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Executive Summary

This project has been undertaken in order to identify possibilities for redevelopment on the south side of Iowa City that would utilize the Iowa River as an amenity within the community. A central focus of the project is the role of the City of Iowa City in creating opportunities and momentum for private development in the area.

The south side of Iowa City suffers locally from an image problem, and the vast majority of current land uses do not draw upon the Iowa River in any meaningful way. A resource and land use inventory of the study area identified several constraints to redevelopment. The parcels examined are separated by physical and psychological barriers such as Highway 6 and the Iowa River. Current street patterns do not provide entry points to the river or the interior of the study area. Several of the parcels are brownfields, and are contaminated from years of use as landfills, sewage treatment facilities, and industrial centers. The majority of the study area lies within the 100-year floodplain, and has experienced flooding in the past.

The area inventory also revealed positive opportunities for redevelopment. The City owns several parcels in this vicinity, including “bookend” parcels on the north and south that may set the tone for development in the neighborhood. The City has already completed some improvements in the area, and the trail network on the east side of the Iowa River and the ball fields at Napoleon Park are heavily used. Sufficient capacity exists in area infrastructure (water, sewer, electricity, etc) to allow for significant redevelopment in one portion of the study area. The area examined is well served by the arterial street network, and planned improvements to Sand Road and McCollister Boulevard will strengthen that network. The area is within walking distance of both downtown Iowa City and large undeveloped tracts of lands to the south, and has the potential to become a gateway to the City.

Brainstorming and case study research resulted in the creation of three potential themes for the redevelopment of the study area, which were presented to the public in a series of information sessions. As a result of public feedback, we condensed our ideas into one unified theme that incorporates a variety of recreational areas, new mixed-use development, and preservation of natural areas. We have called this theme the RiverLife District, in reference to the range of activities possible for people who visit the riverfront area. The land use plan that we propose involves public investment in certain areas in order to encourage private investment in other locations. We feel that this integrated plan presents the best possibility to appeal to a variety of users.

The land use concept plan attempts to achieve the highest and best use of all parcels in the study area. We suggest commercial and mixed use developments in locations that can support those structures, and a mix of active and passive recreational activities in areas with more barriers to development. We recommend preservation for a large area on the south side of the study area; providing a green corridor as an entrance to the City was
the preference of many respondents in our public input sessions, and that area of our study is the least well-served by infrastructure.

We have generated a detailed set of action steps for each of the key parcels identified. The order of the parcels indicates the timeline proposed. Improvements to the North Sand Lake area should be undertaken first, to capitalize on improvements to Sand Road and Gilbert Street already underway. The construction of McCollister Boulevard and the City’s purchase of the South Sand Lake parcel will drive redevelopment around that area in the near future as well. The actions to be taken for the Public Works and Sturgis Ferry Park sites are less dependent on other City projects, and the timeline for their redevelopment may be extended based on the relocation of services currently in the area. Action steps for the North Wastewater Treatment Plant area are the least certain at this time. The future of this area is dependent to a large extent on removing the processing centers, which may take twenty years or longer.

- For the North Sand Lake area we propose rezoning for residential and commercial uses, with specific emphasis on encouraging indoor/outdoor operations. This will build on the natural amenities of the area and assist redevelopment to move away from the area’s industrial legacy. We also propose a series of public improvements to be made to the area: landscaping and refurbishing the lake itself, creation of a commons area to build upon the attraction, addition of parking areas, and connection to the west side of the river.

- For the South Sand Lake Recreational area the first action must be to purchase the property in question. The riverfront trail should be extended to this area, and the grounds and quarry itself may be improved to encourage many types of recreational activities and private concessions. Transportation improvements will be necessary to integrate McCollister Boulevard into this area.

- Sturgis Ferry Park should be integrated with the North Sand Lake area by means of a pedestrian/bicycle bridge across the Iowa River and the extension of the trail system to the west side of the river. The vehicular access and parking areas should also be improved to encourage more use of the site. With increased use, there will be incentives to improve the landscaping and groundcover in this area.

- For the Public Works and Iowa City Transit site there are few action steps at this time. Relocating the municipal facilities will open this area for commercial redevelopment. The extent of commercial activity will be dependent on the costs to remediate this brownfield. We propose extending the trail system to these parcels, and landscaping improvements would be valuable in the absence of redevelopment.

- If possible, the processing activities at the North Wastewater Treatment Plant should be relocated to the new plant to the south of town. This may open the parcel for some public uses, and allow the surrounding parcels to transition away
from industrial, toward more mixed uses. If the plant cannot transition to odorless and underground uses, no action steps are needed at this time.

The City’s role in implementing this redevelopment proposal goes beyond the action steps we provide. The City should first broaden stakeholder involvement to obtain feedback and clarify the concept plan. Secondly, the City needs to reexamine its current district plans as they are not conducive to riverfront redevelopment at this time. A third step the City should undertake is to develop formal leadership to manage redevelopment in a focused effort. Finally, the City needs to adopt a funding strategy and actively pursue various funding opportunities.

Our proposal envisions a major role for the south side of Iowa City after redevelopment. The impact of this proposal is not limited to study area alone; we believe that the surrounding area will also be positively impacted. We believe that by placing more emphasis on the Iowa River and improving public lands in surrounding areas, the south side of Iowa City can become a better place in which to live and do business.
Introduction

In the summer of 2004, the City of Iowa City’s Department of Planning and Community Development approached the University of Iowa’s Graduate Program in Urban and Regional Planning to request an exploratory project for the Iowa City South Riverfront Area. The area under consideration is the land on either side of the Iowa River, for properties south of the Iowa Interstate Railroad tracks, to the southern boundary of the City. The geographic boundaries of the study area can be found on Map 1 (on pg. 2). The City of Iowa City has already invested in land purchases and trail development in this area, and would like to capitalize upon those investments.

Our group was charged with the task of identifying opportunities to integrate the Iowa River into the community on the south side of Iowa City. Specific questions asked included:

- What are the opportunities and constraints in this area of the City?
- What kind of developments would make the river into an amenity?
- How can redevelopment be stimulated in this area?
- What kinds of funding resources exist for redevelopment efforts?
- What should the role of the City be in the redevelopment process?

Our first step in answering these questions was to conduct a land use inventory of the study area. The majority of land within this area is zoned for light industrial uses, or is publicly owned. Industrial uses are the most common among riverfront properties, while commercial uses are more prevalent in the Gilbert Street Corridor. Publicly owned properties in this area have many different uses, ranging from groomed baseball fields at Napoleon Park, to processing tanks at the North Wastewater Treatment Plant, to largely unimproved landfill cover at Sturgis Ferry Park. Our group determined that current uses do not acknowledge the Iowa River in a positive manner, and that the appearance of most parcels does not improve the image of the City.

We then examined potential for growth in the study area. Most parts of the area have municipal services (water mains, sewer capacity, electricity, bus service) that are adequate for expansion and redevelopment opportunities. The entire area is well served by the road system, and contains a section of the Iowa River Corridor Trail which is heavily used. Development analysis from the past several years indicates that the southeastern quadrant of Iowa City is the most rapidly growing, and the study area will become increasingly important as an entry to the City from these developments. In short, there is potential for significant redevelopment in the area.
Map 1: Geographic limits of the study area (shown by pink outline)
A review of literature on riverfront redevelopment in Iowa, the Midwest, the nation, and in other countries helped us determine common approaches to making riverfronts responsive to the needs and desires of the community. Most successful projects stressed the need for locally unique strategies; transferring a good idea from one community to another will not ensure success. Drawing upon these sources and our knowledge of Iowa City, the group outlined three potential themes to unify and coordinate the development of this area. The themes varied in their proposed intensity of land use, extent of public investment, and activities for residents. These themes were presented to targeted populations in a series of preference surveys. Public interaction sessions helped clarify what type of development is perceived to be appropriate and desirable for the area, and solidified our recommendations.

In general, we believe the area needs to refocus on its natural environment and play to the strengths of the open spaces already present. Neighboring uses should be oriented toward the river and trails in addition to the street frontage. Development in this area could provide pleasant views of the river and trees surrounding it, access to the water and the trail, and attractive open spaces for area residents. Therefore, we propose a scenario in which the area as a whole is redeveloped, identified, and marketed as an active outdoor district.

Many parcels in the study area have limited capacity to support development. Parkland and natural areas are proposed for these parcels. Groomed areas for passive recreation attract visitors to the riverfront and provide low-cost recreation opportunities for families. Publicly owned parks do not yield property taxes, however, and this is a major concern for the City. For this reason, commercial and residential opportunities are proposed for parcels with fewer limitations. An environmentally sensitive development strategy will help to protect the natural resources that remain in the South Riverfront area, and integrate the built environment with the open spaces.

The City of Iowa City owns a fair amount of land in the South Riverfront area, as we have defined it, including the “bookends” of the study area, to the north, south and west. We viewed these parcels as keys to the redevelopment of Iowa City’s Southside, and focused our efforts on these areas (see Map 2 on the following page for the locations of the key parcels). Redevelopment of these key parcels will set the tone for the area as a whole, and could encourage appropriate developments in nearby locations. City-owned property also presents an opportunity to test design and conservation guidelines for the area.

The State of Iowa is experiencing revenue shortfalls which have adversely affected the budgets of local governments. We have therefore recommended several funding sources to aid in the redevelopment process. We conclude with a series of action steps to implement the vision presented.
Legend

Type
- North Sand Lake
- Wastewater Treatment Plant
- Public Works & Transit
- South Sand Lake Rec. Area
- Sturgis Ferry Park

Map 2: Key Parcels
Methodology

Our review of literature on other riverfront redevelopment projects indicated that the most successful projects were those that were organized around a central theme. This creates unity within the area for redevelopment, and gives public and private developers a marketing concept with which to operate. In the early stages of this project we developed three separate possible themes for the South Riverfront Area. These three themes were designed with different intensities of land use in mind, and different levels of City involvement. After we developed specific ideas for each of these three scenarios, we presented them to the public for feedback.

Themes

The first theme we presented was described as a Riverside Cultural Park. Land uses under this theme consisted of mostly large open spaces. Uses such as a dog park, and recreational fields could be developed on land to build off water uses like kayaking and fishing. There would be possibilities for commercial endeavors such as artists’ markets, farmers’ markets, and ethnic food stands. We chose this theme because much of the area is in the flood plain, and these uses would not be adversely affected by future flood events. Under this scenario, the key public parcels earlier identified would be mostly open green spaces; these uses have relatively low expenses for development but significant maintenance costs. This area could serve as Iowa City’s recreational hub, and if riverside ecosystems were restored in the context of open space improvement, the area would be a model for responsible floodplain use.

A second theme developed was labeled as Pioneer Landing Historical Area. This theme would use the trail system to entice people along a historical discovery zone. This development would consist of mix of open spaces and publicly-sponsored historic reconstructions. Structures in the area would be primarily low rise constructions imitating pioneer architecture and design. Museums, a “trading post”, and an old-time main street would be recreated for discovery and commercial opportunities. Outdoor features would include a petting zoo, picnic areas, and activities for children. This theme would build on a mix of public and private investment, but would be primarily City-initiated. The City could gain revenue from museums and zoos, and limited private commercial development would provide restaurants and shopping areas.

The RiverLife Village theme was our third idea, and was designed to encourage residents to live active, healthy, outdoor lives. The Village was conceived as a mixed-use area, featuring intense land uses. In addition to housing and commercial opportunities, there would be an amphitheater, a bowling alley, rock walls, playing fields and other indoor/outdoor active uses. All housing would be required to orient towards the river, so as to build on the natural amenity. To incorporate the healthy living aspect, interactive kiosks would be placed throughout the Village. These would be used by residents and visitors to measure height, weight, blood pressure, body mass index, etc. This option would feature extensive private development for the area and increase the property tax base for the city.
Public Input

We presented these three themes to the public at two locations. We first went to the University of Iowa's Cultural Diversity Day, to draw on the mixed crowd that attends the event every year. We also presented our themes at Hy-Vee on Waterfront Drive in Iowa City to target people who currently live in the study area. We were overwhelmed by individuals' support and enthusiasm, as we received comments from over 100 people. In addition to speaking to interested individuals, we collected their impressions and responses with a short survey. A summary of the survey results can be found in the Appendix.

While overwhelmingly enthusiastic, the respondents offer a variety of specific observations and suggestions. Many of the respondents liked features from all three of the themes presented, and commented that a mix of ideas was preferable to a single use. While a slight majority of respondents preferred the Riverside Cultural Park idea, the results were also positive for the River Village theme. Pioneer Landing came in a very distant third in the overall results. Based on this information, we decided to use a combination of the three themes for our final recommendation. We felt that this would attract the most public interest and would allow us to include the best from all of the themes. Planning multiple uses in the area also allowed us to pay greater consideration to the constraints and opportunities for individual parcels. Those factors are discussed in the next section of the report.

Photo 1: Public participation played a major role in the development of our recommendations for the study area. In this photo, Joe Pospisil and Vasavi Mallena describe different themes to interested citizens.
General Area Constraints and Opportunities

Constraints

The study area includes three distinct districts that will not be easily united in one redevelopment plan. These three areas are designated on Map 3, on the following page. The northernmost properties are separated from the remainder of the parcels by Highway 6. This state highway is a physical and psychological barrier to connectivity. Pedestrians and other users of the trail may not feel this barrier to the same extent that drivers do, as the riverside trail leads directly from one area to the next.

The City-owned property on the west side of the Iowa River is similarly isolated, by the river itself. Highway 6 provides a vehicular crossing, but pedestrian and bicycle crossings on this bridge are unpleasant due to the noise, proximity, and speed of vehicles. A pedestrian bridge across the river could unite this portion with the remainder of the study area. Expanding the trail to the west riverbank would also unite the two sides of the river visually and physically.

The large remaining area could be seen as a single unit. It has well-defined boundaries on three sides: Highway 6 to the north, the Iowa River to the west, and Gilbert Street/Sand Road to the east. The future construction of McCollister Boulevard near the southern end of our study area will define the fourth side of this area, and will create another river crossing.

