



PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

December 10, 2024

6:00 PM

City Council Chambers

Minutes

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 PM.

2. Roll Call

Commission members present: Cortney Marmon, Al Farris, Carrie Woerdeman, Misty Darling, Lin Stecker, Jake Vice, Justin Noethe, Rich Piper.

Staff members present: Ben Reeves, Bill Mettee, Tim Little, Tara Bosteder.

3. Agenda Approval

A. Approval of the December 10, 2024 agenda.

Vice made a motion to approve the agenda.

Farris seconded the motion.

Motion was passed.

4. Minutes Approval

A. Approval of the November 26, 2024 meeting minutes.

Woerdeman made a motion to approve the meeting minutes.

Stecker seconded the motion.

Motion was passed.

5. Public Comment

No public comments.

6. New Business

A. Consider Site Plan for Indianola Veterinary Clinic Parking Lot Improvements.

Planner Mettee presented the request and related staff report.

City Manager Reeves added that this project is working closely in partnership with the developers of Emerald Bay, the city, and the Iowa DOT because of the realignment of that intersection and the alignment of the veterinary clinic's driveway/parking lot access. This road will also tie into the Kwik Star development. While the planning and zoning process is happening, Reeves said he is also working on the development agreement. This development agreement will not only help with the realignment and Kwik Star, but will also work toward opening up Fair Acres. Fair Acres is a development that has been around since the 1950s. It was recorded, but the improvements never went in, resulting in landlocked parcels. He continued that he wanted to provide a bigger picture of everything that was going on and that the developers were present to answer any questions with regard to timing and why they are

looking to move forward more quickly without having all the things in line. Mettee said staff is currently working on the first review, that the deadline is tomorrow morning, and that he planned to have comments to the applicant tomorrow.

Commissioner Farris asked for clarification on ownership and zoning of the parcels involved. Mettee answered that the parcels were all owned by the same party. He continued that the project expands into parcels with different zoning, of which does not permit veterinary clinics. This would be an issue that needed to be resolved. Farris asked if they are going to apply for rezoning of those parcels. Mettee answered it is going to be one of his review comments in their comment letter.

Commissioner Farris asked what the issue was with the storm water. Mettee answered that we just needed storm water calculations, that a storm water management plan should have been submitted with the application, but hasn't yet been received. He continued that we would need to make sure the intakes and pond design is sufficient. This is something our city engineer will review once the plan is submitted.

Commissioner Farris also asked for confirmation that there are no landscaping plans. Mettee answered no and that parking lot expansions do require a landscaping plan.

Commissioner Farris commented that the commission was being asked to make a recommendation with these loose ends. Commissioner Woerdeman also stated that this request felt incomplete for the commission's consideration. She continued that it would have been good to have the rezoning request and the site plan with the complete package to consider before this request.

Commissioner Marmon pointed out the commission's options could be to table it until all the information was provided or to approve it with contingencies including the storm water and landscaping plan requirements.

Commissioner Farris stated his concern about a precedent that this approval might set for future projects.

Wally Pelds, with Pelds Design Services, addressed the commission and stated this is not their preferred method either. They like to have complete sets. He said this site plan was started back in the summer; that it's been in negotiations with the vet clinic so the city wouldn't have to condemn their property. It's been slow negotiations, which also includes the Fair Acres development which has been landlocked since the 1950s. His client, Mr. Rognes has acquired that property, and they have been trying to include it in the Emerald Bay north portion in exchange for the vet clinic donating the right of way that's necessary to make it. Otherwise, it cannot be paved in that area. It's also planned to redo their entrance, which is not currently in compliance with the DOT. He said all of these things they have been negotiating have come to a head, and they are concerned that if they get deferred, the Kwik Star deal will potentially go away. He said they've done a ton of infrastructure as well as other things. He said he had previously negotiated with Charlie, and he knows there has been staff turnover, but is not blaming anyone; it's just that this is such a unique situation - the DOT is

