

Planning Commission

Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee Meeting #5

December 3, 2013 at 5:30 PM
Council Chambers, Third Floor, City Hall
1528 3rd Avenue, Rock Island

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
2. Approval of the November 5, 2013 Meeting Minutes
3. Approval of the November 19, 2013 Meeting Minutes
4. Approval of the written Agenda
5. Continued discussion on draft Comprehensive Plan
6. Public Comments
7. Other Business
8. Adjournment

Comprehensive Plan documents available online:

Draft Strategic Development Plan

<http://www.vandewalle.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Economic-Strategy-Document-Layout-1.pdf>

Draft Comprehensive Plan

<http://www.vandewalle.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Draft-1-Comprehensive-Plan-11-5-13-reduced.pdf>



UNAPPROVED

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING OF NOVEMBER 5, 2013
CITY OF ROCK ISLAND, ILLINOIS**

The Rock Island Planning Commission held its regularly scheduled meeting in the City Hall Council Chambers at 1528 – 3rd Avenue, Rock Island, Illinois. The meeting was called to order by Chairman David Levin at 5:30 PM. Present were Commissioners Michael Creger, Bruce Harding, Ted Johnson, David Levin, Jason Lopez, Kevin Nolan, Diane Oestreich and Berlinda Tyler-Jamison. Commissioner Lorian Swanson arrived at 5:33 PM and Commissioner Bruce Peterson arrived at 5:46 PM. Commissioner Norm Moline was absent. Also in attendance were Alan Fries, Ben Griffith and Brandy Howe.

AN ORDER APPROVING THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 8, 2013 MEETING

The Commission considered the matter of approval of the minutes of the October 8, 2013 meeting. After a brief discussion, Commissioner Oestreich made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion and the Commissioners unanimously approved said minutes.

AN ORDER APPROVING THE WRITTEN AGENDA

The Commission considered the matter of approval of the written agenda for the meeting. Chairman Levin asked if there were any suggested amendments to the written agenda and seeing none, asked for a motion. Commissioner Lopez made a motion to approve the written agenda as presented, which was seconded by Commissioner Creger. The Commissioners then voted unanimously to approve the written agenda.

PROCEDURAL EXPLANATION

Chairman Levin provided a brief explanation of the public hearing procedures for the benefit of the Planning Commissioners and those in attendance.

PUBLIC HEARING #2013-12: REQUEST FOR REZONING FROM PUD (PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT) DISTRICT TO B-3 (COMMUNITY BUSINESS) DISTRICT AT 1220 AND 1224 5TH AVENUE; 516, 522/24, 526, 528, 528 REAR, 602 AND 612 13TH STREET; 1221 AND 1231 6TH AVENUE; AND 513, 517, 537/39, 545 AND 603 12TH STREET;

AND 1221, 1225 AND 1231 7TH AVENUE

Next there came before the Planning Commission Public Hearing #2013-12: a request for a rezoning from a PUD (planned unit development) district to B-3 (community business) district. Chairman Levin asked Mr. Fries to present the staff report. Mr. Fries stated that in addition to the rezoning request, the City Council would need to vacate a portion of an alley south of 5th Avenue between 12th and 13th Streets and provided a copy of the vacation location map to the Commissioners for their reference. He then proceeded to present the staff report, stating that architectural and civil design was nearly complete, but that there would be a need for some dimensional variances that would be requested of the Board of Zoning Appeals in the near future. After presenting the staff report, Mr. Fries was asked if there were any questions for staff from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Creger asked about the parking requirements and whether the number of parking spaces proposed was really necessary, citing increased costs and stormwater run-off. A discussion amongst the Commissioners began about what was or was not appropriate for meeting the parking needs of the police station.

Rock Island Police Chief Jeff VenHuizen addressed the Commissioners and discussed the development and design of the police station, stating that he was learning much about parking, landscaping and lighting. He stated that he hoped to be moved into the new station by December 2015. The Chief explained some of the unique needs and features of the police station, such as evidence storage, security lighting, undercover vehicles, holding cells and the processing of prisoners. There was some discussion amongst the Commissioners about the difference between the proposed holding cells and the County Jail and the Chief explained the processes and procedures for each.

