ALTOONA PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
April 9, 2019
Altoona City Hall

Members Present: Michelle Sloan, Jill Pudenz, Eric Gjersvik, Ann Moyna, Dan Dove
Members Absent: Dan Narber, Scott Henry
Staff: Chad Quick, Jenn Naylor, John Shaw
Guests: Ted Griffieon, Melvin Quinn others not signing in

Chairwoman Jill Pudenz called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. Roll call was taken with five members present.

1. Public hearing, consideration and recommendation of a rezoning request from Valley Development Co. to rezone 57.95 acres on the south side of 25th Street NW / NE 62nd Avenue from A-1 (Agricultural) to M-1 (Limited Industrial). Property includes the pond.

Ted Craig (Dickinson Law Firm) presented the request on behalf of Valley Development Company. They are seeking to rezone approximately 58 acres of currently zoned A-1 to M-1. The client intends to market his property for sale and believes that an M-1 zoning represents the highest and best use of the property. They ask that the Commission vote in favor of the rezoning.

With no questions from Commission members, Pudenz opened the hearing to public comments. With no questions from the public, Pudenz closed the public hearing.

Dove moved to approve the recommendation of a rezoning request from Valley Development Co. to rezone 57.95 acres on the south side of 25th Street NW / NE 62nd Avenue from A-1 (Agricultural) to M-1 (Limited Industrial). Property includes the pond. Seconded by Moyna.
Votes: Yes—Dove, Moyna, Sloan, Pudenz, Gjersvik. No—None. Motion passed, 5-0.

2. Consideration and recommendation of a site plan for Project Sequelant Construction Staging Areas.

Craig Bennett (Miller & Associates, Consulting Engineers P.C.) presented the request. He projected the site plan and indicated areas to be used for different purposes, including a laydown area for construction equipment and contractor parking.

Shaw asked if they had determined the access point for the trailer section of the Valley Lakes area. Bennett stated that it had not been officially determined, but indicated on the projection that it was a half a mile between an intersection and just west of the lake, and they were looking at about a quarter of a mile away, so they could get a good separation in visibility from that intersection. Shaw asked about the western construction laydown area. He stated that it is Staff's assumption that they will be coming off the drive that will be built just north of it going to the new substation location and that all the driving in and out will be internal from 62nd down to that with no new access off of 46th from the west. Bennett stated that the substation driveway access would primarily be the access that they have. Shaw asked for clarification that it would be used for the substation but for not the construction site. Bennett stated they were looking at using it as a joint access, so they wouldn't have a separate access. As they build the substation access, they would utilize that for construction purposes. The primary activity or routing would be a cross-connection between the existing road just south of the guard shack. There would be secondary access they would need to get to the street to the west. They would

prefer to have the substation drive be the access in the interim. Shaw asked for what purposes. Bennett stated to get equipment into a laydown area that he indicated on the site plan, should they need secondary access. He said it was a controlled, secure access which will be gated with a security fence. It allows contractors to come in from the west into the laydown area. Shaw stated that that was Staff's concern—heavy trucks using that road, as the road isn't designed to handle that type of heavy equipment and traffic. Their preference would be from 62nd down to through their controlled access point to the laydown point versus coming out from the western street. Bennett stated that is something they could definitely consider. He asked if Staff was worried about the sub-base of that asphalt road. Shaw stated it isn't a very substantial road. Vern Willey explained that when they asphalted the roads, they came in and seal-coated them first, waited awhile, drove on them, and put two inches of asphalt on top of them. They're not really structural, which is a concern. Willey then suggested that perhaps if they use the road and tear it up, they repair it afterward. Bennett stated that is something that could be worked out. They have opportunities to navigate the site. He showed where they would enter and how they would circulate. He said he felt that could be a very limited access, that there are ways they could do that knowing that they would have that access internally throughout the site. He stated that is something they could certainly work with. He showed a road that ran through the site and indicated an area for a future temporary construction road. He said he felt that there could be a good way to actually limit that to the northern access, whether it's the future construction road or the existing access. He indicated an area referred to as "Trailer City" which is also an access. Shaw explained that one of the things the Planning and Zoning Commission could do with the issuance of a curb cut or basically a driveway approach in that location, is to place limitations on that, which is something they will probably seek out. Staff will work with them on that. Bennett stated that if the owner decides to pursue that further, they could work through what would happen to remove and replace the road if that was a condition.

Sloan asked Shaw whether he was suggesting they do limitations or conditions. Shaw stated they are bringing this up at the staff level. Obviously this would be a condition of the site plan. What Staff would probably do would get better direction to have attached with the Council's approval. At that time, Staff would make Council aware of the limitations that the road has on the west side. They do have options regarding how they'll move around there internally, but if they decide they do have to use it, if they exceed the limitation, the City could document the condition of the road before and after and hold an agreement that they will put in another road, or something like that. Sloan stated okay. Bennett stated that for the record, this agenda item is just for the east portion, although he had been describing both. Shaw stated it's nice that that diagram is on that also, because with either site plan, it would be tied to the project.

With no further questions from Commission members, Pudenz opened the hearing to public comments.

Ted Griffieon, 6561 NE 46th Street, has lived in that area for the last 44 years. He farmed Valley Development farm during that time. One of the concerns he has is when getting onto 46th Street, there is a big hill. Traffic comes over it pretty fast. If there is a lot of traffic coming through there, and there are trucks turning into the site, it could possibly set up for an accident. He always thought when they paved that road, they should've cut the hill down. It is kind of dangerous there, but there hasn't been any accidents that he's aware of. It's a blind area. Pudenz asked if the speed limit is still 55 mph through there. Griffieon stated he thinks it is 45 mph now. Pudenz stated that reducing the speed limit could be something to consider with all the extra traffic through there.

