C Avenue NE. The current Preliminary Site Development Plan was approved on May 2, 2012 by City Planning Commission Resolution No. CPC-92-050. The applicant requested a time extension in March of last year, which was granted by the City Planning Commission by Resolution No. CPC-PSDP-035-080 dated April 23, 2014. The Preliminary Site Development Plan is scheduled to expire on May 3, 2015.

Subsection 32.02.020.M2. of Chapter 32 of the City’s Municipal Code, the Zoning Ordinance allows for a request by the property owner to extend the expiration date by 1-year, provided the request is made prior to the Preliminary Site Development Plan approval expiring.

City staff has reviewed this time extension request and recommends approval subject to the conditions of the original Rezoning Ordinance No. 014-12 and the Preliminary Site Development Plan CPC Resolution No. CPC-92-050.

FINDINGS:

This is to certify that the request to extend the expiration date for the Preliminary Site Development Plan as requested by Hy-Vee, Inc. for property located at 8005 C Avenue NE, has been examined and when in accordance with any proposed staff conditions and any conditions deemed necessary by the City Planning Commission should be substantially in accord with the Zoning Ordinance of the City.
To: City Planning Commission  
From: Kirsty Sanchez, Community Development and Planning  
Subject: Consideration regarding conformity of the proposed Amendment No. 2 to the Council Street Urban Renewal Area Plan with the City’s Comprehensive Plan  
Date: April 9, 2015

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Based on recent TIF legislation, Amendment No. 2 to the Urban Renewal Plan for the Council Street Urban Renewal Area is necessary in order to fund new activities through tax increment revenues within the designated area. Specifically, this Amendment updates the Urban Renewal Plan to reflect:

- Removal of 1103 and 1201 Blairs Ferry Road NE from the Council Street Urban Renewal Area

The Council Street Urban Renewal area was established in 2003 to promote economic development in the City of Cedar Rapids by providing public and quasi-public improvements within a newly developing area of the community. The area is generally located east of the intersection of Interstate 380 and Highway 100 in the City of Cedar Rapids.

The State Code of Iowa requires that prior to City Council adoption of an amendment to an Urban Renewal Area, the Urban Renewal Plan be referred to the City Planning Commission for review and recommendation “as to its conformity with the general plan for the development of the municipality as a whole.”

The action requested from Planning Commission at this time is to make a finding regarding the consistency of the proposed Amendment No. 2 to the Urban Renewal Plan for the Council Street Urban Renewal Area with the Comprehensive Plan. In addition to City Planning Commission review, the City consulted with affected taxing agencies on April 7, 2015. All comments received will be presented to City Council for consideration during the public hearing scheduled for April 14, 2015.
AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO THE
URBAN RENEWAL PLAN FOR THE
COUNCIL STREET URBAN RENEWAL AREA

As Approved by City Council

Resolution No. ________

Community Development Department
City Hall
101 First Street SE
Cedar Rapids, IA 52401
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose and Background

The purpose and intent of this Amendment No. 2 to the Urban Renewal Plan for the Council Street Urban Renewal Area (the "Amendment") is to provide current information on such subjects as proposed projects, types of renewal activities and the disposition of property for the Council Street Urban Renewal Area.

This Amendment is intended to augment and update the Urban Renewal Plan for the Council Street Urban Renewal Area as indicated above. All provisions of the existing Urban Renewal Plan not directly impacted by this Amendment as adopted by the City Council shall remain in full force and effect.

1.2 Council Street Urban Renewal Plan Amendments

Section 11.0 of the Urban Renewal Plan for the Council Street Urban Renewal Area provides that the Urban Renewal Plan may be amended from time to time to include changes in the Urban Renewal Area, to add or change land use controls and regulations, to modify goals or types of renewal activities, or to amend property acquisition and disposition guidelines. The City Council may amend the Urban Renewal Plan by resolution after holding a public hearing on the proposed change in accordance with applicable Iowa law.

Amendment No. 2 to the Urban Renewal Plan for the Council Street Urban Renewal Area is consistent with this provision.

2.0 PROPOSED URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT ACTIVITIES

In accordance with recent amendments to Chapter 403 of the Code of Iowa, the Urban Renewal
Plan for the Council Street Urban Renewal Area is amended to add the following subsection 5.1, entitled "Proposed Urban Renewal Project Activities":

5.1 Proposed Urban Renewal Project Activities

The following urban renewal project activities have been undertaken:

Removal of 1103 and 1201 Blairs Ferry Road NE from the Council Street Urban Renewal Area

3.0 PROPERTY ACQUISITION/DISPOSITION

The City will follow any applicable requirements as set forth in the Urban Renewal Plan and pursuant to the Code of Iowa, as amended, for the acquisition and disposition of property.

4.0 EFFECTIVE DATE

This Amendment No. 2 to the Urban Renewal Plan for the Council Street Urban Renewal Area shall be deemed to be effective upon the adoption of a City Council Resolution approving the said amended Urban Renewal Plan. The Urban Renewal Plan, as so amended, shall remain in full force until amended or rescinded by the City Council.
To: City Planning Commission  
From: Kirsty Sanchez, Community Development and Planning  
Subject: Consideration regarding conformity of the proposed Amendment No. 4 to the Southwest Consolidated Urban Renewal Area Plan with the City’s Comprehensive Plan  
Date: April 9, 2015

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Based on recent TIF legislation, Amendment No. 4 to the Urban Renewal Plan for the Southwest Consolidated Urban Renewal Area is necessary in order to fund new activities through tax increment revenues within the designated area. Specifically, this Amendment updates the Urban Renewal Plan to reflect:

- Previously approved financial assistance to provide public improvements to a sanitary sewer that currently serves a large portion of the Urban Renewal Area

The Amended and Restated Southwest Urban Renewal area was established in 1997 and expanded in 2002 to combine three separate TIF districts, Southwest, Waconia, and the Airport Industrial Park No. 1. The district was created to facilitate new economic development and infrastructure installation. The area is generally located west of the intersection of Interstate 380 and Highway 30 in the City of Cedar Rapids.

