

**MINUTES**  
**November 13, 2018 – 5:30 p.m.**  
**Planning and Zoning Commission**  
**Muscatine City Hall**  
**City Council Chambers**

**Present:** Jodi Hansen, Rochelle Conway, Andrew Anderson, John Sayles, Wendi Ingram, and Robert McFadden

**Excused:** Steve Neinhaus

**Staff:** Andrew Fangman, City Planner, Community Development  
Christa Bailey, Office Coordinator, Community Development  
Lindsay Whitson, Community Development Coordinator, Community Development

Chairperson Jodi Hansen opened the meeting at 5:30 p.m and read the Mission Statement.

**Minutes:**

Robert McFadden motioned to approve the minutes submitted for the October 9, 2018 meeting; seconded by Andrew Anderson. All ayes, motion carried.

**Subdivision:**

**Subdivision Case PZS #11 – Peters Subdivision – Brian Peters – 1 lot – 26,500 sq. feet – 3116 Allen Street**

No one was present to discuss the request of the proposed subdivision which would transfer approximately 26,500 square feet of land from the parcel located at 3120 Allen Street to the parcel located at 3116 Allen Street. There was discussion among the commission members on whether to table this request until the next meeting due to no one showing up. The commission decided to move forward with the request because it is a simple transfer of land that is not creating any new parcels nor is it likely to result in any new construction.

Andrew Anderson motioned to approve the subdivision case; seconded by Wendi Ingram. All ayes, motion carried.

Brian Peters, 3116 Allen Street, arrived late and apologized for being absent when the request was discussed. Jodi Hansen informed him that the request was approved and will move on to the next steps with City Council.

**Subdivision Case PZS #12 – Proffitt Subdivision – Joel Proffitt – 1 lot – 23,004 sq. feet – 2801 Houser Street**

Duane Goedken, 105 Deerpath Ln, an attorney in Muscatine was present to discuss the proposed subdivision which would create a new 0.53 acre parcel containing the existing residence at 2801 Houser Street to separate it from the cultivated areas on the 5.22 parent parcel. Goedken explained the current parcel is owned by three parties and the intent of the subdivision is to allow the residence to be under separate ownership from the cultivated areas. The commission had no questions for Goedken and Jodi Hansen asked Andrew Fangman if there had been any comments from neighbors. Fangman stated a neighbor had come in to get clarification and Fangman helped answered all his questions. After understanding the purpose of this subdivision, the neighbor said he is in favor.

Robert McFadden motioned to approve the subdivision case; seconded by John Sayles. All ayes, motion carried.

**Rezoning:**

**Rezoning Case PZZ #6 – Rezoning RL to M-1 Alliant Energy – 1 Lot – 22.1 Acres – Parcel # 0930101011 – Northwest Corner of University Drive and Oak Valley Drive**

Brad Morgan, an employee of Alliant Energy located at 215 Oak Street, was present to discuss the rezoning request to rezone a 22.1 acre portion of a 35.4 parcel located on the west side of University Drive, from R-L Large Scale Residential Development to M-1 Light Industrial. Alliant Energy is proposing to acquire 5 acres from HNI for the purpose of relocating the existing Alliant Energy Muscatine Operations Center, from which Alliant serves its gas customers in the Muscatine

area, from its current location on Oak Street. The proposed development would include a 20,000 square foot building, parking, new utilities and connections to existing utilities near the site, and related landscaping and lighting.

Jodi Hansen asked Morgan to expand on the project and what it will look like. Morgan explained there will be 14-16 employees working at the location and there will be 7-8 Alliant vehicles plus employee parking. Andrew Anderson questioned what activities would take place at the location and if any equipment would be there. Morgan stated the employees will use the location as a home base where they come in to prepare for the day and will disperse in Alliant vehicles, which would not be larger than a one-ton truck. The materials would be stored inside mostly but have piping stored outside short term. John Sayles asked what the impact would be on vehicular traffic and Morgan stated it would be under 50 vehicles per day. Robert McFadden asked if any employees would be on location during the night, to which Morgan said no it is not an overnight facility. McFadden then asked if there will be exterior lights on during the night. Morgan stated yes there will be some lowkey lighting which will be aimed away from the street or any surrounding properties.

At this point renderings of the building were passed among the commission members and the images were projected onto the screen for the audience. John Sayles asked if the plans would have to go through site plan review if the rezoning was approved and Fangman stated yes. Sayles then asked Morgan if Alliant had any thought of having parking behind the building to screen parking from the residential areas? Morgan explained with the topography of the parcel it would not be efficient but all Alliant Energy trucks would be parked inside, only the employees' personal vehicles would be visible. Andrew Anderson questioned whether there are any future plans to construct more on this proposed parcel subdivision. Morgan stated the parcel would be almost fully utilized with this project so there are no future plans. Sayles asked what the size of the property the building is currently on. Morgan stated that is currently about an acre and they would usually only build a new facility on 10+ acres of land but have been wanting to build for a long time. Wendi Ingram asked what portion of the building would people see if they were coming out of Oak Valley Dr and Morgan stated it would be the office portion.

