

URBANDALE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MINUTES

March 15, 2021

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and associated protocols, the Urbandale Planning & Zoning Commission met in regular session as a virtual meeting on Monday, March 15, 2021, via WebEx. Vice-chairperson Hatfield called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said the March 15, 2021 regular meeting of the Urbandale Planning and Zoning Commission will now come to order. The Commission is empowered by Iowa law and by City ordinances to make recommendations to the City Council for action on petitions for rezoning, amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, and various development proposals such as subdivision plats and site plans.

Urbandale strives to promote and model the principles of Character Counts, and we expect all participants in tonight's meeting to conduct themselves in a respectful manner that adheres to the principles of trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and citizenship.

Commissioners present were Joan Racki, Lee Hollatz, Julie Roethler, Marcus Galante, Aaron Smith, Judy Ralston-Hansen, Jeff Hatfield, and Wayne Van Heuvelen. Staff members present were Kristi Bales, Community Development Manager/Chief Planner; Annika Schilke, Planner II; Cheryl Vander Linden, Administrative Specialist; and Nicole Lunders, City Clerk.

This is an informal meeting that is open to the public. The matters that appear on the agenda are not public hearings unless specifically noted. However, if anyone wishes to address the Commission briefly on any item that is on the agenda you may request to be recognized using the WebEx application. We ask that each person addressing the Commission please unmute your microphone when prompted to do so by the Commission Chair, and state their name and address for the record prior to speaking.

The Commission will take action on each item on the agenda at this meeting, unless the Commission determines that additional information should be gathered prior to voting. The Commission's action is advisory only and is not binding on the City Council.

Finally, please mute your electronic device to lessen background noise but also remember to "un-mute" your electronic device at the time of discussion, questions and voting.

The first item on the agenda was election of chairperson and vice-chairperson for 2021.

Mr. Hatfield said, as you all know, Lesa Quinn resigned from the Commission due to purchasing a new home in Florida and just not having enough time and not being in Urbandale about half of the year.

Ms. Bales said Mr. Hatfield is serving as the Vice-chairperson and depending on how the election of the Chairperson goes, I wasn't sure if we'd elect him into the Chair position and then elect a new vice-chairperson, or how you wanted to do it. So I put both titles down on the agenda. We can open it up for nominations, like we did just a few months ago, for the Chair, see who gets that, and then open up nominations and vote on the vice-chair.

Mr. Hatfield said I'd be happy to go ahead and step up to the Chairperson, if we could find somebody who will assist me and correct all my errors throughout the year, as vice-chairperson.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said I think you've done a great job as vice-chair and I see no reason that you couldn't serve as chair. I think you're up to the task.

Mr. Hatfield said I'd be happy to do that. He asked if there was any discussion or if anybody else wanted to be considered for the Chair position?

Ms. Ralston-Hansen moved, and it was seconded by Smith, to approve Jeff Hatfield as Chairperson of the 2021 Commission. The motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Hatfield asked who would like to be the vice-chair this year?

Ms. Ralston-Hansen said I'd be honored and willing to fill the position.

Mr. Hatfield asked if there was anyone else wishing to be considered.

Hearing no one, Ms. Roethler moved, and it was seconded by Galante, to approve Judy Ralston-Hansen as Vice-chairperson of the 2021 Commission. The motion was approved unanimously.

The next item on the agenda was the public hearing on Amending Chapter 160: Zoning Ordinance to add "Mobile Food Units" as a temporary use, Case No. 010-2021-03.01. Mr. Van Heuvelen said, if there were no objections, he would dispense with reading the following official publication:

Case No. 010-2021-03.01

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

Notice is hereby given that the Urbandale Planning & Zoning Commission will hold a public hearing at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, March 15, 2021, to consider an amendment to

Chapter 160: Zoning of the Urbandale Municipal Code, regarding Mobile Food Units (“food trucks”). The proposed amendment would allow Mobile Food Units on a temporary and limited basis upon issuance of a permit.

Due to public health concerns and guidance, in accordance with Iowa Code sections 21.4(1)(b) and 21.8, this meeting will be conducted electronically via a WebEx virtual meeting application.

To join the meeting via WebEx type in the link below:

<https://cityofurbandale.webex.com/cityofurbandale/j.php?MTID=mbaf52c9c29bc41ea18a8a3a3cd9f04ab>

Meeting number: 187 143 5978

Password: 1234

To join the meeting via phone dial: (408) 418-9388 Access code: 187 143 5978

More information on the proposed amendment can be obtained at the Department of Community Development, 3600-86th Street, Urbandale, Iowa between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. The Department can be reached by phone at 515-278-3935. All interested parties either for or against the proposed amendment will be heard at the time and place set forth above.

There were no objections to the official notice as published.

Ms. Bales said this proposed amendment to the Zoning Ordinance was drafted by staff after administering a pilot program for Mobile Food Units (“food trucks”) since 2017. The pilot program started in 2017 in response to frequent requests to allow food trucks at various locations throughout the City. The pilot program continued through 2020. Staff presented the proposed language to the City Council at their Lunch & Learn on November 10, 2020.

The proposed amendment would formalize the pilot program by incorporating the language into the Zoning Ordinance. The temporary use permit application process for the vendors is all on-line through the Citizenserve permit portal. Once an application is reviewed and approved, a temporary use permit will be issued for a specific property but may be issued for multiple dates/times for said specific property. The fee for a temporary use permit is \$30.

Under the pilot program, the City issued 11 temporary use permits in 2017; 21 permits in 2018; 20 permits in 2019; and 5 permits in 2020. Permits are required for each individual location where the food truck will be located. As part of the permitting process, the applicant must provide proof of the owner’s property consent, a health inspection certificate, a site plan and vehicle information. This proposed language sets requirements related to building separation, inspections, signage and overall operation.

Ms. Bales said Staff recommends approval of the attached amendment to the Zoning Ordinance allow "Mobile Food Units" as temporary use.

Mr. Hatfield asked it's \$30 for the permit. Is that per year, per month, per incident?

Ms. Bales said it's going to be per location. Each location requires an inspection by the Fire Department. They're there the first time that particular food truck is there to check for the safety equipment, to check for separation from the nearest building, that sort of thing. So if you're there a week later, they don't come back again, it's just that first time that that truck is there.

Mr. Hatfield said got it. So it would be per calendar year per location.

Ms. Bales said yes.

Mr. Hatfield asked where were these mobile trucks in the past most often used? Were they at business parks, or parking lots, or what were the top three locations that were most popular?