involved, the city staff is involved, a vet clinic is involved, and there are land sellers to the north. They are all tied and intermingled together. He stated it truly is a parking lot expansion. He assures that they will get the zoning changed; the ownership group has already agreed to complete that application, it just takes time to complete as there are multiple parties in the ownership group. He said if they are unable to get the right of way, it throws their timing off. It is part of the negotiations with the vet clinic, as the vet clinic is concerned with access for their trailer traffic and large animal business. He also assured that, from their end, the detention basin is sized properly. He said there was concern about keeping the treeline as much as possible and that's why a landscape plan hasn't been submitted, because they are still tweaking it to be able to do that as much as they can. He said there is also a septic system that needs to be abandoned and plumbed a different direction. He does not have all the details on that. He continued to reiterate that to obtain approval from the vet clinic, part of the Mr. Rognes's agreement is that this parking addition gets completed in exchange for the right of way to make it a public street. He also said they will submit a landscaping plan, but he still needs to get the signatures from Mr. Rognes as well as the vet clinic. He mentioned they have already made some minor changes. He continued that this is, again, a parking lot expansion. They are tearing out everything that is there to make the grades work. And it's certainly going to improve that intersection, because the entrance was within 50 feet of the intersection which would not be approved by the DOT. He added that everything out there that is currently gravel will be paved. Additionally, he said there is a paved rear turn around space for trailers that was added so that trailers could enter through the back and not have to wind around cars in the parking lot.

Reeves added that it was important to note that while the development agreement is not yet finalized, the language is being put together and will be going through final negotiations with the developer. It is anticipated in the terms that we're working towards that the developer is doing all the site work, site plan, putting all the improvements in, negotiating all the zoning changes, doing all the work, and the city will be rebating them with TIF dollars in the back end to pay for the improvements of the veterinary clinic as well as the intersection and all those improvements therein. So we do have the confidence it will be done.

Jesse Rognes spoke to the commission. He said Bill and Ben did a good job of explaining the project, but that this has been a process and with the turnover, to the commission it looks incomplete. But to him, it's been a 2 year process for him and he's at the point with Kwik Star where they're questioning whether they'll get this road or not, is he going to make a deal with the vet clinic or not, or do they need to go do something else. It's taken a lot to get to this point and at the end of the day, what we're asking the vet clinic to do, compromise with, and give up may seem like a little piece, but to them, it's a big piece. Because when that intersection was put in, in their mind, they were wronged. In their mind, it wasn't handled properly, the proper easements obviously were never gotten at that time, or we wouldn't be sitting here right now. So he said this has been a process for him to go through for the past year plus, just to navigate those waters and get that done. Initially, he said he was told this could be included as part of their project and added to their plans. That's why if anyone has looked at their Emerald Bay plans, this was included. It was going to be a simple exchange, then he said it was no, he has run through a full site plan. He said that's where some of the back and forth delays on their end have happened as well. He acknowledged it's not the preferred method for

any of them, but if this project gets tabled, he said it doesn't put them in a very good spot to be able to move forward. He continued that at the end of the day, they're cleaning up a mess, not even mentioning the Fair Acres mess he's working on cleaning up, but that is not even their driveway but is that intersection. There is no way to put a street through there without completely cutting off the vet clinic's driveway. That's the point of the realignment and the new driveways, for them to have access and access for their customers. He also said that he'd argue that this is an established lot that already has a lot of existing landscaping. They are doing a simple parking lot improvement. Also, he said they will putting them on city sewer and water eventually. Right now another problem they have is a 1 or 2 inch water service that runs south along the ditchline all the way to the Hillcrest development. So if anything ever happens there, there's a lot of pipe. He said when they get the new main in, it's one of the parts of this, that they'll tie them in. He said they would abandon their septic as well and tie them into the new sewer system when that's installed. He said in regard to the properties being zoned differently, it just popped up this week that this was a problem. He said he's already talked with the vet owners and they're fine with combining them together. He said they don't understand why it matters, but their intention is to sell it to the current operators, to which they are currently renting to. They do not intend on ever parceling them off. So whether it takes a boundary retracement or a lot tie, there's ways to quickly get through that process as well.