Apart from the physical barriers mentioned and the isolation of separate districts within the study area, there are other concerns. Two City-owned properties are brownfields, and have significantly degraded conditions. The parcel on the west side of the Iowa River which currently houses the Iowa City Transit building is a former landfill. This presents a host of problems for redevelopment efforts. The extent of contamination and depth of rubbish worsen near the southern end of that parcel, until they end near the boat ramp at Sturgis Ferry Park. The North Wastewater Treatment Plant is the second municipally owned brownfield in the study area. City officials have indicated that this plant is being phased out, and portions of this lot may be available for reuse in the future. In its current condition, the Treatment Plant has a negative effect on its surroundings due to the odors it generates; removing treatment operations in this location may create opportunities for different types of uses on neighboring parcels.

Perception is a primary concern for the South Riverfront area. Some neighborhoods south of Highway 6 are considered to be lower-income areas, with problems not typically seen on the north side of Iowa City. While the generalization is most frequently leveled at residential areas east of the riverfront, this perception may limit the attractiveness of new development in the study area. Further, there are some concerns about safety on the trail in the study area. Homeless people are frequently found living along the wooded areas near the trail and near the intersection of Gilbert Street and the railroad tracks north of Napoleon Park.
Map 3: Physical Barriers Create Different Districts
The image of this area is not improved by the current land uses along the Iowa River. Views north and south along the water show eroded and degraded banks, dying trees, rip-rap, and the backyards of industrial uses (see Photo 2). The Iowa River Corridor Trail allows users to interact with the water and riverbanks, but the river is not easily approached by vehicle.

![Photo 2: Degraded banks along Iowa River, a common sight south of the University of Iowa campus. Source: Varsha Sehgal](image)

There are other environmental and man-made constraints to redevelopment in the South Riverfront area. The majority of the study area lies in the 100-year floodplain, and much of the area was inundated during the 1993 flood. Soil types along the Iowa River are not conducive to intense development. Finally, the Iowa City Municipal Airport lies just west of the South Riverfront, and much of the study area is in a Runway Protection Zone. For obvious reasons, height and occupancy of structures within airport flight patterns are limited by local and federal regulations. Maps 4 and 5 on the following pages document the extent of the floodplain and runway zones.
Map 4: Runway Protection Areas

Iowa City South Riverfront Redevelopment
Map 5: Approximate 100 year floodplain areas within and near study area
Opportunities

The Iowa River provides a powerful focal point for the South Riverfront area. The City has already capitalized on this feature with the recreational trail along the river. The river's presence defines this area as unique within the City. Riverfront redevelopment projects in other cities have been very popular recently, and residents and visitors are likely to be attracted by such a project. Other water features in the area (North Sand Lake and the South Sand Lake Recreation Area) could be better utilized as well.

There are development pressures throughout the community, large parcels of land in the study area are held by private developers, and the south side of Iowa City is growing. As residential areas to the east of our study area are built out, the Gilbert Street/Sand Road Corridor will become a more important arterial street. The construction of McCollister Boulevard in the near future will also raise the visibility of this area and increase developmental pressure on the South Riverfront area. This offers a wonderful opportunity to create a south side gateway to Iowa City. This opportunity also entails some risk - without managing development carefully, this entryway may not be an asset to the City.

Though local streets do not provide direct access to the river, this area is well served by major arterial roads. The study area could become a regional destination center, with easy access to interstate highways. Some local streets and intersections would likely need to be redesigned to accommodate any change in use, but the access necessary for a major redevelopment is in place. Likewise, the South Riverfront area is well-served by other City infrastructure. According to the Engineering and Water/Sewer departments, adequate capacity exists in the water lines, sewer lines, and electricity grid to provide for large scale redevelopment in the area.

A final strong point of the South Riverfront area is its proximity to Downtown Iowa City. In the past five years, most residential housing developments in the City have occurred on the edges of town. Iowa City has witnessed rapid growth in the southeast and southwest portions of the City, which has necessitated expansion of bus and school services. The study area presents an opportunity for significant housing or other development near the city center that would not contribute to problems of urban sprawl.
Recommendations for the study area

Land use concept plan for the South Riverfront Area

Map 6, on the following page, documents the proposed land use plan for the study area. The results of our public outreach sessions convinced us that a mix of uses was best for the area, and would be supported by residents of the City. The next step, then, was to look more closely at individual portions of the study area and determine how different areas could be put to use to become the RiverLife District. We attempted to maximize the productive value of the land, and built again on our theme of the "key parcels" stimulating development. For ease of understanding, the area will be discussed from the south to the north.

South Sand Lake Recreation Area and surroundings

This area is not yet under City ownership, but we anticipate that it will be in the near future. The largest parcel in this area is home to the S&G quarry operation, and it is characterized by a large man-made water feature created by filling in deep extraction pits. The industrial history of the area is therefore quite clear, but the extent of contamination on site is uncertain. We anticipate that there will be few environmental issues once the operation of the quarry ends, but it is possible this area will be another brownfield. There are several residences along the banks of the Iowa River. These homes are in serious danger of flooding during heavy rain. When the City acquires the quarry parcel, the residential areas should be purchased, annexed, and converted into open space for passive recreational uses.

Currently outside the municipal boundaries, this area is not served by municipal facilities and is somewhat isolated. Planned improvements to Gilbert Street/Sand Road and the extension of McCollister Blvd through this area will open it up for development possibilities, though, and likely add to development pressure on surrounding parcels. This area will not be easily served by all city facilities, however, as it is downstream of the newer South Wastewater Treatment Plant. This area is therefore not appropriate for large scale development. The large body of water may have some recreation potential, but will not support boating or other motorized activities to rival the Coralville Reservoir or Lake MacBride.

Many residents expressed a desire to maintain a "green buffer" around the city. The South Sand Lake Area is an appropriate location for landscape preservation and passive open space activities such as fishing, hiking, and bird watching, and in conjunction with the Napoleon ball fields could present a dramatic green entryway into Iowa City. We have therefore marked this area on the map as Public Open Space, with the exception of the City services campus which may be expanded to accommodate relocation of the Public Works facility.
Map 6: Proposed Land Uses

Iowa City South Riverfront Redevelopment
North Sand Lake and its surroundings

On the map we have divided the area east of the river, west of Gilbert Street, and south of Highway 6 into public open space and mixed use areas. This is the portion of our study area with the greatest number of parcels available for purchase and development. There is good potential for high-value development here, as many of the properties adjoin the North Sand Lake parcel and the Iowa River.

Our recommendations for this area hinge upon the improvement of publicly owned land around North Sand Lake. We feel that an investment in landscaping, parking areas and some expansion of the green space surrounding the lake could act as a catalyst to redevelopment of surrounding parcels. The current state of the lake does not invite many users, but if it were improved it could attract a diverse group of people. Specific recommendations are discussed in the next section of the report.

There are few constraints on development in this portion of the study area. City water and sewer lines have excess capacity as they cross this area, and privately-provided services are adequate as well. This area is easily accessed by foot or bicycle via the trail network, by private vehicle, and by Iowa City Transit lines. The Iowa City Municipal Airport is west of this location, and portions of the Runway Protection Zone do extend to some parcels (refer to Map 5 on Page 11). The runway protection zone would normally prohibit residential uses in affected areas. Our discussions with City officials led us to believe that the long-term future of the airport is not certain, however. Even if the airport remains in operation, opportunities for low-rise developments exist in the southern portions of this area. As with other locations in the study area, the possibility of flooding is a concern.

In a long-term view, we feel that this area is best suited for a mixed use commercial/residential area with public lands providing a focal point for the neighborhood (see photo below). Commercial uses will benefit from a solid transportation network and frontage along Gilbert Street and along the water features. It is our opinion that extending the Gilbert Street commercial/mixed use corridor south of Hwy 6 and west to the river is entirely appropriate for an area of the city that will become increasingly important as an entryway to the city. The area’s proximity to downtown, and to other commercial areas and their mix of businesses, make it suitable for residential living as well.
Iowa City Transit & Public Works Site

This portion of our study area has very different constraints than the North Sand Lake area across the River. The former landfill underground here will severely limit construction on two-thirds of this parcel, and the area is impacted by airport operations to a greater extent than other areas. Because the waste is deeper and/or more unstable under different parts of these parcels, we have examined the limitations and attributes in three different sections (see Map 7 on pg. 17). The northernmost portion of this area is suitable for commercial development, but unless environmental rehabilitation costs change dramatically in the future, other portions of this area may not be marketable for commercial development. On the map this area is marked as mostly public open space, with a commercial parcel at the northern end.

“Portion A” – Public Works buildings

This is the portion of the site with the greatest potential for development. The landfill is not deep or unstable here, and construction of underground structures may be possible. The area is within the runway protection zone, but not directly in the flight path of approaching aircraft. Further, the parcel has good access to and visible frontage along Highway 6 and Riverside Drive. Commercial areas have thrived on each of the corners of those two arterials, and we believe this parcel should be developed for commercial uses.

There are a few concerns for this area, however. The actual building area is limited by the landfill issues to the south. This commercial parcel would therefore be isolated from other similar uses by arterial streets. The opportunity for expansion of the commercial district is limited by the costs of rehabilitation of the contaminated ground. Further, this parcel would not be allowed to have direct vehicle access to Highway 6, and access to
Map 7: Iowa City Transit and Public Works site
Riverside Drive would be limited by proximity to the intersection. It is unlikely that any new access would be approved; the parcel would have to share access with the current entrance to the Iowa City Transit building to the south.

“Portion B” – Iowa City Transit Building and municipal parking area

The City has attempted to use this parcel for municipal purposes, with mixed success. Environmental problems underground have required extensive mitigation of methane gas, and monitoring continues. This portion of the site is in the airport approach zone and directly in the flight path. While the area has good access to Riverside Drive and is in close proximity to the shopping center and airport to the west, future development potential is limited by the instability of underground material. Further, the City may have difficulty relocating the current Transit facilities. The future for this parcel is uncertain. Absent drastic changes in remediation costs, we feel that the most feasible long-term land use for this parcel is open space and parkland, connected to Sturgis Ferry Park.

“Portion C” – unimproved parcel just north of Sturgis Ferry

This final portion of the site is most heavily impacted by the landfill underground. It has massive environmental problems, similar to those of Parcel B but on a larger scale. This area is suited for surface uses only, and even those must be carefully planned. We recommend that this area be used for open space as well. Methane recovery and compaction may be necessary if the area is to be used, but may be avoided if access to the area is limited.

Sturgis Ferry Park

Sturgis Ferry Park is located just south of the three parcels discussed above, and has many of the same issues. There are sinkholes and other hazards, and the entire area should be compacted, but there are not significant methane problems as there are further north. Underlying landfill debris makes this land unsuitable for construction in the north, but the situation improves farther south. On a positive note, Sturgis Ferry has good frontage on Riverside Drive and with better landscaping could provide a more attractive gateway for the City. Surface uses are most appropriate for this area; open space and parkland are the preferred alternatives. We recommend that this area remain under public ownership and be improved visually. Landscaping and other surface improvements would complement the recommendations for the east side, and create a green corridor to enter Iowa City.

North Wastewater Treatment Plant and surroundings

This is the area for which the future is most uncertain. Currently this group of parcels is negatively impacted by the odors generated by the treatment plant, and uses other than industrial are not feasible. The area is also crossed by quite a variety of utility lines, and underground construction possibilities will be limited. The treatment plant site is hindered by noise from the Highway 6 bridge, and has experienced flooding in the past. Further, the Iowa River Scenic Trail is disjointed through this area and needs to be rerouted and carefully marked.
The constraints listed above are particularly unfortunate given the strengths of the area. Though the areas north of the wastewater treatment plant have been used by industry for many years, it is likely that contamination from those uses is minimal. These parcels are just outside the Near Southside area and close to downtown and the University of Iowa. The area is near both the Gilbert Street and Riverside Drive commercial areas, and a transition to commercial uses seems possible if the problems are resolved. There are nice views of the river in this area and it is within walking distance of many residences.

City officials indicated that they would like to reduce operations at this treatment plant in the near future, and that may free up some areas for open space uses. If the treatment plant can transition to backup uses only, with primarily underground and odorless operation, we feel that there is a potential for some open space uses on the property, and a chance to expand the Gilbert Street corridor with mixed use developments on neighboring properties. That would allow the area to transition away from the industrial uses that are at odds with the rest of the Near Southside District. We are a bit skeptical about the plant’s future, however. On the map we have labeled the area as public institutional uses, surrounded by light industrial. If there is no drastic change in the operations, we foresee this area remaining appropriate for industrial uses only.
The Role of the City

Creation of a new district

In sum, the recommendations above offer a land use plan for the area. We recommend that the City’s first step be to designate this area the RiverLife District, and treat it as a new planning district in Iowa City. The district should be structured to include open space for passive recreation, formal gathering areas in the publicly owned areas, and a mix of commercial and residential opportunities.

There are many benefits of creating a district identity with a mix of land uses and activities. One is the ability to maximize the potential of individual parcels in the study area to be redeveloped to their highest and best use. Property that fronts an arterial, has excellent infrastructure in place, and has always been in industrial use should not be converted to parkland if an appropriate commercial or residential development can be attracted. This represents maximizing the efficiency of services already in place.

A second reason for recommending a diversity of uses is that they are likely to bring in a diversity of users. Folks who would not visit a historical theme destination may choose to visit the area for the trails. Shoppers at the commercial district may remain to have a picnic on the green lawns. Joggers may be drawn in by an ice cream stand or a unique piece of art. In this way the potential number of users of the district is increased. Integrating housing with the other activities leads to a 24/7 presence that is exciting for many area residents.

Photo 4: Commercial endeavors in the south riverfront area will benefit from proximity to public spaces. Source: www.crcrealty.com
The City will also be responsible for publicizing the new district. This will involve creation of logos and banners that identify the area and market it to potential users. Marketing should focus on the integration of activities in this area and the opportunities to “live a little, along the river”. Design standards and markers can be used to demarcate the area as unique and distinct from surrounding neighborhoods.