Commissioner Oestreich asked if police vehicles would be serviced at the station and Chief VenHuizen answered that they would be serviced at the City's garage at the Public Works Department.

Commissioner Tyler-Jamison asked if there were any comments received from any of the neighbors and Mr. Fries responded that Chief VenHuizen and Mr. Griffith had both been in contact with Ms. Sheila Solomon and that no other comments had been received by the Planning Office.

Hearing no further questions for the Chief, Chairman Levin asked if anyone in the audience would care to speak.

Mr. Virgil Mayberry of 559 – 22nd Avenue in Rock Island stepped forward. He stated that the County Sheriff had taken over many of the local law enforcement responsibilities of the smaller communities around Rock Island County and that the County Jail was the central processing and booking facility for all arrests in the County, regardless of who makes the arrests. Mr. Mayberry stated that there would be a referendum on March 18th for a ¼-cent sales tax increase for the increased costs of operating the jail. He concluded that he was glad to see all the new building going on in the City of Rock Island.

Rev. Donald Johnson of 1108 – 4th in Rock Island stepped forward. He stated that he was supportive of the project between 5th and 6th Avenues, but didn't see any minorities employed at any construction sites and asked about the issue of minority representation.

Chief VenHuizen responded that he didn't know if he was qualified to provide an answer, but stated that the City would go through a rigorous competitive bidding process and that a construction manager had been hired to oversee the process.

Chairman Levin stated that he was a member of the City's Human Rights Commission and that they had been told that the local construction trades and union hall apprenticeship programs had reported difficulties in attracting minorities into their respective groups and that it was an issue that everyone was aware of, although not quite sure how to overcome.

Commissioner Tyler-Jamison stated that it was indeed an issue with no simple answer and that the City should look at measurable DBE (Disadvantaged Business Enterprise) goals, adding that there may be barriers but we need to make sure that the larger question is addressed.

Ms. Sheila Solomon of 1309 – 6th Avenue in Rock Island stepped forward. She stated that she was the president of the 6th Avenue Block Club and had been in contact with the Chief VenHuizen and Mr. Griffith. She stated that the neighbors had some concerns that she would discuss in the future.

Commissioners Tyler-Jamison and Creger both asked Ms. Solomon to elaborate on the concerns, that this public hearing was definitely the place to raise questions and concerns. Ms. Solomon stated that she was not prepared to discuss the neighbors' issues since the neighbors were not present.

Chairman Levin stated that it was important to discuss the concerns of Ms. Solomon and the neighbors in a public hearing. Ms. Solomon stated that she anticipated a meeting with Chief VenHuizen and Mr. Griffith in the future. Commissioner Oestreich reminded Ms. Solomon that the Planning Commission was going to make a recommendation to the City Council tonight.

Ms. Solomon stated that speaking for herself, she was concerned with the lighting, that she and the neighbors did not want to see any lights shining in their windows and that she was not prepared to discuss any other items at this time.

Chief VenHuizen responded that he had talked to Ms. Solomon previously and that he would sit down with her and the 6th Avenue Block Club at a meeting that she had indicated that she would be willing to facilitate, to discuss lighting and other site issues in the future.

Commissioner Oestreich stated that access to and from the site from 13th Street was probably an issue for the neighbors and that good site design should address this.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Levin closed the public hearing and asked the Commissioners if they were willing to make a motion.

Commissioner Johnson made a motion to recommend approval of the request to rezone the police station site B-3. Commissioner Tyler-Jamison seconded the motion and the Commissioners voted unanimously to recommend approval of the rezoning to City Council.

Chairman Levin stated that the rezoning would go before the City Council at their meeting next Monday, November 11th.

PUBLIC HEARING #2013-13: REQUEST FOR FINAL SITE PLAN IN A PUD (PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT) DISTRICT AT APPROXIMATELY 4422 9TH STREET

Next there came before the Planning Commission Public Hearing #2013-13: a request for a final site plan in a PUD (planned unit development) district at approximately 4422 – 9th Street. Chairman Levin asked Mr. Fries to present the staff report. Mr. Fries stepped forward and presented the staff report to the Commissioners and audience in attendance. Mr. Fries stated that the applicant was present and could answer any questions they may have.

