

The following are minutes of the Bettendorf Planning and Zoning Commission and are a synopsis of the discussion that took place at this meeting and as such may not include the entirety of each statement made. The minutes of each meeting do not become official until approved at the next meeting.

**MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
MAY 17, 2017
5:30 P.M.**

The Planning and Zoning Commission meeting of May 17, 2017, was called to order by Wennlund at 5:30 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers, 1609 State Street.

1. Roll Call

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bert, Kappeler, Ormsby, Peters, Stoltenberg, Wennlund

MEMBERS ABSENT: Rafferty

STAFF PRESENT: Greg Beck, City Planner; Lisa Fuhrman, Secretary; Bill Connors, Community Development Director; *Kristine Stone, City Attorney; Brent Morlok, City Engineer; Steve Knorrek, Fire Marshal; Decker Ploehn, City Administrator

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of April 19, 2017.

On motion by Kappeler, seconded by Stoltenberg, that the minutes of the meeting of April 19, 2017 be approved as submitted.

ALL AYES

Motion carried.

3. Review of Commission procedures.

*Stone arrived.

Land Use Amendment/Rezoning/Design Review (Sign)

4. Case 17-038; 830 State Street, Office/transitional to Commercial, submitted by Cat Clinic of the Quad Cities, LC.

5. Case 17-039; 830 State Street, C-5 Office/transitional District to C-3 General Business District, submitted by Cat Clinic of the Quad Cities, LC.
6. Case 17-040; 830 State Street, Review of the design of an on-premises identification sign in the Downtown Master Plan Overlay District, submitted by Cat Clinic of the Quad Cities, LC.

Beck reviewed the staff reports.

Connors asked if the rezoning is conditioned on the fact that the applicant is allowed to treat cats only. Beck confirmed this.

Bert asked if the condition prohibiting kennels on the site means that applicant would not be allowed to house cats overnight. Beck confirmed this.

Kappeler asked for clarification of the height of the proposed sign as submitted and asked if it is compliant with the Downtown Riverfront Corridor Overlay District (DRCOD) design standards. Beck explained that the design of the sign is not in compliance as it does not include the required masonry base. He added that it is 4 feet by 8 feet and it can only be illuminated by backlights. He reiterated that applicant must provide a masonry base, adding that the sign could then be lowered to connect to that base. Kappeler asked if the Commission is being asked to approve the design of a sign that is not in compliance with the ordinance requirements. Beck confirmed this.

Kappeler asked if the sign would be code-compliant if the posts are removed and the sign was then placed at ground level. Beck explained that the ordinance requires that the sign have a base. Connors stated that the sign must have some sort of masonry or stone base and be elevated off the ground. Wennlund commented that the Code is very clear that the applicant must provide a monument sign.

Wennlund asked if the pole sign shown in the photo is still on the property. Beck explained that he is unsure about whether or not it is still there. He indicated that because the building has been vacant staff would consider that the pole sign has been abandoned and could not be used.

Wennlund stated that it appears as though the entire block where the property is located is zoned C-5. He indicated that the property to the north is zoned R-2 with the property to the south being zoned C-3. He commented that there is a substantial amount of parking area that could serve as a buffer to the residential area and questioned whether approving the request would create a spot zone if the zoning district of only one property is changed. Beck explained that oftentimes a court is

required to determine if a spot zoning exists. Stone stated that when a claim of spot zoning arises the impact on neighboring properties and whether there is a decrease in property values as a result of allowing an incompatible use are considered. She indicated that the Commission must decide if the use is incompatible given the restrictions that are being imposed. She added that there are properties zoned C-3 directly across the street.

Connors stated that in his opinion the proposed conditional zoning meets the intent of the ordinance. He indicated that there would be no external components that would affect the neighbors as might occur if the applicant were planning to operate a veterinary clinic where she would treat dogs and where kennels are allowed.