The State Code of Iowa requires that prior to City Council adoption of an amendment to an Urban Renewal Area, the Urban Renewal Plan be referred to the City Planning Commission for review and recommendation “as to its conformity with the general plan for the development of the municipality as a whole.”

The action requested from Planning Commission at this time is to make a finding regarding the consistency of the proposed Amendment No. 4 to the Urban Renewal Plan for the Southwest Consolidated Urban Renewal Area with the Comprehensive Plan. In addition to City Planning Commission review, the City consulted with affected taxing agencies on April 7, 2015. All comments received will be presented to City Council for consideration during the public hearing scheduled for April 14, 2015.
AMENDMENT NO. 4 TO THE
URBAN RENEWAL PLAN FOR THE
SOUTHWEST CONSOLIDATED URBAN RENEWAL AREA

As Approved by City Council

Resolution No. ________

Community Development Department
City Hall
101 First Street SE
Cedar Rapids, IA 52401
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose and Background
The purpose and intent of this Amendment No. 4 to the Urban Renewal Plan for the Southwest Consolidated Urban Renewal Area (the "Amendment") is to provide current information on such subjects as proposed projects, types of renewal activities and the disposition of property for the Southwest Consolidated Urban Renewal Area.

This Amendment is intended to augment and update the Urban Renewal Plan for the Southwest Consolidated Urban Renewal Area as indicated above. All provisions of the existing Urban Renewal Plan not directly impacted by this Amendment as adopted by the City Council shall remain in full force and effect.

1.2 Southwest Consolidated Urban Renewal Plan Amendments
Section 11.0 of the Urban Renewal Plan for the Southwest Consolidated Urban Renewal Area provides that the Urban Renewal Plan may be amended from time to time to include changes in the Urban Renewal Area, to add or change land use controls and regulations, to modify goals or types of renewal activities, or to amend property acquisition and disposition guidelines. The City Council may amend the Urban Renewal Plan by resolution after holding a public hearing on the proposed change in accordance with applicable Iowa law.

Amendment No. 4 to the Urban Renewal Plan for the Southwest Consolidated Urban Renewal Area is consistent with this provision.

2.0 PROPOSED URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT ACTIVITIES
In accordance with recent amendments to Chapter 403 of the Code of Iowa, the Urban Renewal
Plan for the Southwest Consolidated Urban Renewal Area is amended to add the following subsection 5.1, entitled "Proposed Urban Renewal Project Activities":

5.1 **Proposed Urban Renewal Project Activities**

The following urban renewal project activities are expected to be undertaken:

- Previously approved financial assistance to provide public improvements to a sanitary sewer that currently serves a large portion of the Urban Renewal Area

3.0 **PROPERTY ACQUISITION/DISPOSITION**

The City will follow any applicable requirements as set forth in the Urban Renewal Plan and pursuant to the Code of Iowa, as amended, for the acquisition and disposition of property.

4.0 **EFFECTIVE DATE**

This Amendment No. 4 to the Urban Renewal Plan for the Southwest Consolidated Urban Renewal Area shall be deemed to be effective upon the adoption of a City Council Resolution approving the said amended Urban Renewal Plan. The Urban Renewal Plan, as so amended, shall remain in full force until amended or rescinded by the City Council.
To: City Planning Commission  
From: Kirsty Sanchez, Community Development and Planning  
Subject: Consideration regarding conformity of the proposed Amendment No. 2 to the Village Urban Renewal Area Plan with the City’s Comprehensive Plan  
Date: April 9, 2015

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Based on recent TIF legislation, Amendment No. 2 to the Urban Renewal Plan for the Village Urban Renewal Area is necessary in order to fund new activities through tax increment revenues within the designated area. Specifically, this Amendment updates the Urban Renewal Plan to reflect:

- Previously approved financial assistance to fund Tower Terrace Road Improvements

The Village Urban Renewal area was established in 1999 to promote economic development in the City of Cedar Rapids by providing public and quasi-public improvements within a newly developing area of the community. The area is generally located east of the intersection of Interstate 380 and Boyson Road in the City of Cedar Rapids.

The State Code of Iowa requires that prior to City Council adoption of an amendment to an Urban Renewal Area, the Urban Renewal Plan be referred to the City Planning Commission for review and recommendation “as to its conformity with the general plan for the development of the municipality as a whole.”

The action requested from Planning Commission at this time is to make a finding regarding the consistency of the proposed Amendment No. 2 to the Urban Renewal Plan for the Village Urban Renewal Area with the Comprehensive Plan. In addition to City Planning Commission review, the City consulted with affected taxing agencies on April 7, 2015. All comments received will be presented to City Council for consideration during the public hearing scheduled for April 14, 2015.
AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO THE URBAN RENEWAL PLAN FOR THE VILLAGE URBAN RENEWAL AREA

As Approved by City Council

Resolution No. ________

Community Development Department
City Hall
101 First Street SE
Cedar Rapids, IA 52401
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose and Background

The purpose and intent of this Amendment No. 2 to the Urban Renewal Plan for the Village Urban Renewal Area (the "Amendment") is to provide current information on such subjects as proposed projects, types of renewal activities and the disposition of property for the Village Urban Renewal Area.

This Amendment is intended to augment and update the Urban Renewal Plan for the Village Urban Renewal Area as indicated above. All provisions of the existing Urban Renewal Plan not directly impacted by this Amendment as adopted by the City Council shall remain in full force and effect.

1.2 Village Urban Renewal Plan Amendments

Section 11.0 of the Urban Renewal Plan for the Village Urban Renewal Area provides that the Urban Renewal Plan may be amended from time to time to include changes in the Urban Renewal Area, to add or change land use controls and regulations, to modify goals or types of renewal activities, or to amend property acquisition and disposition guidelines. The City Council may amend the Urban Renewal Plan by resolution after holding a public hearing on the proposed change in accordance with applicable Iowa law.

Amendment No. 2 to the Urban Renewal Plan for the Village Urban Renewal Area is consistent with this provision.