Hearing no questions for Planning staff, Chairman Levin asked the applicant to come forward.

Mr. Pat Eikenberry of 1011 – 27th Avenue in Rock Island stepped forward. Mr. Eikenberry identified himself as President and CEO of 11th Street Development Partners, Inc., stating that they were excited about the new building and that the landscaping and parking would be in excess of the City's requirements. He stated that Missman, Inc. had been in Rock Island since 1946 and that they were committed to staying in Rock Island.

Commissioner Oestreich asked about the primary entrance, landscaping and signage. Mr. Eikenberry showed the locations of the entrances and monument signs, stating that they would be approximately 2x3 feet for the building and 6x8 feet at the main entrances of the development.

Commissioner Tyler-Jamison asked if there had been any responses from the neighbors. Mr. Eikenberry stated that Bob Anderson, owner of City Limits, was very happy with the development since it would accommodate his stormwater runoff and was looking forward to having lots of new neighbors. He added that the only negative comment he had received was about a large semi that parked overnight at the site delivering pipe for the project that had left its engine idling throughout the night, assuring the Commissioners that it should not happen again.

Commissioner Creger asked about the size of the building. Mr. Eikenberry answered that the building would contain 12,000 square feet and would be a two-story building. He stated that they had decided to go with a smaller footprint and a second floor. Mr. Eikenberry stated that it would be masonry construction and that there would be an accessory structure of similar design at the rear of the site which was about the size of a three-car garage and would be used for storage of surveying equipment.

Hearing no further questions for Mr. Eikenberry from the Commissioners, Chairman Levin asked if anyone in the audience would care to speak.

Ms. Sandy Bopes of 4417 – 9th Street in Rock Island stepped forward. She asked about the reconfiguration of 45th Avenue, just north of the 7-Eleven store and about the proposed signage and how it would be lit. Mr. Eikenberry answered that that roadway would not be closed, but rather become a right-in, right-out intersection, due to the reconfiguration of 46th Avenue (Blackhawk Road) to the south. He also explained the size and location of the proposed signage, adding that it would be lit in such a way that it should cause no glare.

Hearing no further questions, Chairman Levin closed the public hearing and asked if the Commissioners had any further questions or comments.

Commissioner Nolan stated that he had recently purchased a building on south 11th Street and asked about the condition of the surrounding roadways. Mr. Griffith responded that the City Engineer and Public Works Department had originally planned to resurface 9th Street in 2016, but with the redevelopment of Watchtower Plaza and Black Hawk Commons, they had moved it up to 2014. He also stated that the City Engineer was working closely with the IL-DOT district engineer on the reconfiguration of the intersection of 11th Street and 46th Avenue.

Commissioner Lopez stated that although some Commissioners may think there was an excess of parking, he thought they were needed and had no problem with providing extra parking spaces. Mr. Eikenberry stated that one of the reasons for the extra parking is that there was a gentlemen's agreement with Bob Anderson to allow overflow parking on their site for his customers during the evenings and on weekends, when the restaurant was busy and the office generally closed.

Commissioner Oestreich made a motion to recommend approval of the PUD plan with the parking minimized to what is required by code. There was no second so the motion died for lack of a second.

Commissioner Lopez made a motion to recommend approval of the PUD plan as proposed. Commissioner Creger seconded the motion and the Commissioners voted unanimously to recommend approval of the PUD plan to City Council.

**REVIEW OF A FINAL SUBDIVISION PLAT OF “BLACK HAWK COMMONS AMENDED
FINAL PLAT OF FIRST ADDITION” LOCATED APPROXIMATELY AT THE INTERSECTION
OF 11TH STREET AND BLACKHAWK ROAD (46TH AVENUE)**

Next there came before the Planning Commission a review of a final subdivision plat: “Black Hawk Commons Amended Final Plat of First Addition” located at the intersection of 11th Street and Blackhawk Road. Chairman Levin asked Mr. Fries to present the staff report. Mr. Fries presented the staff report, stating that the approved final plat had been revised to dedicate the roadways to the City. He stated that the roads had been built to City specifications and that the City Engineer had approved the variances for right-of-way and roadway width that had been requested.

