

**CITY OF WEST DES MOINES
DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING
CITY COUNCIL SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING
Training Room**

Monday, August 8, 2016

Attending:

Council Member John Mickelson
Council Member Jim Sandager
City Manager Tom Hadden
City Engineer Duane Wittstock
Principal Engineer Ben McAlister
Finance Director Tim Stiles
Community & Economic Director Clyde Evans

Development Coordinator Linda Schemmel
Chief Building Inspector Rod VanGenderen
Planner Brian Portz
Planner Kara Tragesser
Public Works Deputy Director Joe Cory
Deputy City Manager Jamie Letzring
Communications Specialist Lucinda Stephenson

Guests:

Item #1 – WDM Public Services Facility
Rob Denhert – EMS Assistant Chief

Item #2 - Roger Farm West Television Antenna Tower
Kirsten Rimes – Edward Rose & Sons
Mike Robhe – Edward Rose & Sons
Tim Kelly – Edward Rose & Sons

Item #3 - Restaurants & Drinking Establishments
General and Light Industrial and Business Park Districts
Jorgen Jensen – Rock Island Development Company
Brett Hyel – Slate Urban Real Estate
Evan Seth – Invision Architecture

The meeting of the Development and Planning City Council Subcommittee was called to order at 7:30 a.m.

1. WDM Public Services Facility – Emergency Communications Tower

Development Coordinator Schemmel stated that as a follow up to the Council workshop for the Public Services facility, there is the possibility that WestCom would have their operations housed at this location. WestCom has certain requirements for communication towers which would need to be included into the PUD standards for the development.

Planner Tragesser continued that a lattice tower has been proposed for the site. Ms. Tragesser introduced Assistant EMS Chief Rob Dehnert representing Westcom to explain their communication needs. A picture depicting two types of poles was displayed. To the left, a lattice tower structure was shown which is located at Camp Dodge at 180 ft. The picture to the right was a monopole which was approved for construction at 4101 EP True Parkway. To install a lattice tower would be a departure from what has been installed in the past (monopoles), and if there is a concern with lattice towers, a distinction in the operation or equipment for this specific installation will need to be determined so that precedent would not be established with regard to other communication towers. Mono-pine towers were mentioned and pictures provided. Mr. Denhert expressed that the mono pine would not meet the essential requirements or the WestCom communication tower.

Council Member Sandager inquired what type of pole would be allowed. Ms. Tragesser stated that there are no code provisions indicating the type of tower that can be installed. In the past, encouraging installation of monopoles for cellular communications has been very successful.

Mr. Denhert explained that the monopole has directional panel antennas that blend in well and are usually used by commercial cellular carriers. The antennas used in public safety are omni-directional antennas that need to radiate out in all directions. These antennas are depicted on the top lattice example provided to the committee. Two six-foot microwave dishes are also located on the lattice pole and provide the connectivity for emergency frequencies. Mr. Denhert expressed that the lattice pole lends itself better for the mounting

of these types of antennas used in public safety. He continued that there is a 75 ft. monopole at Public Safety Station 17 used for safety and has a large triangular mounting platform which gets the antennas out from the steel structure. The mounting system for the lattice pole is sleeker, more aesthetically pleasing, and does not require platforms.

Council Member Mickelson asked if the prongs located on top of the lattice example could be installed on the monopole. Mr. Dehnert replied that the triangle platform would have to be installed to attach the prongs to the monopole.

Council Member Sandager asked for a site where a triangular platform was located on a monopole. Mr. Dehnert replied that Public Safety Station 19 has an example of this use where there is a 75 ft. pole with a platform that is 10 ft. on each side of the triangle with the antennas mounted on each side of the triangle.

Council Member Sandager inquired the size difference between the monopole and the lattice pole. Mr. Dehnert replied, at 180 ft. the base would be 10-12 ft. for the monopole. The lattice would be about the same. The difference between the two structures is basically the appearance. He continued that the monopole is a solid opaque structure which you cannot see through. The lattice has less steel in the air and lends itself better for the types of safety antennas to be installed.