2.0 PROPOSED URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT ACTIVITIES

In accordance with recent amendments to Chapter 403 of the Code of Iowa, the Urban Renewal
Plan for the Village Urban Renewal Area is amended to add the following subsection 5.1, entitled "Proposed Urban Renewal Project Activities":

5.1 **Proposed Urban Renewal Project Activities**

The following urban renewal project activities are expected to be undertaken:

| Previously approved financial assistance to fund Tower Terrace Road Improvements |

3.0 **PROPERTY ACQUISITION/DISPOSITION**

The City will follow any applicable requirements as set forth in the Urban Renewal Plan and pursuant to the Code of Iowa, as amended, for the acquisition and disposition of property.

4.0 **EFFECTIVE DATE**

This Amendment No. 2 to the Urban Renewal Plan for the Village Urban Renewal Area shall be deemed to be effective upon the adoption of a City Council Resolution approving the said amended Urban Renewal Plan. The Urban Renewal Plan, as so amended, shall remain in full force until amended or rescinded by the City Council.
To: City Planning Commission
From: Kirsty Sanchez, Community Development and Planning
Subject: Consideration regarding conformity of the proposed Amendment No. 4 to the Technology Park Urban Renewal Area Plan with the City’s Comprehensive Plan
Date: April 9, 2015

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Based on recent TIF legislation, Amendment No. 4 to the Urban Renewal Plan for the Technology Park Urban Renewal Area is necessary in order to fund new activities through tax increment revenues within the designated area. Specifically, this Amendment updates the Urban Renewal Plan to reflect:

- Previously approved financial assistance to fund Acme Graphics at 320 49th Avenue Drive SW

The Technology Park Urban Renewal area was established in 2005 to promote economic development in the City of Cedar Rapids by providing public and quasi-public improvements within a newly developing area of the community. The area is generally located east of the intersection of Interstate 380 and Highway 30 in the City of Cedar Rapids.

The State Code of Iowa requires that prior to City Council adoption of an amendment to an Urban Renewal Area, the Urban Renewal Plan be referred to the City Planning Commission for review and recommendation “as to its conformity with the general plan for the development of the municipality as a whole.”

The action requested from Planning Commission at this time is to make a finding regarding the consistency of the proposed Amendment No. 4 to the Urban Renewal Plan for the Technology Park Urban Renewal Area with the Comprehensive Plan. In addition to City Planning Commission review, the City consulted with affected taxing agencies on April 7, 2015. All comments received will be presented to City Council for consideration during the public hearing scheduled for April 14, 2015.
AMENDMENT NO. 4 TO THE
URBAN RENEWAL PLAN FOR THE
TECHNOLOGY PARK RENEWAL AREA

As Approved by City Council

Resolution No. ________
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 **Purpose and Background**

The purpose and intent of this *Amendment No. 4 to the Urban Renewal Plan for the Technology Park Urban Renewal Area* (the "Amendment") is to provide current information on such subjects as proposed projects, types of renewal activities and the disposition of property for the Technology Park Urban Renewal Area.

This Amendment is intended to augment and update the Urban Renewal Plan for the Technology Park Urban Renewal Area as indicated above. All provisions of the existing Urban Renewal Plan not directly impacted by this Amendment as adopted by the City Council shall remain in full force and effect.

1.2 **Technology Park Urban Renewal Plan Amendments**

Section 11.0 of the Urban Renewal Plan for the Technology Park Urban Renewal Area provides that the Urban Renewal Plan may be amended from time to time to include changes in the Urban Renewal Area, to add or change land use controls and regulations, to modify goals or types of renewal activities, or to amend property acquisition and disposition guidelines. The City Council may amend the Urban Renewal Plan by resolution after holding a public hearing on the proposed change in accordance with applicable Iowa law.

Amendment No. 4 to the Urban Renewal Plan for the Technology Park Urban Renewal Area is consistent with this provision.

2.0 **PROPOSED URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT ACTIVITIES**

In accordance with recent amendments to Chapter 403 of the Code of Iowa, the Urban Renewal
Plan for the Technology Park Urban Renewal Area is amended to add the following subsection 5.1, entitled "Proposed Urban Renewal Project Activities":

5.1 **Proposed Urban Renewal Project Activities**

The following urban renewal project activities are expected to be undertaken:

| Previously approved financial assistance to fund Acme Graphics project located at 302 49th Avenue Drive SW |

3.0 **PROPERTY ACQUISITION/DISPOSITION**

The City will follow any applicable requirements as set forth in the Urban Renewal Plan and pursuant to the Code of Iowa, as amended, for the acquisition and disposition of property.

4.0 **EFFECTIVE DATE**

This Amendment No. 4 to the Urban Renewal Plan for the Technology Park Urban Renewal Area shall be deemed to be effective upon the adoption of a City Council Resolution approving the said amended Urban Renewal Plan. The Urban Renewal Plan, as so amended, shall remain in full force until amended or rescinded by the City Council.
To: City Planning Commission
From: Kirsty Sanchez, Community Development and Planning
Subject: Consideration regarding conformity of the proposed Amendment No. 2 to the Rockwell Collins Urban Renewal Area Plan with the City’s Comprehensive Plan
Date: April 9, 2015

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Based on recent TIF legislation, Amendment No. 2 to the Urban Renewal Plan for the Rockwell Collins Urban Renewal Area is necessary in order to fund new activities through tax increment revenues within the designated area. Specifically, this Amendment updates the Urban Renewal Plan to reflect:

- Previously approved financial assistance to fund C Avenue NE improvements

The Rockwell Collins Urban Renewal area was established in 2006 to stimulate, through public actions, financings and commitments, private investment in the urban renewal project area. The area is generally located east of the intersection of Interstate 380 and Highway 100 in the City of Cedar Rapids.

The State Code of Iowa requires that prior to City Council adoption of an amendment to an Urban Renewal Area, the Urban Renewal Plan be referred to the City Planning Commission for review and recommendation “as to its conformity with the general plan for the development of the municipality as a whole.”