Wennlund asked how the city could effectively monitor whether the applicant is complying with the restrictions. Connors stated that staff often learns of new businesses when the owner applies for a sign permit. He added that staff found out about the proposed clinic because a sign company submitted a rendering as part of the permitting process before anyone was even aware the property had been purchased. Connors explained that if a use is considered to be a nuisance, the neighbors will inform city staff.

Wennlund asked if staff has any concerns about redevelopment of the property if it is destroyed by fire at some point in the future and has a different zoning classification than the adjacent properties. Connors explained that the proposed rezoning is conditional on the fact that the property is to be used for a cat clinic only, adding that the property will revert to the previous zoning classification if that is no longer the case.

Lisa Kulemin, the applicant, explained that she had purchased the property without knowing that it was not zoned properly for the proposed use. She indicated that her realtor was aware that she needed a commercially-zoned property and showed her the building in question which worked for her needs. Kulemin stated that she found out that the property was not zoned properly approximately 2 weeks after the renovation of the building was started. She explained that her lease at her clinic on Utica Ridge Road in Davenport was up and she decided to move her business. She stated that she treated only 3 dogs during her 15 years at the Davenport location. She expressed concern about the condition prohibiting kennels as she occasionally does hospitalize overnight even though she rarely boards animals. Kulemin stated that because cats tend to recover better at home, her goal is to send them home rather than keep them overnight.

Wennlund asked if the condition could be revised to prohibit boarding of animals. Connors explained that that was the intent of the condition.

Wennlund asked if the sign company was familiar with the requirements of the DRCOD when the drawing was submitted. Kulemin confirmed this, adding that because of the process involved in rezoning the lot, she decided to wait until the Commission meeting to proceed. She indicated that she had planned to mulch around the sign and plant some daisies underneath it.

Kappeler stated that as submitted, the design of the sign is not compliant. She stated that the sign must be lowered and placed on a monument base. Kulemin explained that she cannot afford a monument sign. She asked if the Commission would approve the same basic sign if the posts are shortened and the sign lowered. She stated that she would be willing to encase the posts in brick to match the building. Connors suggested that perhaps the Commission would allow the applicant to install two courses of stone and lower the sign. Wennlund commented that this would be an economical solution, adding that the Commission cannot change each part of the sign to attempt to match the ordinance requirements. He suggested that retaining masonry blocks could be installed up to the bottom of the sign to mimic the appearance of a monument sign and still meet the spirit of the ordinance.

Kulemin asked if the Commission would accept the sign if brick columns were used instead of poles. Wennlund stated that the goal is to eliminate the use of posts in the design of the sign. He reiterated that the code references monument signs only. Kulemin asked if the Commission wishes to require that there be a continuous structure under the sign, not just brick posts. Kappeler confirmed this. Kulemin asked how high the sign could be on top of the stone. Connors explained that given the setback, the sign could be 20 feet tall. He added that the costs of installing a monument base would increase as the sign height increases.

Kulemin stated that in the interest of lowering the cost, she would lower the height of the sign rather than increase it. She asked for clarification of the height of the base and indicated that she would prefer that it not be installed directly on the ground. Connors suggested that the base of the sign be approximately 2 ½ feet tall. Wennlund stated that the sign must have the appearance of a monument sign regardless of the method used. He reiterated that the ordinance requires that signs in the DRCOD be of a monument style.

Wennlund asked if the requests could be approved subject to a different specification for the sign than was submitted. Connors confirmed this.

On motion by Kappeler, seconded by Stoltenberg, that a land use amendment for 830 State Street, Office/transitional to Commercial, be approved subject to staff recommendations.

ALL AYES

Motion carried.

On motion by Kappeler, seconded by Stoltenberg, that the rezoning of 830 State Street, C-5 to C-3, be approved subject to staff recommendations and a prohibition of boarding and kenneling on the property.

ALL AYES

Motion carried.