Ms. Bales said Homemaker's Furniture is probably the top location. In fact they have a staff person who would handle all of their permitting and they'd have different trucks, usually on Friday from 11 to 1, 11 to 2, that was probably #1. Aurora Business Park had a business that would host food trucks from time to time. Those are probably the top two, I can't think who would come in third place.

Ms. Ralston-Hansen asked do you envision publicizing this and making it a little bit more known to increase traffic or opportunity for food vendors?

Ms. Bales said yes. In fact we've already been getting calls for this season's rotation of food trucks. We'll send out some information once it gets approved to the people that have applied in the most recent past, and including some of the businesses who have hosted them in the most recent past, to get that word out.

Mr. Galante asked how many locations have there been? I mean, is this something that is pretty widespread?

Ms. Bales said no, it's not. I would say less than 10 locations. Some of those permits in the early years for multiple trucks but at one location, Homemakers being one location but they'd have four or five food trucks throughout the summer.

Mr. Galante asked are there permits that would allow them to have multiple trucks at a location? Or is it sort of once you apply for it, you own that location?

Ms. Bales said we require the property owner's consent and so if the property owner wants to have a couple, it's not forbidden. They have to be spaced and make sure they're not taking up too many parking spaces. We require the owners consent so that there's not a conflict with maybe existing tenants, if they go into a multi-tenant parking lot, one of them happens to be a restaurant. We don't want to facilitate any friction, so that's why we want the property owner's consent to think through that before a food truck just arrives on their property.

Ms. Roethler asked I'm curious how long the permit lasts. It sounds like someone could apply for a permit and use it on a reoccurring basis. Is that indefinite or is there an expiration?

Ms. Bales said the expiration is at the end of the calendar year, whether it be like a veggie market - we've got a couple who will apply for, one at Rieman Music, one up here on 86th Street – they used to be at Dollar General and last year, they were across the street. Those expire with the calendar year.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said I noticed that they can't be closer than 100 feet from an existing permanent restaurant. Am I reading that correctly?

Ms. Bales said yes, that sounds right.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said that's a third of a football field and seems pretty close to businesses that are supporting the community, perhaps, for years. Is there objection from existing restaurants saying that's a bit close, that they could essentially be in my parking lot when I'm running my business?

Ms. Bales said we haven't heard any objections in the pilot program on that topic. Actually, we haven't really heard a lot of objections on the pilot program. But that gets to the heart of the reason that we require the property owner's consent. Because if an existing property owner has an existing restaurant as a tenant, we want to make sure that that property owner – we're not going to make them prove that they've talked to the restaurant that's on the site, we're certainly going to encourage it. They're going to think ahead and hopefully avoid any conflicts with a temporary one- or two-time user versus their long-standing brick and mortar tenant in the building.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said I could be reading this wrong, but as I read item 7, it seems to be that they could park 101 feet away from an existing restaurant in a parking lot or something like that, without the consent from that restaurant owner.

Ms. Bales said that is right. They still have to have the property owner's consent but you're right, they could park 101 feet away and not have to check in with the restaurant.

Mr. Van Heuvelen asked did notice go out on this public hearing to restaurants? Or, what was the notice procedure?

Ms. Bales said we published, like we're required to do. I've mentioned it to a couple of people as they've called in, like our rules are going to be changing, we're getting rid of the pilot program. We didn't send it out to restaurant owners, because sometimes restaurant owners are the property owners and sometimes they're not. So, we did not do a mailing on this.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said just food for thought, and forgive the pun, but if you do get push back from restaurant owners when they find out that somebody could be 101 feet, can we change that? Or have we given due consideration to that's awfully close to businesses that have been supporting little league, paying property taxes, hiring people and just being a good community citizen, perhaps for decades?

Ms. Bales said we can go through the same process to change the number, if we find that it's an issue. But if I have a restaurant call me, even if they're 101 feet away or 99 feet, I am going to ask the property owner applied for the permit, so if they're a rental in a space but the underlying property owner applied for the permit, the first thing I'm going to do is say we'll verify and make sure it's correct, and please contact the property owner because it's the property owner who applied, or consented.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said I understand that the Council has had a lunch and learn education session about this, so I'm assuming that they've looked at the 100 feet and deemed it adequate, but I guess I would say that if we do get complaints from restaurants, I'm certainly going to be very sympathetic to their plight. I mean, I'm all in favor of this, I like those places. And it's great to see entrepreneurs in our community. But I don't want to create unfair competition for our current citizens.

Ms. Bales said in the top two users, there's not a restaurant within 100 feet. And certainly, if you want to say I'm supportive of it, I make a motion, but it shouldn't be 100 feet, it should be "pick your number", certainly we'll incorporate that into the recommendation that goes forward to the Council.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said let's see how other commissioners feel about it.

Mr. Hatfield said as this is a public hearing, the Commission will take comments from anyone in favor or opposed to this proposed Zoning Ordinance amendment. Then we can circle back to this issue, but I agree with Mr. Van Heuvelen. First we will hear from proponents, those in favor. Seeing no proponents, he asked are there any opponents? We're going to close the public hearing and discuss it, so if anybody has anything to say, now is the time for such comments to be aired. There was no one who wished to speak.

Mr. Galante moved, and it was seconded by Ralston-Hansen, to close the public hearing. On roll call; Ayes: Galante, Ralston-Hansen, Racki, Smith, Hollatz, Roethler, Van Heuvelen, Hatfield; Nays: none. Passes: none. Motion carried.

Mr. Galante said food trucks are not new. Where are we in the order of towns in the metro to adopt something like this? Are we one of the last, one of the first? Do our rules conform with their rules, that kind of thing?

Ms. Bales said our rules aren't exact, but we did check with other cities. The first question I usually get from someone who's been in Des Moines and they say well, Des Moines just has a location and an area for us, we don't have to get a permit for the location. We don't have a concentrated area that's designated for food trucks. So that's usually the first difference I hear. Waukee did the pilot program like we did. In fact, their planner had contacted me just last week, asking if we were doing pilot again this summer. And I said no, we're actually going through the code change. Waukee's a little bit behind us. There are other cities that have them on board. Normally with things like this in the metro, we check with Des Moines, West Des Moines, Ankeny, Grimes, Clive, Waukee, sometimes a couple of other cities. But we've been checking and reading their language, as well. But we don't match anybody specifically.

Mr. Galante asked how did we design our standard then, I'm curious? Was it just based off of feedback from vendors, or from existing standards that are out there, or what?