**Prioritization and Implementation**

Since the five publicly owned key parcels in this area have many limitations that will not allow intense development, it is important that they be developed in a fashion that promotes the desired redevelopment on the surrounding parcels needed to bring this new RiverLife District to life. The goal should be to make the river more of an amenity to the entire community, and not just the residents on the south side. Implementation of the proposed land use plan is primarily the responsibility of the City. Private development will be necessary to complete the transformation of this area, but public involvement will be key to beginning the process. There are several ways in which public officials can help this area become a vibrant new enclave within Iowa City.

A. Prioritization of projects is a necessary first step. While we present our thoughts in the Action Steps section that follows, it will ultimately be up to City officials to determine which projects should be given highest priority.

B. Rezoning will be critical to driving the renaissance of this area. We feel the Gilbert Street commercial corridor should be expanded to the south, and many of the waterfront parcels should be made available for residential uses as well. The city can encourage this type of development by zoning appropriately. Officials in Vancouver, British Columbia and Bend, Oregon have adopted “riverfront zones” that specify construction, design and orientation guidelines for properties within a certain distance of the water, and this is an option the City may wish to consider. Examples of these communities zoning ordinances can be found in Appendix C.

C. Public improvements will be necessary to spur the redevelopment of these areas. Transportation improvements are the most apparent needs — intersections that allow easy access to the interior parcels of the renovated North Sand Lake, formalized entrances and parking areas for visitors and trails that make loops and connections in the area instead of out-and-back lines. Many of these improvements are already being discussed at the City. Improved public spaces will also drive the redevelopment of this area.

D. Development of a funding strategy will also fall to the City. To make this plan work, the City will have to be diligent and creative in seeking and obtaining funds from a variety of sources. We have detailed a number of possibilities in the following section, but it is not an exhaustive list. Ongoing monitoring of funding opportunities will aid the City’s efforts to transform the South Riverfront Area.
Funding Strategy

Large scale redevelopment projects like this require large investment. With the current budget crises and the potential cost to create the RiverLife District, it is not a viable option to secure funds from a single source. In other communities such as Milwaukee and Kansas City, public and private investors played an active role in the riverfront redevelopment process. We recommend that the city establish public-private partnerships with both for-profit and non-profit organizations. Non-profit organizations like the Sierra Club and the Optimist Club have shown an interest in the development of the Iowa City through their contributions to projects such as the Skate Park and the Riverside Festival Stage. Developers such as Southgate and General Growth Company may be interested in partnering with the City as well. This partnership could be either informal, focusing on the development of one key parcel, or it could be a formal partnership with a separate legal identity. The City could consider setting up a “RiverLife District Trust”, a non-profit organization which will monitor and fund the redevelopment activities.

Regardless of whether a formal public-private partnership is created, there are a number of options that can be utilized by the City to help fund this redevelopment plan. For instance, the North Sand Lake area of the RiverLife District is part of a Tax Increment Financing (TIF) district, an economic development tool that allows the City to use new revenues for project costs. Cities such as Kansas City have established a Riverfront Tax Increment Financing plan. Under this plan, the TIF commission can claim up to 5% of the TIF revenue stream as incidental costs for several projects, including mixed income housing development. Iowa City could persuade private developers, like Southgate, to take a leading role in establishment of commercial and mixed income housing in this area and it can also consider establishing a TIF commission for generating additional funds.

A second funding option is state development grants. Vision Iowa grants and Community Attraction and Tourism (CAT) grants are appropriate funding options for riverfront redevelopment projects like this. Vision Iowa is a financial assistance program providing funds to large scale development projects, whose cost exceeds $20 million, and CAT grants are small scale grants of up to $12.5 million. These two programs provide funding to creative projects that enhance the lives of Iowans. Examples of projects which have used these two sources successfully are the Cedar Bend Project in Cedar Rapids where 28% of project cost was covered through Vision Iowa grants (total project cost $50, 450,535; Vision Iowa $14,000,000) and the Adair County Recreation Center in Greenfield where CAT grants covered 18.41% of the project cost.

The city could use the funding mechanisms described below to develop the RiverLife District incrementally. Funding sources are discussed in three broad categories below and a detailed list with criteria and other restrictions is provided in Appendix B.
Recreational activities

To acquire and transform the quarry into a water recreational area the City could use federal grants such as an Outdoor Recreation Acquisition Development and Planning grant. This grant requires a fifty percent community match. Contributions from a variety of private foundations such as Max and Helen Guernsey Charitable Foundation or the McKnight Foundation could be used to meet the federal match.

For the development of the Cultural Commons and Artist Market areas, the City could apply for Challenge America Grants, National Endowment for the Arts or National Endowment for the Humanities grants. The City could make use of local talent by encouraging University of Iowa and Iowa City artists to participate.

For a few parcels we recommended parks, prairie restoration, and community flower gardens as possible options. To establish community flower gardens, the City could mobilize non-profit organizations like New Pioneer Co-op (currently providing seeds to community gardens in Iowa City) or Project Green to provide financial and technical assistance. It could also encourage private citizens to volunteer to setup and maintain these community flower gardens. The City could encourage private groups to establish parks by providing land and maintenance similar to its current commitment to the Johnson County Dog Park. The City could also apply for federal grants like Rural Enterprise Assistance Project (REAP), City Parks and Open Spaces, Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Grants and rely on private foundations to fill the funding gap.

Environmental enhancement activities

In the study area, South Sand Lake, the Iowa City Transit building, Sturgis Ferry Park, City Carton and other industrial parcels are brownfields or contaminated sites. For clean up and development of these sites the City can use the federal and state grants such as Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) grants and Brownfield Assessment Revolving Loan Funds and Clean Up grants. These grants are administered through the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which provide funding for brownfield assessment and clean up, as well as technical information and assistance in financing matters. The BEDI also provides funds for the clean-up and economic redevelopment activities. Without remediation, the sites can only be used for prairie restoration, community flower gardens, and passive recreation in some cases. With further investigation of these sites and clean up efforts using the above grants these parcels could be transformed into revenue generating uses.

Transportation

We recommend that the City extend the Iowa River Corridor Trail to South Sand Lake from Napoleon Park and also extend the trail along the west side of the Iowa River. For the construction of trails the City can apply for the state and federal Recreational Trails Programs and the National Corridor Planning and Development Program. We
recommend the construction of a pedestrian bridge across the river, using innovative materials, which not only makes the bridge unique to promote tourism, but also makes it eligible for Innovative Bridge Research and Construction Program. For transportation improvements and parking purposes the City can use DOT funds and apply for Iowa Clean Air Attainment Program (ICAAP) funds. The Iowa DOT administers the ICAAP grant, which awards federal funds to projects which will reduce transportation related congestion and air pollution. For fiscal year 2006, Iowa City will receive $215,442 towards a Street Traffic Signal Interconnection Project from this grant.

All the above mentioned grants have restrictions; one of the common restrictions on applying agencies is that they should be U.S. nonprofit organizations with 501(c) 3 tax exempt status. These grants operate with limited budgets; because of this they are highly competitive. Every grant has its own policies, procedures and deadlines for application (the contact addresses are provided in the Appendix B). More sources of funding will be available if redevelopment is managed by a non-profit organization. This is another reason why the City should consider establishing a separate non-profit public-private entity. Iowa City is a University town with a pool of knowledge and resources. The city should make active efforts to involve The University of Iowa in this project, and student volunteers should be encouraged to participate for credit hours. This will not only reduces the investment cost but also involve students in this plan.
**Action Steps: Making It Happen**

**Stimulating Private Sector Investment**

There are five main publicly owned parcels along the river that we focused on. They are North Sand Lake, South Sand Lake Recreational Area, Sturgis Ferry Park, Public Works Buildings, and the North Wastewater Treatment Plant. By focusing on improving upon these areas, the City would spur redevelopment in the area.

Since these five parcels have many limitations that will not allow intensive development, it is important that they be developed to complement the desired redevelopment of the surrounding parcels. The goal should be to make the river more of an amenity to the entire community, and not just the residents and other users of the south side.

We identified several action steps to implement this concept, including potential outside funding sources. These funding sources have been identified in the previous section and more details can be found in the Appendix. We have organized the action steps as they relate to the five key parcels. A list of the Action Steps is below:

- Step 1: Improving the North Sand Lake Area
- Step 2: Transforming the Quarry into the South Sand Lake Recreational Area
- Step 3: Improving Sturgis Ferry Park & Connecting It to North Sand Lake
- Step 4: Redeveloping the Public Works Area & Improving Trail Connections
- Step 5: Making the North Wastewater Treatment Plant a Desirable Place

We see the timeline for redevelopment of these parcels following actions that have already been proposed by the City. The City has included the improvement to the Gilbert Street/Highway 6 intersection, and the purchase of the quarry (South Sand Lake) in its Capital Improvement Budget for the fiscal years of 2005-2009. Redevelopment in these areas would fit well with these capital improvements. The City is also looking to move its public works operations in the near future and phase down the use of the water treatment plant in around 20 years. It would therefore be appropriate to address these areas later.

**Step 1: Improving the North Sand Lake Area**

The first step should be to rezone the surrounding area to enable the desired development. The zoning around the Sand Lake area is light commercial and light industrial. These land uses will not attract people to the waterfront. Some parcels around the lake are currently vacant. Rezoning them to mixed-use around the lake would make better use of this amenity, and help populate the area. The most important aspects of rezoning in this area are orientation to the river, pedestrian amenities, and accessibility of parking areas. If the City chooses to create its own riverfront zone, height and density restrictions should also be considered.
Estimates for landscaping improvements for the area have already been finished. F.I.R.S.T. (Friends of the Iowa River Scenic Trail), an organization that was created to advocate for expansion of the Iowa City Trail System, completed a concept plan for the area around Sand Lake in December of 2001. Their proposal includes expanded trails, stabilization of the Sand Lake banks, and a “vegetative barrier” to separate this area from the neighboring industrial uses. They estimated that the total cost would be between $530,000 and $560,000 (in 2001).

Increasing the attractiveness of this area is important, but efforts should include more than just landscaping. Integration of North Sand Lake with the surrounding area would lead to more rapid redevelopment and better utilization of the water bodies. We recommend the construction of a public plaza on the southeastern portion of the North Sand Lake site. This “Cultural Commons” could be a spot where concerts and open markets are held. Restaurants could be located adjacent to the Cultural Commons and provide outdoor seating on the plaza that overlooks the Lake and the riverfront. Areas on the commons could be leased out for kiosks to sell food and merchandise. All of these actions would add to the energy of the RiverLife District and would attract residents and visitors.

Photo 5: Decorative brick work and plantings have been incorporated into this commons area in Wheaton, Illinois. Source: www.wheaton.edu/beamercenter/photos/photo62.html

Transportation improvements would need to be made in this area to accommodate new residents and visitors. Parking would be needed, possibly just south of North Sand Lake. Better pedestrian facilities are needed to accommodate pedestrians coming from the east. Also, public transportation servicing the area could be improved to make it more convenient for the public. This could be done by either changing the Broadway Bus Route, or the Westport Bus Route after McCollister Boulevard is finished.
Finally, when the reconstruction of the Gilbert Street/Highway 6 intersection takes place, the City will have the opportunity to apply for Department of Transportation (DOT) grants to improve the access to and aesthetics of Sand Lake. Currently, access to the lake and river is a gravel driveway and parking area off of Highway 6. According to members of the Iowa City Planning Staff, the DOT believes there are problems with this access road. If the City were to present the DOT with a plan that created access to the lake and river off of Gilbert Street as well as areas for parking, the DOT may be willing to contribute funds if these new facilities were to replace the current access.

**Step 2: Transforming the Quarry into the South Sand Lake Recreational Area**

The City plans to purchase the sand quarry just south of Iowa City’s Corporate Limits within the next five years. McCollister Boulevard, a major east-west arterial on the south side of Iowa City, will be constructed just north of this parcel and is also in the five-year Capital Improvement Plan. The Parks and Recreation Department is very excited about the purchase of the quarry, and with the construction of McCollister Boulevard, the quarry, which will be renamed South Sand Lake Recreational Area, will be more easily accessible to Johnson County and Iowa City residents. There are some key steps the City could follow to ensure that this area is integrated well with the riverfront redevelopment.

The River Corridor Trail should be extended to the quarry from Napoleon Park. This would create another scenic segment to the trail system as well as provide an alternative form of access to the quarry. The City should also build either a pedestrian bridge next to McCollister Boulevard, or construct a separated pedestrian walkway attached to McCollister Boulevard. This connection to the west side of the river would be a starting point for a future trail along the west side of the Iowa River. Again, the DOT could be a potential source of funds for both the trail extension to the quarry and for the pedestrian bridge.

The Parks and Recreation Department has developed some ideas about how they would like to use the New Sand Lake Recreational Area. Obviously activities such as fishing, canoeing, paddle boating, and even swimming are all possibilities. Private businesses may be attracted to run boat rental and other concessions.
Step 3: Improving Sturgis Ferry Park & Connecting It to North Sand Lake

The next key parcel that should be improved upon would be Sturgis Ferry Park. Currently, this “park” is one of the only places residents can drop their boats into the Iowa River south of the University of Iowa’s Water Treatment Plant. The park itself is not an appealing destination as maintenance and landscaping have not been a priority. While maintaining boat access to the river is a key to this park, changes can be made to improve the park and to better integrate it with the new RiverLife District.

The first step the City should take to integrate this park with the rest of the district is to build a bridge from the park to Sand Lake. The Highway 6 Bridge was not designed for pedestrians, so the closest pedestrian friendly bridge is Benton Street. The City has invested a great deal in the River Corridor Trail and in a trail that runs parallel to Highway 6 west of the Gilbert Street intersection. However, pedestrian access to the west side of the river essentially ends at the current Hills Bank building. A bridge at Sturgis Ferry would give pedestrians a better alternative to crossing the river than Highway 6. This bridge could have other functions besides a place to cross. People could fish off of it. Fish food could be supplied along it allowing residents the joy of feeding fish. Artwork and sculptures could be placed along to continue the district theme.

