



PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

April 14, 2026

6:00 PM

City Council Chambers

Agenda

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Roll Call**
- 3. Agenda Approval**
 - A. Approval of the April 14, 2026 agenda.
- 4. Minutes Approval**
 - A. Approval of the March 24, 2026 meeting minutes.
- 5. Public Comment**
- 6. New Business**
 - A. Consider zoning code amendments to Chapter 171 - Parkland Dedication.
- 7. Comments**
 - A. Building Permit Report
 - B. Current Projects
- 8. Adjourn**



PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

March 24, 2026

6:00 PM

City Council Chambers

Minutes

1. Call to Order

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

2. Roll Call

Members present: Al Farris, Carrie Woerdeman, Lin Stecker, Jake Vice, Justin Noethe, Rich Piper.

Members not present: Cortney Marmon, Sarah Ritchie, Misty Darling.

Staff members present: Jacob Meshke, Bryce Johnson, Bill Mettee, Tara Bosteder.

3. Agenda Approval

A. Approval of the March 24, 2026 agenda.

Stecker made a motion to approve the meeting agenda.

Vice seconded the motion.

Motion was passed with a unanimous vote.

4. Minutes Approval

A. Approval of the January 13, 2026 meeting minutes.

Farris made a motion to approve the January 13, 2026 meeting minutes..

Piper seconded the motion.

Motion was passed with a unanimous vote.

5. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

6. New Business

A. Election of Officers for 2026.

Farris made a motion to elect Woerdeman as Chair

Piper seconded the motion.

Motion was passed with a unanimous vote.

Vice made a motion to elect Stecker as Vice Chair

Farris seconded the motion.

Motion was passed with a unanimous vote.

B. Presentation of Gateway Corridor Study.

Emily Rizvic with Confluence presented the Gateway and Corridor Improvement Study to the Commission.

If any of these strategies were implemented, the ongoing maintenance would be the City's responsibility.

Aside from any grant opportunities, the cost of installation or implementation would be the City's responsibility.

The Commission asked what data was gathered and used to determine the high crash potential areas. A couple areas, in specific, that were in question were the stretch in front of Hy-Vee and the area in front of the high school. This information was not readily available and will be provided when presented to Council.

This study will be used as a tool to help provide the city with additional support when applying for grants to make improvements in the mentioned areas. Identifying these areas will also help in the development process when new developments come to the area, discussions can be had with developers about needed or necessary improvements.

This study is not related to the Iowa Department of Transportation Access Management Plan.

Farris made a motion to adopt the plan as presented with the additional data that we requested.

Noethe seconded the motion.

Motion was passed with a unanimous vote.

C. Approval of a final plat for Kentucky Ridge Commercial Plat 1.

Mettee presented the final plat and related staff report.

This is not a re-plat. The previous plat for Kentucky Ridge Townhomes Plat 1 was never recorded and the developer has now chosen to phase the project.

The front half is planned for development while the back half will be pushed to a later date. There is imminent development planned for the front half as discussion was held today with the Director of Community and Economic Development. The stop light planned at Kentucky and Jefferson Way is part of this development. Access to and from the Scooter's site is also part of the development's discussion.

The purpose of this final plat is to establish the legal lot of record so the developer can purchase it. Site plans will follow. There are public improvements that still need inspected as well. The City is working diligently with Snyder & Associates to get these items inspected and keep the project moving forward.

Vice made a motion to approve the final plat as submitted.

Stecker seconded the motion.

Motion was passed with a unanimous vote.

D. Consider sidewalk waiver request at 815 West 1st Street.

Mettee presented the waiver request and related staff report.

The setbacks are measured from the property line. It is 30 feet from the property line to the structure.

For clarification, there is a North-South sidewalk on the property; the waiver is for the East-West sidewalk.

If the waiver is approved, the North-South sidewalk can remain as is. If the waiver is denied, the East-West sidewalk would be required and, therefore, triggering improvements to the North-South sidewalk.

Any future street or major reconstruction projects that would change the viability of a sidewalk there would trigger the inclusion of that sidewalk as part of the city project. City Manager, Jacob Meshke, also provided that for street construction projects, the city has a fund from road use taxes that would be utilized for the project include sidewalk construction and other ancillary expenses related to the project.

There is a driveway planned for this lot. However, its outlet will be onto 1st Ave, while all the utilities causing hardship are along South G St.