Council Member Mickelson asked the cost differential between the two types of poles. The assumption is that a lattice tower should be less expensive because it has less steel.

Development Coordinator Schemmel interjected that the goal would be to make the pole as least obtrusive as possible. Due to the specific equipment requirements for WestCom, the lattice tower would mitigate some of the view. The legal department is researching tower criteria at it relates to the communication devices installed.

Council Member Sandager asked if the use could be limited if allowed in this situation. Ms. Tragesser explained that a provision could add a limitation in the PUD with an explanation of the type of use.

Council Member Mickelson stated that his preference was for neither pole.

Staff will provide the Council Members with photos of the monopole and lattice poles, as well as addresses where they can drive by and view the actual poles. Also, language will be drafted which will outline what can be installed on sites.

Examples of the pine tree pole were provided. There was no support for this type of pole, especially since 100 ft. pine trees are not indigenous to Iowa.

Direction: This item will be revisited after Council Members have had an opportunity to see examples of monopoles and lattice poles.

2. Rogers Farm West Television Antenna Tower

Development Coordinator Schemmel stated that the location of Rogers Farm West was on Jordan Creek Parkway and the south side of Stage Coach Drive. The developer is proposing to install a lattice tower to provide television service.

Kristin Rimes, Edward Rose & Sons, stated that the proposal was for an 80 ft. lattice tower for antenna service so that cable and internet service can be offered to their residents free-of-charge. She continued to describe the one and two bedroom apartment unit project on an approximately 40 acre site. The location of the proposed tower was shown on a map. The tower would be in the middle of the project near the community building surrounded by three-story apartment buildings. An example was provided of one of their 80 ft. towers. The picture depicted a satellite dish which is no longer needed due to advanced

technology. Ms. Rimes continued that they need a tower that is unobstructed which will not allow for co-locate with another carrier.

Ms. Schemmel added that this particular parcel was medium density, and that communication towers are not allowed in this zoning district.

Council Member Mickelson asked the rationale for installing a lattice design rather than the monopole. Mr. Robhe responded that the lattice tower was self-supporting, easy to maintain, and less visible. The monopole is harder to work on, set up, and maintain.

Council Member Mickelson inquired about the maintenance of the tower. Mr. Robhe stated that hopefully there would be low maintenance, but that the connectors would have to be connected to the co-axel cables to the antenna and checked periodically.

Council Member Sandager asked if there was a similar offering in West Des Moines. Mr. Robhe answered not in West Des Moines, but in Ankeny. There are current plans to install a 50 ft. tower in Grimes as there is a transmission tower located nearby. It was determined that West Des Moines would need an 80 ft. tower to function properly.

Council Member Mickelson commended the developer for offering this free service to tenants, and that a large tower would work at this location, but may not for other smaller projects. Ms. Schemmel expressed that to enable this request, an amendment to the ordinance would be required to allow towers in multi-family housing designations, meaning towers would be allowed for all multi-family projects. Setback requirements may limit installation in smaller sites. The recommended amendment would likely designate communication towers as a permitted conditional use.

Ms. Tragesser asked if the units would each have an antenna and was informed that there would be underground cable. Thus, this would be a receiving tower and not a broadcast tower.

Council Member Mickelson worried about the proliferation of towers. He liked it for this situation, but was not interested in changing City Code and he did not want to set precedent. Council Member Sandager was in agreement. Ms. Schemmel stated she did not see a way to accomplish this without changing code, but staff could follow-up with the City Attorney's office to see if there was a method to address this specific situation without a code amendment. Planner Tragesser will follow-up after presenting the issue to the City's attorney.

Direction: Council Members were not in support of amending City code to allow towers in Medium Density designations.

3. Restaurants and Drinking Establishments in General Industrial, Light Industrial, and Business Park districts – possible Zoning Code Amendment

Ms. Schemmel introduce the topic and informed the committee members that this request for an ordinance amendment to allow restaurants and bars in the industrial districts was generated by a request for a bar and restaurant in a General Industrial district where those uses are not allowed. If the Council is supportive of the request, Staff would recommend a change to the zoning ordinance as the allowance of those uses could not be enabled by establishing a planned unit development (PUD).

