



PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

February 8, 2022

6:00 PM

City Council Chambers

Agenda

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Roll Call**
- 3. Agenda Approval**
- 4. Minutes Approval**
 - A. January 11, 2022 Minutes
- 5. Public Comment**
- 6. Old Business**
- 7. New Business**
 - A. Consider recommendation on request for approval of an amendment to Chapter 165, creating an exception to nonconforming structures.
- 8. Comments**
 - A. Building Permit Report
 - B. Current Projects
- 9. Adjourn**



PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

January 11, 2022

6:00 PM

City Council Chambers

Minutes

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:00.

2. Roll Call

Present: Misty Soldwisch, Sarah Ritchie, Al Farris, Bob Ormsby, Jeromy Pribil, Josh Rabe, Courtney Marmon.

Absent: Erin Freeberg

Staff: Charlie Dissel, Miranda Chadwick

Public Present: Mary and Dave Summy 2200 Country Club Rd.

Micheal White 1406 S. G St.

3. Agenda Approval

Commissioner Ritchie moved to approve the agenda of the January 11th, 2022 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Commissioner Farris seconded the motion.

AYES: Sarah Ritchie, Al Farris, Bob Ormsby, Jeromy Pribil, Josh Rabe, Courtney Marmon, Misty Soldwisch

Opposed: None

4. Minutes Approval

A. Approval of the minutes from 12/14/2021 meeting.

Commissioner Rabe moved to approve the minutes from the December 14th, 2021 meeting. Commissioner Marmon seconded the motion.

AYES: Sarah Ritchie, Al Farris, Bob Ormsby, Jeromy Pribil, Josh Rabe, Courtney Marmon, Misty Soldwisch

Opposed: None

5. Public Comment

6. Old Business

7. New Business

A. 7. A. Consider request from Cheryl Taylor for a right-of-way vacation and conveyance of the portion of the north/south alley that lies west of Lot 14 of the Plat of Jones and Windles Addition to Indianola, Warren County, Iowa.

Mr. Dissel gives an overview of the property surrounding the alley. All property owners have agreed to the vacation and there are currently no utilities in the alley. However, IMU is requesting an easement to the alley should they ever need to bore for utilities prior to the vacation. The alley is no longer needed for public use and the expense of maintaining it is no longer justified. The office is recommending the approval of the request.

Commissioner Farris moved to approve item A. 7. A. Commissioner Rabe seconded the motion.

AYES: Sarah Ritchie, Al Farris, Bob Ormsby, Jeromy Pribil, Josh Rabe, Courtney Marmon, Misty Soldwisch

Opposed: None

- B. 7. B. Consider request from the City of Indianola/Indianola Municipal Utilities for a right-of-way vacation and conveyance of a portion of the north/south alley that lies between Lots 5 and 6 in Block 8 of the Original Town Plan of Indianola, Warren County, Iowa.

Mr. Dissell spoke about the portion of the valley to be vacated that is currently part of the electrical underground project that is being done in conjunction with the downtown city streetscape project. IMU does require that certain equipment be placed above ground. They have attempted to secure an easement for this equipment on private property but have been unsuccessful. As such, an alley location is necessary for this equipment. With this, the public would still have access to the alley off of Buxton and Howard St. The city would maintain ownership, and adjoining property owners would still have access to their property via the east and west and alley. It is the staff's opinion that this alley is no longer needed by us of the public and its maintenance is no longer justified.

Commissioner Rabe questioned why not get rid of the whole thing?

Mr. Dissell spoke about the importance of the property owner having access to their property via Boston.

Commissioner Farris asked for clarification on the green boxes noted in the drawing.

Mr. Dissell explained that they are electrical boxes.
This really is the last viable option.

Commissioner Ritchie moved to approve B.7. B as it stands. Commissioner Rabe seconded the motion.