Commissioner Oestreich questioned the reduction in widths of the right-of-way and roadways, and asked about the sidewalks since they were not located within the right-of-way. Commissioner Johnson stated that the streets appeared to be the correct width and that it was the right-of-ways

which were reduced. Mr. Eikenberry answered that the sidewalks would be their responsibility and that MetroLink wanted a bus stop on the site so they had overbuilt the roads to accommodate the bus traffic, they might as well dedicate them to the City.

Commissioner Tyler-Jamison asked about the naming of the street as “Black Hawk Commons Drive” since it did not seem to be consistent with the City’s practices of numbers for street names. Mr. Fries stated that the name had been chosen to give an identity for the development. Several Commissioners expressed their thoughts regarding naming of the street. Mr. Eikenberry stated that it was primarily for Black Hawk College, even spelling it the same.

Hearing no further discussion amongst the Commissioners, Chairman Levin asked for a motion.

Commissioner Johnson made a motion to recommend approval of the amended final plat as requested, including the variances and name of the street. Commissioner Nolan seconded the motion and the Commissioners voted unanimously to recommend approval of the amended final plat to City Council.

REVIEW OF A FINAL SUBDIVISION PLAT OF “BLACK HAWK COMMONS SECOND ADDITION” LOCATED APPROXIMATELY AT THE INTERSECTION OF 11TH STREET AND BLACKHAWK ROAD (46TH AVENUE)

Next there came before the Planning Commission a review of a final subdivision plat: “Black Hawk Commons Second Addition” located at the intersection of 11th Street and Blackhawk Road. Chairman Levin asked Mr. Fries to present the staff report. Mr. Fries presented the staff report, stating that variances similar to those in the phase one plat were being requested and that the City Engineer had approved the variances as requested.

Mr. Eikenberry apologized for the confusion about the two plats, but the reason was to enable Black Hawk College to get underway as soon as possible.

Hearing no questions, Chairman Levin asked for a motion. Commissioner Johnson made a motion to recommend approval of the second addition final plat as requested, including the variances and name of the street. Commissioner Nolan seconded the motion and the Commissioners voted unanimously to recommend approval of the second addition final plat to City Council.

2014 MEETING SCHEDULE

Mr. Griffith provided the Commissioners copies of the 2014 meeting schedule, which included the last meeting of the current year, the upcoming year and January of the following year. He reminded the Commissioners that starting in January the regular meeting day will move to the first Wednesday of the month instead of the first Tuesday and that in January and July whenever New Years or the Fourth of July fell on Wednesday, those meetings would shift down a week. Mr. Griffith added that the 5:30 meeting times allows both Commissioners and applicants ample time to arrive at City Hall for the meetings.

OTHER BUSINESS

Commissioner Oestreich reminded the Commissioners about the APA Audio Conference the next day at the Bi-State Regional Commission offices next door to City Hall.

Mr. Griffith reminded everyone about the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee meeting on Tuesday, November 19th and that Ms. Howe had a few announcements regarding the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Howe stated that she had e-mailed a very rough first draft of the Comprehensive Plan to the Commissioners late in the afternoon and that some of them may not have checked their e-mails prior to leaving for the meeting. She asked that if any of the Commissioners would prefer a paper copy of the draft to let her know and one would be provided. Ms. Howe provided a brief overview of the Comprehensive Planning process up to this point and reminded everyone of the Steering Committee meeting on Tuesday, November 19th at 5:30 PM, adding that the consultant would be in attendance.