Ms. Tragesser provided information on the Foundry project located at 111 S 11th Street (illustrations of the Foundry project were presented to the subcommittee), commonly known as the Al Schroeder building, which has a General Industrial zoning designation. She continued that the concept being proposed is for having a commercial kitchen that would work in concert with food trucks which would be allowed in this zoning designation. There is the potential for producing liquor on the east side of the property which would also be an allowed use in this zoning district. The project also proposes to offer food and beverage which

would be open to the public. This would constitute a restaurant and drinking establishment and is not an allowed use in General Industrial zones.

Jorgen Jensen further explained the project concept. Commitments have been obtained from three tenants to use approximately 25,000 sf. for food preparation, catering, and baking. The center space would be for community use to eat and drink, similar to that of a beer hall. A distillery has also been proposed. It was understood that the current zoning would not allow for serving alcohol and food, but it was felt that this would be the heart of the proposal as it would create an interactive mix of uses. Mr. Jensen continued that he thought this would be the highest and best use for the property which would respect the historic value while engaging the public.

Council Member Mickelson asked how this was different from what was allowed for the Fox Brewery. Ms. Tragesser responded that Fox is a brewery which obtained approval for a tap room within the industrial designation. Fox Brewery does not have a full bar, offers no food, and the size of the allowed space is regulated. This request would be for a full bar and restaurant. A distillery would not have a tap room, but there would be a tasting room.

Council Member Mickelson inquired if all the same requirements would have to be addressed for this project, i.e., parking, storm water. Ms. Tragesser replied yes, which would not be a large challenge for this building, but could be for other industrial district locations.

Council Member Sandager asked what was depicted on the drawing to the space on the left of the proposed beer hall. Mr. Jensen responded that it was a messanine with mechanicals on top and restrooms on the bottom.

Council Member Sandager wondered if food trucks would be selling at this location. Mr. Jensen responded that a food truck may sell once a week. This could be an opportunity for a point-of-sale inside the building. He realizes that currently there is a required separation between food trucks, and that having multiple food trucks is prohibited. Ms. Schemmel interjected that the second reading of the food truck ordinance would be going forward to City Council for approval which would modify allowances for multiple mobile food trucks.

Mr. Jensen added that the food program would be modified by season. In the summer, the intent is to provide food on site. In the winter, multiple food trucks would be allowed to serve out of the kitchen on a regular basis. He added that the Des Moines metro has a huge shortage of space caterers, bakers, etc.

Council Member Sandager asked what could be the repurposing of the building in the event food trucks and/or beer gardens were no longer viable. Mr. Jensen responded that there are many options and that the space could ultimately become a brewery or an event space.

Community and Economic Director Evans interjected that there has been a huge number of inquiries for commercial kitchens, particularly for caterers.

Council Member Mickelson expressed that he liked the proposal as it was a creative use for a building that has been vacant.

Ms. Schemmel summarized that staff can work with the applicant on their approval process in parallel with drafting an ordinance amendment to allow a drinking establishment or restaurant in light industrial districts if the Council is supportive of the change. If income is primarily from liquor sales (drinking establishment), a permitted conditional use permit would have to be obtained from the Board of Adjustment. If revenue is primarily from food sales, staff will determine if a permitted conditional use permit would be required for a restaurant in an industrial designation. The applicant also has the option of moving forward with an application for only the uses that are permitted.

Direction: Council Members expressed support for moving ahead with the amendment as presented by staff.

4. **Update on Building Separation**

Ms. Schemmel stated that this was an update from the previous subcommittee meeting and was initiated from several requests from multi-family developers to change building separation requirements in City code. Currently, a detached townhome building can be up to 14 ft. apart yet all other multi-family buildings have a 30 ft. separation requirement. A stepped approach on separation distance based on building size would address a majority of the concerns expressed by the multi-family developers. Ms. Schemmel also noted the need to clean up terms used in code related to ownership as they are being used interchangeably with the building type. Sometimes a multi-family development does not have a property line between buildings requiring the need to call out building separation as well as setback requirements in the code.