AYES: Sarah Ritchie, Al Farris, Bob Ormsby, Jeromy Pribil, Josh Rabe, Courtney Marmon, Misty Soldwisch

Opposed: None

- C. 7.C. Consider request from Kevin Halterman to rezone property located at 2110 Country Club Road from A-1 (Agricultural Zoning District) to R-1 (Single-Family Residential Detached Zoning District).

Mr. Dissell speaks about the property being a former substation owned by the city. It has been sold to a private citizen who wants this rezoned so that they can build a private residence on the property. In the comprehensive plan, it is designated for future use by Parks and Rec. The boundary lines of the future use of land are not meant to be fixed and, in this instance, there is a golf course to the east and the south and residential uses to the north and the west. With no future parks planned, a rezoning would be appropriate.

Commissioner Ritchie mentioned that even though the land was originally marked for a park, it is now voided because the land no longer belongs to the city.

Mr. Summy is concerned about how rezoning this is going to affect his property. How would this change the landscape of his neighborhood? Will his taxes go up?

Mr. Dissell explains that taxes are governed by the county, not the city. It is possible that this could increase his property value and increase his taxes.

The goal is right now to put a single-family home there.

Mr. Summy wants to know if his zoning will change.

Mr. Dissell assures him that it will not change unless he desires to apply for it to change.

Commissioner Soldwisch shares that building a home on this lot would more than likely not have any more impact on Mr. Summy and his property than any other growth development that is currently taking place on the northside of Indianola.

Mrs. Summy is concerned about safety regarding anything that may have been left in the ground and how digging it up might pose a risk.

Mr. Dissell does not believe there is any concern and that IMU would have done its due diligence to ensure there are no hazards.

Commissioner Pribil moved to approve C.7.C. Commissioner Marmon seconded the motion.

AYES: Sarah Ritchie, Al Farris, Bob Ormsby, Jeromy Pribil, Josh Rabe, Courtney Marmon, Misty Soldwisch

Opposed: None

- D. 7.D. Consider request from Indianola Industrial Park LLC to rezone 60 acres of property generally located southwest of the intersection of East Hillcrest Avenue and 143rd Street from M-1 (Limited Industrial Zoning District) to M-2 (General Industrial Zoning District).

Mr. Dissell talked about how the current LLC, which owns this property, is currently located in town but is looking to relocate to this property. They need additional storage and plan to utilize a portion of this land to do that. In addition, they are hoping to develop the rest of the land to sell as commercial lots. Zoning this to M-2 would allow more variety for the use of this land. Rezoning this would continue to meet the comprehensive plan. The city is working to see what is needed to get utilities out to this property. This property is very important to the growth of our industrial park. Commissioner Farris wanted to know how close this is to the city limit line? Mr. Dissell is right up to the city limit line.

Commissioner Rabe moved to approve D.7.D. Commissioner Ritchie seconded the motion.

AYES: Sarah Ritchie, Al Farris, Bob Ormsby, Jeromy Pribil, Josh Rabe, Courtney Marmon, Misty Soldwisch

Opposed: None

- E. 7. E. Consider recommendation on request for approval of a Plat of Survey for TeaMc Inc., located at 1308 South G Street.

Mr. Dissell stated that they want to split the existing single-family dwelling and accessory building to a one-acre lot and keep the remaining eight acres as a lot. The eight acres would become a buildable parcel that someone could then in turn build a single-family dwelling on it. The comprehensive plan does designate the property as a low-density area.

Mr. White questioned why this was brought up again.

Mr. Dissell explained that it was to rezone the land and they now want to work on dividing the land.

Commissioner Farris moved to approve E.7.E. Commissioner Rabe seconded the motion.

AYES: Sarah Ritchie, Al Farris, Bob Ormsby, Jeromy Pribil, Josh Rabe, Courtney Marmon, Misty Soldwisch

Opposed: None

- F. Review and Approval of Planning & Zoning Commission Annual Report for 2021

Mr. Dissell gave a brief overview of the annual report.

There were no questions.

