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

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

Agenda:
• Approval of Minutes – February 18, 2014

• Recommendation Items:
  1. MedQuarter Overlay Design
     Seth Gunnerson
     Community Development

  2. 629 12th Avenue SE
     Seth Gunnerson
     Community Development

  3. 1216 2nd St. SE Disposition
     Caleb Mason
     Community Development

  4. Alliant Substation
     Paula Mitchell
     Community Development

• Informational Items:
  1. ROOTs Update
     Paula Mitchell
     Community Development

  2. Update on the Historic Preservation Plan
     Anne Russett
     Community Development

• Public Comment
The meeting was brought to order at 4:03 p.m.

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

Council members Weinacht and Vernon approved the minutes from January 21, 2015 with unanimous consent.

**Recommendation Items:**

1. **Proposed Updates to Expend ROOTs Funding**
   Paula Mitchell, Housing and Redevelopment Manager, stated that this is a process for the City to fully utilize the remaining ROOTs funding available through this fourth and last round of the program. There is $11.1 million available to the City to replace lost housing units. Approximately 614 units have been constructed in Rounds 1-3. In Round 4, we have allocated 156 units to date, with 120 of those in Tier 1 and 36 in Tiers 2 and 3. The budget available will allocate approximately 44 additional units. Some of the considerations are insufficient buildable infill lots to expend the remaining budget, builder interest to expand building outside Tier 1, a need to balance market absorption both inside and outside the core neighborhood, and the possible need to reallocate units that do not proceed to Development Agreement. Notices have been sent to builders that have not gotten to a Development Agreement stage yet to assess their progress and interest in continuing. The deadline to respond is at the end of the month. Recommendations are that builders may be awarded up to one unit outside Tier 1 for each unit they have constructed in a previous program round regardless of location, priority will continue to be Tier 1 locations (publicly or privately owned), builders must demonstrate “shovel-readiness”, and phased release of units outside Tier 1 and internal process for reallocation to fully expend funds and balance market absorption.

Ms. Mitchell stated that if the Committee is interested in moving forward the timeline is as follows:

- February 18, 2015 – Development Committee consideration
- February 2015 – Review with development community stakeholders
- March 12, 2015 – Full City Council consideration
- March 13, 2015 – Builder orientation
- April 1, 2015 – Applications due to City
- Spring 2015 – Development Agreements for funded projects to City Council
- Ongoing process for reallocation as needed.

The deadline for using the funding is September 30, but there may be a little flexibility in that it could extend until the end of the year.

Council member Vernon stated that she would like to see the process encourage development in Tier 2 as a higher priority than development in Tier 3. There are places within Tier 2 that would be good spots. Ms. Mitchell stated that, in the second round, Council had weighted scoring that emphasized highest priority for lots in Tier 1, second priority to lots in Tier 2, and the lowest priority to lots in Tier 3. That is something that could be implemented in this round of funding as well. Council member Vernon and Jennifer Pratt, Community Development Director, both agree that would be a good process. Ms. Pratt stated that “shovel-readiness” is going to be critical in getting the funds spent.

Council member Vernon said that there are places where homes were lost in Tier 2 that were not in the core area that were not affected by the floods, but could help with other goals such as housing and keeping neighborhood schools open. Council member Vernon trusts that staff will do a great job and updates along the way would be appreciated.

Council member Weinacht is very interested in making sure that a lot of stability is given to the core neighborhood and would agree to moving on to Tier 2 next.

Council members Vernon and Weinacht agree to move forward with unanimous consent.

**Informational Items:**

1. **Ellis and Kingston Overlay District Update**
   Seth Gunnerson, Community Development Planner, stated that on the City Council February 24th agenda there will be recommendations from the Mayor for the appointment of the Board of the Ellis and Kingston Overlay Districts. In March, they will have orientation and will review any development projects in either Overlay District that comes forward for approval slated for the City Planning Commission. The composition of the committee is to combine the membership for an architect, a developer, and an engineer as this reduces the number of people who have to serve on the committee with the thought being that those people can comment on all the projects for almost anywhere in the community. There are still two neighborhood representatives on each committee as well.

   Council member Weinacht asked if the neighborhood representatives in Kingston or Ellis were from different areas within the neighborhood. Ms. Pratt stated that it was done by application and a lot of people were encouraged to apply to make sure we mixed them up as much as possible to balance the residential with business and property owner business.