On motion by Kappeler, seconded by Stoltenberg, that the design of an on-premises identification sign to be located at 830 State Street be approved subject to compliance with the design and performance standards imposed in the DRCOD and which has the appearance of a monument sign.

ALL AYES

Motion carried.

Land Use Amendment/Rezoning

7. Case 17-054; 3249, 3270, and 3275 Palmer Hills Court and 3280 Middle Road, Office/transitional to Commercial, submitted by Build to Suit, Inc./Kevin Koellner.
8. Case 17-047; 3249, 3270, and 3275 Palmer Hills Court and 3280 Middle Road, C-5 Office/transitional District to C-2 Community Shopping District, submitted by Build to Suit, Inc./Kevin Koellner.
9. Case 17-055; 2895 AAA Court, Office/transitional to High-density Residential, submitted by Build to Suit, Inc./Kevin Koellner.
10. Case 17-053; 2895 AAA Court, C-5 Office/transitional District to R-5 Multi-family Residence District, submitted by Build to Suit, Inc./Kevin Koellner.

Beck reviewed the staff reports.

Kappeler asked if the right-in/right-out access on Middle Road would be allowed as indicated on the concept plan. Beck explained that no access is to be allowed from Middle Road for any of the properties involved. He stated that for access to be allowed from Middle Road, the property would have to be replatted and that approval by the Public Works staff would have to be granted.

Kappeler asked for clarification of the feasibility of the 3 access points indicated along the easternmost property line adjacent to the existing commercial development. Beck explained that both concept plans indicate those 3 accesses, adding that regardless of the eventual design layout, a site development plan including the proposed access points would be submitted which would subsequently be reviewed by the Commission.

Kappeler asked how the development could be considered viable if no access is allowed by the adjoining owners. Beck explained that if the concept which includes a convenience store with gas pumps is chosen, the parent company of Hy-Vee would be involved and could allow their customers to access the proposed development via their existing commercial development and possibly to Middle Road. Connors stated that discussions have been held between the owner of the adjacent commercial development and the current developer. He indicated that staff has encouraged the developer to provide a layout that would allow good access between the existing and proposed developments and the signalized intersection at AAA Court. He stated that improved access should alleviate some of the traffic congestion in the area. Connors explained that there is no certainty as to how the property will be utilized until a site development plan for the property is submitted.

Wennlund commented that the driveway west of the existing building is very narrow, especially at the southern end. Bert added that in his opinion having 3 separate access points for Lots 2 and 10 is a recipe for disaster. Wennlund indicated that there would not be adequate space to turn out of the center access without impinging on the other lane given the location of the existing building.

Kappeler commented that she believes that the project is a good fit for an infill area, adding that the external issues must be addressed so that it is best for people who use that area.

Carly Kirschneider expressed concern about the possibility of increased traffic in the area and suggested that traffic from the proposed development should be routed via AAA Court and the traffic signal there. Wennlund commented that hopefully some of the traffic volume could be taken away from the unsignalized intersection.

On motion by Kappeler, seconded by Peters, that the land use amendment for 3249, 3270, and 3275 Palmer Hills Court and 3280 Middle Road, Office/transitional to Commercial, be approved subject to staff recommendations.

ALL AYES

Motion carried.

On motion by Kappeler, seconded by Peters, that the rezoning of 3249, 3270, and 3275 Palmer Hills Court and 3280 Middle Road, C-5 Office/transitional District to C-2 Community Shopping District, be approved subject to staff recommendations.

ALL AYES

Motion carried.

On motion by Kappeler, seconded by Peters, that the land use amendment for 2895 AAA Court, Office/transitional to High-density Residential, be approved subject to staff recommendations.

ALL AYES

Motion carried.

On motion by Kappeler, seconded by Peters, that the rezoning of 2895 AAA Court, C-5 Office/transitional District to R-5 Multi-family Residential District, be approved subject to staff recommendations.

ALL AYES

Motion carried.

Final Plat

11. Case 16-031;The Woodlands 1st Addition, submitted by Windmill Development, LLC.

Beck reviewed the staff report.