Commissioner Piper asked Mr. Rognes what type of time frame he has with his future customers on that property. Mr. Rognes asked which one. Piper clarified he meant any of them and continued that it sounded like he had his back against the wall with a couple of them. Mr. Rognes answered that Kwik Star wants to close and their due diligence is supposed to end December 20. They want to close following that and start building in March. They have an aggressive schedule that would have them open in June/July. He said he could share that schedule once they allow him to. He said without this piece and without the access, there's no way to make it happen. Piper pointed out that this commission is only the first step. This will have to next go to City Council. Mr. Rognes acknowledged and said he has already talked to a lot of the council members to try and get support. Piper reiterated that we could be setting a precedence here if they don't dot the i's and cross the t's. He doesn't believe there will be any pushback once everything is presented. Piper said in this format there seem to be some red flags, nothing against what has been done and the effort that has been in to this point, but he's not sure how this will be perceived even at the next level. Mr. Rognes responded that from his point of view and even speaking with some of the other developers leaving the council meeting last week, that he believes this will be a breath of fresh air. Piper acknowledged and believed that the positives were there, and Mr. Rognes continued that the perception will be that they're going in the right direction. He said that he develops around Des Moines, and he's not asking for anything that's so crazy out of line that another city wouldn't allow him to do it. Commissioner Woerdeman added that to Piper and Farris's point, while everything looks great and she's excited to see it come, she's brought site plans to cities and they will not put it on an agenda until a checklist of things have been completed. She just said she feels like the cart is a little ahead of the horse. Piper added that is why he asked about Mr. Rognes's perspective, with regard to the next planning and zoning meeting in conjunction with the following council meeting, is two more weeks too much ask for your customer. Mr. Rognes answered that yes it is, with the timeline, they are up against it. And then there's also the holidays that start to mess with the meetings. He continued that this is a simple site plan, just

a parking lot expansion. He said he could point to projects he's done in other areas that he's had permits to build before the site plan was approved. So he said it comes down to the commission working with him. He said that is what he's asking for, some grace. Commissioner Vice added that with his experience and background, he's been in the same challenges before. He said he would like to see, if available, as Mr. Rognes mentioned that this was already in the PUD for the Emerald Bay development. Mr. Rognes confirmed they've always had it the plans that have been submitted to the city. He said it's been talked about since the beginning. This issue of access has been number one from the beginning because without that, nothing can go in there.

Reeves explained that where the confusion and the gap are is that there are two concurrent processes going on. You've been through a PUD, there's the development agreement, and all those processes that are going on. We're talking about negotiating and all that. But there is still the planning and zoning, City Council formal processes where you go through site plans, site plan reviews, all those types of things. To advance through each phase, you go through that standard process. It's very easy, especially with staff transitions as of late, for things to get confused; that advancing on one is not necessarily advancing on the other. Submissions coming in can create confusion and he can see that.

Mr. Rognes commented that there were times between transitions that several weeks went by where things weren't moving forward. And he doesn't know who you but that on, but he was in the middle of it.

Commissioner Woerdeman asked that if the commission were, theoretically, to recommend approval, what would go to City Council. Would they be considering it based on all these factors? She clarified her thought process is why bring it to planning and zoning for consideration if the approval is always given contingent that city staff says it meets everything. Mr. Reeves answered that we do need to have mature processes that do come through planning and zoning. He said Bill is doing a great job of bringing them through and now that staff is in place without interim staff, it will help to eliminate the confusion. He furthered that there are four choices. He said the commission could approve, but he does not think anyone is expecting approval as it is. The commission could approve conditionally and set those expectations of what it wants to include and require. Or the commission could table it, or deny it. He said to table it would hurt the developer the most because it requires that it comes back here to this level. Where if the commission denies it, it can still advance to City Council and these things can be gathered/put together before City Council. The only negative aspect is that it requires a super majority when it gets to City Council because it doesn't have the Planning Commission's approval. Mr. Rognes said to this point that of the four choices, he would rather the commission didn't even consider tabling it. He said with the delays that have already occurred, he's extended with Kwik Star as many times as they feel comfortable; he believes it's been 6 or 7 times. He asked if the commission would either approve with contingencies and he would work those diligently in the background to get it to Council, or to deny and he would try to get a super majority. He said that is his only chance at success with this development. He continued that he's put a lot of work into this project and the financial impact to him if this doesn't go through, he doesn't even know if it would be worth it to keep moving here.