2. **Beekeeper Ordinance**
   Mr. Gunnerson stated that staff has been doing research into what other communities do as far as allowing beekeeping in the city limits. Currently, within Cedar Rapids, it is permitted within the A, Agriculture Zone District which is typically the fringe areas of town. It also can be done by conditional use in a couple of residential districts: R-T, R-1, and R-2. When the Urban
Agriculture update was done, beekeeping was not allowed with the idea being that Urban Agriculture was just community garden space. A survey was done in various communities in Iowa and around the Midwest and a model beekeeping ordinance was found. The standards for beekeeping involve setback requirements, access to water, notification of neighbors, number of hives, and an annual permit requirement. When EnvisionCR was adopted, initiative number 8 was for staff to update the Urban Agriculture Standards to include beekeeping. Staff recommendation is to wrap this into the Zoning Code update which is scheduled to begin later this year.

Council member Vernon asked about the dangers of beekeeping. Mr. Gunnerson stated that the number one concern is people getting stung especially if they are allergic. Council member Vernon asked about statistics and Mr. Gunnerson stated that research will need to be done.

Council member Weinacht asked if staff has talked to Parks and Recreation because she has talked to Daniel Gibbins about this topic and what the beehives would look like if they were put in parks. Council member Weinacht asked what kind of bees are being looked at. Mr. Gunnerson is assuming it would be a type of honey bee. Council member Vernon wanted to note that local honey is a great way to help with allergies and is in favor of going forward with this. Council member Weinacht is in favor of going forward also as long as public safety is being researched. Council member Vernon wants to continue to be careful of any chemicals that could be used in the beekeeping process.

3. 3rd Street Enhancement Update

Mr. Gunnerson stated that staff is trying to put together a report that will identify future improvements along the corridor. Third Street is something that has been talked about many times with it being a signature street in the community connecting Downtown to NewBo and the Czech Village. The importance of 3rd Street is connected to many plans such as the Downtown Plan and the Post Recovery Flood Plan. The Mayor went to the Mayor’s Institute on City Design in 2014 and presented the 3rd Street Corridor as a design problem for the group. Staff has the results and a lot of it confirmed the direction of the planning so far with a couple other ideas. When EnvisionCR was adopted it identified the need for the City to develop a Corridor Action Plan along a number of corridors in the community with 3rd street being identified.

Mr. Gunnerson stated that the City’s commitment to 3rd Street in the last couple years includes
- 2011 – Streetscape improvements between 8th and 16th Avenue
- 2013 – Road diet and addition of bike lanes
- 2013 – Parklet pilot program
- 2014 – Green bike lanes
- Ongoing – City participation in numerous redevelopment projects

Mr. Gunnerson stated that there are three sections staff is looking at for the Action Plan Report: infrastructure improvements, sidewalk toolkits (a booklet that can be distributed to businesses to come up with creative ways to use the sidewalks), and events to help unify the corridor. For each section, staff will look at identifying projects, estimated costs, and leads such as business owners to help carry the projects forward.

Council member Vernon would like the lighting on 3rd Avenue to be finished from 5th Street to 8th Street and for banners to be hung up to unify the area. The little white lights all year around would be a great addition.
Council member Weinacht likes the idea of the sidewalk toolkits. Ms. Pratt stated that the idea is to let the businesses be creative with what they want but understand a simple set of requirements to ensure safety. Having it be competitive with other businesses would create some excitement. Council Member Vernon likes the idea of having a contest and letting the businesses be creative.

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Anne Kroll, Administrative Assistant II
Community Development
At the April 15 Development Committee meeting staff will present a recommendation to create 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 request was reviewed and unanimously recommended by the City Planning Commission on April 9. A public hearing on the proposed ordinance is scheduled for April 28.

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 Guide 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 Guide covers 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 for new and renovated buildings.
- **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 Development Committee 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 Guide, 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 1st Reading of the Ordinance
- May 12 – 2nd and possible 3rd Reading of the Ordinance
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.
### 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 required parking.
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**

| 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:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Street Frontages</th>
<th>Interior</th>
<th>Lot line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>◊</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Open glass storefronts (where retail is provided) or public entrances (other non-residential development)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Clearly defined entrances to ground and upper floors (if applicable);</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>◊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Sign bands and awnings incorporated into the design and scale of the buildings;</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>◊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Upper floor windows</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Variations in rooflines are encouraged add interest to buildings and reduce the massive scale of large buildings. Buildings which are taller that 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.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>◊</td>
<td>◊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The top edge of the building shall be defined by a cornice line or similar articulation.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>◊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Highly reflective, opaque or darkly tinted glass shall not be used for windows or doors around public entrances.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>◊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Entrances into commercial buildings should not be recessed more than five feet from the exterior building wall</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>◊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) At a minimum 60% of the building elevation dedicated to non-residential uses should be windows, doors, and fenestration.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>◊</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

MEDQUARTER OVERLAY DISTRICT STANDARDS

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.

