

Ryan Waller

From: Ryan Waller
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2018 6:39 PM
To: Steven Richardson
Cc: Kelly Shaw; Ryan Waller
Subject: Re: Questions on Abatement

Good evening, Mr. Richardson.

I hope you are well and staying cool. Thanks for your latest emails. Below, inserted in your email, please find responses in **BOLD/CAPS**.

You sent an additional email at 7:53 pm yesterday (Sunday, August 12th). I will be sending a response shortly following the same format noted above. Please be on the lookout for that response.

Thank you again!

Have a great evening!

Ryan



Ryan J. Waller
City Manager
rwaller@indianolaiowa.gov
p: [515.962.5274](tel:515.962.5274)
[110 N. 1st Street – Indianola, Iowa 50125](#)

From: Steven Richardson <mustangsoa954@gmail.com>
Date: Aug 12, 2018 at 7:35 PM
To: Ryan Waller <rwaller@indianolaiowa.gov>
Cc: Kelly Shaw <kshaw@indianolaiowa.gov>
Subject: Re: Questions on Abatement

Hi Ryan,

Hope you had a good weekend as well. Thank you for the information. I definitely understand the differences in uses. Many years ago I served as a zoning administrator for a small community and learned much about different property uses. I apologize but I am trying to get a handle on this issue. I have a couple more questions.

Perhaps I am missing something and please help me to understand. According to the Resolution's 11th "Whereas" incompatible land uses goes into the section for blight. Correct? **I AM NOT SURE I UNDERSTAND THIS QUESTION.**

You mention uses in your reply to my last e-mail but the map you sent shows I am outside the blighted area you earlier described. **AS REFERENCED EARLIER, THE BLIGHT REPORT NOTED THAT RESIDENTIAL USES BEING ADJACENT TO NON-RESIDENTIAL USES IS THE JUSTIFICATION. YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD IS ADJACENT TO NON RESIDENTIAL USES TO THE SOUTH AND THE NORTH, WITH YOUR PARCEL LOCATED NEXT TO A NON RESIDENTIAL USE.** I am not sure I got an answer to what designation applies to my property to be put into the "Area" in the resolution. My home was not previously in the Urban Renewal area. Resolution 2018-132 changed that by putting the entire city in the Urban Renewal area. **THE URBAN RENEWAL PLAN WAS NOT AMENDED BY THE RESOLUTION YOU NOTED. THIS RESOLUTION AMENDED THE URBAN REVITALIZATION PLAN. YOUR PROPERTY HAS BEEN INCLUDED IN THE URBAN REVITALIZATION PLAN SINCE AT LEAST 2009.** It greatly expanded the area. I did not receive anything by mail indicating my property would now be part of the Urban Renewal area nor was I notified by mail that a hearing would be taking place on such a change. Since it was not the original area and a significant change to the area, doesn't Iowa Code Section 404.2 Subsections 1-6, require those things to happen, among many other things? **THIS WAS AN AMENDMENT TO THE URBAN REVITALIZATION PLAN ONLY. THE URBAN REVITALIZATION AREA HAD BEEN ESTABLISHED YEARS AGO BY ORDINANCE. BECAUSE THIS WAS AN AMENDMENT TO THE PLAN (ABATEMENT SCHEDULE), THE ONLY NOTICE REQUIRED IS THE PUBLISHED NOTICE BY IOWA CODE SECTION 404.2(6).**

Thanks again for your answers.

Steve Richardson

On Fri, Aug 10, 2018 at 5:38 PM Ryan Waller <rwaller@indianolaiowa.gov> wrote:
Mr. Richardson,

As promised, resending my response to you from August 6, 2018. There are three attachments that accompanied this email and are also reattached to this email. These attachments are the executed Resolution approving the Urban Revitalization Plan, a map showing your property in relation to the two non-residential land uses and a copy of the FAQ document on this matter that may also be found on the city's website and social media accounts.

Thank you again for contacting us.

Have a great weekend.

Ryan



Ryan J. Waller
City Manager
rwaller@indianolaiowa.gov
p: [515.962.5274](tel:515.962.5274)
110 N. 1st Street – Indianola, Iowa 50125

Begin forwarded message:

From: Ryan Waller <rwaller@indianolaiowa.gov>
Date: Aug 6, 2018 at 2:53 PM
To: Mustangsoa954 <mustangsoa954@gmail.com>
Cc: Kelly Shaw <kshaw@indianolaiowa.gov>, Andy Lent <alent@indianolaiowa.gov>, Ryan Waller <rwaller@indianolaiowa.gov>
Subject: RE: Questions on Abatement

Good afternoon, Mr. Richardson.

I hope you had a great weekend. Thank you for the follow-up email. I have provided responses to your questions within the body of the email below. The responses may be found in **BOLD CAPS**. Also, attached, please find a few documents that are provided to be responsive to some of your questions. One of the documents is a copy of the resolution adopting the amended plan and the other is a copy of a FAQ document that has been prepared to respond to questions regarding the Urban Revitalization Program.

Thank you again for contacting us.

Have a great day.