Commissioner Farris asked that if the commission approved the site plan subject to remaining staff concerns and comments, how long would it take and would it meet the schedule to go to City Council. Mettee pointed out that he would be out of the country for the next week and wouldn't be able to put anything together for the next Council meeting, he didn't have a full application or fees paid, as well as items that had already been discussed. He would prefer to have those things before putting this on the Council agenda. That way these items don't have to be explained to the Council as they have been explained tonight. He continued that his job is to provide a complete package where staff has done our diligence and reviewed things thoroughly, leaving no unanswered questions. If this goes to the next Council meeting, he's concerned it will go the same as tonight. Commissioner Marmon clarified that if this were approved with contingencies, before it can go to Council, these contingencies would need to be met. Mettee confirmed that yes, that is his preference. Farris questioned the outcome if it were to go to Council without those contingencies being resolved. Mr. Rognes answered that the Council could still approve with contingencies that would need to be met prior to building. Mettee expressed concern that once Council approves things, we have the chance to lose our footing with a project because they've already gotten Council approval. Mr. Rognes commented that his footing is lost.

Commissioner Vice referred back to the Village. He remembered that one being approved with contingencies and questioned if that plan came back to the Planning and Zoning Commission before moving forward. Reeves answered that if it's approved with contingencies, typically two things happen. One, it doesn't come back to Planning and Zoning because it's approved, but those contingencies have to be met before it goes to council.

Commission Piper asked about the zoning precedent. He asked what the process was to get it rezoned and if there's a required public notice. Mettee answered that once he gets an application, newspaper and neighboring notices will have to go out and the timing of that will determine which meeting it is scheduled for. Mettee further commented that he's willing to do things a little bit out of order to help. He said his job is not to deny projects. It is to successfully get a project from submittal to approval and doing his part to ensure that everything is in order. He said as soon as he gets that application and the fees paid, he will start that process. Piper stated this would be something for consideration for approval to take this to the next step.

Reeves added that what we're trying to get is enough comfort to the veterinary clinic that in order to let go of their easement and to provide the easement, so the intersection can be realigned. We're going to go through the process to rezone, make it compliant, and do all the things we need to do to have this parking lot go in. And the city is concurrently working on the development agreement to help pay for that. That will give them the comfort to get the developer the easement they need. Once they have the easement they need, they can move forward and close on the property with Kwik Star because they now have the confidence they need that the road is actually going to go in.

Mr. Rognes confirmed that even after approval from Planning and Zoning as well as Council, he will still have to get a building permit before he starts building. He further explained he was

under the understanding that none of the work would be taking place until all of those conditions have been met. He reiterated the aforementioned contingencies and said they weren't huge issues that they wouldn't be able to get taken care of. He said the biggest one would be the rezoning, and that is just more of a procedural time frame to get it done. The major thing they're trying to do is get that easement agreement so they can have the access to get a road in there. He noted that they wouldn't start on their site work until spring.

Commissioner Stecker commented that this project would be very beneficial for the vet clinic with more parking, better access, and the sewer/connection. Mr. Rognes followed up with a comment that the concern is also the disruption of business. He clarified that there is an owner and an operator involved. He said the operator likes it the way it is and mentioned they would probably rather be in the county. So he said there are these internal battles.

Commissioner Vice stated for confirmation that Mr. Rognes is looking for a motion that will move this project forward to give good will toward his tenant/possible tenant that this project is moving. And Vice furthered that this PUD is good for the city. It is really good for the safety of that intersection. Mr. Rognes added in that the intersection will include turn lanes and crossings for pedestrians. He said the other thing that will be in front of the commission sooner or later is that there's another big retailer that's interested in coming to that area. It's not currently a business that's local to Iowa, so a good business to bring in. He said he received a LOI this week and they turned around with a PA today so they are serious. He continued that the schedule with Kwik Star is aggressive, that they want to start building March 17. He said they are managing this project internally and their schedule is set and they will not change, regardless of weather. He said if this project doesn't go through or move forward, he is not sure where it goes.