Ms. Bales said after some initial meetings with members of the Chamber we put the pilot program together, and then refined that as needed. For example, we had a pilot program for private property, and then Parks Department had their program. Then if you're on a public street, you're a block party. This will take care of the two pilot programs. If you're still a block party, you follow that process through the Police Department like normal. But it will consolidate the private property and the public park property into one ordinance.

Mr. Galante asked what necessitates the permit then? Is that just for revenue, for control or what?

Ms. Bales said we did all of the pilot as free, but we still had the staff time for it. There's some paperwork, but mostly it's for that Fire Department inspection where they go and check. So there is one inspection that's done, on site.

Mr. Galante said last question, what about restaurants that are shifting their operation outside because of COVID, trying to stay relevant during this time? What would keep them from maybe operating outside, still within 100 feet of their business or within the proprietor's space? Let's say the restaurant wanted to create a food truck and park right out front of their restaurant? Do you foresee that even as a possibility?

Ms. Bales said I don't see that as a possibility. There's a Mexican restaurant that I can think of off of 121st Street who did, during the times of COVID, they've adapted and added some outdoor space. The zoning code has a provision for outdoor dining and depending on the size, if it's still kind of a small area, you don't have to add more parking. If you're having a big addition for outdoor use, you would have to have a parking conversation. But we did have at least one restaurant, and I'm thinking there was probably a second but I'm drawing a blank right now, but I know the Mexican restaurant on 121st now does have some outdoor provisions. This would not mix with that. You can already do that. If that same restaurant owner wanted to put the food truck in front, first we'd get the property owner consent and then we'd have to think a little bit about that setback stuff.

Mr. Galante asked are there provisions for bathrooms or the like, facilities-wise, for customers?

Ms. Bales said no, we don't get into bathrooms.

Mr. Hatfield said as I look at the staff report, this pilot program has been going on since 2017. 11 in 2017, 21 in 2018, 20 in 2019 and so on. So, it's been going on for four years. Any other questions or comments?

Mr. Hollatz asked is that 100 feet distance similar in other jurisdictions?

Ms. Bales said I think it was, but I can't tell you other cities' numbers. Sorry.

Mr. Hollatz said so it's been going on for a few years and hasn't caused too much of an uproar yet that you've been made aware of?

Ms. Bales said correct.

Mr. Hatfield said I like what Mr. Van Heuvelen was saying earlier, though. Urban Grill comes to mind, we go there often, and they actually are a parcel outside of Signature Real Estate's property. So that parking lot and that building is a parcel. So, it's possible that Signature Real Estate could allow a food truck to be in that first row of parking 100 feet outside of Urban Grill's door, selling steaks and hamburgers and hot dogs. I think 100 feet just seems too close. I realize that we've had this program going for a few years. It just seems a little too close. Maybe 200 feet or 250 feels better and we can change it next year if it seems too restrictive.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said regarding that bathroom issue, at 100 feet you can envision the possibility that somebody would buy that hot dog at the mobile truck, go use the restroom at Urban Grill or the Chicken Coop or Jimmy John's restaurant or whatever, essentially almost use their parking lot. Because if you look at Jimmy John's which I think the whole parking lot or a lot of it probably is community parking lot, that they could

essentially park very, very close to the Chicken Coop or Jimmy John's and set up their truck. And somebody might intend on going to the Chicken Coop but end up buying the chicken leg from the food truck. And then going to use the bathroom at the Chicken Coop.

Mr. Hatfield said so, so far two people have said that 100 feet seems a little bit too tight. Before motions are made, what do you all think? Would you agree to 200 feet? Or do you think 100 is fine? And if so, we can start making motions.

Mr. Hollatz said I wouldn't be opposed to increasing, like you guys have been saying. Since it's been recently in place, it shouldn't inhibit anyone who has currently been doing it for the past few years, whether at Homemaker's or at Aurora Business Park. It would add a little protection for other areas, just in case.

Ms. Roethler asked Ms. Bales if she saw any issues with 200 feet?

Ms. Bales said I don't.

Ms. Ralston-Hansen said and they can always get permission from the restaurant. If the restaurant says, "I don't care, you're selling tacos and I'm selling Chinese". So they can get written permission. So, that would be fine.

Mr. Galante said I agree, as long as they can bypass it with a written signature. That would make sense.

Mr. Hatfield said in this case, it wouldn't affect Homemakers at all because Homemakers sell cookies, but they don't have a formal restaurant. Really it's only 200 feet away from an existing sit-down restaurant or a brick-and-mortar restaurant.

Ms. Bales said I really don't see it being an issue, so whatever is incorporated into the motion, I'll write down and pass it along.

Ms. Ralston-Hansen moved, and it was seconded by Galante, to approve to Amend Chapter 160: Zoning Ordinance to add "Mobile Food Units" as a temporary use, subject to Staff recommendations with the recommended change, Section E Part 7, of the distance to an existing restaurant from 100 feet to 200 feet of separation. On roll call; Ayes: Ralston-Hansen, Galante, Racki, Smith, Hollatz, Roethler, Van Heuvelen, Hatfield; Nays: none. Passes: none. Motion carried.

The next item on the agenda was “The Machine Shed Plat 2” Preliminary and Final Plat (Hickman Road & 111th Street).

Ms. Schilke said this is a resubmittal of a Preliminary and Final plat that were reviewed and approved in 2019, but have since expired. This Preliminary and Final Plat pertain to the area around three existing commercial buildings north of Hickman Road and east of Interstate 80/35. The existing buildings are locally known as 11151 Hickman Road (The Machine Shed), 11167 Hickman Road (Hotel Renovo), and 11211 Hickman Road (Revel Hotel).

This area is zoned Planned Unit Development and is regulated by the Living History Farms Planned Unit Development Master Plan.

This proposed plat is designed to resolve some existing issues related to delineation of ownership and minimum parking requirements, which arose during the review process for recent renovations at the Revel Hotel. The existing condo regime that covers a portion of the proposed area to be platted will also be dissolved as a part of this platting process. A portion of the property was previously platted as “Machine Shed Plat 1” and a portion was previously plated as part of “State Farm Addition”.

This existing property would be divided between three buildable lots, and several outlots. Each of the three buildable lots covers an existing building. The lots proposed in Machine Shed Plat 2, along with their acreages, are as follows:

- Lot 1 (associated with Revel Hotel), 3.17 acres;
- Lot 2 (associated with Hotel Renovo) 3.51 acres;
- Lot 3 (associated with The Machine Shed) 3.01 acres;
- Outlots: V - 2.38 acres, W - 1.32 acres, X - 1.00 acres, Y - 0.59 acres, and Z - 1.02 acres.