Since a concern of the Parks and Recreation Department is the cost of maintaining current parks, increasing spending on Sturgis Ferry Park may be difficult. However, the Parks and Recreation Department could consider providing community flower gardens, which would be maintained by interested residents of Iowa City. Another low maintenance landscaping option would be to convert the park into a small prairie. This
would have a benefit over the community flower garden in that it would not require constant participation by the public to be maintained.

![Photo 7: Prairie restoration could be low-cost, visual improvements to Sturgis Ferry Park. Source: www.inhf.org/eastiowarescue2003.htm](image)

A final use for Sturgis Ferry Park could be to provide additional parking for the businesses that will locate around Sand Lake. While most people prefer to park as close to their destination as possible, perhaps these people would not object to a stroll through a park, over a bridge, and then through another park before they reach the restaurants or retail stores on the other side of Sand Lake.

![Photo 8: This small riverfront park consists of three acres adjacent to the Caperton Trail and Monongahela River in Pittsburgh. It features a boat ramp, picnic tables, parking, amphitheater, and green space. This may be a suitable idea for the redevelopment of the Sturgis Ferry Park area. Source: www.boparc.org/details.php?fFacility=9](image)
Step 4: Redeveloping the Public Works Area & Improving Trail Connections

The City’s intention to move the Public Works facilities currently located on the corner of Riverside Drive and Highway 6 will enable the City to sell the parcel to a private developer. Since the other sites around this intersection are zoned for commercial use, it would be appropriate to zone this parcel the same. There is already a mix of retail and restaurants in the area so a private developer would potentially have many options for redevelopment.

Given the site’s limitations, its value may be quite low even though it is located at a busy intersection. In return for a discounted price, a developer may be willing to allow an easement along the river for a trail and may contribute to the cost of the trail. From a developer’s point of view, a trail that connects the new residential uses on the west side of the river to the redeveloped parcel would be beneficial, especially if the businesses on the site are consumer-oriented.

After a trail has been established from the pedestrian bridge to the newly developed parcel, the next step would be to extend the trail under the Highway 6 bridge behind the commercial development along Riverside Drive, and finally connecting it to the existing trail at Ned Ashton Park, north of Benton Street. There are easements for most of the commercial parcels between Highway 6 and Benton Street already so there would only be a few land owners to convince into dedicating the remain portions.

Step 5: Making the North Wastewater Treatment Plant a Desirable Place

The final step would be to redevelop the area around the Waste Water Treatment Plant. It makes a lot of sense to save this area for last. For starters, neither the Iowa City’s Department of Public Works nor City Carton has any intentions of moving their operations any time soon. Also, there is a physical barrier in the form of Highway 6 that separates this area and the rest of our subject area.

The City intends to use part of the Waste Water Treatment Plant for pumping purposes even after all treatment operations are moved to the newer treatment plant located south of town. Since private development next to a large sewage pumping station might not be feasible, the creation of a large dog park could make this once unappealing location more attractive. The City already intends to create a dog park in the Peninsula Neighborhood. However, this neighborhood is isolated from most of Iowa City, and would require most people to use a vehicle to reach this destination. A dog park located on this parcel of land would be easier for more residents to reach by foot.

Since not all of this newly opened land would be needed for a dog park, the City could explore other public uses. Docks for fishing and boating could be located at the south west side of the treatment plant. Direct vehicle access to these docks might not be
possible, so the docks could be for canoes and kayaks only. The City could also rent the site to a concessionaire.

Although City Carton has given no indication of moving its operations or of transferring some operations to a larger facility, it has no room for expansion and it is the City’s belief that they may eventually move. The two large parcels vacated if City Carton moves will be located adjacent to a major collector road, Benton Street, and in close proximity to Highway 6. This land will be prime for redevelopment and could be rezoned for mixed-use and/or commercial use. The City should request an easement to be dedicated along the river. With this easement, the City could then extend the trail along the river on the east side. Eventually, with cooperation from the University of Iowa, the City could have a riverside trail all the way to Terrill Mill Park on the north side of town.

![Photo 9: A community flower garden could provide an opportunity for public interaction at a refurbished North Wastewater Treatment Plant site. It would also provide a positive image from the Highway 6 bridge over the Iowa River. Source: http://www.artistryinprint.com/images/designs/Flower%20garden%20in%20yard%20Dscn0909.jpg](http://www.artistryinprint.com/images/designs/Flower%20garden%20in%20yard%20Dscn0909.jpg)
Conclusion

Nine months ago we were asked to formulate a redevelopment plan for the riverfront area of the south side of Iowa City. This area has a lot of potential for redevelopment and with proper planning it can be made a very attractive place for people to live and to do business in. We envisage a mix of commercial and residential uses with abundant availability of outdoor facilities. By making the outdoors a prominent part of the area, the Iowa City South Riverfront area will become a magnet for people of all ages and backgrounds. This has been confirmed by enthusiastic public support for our proposal. It is important to focus on under-utilized public facilities and make the river a dominant part of the area. If more people are attracted to the south side of Iowa City then this will increase property tax revenue and will stimulate growth in surrounding neighborhoods. Successful redevelopment of this area will also act as a catalyst for other projects currently in the pipeline such as the airport redevelopment plan.

We have created land use concept plan for the study area and generated a list of action steps to bring the plan to life. Before these action steps can be undertaken, the City will need to address the following issues that were outside the scope of this report.

- First and foremost, the City should communicate effectively with stakeholders in the proposed RiverLife District. This includes land and business owners in the proposed district, residents, and other users of the area. The City should hold public sessions where stakeholders are given detailed presentations on the proposed changes and the impacts these changes might have on the area. At this point feedback from the stakeholders could be obtained, which should be used to refine the plan for the proposed district. This participation would give the stakeholders a strong feeling of involvement in the plans creation and would enhance the likelihood of implementing the plan.

- Secondly, the City needs to reevaluate its local district plans. This study area is currently part of two different local district plans, the South Central District Plan and the Southwest District Plan, which makes coordinating riverfront redevelopment difficult. This study area should be treated as a single unite either encompassed in one of the existing plans or through the creation of a new Riverfront District.

- Thirdly, the City should act as a coordinator among city departments, private developers, investors, and interested citizen groups that are responsible for different aspects of the plan’s implementation. The City’s leadership will be crucial to ensure the redevelopment effort is focused and not fragmented.

- Finally, the City should examine the financial feasibility of the redevelopment plan and actively pursue appropriate sources for both short-term and long-term funding. Development of funding estimates will only be possible once a detailed master plan is created.
Our proposal envisions a major role for the south side of Iowa City after redevelopment. We believe that the riverfront area has potential to become a unique destination within the City. The impact of this proposal is not limited to study area alone; we believe that the surrounding area will also be positively impacted. Our interaction with the public during the compilation of this report has been extremely encouraging. We found that most people responded positively to the proposed changes. We believe that by placing more emphasis on the Iowa River and improving public lands in surrounding areas, the south side of Iowa City can become a better place in which to live and do business.
Appendix A – Summary of Public Feedback

After formalizing our ideas we decided to ask the public to assess them and give us their feedback on how they would rate each idea (on a scale of 1-10) and what they liked and disliked about each of them. We conducted three public sessions at two different locations. Our first session was at the Cultural Diversity Day at the Field House. We then had two more sessions on different days at the local Hy-Vee Store on Hwy 6. The former location had the advantage that there would be a diverse group of people present. We chose the latter location because many people from different areas in Iowa City (but especially the south side) come to Hy-Vee to shop and they are the ones most affected by our proposals. Our interaction session consisted of two parts: we first presented our ideas and then asked them to fill out survey forms (see a sample on Page 34) to give us their feedback.

Overall we received a tremendous response. Most people were very enthusiastic about our ideas and asked many questions and also gave us other ideas to think about. The response we received made us conclude that discussing our ideas with the general public was a very important and beneficial step.

On Cultural Diversity Day at the Field House a majority of our respondents were non-students but there were also a fair number of students, both from the US and other countries. There were some respondents who chose more than one proposal. Out of the three proposals the Riverside Cultural Park received the most votes.

Our next session took place at Hy-Vee during a weekend (Saturday and Sunday). On both the days most of our respondents were not affiliated to the University. As expected we saw very few people on Sunday. On Saturday, people equally chose both the Riverside Cultural Park and the RiverLife Village proposals as the ones they liked the most. The Pioneer Landing Historical Area proposal received only half as many votes. The scenario was very different on Sunday where the Riverside Cultural Park received over 80% of the votes. This was similar to what we observed during our session at the Cultural Diversity Day. Again, during both days, some people voted for more than one proposal.

We then combined results for all three public sessions to obtain an overall picture. Table 1 shows the overall number of respondents from each group and the percentage of votes each proposal received. We see that overall half the respondents chose the Riverside Cultural Park proposal as the one they liked the most. On average this proposal received a rating of 8.4. The rest of the respondents are roughly equally divided among the other two proposals. Pioneer Landing Historical Area and the RiverLife Village received average ratings of 6.8 and 7.5 respectively. Overall more than 80% of the respondents were from the Iowa City area, 6% were from Coralville while the rest were from surrounding areas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Students</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Cultural Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Landing Historical Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RiverLife Village</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Overall Survey Responses*

From our surveys we also found that the *Riverside Cultural Park* idea was first choice for most people because it involved many outdoor activities such as, kayaking, fishing, open green spaces, fresh markets, bike trails, etc. It gave people the chance to get out more and get involved in some fun activities. This idea appealed to people from all ages. However, people were concerned that this idea may not be acceptable to the City Council and that it wouldn’t be financially viable. The *Pioneer Landing Historical Area* idea was also liked by many but did not score high because of concerns that there were many other places like this in Iowa and that people wouldn’t want to go to such a place often. There were also concerns about the cost of this proposal. The *RiverLife Village* idea also appealed to many but most people had reservations because it was more commercially oriented and people did not see any novelty in the idea. Some people suggested that we build on the housing units’ aspect and make them low-cost housing units.

Our survey results tell us people liked and disliked each proposal to a certain extent. Therefore, we decided to design a hybrid proposal that included positive aspects from all three ideas. This was also suggested by many people in our survey.
Iowa City South Riverfront Redevelopment Plan
Opinion Survey

1) What city do you live in? ..................................................

2) Are you a student?  Yes □  No □
If yes, are you an international student? Yes □  No □

3) Which idea did you like the most?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>□</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Cultural Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Landing Historical Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Leisure District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4a) On a scale of 1-10, how likely would you be to visit the ‘Riverside Cultural Park’?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) What do you like best about this idea? ........................................................................

c) What do you like least about this idea? ......................................................................

5a) On a scale of 1-10, how likely would you be to visit the ‘Pioneer Landing Historical Area’?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) What do you like best about this idea? ........................................................................

c) What do you like least about this idea? ......................................................................

6a) On a scale of 1-10, how likely would you be to visit or choose to live in the “RiverLife Village”?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) What do you like best about this idea? ........................................................................

c) What do you like least about this idea? ......................................................................

7) What other kind of development, if any, would you like to see in the South Riverfront area in Iowa City? ........................................................................

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................

Iowa City South Riverfront Redevelopment
Appendix B – Funding Sources

1. Recreational activities

**Challenge America Grants (Arts):** These are federal grants that provide funds for community arts development at different stages including activities that use arts as a focus for cultural tourism. The Cultural Commons proposal is an eligible project for these grants. Grant amount $10,000.

Website: [www.nea.gov/guide/Challenge02/Challengelndex.html](http://www.nea.gov/guide/Challenge02/Challengelndex.html)

**National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) for Special Projects:** Funding is provided to the projects which provide hands on learning experience outside of the class room (applicable for Artist Corridor). Awards of up to $10,000 are normally made for a period of 6-12 months. Any U.S. nonprofit organization with 501(c) 3 tax exempt status is eligible, as are state and local government agencies. Grants are not awarded to individuals. Website: [www.neh.gov](http://www.neh.gov)

**Outdoor Recreation Acquisition, Development and Planning:** These are Federal grants, providing assistance for a wide range of outdoor recreation projects, such as picnic areas, inner city parks, campgrounds, tennis courts, boat launching ramps, bike trails, outdoor swimming pools, and support facilities such as roads, water supply, etc. This is a matching fund providing a 50% federal contribution towards the project cost; range and average of financial assistance is between $150 and $5,450,000.

Website: [http://www.nps.gov/lwcf](http://www.nps.gov/lwcf)

**REAP City Parks and Open Space:** This money is available through city competitive grants, consist of 15% REAP funds. These funds are based on population; a city like Iowa City (Population 62220 according to 2000 census), could receive up to a maximum amount of $200,000.