There is no East-West sidewalk on the block West of this parcel either.

If the Planning and Zoning Commission denied the waiver request, the City Council can still approve it with a super majority vote.

Noethe made a motion to approve the request as submitted.

Vice seconded the motion.

Motion was passed with a unanimous vote.

E. Consider zoning code amendments for Chapter 171 Parkland Dedication.

Mettee presented the zoning code amendments and related staff report.

The concern of several commissioners was that developers might be inclined to include a tiny park instead of paying the fee in lieu of just to satisfy the code requirement.

Doug Bylund, Chief of Culture of Recreation, pointed out that the Parkland Dedication Ordinance allows the Commission, and ultimately the City, to approve or deny the donation. So it will still need to meet some minimum specification as to what is desired. This will give allowance for parks, trails, trail heads, etc, depending on what's most beneficial based on circumstances.

There is no size stipulation as part of the city's comprehensive plan, but the amendment brings the requirement to be more consistent with those of our peer communities.

A dollar amount of \$30,000 is proposed, in lieu of an 'assessed value', in order to eliminate confusion in the determination of the assessed value of the property. This dollar amount is

comparable to what other peer communities are assessing. In addition, this fee is included in the City's fee schedule, allowing it to be reviewed annually. Meshke added that as part of the annual budget process, every department head is tasked with reviewing their budget and fee schedule where they will benchmark costs/fees as well as make those peer community comparisons. These budgets and fee schedules are presented and approved by Council annually.

Commission Member Farris voiced concern about the accuracy of the 2.4 persons per household statistic that was provided. This statistic was provided through a study done by Confluence, and likely derived from the census.

Commission Member Farris also voiced concern about undervaluing parkland in our community. Johnson provided that this code allows developers to credit their area. So the developer would be able to have a surplus credit, allowing them to place parkland in areas that would meet the goals of the comprehensive plan, thus making those goals more achievable.

Commission Member Farris also stated he would like the text removed that allows the fee in lieu of to be used for park maintenance. He would prefer the fee to only be used for future parkland acquisition. Bylund supplied that there is a fund specially designated for parkland, but ultimately the Council has authority over use of those funds. Commission member Woerdeman added that the City would also not want their current parkland and play areas to become dilapidated in the event of a budget crisis. Meshke also added that the City would not want to put itself in a position where there's funding to purchase land, but no funding to place anything on that land.

Commission Member Piper asked if there was any data regarding developers' choice of building parkland versus paying the fee in lieu of. Johnson answered no, he's seen both, and it's purely developer/development driven.

Commission Member Woerdeman asked if the City would be required to accept parkland dedications from developers. Bylund answered that no, the City has the ability to decline the dedication if it didn't fit the City's needs or goals. If a parkland dedication was being declined, the City would just be requesting the fee in lieu be paid instead.

Commission Member Noethe requested charted comparison data regarding the fee in lieu of from our neighboring peer communities.

These amendments were presented to the Parks and Rec Commission in March, where the amendments were approved 5-0. After Planning and Zoning, it will proceed to City Council and the three hearing process for approval and adoption.

Vice made a motion to delay this consideration until next meeting where the additional data requested can be provided.

Farris seconded the motion.

Motion was passed with a unanimous vote.

7. Comments

A. Building Permit Report

There were no comments.

B. Current Projects

Johnson provided a few updates:

- The CDBG program has been finalized and contracts have been signed. There is a kickoff meeting with contractors and building owners on April 9, and hopefully building permits will be pulled shortly thereafter. Construction anticipated to being early May.
- Spruce Street Townhomes had a groundbreaking today held by the Chamber of Commerce. This is a collaborative initiative to recognize progress and growth in the community which often goes unseen. These groundbreaking ceremonies will be held going into the future with each new development to celebrate that growth, with this Spruce Street groundbreaking today being the first.
- The Hillcrest sidewalk connection has been poured. Other future connections on the Northwest side are in progress.
- There are two upcoming urban renewal plans that can be expected in the next couple months for Deer Run that will require the Commission's approval.
- The City website's Current Development Projects has been updated/finalized through collaboration with Snyder and Associates.

Additionally, Commission Member Farris queried about the stop light near the Schoolyard Development and if the timing would be adjusted now that the property development is underway. Johnson answered that the planning and studies have already been completed and after the vertical construction has taken place, he does not believe there's a way to go back to remedy that. This would be up to the Iowa Department of Transportation.