Existing access is currently provided from Hickman Road on the eastern side of the proposed plat and is not impacted by this platting process.

Ms. Schilke said Staff recommends approval of the preliminary plat subject to requiring the developer to:

1. Verify acres on each lot and in the overall plat; Show sufficient access easements, and provide associated legal descriptions, to provide movement between the parcels and circulation to all lots, including provision of easements across Lots 2 and 3 to provide access to Lot 1.
2. With the creation of lot 2 and 3, there will be two lots on one private sanitary sewer. Provide a maintenance agreement for the two lots for city review. Once approved by city, provide recorded book and page number.

3. A stormwater facility maintenance agreement per the Post Construction Stormwater Ordinance will be required at the time of the final plat. We have a SWFMA for Lot 1; a SWFMA for the detention on Outlots X, Y, and Z is required with the final plat. Provide easement exhibit or show all bearings and callouts with linework on Plat. It is preferred that the easements are described using Plat 2. There should be two separate legal descriptions for the two basins (only one was provided).

Staff also recommends approval of the final plat subject to requiring the developer to:

1. Submit an Attorney's Opinion and all other plat documents as found to be necessary for approval; verify that there are no public improvements associated with this plat.
2. Verify acres on each lot and in the overall plat; Show sufficient access easements, and provide associated legal descriptions, to provide movement between the parcels and circulation to all lots including provision of easements across Lots 2 and 3 to provide access to Lot 1.
3. Provide updated easement descriptions. Previous comments on Easement Descriptions:
 - a. 10' private water main easement: Revise the third leg, should be $S70^{\circ}14'39''E$.
 - b. For both the 10' private water main and 20' private sanitary sewer Easements, clarify the point of commencement. It should read "Parcel D" from Book 7941 Page 616, rather than "Lot 1 o" or "Lot 1 D" of Plat 2.
 - c. Irregular private sanitary sewer easement: Verify the first bearing, it does not match the lot line bearing.
 - d. Capitalize all directions in bearings.
4. A Stormwater Facility Maintenance Agreement is required per our Post Construction Stormwater Ordinance. We have a SWFMA for Lot 1, provide a SWFMA for the detention on Outlots X, Y, and Z. Provide easement exhibit or show all bearings and callouts with linework on Plat. It is preferred that the easements are described using Plat 2. There should be two separate legal descriptions for the two basins (only one was provided).
5. With the creation of lot 2 and 3, there will be two lots on one private sanitary sewer. We will need to review a maintenance agreement for the two lots. Once approved by us it will need to be recorded.

Mr. Larry Hyler, Bishop Engineering, 3501 104th Street, Urbandale, said we have read all the review comments and we don't have any issues with them. We're working with Staff, so we'd like your blessing.

Mr. Hatfield said what was previously set up by the lawyers and owners was a little bit convoluted and what you're doing is cleaning this up, so that it can be refinanced and perhaps you have different ownership of each parcel and it's more clear for the owners and for the refinancing going forward. Is that accurate?

Mr. Hyler said that is my understanding. It was the condo. When Revel Hotel got built and they were going to try to add that into the condo, and this straightened out buildings and parking spaces, like Ms. Schilke said. It just cleaned it all up.

Mr. Hollatz moved, and it was seconded by Smith, to approve the "Machine Shed Plat 2" Preliminary and Final Plat, subject to Staff recommendations. On roll call; Ayes: Hollatz, Smith, Racki, Galante, Roethler, Ralston-Hansen, Van Heuvelen, Hatfield; Nays: none. Passes: none. Motion carried.

The next item on the agenda was "Timberline Village P.U.D. Plat 3" Preliminary Plat, 142nd Street and Douglas Parkway. In conjunction with this Preliminary Plat, Ms. Bales said she would cover "Timberline Village P.U.D. Plat 3 Regional Detention" site plan and "Kiddie Academy at Timberline Village" site plan, 14101 Douglas Parkway.

Ms. Bales said this preliminary plat covers Outlot U of "Timberline Village P.U.D. Plat 1", located in the northeast corner of the intersection of 142nd Street and Douglas Parkway. This plat totals 4.27 acres. The property is subject to the "Timberline Village" P.U.D. Master Plan which was approved in 2005 with a combination of uses at this street intersection, and Plat 1 was recorded in 2005.

This preliminary plat proposes one buildable lot consisting of 1.55 acres and one outlot totaling 2.72 acres. The buildable lot would contain all buildings and associate site improvements and the outlot would include the regional detention basin. The plat is bounded by Douglas Parkway, 142nd Street, Horton Avenue and a future private 141st Street which will be a minimum of 26 feet in width. An easement for ingress/egress along 141st Street is proposed with the plat. The plat is required to have a 20' Landscape Setback along Douglas Parkway and 142nd Street and a 10' landscape setback along Horton Avenue and 141st Street. A right turn lane is proposed at 141st Street.

Two site plans are also under consideration on this same meeting agenda for a regional storm water detention basin and a daycare business. An existing 8" sanitary sewer line is on the east side of the plat and an existing 8" water main is on the south side of Douglas Parkway and a 12" water main is on the west side of 142nd Street. Any future development of the outlot will require a site plan for review and approval.

The plat is adjacent to other portions of the same P.U.D. Master Plan on the north, east, south, and southwest. Across 142nd Street to the west is property regulated by "Village

Center West P.U.D. Master Plan". The subject property is located in the Urbandale School District and drains westward into Walnut Creek.

Ms. Bales said Staff recommends approval of the preliminary plat subject to requiring the developer to:

1. Add Lot 1 address; revise "Ridgemont Drive" to "Horton Avenue" and label 141st Street; add building setback lines and landscape setback lines along all streets; provide Public Improvement Drawings for 141st Street; show only work being done with the platting process (remove work being done with the site plans); show street signs (developer to install with construction of 141st Street); remove duplicate set of street labels;
2. Label proposed easements (pedestrian, those associated with construction of regional basin, etc.); provide 20-foot temporary construction easement along 142nd Street; add a note that no lot is to have direct access to Douglas Parkway or 142nd Street (this note will be required on the final plat also); verify all bearing callouts are legible (east plat line of Outlot Z, south lot line of Lot 1). Clarify all overlapping text.; provide a callout and linework showing the building setback line.
3. Clarify erosion control measures; silt fence linework is missing along plat boundary. Show construction entrance and concrete washout. A standpipe will be required in the basin as a temporary sediment control measure; provide copy of NPDES Permit and SWPPP prior to any grading work and final approval of the preliminary plat. NPDES and SWPPP may be submitted to stormwater@urbandale.org; a hard copy is not necessary. Weekly inspection reports and follow-up documentation as required by GP2 will also need to be submitted to this email address.
4. At time of final plat, provide maintenance agreement for 141st Street and Horton Avenue, shared access/maintenance easements for Horton Avenue and 141st Street entrances and the entire parking lot, easement legal descriptions, and a stormwater facility maintenance agreement per the Post Construction Stormwater Ordinance.