Based on information received at the previous meeting, staff is proposing for modifications:

- Detached townhomes retain the minimum separation of 14 ft.
- For an attached product, two story up to four units will retain the separation of up to 14 ft. If more than four units that are two stories or three story of four units or less, up to 20 ft. of separation would be allowed.
- A three story of more than four attached units, the separation would be 30 ft. (the current distance required).

Council Member Mickelson asked if the density would remain the same. Ms. Schemmel stated that the density would be unchanged.

Ms. Schemmel continued to elaborate on the separation requirements. As a building goes to a four-story, 10 ft. of separation is required for every additional story. Staff has also realized current building separation requirements do not address a situation with outdoor living area between the buildings. Measurements would now be taken from wall-to-wall or outdoor space to wall. Building projections to include overhang, fireplaces, bay windows, etc. can encroach up to two feet into the separation distance. The new modification would also allow front porches to encroach into the front yard setbacks to avoid the protruding “snout” house look for townhomes.

Ms. Schemmel continued that the other issue discussed at the last meeting was allowance of detached townhomes to be located in single family residential. There are two levels to consider when enabling this: (1) just to allow another ownership type for single family or (2) the ability to cluster homes on a site. Clustering homes would not change the allowed density of a development, but would allow the buildings to be moved together leaving a portion of the site undeveloped. Overall density would match the zoning with a requirement that the remaining parcel area would remain as open space. A mechanism would be in place to inform future owners that the open space could not be developed.

Ms. Schemmel will complete the final draft for City Council review and approval.

Direction: Council Members were supportive of the proposed draft for separation modification as presented by staff.

5. **Upcoming Projects – A map was provided with a brief description of each provided by the case planner.**

- a. 1611 Fuller Road Warehouse Grading Plan: Grading of accumulated soil in preparation for a future warehouse. (GP-003165-2016)

- b. Browns Woods Estates Rezoning: Rezone property along Veterans Parkway from Residential Estate (RE-1A) and Medium Residential (RM-8) to Residential Single Family (RS-20) or ½ acre lots next to existing platted Residential Estate Lots and Single Family (R-1). Ms. Tragesser stated that there has been neighborhood opposition, and that there will be public noticing when the rezoning goes through for approval. The proposed park will be redefined to obtain access. Council Member Mickelson stated that the property owner to the south has expressed concern that the proposed road would split his property in half which would make it undevelopable. Ms. Schemmel stated that there have been a development proposal from property owners further south and they have also been asked to work with the adjacent property owners to make sure connections are viable for everyone. (ZC-003167-2016)
- c. Val Gate Preliminary Plat: Subdivide the property located at the SW corner of 1st Street and Grand Avenue into seven (7) lots for construction of a commercial development and one (1) street lot (7' dedication of right-of-way along Grand Avenue). Ms. Schemmel commented that the applicant has been working with his attorney and the City's attorney to resolve the question on if the overhead power replacement would be the responsibility of the applicant. (PP-002895-2015)
- d. Lutheran Church of Hope classroom/nursery addition – PC: Construction of an approximately 1,900 square foot, two-story building addition to include nursery and classroom space for Lutheran Church of Hope, located at 925 Jordan Creek Parkway. Architecture would match the existing building. (PC-003172-2016)

6. Minor Modifications

- a. The Flats (formerly known as Warren House and Warren Terrace), 3000 Westown Parkway: new owners propose addition of a clubhouse and parking, demolition of garages, and modification of paint colors on buildings. (MML2-003173-2016)

7. Other Matters

- a. 4101 EP True Parkway cell Tower – Mono-Pine Structure

Mono-pine structures were discussed earlier in the meeting. Council Members were not supportive and did not elaborate further.

The meeting adjourned at 8:32 a.m. The next regularly scheduled Development and Planning City Council Subcommittee is August 22, 2016.

Linda Schemmel, Development Services Coordinator

Kim Taylor, Recording Secretary