Mr. Griffith reminded the Commissioners of their need to complete their Open Meetings Act (OMA) training as required by the State of Illinois, especially for the new members. He concluded by asking the Commissioners to be mindful of any *ex parte* communications and to contact the Planning Office with any questions regarding any items on upcoming agendas.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Tyler-Jamison made a motion to adjourn the meeting at approximately 6:43 PM. Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission is Tuesday, December 3, 2013 at 5:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,



Ben Griffith, AICP



UNAPPROVED

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #4
NOVEMBER 19, 2013
CITY OF ROCK ISLAND, ILLINOIS**

The Rock Island Planning Commission held a Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee meeting in the City Hall Council Chambers at 1528 – 3rd Avenue, Rock Island, Illinois. The meeting was called to order by Chairman David Levin at 5:30 PM. Present were Commissioners Bruce Harding, Ted Johnson, David Levin, Jason Lopez, Diane Oestreich and Berlinda Tyler-Jamison. Commissioner Bruce Peterson arrived at 5:35 PM and Commissioner Michael Creger arrived at 5:40 PM. Commissioners Norm Moline and Kevin Nolan were absent. Also in attendance were Alan Fries, Ben Griffith and Brandy Howe, and Consultants Scott Harrington and Ashley Robertson of Vandewalle & Associates.

**CONSULTANT PRESENTATION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY INCLUDING DISCUSSION BY THE
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

Mr. Harrington provided a PowerPoint presentation for the Commissioners, reviewing the elements of the Strategy Development Plan and the Comprehensive Plan. He began by reviewing the “key assets.” There was a lengthy discussion of the West End Employment Center and whether or not the name “West End” was appropriate given the historically negative connotation associated with it. Some Commissioners thought it was a matter of rebranding the area.

Mr. Harrington then presented the four placemaking elements of the plan beginning with the Mississippi River frontage areas, discussing each of them in turn. The Commissioners provided much feedback on each area individually and collectively.

Commissioner Johnson pointed the survey results on page 74 regarding public safety. He stated that he was surprised and disappointed by the responses which seemed to indicate that some residents did not feel safe in their neighborhoods during the day or night. There was much discussion amongst the Commissioners on the topic of public safety and/or the perception of public safety.

Mr. Harrington then presented Positioning Goal #1—International. He stated that in meetings earlier that day with other groups and City staff, there had been much discussion this item. He stated that the intent was to emphasize the strengths of the diversity of the community and utilize it as a strength for the area to become a bigger player in the global economy. Mr. Harrington pointed out that some schools have over 20 languages spoken in them and that rather than view this as an obstacle, the community may want to explore ways to capitalize on this and develop it for the future. Several Commissioners expressed their interpretations of the goal and pointed out the differences between immigrants and refugees and the associated challenges presented to the community in recent years.

After further discussion, Mr. Harrington stated that he would work on refining the goal some more for clarification.

Mr. Harrington then presented Positioning Goal #2—River. He pointed out the differences between the Mississippi and Rock Rivers, how one was more recreational in use and the other more commercialized. The Commissioners were in agreement on most of the contents of this goal.

Mr. Harrington then presented Positioning Goal #3—City Living. He emphasized that this section did not just concentrate on downtown city living, but living in Rock Island as a whole, especially the northern portions of the City. He discussed the look and feel of the neighborhoods and discussed the concept of mixed uses throughout the City.

Chairman Levin announced that he had to leave the meeting at approximately 6:30 PM and passed the gavel to Vice-Chairman Oestreich.

Ms. Howe suggested that the Commissioners may want to discuss the Future Land Use Map, adding that the vision page had been included in the draft, most of the contents based on what was discussed during the visioning workshops.

Vice-Chairman Oestreich asked if the Future Land Use Map needed to be consistent with the Unified Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Harrington stated that future rezonings should be consistent with the future land use map and that the City's zoning ordinance needed to be updated. He pointed out that Moline had updated its zoning ordinance and that their current zoning ordinance was probably 80% compliant with the Unified Zoning Ordinance.

Commissioner Johnson stated that he had a couple of questions regarding the Future Land Use Map. First, he wanted to know why the Columba Park area was shown as white on his map and second, whether or not the Augustana College master plan had been consulted in preparation of the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Howe answered that the PDF showed it as white when printed out, but that the Columbia Park area should be shown as an "employment center" land use. Mr. Fries stated that the Future Land Use Map follows the college's university zoning classification. Mr. Griffith stated that Kai Swanson had been participating in discussions regarding the Comprehensive Plan, so staff would contact him about the campus master plan.