With no further questions, Dove moved to approve recommendation of a site plan for Project Sequelant Construction Staging Areas, subject to deficiencies to continue to work with Staff. Seconded by Gjersvik.
Votes: Yes—Dove, Gjersvik, Sloan, Pudenz, Moyna. No—None. Motion approved, 5-0.

3. Consideration and recommendation of a site plan for Project Sequelant Data Center.

Craig Bennett (Miller & Associates, Consulting Engineers P.C.) presented the request. The owner of the property is Siculus, Inc. Bennett had Quick show various plans on the projector. He showed ATN5-6 in relation to the location of the new building. It is H-shaped, just north of ATN5-6. It is on Lot 1 Ambrose Place Plat 2. They have to move some of the dirt piles and current parking in order to build this building. He showed a staging area including building pads, trailers, contractor laydown area, and parking lot. He showed the similarities between ATN5-6 and the new building in terms of the admin middle portion, which is narrower in the new building. They have looked at a design for a two-story admin portion. He pointed out the substation and drive from the last agenda item. Coming out of the substation would be access to the existing campus on the southeast and the northwest. He pointed out existing and proposed detentions. Bennett explained that there is a ring road that circulates the entire building, similar to the existing one. The front of the building is the east side with parking. The west side is the loading dock area. He showed where sanitary sewer tie-ins would be located, as well as the location of a water distribution plant and an existing 16-inch water main. He mentioned the tall security fence and fire hydrants on the northern side of the building, adding that the hydrants on the south side of the right-of-way would be unusable for this building. A fire loop would go around the building. He showed a variety of plans including: the subsurface drainage plan, the electrical plan with the feeds and gen yards, the telecom plan with fiber runs and redundant routes, and the logistics plan that show how the laydown areas serve the new project. Bennett then showed the 50 feet of right-of-way easements, 10 feet of sidewalk easement, 5 feet of gas easement, and 10 feet of public utility easements, and illustrated the landscaping challenge due to the nine to ten easements in that area, with Mid-American's proposed overhead lines on both sides of the fence. Planting trees would be difficult, so they are going to try to use ornamental grasses or vegetation that wouldn't grow up into power lines. He showed the landscape plan with different seed mixture types. He showed a rendering of how to provide screening to the west and north right-of-way lines. Trees will be planted along the west side, which is consistent with how they are tied in with the rest of the site. The goal is to make it look uniform. He pointed out an existing berm that wraps around the east side of an existing residence and continues northerly. They will replace that and bring landscaping back to the southwest, west, and north sides. He showed the front entry area where employees will primarily be. He pointed out different handicapped accessibility routes, as well as traffic circulation, employee parking, delivery routes, and loading docks. The building is about a quarter of a mile long. Bennett showed the building elevations, including 54 feet to the top of the penthouse from grade. The two-story admin area will shorten the footprint, but it is a design in progress that may evolve as the project progresses. This project is the prototype for the two-story admin portion. He showed the gen yards and the rear elevations. He also showed rendered views from the primary road (62nd), including power lines, existing fencing, the building, the lake, the dam, the bike trail, and existing building ATN5-6.

Gjersvik asked if there were plans for a controlled burn to keep the prairie grasses healthy. Bennett stated that their landscape architect selected grasses that have an annual and tri-annual period where they have to go in and take them down. It is a cyclical maintenance process. Burning is not a process the owner would want. Part of the whole building is to provide clean air circulation and not plug the filters. When species and varieties of plants were selected, they had to select the least pollinating varieties.

With no further questions from Commission members, Pudenz opened the hearing to public comments.

With no questions from the public, Pudenz asked for a motion. Shaw wanted to point out that the reason Bennett went into so much detail as to what is happening on the north side of the building is that they have all those mechanical units sitting out there along the front of the building. They are chain linked in but not really screened in. They can still be seen. The City requires they be screened in. With the other buildings, given how far off of the street they are, it wasn't much of an issue. They flip-flopped ATN3-4, so the units couldn't be seen from the street. If they cannot put in trees to provide screening, they could put in solid panels to give it an opaque fencing around that area. There is space for plantings, ornamental trees, different things of that nature. Dove asked what mechanical units he was talking about. Shaw stated the generators, the water tanks, everything in the fenced-in area. Dove stated he would agree to let them work that out, but just like the building, the generators need air. If the air is blocked off from them by fencing, the generators won't have air. Gjersvik asked if the generators already sit behind a solid wall already. Shaw stated no, that it's a fence. Bennett clarified that it's a perforated fence, so it's not like a chain link fence. It's a fence with perforations in it. It's not like an exterior wall. Shaw stated you can still see through it. Bennett stated that if the Commission were to go out there, they would see the transparency or opaqueness of the existing screen walls that they have. Pudenz asked if there were a louvered option because of the elevation of the road and the building. Shaw stated there is a lot of space in that area.

Dove moved to approve recommendation of a site plan for Project Sequelant Data Center, subject to deficiencies. Seconded by Pudenz.
Votes: Yes—Dove, Pudenz, Sloan, Gjersvik, Moyna. Motion passed, 5-0.

4. Old Business.
There was no old business to discuss.

5. New Business:
There are two ongoing annexations that will probably be going to City Council in June.

Moyna moved to adjourn. Seconded by Sloan. Votes: Yes—Moyna, Sloan, Pudenz, Gjersvik, Dove. No—None. Motion approved, 5-0. Meeting adjourned at 7:09 p.m. Next regular meeting is April 30, 2019.

Respectfully submitted,
Jennifer Naylor
Office Assistant