The action requested from Planning Commission at this time is to make a finding regarding the consistency of the proposed Amendment No. 2 to the Urban Renewal Plan for the Rockwell Collins Urban Renewal Area with the Comprehensive Plan. In addition to City Planning Commission review, the City consulted with affected taxing agencies on April 7, 2015. All comments received will be presented to City Council for consideration during the public hearing scheduled for April 14, 2015.
AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO THE
URBAN RENEWAL PLAN FOR THE
ROCKWELL COLLINS URBAN RENEWAL AREA

As Approved by City Council

Resolution No. ________

Community Development Department
City Hall
101 First Street SE
Cedar Rapids, IA 52401
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose and Background

The purpose and intent of this Amendment No. 2 to the Urban Renewal Plan for the Rockwell Collins Urban Renewal Area (the "Amendment") is to provide current information on such subjects as proposed projects, types of renewal activities and the disposition of property for the Rockwell Collins Urban Renewal Area.

This Amendment is intended to augment and update the Urban Renewal Plan for the Rockwell Collins Urban Renewal Area as indicated above. All provisions of the existing Urban Renewal Plan not directly impacted by this Amendment as adopted by the City Council shall remain in full force and effect.

1.2 Rockwell Collins Urban Renewal Plan Amendments

Section 11.0 of the Urban Renewal Plan for the Rockwell Collins Urban Renewal Area provides that the Urban Renewal Plan may be amended from time to time to include changes in the Urban Renewal Area, to add or change land use controls and regulations, to modify goals or types of renewal activities, or to amend property acquisition and disposition guidelines. The City Council may amend the Urban Renewal Plan by resolution after holding a public hearing on the proposed change in accordance with applicable Iowa law.

Amendment No. 2 to the Urban Renewal Plan for the Rockwell Collins Urban Renewal Area is consistent with this provision.

2.0 PROPOSED URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT ACTIVITIES

In accordance with recent amendments to Chapter 403 of the Code of Iowa, the Urban Renewal...
Plan for the Rockwell Collins Urban Renewal Area is amended to add the following subsection 5.1, entitled "Proposed Urban Renewal Project Activities":

5.1 **Proposed Urban Renewal Project Activities**

The following urban renewal project activities are expected to be undertaken:

| Previously approved financial assistance to fund C Avenue NE improvements |

3.0 **PROPERTY ACQUISITION/DISPOSITION**

The City will follow any applicable requirements as set forth in the Urban Renewal Plan and pursuant to the Code of Iowa, as amended, for the acquisition and disposition of property.

4.0 **EFFECTIVE DATE**

This Amendment No. 2 to the Urban Renewal Plan for the Rockwell Collins Urban Renewal Area shall be deemed to be effective upon the adoption of a City Council Resolution approving the said amended Urban Renewal Plan. The Urban Renewal Plan, as so amended, shall remain in full force until amended or rescinded by the City Council.
To: City Planning Commission  
From: Kirsty Sanchez, Community Development and Planning  
Subject: Consideration regarding conformity of the proposed Amendment No. 6 to the Amended and Restated Urban Renewal Plan for the Consolidated Central Urban Renewal Area Plan with the City’s Comprehensive Plan  
Date: April 9, 2015

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Based on recent TIF legislation, Amendment No. 6 to the Amended and Restated Urban Renewal Plan for the Consolidated Central Urban Renewal Area is necessary in order to fund new activities through tax increment revenues within the designated area. Specifically, this Amendment updates the Urban Renewal Plan to reflect:

- Previously approved financial assistance of Kingston Lofts located at 200, 210, and 212 3rd Avenue SW

The Consolidated Central Urban Renewal Area was established in 2000 to provide a comprehensive approach for redevelopment and revitalization of established blighted areas which surround the Cedar Rapids downtown area. In addition the Urban Renewal Area was established to plan and provide for commercial, office, open-space, industrial, and residential development consistent with City land use and development policies and regulations.

The State Code of Iowa requires that prior to City Council adoption of an amendment to an Urban Renewal Area, the Urban Renewal Plan be referred to the City Planning Commission for review and recommendation “as to its conformity with the general plan for the development of the municipality as a whole.”

The action requested from Planning Commission at this time is to make a finding regarding the consistency of the proposed Amendment No. 6 to the Amended and Restated Urban Renewal Plan for the Consolidated Central Urban Renewal Area with the Comprehensive Plan. In addition to City Planning Commission review, the City consulted with affected taxing agencies on April 7, 2015. All comments received will be presented to City Council for consideration during the public hearing scheduled for April 14, 2015.
AMENDMENT NO. 6 TO THE AMENDED AND RESTATED URBAN RENEWAL PLAN FOR THE CONSOLIDATED CENTRAL URBAN RENEWAL AREA

As Approved by City Council

Resolution No. ________

Community Development Department
City Hall
101 First Street SE
Cedar Rapids, IA 52401
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose and Background

The purpose and intent of this Amendment No. 6 to the Amended and Restated Urban Renewal Plan for the Consolidated Central Urban Renewal Area (the "Amendment") is to provide current information on such subjects as proposed projects, types of renewal activities and the disposition of property for the Consolidated Central Urban Renewal Area.

This Amendment is intended to augment and update the Urban Renewal Plan for the Consolidated Central Urban Renewal Area as indicated above. All provisions of the existing Urban Renewal Plan not directly impacted by this Amendment as adopted by the City Council shall remain in full force and effect.

1.2 Consolidated Central Urban Renewal Plan Amendments

Section 11.0 of the Urban Renewal Plan for the Consolidated Central Urban Renewal Area provides that the Urban Renewal Plan may be amended from time to time to include changes in the Urban Renewal Area, to add or change land use controls and regulations, to modify goals or types of renewal activities, or to amend property acquisition and disposition guidelines. The City Council may amend the Urban Renewal Plan by resolution after holding a public hearing on the proposed change in accordance with applicable Iowa law.

Amendment No. 6 to the Amended and Restated Urban Renewal Plan for the Consolidated Central Urban Renewal Area is consistent with this provision.

2.0 PROPOSED URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT ACTIVITIES

In accordance with recent amendments to Chapter 403 of the Code of Iowa, the Urban Renewal
Plan for the Consolidated Central Urban Renewal Area is amended to add the following subsection 5.1, entitled "Proposed Urban Renewal Project Activities":

5.1 **Proposed Urban Renewal Project Activities**

The following urban renewal project activities are expected to be undertaken:

| Previously approved financial assistance of Kingston Lofts located at 200, 210, and 212 3rd Avenue SW |

3.0 **PROPERTY ACQUISITION/DISPOSITION**

The City will follow any applicable requirements as set forth in the Urban Renewal Plan and pursuant to the Code of Iowa, as amended, for the acquisition and disposition of property.