Several Commissioners pointed out several discrepancies with the Future Land Use Map, especially in the areas of 30th and 38th Streets, between 14th and 18th Avenues. There were also questions about why some schools and churches were shown in different colors on the Future Land Use Map. Ms. Howe explained that schools and churches were given land use designations that are consistent with neighboring land uses (i.e. residential and commercial). In the event that land use would change, the new land use/development would need to be consistent in character to surrounding uses. There was some discussion by the Commissioners on the proposed land uses of particular properties such as the Math & Science Center.

Mr. Harrington stated that although zoning maps and future land use maps are related, they are different, just as an existing land use map is different from a zoning map. He emphasized that a future

land use map is just that, emphasizing “future” and that it would be better to wait until a specific development proposal comes along for a specific area in order to determine what should be done. Mr. Harrington gave an example of upsizing the zoning for a single-family residential area with larger homes, where the upzoning caused many of the homes to be converted into three or four apartment units, which was not the intent of the upzoning at all. He suggested that they consider an overlay type of approach for specific commercial corridors which would include text along with the map to provide criteria for the Planning Commissioners and Aldermen to consider when future development proposals are submitted, because maps alone do not tell the whole story.

Commissioner Johnson stated that the overlay approach would provide guidance to the Commissioners and Aldermen. The Commissioners seemed to be in agreement and discussed several specific development proposals and how to buffer or screen them from adjacent existing residential uses. Mr. Harrington emphasized that the point was to increase the tax base through development, not increase taxes and everyone agreed.

Vice-Chairman Oestreich asked if anyone had additional questions, comments or concerns to please forward them to Brandy as soon as possible so she could incorporate them into the plan. Hearing no further discussion amongst the Commissioners, she asked if anyone in the audience would like to provide public comments.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Peter Ruklik of 2128 – 22nd Street in Rock Island stepped forward. He began by asking about the City’s visioning strategy, why it was still struggling with its brand/image and what was it hoping to accomplish with the Comprehensive Plan. He began a lengthy commentary about what he thought made the City of Rock Island desirable such as the ability to walk and bike and utilize the bus system without the need for a car. After a while, Vice-Chairman Oestreich stated that since he had made similar comments at previous meetings, could he provide his thoughts in writing to City staff so the Commissioners could thoroughly review his comments.

OTHER BUSINESS

Commissioner Swanson stated that she was concerned with the County Courthouse and what the County intended to do about it. She compared the renovation of the County Courthouse with the restoration of Old Main at Augustana College, adding that the area around the Centennial Bridge should be inviting for visitors.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no other business, Vice-Chairman Oestreich asked for a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Tyler-Jamison made a motion to adjourn the meeting at approximately 7:24 PM. Commissioner Peterson seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission is Tuesday, December 3, 2013 at 5:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,



Ben Griffith, AICP

**City of Rock Island
Comprehensive Plan
Transitional Overlay Area & Future Land Use Implementation
November 15, 2013**

Transitional Overlay Area Concept

A Transitional Overlay Area could be included on the Future Land Use Map in a general “bubble” form along corridors or areas where a change in land use may be acceptable if it meets the qualitative guidelines contained in the Plan text. If it desires, the City could add more detail to this in the zoning code.

In most cases, properties in the Overlay Area will have the potential to transition from single family residential to commercial along corridors like 11th Street and 18th Avenue, but the Overlay Area also could be mapped around campuses like Trinity and Augustana to indicate the potential for expansion in advance of actual property acquisition.

Below is a general outline of the types of qualitative guidelines that could be included in the Future Land Use chapter of the Plan. If the City wishes to include the Overlay Area in the Plan, we can detail these further and include some graphics to help communicate the concepts.