Ryan

From: Steven Richardson <mustangsoa954@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 04, 2018 6:31 AM
To: Ryan Waller <rwaller@indianolaiowa.gov>
Cc: Kelly Shaw <kshaw@indianolaiowa.gov>; Andy Lent <alent@indianolaiowa.gov>
Subject: Re: Questions on Abatement

Thanks Ryan. While I live close to the the area bounded by the streets you mention, it is not my specific area of the community. **THE SECTION PROVIDED IS AN EXAMPLE WITH THE MAIN POINT THE CONSULTANT NOTED IS THAT THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NON-RESIDENTIAL USES AND RESIDENTIAL USES CAN IMPACT THE QUALITY AND GROWTH OF HOUSING IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD. THEY NOTE THAT THE ADJACENT NON-RESIDENTIAL USES COULD BE A CONTRIBUTING FACTOR. I HAVE ATTACHED A PRINT OUT HIGHLIGHTING YOUR PROPERTY WHICH HAS THE PARTICULAR AREA NOTED PREVIOUSLY TO THE SOUTH WITH OTHER NON-RESIDENTIAL USES ADJACENT TO THE NORTH. I HAVE DONE THIS AS IT HELPS ILLUSTRATE THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN USES.** If I read your letter correctly, and please do correct me if I am wrong, there is nothing specific the Council can point to in other areas of the community that constitute blight? **THIS WAS NOT STATED IN MY EMAIL RESPONSE. WHILE BLIGHT HAS BEEN MADE THE FOCUS OF THE RECENT AMENDMENT, BLIGHT IS ONLY ONE OF SEVERAL ITEMS THAT STATE CODE IDENTIFIES AS CRITERIA FOR AN URBAN REVITALIZATION PLANS. THESE CRITERIA ARE INCLUDED IN THE FAQ DOCUMENT.** If there are specific things for our particular area, again I would appreciate knowing what those issues would be.

One last question, since this was a change in a City Ordinance did the Council wave the usual three readings or had those already taken place as well? **THE PROGRAM WAS ADOPTED BY A RESOLUTION AND NOT AN ORDINANCE. THESE MATERIALS WERE ALL PREPARED BY LEGAL COUNSEL. I HAVE ATTACHED A COPY OF THE RESOLUTION FOR YOUR REFERENCE.**

Thank you again for the information.

Steve Richardson

On Fri, Aug 3, 2018 at 5:31 PM, Ryan Waller <rwaller@indianolaiaowa.gov> wrote:

Good afternoon, all.

I hope this find everyone well. We appreciate the questions below and hope that this email is helpful in responding to those questions.

The tax abatement program was adopted via a resolution at the July 16th City Council meeting, was signed and is in full effect. The attached spreadsheets provide application of this new program as requested below. Please note that you will find two different scenarios – one using the suggested 60% rollback number below and one using the current rollback rate of 55.62%. Also, for illustration purposes only (given the requested comparisons values of \$500k and \$1mil) we used a recently approved plat where those valued homes have been suggested.

In response to the second question, the consultants that performed the blight assessment noted the relationship between the non-residential uses and the residential uses in the neighborhood bordered by N. 5th Street on the west, E. Euclid Avenue on the north, E. 9th Street on the east, and E. Ashland Avenue on the south that created the existence of blight. The example that they specifically referenced is the dust, truck traffic and noise that is generated by the non-residential uses in that particular neighborhood. In this particular neighborhood, the consultants calculated the percentage of blight as 26%. It has been shared during council meetings that while references are made to percentages there are no guidelines from the State or other entities (including the Iowa Supreme Court) stipulating a required percentage threshold.

Thank you again for the email.

Have a great weekend.

Sincerely,

Ryan



Ryan J. Waller

City Manager

rwaller@indianolaiowa.gov

p: 515.962.5274

110 N. 1st Street – Indianola, Iowa 50125

From: Kelly Shaw

Sent: Thursday, August 02, 2018 12:44 PM

To: Andy Lent <alent@indianolaiowa.gov>; Ryan Waller <rwaller@indianolaiowa.gov>

Cc: mustangsoa954@gmail.com

Subject: Fw: Questions on Abatement

Dear Andy and Ryan,

Please see the email below from Mr. Steven Richardson regarding the tax abatement program that is in the process of being passed by Council in August. Mr. Richardson's numbers look accurate to me. Though the 60% rollback is not as aggressive as the Iowa Legislature's current rollback, per his question the 60% figure can be used to make comparisons at the \$500K and \$1MK price points per his question.

Ryan, I believe you are better positioned to answer the second question from Mr. Richardson. While I recall Chuck Burgin's presentation, I don't believe I've seen the legal opinion from the attorney to explain the second question. I recall the blight study found that the city had a blight percentage at 16% and change, below the state suggested rate of 25% for a more aggressive abatement, so I'm curious about these questions, too.

Please copy Mr. Richardson, cc: here, and myself to your response. Mr. Richardson is a former council member in Indianola, and state representatives in the Iowa House, so he should be familiar with the language surrounding abatements and Iowa law.

Thanks in advance,

Kelly

From: Steven Richardson <mustangsoa954@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 1, 2018 6:42 PM
To: Kelly Shaw
Subject: Questions on Abatement

Hi Kelly,

I have a question regarding the tax abatement passed by the City Council. If someone would choose to build a one million dollar house under the abatement program, what would the aggregate tax savings be for that house and owners? If my rough calculations are correct, and they are rough, the aggregate savings to the owners would be around \$65,000 in 5 years. I based that number on a 60% residential rollback, a \$37.50 aggregate tax rate for City, County, Schools and misc, taxing entities. Could you ask the proper number cruncher and get me the correct number? I would also like the info on a 500,000 home too. Of course the numbers would change as the State changes the rollback percentages in future years.

Second question: I live on 6th Street Place right next to Dayton Park. Based on the state law as to what constitutes a blighted area, can the city tell me specifically what it is in our neighborhood that triggers the blighted label? I believe there has to be more than one of the criteria met in order to get the designation, so I would like to know what was pinpointed in our neighborhood. Did anyone ask how does that designation affect our property values?



Thanks for your consideration

Steve Richardson