

OFFICIAL MINUTES

Chairperson Tanner Aiken called the meeting of the City Planning Commission to order on Monday, May 6, 2024, at 5:30 PM in the Council Chambers Room #310 on the third floor of the City & County Government Center. Members present were Scot Leddy, Debra Spear, Jacob Mills, Roger Solum, Kyle Jamison, Jacob Limmer, Nick Schmeichel and Richard Smith. Also present were City Planner Ryan Miller and Community Development Director Michael Struck. Also present were Kaitlin Lee, Andy Lee, Debra Aalderks, Curt Kabris, Brian Brenner, Lyle Prussman, Shawn Storhaug, Matthew Weiss, Katie Murray, Robert Geary, Charles Ziegloff, Kurt Gutormson, Kyle Prodoehl and Patrick Daily.

Item #7d – DesignArc Group submitted an initial development for Campanile Flats. The Initial Development Plan proposed a redevelopment of 1.18 acres of land along Campanile Avenue. The Initial Development Plan was submitted concurrently with a petition to rezone the property from a Residence R-2 two-family district to a Planned Development District with Residence R-3 apartment district underlying zoning.

(Smith/Schmeichel) Motion to approve the initial development plan with the staff recommendations including the following requests exceptions: reduction of required parking by ten stalls, allow shared parking on lot across Campanile Ave, reduced setbacks for parking lot at 615 Campanile Ave, reduction to required landscape area in rear yard where parking is proposed, reduced bufferyard setback to the south, six-foot front yard encroachment for balconies.

(Schmeichel/Mills) Amendment to the motion removing the reduction of parking as an approved exception. All present voted no. **MOTION FAILED.**

Original motion was voted on. Spear voted no. All others present voted aye. **MOTION CARRIED.**

OFFICIAL SUMMARY

Item #7d –The proposed redevelopment includes an apartment building located east of Campanile Avenue and south of 7th Street. The apartment building would include ground level parking accessed from the alley as well as additional parking adjacent to the alley. An additional lot across Campanile Avenue would serve as additional parking for the development. A mid-block pedestrian crossing and a total of 91 off-street parking stalls were proposed. The minimum off-street parking requirement is 101 parking stalls. The developer will also separately propose on-street parking along 7th Street. The developer sought a reduced bufferyard setback of 7-feet to the south. The first floor of the structure is located at the 7-foot side yard setback with additional floors setback to the 25-foot bufferyard setback. Parking stalls along the alley will prevent the project from meeting the required landscaping for an apartment use, which requires that all setback areas be landscaped. The developer is seeking a variance to remove landscape requirements where twelve parking stalls are located along the alley. The satellite parking lot would also require exceptions. Shared parking is permitted when lots are adjacent. A cross street parking lot would not meet the definition of adjacent. Additionally, the parking lot must meet the setback requirements for the lot due to its accessory use for an apartment. The parking lot would need variances for setbacks to the north, west and east. The proposed setback from Campanile Ave was 10-feet. Setbacks to the north, south and alleyway are proposed to be 3.5 feet. The parking lot will be

screened with fencing and landscaping. Lastly, the Initial Development Plan sought setback encroachments for balconies that would overhang the front yard setbacks of Campanile Ave and 7th Street by six-feet.