General Guidelines

- A detailed development plan should be required prior to permitting a change in land use, or the area involved should already be cleared or otherwise made ready for immediate redevelopment with no remaining residents.
- Conversions needed for the expansion of an existing use are preferred over those that are requested to support an entirely new use/development.
- A building originally constructed as a single family home should not be converted to non-residential use unless the structure is historically significant and its conversion results in a high quality appearance and complies with all life-safety and building codes.
- Adequate screening and buffering (including sound and lighting) shall be provided along perimeters that adjoin remaining residential uses.
- Where the Overlay Area is shown along corridors that are backed by alleys or have a short depth to another street, the alley or street should be considered to be the boundary of the Overlay Area.
- Primary ingress and egress to the converted parcels should be from a collector or arterial street, and steps should be taken to discourage commercial traffic from traveling through the adjacent residential neighborhood.

- At corners, the extent of frontage of converted parcels along local streets that face single family homes on the other side of the street should be minimized. Where this does occur, building heights and setbacks and front yard landscaping along the local street shall be consistent with those of the remaining home, and additional screening and buffering should be incorporated to minimize visual and other impacts on the homes across the street.
- The depth of the converted area should be limited to an extent that there are enough remaining homes on the block to maintain a primary residential character along the block.

Future Land Use Implementation

The primary means of implementing the Future Land Use Map is through zoning. Over time, the City should seek to achieve consistency between the Zoning Map and Future Land Use Map and between the Zoning Districts and the Future Land Use Categories. In this Plan, several methods are proposed for accomplishing this:

- Proactive rezonings on the part of the city
- Creation and adoption of "overlay" regulations for specific areas
- Development-specific Planned Unit Development, Special Use or Conditional Use proposals
- Landowner proposed rezonings

Proactive Rezoning

In most instances, these are areas where the current zoning is inconsistent with actual existing uses. Examples of this include neighborhoods where the vast majority of development is detached single family homes but are zoned for higher density, multifamily development. In some neighborhoods, such "over zoning" has created compatibility, traffic and code enforcement problems. To bring about stability and encourage additional homeownership and homeowner investment, the zoning should be proactively changed on an area-wide basis. In most instances, this should occur simultaneously with the adoption of a revised zoning code and accompanying revised zoning map. These are both top priorities for the implementation of this Plan that should be accomplished as soon as possible following Plan adoption.

Overlay Districts

These may be commercial districts where the overlay provisions would address unique use, signage, landscaping, setbacks, buffering, parking and, possibly, architectural design requirements to preserve and enhance the character of the areas. Once these are in place, the higher intensity uses shown on the Future Land Use Map should be implemented with a proactive increase in the intensity of underlying zone. Prior to adoption of the overlay districts, however,

increases in intensity should take place only on a development-specific basis either through the Planned Unit Development, Special Use processes to best meet the objectives of the particular area.

In some areas, significant land use/zoning changes are recommended that would greatly increase the density/intensity of development. Most of these are in "transitional" areas where changes in surrounding development have created isolated pockets of incompatible and/or marginal uses. However, an inappropriate conversion of these uses to a higher density/intensity would have an even greater negative impact on the surrounding area. Since most of these areas aren't large enough to support unique overlay standards, the best means of achieving the proposed land uses is through development specific Planned Unit Developments, and Special Uses.

Landowner Proposed Rezonings

One of the difficulties currently facing the city in managing the quality and compatibility of development is an antiquated set of zoning and development regulations. Because the current zoning code contains very few "performance" standards (such as screening, buffering, landscaping, building mass and scale, building orientation, etc.), the City has been greatly reluctant to rezone properties, including lowering the intensity/density, without the benefit of a specific plan. A strong recommendation of this Plan is to adopt a more modern code that includes a range of performance standards that help to differentiate the zoning districts as much by character, look and feel as by use. With such a code in place, the City should have more security and assurance of the ultimate development potential of sites within each of the zoning districts. Accordingly, "straight" rezoning applications should be much easier to evaluate, and where found consistent with this Plan, approve.

Development Review

The Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map have been intentionally designed for use in evaluating proposed development projects in addition to guiding the general growth and development of the city. Accordingly, it is strongly recommended that the city's development codes be amended immediately after the adoption of this Plan to require consistency with the Plan as part of the criteria for evaluating and deciding all significant development applications such as Rezonings, Zoning Code text changes, Subdivisions, Planned Unit Developments, and Special Uses.



