

Community Development Committee  
Special Meeting Minutes  
August 20, 2014

**1.) Call the Meeting to Order**

The meeting of the Community Development Committee was called to order by Vice Chairperson Patsy Cody at 5:34 p.m.

**2.) Roll Call.**

Members Present: Patsy Cody, Mike DeWild, Linda Groenendyk, Mike Kiser, Jody Lautenbach, Lori Parisee, Wayne Stienstra, Robyn Van Berkum, Dennis Vander Beek.

Members Absent: Jerry Brummel, Ginny Moore

Others Present: George Wesselhoft – Director of Planning and Zoning, Jerry Byers – CDC Secretary.

**3.) Design Permit Application**

Design Permit Application was submitted by Winding Landings, Inc. for a Taco Bell restaurant at 1620 Washington Street, Pella, Iowa. The application was for a 2,417 square foot restaurant with drive through.

Vice Chairperson Patsy Cody explained to the members of the Committee that the group was looking at a Design Permit Application submitted by Taco Bell. She continued that the design had been changed due to a height restriction with the Wal-Mart frontage lots. The members had multiple designs to review.

Jerry Byers, secretary to the Committee, stated that some of the members were not present at the previous meeting with the Taco Bell Architect Bob Lodel. Mr. Byers continued by explaining that Mr. Lodel came with a very nice design, but at the last minute corporate asked that the building look like the Applebee's next door. The Committee looked at both designs, talked about changes they wished to see. Mr. Lodel left with an approval for the original design and ideas for possible changes for a new design that was to be submitted for Committee approval tonight. However, then they found out about the height restrictions by Wal-Mart and have submitted new designs for Committee approval here tonight.

Mr. Wesselhoft, Director of Planning and Zoning, commented that time is of the essence due to that the design needs to be approved for submittal to Planning and Zoning Commission on the following Monday. If the design is not approved, then staff can not take the site plan to Planning and Zoning Commission and the entire process will be moved back a month.

Mr. Byers continued by telling the Committee that the accessories to the structure such as the dumpster enclosure, parking lot lights, wall lighting, brick and block detail were all addressed with no concerns. That the only outstanding item was really the roof or parapet details.

Mr. Byers went through the submittals one by one with the first one being the original design which was approved by the Committee and called it A1.0. The second design was the Applebee's design which the Committee gave direction on improvements they would wish to see which A 1.1 was. This design was changed at the last minute due to the height restrictions enforced by Wal-Mart. The third new design will be called A 1.2.

Robyn Van Berkum stated that even though the Committee approved the first design it would no longer pass due to the height issue.

Mr. Byers told Ms. Van Berkum that she was correct in that the application was no longer valid due to it being changed.

Discussion continued about the original design.

Wayne Steinstra commented that he liked the design better since they shortened the roof.

Much discussion continued about roof designs and heights.

Mr. Byers reminded the Committee that any changes to any of the designs in front of them would require new drawings and approval from the Committee. If not approved then the design does not go to Planning and Zoning Commission. The Architect was present at prior meeting but not at the 8/20/2014 meeting.

More discussion ensued about bell gables and beak gables.

Mike DeWild stated he liked the A 1.2 design with the bell gables on all the elevations.

Mr. Byers once again expressed his concern with the Committee making changes that would set the entire process back.

Vice Chairperson Cody stated that if we had an approved design but all they were doing was lowering the roof why we would ask for more changes.

Mr. Byers once again went through the designs stating that the original design A 1.0 was approved as submitted but would need preapproval due to the height restriction enforced by Wal-Mart.

A show of hands for the A1.0 design with a lower roof design was done. Seven yes votes for the original design

A show of hands for the A 1.1 design was done. Three yes, and five no votes.

A show of hands for the A 1.2 design was done. Four yes and four no votes.

Mr. DeWild commented that he like A1.2 but with bell gables. He felt that would be a very attractive design.

Mr. Byers commented that by asking for a redesign, that the entire project might not make the Planning and Zoning meeting.

Ms. Van Berkum stated that the higher walls gave it less of a fast food feel but she too did not like the beak gables.

Once again more discussion ensued about gables.

Mr. Steinstra commented that the gables from A 1.0 were not really a Dutch gable and that they came back in at the bottom, where Dutch gables come down or spread out. He felt that if they come in at the bottoms that they would not look quite right.

The Committee referenced the Dutch gable design sheet.

Ms. Cody commented that Corporate Taco Bell wanted A1.2 as the design.

Mr. Byers stated that the design group submitted A1.0. At the last minute, Corporate Taco Bell came in and said they wanted it to look more like Applebee's. Based on those suggestions, the design group submitted A1.1.

Mike Kiser made a motion to accept as submitted A1.1 design as submitted based on the suggestion by the Committee at the last meeting.

Jody Lautenbach seconded the motion.

Motion failed 3 yes to 6 no. Patsy Cody – no, Mike DeWild – no, Linda Groenendyk – yes, Mike Kiser – yes, Jody Lautenbach – yes, Lori Parisee – no, Wayne Stienstra – no, Robyn Van Berkum – no, Dennis Vander Beek – no.

Ms. Van Berkum had to leave. (6:10 p.m.)

Mr. Steinstra made a motion to accept as submitted A1.2 design.

Mr. Kiser seconded the motion.

Motion failed 4 yes to 4 no. Wayne Steinstra – yes, Lori Parisee – no, Jody Lautenbach – yes, Mike Kiser – yes, Linda Groenendyk – no, Mike DeWild – no, Patsy Cody – yes, Dennis Vander Beek – no.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. DeWild said he would be agreeable to 1.1 or 1.2 if they got rid of the Applebee's gables and went with the gables from A1.0.

Discussion came up to call the Architect.

Vice Chairperson Cody stated that if the Committee asked for another change then the design might not make the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Mr. Wesselhoft stated that if the design was approved and only a minor architectural element was changed, then the design could be approved through sub-committee. If it could be done by noon the following day, then everything could still work.

Vice Chairperson Cody said that if the Committee calls the Architect, then they would like A1.2 with the change in the gable of A1.0.

Mr. DeWild made a motion to approve the A1.2 design with a change in gables to the gable design in A1.0.

More discussion ensued about gables.

Lori Parisee expressed concern about giving approval for the bell gables on A1.2 design without the ability to see what it would look like.

Mr. DeWild asked if the Committee would call the Architect to see if they could submit drawings with those changes.

Mr. Byers expressed concern that the design group could do the changes but more than likely the design would not have approval before the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

Mr. Wesselhoft asked the Committee if they would be willing to place the task of accepting the design on the sub-committee approval so that the entire Committee would not have to re-convene for approval of the change.

Mr. Wesselhoft continued by saying that if the sub-committee did not like the change, assuming they could get the change back to the sub-committee in time, then the project would not go to Planning and Zoning Commission.

Vice Chairperson Cody asked for a second on the motion from Mike DeWild before continuing discussion.

Mr. Kiser seconded the motion.

More discussion ensued about gable design.

Mr. Steinstra commented that if the design team would have only submitted A1.2, which was his favorite, without submitting all the other options and information from Corporate Taco Bell about looking like Applebee's, that the Committee would have been very happy and passed the motion with the one design.

Mr. Kiser continued by stating that this was a situation where they gave too much information for the Committee to comment or vote on.

Mr. Byers reminded the Committee that the Committee looked at a lot of this last week and made decisions and now several Committee members are looking at several of the designs for the first time and adding thoughts and comments.

Ms. Parisee commented that was why it was making it hard for her because she knew that Corporate asked for the design to look like Applebee's last week, however, she respected the input on the gables and roof design by several of the Committee members and would like to see those ideas too.

There was confusion concerning the motion so Mike DeWild withdrew his original motion and made a new motion that asked for design A1.2 with gables from A1.0 on all elevations.

Discussion continued about the gable design, the design looking like Applebee's and concern about getting a design passed so as not to hold up the process.

Mr. DeWild amended the motion to include straight sides on the bell gables.

Vote on the motion passed 7 to 0.

Mr. Wesselhoft called the Architect, Bob Lodel, and explained the motion by the Committee.

Mr. Lodel asked about the gable idea with straight sides.

Mr. Byers explained to Mr. Lodel about how the bottom of the gable on A1.0 angles in at the bottom and that is what the Committee does not want to happen. They want the sides of that gable to go straight down.

Mr. Byers and Mr. Wesselhoft both tried to explain the motion to Mr. Lodel.

Mr. Lodel stated that he thought that they could make that change rather quickly and get it to the sub-committee in the morning.

Discussion ensued about getting this to the Committee members.

#### **4.) Other Business**

Vice Chairperson Cody informed the Committee that she is serving on the Ad Hoc Historic Preservation Committee as the Community Development Committee representative. She continued to give a brief history of the Ad Hoc Committee goal in establishing a two and a half block area as Historic Preservation.

She explained that there had been conversations about a portion of the designated area along Main Street, which is currently under CDC review, being reviewed by the Historic Preservation Committee.

She continued that she understands that the Historical Committee wants clean lines as to the area which would be under their review. However, she also feels that review of this particular area should be reviewed by the CDC due the difference of design review guidelines between Committees.

Mr. Stienstra commented that the process has become very complicated, because when the Historic Trust started the process of having a historic district from Main Street to West First Street, there was no business there. It was all existing housing but the houses are not there anymore.

Mr. Byers commented that there was discussion about commercial construction being reviewed by the CDC and residential construction being looked at by the Historical Preservation Committee.

Discussion ensued.

Vice Chairperson Cody stated that the Historic Trust and the Ad Hoc are trying to preserve some of the older homes in our community. However, her concern is about what to do with the area along Main Street that due to the commercial zoning would be under CDC review.

Mr. Kiser asked if the Historic Preservation Committee Ad Hoc is going to ask the CDC to relinquish area over and would this be something that the CDC is going to have to vote on.

Mr. Wesselhoft commented that the Ad Hoc would be presenting recommendations to City Council.

Vice Chairperson Cody finished by asking what the Committee thought.

Mr. DeWild concluded by stating it will depend on what the Historic Preservation Committee ends up doing.

Mr. Steinstra commented about the possibility of an overlap which would allow CDC to review commercial and Historic Preservation Committee to review residential construction.

Mr. Wesselhoft indicated that is what the initial proposal was to consider the overlap between committees. He continued by stating that the Ad Hoc has not come to a final conclusion as to what they will be submitting to City Council.

**5.) Minutes**

Approval of the August 13, 2014 meeting minutes. The minutes were approved as submitted.

**6.) Adjourn**

Vice Chairperson Cody adjourned the meeting at 7:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted.  
Jerry Byers  
Building Official