Website: [http://www.iowadnr.com/reap/cityopen.html](http://www.iowadnr.com/reap/cityopen.html)
Contact person: Ross Harrison
Iowa Department of Natural Resources
Wallace State Office Building, Des Moines, IA 50319
Phone: (515) 281-5973
Email: Ross.Harrison@dnr.state.ia.us

**Urban Park and Recreating Recovery Grants:** This program provides matching grants and technical assistance to economically distressed urban communities for rehabilitation of critically needed recreation facilities, including capital funding for renovation or redesign. Website: [www.ncrc.nps.gov/PROGRAMS/UHRR/index.html](http://www.ncrc.nps.gov/PROGRAMS/UHRR/index.html)
Bruce A. & Mary L. Heistad-Bro Family Foundation Trust: This is a private foundation with a grant amount of $8,766. Some of the sample grants include City of Harlan, Parks & Recreation, $4,000, Faith Sound Organization, $8,066 etc.
Contact Information:
Bruce Bro and Mary Bro, Trustees
973 Oak Rd.
Harlan, IA 51537
Telephone: (712) 755-3233

Duane & Evelyn Munter Charitable Trust: This is a private foundation with a grant amount of $7,034. They provided $704 to the City of Strawberry Point towards park improvements.
Contact Information:
P.O. Box 4
Strawberry Point, IA 52076
Telephone: (319) 933-2213

Edward Family Foundation: This private foundation provides funds to several community enhancement projects operating with a grant amount of $76,000. Sample grants include Iowa Environmental Council, $1,000 and Des Moines Art Centre, $50,000.
Contact Information:
C/o Charles C. Edwards, Jr.
2300 Terrace Road
Des Moines, IA 50312-5430
Telephone: (515) 243-7255

Fleming Family Foundation: This is a private foundation providing support for diversified projects. Total grant amount of this foundation is $84,200. Sample grants include Wallace House Foundation, $25,000; Des Moines Botanical Centre, $2,000 etc.
Contact Information:
2014 Scotch Ridge Rd.
Carlisle, IA 50047-3142
Telephone: (515) 989-0229

Follows Family Charitable Foundation Trust: This is a private foundation which uses a grant amount of $34,310 to promote the health and wellbeing of the community. Some of the sample grants include Greenpeace, $2,000 and Parks Commission in Spencer IA, $500.
Contact Information:
2140 300th St.
Spencer, IA 51301
Telephone: (712) 262-5901

George H. Scanlon Foundation: This foundation provides funds for private foundations to improve the quality of life, with a total grant amount of $164,000. Some of the sample grants include Iowa City Parks and Recreation, educational, $20,000.
Contact Information:
Clarke Scanlon, President
9619 Oakwood Dr.
Urbandale, IA 50322-6224

Gethmann Foundation: It is a private foundation with a grant amount of $11,225. Some of the sample grants include Marshalltown Parks and Recreation, $500
Contact Information:
Jack B. Gethmann, President
P.O. Box 220
Gladbrook, IA 50635
Telephone: (641) 473-2323

Max and Helen Guernsey Charitable Foundation: This is a private foundation, with a total grant amount of $99,762. Some of the sample grants include Cedar Valley Arboretum, Charitable purpose, $25,000. (Note: We left a message to this foundation to see whether they provide funds to Iowa City or not, in the funding information we could not find any restriction on geographical location).
Contact Information:
Max Guernsey, President
P.O. Box 1172
Waterloo, IA 50704-1172
Telephone: (319) 234 5588

Mid-America Foundation: The Mid-American foundation is a private foundation providing funds to several projects to improve quality of life among Americans. Total grant amount of this foundation is $395,549. Sample grants include $5000 grant to Iowa Children’s Museum, Blank Park Zoo Foundation $10,000 etc.
Contact Information:
4700 Westown Pkwy., Ste. 303
West Des Moines, IA 50266
Telephone: (515) 244-3600

Our Foundation for the Future, Inc.: This is a private foundation with a total grant amount of $25,820. Sample grants include Eagle Park, donation-gazebo, $5,000; Trinity Health System, physician recruitment $10,000.
Contact Information:
Peggy Burres, Treasurer
P.O. Box 2
Eagle Grove, IA 50533, IA 50533
Telephone: (515) 448-5161

The Christian & Lou Utz Zeidler Trust: This is an operating foundation (currently not accepting application but in future it will). Sample grants include $75,249 for development and operation of a free public park located near Rockwell, IA

Iowa City South Riverfront Redevelopment
Contact Information:
622 1st St. N.
Rockwell, IA 50469
Telephone: (515) 822-3120

Taylor Family Foundation: These grants are limited to pre-selected organization (not mentioned), with a grant amount of $23,000. Some of the sample grants include Clear Lake Yacht Club $15,000, Black Park Zoo $1,000 etc.

Contact Information:
c/o Donald H. Taylor, Sr.
1533 E. Euclid
Des Moines, IA 50313
Telephone: (561) 391-5105

The Rose Lampe Trust / The Lampe Trust: Total grant amount of this private foundation is $3,703. Sample grant include shelter & other improvements at Templeton Ball Park, $2,702.81.

Contact Information:
Ronald J. Wadle, President
206 Main St.
Manning, IA 51455
Telephone: (712) 655-2857

The Donald C. and Doris K. Byers Charitable Trust: This is a private foundation providing funds to parks and other community enhancement programs. Total grant amount of this foundation is $9,500. Sample grants include United Methodist Church of Estes Park, unrestricted use, $1,000, Drake University, $3,000 etc

Contact Information:
720 W. 11th St. S.
Newton, IA 50208-3539
Telephone: (641) 792-5060

The Claude W. & Dolly Ahrens Foundation Corp.: The purpose of this private foundation is to “Leave It Better Than You Found It.” It provides funds to the organizations with in state of Iowa who are seeking support for specific projects with a total grant amount of $4,739,847. Sample grants include University of Iowa, Women's Softball,$75,000; Iowa Park & Recreation Association: IPRA, Donation of Property, $210,973 etc. Website: http://www.ahrensfamilyfoundation.org

Contact Information:
President
P.O. Box 284
Grinnell, IA 50112
E-mail: info@ahrensfamilyfoundation.org
Thomas and Linda Koehn Foundation: This is a private foundation supporting public parks, libraries, youth programs etc enhancing quality of life in America. It provides total grant amount of worth $56,775.

Contact Information:
412 S. 26th St.
West Des Moines, IA 50265-5514
Telephone: (515) 284-1911

The Gazette Foundation: This is a private foundation providing funds for several programs like skate parks, with a total Grant amount of $149,236.

Contact Information:
Joseph F. Hladky III, President
500 3rd Ave., S.E.
Cedar Rapids, IA 52401
Telephone: (319) 398-8280

2. Environmental enhancement activities

Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) Grants: These grants are provided to cities to assist them in the redevelopment of Brownfield, abandoned, ideal or under utilized properties. These funds are appropriate for the cleaning of parcels near bus barn.

Website: www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/economicdevelopment/programs/bedi/index.cfm
www.cfda.gov/public/viewprog.asp?progid=343

Brownfields Assessment, Revolving Loan Fund, and Cleanup Grants: These grants are for redevelopment of Brownfields, abandoned properties or other properties where redevelopment is complicated by contamination. These funds are appropriate for the cleaning of parcels near bus barn. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) can provide grants which include capitalizing of revolving loans for cleanup projects.

Website: www.epa.gov/brownfields/
www.cfda.gov/public/viewprog.asp?progid=858

Iowa Clean Air Attainment Program (ICAAP): The purpose of this funding is to promote project/programs which help maintaining Iowa Clean air quality by reducing transportation related emissions (appropriate for proposed Bridge which will connect trail on the east side of the river with proposed trail along the west side). This funding requires a local match of at least 20%. Minimum amount of $20,000 is awarded under these grants. Website: www.dot.state.ia.us/forms

REAP Soil and Water Enhancement: These funds are available to landowners (near Quarry, land funds to land owners to maintain natural landscape) for soil and water conservation and enhancement projects and practices. Soil and Water Enhancement funds consists of 20% of REAP funds. Funding is available for projects like reforestation, woodland protection and enhancement, wildlife habitat preservation and enhancement, protection of highly erodible soils, and water quality protection.
Contact person:
Jim Gillespie or Bill McGill
Division of Soil Conservation
Department of Agriculture and Land Stewardship
Wallace State Office Building
Des Moines, IA 50319
Phone: (515) 281-7043 or 281-6148

REAP County Conservation: These are state funds consisting of County Conservation (20% of REAP funds). Funds are available to counties for land easements or acquisition, capital improvements, stabilization and protection of resources etc. These funds can be used specially for acquisition of land near sand lake and other parcels in the project: Thirty percent of the county conservation account is allocated automatically and equally to all 99 counties. Another thirty percent is population based, higher the population more money they receive. There are some eligibility requirements for this. Counties are eligible to receive these funds if they are dedicating at least 22¢ per $1,000 of the assessed value of taxable property in the county for county conservation purposes. In other words, a county must be committing a specified tax levy amount from county tax dollars to conservation in order to receive per population REAP allocation. The remaining 40% of the county conservation account is available to counties through competitive grants. The 22¢ eligibility criteria also apply to these grants. Grants are 100%, so local match money is not required.

Contact person:
Ross Harrison
Iowa Department of Natural Resources
Wallace State Office Building, Des Moines, IA 50319
Phone: (515) 281-5973
Email: Ross.Harrison@dnr.state.ia.us

The Mcknight Foundation: This is a private foundation supporting environmental quality projects. Iowa organizations are eligible for environmental grants and research grants. Total grant amount is worth $90.7 millions. This organization has provided $90,000 to Environmental Council, to advocate better policies to improve water quality in Iowa. Website: http://www.mcknight.org

Contact Information:
Kristin Batson, Manager, Organizational Learn
121 South 8th Street
Suite 600
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 333-4220
Fax: (612) 332-3833
E-mail: info@mcknight.org

Urban and Community Forestry Program: This is a federal project grant providing support for projects like green space, forestry, manage and protect trees etc to improve the ecological function, and social and economic stability of cities and communities.
Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Program: These federal grants are provided to local governments for the rehabilitation of recreation areas and facilities, demonstration of innovative approaches to improve park system management and recreation opportunities, and development of improved recreation planning. These funds may be used for restructuring the Sturgis Ferry Park to develop into community gardens. The Recovery Action Program grants are matching grants, 50% federal grants and 50% local government. Since its inception of this grant in 1978, an investment in excess of $316 million have been provided to the local government for rehabilitation of their parks.

Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention: This Federal grant provides assistance for carrying out works of improvement to protect, develop, and utilize the land and water resources in small watersheds. Technical and financial assistance under which program funds provide certain prescribed services and costs and a percentage of other costs on the basis of a contract vary according to purpose of the works of improvement.

Website: http://www.nps.uparr

3. Transportation

DOT/DNR Fund: The purpose of these funds is to provide support for beautification of corridors with the plant material. These funds can be utilized for the proposed corridor on the west side of the river and also for the existing corridor. This program is operating with an annual funding level of $300,000.

Contact Information:
Iowa Department of Transportation
Office of Design
800 Lincoln Way
Ames
IA 50010 515-239-1424

Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP): Funding is provided for road or bridge project on the federal aid system. One of the requirement for this program is 20% non-federal matching is essential. The annual funding level available for Regional Planning Affiliation/ Metropolitan Planning Organization (RPA/MPO) is $51 millions.

Contact Information:
Lee Benfield
430 16th Ave.S.W
P.O. Box 3150
Cedar Rapids
IA 52304-3150
(319) 364-0235
Fax: (319) 364-9614
Federal Transportation Enhancement Program: Primary purpose of these programs is to fund activities related to transportation like trail and bikeways, scenic and environmental and historic and archaeological. These funds are appropriate for the existing and proposed trails. Public and private non profit organizations are eligible to apply. Requirement include, 20% or more local match is required. Approximate funding annual funding level of $4.45 millions is available for statewide/regional projects. Website: www.dot.state.ia.us/sysplan

Contact Information:
Office of Systems Planning
800 Lincoln Way
Ames, IA 50010
515-239-1621

Iowa Clean Air Attainment Program (ICAAP): The purpose of this funding is to promote project/programs which help maintaining Iowa Clean air quality by reducing transportation related emissions (appropriate for proposed Bridge which will connect trail on the east side of the river with proposed trail along the west side). This funding requires a local match of at least 20%. Minimum amount of $20,000 is awarded under these grants. Website: www.dot.state.ia.us/forms

Innovative Bridge Research and Construction Program: This program provides funds for the demonstration and application of innovative material technology in the construction of bridges. One of our recommendations for the proposed development was to restore the existing old railway bridge and modifies that to a pedestrian access bridge connecting east side of the river with the west side of the river. Website: www.fhwa.dot.gov/discretionary

Living Roadway Trust Fund: Primary intent of this program is providing funding for Roadside Vegetation Management Programs (IRVM). It includes several projects like roadside inventories, gateways, education/training, research/demonstration, roadside enhancement, speed propagation and special equipments. These funds are available for individuals, cities, counties or the state. Website: www.iowalivingroadway.com

Contact Information:
Iowa Department of Transportation
Office of Design
800 Lincoln Way
Ames, IA 50010
515-239-1768

National Corridor Planning and Development Program: We are proposing the development of a trail corridor along the west side of the river to provide a continuous access form the east side of the river. These Federal funds provide funding for planning, design and construction of corridors. The State and Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) are eligible to request for these funds. Website: www.fhwa.dot.gov/discretionary
**Recreational Trails Program (Federal):** These Federal funds provide for maintaining motorized and non-motorized trails and trails related projects. These funds are applicable for the existing and proposed trails along the river. This is matching grant with a requirement of 20% of match.

Website: [www.dot.state.ia.us/sysplan](http://www.dot.state.ia.us/sysplan)

Contact Information:
The Department of Natural Resources
Parks, Recreation and Preserves Division
Wallace State Office Building
Des Moines, IA 50319
515-281-3449 – OR-
Iowa Department of Transportation
Office of Systems Planning
800 Lincoln Way
Ames, IA 50010
515-239-1621

**Recreational Trails Program (State):** The intent of this program is to provide funds for recreational trails. State agencies, counties and cities are eligible to receive these funds. These funds can be utilized for the proposed new tail along the west side of the river. These funds require 25% of local match is required. Annual fund level of $1 million is available. Website: [www.dot.state.ia.us/sysplan](http://www.dot.state.ia.us/sysplan)

Applications: [www.dot.state.ia.us/forms](http://www.dot.state.ia.us/forms)

Contact Information:
Office of Systems Planning
800 Lincoln Way
Ames, IA 50010
515-239-1621

**Revitalize Iowa’s Sound Economy (RISE):** Funding is in the form of grant, loan or a combination to promote economic development in Iowa. Projects which support local economic development are eligible to apply.

Funding level:
Approximately $30 million per year is distributed under the following categories.