Commissioner Ritchie moved to approve F.7.F. Commissioner Farris seconded the motion.

AYES: Sarah Ritchie, Al Farris, Bob Ormsby, Jeromy Pribil, Josh Rabe, Courtney Marmon, Misty Soldwisch

Opposed: None

- G. Election of 2022 Officers

Commissioner Rabe made a motion to elect Misty Soldwisch as Chair and Sarah Ritchie as Vice-Chair.

Commissioner Marmon seconded the motion.

AYES: Sarah Ritchie, Al Farris, Bob Ormsby, Jeromy Pribil, Josh Rabe, Courtney Marmon, Misty Soldwisch

Opposed: None

8. Comments

- A. Building Permit Report

B. Current Projects

9. Adjourn

This meeting was adjourned at 6:40.



MEMORANDUM

To: Planning and Zoning Commission

From: Charlie Dissell, Community and Economic Development Director

Date: February 8, 2022

Subject: Consider recommendation on request for approval of an amendment to Chapter 165, creating an exception to nonconforming structures.

Recommendation: Staff recommends the City of Indianola Planning and Zoning Commission recommends the zoning regulation amendment request be approved, as submitted.

Attachments:

1. Staff Report_Nonconforming
2. Proposed Ordinance_CHAPTER 165_NONCONFORMING



Community Development

110 N. First St., Indianola, IA 50125-0299 • www.indianolaiowa.gov
515-961-9430 • comdev@indianolaiowa.gov

Staff Report

Planning and Zoning Commission

Date of Meeting: February 8, 2022

Agenda Item: 7. A. Consider recommendation on request for approval of an amendment to Chapter 165, creating an exception to nonconforming structures.

Application Type: Ordinance Amendment

Applicant: City of Indianola

Application Summary: The proposed request would add an exception to City Code regarding nonconforming structures that are destroyed beyond 50% of its replacement costs due to a catastrophe or act of God. This exception would not apply to nonaccidental causes, intentional acts by the owner, lessee, or other person such as arson, or by circumstances of neglect where the building runs down or becomes dilapidated.

APPLICABLE CODE SECTIONS

The following sections of the Code of Ordinances of Indianola, Iowa apply to this request:

1.07 AMENDMENTS. All ordinances which amend, repeal or in any manner affect this Code of Ordinances shall include proper reference to chapter, section, subsection or paragraph to maintain an orderly codification of ordinances of the City.

165.02(5) AMENDMENTS

The City Council may, from time to time, on its own action or on petition, after public notice and hearings as provided by law, and after report by the Zoning Commission, amend, supplement, or change the boundaries or regulations herein or subsequently established, and such amendment shall not become effective except by the favorable vote of a majority of all the members of the Council. The procedures for amendment are as follows:

A. Request by Petition

Whenever any person desires that any amendment, or change be made in the Zoning Ordinance, including the text and/or map, as to any property covered by the Zoning Ordinance, and there is presented to the Council a petition requesting such change or amendment and clearly describing the property and its boundaries as to which the change or amendment is desired, duly signed by the owners of fifty percent (50%) of the area of all real estate included within the boundaries of said tract as described in said petition, and in addition, duly signed by the owners of fifty percent (50%) of the area of all real estate lying outside of said tract but within two hundred (200) feet of the boundaries thereof, and intervening streets and alleys not to be included in computing such two hundred (200) feet, it is the duty of the Council to receive and refer the request to the Zoning Commission for its review and consideration at a duly noticed public meeting in accordance to the Commission's rules of procedures and the noticing requirements contained herein. The findings and recommendations of the Zoning Commission shall then be forwarded to the City Council for consideration and action.

