Cedar Falls Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting
September 23, 2026
Cedar Falls, Iowa

MINUTES

The Cedar Falls Planning and Zoning Commission met in regular session on September 23, 2026, at 5:30 p.m. at City Hall. The following Commission members were present: Fischer, Grybovych, Johnson, Koger, Moser, Stalnaker, and Watkins. Hartley was absent. Karen Howard, Planning and Community Services Manager, Shane Graham, Economic Development Coordinator, Thomas Weintraut, Planner III, Chris Sevy, Planner II, and Michelle Pezley, Planner III, were also present.

1.) Chair Stalnaker noted the Minutes from the September 9, 2026 regular meeting are presented. Grybovych made a motion to approve the Minutes as presented. Fischer seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously with 7 ayes (Fischer, Grybovych, Johnson, Koger, Moser, Stalnaker, and Watkins), and 0 nays.

2.) The first item of business was the University Avenue Corridor Urban Renewal Plan. Chair Stalnaker introduced the item and Mr. Graham provided background information. He explained that this would create an urban renewal area around The Mall at College Square. Staff has been working with the new owner who is planning to do some improvements and redevelopment to the property. The City can help by establishing a TIF District, which will allow the City to offer incentives for any improved value that the project creates. He provided state code requirements and discussed the project's conformance with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Graham explained that the objectives are to eliminate blighting influences and promote revitalization; encourage growth and expansion of commercial enterprises within the City; provide a more marketable and attractive investment climate; achieve a well-balanced economy that will provide a desirable standard of living; and to strengthen the tax base. To help meet the objectives in the plan, the City proposes to enter into a development agreement with the mall owner to provide tax rebates on any increased taxable value created. This agreement will go to City Council at a future Council meeting.

Staff finds that the proposed objectives and activities for the University Avenue Corridor Urban Renewal Plan are in conformance with the general plan for the development of the municipality as a whole. Staff recommends that the Commission find that the Urban Renewal plan is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan.

Watkins asked how this is tied to the existing structure. For example, if a portion of the structure is torn down, is the TIF money directly attached to it as it currently exists. Mr. Graham explained that when a TIF District is established it freezes the taxable value at that point and anything added after that is what is collected and can be rebated to the developer.

Stalnaker stated that he is excited about the improvement to this area.

Fischer made a motion to approve the item. Johnson seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously with 7 ayes (Fischer, Grybovych, Johnson, Koger, Moser, Stalnaker, and Watkins), and 0 nays.

3.) The next item of business was an easement vacation for West Fork Crossing. Chair Stalnaker introduced the item and Ms. Pezley provided background information. She explained that the applicant would like to remove the utility and drainage easement to allow for a fence to be

built. She discussed the criteria for easement vacations and explained that the application meets the criteria. Staff recommends approval of the utility and drainage easement vacation.

Grybovych made a motion to approve the item. Moser seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously with 7 ayes (Fischer, Grybovych, Johnson, Koger, Moser, Stalnaker, and Watkins), and 0 nays.

4.) The Commission then considered a request for a zoning code text amendment regarding personal service uses in neighborhood frontages in CD-DT. Chair Stalnaker introduced the item and Mr. Sevy provided background information. He explained that a business at 215 Franklin Street invested in converting a former counseling office space to a tattoo parlor, which is a Personal Service use, and not allowed in Neighborhood Frontages. The City was unaware of this until a sign permit application was submitted, creating an unexpected conflict with the zoning rules. The unforeseen circumstance provides an opportunity to refine the Downtown Character District Code while maintaining neighborhood character.

Mr. Sevy provided policy context and discussed the issue, which is that there is no mechanism to allow Personal Services in existing office buildings despite the compatibility and preservation benefits. He spoke about the proposed amendment and how it will affect the area. Staff recommends discussing the proposed amendment and setting a public hearing for October 14, 2026.

Johnson asked about other personal service uses that might have a higher customer service count and create more parking needs. Mr. Sevy provided examples such as nail salons, hair salons, massage therapy, tattoo, etc. It was pointed out that some office uses also have higher parking needs than others.

Moser asked if there is a way to avoid having this situation in the future, where Planning is unaware of businesses that may be going into an area that is not properly zoned for their purpose. Mr. Sevy explained that a little better communication with other departments could help with this. Ms. Howard also feels that more education in the community would help. Realtors and anyone that is going to be changing the use of a building should check in with the City to find out what the requirements are for their project before putting a great deal of money into it.

Watkins asked about restrictions to hours of operation. The business owner came forward to clarify that they have minimum traffic as the majority of their appointments are for several hours at a time and they typically close around 6:00 p.m., making them similar to office uses.

Fischer made a motion to set a public hearing. Johnson seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously with 7 ayes (Fischer, Grybovych, Johnson, Koger, Moser, Stalnaker, and Watkins), and 0 nays.

5.) The next item for consideration by the Commission was a request to rezone 20.64 ± acres at the northwest corner of the intersection of Hudson Road and West Ridgeway Avenue from A-1 Agriculture District to HWY-1 Highway Commercial District and associated Land Use Map Amendment. Chair Stalnaker introduced the item and Mr. Weintraut provided background information. He explained that the intent is to have five lots for commercial use and he displayed the land use map of changes being proposed. He discussed the criteria for rezoning, which includes consistency with the Future Land Use Map. Staff recommends the approval of the amendment to the Future Land Use Map, as well as approval of the rezoning of the property.

Moser made a motion to approve the rezoning and land use amendment. Watkins seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously with 7 ayes (Fischer, Grybovych, Johnson, Koger, Moser, Stalnaker, and Watkins), and 0 nays.

6.) The Commission next considered a rezoning request for 0.3 acres within West Fork Crossing Subdivision from R-P Planned Residential to R-1 Residential. Chair Stalnaker introduced the item and Ms. Pezley provided background information. The rezoning is intended to prevent split zoning on lots in the new subdivision. She provided a list of what was discussed and that the application meets the criteria for a rezoning and stated that staff recommends approval of the rezoning.

Grybovych made a motion to approve the item. Johnson seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously with 7 ayes (Fischer, Grybovych, Johnson, Koger, Moser, Stalnaker, and Watkins), and 0 nays.

7.) The next item for consideration by the Commission was a preliminary plat for West Fork Crossing. Chair Stalnaker introduced the item and Ms. Pezley provided background information. She explained that this item was discussed at the last meeting and asked if there are any questions. Staff recommended approval of the preliminary plat.

Watkins recused herself from the item and left the meeting.

Fischer made a motion to approve the item. Grybovych seconded the motion. The motion was approved with 6 ayes (Fischer, Grybovych, Johnson, Koger, Moser and Stalnaker), 1 abstention (Watkins) and 0 nays.

8.) As there were no further comments, Johnson made a motion to adjourn. Grybovych seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously with 6 ayes (Fischer, Grybovych, Johnson, Koger, Moser, and Stalnaker), and 0 nays.

The meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Howard
Community Services Manager

Joanne Goodrich
Administrative Assistant