The next related item on the agenda was the "Timberline Village PUD Plat 3 – Regional Detention" Site Plan No. 012-2021-03.00 (142nd Street and Douglas Parkway).

Ms. Bales said this site plan pertains to Outlot U of the "Timberline Village PUD Plat 1" (Plat 3 Preliminary Plat currently pending on this same agenda) located in the northeast corner of the intersection of 142nd Street and Douglas Parkway. The proposed outlot as shown on Plat 3 is 2.72 acres in size with a portion of the outlot designed for the construction of a shared detention basin by the developments on this parcel. The property is regulated by the "Timberline Village" P.U.D. Master Plan which was

approved in 2005 and has been amended over time for permitted uses and building materials, styles, and setbacks.

Per the P.U.D. Master Plan, a 20-foot landscape setback and street trees are required along 142nd Street and Douglas Parkway. The Site Planning Ordinance requires storm water detention be located outside the minimum required landscape setbacks and requires that large storm water detention basins be treated with landscaping and berms to mitigate their utilitarian appearance. The site plan includes a retaining wall on the north/northeast side of the basin. All retaining walls are required to be set back from the property line a minimum of 1 foot for every 1 foot of wall height.

Property to the north, east, south and southwest is part of the same PUD Master Plan. Property across 142nd Street is regulated by the "Village Center West" PUD Master Plan. The subject property is located in the Urbandale School District. The property drains westward into Walnut Creek.

Ms. Bales said Staff recommends approval subject to requiring the developer to:

1. Add lot dimensions; show 20' landscape setback along 142nd Street and Douglas Parkway and provide plantings and berm; shift basin and retaining wall outside of the 20' landscape buffer; label setback dimension from wall to property lines; provide street trees as required in the PUD Master Plan; provide landscaping along wall to screen the blank wall; pay water connect fee of \$4,318.72 (2.72 acres); Sheet C200 – update City contact (Tim Terrill terrill@urbandale.org); provide photometric plan and include pedestrian-scale lighting plan; a separate building permit is required for retaining wall; specify 2021 SUDAS. Include City of Urbandale Supplemental Specifications.
2. Add street names to vicinity map; Sheet C300 remove duplicate set of street labels, revise "Ridgemont Drive" to "Horton Avenue", label 141st Street, remove/lighten linework for the proposed daycare; clarify what infrastructure will be installed with this site plan; i.e., the internal storm sewer should be installed with the Lot 1 site plan, the trail is installed with the construction drawings. Structure labels are not consistent between plans; show linework for the existing pedestrian easement; provide a Surface Water Flowage Easement for the basin and overflow
3. Callout storm sewer removals. Specify if repair work is needed to the existing SW-506 of the roundabout after removals; label normal water level and 100-year HWL of the basin; coordinate ST-17 invert with adjacent property; callout basin overflow and provide spot elevations; provide sediment control in the basin; either provide a standpipe, or calculations to show proposed orifice will provide adequate treatment for the interim condition.

4. Provide dimensions and details on retaining wall materials/finishes and add pedestrian guard to wall details; Wall design Sheet S1.02: clarify on site plan the wall subdrain connection to the storm sewer; callout top and bottom wall elevations. Provide a detail of how ST-14 passes through the retaining wall. Additional information to be provided with the building permit. Retaining walls over 4' high require certification by an engineer in the State of Iowa. Protection shall be required for top of wall when adjacent pedestrian way and parking lot pavement is installed.
5. ST-19: Specify size of structure and side openings; the pipes from ST-15 to ST-20 and ST-17 to ST-20 will be private. Define maintenance responsibilities for these pipes on the site plan or in the Storm Water Facility Maintenance Agreement; provide RCP storm sewer pipes under 141st Street;
6. The capacity of the detention basin will need to be re-verified at the time of final basin clean-out and SWFMA transfer. Provide a bond to ensure the detention area is cleaned out prior to it being turned over to the owners association at time of final plat (bond should be at least \$150 per 1000 cubic feet of detention storage).
7. Provide a Stormwater Facility Maintenance Agreement for the detention basin per the Post Construction Stormwater Ordinance; provide copy of NPDES Permit and SWPPP prior to any grading work. Submit NPDES and SWPPP to stormwater@urbandale.org; a hard copy is not necessary. Weekly inspection reports will also need to be submitted to this email address; at the time of the site as-built, provide signed calculations showing basin volume calculations by the contour-area method, and provide a signed affidavit that the storm water detention facility has been constructed in substantial conformance with the approved plan and confirming installation of orifice plates.
8. Comments on the Drainage Report: Provide drainage summary table of all design storms required by Unified Sizing Criteria; revise area of analysis to include entire site, both on map and in narrative. Show undetained areas on drainage map with their areas; include undetained bypass flow from ST-9 and ST-10; provide calculations for bypass storm pipes (P-15/16 and P-17) and outfall pipe (P-20); verify pipe slopes and material pipe match final design; per ISWMM, if off-site flows are routed through the basin, Unified Sizing Criteria BMPs must be provided for the pass-through flows which do not already have USC management; revise time of concentration sheet flow calculation to use 100 feet. Update two-year 24-hour rainfall to SUDAS value; relate drainage areas to proposed pipes. Provide C values for the drainage areas in the 100-year storm. Provide intake calculations for the 5-year and 100-year events for both the sump intakes and the intakes on 141st Street; add 10-year and 25-year storm events to calculations; update overflow elevation and depth of flow (PDF Page 16); the q_i and ratio of q_o/q_i are not shown in the CPv calculation worksheet (PDF Page 19).

The final related item on the agenda was the “Kiddie Academy at Timberline Village” Site Plan No. 012-2021-04.00 (14101 Douglas Parkway).

Ms. Bales said this site plan proposes the construction of a one-story building on the proposed Lot 1, Timberline Village P.U.D. Plat 3. The property is regulated by the “Timberline Village” Planned Unit Development Master Plan Standards. Lot 1 does not have direct frontage onto Douglas Parkway or 142nd Street but is served by a shared public access easements on Horton Avenue and the future 141st Street which will connect to those arterial streets. The property is 1.55 acres in size and is currently vacant.