B. City Council Referral

The owner of a property may submit a written request to the Zoning Administrator for their property to be rezoned. If the requested rezoning is not consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan, the property owner may further request the Comprehensive Plan be amended as part of the requested rezoning. The Zoning Administrator will then present this request to the City Council, who, at their discretion, may adopt a motion to refer the request to the Zoning Commission for consideration at a duly noticed public meeting in accordance with their procedures and the noticing requirements contained herein. The findings and recommendations of the Zoning Commission shall then be forwarded to the City Council for consideration and action. The City Council may further by motion forward their own request to the Zoning Commission to review and consider an amendment to the adopted Comprehensive Plan, the rezoning of a given property or properties, or amendments to the zoning regulations.

C. Zoning Commission Disapproval or Protest Petition

In case the proposed amendment, supplement or change is disapproved by the Zoning Commission, or a protest is presented duly signed by the owners of twenty percent (20%) or more either of the area of the lots included in such proposed change, or of those immediately adjacent in the rear thereof, extending the depth of one lot or not to exceed two hundred (200) feet therefrom, or of those directly opposite thereto, extending the depth of one lot or not to exceed two hundred (200) feet from the street frontage of such opposite lots, such amendment shall not become effective except by the favorable vote of at least three-fourths ($\frac{3}{4}$) of all members of the Council. Whenever any petition for amendment, supplement or change of the zoning districts or regulations herein contained or subsequently established has been denied by the Council, then no new petition covering the same property or the same property and additional property shall be filed with or considered by the Council until one year shall have elapsed from the date of filing of the first petition.

D. Public Hearing Noticing

Not less than seven nor more than 20 days' notice of the time and place of the City Council hearing to consider any proposed amendment or change in the Zoning Ordinance or zoning district boundaries shall be published in a newspaper having general circulation in the City. The Commission shall not make any recommendation to the Council on an amendment to any zoning district boundaries until a sign 18 inches by 24 inches indicating the amendment requested has been prepared and posted by the City in a visible location on the premises for a period of 10 days. Notice of the Commission meeting shall be mailed by first class mail 10 days prior to the meeting to all property owners within 200 feet of the boundary of the property requesting an amendment to its zoning district boundaries.

E. Filing Fees

Before any action is taken as provided in this section, the owner or owners of the property requesting the proposed changed in the district regulations or district boundaries shall pay to the City Clerk the fee as established by resolution of the City Council.

ANALYSIS

As the Commission is aware, at its meeting on December 14, 2021, a rezoning application for 404 South Jefferson Way was reviewed and recommended for approval. In this application, a request to rezone was made to assist the property owner in making its property for saleable. This issue that made this property less saleable was the fact it was in a C-2 zoning district, and if it were to be destroyed beyond 50%, it would not be able to be rebuilt, hindering many potential buyers from securing financing. In this request, a rezoning worked well as there was adjacent zoned residential property, and the underlying comprehensive plan designation supported a rezoning to residential.

This situation tends to come up a handful of times a year. While some cases have easy solutions to them, others do not. Recently, a sizable renovation/facelift of the property at 201 East 1st Avenue was completed. This property, which is zoned in the C-3 Downtown Mixed-Use Zoning District, is a nonconforming structure as it is used as a single-family dwelling. As such, the property is allowed to continue being used as a single-family dwelling, even though such a use is not allowed in the C-3 zoning district. However, as was the case in the application in December, if destroyed by any means to an extent of more than 50 percent of its replacement cost, it could not be rebuilt. This property is surrounded by C-3 zoning, and its underlying comprehensive plan designation is neighborhood mixed-use, so a rezoning to a residential district is not an option.

As this situation is somewhat common in other areas of town, staff is proposing an amendment to the zoning code that would allow single-family detached residential uses in nonresidential districts to be rebuilt, if destroyed beyond 50%, so long as the destruction is done by catastrophe or act of God, such as a fire or tornado. Reconstruction of such a structure would only be permitted if it did not increase the number of dwelling units, did not increase the degree of nonconformity, and was within the same building line as the original structure. Such a reconstruction would be required to occur within 180 days. This exception would not apply when nonaccidental causes, intentional acts by the owner, lessee, or other person such as arson, or by circumstances of neglect where the building runs down or becomes dilapidated.