Wennlund asked for clarification of the note on the preliminary plat referencing land to be negotiated for future right-of-way. Beck explained that it is the area at the southeast corner of the development, adding that the right-of-way is acknowledged on the final plat.

Kappeler asked where the 8-foot wide recreational trail will be located. Beck indicated that it would be installed along Middle Road.

Wennlund asked if Middle Road would be expanded to 4 lanes in the future. Connors stated that it is the responsibility of the adjoining property owners to add the lane on their side of the property. Morlok explained that the city would attempt to complete the widening project all at once. He indicated that if Windmiller chooses to begin his project this year but the developer of 4784 Middle Road does not, the city could hold the construction and have Windmiller bond for it until it could be done at once. Wennlund asked if the remainder of Middle Road to the roundabout would remain two lanes. Morlok confirmed this, adding that the widening of Middle Road at that location would wait until that corner develops.

On motion by Stoltenberg, seconded by Bert, that the final plat of The Woodlands 1st Addition be approved subject to staff recommendations.

ALL AYES

Motion carried.

Final Plat/Site Development Plan

12. Case 17-014; 1501 State Addition, submitted by Shive-Hattery, Inc.
13. Case 17-015; 221 - 15th Street, submitted by Shive-Hattery, Inc.

Beck reviewed the staff reports.

Ploehn stated that he would like to give some context related to the parking dilemma that exists in the downtown as it relates to the proposed development. He indicated that an acquisition of the Twin Bridges property has been the number one project goal of the City Council for 2 years and that Newbury Development has stepped forward to accomplish that task. Ploehn explained that in addition to the proposed project, there would be 2 other key developments downtown east of the I-74 bridge. He stated that the other project areas involve the lots located across the street from the proposed apartment buildings in addition to the Town Square area that is owned by the city.

Ploehn explained that city staff is in discussions with the property owners and a developer regarding the north side of the 1500 block of State Street. He indicated that two buildings have been acquired, two others are being negotiated for purchase, and 3 remain available. He stated that in his opinion, all of the properties on that block could be under the city's control within the year so that the area could be redeveloped. Ploehn stated that in addition to that block, there will be several unbuildable remnant parcels to the west that will become available as a result of the I-74 bridge replacement. He indicated that those parcels present opportunities for public parking. He stated that senior staff and City Council members feel it is the city's responsibility to ensure that adequate public parking is a part of the development on the north side of State Street and which would alleviate the parking issue for the current project for which not enough parking is available per Code. Ploehn explained that during the transition between the current and new zoning ordinance, the revised shared parking spaces ordinance change gives the city more flexibility to evaluate parking needs for projects in the downtown. He indicated that in these redevelopment areas, the city will likely need to be involved in the financing of and/or possibly construction of public parking lots or ramps. Ploehn stated that if the Commission choose to recommend denial of the proposed site development plan based on the lack of required parking imposed by the current zoning ordinance, a 2/3 majority of the City Council would be required to override the decision. He indicated that the City Council may consider doing that. He stated that perhaps the Commission would consider conditionally approving the site development plan based on the new shared parking space ordinance which gives the city more latitude to accomplish the parking goals for the downtown. Ploehn assured the Commission that the parking would be protected in the downtown and that he is aware of the concerns of the members. Wennlund commented that while the parking gap is an important issue and that the current project does not provide adequate parking, there is a great need to remove the Twin Bridges and begin redevelopment. He stated that the key to a successful redevelopment of the downtown is the provision of adequate parking. Ploehn stated that the 2 redevelopment areas will be the focal point of the City Council for the next 5 years and during the reconstruction of the bridge. He indicated that he is aware that the developments need to include ease of accessibility for not only walkers and bikers but also parking spaces for motorists.