- state primary road RISE funds (for Commercial and Industrial Network) - 64.5%
- County secondary road RISE funds - 3.2%
- City municipal street RISE funds - 32.3 percent

Website: [www.dot.state.ia.us/sysplan](http://www.dot.state.ia.us/sysplan)

Contact Information:
Iowa Department of Transportation Office of Systems Planning
800 Lincoln Way Ames
Iowa 50010
515-239-1664
Appendix C – Riverfront Zoning Ordinances

I. Vancouver Municipal Code From Vancouver, British Columbia

Chapter 20.650 WATERFRONT PLAN DISTRICT

Section 20.650.010 – Purpose
The Waterfront Plan District (WX) district is intended to:

1. Implement the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan for mixed-use development within the waterfront area.

2. Ensure functionally coordinated, cohesive site planning and design that maximizes land use through mixed-use developments.

3. Ensure compatibility of mixed-use developments with the surrounding uses and minimize any off-site impacts associated with development.

4. Encourage water-dependent, -related and -oriented uses within the waterfront area.

5. Encourage a high-activity and high-density urban environment that permits access to the waterfront not only to the residents of developments, but also to the public at large and invokes a sense of community and compatibility with other uses.

6. Prohibit the development of single-family detached dwellings.

7. Secure public shoreline access to or along the waterfront, to include waterfront access plans, construction of waterfront parks, trails, esplanades, bikeways and viewpoints.

Section 20.650.020 – Applicability
A. Small sites. Development on a site located in the WX zone that is 20,000 sq. ft. or less in size shall be reviewed by means of site plan review, as governed by Chapter VMC 20.265 Site Plan Review, using the design and development standards contained in this Chapter.

B. Large sites. Development on a site located in the WX zone that is greater than 20,000 sq. ft. shall require a master plan to be reviewed by the Planning Commission as governed by the regulations in VMC 20.260 Planned Developments, using the design and development standards contained in this Chapter.
Section 20.650.025 – Administration
A. Master plan required. An applicant who proposes any development within the Columbia River Shoreline Enhancement District must submit a master development plan per the requirement of Chapter 20.260 VMC, Planned Developments.

B. Purposes of master plan.
   1. Assure that the proposed development is considered as a whole and will conform to the Comprehensive Plan and the underlying requirements of the zoning district.
   2. Require any changes to the Comprehensive Plan and underlying zoning district to be integrated into the master plan.
   3. Assure that phased development is properly coordinated.
   4. Provide the developer/property owner with reliable assurances of the City's expectations for the overall project as a basis for detailed planning and investment.
   5. Coordinate the master plan process with the requirements of the State Shoreline Management Act and the City's shoreline program, and insofar as applicable with the City's adopted policy for a waterfront trail.

Section 20.650.030 - Design and Development Standards
A. Building design. The following design and development standards shall apply to all development that occurs or is proposed in the WX district:
   1. Multiple buildings on a single site shall be designed to create a strong visual relationship between or among the buildings. Architectural treatment of a building shall be consistent on all sides.
   2. Development shall take into account the relationship of adjacent buildings in terms of height, materials, scale and architecture. The goal is to achieve attractive structures and preserve significant views.
   3. Mixed-use developments shall be encouraged to provide increased opportunities for informal and planned activities beyond the typical 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. work hours, including secure, well-lighted amenity zones and programmed activities. In addition, design that will increase opportunities for activities both within the project boundaries and between existing adjacent developments and neighborhoods shall be promoted.
   4. Interest shall be created by both the repetition and changes in various patterns from window openings to paving designs. Developers shall consider the use of decorative pavement accents in sidewalks and near street intersections.
   5. When a project occurs in a visually rich context, such as the waterfront, its form, materials, orientation, and detailing shall incorporate the assets offered by its setting.
   6. The size, character and sites of proposed projects shall relate to the functions of adjacent streets and pedestrian networks. Buildings shall be oriented to the public rights-of-way and shall be placed close to pedestrian movement.
   7. Environments shall be created that encourage a number of specific activities to front a street, court or plaza at ground level to provide variety at a human scale.
8. Where feasible, the design of multi-use facilities to accommodate retail and other uses at the pedestrian level that increase activity and use shall be encouraged.

9. Buildings shall be designed and located to complement and preserve existing buildings, streets and paths, bridges and other elements of the built environment.

10. Buildings shall be designed to be complementary in appearance to adjacent structures of good design with regard to:
    a. Materials, color and texture;
    b. Setbacks;
    c. Roof lines;
    d. Height; and
    e. Overall proportions.

11. Where existing buildings are to remain on site, new development shall be designed to:
    a. Integrate the remaining buildings into the overall design; or
    b. Provide separate landscaping, remodeling or other treatment that establishes a distinct character and function for the remaining buildings.
    c. Existing pedestrian paths or public areas shall be retained whenever feasible.

12. Bus shelters, drinking fountains, benches, mail boxes and related amenities shall be designed to be complementary in appearance to buildings.

13. The following amenities shall be designed to be complementary in appearance to those buildings or structures upon which they are located: windows, doors, mailboxes, mechanical equipment, downspouts, utility connections and meters, chimneys, lights, signs, awnings, foundations, vents, stairs, decks and railings, weather vanes, aerials and other appendages attached to the roof or projecting above the roofline.

14. Awnings, signs and lights shall be placed at the specific location on the wall to define the first floor or retail cornice height.

15. Trees and other natural elements shall be used to help define building proportion relationships and to provide scale to the structure as a whole.

16. Thematic consistency shall be encouraged and the variety of styles of building elements shall be minimized while allowing a diversity of architecture.

17. Buildings shall be designed and located to complement and preserve existing natural landforms.

18. To the extent practicable, landforms shall be incorporated as design elements that relate to building elevations to determine scale and proportion.

19. Foundations shall be designed to match the scale of the building being supported. Use of berms, re-siding, or sheathing the foundation structure with wall siding are methods that accomplish this purpose.

20. Decks, railings and stairs that relate a building to the contours of the land shall be used.

21. Buildings shall be designed to minimize the personal security risks of users and to minimize the opportunities for vandalism and theft.

22. Buildings shall be designed and constructed to reduce noise impacts on interior occupied spaces and adjacent property.
23. Natural barriers shall be used where possible, and where it is not possible, the use of solid barriers such as fences, berms, or structures to reduce sound levels shall be considered.
24. Heat pumps or similar mechanical equipment shall be located so that operating noise does not affect use of living areas such as bedrooms, outdoor decks, patio areas of the use or adjacent uses.

B. Building scale/transition
   1. A large structure shall contain design elements that create a transition to the human scale, particularly near the ground.
   2. If a development is larger or smaller than surrounding uses, the design shall provide transitional elements at the perimeter to integrate it with its surroundings.
   3. Transition using variety of scale, pattern and texture of building and landscaping elements is encouraged to create a more visually interesting project.
   4. Buildings shall be designed to reveal or express their primary patterns of use and entry.
   5. The proposed building orientation shall respect the orientation of surrounding buildings and streets and shall relate to other buildings on the same site in regard to pedestrian circulation.
   6. Buildings shall be designed and located to complement and preserve existing natural landforms, trees, shrubs and other natural vegetation, where appropriate.
   7. A balance in the height, bulk and scale of the buildings constructed within the site shall be achieved so that large and/or long blank walls are either not constructed or their features are minimized. These standards can be achieved by the use of certain landscape features, specific building materials, limited size and length of buildings, preserving significant existing trees, screening mechanical equipment, innovative signage, limiting or prohibiting structures within side building setbacks, limited fences and/or hedges within view corridors, and visual penetration through structures.

C. Building heights/views
   1. Views from the residential areas above the river to the river shall be protected to the greatest extent practicable;
   2. Views within the waterfront property to the river shall be protected to the greatest extent practicable. Access to views of both the project’s users and the general public shall be considered.
   3. Major views and view corridors that give special emphasis to open space, the river, and special man-made or natural landmarks shall be protected to the greatest extent practicable.
   4. Buildings shall be located and designed to provide access to desirable views, while not blocking the views of others unnecessarily.
   5. The maximum overall height allowed in general is 60’. Higher structures may be allowed if views are not significantly impaired by means of a Type II Variance, as governed by VMC 20.290 Variances.
D. View analysis. As part of the master development plan, an analysis of views from the residential area above the site including view corridors, view profiles and vertical profiles from various locations is required. The views and/or view corridors to be protected are perpendicular and at angles to the river and include those views from the residential area above to the river and those seen from within the site to the river.

Section 20.650.040 – Accessibility
A. Pedestrian access/orientation
   1. Buildings shall reflect a strong sense of human scale and interest within the pedestrian environment.
   2. Ground floor levels of buildings shall include elements of pedestrian interest.
   3. Development, especially buildings taller than 40’, shall address pedestrian scale and open space requirements and maintain human scale by creating variation of the urban form.
   4. Separation of pedestrians and automobiles shall be encouraged. This can be accomplished by providing on-street parking and/or planting strips between the street and sidewalk.
   5. The areas immediately adjacent to buildings shall be designed to integrate with the surrounding landscape and pedestrian walkways. Elements such as courtyards, colonnades and public art may be used to define this space.
   6. Development shall provide convenient pedestrian access via sidewalks to transit stops.
   7. Building entrances shall be identifiable and directly accessible from a public sidewalk. Entry areas shall be emphasized and strengthened through design articulation.

B. Accessibility and clarity
   1. Environments shall be created that are understandable and help orient the user and the general public.
   2. Sites shall be planned to respect existing natural and man-made landmarks and to create landmarks for the ease of public recognition.
   3. Major vistas and panoramas that give special emphasis to open space and the river shall be protected to the greatest extent practicable.

Section 20.650.050 - Landscaping and Screening
A. Ground-level equipment. Structures such as antennas and satellite dishes shall be integrated into the project architecture and/or landscaping.

B. Open space. Open space shall be an integral part of any proposal. Exterior plazas, entry gardens, urban parks and sufficient landscaped areas should be clearly defined to strengthen the human scale and reduce the visual impact of tall buildings.

C. Public and semi-public places. Creation of public and semi-public places at both large and small scales shall be promoted to encourage a sense of community, where appropriate. Open spaces shall be designed to attract the public through the creation of
comfortable places, attractive exhibits and easy access. Any open space shall be designed at a human scale to encourage human interaction.

D. **ADA compliance.** Open space shall be designed to be accessible and usable by people those with physical limitations and disabilities by complying with the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

E. **Landscaping size and spacing.** The size and spacing of landscape elements shall be consistent with the size of the project and should relate to any identifiable streetscape.

F. **Landscaping purpose.** Landscaping shall provide variety and interest and improve the aesthetic quality of a project, in addition to providing a functional purpose.

G. **Coordination with utilities.** The landscape design shall be coordinated with all site utility elements such as power lines, transformers, meter boxes, backflow preventers and fire protection devices to effectively diminish the impact of such elements on the character of the site.

**Section 20.650.060 Other Development Standards.**

A. **Public amenities**
   1. Overhangs and canopies shall be integrated in the building design along all pedestrian thoroughfares.
   2. Comfortable and attractive street furniture, such as seating and tables, fountains, trash receptacles, information kiosks, and directories which are accessible to the physically disabled shall be provided in public spaces for public enjoyment and comfort.

B. **Site grading**
   1. Site design shall minimize the removal of mature trees and other existing mature vegetation.
   2. The proposed grading shall be designed with slopes and topographic features that match the natural grade to the maximum extent practicable.
   3. Sites shall be designed to minimize erosion.
   4. Where they exist in their natural state, significant wetlands, drainage ways and streams shall be preserved.

C. **Art and furnishings**
   1. The use of art is encouraged and shall be integrated into the overall design of a project, if proposed.
   2. Lighting fixtures and illumination shall be of similar design and character as the project's building components.

D. **Pathway guidelines/requirements**
   1. Public use and access to the Columbia River shoreline shall be provided.
   2. A trail that extends along the entire waterfront from the Burlington Northern Railroad Bridge to the eastern city limits with viewpoints and access points shall
be provided within 35' of the ordinary high water mark. Flexibility may be allowed to vary the location of the path, keeping it as close to the river as possible. Under special circumstances, the path may be allowed to vary or depart from the river for short distances. Also, it may be necessary from time to time to temporarily close a portion of the path. As part of an application submitted in compliance with Section 20.650.020 VMC, the location of the path, viewpoints and access points shall be shown and an explanation shall be submitted as to why the proposed location is the most appropriate for the site and that the equivalent of the pathway requirement can be met.

3. Along the pathway there shall be viewpoints and access points provided for the public. The location of the viewpoints and access points shall be determined after the analysis required under Subsection C above, Building Heights/Views, is complete.

4. All applications submitted shall comply with the intent and purposes of Resolution No. M-2739 regarding the pathway along the river, which outlines the City's responsibilities in terms of the pathway requirement including, but not limited to planning for a trail from the Burlington Northern bridge to the eastern city limits which includes some public amenities and includes the providing by the City of adequate maintenance and public safety.

E. **Screening.** All trash cans, trash collection areas, storage yards, service areas and mechanical equipment, including heat pumps, air conditioners, emergency generators and water pumps, shall be screened from view or placed in locations where they will generally not be visible. Screened materials shall be incorporated into the building design. Small rooftop mechanical equipment, including vents, need not be screened if the total area of such equipment does not exceed 10 sq. ft. per structure.

F. **Fencing.** A minimum 6’ sight-obscurring fence is required for storage, assembly and/or fabrication uses when allowed as a conditional use.

G. **Signage**

1. **Types:** Business park type monument base signs are permitted. The maximum height of a monument base sign is 15'. The maximum size of a monument base sign is 50 sq. ft. Rotating, flashing and free-standing pole, and roof-top signs are prohibited. Fascia signs are permitted as set forth in VMC 20.960 Signs, provided that they are consistent with the standards set forth in this subsection.