Staff has reviewed similar nonconforming ordinances from Ankeny, Cumming, Knoxville, Marshalltown, Nevada, Newton, Norwalk, Pella, Urbandale, Waukee, West Des Moines, and Windsor Heights. While most communities have similar language as to what Indianola currently has, both Norwalk and West Des Moines have similar exceptions.

ALTERNATIVES

The City of Indianola Planning and Zoning Commission may consider the following alternatives:

- 1) The City of Indianola Planning and Zoning Commission recommends the zoning regulation amendment request be approved, as submitted.
- 2) The City of Indianola Planning and Zoning Commission recommends the zoning regulation amendment request be approved, with changes.
- 3) The City of Indianola Planning and Zoning Commission recommends the zoning regulation amendment request be denied.
- 4) The City of Indianola Planning and Zoning Commission remands the zoning regulation amendment request, back to staff for further review and/or modifications and directs staff to place this item on a future Planning and Zoning agenda.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends alternative number 1, that the City of Indianola Planning and Zoning Commission recommends the zoning regulation amendment request be approved, as submitted.

ORDINANCE NO. _____

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE CITY CODE OF THE CITY OF
INDIANOLA, IOWA CREATING AN EXCEPTION TO
NONCONFORMING STRUCTURES

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF INDIANOLA, IOWA:

Section 1. Section 165.04(5)(D) be and is hereby amended by inserting the underlined language as follows:

D. Nonconforming Structures. Where a lawful structure exists at the effective date of adoption or amendment of this chapter that could not be built under the terms of this chapter by reason of restrictions on area, lot coverage, height, yards, or other characteristics of the structure or its location on the lot, such structure may be continued so long as it remains otherwise lawful, subject to the following provisions:

(1) No such structure may be enlarged or altered in a way which increases its nonconformity.

(2) Should such structure be destroyed by any means to an extent of more than 50 percent of its replacement cost at time of destruction, it shall not be reconstructed except in conformity with the provisions of this chapter, unless the following exception is met:

a) Except for the provisions in Section 161.22, an exception will be given to single-family detached residential uses in nonresidential districts, where the residential building or detached accessory structure is damaged by catastrophe or act of God. Reconstruction of the structure or building shall be permitted provided that there is no increase in the number of dwelling units. The reconstruction of the building or structure shall not increase in the degree of nonconformity and shall be within the same building line as the original structure, as determined by the Zoning Administrator. The reconstruction of the building or structure shall meet all other pertinent codes and regulations existing at the time of reconstruction. Reconstruction must begin within one hundred eighty (180) days from the date of damage, or the use will be deemed discontinued, abandoned, or vacated. This exception will not be granted when nonaccidental causes, intentional acts by the owner, lessee, or other person such as arson, or by circumstances of neglect where the building runs down or becomes dilapidated are in evidence.

Section 2. Repealer. All ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict with the provision of this Ordinance are hereby repealed.

Section 3. Effective Date. This Ordinance shall be in full force and effect after its passage, approval and publication as provided by law.

Passed by the City Council on the _____ day of _____, 2022, and approved

this _____ day of _____, 2022.

Stephanie Erickson, Mayor

ATTEST:

Jackie Raffety, City Clerk

The foregoing Ordinance No. _____ was adopted by the Council for the City of Indianola, Iowa, on _____, 2022, and was published on _____, 2022.