Stone explained that approval of both the final plat and the site development plan are conditional. She indicated that the final plat is conditioned on the city's vacation of the adjacent right-of-way, adding that the process to transfer ownership has already started with a public hearing to be held on June 6. Stone added that the city's vacation of the right-of-way is contingent on Newbury's successful acquisition of the property which is scheduled to happen in June. She indicated that any recommendation for approval by the Commission of the site development plan would be contingent on the City Council's approval of the ordinance reducing the required parking standard.

Ormsby asked for clarification of the type of development that would occur on the properties on the north side of the 1500 block of State Street. Ploehn explained that the proposed use has not yet been determined because not all of the properties have been acquired. He indicated that the goal is to complement the current project with both commercial and residential uses and that the buildings would likely be vertical. He added that it would likely have a similar appearance as the current project but with more of an accent on commercial uses such as restaurants and bars with residential on the upper levels. Ormsby commented that she has seen similar developments in Iowa City that have been very effective, reiterating that parking availability is essential for success.

Kappeler stated that the Commission's recommendation for conditional approval indicates that the members trust that the City Council and staff will accomplish the required steps for the developments to be successful. She commented that typically the Commission sees very definite plans for developments, adding that she is willing to trust that adequate parking will be provided given that the proposed project will anchor the larger development area in the downtown. Kappeler indicated that the full impact of the parking shortfall will not be felt immediately as the structures will be built in stages. She commented that hopefully the parking situation will have been resolved by the time the second building is complete.

Wennlund asked if both buildings will have parking underneath. Connors confirmed this.

Kappeler asked if the proposed restaurant would be located in the first or second building. Connors explained that the architect had indicated to him today that the commercial space would be for offices, not a restaurant. Kappeler commented that the change in use would have a big impact on the number of required spaces.

Kappeler asked if there would be diagonal spaces on the north side of State Street in addition to the diagonal spaces indicated on the site plan on the south side of the street. Ploehn confirmed this, adding that the spaces on the street would be angled as it will no longer be a through street. He reiterated that as development occurs on the block across the street and the remnant properties, adequate public parking will be included to serve the businesses on both sides of the street.

Ploehn explained that staff's recommendation is to remove the 5 year expiration of interim parking plan approvals in the downtown area and instead leave it entirely to the City Council's discretion. Wennlund asked if the decision with regard to reductions of parking requirements would be made solely by the City Council. Ploehn confirmed this.

Wennlund asked for clarification of the boundaries for which the revised ordinance would be applicable. Ploehn stated that the ordinance would apply only to developments in the DRCOD.

Stone explained that the ordinance that was presented to the Commission at the last meeting included a sunset clause for 5 years for parking reductions at which time a developer would be required to comply with current regulations. She indicated that the ordinance for which the Commission made a recommendation for approval has not yet been presented to the City Council. She added that staff is now recommending that the sunset be removed but that the remainder of the ordinance as previously presented is the same. She indicated that the Commission and subsequently the City Council would have the ability to allow permanent reductions of required parking standards but would still require a developer to comply with the other conditions listed in the ordinance. Kappeler asked if the Commission would be considering recommending approval of the site development plan contingent on City Council approval of the shared parking space ordinance which no longer includes a 5 year sunset. Ploehn confirmed this. Kappeler commented that the recommendation at the last meeting had been to revise the ordinance to include the Commission and the City Council in the review of any proposed parking reductions and asked if this is still the case. Stone confirmed this, adding that the only change to the ordinance is the removal of the 5 year sunset.

Wennlund commented that downtown developments can only be successful if adequate public parking is provided.

Ormsby asked if the required number of parking spaces per unit would change as a result of implementation of the new zoning ordinance. Stone explained that the required number of spaces would be at the Commission's and City Council's discretion as long as the reduction is no more than 50 percent. She added that staff would likely make recommendations as projects are submitted.

On motion by Stoltenberg, seconded by Kappeler, that the final plat of 1501 State Addition be approved subject to staff recommendations and final approval of a parking plan compliant with the shared parking spaces ordinance.

ALL AYES

Motion carried.