2. **Standards**
   a. The size, shape, location and design of all signs shall be compatible with building proportions and features and be consistent with the overall character of the site.
   b. Sign locations shall be integrated within the design of the site and adjacent streetscape.
   c. Signs shall be integrated with landscape elements such as walls, planters, and street furniture and be placed so they are not obscured by landscaping when it has reached full maturity and should.
d. Consideration shall be given to the location and design of signs on adjacent parcels.
e. Multi-tenant buildings and shopping centers shall all have a comprehensive sign program. Provisions should be made for coordination of sign dimensions, materials, textures, colors, illumination and method and location of mounting. These signs shall be delineated in a uniform and consistent manner.
f. Traffic directional signs should be placed to promote safe and efficient traffic flow.
g. Signs shall be oriented to promote readability and serve their intended function.
h. The use of individual letters for signs is preferred over cabinet signs with brightly lit backgrounds or signs that have emphasized backgrounds. Sign letters shall be illuminated rather than the background area or backlit signs should have opaque backgrounds.
i. The light source of externally illuminated signs shall be shielded or out of the public's view.
j. Visible braces and other supporting devices should be avoided but, if required, be incorporated as a design feature.

H. Other development standards
1. Maximum lot coverage. The maximum lot coverage shall be 70%, including building footprints and all paved areas devoted to vehicular parking, loading and circulation.
2. Minimum landscaping/open space. The minimum landscaped area shall be 20%. The height of all planted trees shall be coordinated with view corridors and with the height of adjacent buildings. This will help ensure that the view corridors are protected.

I. Parking requirements
1. Parking adjacent to the river. No parking shall be allowed adjacent to the river. This is to avoid potential problems related to storm water run-off and other water quality problems impacting the river and to enhance the view corridors through and along the river. In some cases, parking may be allowed adjacent to the river but only if
   a. The parking is required for a water-dependent or a water-related use and no reasonable alternative exists; or
   b. The area of the lot where the parking would be located is depressed 4’ or more below street level.
2. Shared parking between and among uses shall be encouraged.
3. Joint circulation and shared access between abutting properties is encouraged.
4. Adequate lighting for parking lots shall be provided to ensure personal safety. Lighting shall be integrated into the architectural character both in terms of illumination.
J. Transit facilities
   1. Depending on the type and intensity of development proposed, certain transit facilities may be required including, but not limited to bus shelters and bus pull-outs.
   2. Where bus shelters and other transit facilities are provided, they shall be located near building access and/or activity areas and be incorporated in the building design.

K. Utilities: All required utilities shall be constructed underground.

L. Lighting: Lighting for development shall be provided in a uniform and consistent manner in terms of location and design within a development and in coordination with adjacent development and/or zoning. Lighting shall not create glare beyond the subject parcel’s boundaries. Lighting shall be uniform and consistent along pathways and/or open spaces and public areas and shall be complimentary within developments.

M. Setback requirements
   1. Required perimeter setbacks from the project boundary shall be based upon the setbacks of the adjacent zone or the following requirements whichever is greater:
      a. For a structure: 25’.
      b. For a parking lot: 10’.
      c. For a vehicular access way: 5’.
   2. An access way shared by property zoned commercial and residential is not subject to the yard requirement.
   3. There are no mandatory setbacks required within the site. However, a requirement may be established at the time of Planning Commission review depending upon the type and intensity of development proposed.
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Section 21A - Mixed-use Riverfront Zone or MR Zone

(1) Purpose. The purpose of this zone is to implement the General Plan policies for the creative redevelopment of mill site properties adjacent to the Deschutes River. It is intended to allow for a mix of uses that:

(a) Provide a variety of employment opportunities and housing types;
(b) Foster pedestrian and other non-motor vehicle activity;
(c) Ensure functionally coordinated, aesthetically pleasing and cohesive site planning and design;
(d) Ensure compatibility of mixed-use developments with the surrounding area and minimize off-site impacts associated with the development; and
(e) Encourage access to, and enjoyment of, the Deschutes River.

(2) Development Plans Required. The Mixed-use Riverfront zone shall only be applied to the area designated on the Bend Area General Plan Map. Before development of properties can occur in the MR zone, a Facilities Plan shall be reviewed and approved. Before development of properties, other than property described in Section 4(d) below can occur in the MR zone, a Master Development Plan shall be reviewed and approved. The Facility Plan shall be processed as a Type II Activity. The Bend Urban Area Planning Commission acting as the Design Review Board shall review and approve the Master Development Plan.

(3) Facilities Plan. Prior to or concurrent with submitting a Master Development Plan the owners shall submit for review and approval a Facilities Plan that shows how the area will be served by roads and utilities.

(a) Due to the size and physical variations of the MR zone area the Facilities Plans shall be prepared for three sub-areas:
   (A) West of the river and north of Colorado Avenue.
   (B) West of the river and south of Colorado Avenue.
   (C) East of the river.

(b) The Facilities Plan shall, at a minimum, include:
   (A) A map of existing and planned water and sewer facilities to serve the sub-area including line sizes, general location or routes, and how the lines will tie in with areas adjacent to the MR zone.
   (B) A map of existing and planned collector and arterial streets adjacent to the sub-area and of the general route of planned collector, arterial, and major local streets through the sub-area and where the streets will connect with the existing collector or arterial street system.
   (C) Such other utility or transportation information as the City may determine.
   (D) A written narrative that explains or describes:
      i. How the proposed water, sewer, and street system will be adequate to serve the type and size of development planned for the area;
ii. How the location and sizing of facilities on-site will be consistent with the existing and planned utilities;
iii. How adequate water flow volumes will be provided to meet fire flow and domestic demands; and
iv. The function and location of any private utility systems.

(c) The Facilities Plan shall be approved if it is determined to be consistent with the Utilities Master Plan and the Transportation Element of the Bend Area General Plan and other information required by the City.

(4) Master Development Plan. The minimum acreage for a Master Development Plan shall be ten acres unless specifically exempted as described in Section (4)(d) below. The Master Development Plan shall include maps and descriptive text as described in (a) and (b) below which shall serve as approval standards for the Master Development Plan.

(a) The Master Development Plan shall include a plan view drawing with dimensions that show the following elements and how they fit together as a functional design:
   (A) Building envelope;
   (B) Parking area location, size and access;
   (C) Access points to local streets and major street network;
   (D) Pedestrian/bicycle corridors;
   (E) Landscape areas; and
   (F) Other open space and common areas.

(b) The Master Development Plan shall demonstrate that the proposal satisfies the planning and design objectives of a mixed-use development. Such text shall address:
   (A) The expected uses to be developed and approximate square footage of building area in each category;
   (B) Creation of a stimulating and attractive mixed-use environment through the use and inter-relationship of open spaces, building locations, building scale and design, and pedestrian amenities;
   (C) Providing pedestrian access and movement to and through the site in a manner that maximizes foot traffic exposure to goods and services and minimizes conflicts with vehicle circulation areas;
   (D) Encouraging access to and enjoyment of the Deschutes River;
   (E) Providing for traffic and service vehicle circulation between on-site uses as appropriate;
   (F) Maintaining and improving the aesthetic and location advantages provided by the terrain and natural features of the site and minimize alteration thereof as much as practicable;
   (G) Reducing to a minimum any negative impacts of proposed uses on adjacent properties and ensure the livability of residential areas when applicable;
   (H) Any private development covenants, conditions or restrictions that will be recorded with the property;
   (I) Any other information the City may require;
(J) How the types and levels of uses are consistent with the planned function, capacity and level of service of transportation facilities.

(c) Upon approval of a Master Development Plan all subsequent building and site development must comply with the approved Master Development Plan and the standards and conditions in this section. Minor alterations to an approved Master Development Plan may be revised or modified as a Type II Activity using the procedures and standards in this section. A minor alteration to a Master Plan may include adjustments to local street and pedestrian corridor alignments, alterations to site design guidelines, changes to lot configurations, and the re-location of plazas and open space within the master plan area provided the approved Master Development Plan concept is not compromised.

(d) Exemptions:

(A) Properties less than ten (10) acres in size that are not a part of a previously approved and valid Master Development Plan and cannot practicably be combined with surrounding properties in the MR zone may apply independently for a Master Development Plan in accordance with Section (4)-A above; and

(B) As an alternative to sub-section (A) above, properties that were less than ten (10) acres in size on or before August 4, 1995 and that are not part of a previously approved and valid master Development Plan may develop after obtaining site plan and design review approval from the Bend Urban Area Planning Commission after demonstrating compliance with Sections 10.10.23, 10.10.23A(6)(a)(E) and 10.10.24 of the City Zoning Ordinance. The Commission shall use the master planning and design objectives set forth in Sections 10.10.21A(4)(b)(A)-(J), to the extent applicable to the subject property, when determining compliance with Section 10.10.23. Section 10.10.23A(6)(a)(E) applies to a Section (d)(B) site plan review even if Section 10.10.23(A)(6)(a)(E), by its express terms, would not otherwise apply to such an application.

(5) Permitted Uses. The following permitted uses are subject to the building and site design standards of subsection (4) of this Section. Permitted uses may be restricted or mitigation measures applied if the use conflicts with existing uses adjacent to the MR zone. Any proposed development that is on property within 100 feet of the ordinary high water mark of the Deschutes River is also subject to the design review standards in Section 22A.

**Industrial:**

(a) Manufacture, assembly, and packaging of products from previously prepared materials such as cloth, plastic, paper, leather, and precious or semi-precious metal or stone.

(b) Manufacture, assembly, and processing of food and beverages.

(c) Manufacture, assembly, and testing of communications equipment, medical instruments and apparatus, optics, photographic equipment and supplies, timing equipment, musical instruments and related equipment.

(d) Research, engineering and development facilities or laboratories.

(e) Motion picture or video production facilities and sound stages.
(f) Printing, publishing, and book binding.
(g) Warehouse, storage, and distribution center, with any retail space limited to 15% of the gross floor area or a maximum 15,000 square feet, for:
   (A) Postal and package delivery or mail order companies;
   (B) Household or consumer goods; and
   (C) Plumbing, electrical, heating, hardware and similar goods used in the construction industry.
(h) Studio for manufacturing of pottery items, metal sculpture, and other artistic products.

Commercial:
(i) Branch banks and other financial institutions designed to serve the area businesses and adjacent neighborhoods.
(j) Business support services including copying, blueprinting, film developing and processing, photo reproduction, accounting, computer services, building and grounds maintenance, security services, and temporary help.
(k) Motel, hotel or similar lodging facilities.
(l) Conference center and meeting facilities when associated with a motel, hotel or similar lodging facility.
(m) Commercial recreational facilities such as indoor theaters and athletic clubs but excluding intensive outdoor facilities such as go-cart tracks, bumper boats, BMX courses, and target ranges.
(n) Offices.
(o) Restaurants, delicatessens, cafes, and similar food service establishments excluding drive-through service.
(p) Retail sales and service businesses with less than a total of 15,000 square feet of gross floor area, but excluding the following uses:
   (A) Motor vehicle or equipment repair and painting;
   (B) Motor vehicle sales or storage;
   (C) Veterinary clinics with kennels;
   (D) Drive-up windows for motor vehicle service.
   (E) Notwithstanding the above, structures in existence at the time of the adoption of Ordinance No. NS-1636 creating the MR Zone that exceed 15,000 square feet may be leased as a single retail sales and service unit regardless of total gross floor area.
(q) Child day care centers and pre-schools subject to the special standards in Section 25(17) of this ordinance.
(r) Vocational, training, or technical schools.
(s) Automobile service stations subject to the special standards in Section 25(1) of this ordinance.

Residential:
(t) Single family detached or attached homes.
(u) Duplex, triplex, and multi-family dwellings subject to site plan and design review approval.
(v) Apartments, lofts and similar dwelling units located above ground floor commercial and industrial uses.

Miscellaneous:
(w) Utility facilities that are necessary to serve the developments within the MR zone such as power substations, pump stations, wells and reservoirs.
(x) Public facilities such as a park, library, fire station, amphitheater, and armory.
(y) Planned Unit Development (PUD) subject to the standards in Section 30 of this ordinance.
(z) Pedestrian amenities such as seating areas, drinking fountains, low level directional
(aa) Other compatible uses subject to approval by the Design Review Board.

(6) Building and Site Development Standards. In addition to the Master Development Plan approval in Section (4) the development of individual buildings and related areas shall comply with the following standards. Building and Site Development shall be processed as a Type II Activity.
(a) Deschutes River Corridor Design Review. Property within 100 feet of the ordinary high water mark of the Deschutes River shall comply with Section 10.10.22A of this ordinance.
(b) Bed and Banks of Deschutes River. Any fill or removal of material or vegetation within the bed or banks of the Deschutes River shall comply with Section 10.10.25(26) of this ordinance.
(c) Height limitations. No new building or modification to an existing building shall exceed 35 feet in height without receiving conditional use approval in Section 29.
(d) Building Design. Buildings and structures shall have architectural elements and features which are in scale with each other. The colors and exterior material of buildings within the Master Development Plan shall be compatible. Buildings housing retail uses shall provide ample window area oriented toward pedestrian walkways or plazas.
(e) Landscaping and Open Space. The design and development of landscaping and open space shall:

(A) Retain and conserve riparian vegetation within the bed and banks of the Deschutes River and adjacent to the river to the maximum extent practicable.
There shall be no net loss of natural wetlands adjacent to the river.
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(B) Emphasize the use of native trees, shrubs, or other plants adapted for survival and growth in the high desert life zone.
(C) Include street trees and parking area trees which are in scale with the development.
(D) Provide a cohesive open space and pedestrian network within the development, with appropriate connections to surrounding properties and uses.
(E) Provide pleasing transitions between uses, soften and buffer utility and loading areas, and provide pleasing textures and variety particularly next to buildings, along walkways, and within pedestrian plazas.
(F) Include open spaces and plazas which are in scale with the development and invite activity appropriate to adjoining uses.
(f) Operations within Buildings: For industrial and commercial uses all manufacturing, processing, assembling, packaging, repairing, and storing of equipment, materials and supplies shall occur within enclosed buildings. Exceptions to this requirement may be allowed as necessary to comply with state and local safety regulations.

(g) Refuse collection and recycling: Refuse collection and recycling areas for businesses shall be enclosed with a fence, wall or structure high enough to screen all collection bins.

(h) Outside mechanical equipment: Industrial or commercial heating, ventilation, air conditioning, or other mechanical equipment on rooftops or ground shall be screened with a material and design that is visually compatible with the building.