2) Site furnishings are encouraged to be provided in pedestrian spaces such as building entrances, along walkways and in pedestrian plazas and seating areas.

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 Nurserymen. 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
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 used. 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 relates 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MEDQUARTER OVERLAY DISTRICT STANDARDS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Signage shall be simple and incorporated into the building’s architecture. New signage shall not obscure significant architectural details of structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 under 6 square feet are not required to be in planting areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Public Art, sculpture, murals, etc are encouraged in the MedQuarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 wayfinding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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
To: City Council Development Committee  
From: Seth Gunnerson through Jennifer Pratt, Community Development and Planning Director  
Subject: Request for City-owned Properties – Alliant Energy  
Date: April 15, 2015

Background:  
In January, the City received a request from Green Development, LLC to acquire City-owned parcels adjacent on 7th Street SE adjacent to 629 12th Ave SE.

The developer is requesting to acquire the properties to develop parking and an outdoor seating area for the restaurant at 629 12th Ave SE. The parking would also be shared with the restaurant at 624 12th Ave SE.
Site and Neighborhood Considerations:
The parcels requested for disposition are:
- 1203 7th St SE
- 1205 7th St SE
- Vacant land on 12th Ave SE located to the west of 629 12th Ave

The property is zoned O-S and is located on a triangular shape block bounded by 12th Ave SE, 7th St SE and Otis Rd SE. The remainder of the block, besides the restaurant owned by Green Development at 629 12th Ave, is occupied by Poets Park. Across 7th St SE is Metro High School. The properties were affected by the 2008 Flood, but are not located in the 100 or 500 year flood plains.

The combined parcels would create an irregular shaped lot of approximately 9,114 sq. ft. Staff believes that the properties are unlikely to be developed as a use permitted in the O-S zone district, and the City has not received any interest for the parcels as part of the ROOTs program.

The proposed use of the property is to provide additional parking for the restaurant’s at 624 and 629 12th Ave SE, along with an outdoor seating area for 629 12th Ave. The restaurant at 629 12th Ave SE is 704 sq ft in size. The restaurant across the street at 624 12th Ave is 813 sq ft. While no additional parking was required for the renovation of existing buildings in the core, the Zoning Ordinance would normally require 16 parking spaces for the combined 1,517 sq ft of restaurant space. Maximum parking lot requirements adopted by the City would prohibit construction of a parking lot greater than 24 cars for the combined businesses. Currently the two restaurants have on-site parking for approximately 6 cars.

Any development on the site would be required to meet the City’s Zoning Ordinance, including landscaping and buffering requirements. If the property is developed in conjunction with the restaurant at 629 12th Avenue staff is requesting that a garbage enclosure be provided as part of the site plan.

Staff Recommendation
Based upon initial review of the request, staff recommends moving forward with the process of competitive disposition.

Timeline and Next Steps:

- April 15, 2015 – Development Committee consideration.
- May 12, 2015 – Motion setting public hearing.
- May 26, 2015 – Public hearing to consider disposition.
- July 14, 2015 – Potential City Council consideration of a Development Agreement.
To: City Council Development Committee
From: Caleb Mason through Jennifer Pratt, Director of Community Development & Planning
Subject: 1216 2nd St SE
Date: April 14, 2015

Background
In April 2014, staff brought forward for the Development Committee’s consideration a request from F & F Enterprises for the City to initiate disposition of 1216 2nd St SE for allowing the owner to expand parking for its building. F & F owns the historic Village Bank building at 1201 3rd ST SE which houses the NewBo Alehouse and NewBo Sushi. The Committee recommended not issuing an RFP for the property citing interest in ensuring the highest and best uses of City land develops density in key districts.

Staff has continued discussions with the property owner and restaurant manager about their continued interest in use of the property for use as urban garden and location for garbage collection enclosure. As an alternative to purchasing the property, staff has discussed with the parties a lease arrangement of the the property for short term, temporary.