4.0 **EFFECTIVE DATE**

This Amendment No. 6 to the Amended and Restated Urban Renewal Plan for the Consolidated Central Urban Renewal Area shall be deemed to be effective upon the adoption of a City Council Resolution approving the said amended Urban Renewal Plan. The Urban Renewal Plan, as so amended, shall remain in full force until amended or rescinded by the City Council.
To: City Planning Commission  
From: Kirsty Sanchez, Community Development and Planning  
Subject: Consideration regarding conformity of the proposed Amendment No. 3 to the Second Amended and Restated Urban Renewal Plan for the Central Urban Renewal Area Plan with the City’s Comprehensive Plan  
Date: April 9, 2015

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Based on recent TIF legislation, Amendment No. 3 to the Second Amended and Restated Urban Renewal Plan for the Central Urban Renewal Area is necessary in order to fund new activities through tax increment revenues within the designated area. Specifically, this Amendment updates the Urban Renewal Plan to reflect:

- Previously approved financial assistance of the Avril House located at 616 4th Avenue SE;
- Previously approved financial assistance of the Great Furniture Mart located at 600 and 616 1st Street SE;
- Previously approved financial assistance of CRST located at 201 1st Street SE;
- Previously approved financial assistance of the Green Development Sokol project located at 417 3rd Street SE;
- Previously approved financial assistance of Coventry Lofts located at 211 and 213 1st Avenue SE;

The Central Urban Renewal Area was established 1966 (formerly known as the Civic Center Urban Renewal Plan) to clarify development objectives for the existing Urban Renewal Area. The Central Urban Renewal Area was established to contribute to a diversified, well-balanced economy providing for development of commercial, office, and residential facilities within the district, resulting in the creation of new supporting employment opportunities and strengthening the tax base.

The State Code of Iowa requires that prior to City Council adoption of an amendment to an Urban Renewal Area, the Urban Renewal Plan be referred to the City Planning Commission for review and recommendation "as to its conformity with the general plan for the development of the municipality as a whole."

The action requested from Planning Commission at this time is to make a finding regarding the consistency of the proposed Amendment No. 3 to the Second Amended and Restated Urban Renewal Plan for the Central Urban Renewal Area with the Comprehensive Plan. In addition to City Planning Commission review, the City consulted with affected taxing agencies on April 7,
2015. All comments received will be presented to City Council for consideration during the public hearing scheduled for April 14, 2015.
AMENDMENT NO. 3 TO THE SECOND AMENDED AND RESTATED URBAN RENEWAL PLAN FOR THE CENTRAL URBAN RENEWAL AREA

As Approved by City Council

Resolution No. ________

Community Development Department
City Hall
101 First Street SE
Cedar Rapids, IA 52401
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose and Background
The purpose and intent of this Amendment No. 3 to the Second Amended and Restated Urban Renewal Plan for the Central Urban Renewal Area (the "Amendment") is to provide current information on such subjects as proposed projects, types of renewal activities and the disposition of property for the Central Urban Renewal Area.

This Amendment is intended to augment and update the Urban Renewal Plan for the Central Urban Renewal Area as indicated above. All provisions of the existing Urban Renewal Plan not directly impacted by this Amendment as adopted by the City Council shall remain in full force and effect.

1.2 Central Urban Renewal Plan Amendments
Section 11.0 of the Urban Renewal Plan for the Central Urban Renewal Area provides that the Urban Renewal Plan may be amended from time to time to include changes in the Urban Renewal Area, to add or change land use controls and regulations, to modify goals or types of renewal activities, or to amend property acquisition and disposition guidelines. The City Council may amend the Urban Renewal Plan by resolution after holding a public hearing on the proposed change in accordance with applicable Iowa law.

Amendment No. 3 to the Second Amended and Restated Urban Renewal Plan for the Central Urban Renewal Area is consistent with this provision.

2.0 PROPOSED URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT ACTIVITIES
In accordance with recent amendments to Chapter 403 of the Code of Iowa, the Urban Renewal
Plan for the Central Urban Renewal Area is amended to add the following subsection 5.1, entitled "Proposed Urban Renewal Project Activities":

5.1 Proposed Urban Renewal Project Activities

The following urban renewal project activities are expected to be undertaken:

| Previously approved financial assistance of the Avril House located at 616 4th Avenue SE; |
| Previously approved financial assistance of the Great Furniture Mart located at 600 and 616 1st Street SE; |
| Previously approved financial assistance of CRST located at 201 1st Street SE; |
| Previously approved financial assistance of the Green Development Sokol project located at 417 3rd Street SE; |
| Previously approved financial assistance of Coventry Lofts located at 211 and 213 1st Avenue SE; |

3.0 PROPERTY ACQUISITION/DISPOSITION

The City will follow any applicable requirements as set forth in the Urban Renewal Plan and pursuant to the Code of Iowa, as amended, for the acquisition and disposition of property.

4.0 EFFECTIVE DATE

This Amendment No. 3 to the Amended and Restated Urban Renewal Plan for the Central Urban Renewal Area shall be deemed to be effective upon the adoption of a City Council Resolution approving the said amended Urban Renewal Plan. The Urban Renewal Plan, as so amended, shall remain in full force until amended or rescinded by the City Council.
To:       City Planning Commission
From:    Seth Gunnerson, Planner
Subject: Consideration of an Ordinance to establish a Design Review Overlay District for the MedQuarter Self-Supporting Municipal Improvement District (SSMID)
Date:   April 9, 2015

City Planning Commissioners will be asked to consider an Ordinance to establish a Design Review Overlay District for the Medical Quarter (MedQuarter) Self-Supporting Municipal Improvement District (SSMID).