The building is proposed to be 13,039 square feet in size with an approximately 11,800-square foot outdoor play area and open field area on the north side of the building. The building consists of brick and natural stone as the predominant building materials on all four sides of the building, with the primary entrance on the building’s south side. The building’s main roof line is 24’3” with the tower extending up to 39’7” in height.

For child day care centers, the Zoning Ordinance requires 1 parking space per employee for the maximum staffing period plus 1 parking space for every 6 children. The applicant has indicated that at full capacity there will be 30 employees and 182 children, which will require 60 spaces. A total of 59 parking spaces are shown on the site plan, three of which are labeled as accessible parking spaces.

Per the P.U.D. Master Plan, sidewalk design, street trees, furniture, pedestrian scale lighting, and accent plantings are to be utilized to enhance the pedestrian environment. Methods to achieve this include trees, accent paving, street lighting, and/or street signage. This site plan includes a 5-foot sidewalk along Horton Avenue and 141st Street frontages along with the connection south to Douglas Parkway.

A 10-foot landscape buffer setback is required along Horton Avenue and 141st Street. The Zoning Ordinance requires that a minimum of 15% of the lot and 5% of the parking lot to be maintained as open space, in addition to the landscape setback. A masonry refuse enclosure is provided with the doors opening to the west.

This parcel is adjacent to other parcels within the same P.U.D. Master Plan. Across Horton Avenue to the north is attached residential housing, to the east is the future senior housing development (“Edencrest at Timberline”) and immediately adjacent to the south and west are future commercial development. The property is located in the Urbandale School District.

Ms. Bales said Staff recommends approval of the site plan, subject to the following requirements:

1. Sheet C100: Add address and provide engineer's signature block; Sheet C101: revise City Contact (Tim Terrill (tterrill@urbandale.org)) and revise Note #2: include City of Urbandale Supplemental Specifications and Urbandale Water Utility Specifications. Note #11, revise to 8" topsoil depth.; Sheets C300 and C301: "2F" of the west side of building should point to service line (not the side of building); Sheet C500: add street trees along Horton Avenue and 141st Street per the PUD Master Plan.
2. Revise "Ridgemont Drive" to "Horton Avenue" and label 141st Street; add building setback lines and 10' landscape setback lines along both streets; show location of grease interceptor; label all ground/rooftop mechanical and utility equipment and add screening/shrubs accordingly; address numbers need to be prominently displayed on the south side of building (show building numbers on building elevation); provide interim curbing/barrier on west and south pavement edges to be removed at a future time when the remainder of the development is completed; coordinate alignment of driveways with "Edencrest"; shift retaining wall out of 10' landscape setback in order to accommodate the 5' sidewalk and street trees; shift transformer box east out of the 25' Vision Clearance Triangle; add parking calculations for employees/children, and add 1 additional parking space; Easements: Show existing sanitary and pedestrian easement linework on all sheets. Show proposed pedestrian easement for trail along Douglas Parkway. A temporary construction easement is required along 142nd Street for future reconstruction.
3. Pay water connection fee of \$2,504.00 (1.5 acres) at time of building permit; separate permits required for building, fence, signage, and shade structures; show location of shade structures; provide photometric plan and include pedestrian-scale lighting plan; provide construction drawings for 141st Street (this may be part of the site plan or separate public improvement drawings); clarify what infrastructure will be installed with this site plan; i.e., the storm sewer at the southwest corner of Outlot Z should be installed based on the detention basin site plan. Structure labels do not match between plan sets.
4. Sheet C102: PCC Trail shall be 5" thick. Curb ramps and turning spaces for sidewalks and trails shall be 6" thick. Provide ADA crossings from NE corner of site across Horton Avenue and across 141st Street.
5. Sheet C200: Clarify whether south edge of parking lot has standard curb. Lot line is covering linework. Update Note 1D for sheet reference; refer to Urbandale Supplemental Specifications for adjustment ring requirements. Callout width of sawcut on Horton Avenue for driveway connection (minimum 2'). "1A" is the incorrect label for proposed pavement work.
6. Sheet C300: Update callout for existing Sanitary manhole at NE corner of site for flow direction. Note #2, change to "Urbandale Water Utility Standards"; Sheet

C300: Provide rip-rap or other slope stabilization around ST-14A. The pipes from ST-15 to ST-20 and ST-17 to ST-20 will be private. Define maintenance responsibilities for these pipes on the site plan or in the Storm Water Facility Maintenance Agreement. Provide RCP storm sewer pipes under 141st Street; Sheet C301: Provide cleanouts at the end of the footing drains adjacent to the building. Verify that ST-8 can be constructed with pipes as shown; upsize if necessary. Labels for pipe and FES to basin are obscured.

7. Sheet C400: Verify that sidewalks and ramps in the public ROW and adjacent to private streets are ADA compliant. Provide slope labels. Provide landing spaces at 141st Street entrance and Horton Avenue entrance; add spot elevations. Clarify if there are ADA ramps at the driveway; typically, the pedestrian right-of-way and sidewalk cross slope is carried through the access locations and ADA ramps and detectable warnings are not needed. If stop control is provided, detectable warnings are required. If ADA ramps are installed at the driveway, add a note that the owner will be responsible for maintaining them. Show detectable warnings; Sheet C400: callout adjusted rim elevation of existing sanitary manhole; Sheet C400: Show construction entrance and concrete washout. A standpipe will be required in the retention pond as a temporary sediment control measure and may be removed upon occupancy of the site. Alternately, provide sediment basin calculations to show proposed orifice will provide adequate treatment for the interim condition.
8. Provide details on the retaining wall to the north and east of the building. Additional information to be provided with the building permit. Retaining walls over 4' high require certification by an engineer in the State of Iowa.
9. At the time of the site as-built, provide signed calculations showing basin volume calculations by the contour-area method, and provide a signed affidavit that the storm water detention facility has been constructed in substantial conformance with the approved plan and confirming installation of orifice plates; provide copy of NPDES Permit and SWPPP prior to any grading work. Submit NPDES and SWPPP to stormwater@urbandale.org; a hard copy is not necessary. Weekly inspection reports will also need to be submitted to this email address.

Ms. Ralston-Hansen said on your site map that you've got up on the screen now, you have just to the north of Kiddie Academy, Ridgemont Drive – are you saying that that is going to be renamed to Horton?