8. Adjourn

Vice made a motion to adjourn.

Noethe seconded the motion.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:34 pm.



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

To: Planning & Zoning Commission
From: Bill Mettee, Senior Planner
Date: April 14, 2026
Re: Consider approval of Parkland Dedication code amendments

Commissioners:

Community Development staff has continued to review the zoning and subdivision ordinances and is offering the following recommendations:

1. Section 171 Parkland Dedication. On July 1, 2024, City Council had their third reading and adopted the Parkland Dedication ordinance. The intent of this ordinance is for developers of residential projects to dedicate areas for parkland for the residents the subdivision serves. If there is not enough space in the plat for parkland, the developer may instead provide a fee-in-lieu of amount to be used for park improvements or towards the development of a future park.

Community Development has collaborated with Chief of Culture and Recreation, Doug Bylund, to review the ordinance and proposed amendments. There are two major amendments that will make this ordinance more successful.

- a. Amending the amount of parkland required. The ordinance states that 16 acres per 1,000 residents (0.016 acres per resident) is required. This amount is 130% more than our peer communities and in other communities in the Des Moines metro area. We propose to reduce this from 16 acres per 1,000 residents to 6-acres per 1,000 residents and from 0.016 acres per resident to 0.006 acres per resident. This amendment puts us in line with other communities and helps Indianola remain competitive in the residential development market. The persons per household amount of 2.4 is 10% higher than the same peer communities. The attached chart shows Indianola and six peer communities with parkland requirements.
- b. When a developer wishes to pay a fee-in-lieu instead of dedicating parkland, the ordinance states that a mutually agreed-upon appraiser must determine a fair market value that the developer then pays. This has caused some confusion between developers and appraisers about what exactly their role is and how exactly this number should be calculated. We reviewed other communities and their parkland fee per acres and collectively decided that \$30,000 per acre was satisfactory. It's slightly less than cities in the metro area.

- c. The codified line referencing the mutually agreed upon appraiser will be removed. The goal of establishing a set fee, rather than relying on an appraisal, is to allow developers to better estimate development costs and streamline the entitlement process. The set \$30,000 per acre fee will be included in the City's fee schedule allowing it to be easily amended during the annual fee schedule review.
- d. Several other minor amendments are proposed including updating the calculations based on the proposed numbers, updates in minimum park size and proximity to the development where funds may be used. The current code requires parkland dedication or fee-in-lieu contributions to be located within ½ mile of a proposed development. Staff recommends a more flexible approach that allows the City to determine where parkland should be designated or where cash-in-lieu funds should be allocated.

All proposed changes can be seen in their entirety on the following sheets.

The proposed code amendments were presented at the March 11th, 2026 Parks and Recreation Commission meeting where the members voted 5-0 to recommend approval to the Planning Commission and City Council.

At the March 24, 2026 Planning Commission meeting, the Commissioners asked for additional information about the numbers that were presented related to acres per resident and persons per household and how they compare to other communities. The chart can be found on the following sheet.

Our current persons per household is 2.4, which is 10% higher than the peer communities, and is not subject to this amendment. Our current acres per resident of 0.016 is 130% more than those communities. Our proposal to reduce the acres per resident to 0.006 is slightly lower than the average.

Bill Mettee
Senior Planner

City	Acre / Resident	Acres per Resident	Persons per Household		
Norwalk	8.5 acres / 1,000 people	0.0085	2.05	avg	SF - 3; SFA - 2; MF - 1.6; Mob - 1.6
Waukee	6.5 acres / 1,000 people	0.0065	2.33	avg	SF - 3; TH - 2.25; MF - 1.75
Van Meter	5 acres / 1,000 people	0.005	2.175	avg	SF - 2.8; SFA - 2.5; MF - 1.8; Mob - 1.5
Bonduarant	5 acres / 1,000 people	0.005	2.5	avg	SF/SFA/TH - 3; MF - 2.0
Polk City	8.284 acres /1,000 people	0.008284	2.086	avg	SF - 2.76; SFA - 2.0; MF - 1.5
Clive	8.36 acres / 1,000 people	0.00836	1.98	avg	SF - 2.7; TH - 2.0; MF - 1.25
Altoona	No standard				
Newton	No standard				
Average	6.94 acres / 1,000 people	0.006941	2.19		
Median	7.33 acres / 1,000 people	0.007392	2.13	median	
Indianola	16 acres / 1,000 residents	0.016	2.4		
current		(130% more)	(10% higher)		
Indianola	6 acres / 1,000 residents	0.006	2.4		
proposed		lower than average	higher than average		

171.01 TITLE.

This chapter shall be known and cited as the "Parkland Dedication Ordinance of the City of Indianola, Iowa."