Staff has met multiple times with the MedQuarter Standards Committee, which is comprised of property owners and business representatives within the district, to develop draft overlay district standards. The standards were presented to the full MedQuarter SSMID Board on December 3, 2014 and after receiving no negative comments the Board unanimously endorsed the standards on January 7, 2015. On February 26, 2015 the MedQuarter SSMID hosted an open house for property owners in the MedQuarter to present the proposed standards.

The MedQuarter Overlay District will be similar to existing overlay districts in the Czech Village/New Bohemia area, Kingston Village and Ellis Boulevard. Key differences include:

- More detailed design requirements based on recommendation from the MedQuarter plan and lessons learned in existing overlay districts.
- MedQuarter specific guidelines such as a build-to line along 10th Street SE and 4th Avenue SE to create a pedestrian friendly greenway.
- Additional design recommendations that will not be included in the ordinance language but will be part of a proposed Design Manual to give guidance to developers.

Each section of the guide contains a number of standards which all new development will be required to meet, along with recommendations on best practices. The draft recommendations cover five aspects of building and site design:

- **Building Massing, Orientation and Site Design** – Requiring appropriate placement for urban infill development with an emphasis on pedestrian friendly design.
- **Building Design** – Requiring high quality of design
- **Site Furnishings and Landscaping** – Recommendations for elements that enhance site design.
- **Signage** – Requirements for attractive building signage as well as permitting districtwide signage.
- **Greenway Design Standards** – Required and recommended elements for the proposed “greenway” along 4th Avenue SE
The specific recommendations are found beginning on Page 4 of this memo.

**Recommendation:**
Staff is seeking a recommendation from City Planning Commission on the following actions:
- Amend Chapter 32 of the Municipal Code, the Zoning Ordinance, by creating a new Section 32.03.010.C.6.c.iv – MedQuarter Overlay District with development standards matching the Medical Quarter Overlay District Standards in the following pages.
- Establish the boundaries of the overlay district as the same as the MedQuarter SSMID (exhibit on next page)
- Amend the Czech Bohemia Overlay District to remove the block bounded by 8th Avenue, 8th Street, 9th Avenue and 7th Street.
- Recommend adoption of a MedQuarter Overlay District Design Manual, which includes the required Overlay District Standards along with the Design Recommendations outlined in the following pages.

**Next Steps:**
- April 14 – City Council Motion Setting a Public Hearing on the proposed Overlay District
- April 15 – Presentation to City Council Development Committee
- April 28 – Public Hearing on the proposed Overlay and First Reading of the Ordinance
- May 12 – Second and possible Third Reading of the Ordinance
Proposed MedQuarter Overlay District Boundaries

Block to be removed from Czech-Bohemia Overlay District
What is affected by the MedQuarter Overlay District?

- Construction of new buildings.
- Building additions, to the extent feasible.
- Changes to the exterior of buildings.

What is NOT affected?

- Single or two family home construction or renovation.
- Any interior work on a building.
- Building maintenance that does not change the exterior.

How are the Standards and Recommendations in this document structured?

**Medical Quarter Overlay District Standards** – Shall apply to new construction, additions to existing buildings and/or the exterior rehabilitation of buildings located within the boundaries of the CB-O District and that are submitted after **APPROVAL DATE**. The Zoning Administrator may waive certain standards which may not be applicable to certain projects due to scope of work. For example, specific façade requirements may be waived for rehabilitation work on existing structures.

**Design Recommendations** – Should be considered as part of the development of site plans and the design of buildings within the district. These recommendations include best practices along with suggested strategies to meet district standards and other aspects of the zoning ordinance. These recommendations may be included in recommendations made by the Design Review Committee and may be considered by approval bodies such as the City Planning Commission, Board of Adjustment or City Council.

What is the Design Review Technical Advisory Committee?

The DRTAC is a five member committee tasked with reviewing and providing comment on projects within the overlay district. The Committee is appointed by City Council and will be comprised of district stakeholders.

What is the timeline for review of projects in the Overlay District?

- For building permits or site plans which are reviewed and approved by staff:
  - The DRTAC will meet and make recommendations within 10 business days.
- For Land Development projects which go to the City Planning Commission
  - The DRTAC will review the case prior to the CPC meeting. This will not add time to the project.
Section A: Building Massing, Orientation and Site Design

**MEDQUARTER OVERLAY DISTRICT STANDARDS**

1) Building setbacks for new construction shall be as follows:
   - Along 4th Avenue SE – 20’ build-to-line
   - Along 1st Avenue SE – maximum setback of 5’
   - Along 10th Street SE – 10’ build-to-line
   - Along all other streets – contextual setback and location close to the sidewalk encouraged

2) Building height shall be set by the underlying zoning classification except within the following transition zones:
   - Properties located on the half-block on either side of 2nd Avenue SE between 12th and 13th Streets SE
   - Properties located within the Overlay District Boundaries which are south of 8th Avenue SE

Within these transition zones building height shall be limited to three stories. An additional (fourth) story may be granted for projects which provide enclosed parking on at least 50% of the ground floor.
3) Building scale and massing shall maintain a relationship with adjacent structures to create building street walls along streets, drives and sidewalks where possible. Building massing shall be consistent with the City’s Comprehensive Plan and may use the MedQuarter Master Plan as a reference.

4) Building shall be oriented towards the street with a pedestrian entrance facing the street encouraged.

5) Protective canopies are encouraged for entrances or vehicular drop-offs that are located within the property for the express purpose of dropping off people with physical limitations.

6) Buildings shall hold the corners of intersections where possible to enhance the sense of enclosure and pedestrian-orientation of the commercial area.

7) Multi-story buildings are encouraged. Single-story commercial buildings shall be at least 22 feet in height. These should be constructed with high ceilings or parapet walls to create a greater feeling of enclosure along the street and to compliment horizontal elements of adjacent buildings.

8) Buildings shall be placed close the street (or the build-to line, if required), drives and other buildings. Pedestrians shall be able to easily travel between buildings on clearly defined pedestrian paths, not parking lot driveways.

9) Service/loading areas should not be located near primary entrances to buildings.

10) The required screening of mechanical, loading, trash, and utilities shall complement materials used on the adjacent building. Brick or decorative stone in combination with decorative fencing and landscaping is preferred.