Commissioner Woerdeman stated she is excited for this project and doesn't have any concerns with what they're visually seeing, but her concern falls back to - would the intent be to bring this to Council next week as is without the contingent pieces in place or would it be to bring it to Council after the first of the year when the contingencies have been resolved. Mr. Rognes answered that he would like to bring it right to Council and let them approve it with additional contingencies if they're not completed by then, such as the rezoning piece, with the understanding that he won't move forward on any improvement until those pieces are completed. Reeves added that maybe another way to answer that question is in relation to the other process, to maybe share the timeline. He said perhaps because what they're looking for is leverage or contingencies. Woerdeman said where she's coming from really is what is the point of bringing a site plan to Planning and Zoning or Council if we're just saying as long as staff approves all of these contingencies. Then there's no point of us wasting time here. It might as well be a by right development where staff reviews it, which she is fine with too. Mr. Rognes interjected that's what they thought it was going to be at some point, a staff level approval on that site portion to help get this easement. That's where this started way back in the beginning for them. So exactly what was just said is what we thought the process was going to be, so when they had to go back to the vet clinic to tell them that's not the deal, we then spent two months with attorneys and \$50,000. And meanwhile, there was a staff change internally and I started over.

Reeves additionally said that going back to the development agreement, it requires several steps. One of those steps is that they have to set a public hearing. We have to get the language all agreed upon and there's a lot of work in setting up a URA and a development agreement as well as having it ready in time for the 19th. The 19th would set a public hearing. It has to be at least 28 days out from the next meeting. So the development agreement side is for sure going to be at least January 20 if all the stars align. Before it can come to them, it also has to go to the Planning Commission, and a meeting with the school district and the county, where they have the opportunity to share their concerns and thoughts. So there's a lot of steps involved on the development agreement side too and we're going to be working on those, just so you know that piece is going on. With regard to this though, if the Planning Commission is feeling concerned, maybe the appropriate action so that you don't set precedent would be to deny it. Because if you do deny it, that at least sets your precedent going forward when you don't have a complete package, but it doesn't necessarily preclude the developer from being able to go to the next steps. Mr. Rognes commented that in a perfect world, the commission would approve it with contingencies. This has not been a perfect process.

Commissioner Farris said he had two questions. First, he said Reeves mentioned a fiscal aspect to the city and asked him to repeat that aspect. Reeves said subject to many steps along the way, including the approval of the City Council, it is anticipated that the city would be working with the developer to have an urban renewal area (URA) created. This creates tax dollars generated from this area, so it's the increment generated specifically from this area, not anything coming in from any other source. And this increment would be used to reimburse the developer for the aspects we just talked about - putting in the infrastructure, the intersection, the vet clinic, the park, and those different improvements that would benefit the city. The developer would be fronting, taking care of, and putting in with a remuneration with tax rebate of their own dollars coming back to them to repay for those improvements that are going in. If the developer never performs, then those rebates never come. Farris continued with his second question. He asked if the Commission were to approve this in it's incomplete state, does that put the city in any jeopardy if someone were to challenge the process. Reeves answered that he is not an attorney so he can't answer that question directly, but he said that would probably be the case if it were the City Council taking that action as an approving authority. However, this commission is a recommending body so there is a difference. Woerdeman furthered the discussion and said she felt like what was being said is that if the Commission sent a recommendation to Council and they vote to approve with contingencies not resolved, they could be creating a liability. Reeves answered possibly, but he was not an attorney. Piper added that a building permit has not been issued yet so the developer still has to go through a process to get the permit to build. Building Official Little clarified that a building permit has not been issued, but they can't start building until there's road put in. There's got to be an entrance in there somehow. Piper continued that there's a lot of steps so the question becomes what can we do to catapult these steps so that Mr. Rognes doesn't lose any business. He acknowledged that Mr. Rognes is at risk already as he's put forth a lot of money to do this. He just wants to make sure we're dotting our I's and crossing our T's. Woerdeman stated that if helps to process, just discussing, she'd be willing to make it a motion to deny us recommending so that the commission isn't holding Mr. Rognes up from going to Council and asking for a super majority. She said she would also recommend in the interim that the city

attorney is able to give some advisement; that's up to Council, but it seems like there's some questions that need to be answered as far as does this create a situation where we're circumventing a documented site plan approval process and does that open up some legal concerns.