171.02 PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Parkland Dedication ordinance is to ensure that new developments support the health, safety, and welfare of future residents by providing land for public parks within the City and within areas being newly developed or redeveloped for residential purposes.

171.03 APPLICATION.

When a preliminary plat for new single-family development (detached or semi-detached), two-family, and/or townhouse development is proposed or a site plan or building permit is submitted for a new multi-family residential development, including manufacture housing community, parkland dedication in a manner consistent with this ordinance shall be required.

Any developer who, after the effective date of the ordinance seeks to develop land for residential purposes within the City shall be required to dedicate public parkland as prescribed herein. No new plats or site plans for residential development shall be approved unless and until the provisions of this chapter are complied with.

171.04 STANDARD FOR PUBLIC PARKLAND PER RESIDENT.

The standard for the amount of neighborhood parkland required is ~~6.16~~-acres per 1,000 residents or ~~0.006 016~~ acres per resident. Based on the estimated persons per household number, as determined by the last decennial census, the following calculations shall be applied for new residential developments.

Number of lots or dwelling units) x (Census estimated persons per household) x (0.0.006 ~~016~~ acres/resident) = required parkland dedication (Decimals rounded up the nearest hundredth)

Examples (assuming 2.4 estimated persons per household):

A 100-lot single family subdivision would be required to dedicate ~~1.44 3.84~~ acres of parkland.

(100 lots) x (2.4 residents) x (0.006 ~~016~~ acres/resident) = ~~1.44 3.84~~ acres

A 120-unit apartment complex would be required to dedicate ~~1.73 4.61~~ acres of parkland

$$(120\text{-units}) \times (2.4\text{ residents}) \times (0.\text{006}\text{ } \del{016}\text{ acres/resident}) = \text{1.73}\text{ } \del{4.61}\text{ acres}$$

171.05 PARKLAND DEDICATION MINIMUM DESIGN STANDARDS.

1. ~~Land dedicated for parkland shall be located within ½ mile of the proposed development.~~ The specific location of the land to be dedicated shall be acceptable to the City and shall be located and planned with future parkland dedications to create a neighborhood park site that will be no less than 10,000 square feet in area~~1-acre in size.~~

A. Public Recreational Trail corridors deeded to the City or dedicated by easements may be included in this calculation of land dedication.

2. All land to be dedicated to meet this parkland dedication requirement shall be useable park space and shall not be located within any floodway, delineated wetlands, shall not contain any areas for storm water detention, and shall have cross slopes no greater than 5%. An exception may be granted by the City Council to accept parkland that includes wetlands, ponds, and/or storm water retention areas that provide a recreational benefit.

3. The dedicator of parkland shall be responsible for rough grading, stabilization, and seeding of the parkland and providing paved public street access, sanitary sewer services, and water service to the property.

4. The developer shall designate on the plat map or site plan the proposed number of dwelling units by type. Designation shall be for park dedication calculation purposes only.

5. The developer shall be required to prepare the parkland prior to dedication in a manner acceptable to the City. This includes:

A. The site shall be located adjacent to an improved street with sidewalks and utilities, as required by the City. The site shall have access to such a fully improve street across at least ten (10) percent of the distance of its perimeter. Any access route shall be at least thirty (30) feet wide for trails and fifty (50) feet for roadway access.

B. On-site drainage patterns shall be designed and constructed by the developer with the approval of the City.

C. Grading shall comply with approved plans.

D. Top-soil shall be spread evenly and lightly compacted to an adequate depth for turf growth.

E. Seeding shall occur during the fall or spring, in accordance with standard specifications of the City. A maintainable stand of grass shall be established prior to acceptancy by the city.

171.06 ALTERNATIVES TO DEDICATION OF PARKLAND.

1. When all or a portion of the required parkland cannot be dedicated, the developer shall construct or otherwise complete park improvements and/or trail improvements ~~as determined by the City, within ½ mile of the proposed development.~~ The value of the improvements shall be equal to the value of the required parkland dedication. The value of these improvements shall be based on the fair market value of the land to be dedicated. Subject to approval by the City, park improvements may include construction and installation of trails, parking lots, playground equipment, park shelters, tennis courts, basketball courts, ball fields and appurtenances, and landscaping and the dedication of land or easements necessary for planned trails. The developer shall provide written proof of the land's value and written estimates of the costs of the park improvements.

2. The City may further allow a portion of the parkland dedication requirement be satisfied by the dedication of greenways and stream buffers as may be desired by the City. Because this land has a reduced value as neighborhood park space, the following dedication conversation rate should be applied: 1-acre of greenway or stream buffer dedicated to the City shall be equivalent and worth 0.10-acre of required parkland.

3. In lieu of dedicating parkland, the developer may request the ability to make a cash payment into a fund to be used for future park improvements or park land acquisition for a park facility. ~~that is within ½ mile of the proposed development.~~ The City Council shall evaluate this request giving due consideration to all of the factors listed in Section 171.05. The donation shall be no less than the minimum number of acres required. ~~A mutually appointed Appraiser will determine parkland Fair Market Value. The Developer shall pay any expenses accrued in the determination of the payment amount.~~ Payment in lieu shall be completed prior to development recording or issuance of building permits.

171.07 PARKLAND DEDICATION CREDIT.

Should a new development desire to dedicate more parkland than is required, the dedicator may sell or transfer the parkland credit to another developer or apply as credit for a current or future parkland dedication requirement. Written notice and copies of a transfer agreement shall be provided to the City as record of all credits transferred or sold to another party.

171.08 PARKLAND DEDICATION AGREEMENT AND SURETY.

At the time of development, the developer shall enter into a written agreement with the City to detail the parkland dedication and/or park improvement. Depending on the timing of the

dedication or park improvement, the developer may propose, and/or the City may require the developer to provide adequate surety to the City to ensure completion of the dedication or improvement. The form and amount of surety shall be determined by the City at its full discretion.

171.09 EXEMPTIONS.

The following shall be exempted from the requirements this chapter:

1. The construction of any non-residential building or structure.
2. Alterations or expansion of an existing building where no additional residential units are created.
3. The construction of an accessory dwelling unit.
4. The replacement of a destroyed or partially destroyed building or structure with a new building or structure where there are no additional residential units created.
5. The installation of a replacement mobile home.
6. The division of a parcel into no more than two (2) lots.
7. The replat of an existing subdivision where no additional residential lots are created.
8. Any claim of exemption shall be made no later than the time of application for a preliminary plat approval. Any claim not so made shall be deemed waived.



Community Development

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

March 2026

<u>Code</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Permits Issued</u>	<u># of Units</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Average</u>
101	Single Family Home	2	2	\$705,500.00	\$352,750.00
102	Single Family Attach	1	2	\$650,050.00	
103	Two Family	0		\$0.00	
104	Three or More Families	0		\$0.00	
	Mobile Homes	0		\$0.00	
322	Service Stations	0		\$0.00	
324	Office	0		\$0.00	
328	Non-resident buildings	0		\$0.00	
329	Pool	0		\$0.00	
434	Residential Add/Alt	4		\$92,155.00	\$23,038.75
437	Non-residential add/alt	1		\$26,000.00	\$26,000.00
438	Res garage/carports	0		\$0.00	
645	Demo - residential	1		\$50.00	
649	Demo - commercial	0		\$0.00	
March Total		9		\$1,473,755.00	
Residential Value				Commercial Value	
98.2%				1.8%	

YEAR TO DATE TOTAL					
<u>Code</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Permits Issued</u>	<u># of Units</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Average</u>
101	Single Family Home	3	3	\$1,108,633.00	\$369,544.33
102	Single Family Attach	1	2	\$650,050.00	
103	Two Family	0		\$0.00	
104	Three or More Families	0		\$0.00	
	Mobile Homes	0		\$0.00	
322	Service Stations	0		\$0.00	
324	Office	0		\$0.00	
328	Non-resident buildings	0		\$0.00	
329	Pool	0		\$0.00	
434	Residential add/alt	12		\$229,648.00	\$19,137.33
437	Non-residential add/alt	3		\$200,550.00	\$66,850.00
438	Res garage/carports	1		\$13,000.00	
645	Demo - sfd	1		\$50.00	
649	Demo - commercial	0		\$0.00	
YTD TOTAL		21	5	\$2,201,931.00	
Residential Value				Commercial Value	
90.9%				9.1%	