Dale Wilder, 2204 Oak Valley Dr, president of the Oak Valley Condo Association came forward to discuss on their behalf. The condos were purchased when the land was residential and because the future use is unknown for the other 16 acres that would be rezoned, they are concerned it could become a small industrial park. The association also does not think anyone will want to build on the southside once its rezoned. Andrew Fangman stated that the parcel is currently residential but it butts against M-2 so there is currently no buffer. Robert McFadden asked what the difference is between M-1 and M-2 Industrial. Fangman explained that it is light industrial versus heavy industrial, with heavy being like manufacturing plants.

Allen Harvey, 2206 Oak Valley Dr, came forward to state he is not against Alliant Energy but against the general concept of rezoning the area. Harvey passed out a map for the commission members to view as he made his comments. Harvey stated that if Ford Ave were to be completed to meet up Keener Road this would be a line where it separates residential and industrial, so the proposed rezoning would be on the residential side of the line. Harvey commented that zoning can be a slippery slope and while they are not currently asking to rezone the south part he thinks if the north portion is rezoned they will eventually request to rezone the south portion as well. Harvey state the may condos, apartments, and single-family residences will be impacted by this change and if the land was zoned as M-1 back in the 2000s he doubts the condos would be there. Harvey mentioned that there are two S-3 zoned parcels for sale by Menards that would allow Alliant Energy to build without rezoning, among other parcels for sale that would be useable for Alliant Energy. Harvey stated that he had approached HNI about allowing Alliant Energy to purchase part of their M-2 zoned parcel located directly north of the property in question but was told there would be no compromise for this situation.

Gary Carlson with HNI came forward to expand on the fact that HNI will not compromise on putting Alliant in the M-2 property. HNI is currently trying to get Alliant out of their campus so they do not want to put them back into a campus just in a different area. Carlson commented that by looking at the area maybe it could be rezoned as C-1 General Commercial Neighborhood. Andrew Fangman explained that the city is leaning towards M-1 because it is a clear acceptable use for Alliant but may be able to make C-1 work. Carlson suggested that the commission consider rezoning as C-1 as a possible compromise for people with concerns about more industrial coming in. John Sayles asked Andrew Fangman to expand on the possibilities of rezoning as C-1 instead of M-1 and what the effect would be. Fangman explained that C-1 is typically for more retail use not industrial and is a more constricted zone allowing less uses, so if rezoned to C-1, Alliant Energy would then have to apply for a variance as well to be able to use the property as they wish. John Sayles stated that the commission worked for over a year on the Land Use Plan and in the plan the property is listed for industrial so he is not in favor of considering C-1.

Brad Morgan asserted that Alliant Energy desires to rezone to whatever classification will allow them to be able to build what they have planned. They applied as M-1 because the City's future Land Use Plan shows it moving towards industrial. Alliant wants to get off HNI's campus as well and is willing to change the zoning request if needed. Wendi Ingram questioned whether the parcels by Menards were considered. Morgan said he is not positive but they did look at multiple sites, including other University Dr parcels. Andrew Anderson asked why closer north to Ford Ave was not chosen. Morgan explained that was the original plan but that portion of the parcel is not very buildable due to a large ravine.

Allen Harvey stated that he doesn't agree with the City's future Land Use Plan. Harvey reiterated about the other parcels available for sale that would appear to work but he does not know the agreement between HNI and Alliant Energy. Gary Carlson commented that it is a property swap not a cash deal so essentially if the rezoning is not approved the deal will be terminated. HNI and Alliant Energy considered the Land Use Plan when creating this deal.

Devin Petit, 618 Walnut Street, commented that S-3 might be a better fit to rezone as any future uses would have to be brought before the Planning and Zoning Commission for approval. Andrew Fangman explained that S-3 would not work as there is an 80-acre minimum to be zoned as such but S-1 would be applicable. Wendi Ingram asked if the commission could change the request to S-1? Fangman said yes, Alliant Energy's plans would allowable under S-1. Andrew Anderson confirmed with Andrew Fangman that if the land were to be rezoned as S-1 any future plans would be reviewed by the commission. Fangman then explained that M-1 was proposed because it is in the Land Use Plan, it is a step down from M-2 which would act as a buffer between residential and heavy industrial, and there are clear rules in M-1 about screening the business from residences.

Robert McFadden motioned to approve the rezoning request as submitted; John Sayles seconded. 5 ayes (Jodi Hansen, Rochelle Conway, Andrew Anderson, John Sayles, and Robert McFadden) – 1 nay (Wendi Ingram), motion carried.

Meeting adjourned.

ATTEST:

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Jodi Hansen, Chairperson  
Planning & Zoning Commission

---

Andrew Fangman, Secretary  
City Planner