11) Sharing of loading, trash and utility areas among business is encouraged.

12) Site plans should conform to the Pedestrian Friendly Site Design standards of the Commercial and Office Building Placement Guidelines section of the ordinance.

13) Sites shall be designed to provide for vehicular access in the following order or priority:
   i. Alley or any street not listed below
   ii. 10th Street SE
   iii. 4th Avenue SE
   iv. 1st Avenue SE

14) Where feasible, parking lots shall be linked between sites to reduce the need for district visitors to drive between adjacent stores and services. Shared parking between parcels is encouraged, and parking should be coordinated and signed appropriately to avoid user confusion.
DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Any mechanical equipment, whether on rooftops or in service/loading areas, should be consolidated if possible and screened from view.
- Screening should be at least as high as the equipment it is supposed to hide and should be of a color and material that matches or is compatible with the dominant colors and materials found on the building. Chain link fencing, with or without slats, is prohibited.
- Loading, trash, and utility areas adjacent to a building should be designed as an integral component of the building. Outside storage of materials, equipment, or trucks should be kept to a minimum and in areas screened from view.
- Parking and service areas should incorporate attractive materials to minimize the “hard” appearance of driveways and surface parking lots. Decorative paving should be used to delineate pedestrian crossings, parking aisles, and entrances within parking lots.
- Parking and service areas, including alleys, should be well lit with glare on surrounding properties minimized.
- All parking and service areas should be designed to accommodate efficient snow removal and storage.
- Parking and service areas should be located and designed to minimize interference with pedestrian circulation and sidewalk connections to surrounding neighborhoods.
- Parking areas should be buffered with landscaping, fencing, and or architectural elements to help contribute to an attractive streetscape.
Section B: Building Design

New and reconstructed elevations within the MedQuarter Overlay District shall comply with the requirements of this section. Provisions may be waived for existing structures if necessary to preserve the historic character of the building.

A high quality of design is expected of all new construction within the MedQuarter. Criteria may vary whether an elevation is facing a street frontage, interior portions of a property, or are places close to a property line. The diagram and tables below shall be used to guide the application of Building Design requirements in the MedQuarter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagram Reference</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Street elevation</td>
<td>Elevations along street frontages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Interior elevation</td>
<td>Elevations interior to the parcel which are visible to the street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Lot line elevation</td>
<td>Elevations <strong>without a public entrance</strong> which are located within 7’ of a rear or side yard parcel boundary which may be obscured by future construction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>●</td>
<td>All new or reconstructed elevations must comply with this requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◊</td>
<td>All new or reconstructed elevations are encouraged to comply with this requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td>This requirement is not applicable to the elevation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MedQuarter Overlay District Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Street Frontages</th>
<th>Interior</th>
<th>Lot line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1) Building design and architectural style create and enhance the character of the MedQuarter for pedestrians and motorists. A range of architectural styles is preferred. However, all buildings should be designed with common elements:  
  o Open glass storefronts (where retail is provided) or public entrances (other non-residential development)  
  o Clearly defined entrances to ground and upper floors (if applicable);  
  o Sign bands and awnings incorporated into the design and scale of the buildings;  
  o Upper floor windows | ![ ] | ![ ] | ![ ] |
| 2) Variations in rooflines are encouraged to add interest to buildings and reduce the massive scale of large buildings. Buildings which are taller than adjacent structures by more than 1 story should consider the use of upper-floor setbacks, dormers or other architectural features to soften the transition between structures. | ![ ] | ![ ] | ![ ] |
| 3) The top edge of the building shall be defined by a cornice line or similar articulation. | ![ ] | ![ ] | ![ ] |
| 4) Highly reflective, opaque or darkly tinted glass shall not be used for windows or doors around public entrances. | ![ ] | ![ ] | ![ ] |
| 5) Rear building entrances and facades shall be designed in a manner consistent with the front and a side facade, especially when parking is behind buildings. | ![ ] | ![ ] | ![ ] |
| 6) Entrances into commercial buildings should not be recessed more than five feet from the exterior building wall. | ![ ] | ![ ] | ![ ] |
| 7) Buildings shall primarily be constructed of high-quality materials such as brick, stone, split face block masonry, architectural paneling, and glass. The use of natural indigenous materials, such as limestone, is strongly encouraged. Exterior finish insulation systems (EFIS) may be used on upper floors but use should be limited on the ground level. Concrete block, metal or plywood should not be used on building facades or on walls that are visible from streets, driveways, sidewalks or parking areas. Stucco is allowed but should be limited on any building façade to a maximum of 10% of the façade. | ![ ] | ![ ] | ![ ] |
**MEDQUARTER OVERLAY DISTRICT STANDARDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Frontages</th>
<th>Interior</th>
<th>Lot line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>●</td>
<td>◊</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8) At a minimum 60% of the building elevation dedicated to non-residential uses should be windows, doors, and fenestration.

**DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- Interesting architectural details and features are preferred to provided layers of interest and variety for pedestrians and motorists.
- Whenever possible, adjacent buildings should have component parts in good proportion with one another. Similar design linkages include placing window lines, belt courses, and other horizontal elements in a pattern that is harmonious and reflects the same elements on neighboring buildings.
- Solid windowless walls are discouraged unless necessary to the function of the building. These should be avoided along building elevations which face the right-of-way or interior elevations which are visible from the right-of-way. In such a case, a solid, windowless wall should incorporate material and color variations, arches, piers, columns, murals, high quality graphics, landscaping and other elements that reduce building scale and add visual interest.
- Building entrances should be designed so that doorways and vestibules are easily seen by shoppers and visitors, easily distinguished by tenant and use, and open and visible from the sidewalk. Entrances should provide a sense of welcoming hospitality.
- Architectural design should articulate and enhance buildings, especially those at street corners because of their prominence and visibility.
- Buildings that attempt to use the building itself as “advertising” are discouraged, particularly where the proposed architecture is a corporate or franchise style.
- Building projections, such as awnings, window bays, and terraces should be pedestrian scale, proportional to the building façade, and proportional to adjacent structures.
- Building entrances should be visible from the street, well-lit, and easily accessible. Architectural elements, canopies, and/or lighting are preferred to identify entrances, not screen them. If vehicular canopies are provided, provide adequate lighting – either natural or artificial – to avoid dark or unsafe conditions.
- Main commercial building entrances should be emphasized with larger door/window combinations, overhangs, slight recesses, unique roof forms, arches, accent colors, or architectural details.
- Building-mounted lighting should be carefully integrated into the design of the building and streetscape.
- The number of materials on an exterior building face should not exceed five to prevent visual clutter.
Section C: Site Furnishings and Landscaping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEDQUARTER OVERLAY DISTRICT STANDARDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Visual continuity within the district is important. Site furnishings and other amenities significantly contribute to the overall image of any district. These elements include approved benches, waste receptacles, planters, railings, bollards, bike racks, and tree grates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Site furnishings are encouraged to be provided in pedestrian spaces such as building entrances, along walkways and in pedestrian plazas and seating areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- Visual continuity within the district is important. Site furnishings and other amenities significantly contribute to the overall image of any district.
- The elements should include approved benches, waste receptacles, planters, railings, bollards, bike racks, and tree grates.
- Benches should be provided near drop-off areas and entryways to major buildings, at key locations along pedestrian ways, and at bus stops and plazas.
- Planters should be provided in plaza areas, building entry areas, and other paved open spaces to provide green space and sense of scale to pedestrian spaces.
- Waste and recycling receptacles should be provided at building entry ways, public plazas, bus stops, and near benches.
- Bike racks should be provided at public plaza spaces and major building entryways.
- Tree grates should be provided in paved plazas and pedestrian ways to protect tree roots from compaction.
- Plants installed to satisfy the requirements of this section should meet or exceed the standards of the most recent edition of the American Standard for Nursery Stock, published by the American Association of Nurseriesmen. Plants should be capable of withstanding the extremes of individual microclimates, be nursery-grown, and be balled and burlapped (when applicable).
- Landscape treatment should be provided to enhance architectural features, strengthen vistas, and provide shade.
- Plant materials should be selected for structure, texture, color and for ultimate growth potential. Plants that are indigenous to the area and that will be hardy, harmonious to the design, and attractive (including seasonal interest) should be used.
- In locations where plants will be susceptible to injury by pedestrian or vehicular traffic, they should be protected by appropriate curbs, tree guards or other devices.
- Trees should be installed consistently along all sidewalks and pedestrian paths in parks/plazas.
- New plantings and color pockets should be added along the street where space allows. Raised beds, moveable planters, flower boxes, and hanging baskets are favored and provide seasonal interest, enhance the pedestrian experience, and reinforce an areas character.
- Along wider sidewalks, raised landscape planters may be used to break up large paved areas, add visual interest to the street, and separate pedestrians from traffic.
- All parking lots should be designed with perimeter and island landscaping. Such planting areas should be sufficient in size to provide visual breaks in parking areas and to allow for plant materials to grow. Sidewalks provided in parking lots to direct pedestrians to commercial frontages and storefronts should also include edge landscaping.
- Plant materials in islands, excluding shade trees, should not exceed a height of 36” at maturity.
- Vacant lots should be maintained with sod and low-level plantings until developed with new buildings.
- In areas where general planting will not prosper, other materials, such as fences, walls and pavers should be sued. Carefully selected plants should be combined with such materials where possible.
- Where a building does not form the street edge, landscaping should be used to delineate that separation.
- All required landscaping areas not dedicated to trees, shrubs, or preservation of existing vegetation should be landscaped with grass, ground cover, or other landscape treatment, not including sand, rock or pavement.
- For each plant type associated with the landscaping requirements of this section, no single plant species should represent more than 40% of the total plantings.
- Plant material should be installed so it related to the natural environment and habitat in which it is placed.
- The scale and nature of landscape material should be appropriate to the site and structures. For example, large-scale buildings should be complemented by large-scale plant material. Plant material should be selected for its form, texture, color and concern for its ultimate growth.
Section D: Signage

**MEDQUARTER OVERLAY DISTRICT STANDARDS**

1) Signage shall be simple and incorporated into the building’s architecture. New signage shall not obscure significant architectural details of structures.

2) All freestanding signs shall be low in height and placed within planting areas that are coordinated with the overall design of the site. Small directional signs fewer than 6 square feet are not required to be in planting areas.

3) Public Art, sculpture, murals, etc. are encouraged in the MedQuarter.

4) Acceptable forms of signage include signs integrated into or affixed flat against a building facade, wall signs, projecting signs and monument signs. Other types of signage, including pole signs, may be considered if compatible with the unique character of the District.

5) The City Council may approve by resolution a districtwide signage plan for the MedQuarter District SSMID. The plan shall specify the location, type and size of any signage considered as part of a comprehensive signage plan for the district. Signage permitted by this plan may be exempted from the requirements of the Sign Ordinance and should be limited to signage intended to promote the MedQuarter and assist with way finding.

**DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- Signs should be constructed of high-quality, solid, and durable materials.
- Sign colors and materials should be consistent with the colors and materials of the associated building.
- Sign lighting should be carefully considered in the building design. Back-lit panel signs are discouraged. Back-lit lettered signs are appropriate. If direct lighting is used, glare, brightness, visible hardware, and maintenance issues must be addressed. Strategically placed lamp fixtures that are compatible with the sign design and building architecture should be used for illuminated signs.
- All signs placed on a site be designed as part of a coordinated signage theme.
- Text on signs should be simple and easy to read.
- To avoid visual clutter, redundant signage or multiple external signs should not be used.
Section E: Greenway Design Standards:

(For the 10’ required setback along 10th Street SE or the 20’ required setback along 4th Ave SE)

Prohibited uses:

- Parking (new construction)
- Buildings
- Accessory structures
- Asphalt surfaces
- Undecorated pavement over 8’ in width

Required elements

- Pedestrian path from sidewalk to adjacent structure or parking area.
- Green landscaping (grass, trees, planters) which covers at least 50% of the area.

Encouraged elements

- Trees
- Planters or flower beds
- Grass
- Decorative plaza areas for outdoor seating
- Pedestrian amenities such as benches and bike racks
- Art such as sculptures and fountains