Storhaug, property owner, and Weiss, architect, came to speak on behalf of this request. Matthew proposed to meet engineering standards to capture all water with curb and gutter. One proposal reduced landscaping buffers to increase parking with a full loop and not tie into the alley. The alley is being maintained and an opaque 6' fence would be installed on the north and south sides of the parking lot. Proposed high density building to be of use near campus. Schmeichel asked for clarification of opaque fence due to headlights shining into people's homes. Weiss said it would be opaque to effectively, 100% as far as fence standards go, block the light when viewing from a 90-degree angle. There would also be some light blocking landscaping on the inside of the fence. Aiken followed up if there would be fencing on the west side of the lot and Weiss said it would not as proposed. Aiken expanded on his concern about light shining into people's back yard when turning through that lot. Weiss said if a fence was installed on the west side, it would be 2.5' from landscape buffer. Mills asked for more details on drainage plans and if there would be underground detention. Weiss pointed out that on right and left sides of Campanile Ave, each lot is under an acre so he believes it to be a grey area on what types of drainage would be required. Bioswales were proposed on the apartment side and if more drainage would be required to be captured, it would be underground system. The parking lot side would flow directly into the city sewer. Mills asked if they are requesting 10 less spaces than required, not considering the 13 boulevard spaces, Matthew said yes. Limmer asked Weiss to explain the need for a west parking lot instead of under the building. He stated that the site does afford a parking ramp design but it is difficult with that small of a site and cost prohibitive. Mills asked if all 84 units are single bedroom units. There were (40) 1-bedroom units, (8) 2-bedroom units and (36) efficiency units. Mills inquires if another story would be required to make it economical since other projects in the area required more units to be economical. Storhaug said that they originally looked at smaller building so they increased the unit count it to make it financially work. Jamison asked if the city required anything for pedestrian safety on the cross walk. Weiss had not figured that out yet, with this being a midblock crossing, there would be some signage at least. He did not know if raised pedestrian crossings, additional striping or twirling signs would be permitted. Jamison suggested a built-out curb, daylighting and a walk signal. Weiss liked those options and said it would be defines as a "choker" like those on main.

Murray asked for clarification on the curb and gutter on the parking lot and if it is just the city required curb and gutter or if it would be around the entire lot. Weiss stated that it would be the whole lot. Gutormson asked that the drainage slope to the east. He also inquired if alley access would be blocked with current plan. Storhaug stated that the alley would stay as it is. Kurt pointed out that traffic on Campanile Ave was always backed up and how would they widen the road in the future or what would it look like. Charles noted that from personal experience of being in the area for four years, he did not see the fit with 2-3 person homes who are used to having a view of the campanile in their back yards now having a five-story apartment building in their yard. Gutormson asked that since the City maintained the alley, even though it was not legally an alley, could they request it to be legally dedicated as an alley? Miller responded that there would be a process, separate from this agenda item, that they could discuss at a later date. Gutormson confirmed that the rezone would not impede with the legal rights of the landowners using the alley. Prodoehl would like to see master plan for north of 6th St. as he also has some property there west of Medary and believed that a similar request would work well. He also noted that it may be worth revisiting the code to make those areas more usable.

Schmeichel has heard the main concern of the alley and wanted to know if it was left in place on the proposed plan due to code or law. Miller clarified, that it was a private alleyway, it had been used as a public alley but was private until the midpoint. The site plan showed no changes to the alley and any major changes such as the setbacks would need to be seen again if proposed. Mills was excited about project with need for density in the area. His primary concern was detention and drainage not following traditional rules due to being on two parcels and his other concern was reduction in parking because there was no control over boulevard parking and recently reduced parking requirements. Miller stated that drainage rules applied but the plan was not required at this point. Limmer suggested that the number of exceptions made for this project seems to be ‘crowbarring’ the project into the neighborhood. Leddy thanked the developers and commented that it would change the landscape. He stated that parking was a huge concern and making the exception would also cause a loss of parking on the street. Leddy also commented that bioswales become ineffective over time and they need to make sure to have adequate drainage.

Church at 1204 7th St. said that when school was in session the streets were full and need all available parking. Struck clarified that there would not need to be a reduction of ten parking spaces if the boulevard was approved. The current code requires one parking spot per bed plus 10%. Since the apartment was near campus, he anticipated some people with no vehicle. Jamison agreed that given the proximity to campus that there would be people without a vehicle. Struck went on to say that boulevard parking was intended for service or delivery vehicles and safety backing out of boulevard parking was a concern. Aiken inquired if every bed has a parking space. Struck said that at full occupancy, with the ten-parking space reduction, only one bed would be without a parking space.

Schmeichel clarified that it was one parking space per bed and if the boulevard parking was approved, they would be over required parking requirement. Schmeichel expressed his desire to withdraw his amendment. Jamison inquired if there was indoor bike parking. Storhaug stated that there would be bike parking on west side of the building but he did not want to promise something that was not set in stone.

Prodoehl would like to see master plan, an area designated R-3 and the same variances seen at the meeting extended to other builders. Miller stated that the master plan included mixed uses, not just R-3. Struck clarified that the city would not force a rezone at this time, however each individual project with individual variances, could be brought to be seen by the board.