Ms. Bales said actually it's Horton, it's a typo. Ridgemont is actually the next block north, but Google Maps has it as Ridgemont, but it's platted as Horton. So I keep saying Horton because we have to get that fixed. But, that is just a typo.

Ms. Ralston-Hansen said okay, because I thought Ridgemont had the townhomes up a little bit north of there.

Ms. Bales said it does, you're exactly right.

Ms. Roethler said I'm curious, can you help me visualize what this detention pond area will look like? It's sort of a highly visible location. I know you said there would be a retaining wall. Anyway, if you can provide anything on that, or maybe it's too soon to ask for that. I'm just curious!

Ms. Bales said I've asked for some additional wall details. I'll tell you what we talked about and then Mr. Steding can provide maybe any updates. Because you're right, this is a very visible corner. So a couple of my comments related to, we want to see the materials for the wall. I don't know that we expect it to be brick like the predominant building material, but we do expect it to be incorporated and sort of match the other materials of the Kiddie Academy and the future buildings. And then I've also asked for some landscaping, like at the base of the wall, to kind of break up that face. So we expect some more details before that wall's actually finished, just so it looks like an attractive feature. Mr. Steding can talk a little bit about the water and the basin and that sort of thing. We'll also require some additional tree plantings to meet that requirement for street trees that will hopefully break up that massiveness of the wall, as well. But I don't have an architectural rendering of what it actually looks like.

Mr. Hatfield said this is preliminary plat anyway, so it's early, but good question.

Ms. Ralston-Hansen said so the expectation is that we will see it before the final platting is done? Because that is such a visible corner, I'd hate to see it go to waste with just a functional use and not something aesthetically pleasing.

Ms. Bales said normally we wouldn't bring that wall back. But as we talk through comments and conditions, we can certainly bring back once we get a proposal of what that looks like, the details and stuff. It's a good question. It is a preliminary plat, it is a site plan, but there won't be really a second review since it is a site plan. The wall's on the site plan, you're good to ask for that information now, I'll put it that way.

Mr. Hatfield said we can incorporate that into the motion too, correct? That we would be able to see the materials for the wall before it's built?

Ms. Bales said yes. If you want to add that as a condition, absolutely.

Mr. Matt Steding, Snyder and Associates, 2727 SW Snyder Boulevard, Ankeny said we're excited for this project. Like Ms. Bales was stating, this detention basin, I know you guys have some questions here. This is proposed as a wet bottom basin so, as you look at this, you can see the contour. So the normal pool where the actual water level is going to sit is going to be at that 173 contour line. So it will be, like I said, an actual wet bottom pond, so it's not going to be just a dry dirt hole there. The retaining

walls around this are rather high due to the complexity of the site and the elevation change that we're dealing with here. Like Ms. Bales had said, we're going through a lot of these comments with Staff still on this retaining wall portion, but yes we are planning to have some really nice landscaping around that back side to kind of break this wall up so it's not just in your face. And we're also potentially planning, and this has to go through Staff and everything as well, but there's potential for some signage on that wall, maybe some back lighting of some sort, to really just bring some really nice visibility to the overall little P.U.D.'s here. So that's another thing that we're looking at. Then there will also be landscaping basically all around the berming up against the property line both on the south and the west sides of that basin. Just to get you a little better visual of that, but we are going to work through some more details and we're still going through everything with the owners about what kind of form liners they want to use. Like Ms. Bales said, we want to make sure, since we don't necessarily know what future commercial buildings are proposed in those two areas yet, we want to make sure that we can get everything to match, that kind of compliments both Kiddie Academy and those future commercial buildings. So we're still kind of hashing through a few of those details. If you have any other questions, I'm going to leave it open so you guys can ask. But thank you very much!

Mr. Hollatz said I heard you say "form liner", so assuming you'd anticipate that wall being cast in place concrete with a fence on top of it of some sort?

Mr. Steding said that is correct, yes. There will be a guardrail on top, because as you can see in the future, we're going to have a pedestrian walkway very close, as well as a parking lot, and then there are some proposed patios at both ends of the future commercial buildings, so yes we'll have a protective guardrail there. We ask the Commission to postpone that off until the future just due to the fact that we want to incorporate that guardrail to make it look in conjunction with the two commercial buildings that are going to go in there, which we don't necessarily know what those are going to look like yet.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said it seems to me that this is a very important discussion and I think Ms. Ralston-Hansen initiated it, but on what this basin is going to look like. It's perhaps even going to drive what goes in the northwest quadrant. I've heard some descriptive words, but I'm not exactly sure what it's going to look like. So I hope, going forward, that City Staff working with the applicant here, let's make sure this is going to be a focal point for Urbandale and that this basin doesn't look like a dry hole or anything close to it, but it has some decorative elements to it. I mean, we spend money on artwork in Urbandale, this is artwork here too and it's going to drive the development on the northwest side.

Mr. Steding said yes, that is totally understandable, and we are for sure working through all these details, and we're going to get something that everybody can agree upon and that is visually pleasing to this area, because you are 100% correct, this is a very visual corner.

Mr. Grant Schmitz, 522 SW Kennybrook Drive, Grimes, said thanks for the review tonight. I think Ms. Bales and Mr. Steding covered it pretty well, in terms of what we're trying to accomplish here. But I'll speak to Kiddie Academy itself. Kiddie Academy is a national franchise. They're located in Baltimore, Maryland. They have 200+ franchises around the country and this is kind of their first franchise in Iowa, we're the first franchisee here in Iowa and obviously Des Moines. We're excited to be part of the community, should we go forward in this location. Outside of that, I don't know if I have any other specific comments. If you have any questions in regard to the business or the site, please let me know. I'd be happy to address them.

Mr. Van Heuvelen asked are you planning on starting this immediately, assuming that it's approved?

Mr. Schmitz said yes, so once the grading gets completed by Knapp, we would start construction. We're estimating anywhere between 8 and 10 months, so we're hoping to open up early next year.

Mr. Hollatz said with this Kiddie Academy being the first one built, would the retaining wall and stuff need to be put in now, assuming that those other parking lots aren't in, maybe everything could be sloped, the pond could be formed, at least used for detention until the other two commercial properties get constructed? Or would all of that need to go in right away?

Mr. Steding said yes, we had some early concepts of what things would look like without that, but just due to the extensive elevation changes across this site and having to have this parking lot, as you see the shaded parking lot in there right now, just having that in there, we want to do the rough grading on this site and get everything up to where the elevations need to be. To do that and adequately size the basin to handle all of this run-off, short story is those retaining walls do need to be there.