Jackie Raffety, City Clerk



Community Development

110 N. First St., Indianola, IA 50125-0299 • www.indianolaiowa.gov
515-961-9430 • comdev@indianolaiowa.gov

Jan 2022 Permit Report

<u>Code</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Permits Issued</u>	<u># of Units</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Non-Taxable</u>
101	Single Family Home	10	10	\$3,119,369.00	\$311,936.90	
102	Single Family Attach	0	0	\$0.00		
103	Two Family	0	0	\$0.00		
104	Three or More Families	0	0	\$0.00		
	Mobile Homes	0	0	\$0.00		
322	Service Stations	0		\$0.00		
324	Office	0		\$0.00		
328	Non-resident buildings	1		\$2,400,000.00	\$2,400,000.00	
329	Pool	0		\$0.00		
434	Residential Add/Alt	3		\$55,000.00	\$18,333.33	
437	Non-residential add/alt	1		\$7,500.00	\$7,500.00	
438	Res garage/carports	0		\$0.00		
645	Demo - sfd	0		\$0.00		
649	Demo - commercial	0		\$0.00		
Jan Total		15	10	\$5,581,869.00		
<u>Residential Value</u>		<u>Commercial Value</u>		<u>All Non-Taxable</u>		
56.9%		43.1%		0.0%		

<u>YEAR TO DATE TOTAL</u>						
<u>Code</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Permits Issued</u>	<u># of Units</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Non-Taxable</u>
101	Single Family Home	10	10	\$3,119,369.00	\$311,936.90	
102	Single Family Attach	0	0	\$0.00		
103	Two Family	0	0	\$0.00		
104	Three or More Families	0	0	\$0.00		
	Mobile Homes	0	0	\$0.00		
322	Service Stations	0		\$0.00		
324	Office	0		\$0.00		
328	Non-resident buildings	1		\$2,400,000.00	\$2,400,000.00	
329	Pool	0		\$0.00		
434	Residential add/alt	3		\$55,000.00	\$18,333.33	
437	Non-residential add/alt	1		\$7,500.00	\$7,500.00	
438	Res garage/carports	0		\$0.00		
645	Demo - sfd	0		\$0.00		
649	Demo - commercial	0		\$0.00		
YTD TOTAL		15	10	\$5,581,869.00		
<u>Residential Value</u>		<u>Commercial Value</u>		<u>All Non-Taxable</u>		
56.9%		43.1%		0.0%		



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

To: Mayor and City Council
From: Charlie E. Dissell, AICP, Community and Economic Development Director
Date: February 3, 2022
Subject: Current Projects Update

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide a brief synopsis of different projects that may be of interest to the Council. Of the 19 projects listed, 10 are in review, one (1) has been approved and is awaiting construction to begin, and eight (8) are in construction. All dates are 2021, unless noted otherwise.

1. Indianola Community School District Auxiliary Building (403 South 15th Street)

Status: Review

- Site plan and stormwater management plan submitted on December 20
- Site plan review comments returned on January 6, 2022
- Updated site plan submitted on January 21, 2022

2. Executive Laser Wash (2001 North 4th Street)

Status: Approved

- Site plan for building and site improvements submitted on July 27
- Site plan approved December 29

3. Southtown Chrysler Dodge Jeep Ram (2412 North Jefferson Way)

Status: Review

- Site plan for building and site improvements submitted on July 22
- Site plan review comments returned on August 6
- Updated site plan submitted on September 1
- Site plan approved on September 8

4. Overton Funeral Home (501 West Ashland Avenue)

Status: Construction

- Site plan submitted on June 15
- Site plan approved on July 14

5. Cavitt Creek Condominiums (1400 and 1500 blocks of North 9th Street)

Status: Review

- Site plan for Cavitt Creek Condominiums I, which proposes one (1) single-family unit and eight (8) two-family units, and for Cavitt Creek Condominiums II, which proposes one (1) single-family unit, 20 two-family units and 13 multi-family units (six-plexes), was submitted on May 20
- Site plan review comments returned on June 2

6. Phillips Floor (1605 North 9th Street)

Status: Construction

- Site plan and building permit submitted on May 3
- Site plan approved on June 9
- Building permit issued on June 29

7. Des Moines Metro Opera Warehouse (1909 North 14th Street)

Status: Construction

- Site plan submitted on April 8 for a building addition
- Site plan approved on June 18
- Building permit issued on June 18