On motion by Stoltenberg, seconded by Peters, that the site development plan for 221 - 15th Street be approved subject to staff recommendations and final approval of a parking plan compliant with the shared parking spaces ordinance.

ALL AYES

Motion carried.

Final Plat/Development Plan

14. Case 17-027; The Fountains 8th Addition (replat), submitted by Dan Dolan.
15. Case 17-028; The Fountains 8th Addition (development plan), submitted by Dan Dolan.

Beck reviewed the staff reports.

On motion by Bert, seconded by Stoltenberg, that the final plat of The Fountains 8th Addition be approved subject to staff recommendations.

ALL AYES

Motion carried.

On motion by Bert, seconded by Stoltenberg, that the development plan for The Fountains 8th Addition be approved subject to staff recommendations.

ALL AYES

Motion carried.

Preliminary Plat/Final Plat/Site Development Plan

16. Case 17-049; Bettplex First Addition (preliminary plat), submitted by Build to Suit, Inc./Kevin Koellner.
17. Case 17-050; Bettplex First Addition (final plat), submitted by Build to Suit, Inc./Kevin Koellner.

18. Case 17-051; Lot 1, Bettplex First Addition (proposed), submitted by Build to Suit, Inc./Kevin Koellner.

Beck reviewed the staff reports.

Wennlund asked for details regarding the lighting plan for the development. Beck explained that the applicant submitted a plan from Musco Lighting which will be evaluated by staff. Connors indicated that light cannot shine at a brightness of more than one foot candle at the property line.

Koellner explained that the lighting of the development will be by LED. He indicated that the most recent photometric test indicated that it exceeds one foot candle by approximately 60 feet. He stated that a new model is being run which takes into account the solid, 6-foot high fence which will be installed and which will hopefully bring the lighting into compliance. Koellner stated that possibly a higher fence may be required, adding that the poles are shorter than are typically seen at older athletic fields and reiterated that LED lighting will be used which uses fewer fixtures.

Koellner stated that language will be added to the plat indicating that the applicant/developer recognizes that there is an adjacent agricultural use and that there will never be any objections raised or nuisance complaints submitted regarding the farming operation and the attendant dust, odors, noise, etc.

Kappeler asked which of the fields will be artificial turf. Koellner explained that all of the fields are planned to be artificial turf but that it is possible that the two soccer fields on the eastern end of the development would be natural turf. He indicated that the developer will evaluate the final budget and then determine which surface will be used. Kappeler stated that she had wondered about the chemicals that would need to be applied to natural turf fields but which would not be required for artificial turf. Kevin commented that the fence that will be installed on the property line will hopefully prevent detritus from harvesting operations and litter from the athletic fields from traveling across property lines.

Stoltenberg asked how staff made the determination as to how many parking spaces would be required. Connors stated that he allowed the developer to plan for a comparable number of spaces as have been used at similar developments across the country. He indicated that there are between 1400 and 1500 parking spots. Koellner stated that there would be 1550 parking spaces on the property. Connors stated that the number planned is on the high end of what is provided at other facilities.

Koellner stated that public right-of-way and an east-west street is included from Middle Road to the edge of the adjacent property. He added that a public street connection could be made in the future if development occurs there. He explained that the street would be asphalt to tie into the parking areas but would be built to city specifications. Morlok explained that there would be the opportunity to put down a temporary surface for overflow parking on the property the city purchased and some of the outlots if necessary.

Ormsby asked for clarification of the time frame for completion of the project. Koellner explained that it is likely that the artificial turf would be installed this fall so that tournaments could be hosted in the spring. He indicated that the plan is to open the building in the spring, adding that weather and soil conditions could impact the schedule.

Donald Mott, River of Life Church, asked if all of the entrances to the sports complex would be from Middle Road. Morlok explained that one entrance would be from Middle Road with two additional entrances from Forest Grove Drive. He added that one of the Forest Grove Drive entrances would align with Friendship Path on the west and one would be located between the church and the Middle Road intersection.