Mr. Hatfield said, as I understand it, we have three motions to make and three discussions. So items 6, 7, and 8 are all separate items. Does everybody agree we're ready to vote on Timberline Village P.U.D. Plat 3, at this point?

Mr. Van Heuvelen moved, and it was seconded by Ralston-Hansen, to approve "Timberline Village P.U.D. Plat 3" Preliminary Plat, subject to Staff recommendations. On roll call; Ayes: Van Heuvelen, Ralston-Hansen, Racki, Smith, Galante, Hollatz, Roethler, Hatfield; Nays: none. Passes: none. Motion carried.

Mr. Hatfield said just to clarify what we've done, the first P.U.D. was just talking about how many buildable lots and how many acres and what can go in there, so now we've moved on to the Timberline Village P.U.D. 3 Regional Detention site plan, and we may have discussion on that before we make a motion.

Ms. Ralston-Hansen asked how do we capture the comments that we just don't want it to be a detention pond, from all the conversation that we've already had?

Ms. Bales said I think I would add a condition to the site plan, something similar to "review and approval of detention design work and materials by the Planning and Zoning Commission prior to a building permit being issued" or something like that. A building permit will be required so that could be the trigger on that.

Mr. Hatfield said one possible way we could word that is "the Planning and Zoning Commission would have to have final review of design materials prior to a building permit being issued for the detention pond".

Ms. Bales said correct.

Ms. Ralston-Hansen moved, and it was seconded by Hollatz, to approve the "Timberline Village P.U.D. Plat 3 Regional Detention" Site Plan, subject to Staff recommendations with the additional stipulation that before a building permit is provided to the builder, that the Planning and Zoning Commission will see the site plan with design elements included. On roll call; Ayes: Ralston-Hansen, Hollatz, Racki, Smith, Galante, Roethler, Van Heuvelen, Hatfield; Nays: none. Passes: none. Motion carried.

Mr. Hatfield said the next one is the Kiddie Academy at Timberline Village site plan, and this only pertains to the site plan for the Kiddie Academy on that particular site we've talked about already.

Mr. Hollatz moved, and it was seconded by Roethler, to approve the "Kiddie Academy at Timberline Village" Site Plan, subject to Staff recommendations. On roll call; Ayes: Hollatz, Roethler, Racki, Smith, Galante, Ralston-Hansen, Van Heuvelen, Hatfield; Nays: none. Passes: none. Motion carried.

Mr. Hatfield said thank you to Mr. Steding and Mr. Schmitz, and we'll see you down the road here a little bit when we do more reviews.

Regarding Staff reports, Ms. Bales said in two weeks and one day, when we'll be meeting on Tuesday, March 30, not our normal Monday, we will be back at this same corner. They're asking for a P.U.D. amendment for signage, so that they can have two monuments, one along Douglas and one along 142nd. This is because, for Kiddie Academy to be on that sign, they had to do a P.U.D. amendment, otherwise it would be off-site signage and not allowed. But given that the Kiddie Academy will be addressed off of Douglas, they've asked that an amendment be made to the signage to allow for that since it's on a different lot. So pretty straightforward, but we'll be exactly back at this corner in two weeks and a day. Next up the Hickman Commercial will have a couple of projects. They concern the same lot on 104th. This will be very familiar. You

saw a P.U.D. amendment a couple of weeks ago for some additional uses on these two parcels. They're going to build on that vacant lot to the south of Two Men and a Truck. So it's the preliminary plat to plat an outlot as a buildable lot and then the building that comes with that. And then also Ramsey Mazda on Hickman Road, they're going to demolish that shorter, smaller building called Used Car Center and put in a new Ramsey Mazda building, so if you drive a Mazda, you will take your car to this building and meet your service people there. So that's on for two weeks, on March 30. We will have your meeting on April 12. We will have a couple of P.U.D. amendments, we will have at least two site plans, and so that will be a busy agenda on April 12.

Finally, we got an email today from the City Manager, and we will invite you, if you're comfortable coming back in person as the Commission, to come back to City Hall on Tuesday, March 30 for an in-person meeting. If you're not quite comfortable yet, we'll still have the WebEx ability. We'll kind of run a different, sort of hybrid meeting, but we are opening it back up to the commissions and boards to come back in person into City Hall. The Council has had their first meeting in person. By then they will have had their second one in person. So if you would like to come back and are comfortable coming back, we'll unlock the doors so you can come on in and join us. We do have the room set up pretty much the same, except where you sit as the Commission, there are plexiglass dividers between each desk area, so same chairs, same setup but there is plexiglass on the desk. The Council Chambers area looks very different. There aren't a whole bunch of chairs, that's why the general public won't be really coming in quite yet. We still have tables with dividers for staff to sit six feet apart from one another and that sort of thing. So think about it, if you have any questions, let me know, if you have any concerns let me know. If anything changes, I will let you know, but Tuesday March 30, we would like to see you back in the room, if you're willing to join us. So, that's my report. I'll take any questions you may have. Otherwise thank you again for your time and we'll go from there.

Ms. Ralston-Hansen said for the meeting on the 30th, will there be other safety protocols, as far as masks and things like that?

Ms. Bales said yes, we're expected to wear our masks unless we're talking right here at the microphone, so I'm assuming the same will go for you, coming in the door and when you're sitting at the table. We have temperature check stations, we have jars of Lysol wipes all over, and bottles of hand sanitizer.

Mr. Hatfield asked is there anybody that would be willing to share that they just absolutely won't be there in person for a while? Which is absolutely fine. Is there anybody that's absolutely not going to be here?

Mr. Van Heuvelen said I'm planning on being there, but I'm wondering if down the road, if it's going to be permissible to still attend a meeting if we are out of town, in Florida or what-have-you, remotely? Will that be acceptable going down the road in the future?

Ms. Bales said this hybrid set-up is being discussed. Based on what Mr. Franklin has told me, he thinks that there will continue to be a digital presence at least for a while. In a year I don't know what that looks like, but we're not going to flip the switch in April and just do away with it. We'll still be setting up the Webex meetings as we expect P & Z people to come back into the room.

Mr. Van Heuvelen said good, I'm glad to hear that, because there would be times when we might be missing and it would be great to be able to be a part of the meeting, even if we are traveling or something like that.

Ms. Bales said exactly. I've told Mr. Franklin that attendance has been excellent. To answer Ms. Ralston-Hansen's question, I have A.J.'s email, it says the initial restrictions of social distancing and mask requirements are still applying.

Mr. Hatfield said great. We'll see you all in person, and if you don't feel comfortable, absolutely stay at home and be safe.

The meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m.