Commissioner Vice stated he doesn't see the difference between approving this one with contingencies and others in the past they've approved with contingencies. Woerdeman stated her understanding is that in the past, when it's been approved with contingencies, those contingencies are resolved before going to Council and we're specifically saying here that these contingencies will not be resolved before going to Council. Mettee added that everything the Planning Commission should see should have a review or two that's been completed as well as resubmittals to provide information to the Commission and also that everything meets requirements. He was just asked on Wednesday to bring this to this commission tonight. He said he was uncomfortable doing so because it hasn't been through a full staff review yet and he has comments in a letter that they don't even have yet as staff isn't done reviewing it. Commissioner Marmon asked if other things have been sent to Council that haven't had all the contingencies met. Mettee answered that when he brings things to Council, those comments, if they're not all addressed, it's a couple of minor outliers such as a label is incorrect. Everything is already addressed prior to Council because they are the final approval; they are who signs the resolutions. He said everything he brings to this commission he likes to have pretty well tied up and what he brings to Council he likes to have really tied up.

Commissioner Darling asked a question in relation to the zoning issue. She asked that if the street going in and the DOT involvement wasn't an issue, could someone could have theoretically laid concrete on those lots and it not have been an issue? Reeves asked for her to clarify her question. He asked if she was referring to an expansion of the existing use or if someone could lay concrete in an ag zone. Darling clarified that it's not typical that they have to go through an approval process for a parking lot getting redone. She continued to ask for confirmation that it was only because of the street coming through and the right of way; Piper added the retention pond with the calculations. Mettee answered that what triggered the major site plan was an impervious surface increase of more than 2,000 square feet. The major site plan is what requires the landscaping plans, storm water requirements, and things like that. If it were a minor site plan, it would not be brought before the Commission. Mr. Rognes commented that's why they've been kicked back and forth whether it was going to be a major or minor. He continued that he could have looked at doing this project in phases to try and work around it with the existing concrete on site, but he is in the middle of trying to get an easement that wasn't already acquired and instead of having the city help them go through some kind of condemnation process to get access and this is the route in which they were guided.

Commissioner Marmon stated she could see both sides. She said she could see why they'd want to deny it, because it could open the city up for liability issues. But she said she could also see approving it with contingencies because you can't get a building permit until those contingencies are met. Piper asked if the commission wants to narrow down what the contingencies are and vote on them. Marmon followed up saying it would be a vote inclusive

of all contingencies on that approval. Piper concurred and stated that he was hearing 4 - zoning, Stormwater management plan, landscape, and Mettee added the fourth which was that it would need final platted to bring all the lots together. Piper reiterated that the motion would include those 4 contingencies. Mr. Pelds addressed the Commission with a suggestion. He said he does a lot of presentations throughout Missouri, Nebraska, and Iowa. He said he's presented at P&Z meetings where certain city engineers don't even have their staff comments back to them, yet it's already been posted on their schedule, so it's subject to whatever their review comments are. He said he would want to make sure that they're addressing Bill's comments. He said he would like to see his comments, because right now he's just guessing what they are. But he said if the Commission trusts their staff, which he said has been diligent, his recommendation, which he experiences in many places, is approval subject to addressing staff comments. Whether it goes to Council or not has sometimes been deferred depending on the jurisdiction and what the staff is comfortable with at that point. Sometimes they've taken it where there are still contingencies of things that are beyond their control, such as gas main easements, other utilities or something they don't control. Again, he said he thinks that part of this issue is that it wasn't under their control and they were originally just going to redo their entrance and move their lot down. And then it grew and grew and grew what their requirement was to get that right of way. So he thinks that they all intended to get here much faster than they actually got here. He said his request would be that the Commission approve subject to staff comments. And then, City Council; Again until he's issued a building permit, he can't pull a grading permit to do it, they won't sign off on his storm water management plan or SW permit. Again, he said this will be constructed later. He said he doesn't think there's much risk to it. And from all the different P&Z's he's been to, he said this happens 50% of the time subject to comments being addressed. Then the question becomes whether Council will approve it subject to comments. He said they will make their best efforts to address every comment he gets. Again, he said he has to get a lot of approvals from about four different entities to make sure everyone's ok with it. The landscaping plan shouldn't be an issue. Storm water calculations he said he has, but they are potentially changing the shape of the pond because of some of the treed areas and a possible conflict with the septic that they didn't know about yet. That would be his request. He does not think it sets a bad precedent in terms of they've done it in many communities from all the people they've represented in the past. He said that is his humble request and it could even be a contingency of the site plan that construction doesn't begin until zoning is approved and the building permit is issued. But he said it shows, again, that it gives comfort to the vet clinic because they feel they got burned by the DOT. He said they see the nice entrances downstream, how everybody else got some good stuff, and they ended up with something awkward. It ended up taking 220 feet of right of way in front of their business so it was a big deal to them. He said that is his request and thanked the Commission.