Eligible Activities

The funding priority for the Ike-Planning Program is for comprehensive planning on a local or regional basis in order to guide long term recovery and redevelopment.

Applicants may propose to: (1) develop new plans (e.g., in areas where none exists or where existing plans are outdated, etc), (2) augment or update existing plans, or (3) develop "actualization" or "execution" plans to help implement plans that have been recently established but have not yet had an impact on the landscape. In all instances, the applicant must produce a new planning document that will be formally adopted by all of the local governmental entities participating in the application whether it is a wholly new plan, an amended plan, or an "actualization plan" designed to spur the implementation of an existing plan. For instance, a region that has recently completed a plan that did not contain a fully developed section on disaster recovery may want to develop this aspect as a new component. An area that has completed a "visioning" plan may want to establish an "execution plan" that provides practical steps to refining and achieving that vision.

In the case of multi-jurisdictional and regional applicants, the process may also involve the adoption of community-specific documents. For example, a multi-jurisdictional consortium may use this grant to produce an overall multi-jurisdictional strategic plan but also update the individual comprehensive plans and zoning ordinances of each participating community to make them consistent with the multi-jurisdictional plan's recommendations. This is particularly important because of the focus of this program on implementation; applicants should be clear about how program funds will be used to actually change the regulatory and legal environment that guides development within their community.

In conjunction with an applicant's planning activities, program funds may also be used for conducting community input sessions as required below, as well as for designing/instituting performance metrics by which a community can measure their success in developing/implementing their plan.

Applicants may choose to conduct the proposed activities "in-house" (i.e. the activity can be conducted by a member of the applicant consortium) or to solicit an outside entity to perform all or a portion of the proposed activities for which funding is being sought. Any procurement of an outside for-profit entity should occur only after the applicant has been selected by DCEO to receive an award and such procurement must be done in conformance with 24 CFR Part 85.

Plan Requirements

In all instances, any plan that is funded with Ike-Planning Program funds must at a minimum directly address the project area's disaster recovery needs. Specifically, the plan must:

- (1) Analyze the impact of the floods of 2008 on the area, paying special attention to the areas and groups that were most adversely affected, and the kinds of unmet "needs" that were created by the storm either directly or indirectly (e.g. infrastructure, housing, economic development etc.).
- (2) Put forth principles/policies designed to best serve the affected populations and address the identified needs created by the disaster.
- (3) Outline strategies designed to mitigate or minimize future disaster damage.

Proposed plans should consider each of the following subject areas –housing/community development,



economic development, infrastructure, transportation, and environmental preservation – with a view toward their significance in the area's efforts to recover from the recent disaster; though plans may elect to focus on one or more areas in more depth.

All applicants must hold at least two public meetings to solicit public participation in the planning process. Plans must be completed, and all program funds must be expended within 24 months of receipt of the award, with the goal to expend funds within 18 months of award.

All applicants will also be asked to address in the application how the proposed planning project will promote the sustainable planning principles summarized below:

Sustainable Planning Priorities

1. Provide more transportation choices.

Develop safe, reliable and economical transportation choices to decrease household transportation costs, reduce our nation's dependence on foreign oil, improve air quality, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and promote public health.

2. Promote equitable, affordable housing.

Expand location- and energy-efficient housing choices for people of all ages, incomes, races and ethnicities to increase mobility and lower the combined cost of housing and transportation.

3. Enhance economic competitiveness.

Improve economic competitiveness through reliable and timely access to employment centers, educational opportunities, services and other basic needs by workers as well as expanded business access to markets.

4. Support existing communities.

Target funding toward existing communities—through such strategies as transit-oriented, mixed-use development and land recycling—to increase community revitalization, improves the efficiency of public works investments, and safeguard rural landscapes.

5. Coordinate policies and leverage investment.

Align policies and funding to remove barriers to collaboration, leverage funding and increase the accountability and effectiveness of all levels of government to plan for future growth, including making smart energy choices such as locally generated renewable energy.

6. Value communities and neighborhoods.

Enhance the unique characteristics of all communities by investing in healthy, safe, and walkable neighborhoods—rural, urban, or suburban.