Staff Recommendation
Staff is recommending pursuing negotiating a ground lease as an interim use. In this model, the developer would make necessary parking lot improvements at its expense. In this arrangement, the owner and its restaurant uses would be given a three year lease for the land with optional one-year extensions. This model has been used in the past by the City to preserve the highest and best use of a City-owned property while allowing a temporary use of the property.
To: City Council Development Committee
From: Paula Mitchell through Jennifer Pratt, Community Development and Planning Director
Subject: Request for City-owned Properties – Alliant Energy
Date: April 8, 2015

Background:
In September 2014, the City received a request from Alliant Energy to acquire City-owned parcels and adjacent right of way in the Northwest quadrant for construction of a new electrical utility substation. The proposed substation would serve portions of the near Northwest and near Southwest quadrants of Cedar Rapids, servicing current load and providing capacity for load growth expected to result from future development and redevelopment in these areas. The request specifically includes:

- Parcels located at 816, 820, 824, 828 and 908 4th Street NW
- Parcels located at 402, 404, 408, and 413 H Avenue NW
- A portion of H Avenue right of way to be vacated
- Intervening 10 foot alley to be vacated.

The requested parcels and right of way are shown in the map attached to this memo. Current zoning for this area is I-1 and RMF-2. The proposed site is approximately 2 acres in size and is located in close proximity (within approximately 200 feet) of a transmission line that will provide the tap source for the proposed substation. This proximity provides several benefits, including reduced construction cost, minimizes right of way needed, and minimizes visual impacts to the neighborhood resulting from a need for larger transmission lines as the site moves further away from a viable tap source.

Site and Neighborhood Considerations:
Since September, staff has evaluated the request and worked with the Iowa Economic Development Authority (IEDA), the agency that provided funding for the City’s acquisition of the parcels, to identify any limitations on transfer of the parcels for this purpose. Parcels are located in the 100-year flood plain and carry both CBDG use and 100-year flood plain deed restrictions.

IEDA has indicated that this would be a permitted transfer, provided the City and Alliant can satisfy the process to mitigate future flood risk and secure release of the 100 year flood plain deed restrictions. Preliminarily, Alliant has indicated that it would be possible to elevate the substation above the level of the 100-year flood plain. In addition, should the substation be threatened by future flooding, Alliant has indicated it would be possible to temporarily remove the sub-station from service and transfer the load to backup facilities.
It has been proposed that the mechanism for satisfying CDBG use restrictions could be a land swap, which is allowable so long as the land is conveyed for a public purpose (including provision of necessary utility services) and the land the City receives in exchange is of equal or greater value than the land being conveyed and also meets a public purpose. In this scenario, the City could convey the subject properties, which are valued by the City Assessor at $111,800, in exchange for property offered by Alliant located on the NW corner of Wenig Road NE and Glass Road NE, valued at $130,000 by an appraisal. The Glass Road property is needed by the City for a planned water tower project, satisfying the “public purpose” requirement.

Neighborhood aesthetics have also been part of preliminary discussions. As noted above, this site was selected in part to minimize visual impacts from overhead transmission lines. Alliant indicates that this proposed substation could be designed to standards similar to the new “Buffalo” sub-station in the Northeast quadrant to ensure proper screening from adjacent residential areas. Specific terms related to design and screening could be incorporated into a development agreement. Alliant has indicated that neighborhood input would be a further component of the design process.

**Staff Recommendation**
Based upon initial review of the request, staff recommends moving forward with the process of competitive disposition.

**Timeline and Next Steps:**

- April 15, 2015 – Development Committee consideration.
- April 28, 2015 – Motion setting public hearing.
- May 12, 2015 – Public hearing to consider disposition.
- June 9, 2015 – Potential City Council consideration of a Development Agreement.
To: City Council Development Committee  
From: Paula Mitchell through Jennifer Pratt, Community Development and Planning Director  
Subject: Single Family New Construction “ROOTs” Program Update  
Date: April 10, 2015

Background:
On August 8, 2014, City Council approved an amended administrative plan for the fourth round of the Single Family New Construction Program, locally known as the “ROOTs” Program. The program, offered in conjunction with the Iowa Economic Development Authority (IEDA), is funded with federal CDBG Disaster Recovery funds and is intended to replace units lost as a result of the flood. Cedar Rapids has participated in three previous rounds of the program, which have generated 614 replacement housing units. The fourth round of the program is funded at approximately $11.1 million, which can support the construction of approximately 200 units.