Commissioner Vice had some comments for the Commission. He said he's personally seen in the past, not sure how many years, that the City of Indianola is not easy to work with. That the city has lost out on multiple development opportunities. He's personally got friends who has missed out on sales of lots because of the difficulty to work here. He said if we want to grow, he feels like we've got to be a little flexible. He said we have a big tenant coming and another one from out of state possibly coming. He said he knows there's a lot of pushback from Indianola as far as how it wants to grow and which direction, but he stated he almost moved

his business out of here because of all the pushback he got from the county. He said just going through it himself, sometimes there's ways to expedite things, and that the Commission trusts Bill. He acknowledged that Bill doesn't want to push through things without having time to go through it. He said they are a recommendation board, it is a unique situation, and he believes time is of the essence.

Little added that he could speak to some of the landscaping as well. He said the vet is currently putting in a crematorium that does have a building permit where they are required to put in a landscaping screen. Mettee confirmed that is a comment he's got in his comment letter.

Commissioner Woerdeman asked Mr. Pelds if those items he just listed as almost ready would be submitted prior to Council. Mr. Pelds said yes but he would like to see the comment letter before committing to a time frame. He continued saying the staff has been great to work with through the multiple projects that they've been doing in town so that's not an issue. He said this project has just morphed into something they didn't expect. They expected it to be a minor site plan, not a lot of huge paving, just relocating that entrance and then it became when the entrance is relocated, some of those 40 foot cattle trailers can't snake through that parking lot and then all of a sudden a second entrance was needed. So it just morphed itself and that's how we ended up here; he said they were just asking for the Commission's assistance. Woerdeman confirmed that it wasn't that the project started with this much concrete that would trigger this process and it was just glossed over, it's that the amount of concrete has increased to trigger this process. Mr. Pelds concurred and commented that it triggered a complete review. He further commented that they're not currently in compliance storm water wise and everything else. He said it triggered it to make it compliant with the city code. So that's where we've ended up, but not intentionally. Vice commented that with this, not only does the vet clinic gain, but the City of Indianola gains by getting them into compliance. He said it sounds like Mr. Rognes initially just wanted to make a better entrance for them but now he's being forced to triple the parking lot. He said he feels like on good will, if they're willing to do all this stuff that was more than they planned to begin with, he thinks they are going to do their due diligence on some landscaping and SWMP plan. Piper commented that the question just becomes how does the Commission word it. He thinks there seems to be a positive vibe, they just have to word it properly. Vice said in his opinion, he like Mr. Pelds suggestion as far as putting it on staff comments. That way if one of the points is forgotten, it's covered in staff comments. Farris pointed out the Mettee has listed out four options for the Commission to choose from. Mettee mentioned that this is the first time he has not made a recommendation and has left it up to the Commission.

Commissioner Noethe stated that it seems like there's a lot more positives than negatives and concern for the Commission to be setting a precedent that will put us in a poor position in the future, which none of them wanted to continue to happen either. He said that it's the scarcity mentality to say that the future tenant is going to walk unless this happens right now, but there is a lot of time, money, energy, and effort invested to get them here to this point too. So he said he would like to see it move forward subject to the approval of staff comments.

Noethe made the motion to do that - approve the site plan subject to all remaining staff

comments.

Stecker seconded the motion.

Motion was passed with a unanimous vote.

- B. Review and Consideration of the Proposed The Village Urban Renewal Plan for its Conformance with Elevate Indianola Comprehensive Plan.

City Manager Reeves presented the proposed plan.

There were no questions from the commission.

The commission unanimously concluded The Village Urban Renewal Plan is in conformance with the Elevate Indianola Comprehensive Plan.

7. Comments

- A. Building Permit Report

No comments on the building permit report.

- B. Current Projects

No comments on any current projects.

8. Adjourn

Darling made a motion to adjourn.

Vice seconded the motion.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:01 PM.