(i) Lighting: Parking lot lights, security lights, and other lights on a development site shall not exceed a height of 25 feet above the site's finish grade. All on-site lighting shall be designed to direct light down onto the site and away from adjacent residential property.

(j) Drainage: All drainage from buildings, parking/loading areas, and other impervious surfaces shall be retained on the development site or directed to a drainage facility as part of an overall drainage master plan using dry wells or other City approved method such as landscaping, retention basin, swale, or similar bio-filtration systems that are not directly connected to a surface stream or canal.

(k) Parking: Motor vehicle and bicycle parking shall comply with the standards in Section 24 of this ordinance. The following exceptions to the parking standards may be allowed if part of the approved Master Development Plan: the use of parking areas away or separated from the buildings or uses, and parallel parking on collector streets if bicycle lanes and adequate vehicle lanes are provided.

(l) Utilities: Electric power, natural gas, telephone and cable lines shall be installed underground.

(m) Signs: Directional and identification signs shall be in proportion with and visually related to the architectural character of the building and restrained in size. Pole signs are not allowed in the Mixed-use Riverfront Combining zone.

(n) Industrial Air Emissions: There shall be no emission of odorous, toxic, noxious matter, or dust in such quantities from industrial operations as to be readily detectable along or outside the MR zone boundary as to produce a public nuisance or hazard.

(o) Local Streets: Local streets approved as part of the Master Development Plan may be public or private streets. If private streets are proposed as part of a Master Development Plan, the Director shall:

(A) Ensure that public access is not restricted except as agreed to by the City.
(B) Provide adequate access for emergency vehicles and for school buses as necessary.
(C) Provide that construction standards and specifications are satisfactory to the City.
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Section 22A.2 - Deschutes River Corridor Design Review Combining Zone
(1) Purpose. It is the purpose of the Deschutes River Corridor Design Review Zone to ensure compliance with the objectives of this Ordinance and the goals and policies relating to the Deschutes River in the Bend Area General Plan. The purpose shall also be to:

(a) Recognize and respect the unusual natural beauty and character of the Deschutes River.
(b) Conserve and enhance the existing riparian zone along the Deschutes River.
(c) Allow the community flexibility in reviewing development proposals within the Areas of Special Interest that are designated on the Bend Area General Plan.
(d) Maintain the scenic quality of the canyon and rimrock areas of the Deschutes River.
(e) Conserve and enhance property values.
(f) Preserve, protect and enhance water quality.
(g) Encourage development, preservation and enhancement of reasonable public access to the river for recreational use and visual enjoyment.

(2) The following areas and uses are exempt from the Deschutes River Design Review process:

(a) Public streets and utility facilities existing as of the date of adoption of this ordinance. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this ordinance, a variance may be granted to the mandatory 40 foot setback for future public streets and utility facilities.
(b) Irrigation facilities, canals and flumes existing as of the date of adoption of this ordinance.
(c) The existing Korpine Mill operation on the east side of the Deschutes River.

(3) Design Review Procedure. All new development, structures, additions and exterior alterations to structures, including outside storage and off-street parking lots within the Deschutes River Corridor, are subject to a design review process.

(a) Prior to filing a design review application, the applicant shall confer with the Planning Department concerning the requirements of formal application.
(b) The design review application shall be filed on a form provided by the City Planning Department and shall be accompanied by drawings and information as specified by the Planning Department. Copies of the plan shall be submitted and such additional information as is deemed necessary for the Site Plan Committee or Bend Urban Area Planning Commission to adequately review the applications.
(c) The Bend Urban Area Planning Commission shall approve, approve with conditions, or disapprove the design plan. The decision of the Bend Urban Area Planning
Commission shall be final unless appealed in accordance with the City of Bend’s land use procedures.
(d) To approve a design plan the Bend Urban Area Planning Commission must find compliance with the provisions of this ordinance.

(4) Site Plan Committee. The Site Plan Committee, as designated in Section 23(3), shall review a site plan application subject to design review on its technical merits and submit recommendations for approval, conditional approval, or rejection to the Bend Urban Area Planning Commission. The Commission decision shall be based on the site plan criteria, City policies, and standards.

(5) Minimum Standards. Within the Deschutes River Corridor the following minimum standards shall apply:

(a) Building and Parking Setbacks.

(A) 100 foot setback area - For the areas described below, the setback for all new buildings, parking lots and loading areas shall be a minimum of 100 feet from the ordinary high water mark unless the Bend Urban Area Planning Commission approves a lesser setback. In no case shall the setback be less than 40 feet from the ordinary high water mark of the Deschutes River.

(i) The east and west bank from the Arizona/Commerce Street line to the southern boundary of the Bend Area General Plan map;
(ii) The east bank from the southern property line of Magill’s Landing Subdivision to the northern property line of the Bend Riverside Motel;
(iii) The east bank from the southern property line of Sawyer Park to the southern boundary of the Rimrock West Subdivision;
(iv) The east and west banks from the northern boundary of the Rimrock West subdivision to the northern boundary of the Bend Area General Plan map and
(v) The west bank north of the Park District property known as "Flume Park" to the southern boundary of the Rimrock West Subdivision. After the applicant has demonstrated through design review that the project provides at least the following:
   1. Protection of water quality, and fish and wildlife habitat;
   2. The improvement or restoration of riverfront riparian areas by the creation of new riparian vegetation areas or by improvements to existing riverfront riparian areas through appropriate plantings, and;
   3. The provision of open space along the riverfront: The Bend Urban Area Planning Commission may approve a lesser setback.

(B) Commercial Property. For all existing commercially zoned property within the Deschutes River Corridor in existence upon the adoption of this ordinance, the setback for all buildings, parking lots, and loading areas shall be 30 feet from the ordinary high water mark of the Deschutes River.
(C) Other Areas. For the areas not described in (a) (A) or (B) above, all buildings, parking lots, and loading areas shall be 40 feet from the ordinary high water mark of the Deschutes River. In no case shall the setback be less than 40 feet from the ordinary high water mark of the Deschutes River.

(b) Features in Building Setback Area. Within the 30, 40 and 100 foot building setback area, required in (a) (A), (B) and (C) above, the Bend Urban Area Planning Commission may approve features to enhance or support public use. Such features may include sidewalks, trails, utility facilities, streets and bridges crossing the river, boardwalks, decks, plazas, outdoor cafe seating areas, utilities, lights, bike racks, trash and recycling receptacles, furniture, bank stabilization structures, fences, art work, stairs, bike and pedestrian bridges, boat launch facilities, and vendor carts as defined by Bend Code Section 7.516. The placement and uses shall be subject to the criteria in Section 6.

(c) Rebuilding of Existing Structures. This setback restriction shall not prohibit rebuilding an existing structure provided that the rebuilt structure is comparable in size, profile, use and location to the structure that previously existed. The term "new development" shall not include rebuilding an existing structure provided that the rebuilt structure is comparable in size, profile, use and location to the structure that previously existed.

(d) Building Heights. Maximum structure height shall be limited to 30 feet at the minimum setback line. The Bend Urban Area Planning Commission may allow increases in building heights up to the allowed height in the underlying zone the farther the building sets back from the river. The Bend Urban Area Planning Commission may limit building height the closer to the river a building is allowed. The building height shall be measured from the lowest natural grade facing the river to the highest measurable point on or projecting from the roof of the structure.

(6) Site and Design Review Criteria. In addition to the minimum standards above, the Bend Urban Area Planning Commission shall review the development using the following design criteria:

(a) Conservation of natural features. Major rock outcrops, stands of trees, riparian areas, or other prominent natural features are an important part of the visual character and quality of the community. The Bend Urban Area Planning Commission shall review the applicant's proposal for impacts on these resources and may limit the amount of removal, require additional screening, or moving or reducing in size the development addition or structure in order to preserve to the greatest extent possible, existing natural features.

(b) Compatibility with existing area. The Bend Urban Area Planning Commission shall consider the relationship of the proposed development with the existing surroundings, in terms of building bulk, height, location, separation, shape, parking areas, lighting, fences, landscaping, open space, visual and physical corridors to the river and adjacent land use.
(c) Colors and Materials. The Bend Urban Area Planning Commission shall consider colors and materials. The Bend Urban Area Planning Commission may require new structures and additions to existing structures to be finished in muted earth tones that blend with and reduce contrast with the surrounding vegetation and landscape of the building site or colors that are compatible with adjacent buildings.

(d) No large areas, including roofs, shall be finished with bright or reflective materials. Metal roofing material is permitted if it is non-reflective and of a color which blends with the surrounding vegetation and landscape.

(e) The Bend Urban Area Planning Commission may establish increased setbacks, limitations of building heights, and limitations on the bulk and length of buildings, limitations on lighting, landscaping, fences, size and shape of windows facing the river, size and location of parking, and outdoor storage areas and any other improvement or use listed in 5 (a) and (b) above in order to carry out the purpose of this ordinance.

(f) For projects proposing development within the setback area, the Bend Urban Area Planning Commission may consider the degree to which the project provides public access along the riverfront, and may require the dedication of public access on an individualized determination that the required access is reasonably related to the project, and that the required dedication is also roughly proportional to the impact of the proposed project.

(g) For projects incorporating a setback less than 100 feet the BUAPC may required enhanced site landscaping, minimum corridors between buildings, variations in building setbacks, size or bulk of facades and may impose any other conditions of approval reasonably required to meet the purposes of this ordinance.
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The “Riverfront Renaissance” project is focused on the Cedar River as it runs through downtown Waterloo. The city hopes redevelopment along the river, including a high-tech agribusiness, a facility, urban housing, and commercial development, will attract and keep young workers. A multi-story apartment building with retail on the main floor will anchor a new pedestrian plaza, and a condominium project will occupy the other side of the river. Federal and State brownfield grants are being used to clean up riverfront industrial areas, and the City received a $7.3 million grant from Vision Iowa. The money will help develop a riverfront trial loop, large pedestrian plaza, and amphitheater. Overlay zoning is in progress.

It is a broad overview of issues confronting riverfront development and redevelopment. Chapters focus on design, transformation, environmental issues, and startup issues. The second half of the text features thirteen case studies from urban areas around the world that include land use, funding sources, and project participants. An interesting look at larger cities which mostly have historical precedent for waterfront usage, many of the case studies are on seaports and not rivers.

The group used a VPS to determine appropriate riverbank reconstruction with the goal of beautification and enhancement of the landscape. The overall goal was to integrate the City with the river by establishing viewing corridors. Their riverbank was also hampered by limited public access, engineered banks, and industrial surroundings. They identified a need for lighting, benches, emergency phones, toilets, trash cans, and water fountains in order to sustain people using the area. The methodology used was to perform a site assessment, conduct the VPS, conduct interviews with stakeholders and professionals, examine case studies, and research funding sources.

This was a study for redevelopment proposal very similar to ours, but on a much grander scale near downtown Portland. The goals of the study were to identify the public and private actions necessary to stimulate new development, and to create implementation strategies to make the project happen. Emmons researched the area’s strengths and weaknesses, met with officials, citizens, and other stakeholders, and created a vision for the area. This redevelopment was focused on a mixed use neighborhood.
In 1998 the Kansas City, Missouri approved a Riverfront Tax Increment Financing Plan. Under this, the TIF commission may claim up to 5% of the TIF revenue stream as incidental cost to the project. The costs eligible for the TIF reimbursement include environmental remediation, infrastructure, structured parking, extraordinary hard building costs and site improvement cost. The Kansas City Riverfront has also been accepted into the Missouri Brownfields' Redevelopment Plan and is eligible for tax credits for clean up as well as grants for infrastructure.

Spurred by a flooding disaster (and the FEMA money that followed it), the city of Stamford rethought their land management plan for an area around the Mill River. The goal of this plan was primarily to reclaim open space within the flood zone, but it also served to clarify the future of the area. The city was able to extend and improve its park system, and spark some redevelopment in adjacent downtown areas. Public funds were used to clear some parcels, and others were cleared by private firms and donated to the city in exchange for FAR bonuses on other projects.

This short article highlights several success stories from cities that have undergone urban river restoration projects. Included throughout the piece are general recommendations for the undertaking.

A series of statements about riverfronts and riverfront development, meant to guide decision-makers toward solutions that respect the environment and the citizens affected by the project.

Dubuque has under taken a $188 million project to completely revitalize one area of the waterfront. Funded jointly by the City, the County, non-profit organizations, private donations, and a $40 million Vision Iowa grant, the project features a hotel resort with water park, a conference center, museums, amphitheater, and river walk. Dubuque is seeing a “ripple effect” in redevelopment, as this project was spurred by development on the opposite shore and in their downtown.

The Eastbank Esplanade is located in a gritty, urban environment between the riverbank and the freeway. While acknowledging the industrial aesthetic of the area, the historic drawbridges, and the steel and concrete character of the Eastbank trail, the City has
erected Urban Markers that are also a beacon to the future evolutionary urban changes of the riverfront. Eastbank story panels graphically portray the changes that have occurred along Portland's waterfront, including historic photographs of the intact city fabric and the active commercial waterfront prior to the freeway's construction. The Urban Markers and interpretive panels provide the opportunity for trail users to stop, visualize and consider the value of informed decision-making in the creation of a livable city. However brief the presentation of information, the topics are certain to spark curiosity and conversation about Portland and its river.

The author outlines the steps necessary to plan for a change of land use on riverfront property. He points out the need for environmental remediation, increased accessibility, and a collective planning approach. The author promotes a variety of mixed-use projects, and states repeatedly that housing, manufacture, and open space can coexist if carefully designed. Most importantly, he stresses the need for visioning projects that give the community a clear sense of the future of the waterfront.

This author maintains that zoning is the primary tool for setting a community’s priorities for land use, and that waterfront properties present a heightened need for control. The article discusses the use of overlay zones for waterfront development and conditional use permits, and highlights some pitfalls of requiring water-related uses. Schwab’s main point is that the creation of waterfront zones and design guidelines can be an effective tool to put community priorities into motion – but only if those priorities are thought out.
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