8. DeYarman Ford (2406 North Jefferson Way)

Status: Construction

- Partial site plan submitted for building renovation on February 18
- Alternate site plan for building elevations was approved by the City Council on March 23
- City Council approved minor subdivision plat on April 19
- Site plan submitted on May 14
- Site plan approved on August 23
- Building permit issued on August 23

9. All Creatures Small (2400 West 2nd Avenue)

Status: Review

- Addition to the existing facility
- Site Plan/Stormwater Management Plan submitted on January 25
- Site Plan/Stormwater Management Plan comments returned on February 4
- Revised site plan received on February 26
- Site Plan/Stormwater Management Plan comments returned on April 28

10. Williams Terrace (1600 Block of North 9th Street)

STATUS: Construction

- Developer hosted a neighborhood meeting on March 9, 2020
- City Council approved the rezoning request on July 6, 2020
- City Council approved the final plat on January 19
- Building permit application/plans received on February 26
- Site Plan submitted on March 26
- Easement vacation application submitted on May 18
- City Council approved site plan at its June 21 meeting
- Building permit issued on July 14
- Easement vacation approved on July 19
- Site work has begun

11. Prairie Glynn 4

Status: Review

- Located north of East Euclid Avenue, along North 18th Street
- Preliminary plat application submitted on January 14, 2022

12. Deer Ridge

Status: Review

- Located west of 1909 South K Street
- Preliminary plat application submitted on January 14, 2022

13. Ashton Park Plats 8-10

Status: Review

- Located on the east end of East Euclid Avenue
- Preliminary plat received on November 30
- Preliminary plat review comments returned on January 5, 2022
- Updated preliminary plat submitted on January 17, 2022

14. Quail Meadows 4

Status: Review

- Located on the north end of North 8th Street
- Construction documents received on August 27
- Comments on construction documents returned on September 8
- Revised construction documents received on September 29
- Comments on construction documents returned on October 19
- Updated construction documents received on December 15
- Comments on construction documents returned on December 28
- Updated construction documents submitted on February 1

15. Heritage Hills 12

Status: Review

- Located on the west end of Trail Ridge Road
- Preliminary plat received on August 10
- Comments on preliminary plat returned on August 25
- Revised preliminary plat submitted on September 8
- Comments on revised preliminary plat returned on September 22

16. Fox Run 2

Status: Review

- Located north of the intersection of North 7th Court and East Lincoln Avenue and east of the intersection of North 7th Street and East Norwood Avenue
- Preliminary plat received on April 23
- Review comments returned on May 10
- Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed preliminary plat at its meeting on May 11

- Updated preliminary plat submitted on May 28
- City Council approved preliminary plat at its June 21 meeting
- Revised preliminary plat submitted on August 18
- Comments on revised preliminary plat returned on August 25
- Updated revised preliminary plat submitted on September 1
- Revised preliminary plat approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on September 14
- Revised preliminary plat approved by the City Council on September 20
- Construction documents submitted on September 24
- Construction document comments returned on October 11
- Updated construction documents submitted on January 21

17. Heritage Hills 11

Status: Construction

- Located north of the intersection of North G Street and West Orchard Avenue
- Preliminary plat received on April 16
- City Council approved preliminary plat at its June 7 meeting
- Construction documents submitted on June 10
- Construction documents approved on December 1
- Site work has begun

18. Prairie Glynn Plat 3

STATUS: Construction

- Located southeast of the intersection of North 15th Street and East Iowa Avenue
- Preliminary plat received on October 20, 2020
- City Council approved preliminary plat at its meeting on May 17
- Construction documents approved on October 20
- Site work has begun

19. Summercrest

STATUS: Construction

- Located north of the intersection of North 7th Street and East Hillcrest Avenue
- The City Council approved the Rezoning/PRD plan and preliminary plat on July 6, 2020
- Construction documents approved on September 25, 2020
- Site work has begun