On motion by Stoltenberg, seconded by Ormsby, that the preliminary plat of Bettplex First Addition be approved subject to staff recommendations.

ALL AYES

Motion carried.

On motion by Stoltenberg, seconded by Ormsby, that the final plat of Bettplex First Addition be approved subject to staff recommendations.

ALL AYES

Motion carried.

On motion by Stoltenberg, seconded by Ormsby, that the site development plan for Lot 1 of Bettplex First Addition (proposed) be approved subject to staff recommendations.

ALL AYES

Motion carried.

Site Development Plan

19. Case 17-052; 3627-51 Devils Glen Road, submitted by Build to Suit, Inc/Kevin Koellner.

Beck reviewed the staff report.

Kappeler asked if there would be an entrance in the back of the building for the customers who use the rear parking lot or if they would have to walk around. Koellner explained that those customers would have to walk around the building to the front. Kappeler commented that those customers would also have to walk up a floor level given the grade change on the property. Peters asked if there would be a sidewalk for those customers. Koellner confirmed this.

Ormsby asked if the business would be a bicycle shop or a motorcycle shop. She commented that if it is a motorcycle shop, noise might be an issue. Koellner stated that the owner of Healthy Habits plans to move in to the space from his current location on Devils Glen Road. Bert asked if there would be a combined bike shop and brewery or if the businesses would be separate. Koellner stated that the businesses would be separate.

Wennlund asked if handicapped parking spaces are required in the rear parking lot. Morlok stated that as long as there is no handicapped accessible entrance, no handicapped parking spaces are required as long as the total code requirement is met. Wennlund asked if two handicapped spaces is adequate for the entire site. Morlok confirmed this.

Kappeler commented that in her opinion the parking layout is not very convenient even if it is code-compliant. Wennlund stated that the grade change appears to be quite significant. Morlok explained that the change in grade is approximately 13 feet floor to floor. Wennlund asked for clarification of the distance over which the grade changes 13 feet. Morlok stated that the distance is approximately 65 feet. Connors stated that this is not unusual for garden style buildings that were popular in the 1970s and 1980s.

Kappeler asked if there are any concerns about spillover from the adjacent student housing parking lot. Koellner stated that he believes that it is more likely that customers of the two businesses would park in the student housing lot than the reverse. He stated that there is no cross parking easement in place. He explained that the overflow parking lot is required for the student housing complex in order to meet the required number of spaces. Koellner stated that the square footage of the mezzanine level of the building

was reduced in order to meet the ordinance requirements for parking spaces. He indicated that he had discussions with the owner of the apartment buildings and that there will likely be a replat forthcoming that would involve the apartment building and the storage facility that may address this issue.

On motion by Bert, seconded by Kappeler, that the site development plan for 3627-51 Devils Glen Road be approved subject to staff recommendations.

ALL AYES

Motion carried.

Other

20. Discussion of implementation of new zoning ordinance and comprehensive plan.

Connors indicated that he had decided that a special meeting would be scheduled to discuss the new zoning ordinance and comprehensive plan as a traditional meeting is not necessarily a good setting for an interactive workshop. Wennlund commented that the workshop would be a good opportunity for residents to better understand the new ordinance and comprehensive plan. Kappeler expressed her appreciation for Stone’s guidance throughout the process. Other Commission members concurred.

21. Commission Update.

Connors stated that the City Council followed the recommendation of the Commission regarding the following cases:

- Lots 69-74, The Fountains 4th Addition - land use amendment and rezoning
- Bettplex First Addition (proposed) - land use amendment and rezoning
- Lot 2, The Springs at Bettendorf - land use amendment and rezoning
- Glenbrook Ridge - final plat and site development plan
- Coreline Addition - final plat
- 4555 Utica Ridge Road - site development plan

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at approximately 7:10 p.m.

These minutes approved _____

 Gregory W. Beck, City Planner