The following table shows housing production to date (homes constructed with sales closed) by program round and “Tier” Area of the City:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Round</th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Tier 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Public Investment</td>
<td>Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rounds 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$265,397</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>$5,903,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$963,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>$7,131,397</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Allocation Update:
On March 11, 2015, staff held a Builder Orientation session to seek proposals for additional Round 4 allocations. Seven builders submitted applications by the April 1st deadline. Applications were scored by staff and a neighborhood representative and an additional 54 units were allocated, for a total of 198 units allocated in Round 4. Following this latest allocation, the unit breakdown for Round 4 by Tier is as follows:
- Tier 1 - 108 units
- Tier 2 - 1 units
- Tier 3 - 89 units

2015 Annual Infill Valuation Update:
Annually, staff works with the assessor’s office to determine the impact of the program investment on property valuation for the subject lots. As of this year’s update, 182 ROOTs homes had been constructed, sold, and valued by the assessor. For those lots, the combined 2008 pre-flood assessed value was approximately $13.5 million. The 2015 combined assessed value of those same lots is approximately $24.1 million for over $10 million in additional value. The
chart below shows the history of property values for these lots pre-flood, post-flood, and as new homes have been constructed and sold:

Next Steps:

Builders and approved potential buyers have been notified of the new allocations, and construction is expected to commence on these homes in the upcoming construction season. Currently, the program deadline has been extended to December 31, 2015.

Based on the adopted administrative plan, staff will continue to monitor progress and make adjustments as needed to expend the funds within program deadlines.
To: City Council Development Committee  
From: Anne Russett, Planner III  
Subject: Update on the Historic Preservation Plan  
Date: April 15, 2015

Background
In August 2011, the City of Cedar Rapids entered into a memorandum of agreement (MOA) with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the State Historical Society of Iowa (SHPO), and the Iowa Homeland Security & Emergency Management Division (IHSEMD) regarding the demolition of historic properties that resulted from the 2008 flood.

The MOA outlines eight mitigation measures to address the adverse impact on historic properties. One of these mitigation measures is the preparation of the City’s first Historic Preservation Plan (Plan). In March 2014, the City entered into a contract with Winter & Co. for the preparation of the Plan.

Overview of Outreach
As part of the development of the Plan, focus group meetings were convened that brought together various stakeholders with an interest in historic preservation. A public workshop was held in September 2014 that drew nearly 40 individuals. In addition, representatives from the City Council, City Planning Commission, Historic Preservation Commission, Downtown and Medical Self Supporting Municipal Improvement Districts, and City staff from Building Services and Development Services make up the Historic Preservation Plan Task Force. The task force has provided insight throughout the development of the Plan.

Draft Plan Framework
With the information obtained from the public outreach events and feedback from the task force, a Draft Plan [Attachment 1] has been prepared. The Draft Plan is organized into three parts: 1) Preservation in Cedar Rapids, 2) Preservation Background, and 3) The City’s Cultural Resources. Part 1 of the Plan identifies the five components that make up the Cedar Rapids Preservation Program:

- **Administration**: The framework for operating the preservation program.
- **Identification**: The survey and recognition of properties with cultural or historic significance.
- **Management Tools**: The specific mechanisms for protecting historic resources.
- **Incentives and Benefits**: Programs that assist property owners and support preservation.
- **Education**: The tools to build awareness and strengthen skills to support preservation.

Using the five components as a framework, Part 1 outlines goals, policies, and initiatives. In total, the Draft Plan identifies around 40 initiatives. The following initiatives are a sampling of some of the key actions:

- Incorporate historic preservation into Neighborhood Action Plans and Corridor Action Plans, planning study areas, and other City planning projects.
• Explore creating a program that coordinates Public Works and Community Development staff on infrastructure projects within historic districts.
• Prioritize the list of areas that have been identified for intensive surveys in the Cedar Rapids Citywide Historic and Architectural Reconnaissance Survey.
• Update Chapter 18 Historic Preservation of the Municipal Code.
• Update the Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts.
• Update Chapter 32 Zoning of the Municipal Code to better support preservation and consideration of neighborhood character.
• Consider developing a Neighborhood Conservation District program for neighborhoods that may not be eligible for historic district designation.
• Develop an endangered property WATCH list.
• Explore the development of an emergency preservation fund.
• Explore the establishment of grant and loan programs for owners of historic resources.
• Develop a formal Heritage Tourism Program.

Timeline
Currently, the Draft Plan is being reviewed by FEMA, SHPO, IHSEMD, and the Cedar Rapids Historic Preservation Commission. Upon receipt of comments, which are anticipated by mid-April, the Draft Plan will be revised and released publically in preparation for the second public workshop. A more detailed timeline is outlined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Anticipated Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Outreach</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Draft Plan</td>
<td>March 2015 - Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Draft Plan by FEMA, SHPO, IHSEMD, and the Cedar Rapids HPC</td>
<td>April 2015 - Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Review Draft</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Public Workshop</td>
<td>Late April / Early May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Draft</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation to City Planning Commission</td>
<td>August 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation to Historic Preservation Commission</td>
<td>August 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council Adoption</td>
<td>September 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments