

Notice is hereby given that the Board of Adjustment for the City of Grinnell will conduct a public hearing at 12:00 p.m. on Tuesday, January 19, 2021.

**This meeting will be held remotely on zoom and can be accessed by visiting the following**

**link** <https://zoom.us/j/6468685281?pwd=US9qR0drckNRc2dZM0RJRtVCckxaQT09>

Or by entering the following when prompted by the zoom website or app:

**Meeting ID: 646 868 5281 Passcode: 12345**

## **MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**

21-1

January 19, 2021

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Grant at 12:06pm.

Roll Call: Hatting   P  , Burnell   P  , Johnson   P  , Hammen   P  

Also present: Tyler Avis, Dan Agnew, Russ Behrens, Abbey Gilroy, Bill Ludwig, Kyle Wilcox, Keeley Smith, Kameron Smith

### **APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

Hammen motioned to approve the agenda. Johnson seconded the motion. The Agenda was approved unanimously.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Grant asked if any changes were needed of the minutes. None were observed. Hammen made a motion to approve the minutes, Burnell seconded the motion. The Minutes were approved unanimously.

### **COMMUNICATIONS:**

Grant requested if there were any communications. Avis made sure the Board members were able to review the letter submitted from the Smith's and all indicated they had and had no comment. Avis then read a letter received from Pete Brownell on behalf of Brownell's indicating they were in support of the project.

### **NEW BUSINESS:**

1. Review an application from Grinnell Promenade, LLC a potential developer of 802-818 Reed St to the Board of Adjustment to review a variance request allowing an increase of 11 units to 29 total units at an R-3 PUD site, and reducing the number of off-street parking spaces from 1.5 spaces per unit to 1 space per unit.

Avis read the updated portion of the Memo as it was written and then did an overview of the updated site plan comparing it to the original. Some key things that were noted included the reduction of the number of units, the reduction of the number of parking spaces, and the increased separation distance from the adjoining property to the North as well as an elevation plan showing screening from the neighbor to the north.

Grant asked for any questions or comments.

Johnson asked a question about where visitors will park.

Gilroy explained that in a previous discussion it was noted that a large number of the on-street parking spaces nearby are typically only used during the daytime and are free in the evening and weekends.

Ms. Smith detailed that the parking provided will be used quickly by the residents, and during the day there is no additional parking available as the hospital staff and patients use what is available on street. She stated she has great concerns about the lack of parking.

A question was asked on the number of required handicap parking spaces provided, it was confirmed that two would be provided per ADA Regulations.

Avis explained that there are roughly 39 on-street parking spaces nearby the potential development.

Mr. Smith asked to confirm the location of the on-street parking spaces and that location of those, He also commented on security, and if security cameras would or could be provided.

Gilroy explained that yes that is something that they have considered and would be willing to install.

Mr. Smith also asked about background checks completed for any potential tenants.

Gilroy explained there is a thorough criminal background check that is completed for each applicant and safety is greatly considered before signing any lease. She also proceeded to explain the reasoning for the development a bit further, detailing findings of the recently housing market study, and discussed the rent rates for the project detailing they are in line with the findings of that study and comparable with what Grinnell's market currently affords.

Ludwig explained that they have had a meeting with Brownells and are hoping to have a meeting with Grinnell Mutual so that those businesses can advertise the units to their employees.

Gilroy and Ludwig did an overview of the additional separation, landscaping, and increasing the distance of the proposed building from the lot to the North. Ludwig asked if there would be a request by the homeowner for a fence.

Mrs. Smith stated yes they would ask for that if possible.

Wilcox asked if the parking variance has been approved.

Avis explained the results of the previous meeting in that nothing was approved and instead the applicants were asked to look at everything based on the discussions had and then come back to the meeting for everything to be reconsidered.

Wilcox asked for the makeup of the unit types.

Gilroy stated there were 8 two-bedroom units and the rest were 1-bedroom.

Ludwig explained that three additional parking spaces could be provided for on the site.

Avis asked about the off-street parking spaces to the west of Family Medical and if it is frequently filled up.

Wilcox stated that typically those lots are filled by staff and patients. He also asked about pedestrian safety.

Avis explained that it's likely the crossing of Reed St to the West is possible to become designated with signage and street painting.

Ludwig explained that in the instances where they have a combination of Office/Residential uses, typically during the daytime the parking lot is comprised of vehicles of owners working at the offices, and during the nighttime after everyone leaves the offices, the parking lot is filled with people residing in the residential.

Grant asked what other potential rental unit developments are being discussed.

Avis explained the Grinnell College's plans for two structured in Downtown Grinnell, the rezoning request for 7<sup>th</sup> and Penrose for a Senior Living facility, and the 11 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue proposed development. He asked for a comment from the applicant on the timing for when they would like to begin on this project.

Gilroy explained that they would hope to begin construction this spring and have residents moving in after the 1<sup>st</sup> of 2022.

Mrs. Smith asked about reducing the number of units to what can be permitted.

Gilroy explained that reducing the number of units would likely result in having to increase rent prices, which may lead to rates being abnormally high for Grinnell and leading to the demise of the project.

Ludwig further explained it was reviewed on 31 vs 29 vs 16 units and 29 is what made the most sense financially.

Avis asked if the developer could comment on the potential cost of the project.

Gilroy stated it would be roughly a \$3,500,000/.00 project and they would expect to pay about \$60,000 in taxes.

Mr. Smith stated he would have concern about the property value aspect and that it may halt the increase in the long term of property value growth, which is a concern of his.

Gilroy explained the effort they have put in to the planning in addition to be as little of a negative impact on them, and would hope to be a very good neighbor.

Grant asked for a motion on the matter.

Mr. Hammond recommended approval of 802-818 Reed St allowing an increase to 29 total units at an R-3 PUD site, and reducing the number of off-street parking spaces from 1.5 spaces per unit to 1 space per unit.

Ms. Grant asked for a second. Ms. Burnell seconded the motion.

The roll call vote was as follows: Hatting Nay, Burnell Yes, Johnson Nay, Hammen Yes, Grant Nay. The motion did not pass with a majority vote.

Additional discussions were had by the developer about any future discussions on the matter to work towards a resolution and Mr. Avis explained it would be up to the Board members to take part in that.

Mr. Avis requested the Board to explain any reasoning for denial of the requests, so that all can be made aware of issues surrounding the denial.

Grant stated the concerns brought forward by the neighbor to the North, and how the development of this size would negatively impact them.

Hatting stated the parking congestion because of the number of units.

Gilroy requested if there could be two votes, one related to the scale and the other for the parking.

Avis states the motion to the Board from Mr. Hammond was related to the number of units at the site, which was denied, and that matter is likely concluded.

Johnson stated the concerns of the neighbor and parking issues were the reasoning for his denial.

Hatting stated that the issue ultimately comes down to the zoning regulations which limit this development.

Burnell stated the density was also a concern, but she felt this area is one where the density should increase and with only having mostly 1 bedroom units this made sense.

Ludwig made a comment on moving the building for more parking.

Avis explained that would result in a decrease in the setbacks provided and a variance needed for that issue.

Wilcox asked about decreasing the number of units to what would be allowed.

Gilroy stated the increased cost would result in rents so high that it wouldn't make sense.

Johnson moved to adjourn the meeting. Hammond seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**ADJOURN:** Johnson moved to adjourn the meeting. Hammond seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.at 12:53p.m.

---

TERESE GRANT, CHAIR

ATTEST:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
TYLER AVIS, SECRETARY