

FACTSHEET

TITLE: CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 14011

BOARD/COMMITTEE: Planning Commission

APPLICANT: ESP on behalf of Elsey Partners

RECOMMENDATION: Approval (8-0: Beecham, Sunderman, Corr, Hove, Cornelius, Scheer, Weber and Harris voting 'yes'; Lust absent)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

OTHER DEPARTMENTS AFFECTED: Urban Development

SPONSOR: Planning Department

OPPONENTS: Yes (See Minutes, p.14-16)

REASON FOR LEGISLATION:

To change the zoning from B-3 Commercial District, R-4 Residential District and I-1 Industrial District to R-8 Residential District, on property generally located at North 10th Street and Y Street.

DISCUSSION / FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. This change of zone request and the associated amendment to the Antelope Valley Redevelopment Plan and Special Permit No. 14008 to approve the "1100 Y Street Community Unit Plan" were heard at the same time before the Planning Commission.
2. The purpose of this change of zone request is to allow the development of the 1100 Y Street Community Unit Plan for 126 dwelling units on approximately 2.2 acres, generally located at North 10th Street and Y Street.
3. The staff recommendation of approval is based upon the "Analysis" as set forth on p.6-8, concluding that this location is the southern edge of the North Bottoms Neighborhood and is a transition area between Downtown Lincoln and the single-family neighborhood. R-8 zoning is appropriate on the edge of the North Bottoms Neighborhood and will serve as a transition zone. The proposed zoning change will replace industrial zoning adjacent to residential dwellings with residential zoning, which is appropriate and encouraged by the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. The staff presentation is found on p.11-13,
4. The applicant's testimony is found on p.12-13. Other testimony in support is found on p.13-14.
5. Testimony in opposition is found on p.14-16. This change of zone is a condition of approval of the associated community unit plan approved by the Planning Commission. The issues and concerns of the opposition include inappropriate development in an older, historic neighborhood; lack of green space; reverting the work done with neighborhood design standards to protect the core neighborhoods; traffic; parking; and the potential for phase 2 of the development.
4. The response by the applicant is found on p.16-18.
5. On May 28, 2014, the Planning Commission agreed with the staff recommendation and voted 8-0 to recommend approval of this change of zone request (See Minutes, p.18-20).
6. On May 28, 2014, the Planning Commission also voted 7-1 to recommend approval of the associated Text Amendment No. 14004 and Text Amendment No. 14005; voted 8-0 to find the proposed amendment to the Antelope Valley Redevelopment Plan to be in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan; and voted 8-0 to adopt Resolution No. PC-01397 approving Special Permit No. 14008, the 1100 Y Street Community Unit Plan. The special permit has not been appealed to the City Council.

FACTSHEET PREPARED BY: Jean Preister, Administrative Officer

DATE: June 9, 2014

REVIEWED BY: Marvin Krout, Director of Planning

DATE: June 9, 2014

LINCOLN/LANCASTER COUNTY PLANNING STAFF REPORT

for May 28, 2014 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

PROJECT #: Change of Zone No. 14011

PROPOSAL: From B-3 Commercial District, R-4 Residential District and I-1 Industrial District to R-8 Residential District

LOCATION: The north side of Y Street located between N. 10th Street and N. 12th Street.

LAND AREA: 2.2 acres, more or less

EXISTING ZONING: B-3 Commercial District, R-4 Residential District and I-1 Industrial District

CONCLUSION: This location is the southern edge of the North Bottoms Neighborhood and is a transition area between Downtown Lincoln and the single-family neighborhood. R-8 zoning is appropriate on the edge of the North Bottoms Neighborhood and will serve as a transition zone. The proposed zoning change will replace industrial zoning adjacent to residential dwellings with residential zoning, which is appropriate and encouraged by the goals of the Comprehensive Plan.

<u>RECOMMENDATION:</u>	Approval
-------------------------------	----------

GENERAL INFORMATION:

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 16-30, Block 15, Cahn, Metcalf and Farwell's, Lincoln, Lancaster County, Nebraska.

EXISTING LAND USE: Single-family dwellings and vacant property

SURROUNDING LAND USE AND ZONING:

North: Parking Lot/Single-Family Dwellings; B-3/R-4
South: Parking Lot/Railroad Tracks; P/I-1
East: Parking Lot/Railroad Tracks; P
West: Commercial/Single-Family Dwellings/Steel Fabrication Facility; B-3/R-4/I-1

ASSOCIATED APPLICATIONS:

SP14008 - Special Permit for a Community Unit Plan
CPC14011 - Antelope Valley Redevelopment Plan Amendment
TX14004 - Text Amendment to allow a Community Unit Plan in the R-7 and R-8 zoning districts
TX14005 - Text Amendment to assign density ratios for a Community Unit Plan in the R-7 and R-8 zoning districts

HISTORY:

This site was rezoned from I Commercial District , B Two-Family Dwelling District and K Light Industrial District to B-3 Commercial District, R-4 Residential District and I-1 Industrial District with the 1979 zoning update.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN SPECIFICATIONS:

P. 1.9 - This site is shown as Commercial and Urban Density Residential on the Future Land Use Map.

P. 1.6 - Approximately 16% of new dwelling units will be built within the existing City, with about 3,000 in the Downtown and Antelope Valley areas, 1,000 in existing neighborhood, and 4,000 in mixed use redevelopment nodes and corridors.

P. 1.7 - **Subarea Planning Process.** Subarea planning for neighborhoods or other small geographic areas can address issues at a more refined scale than can be included in LPlan 2040. Subarea plans may then become incorporated into LPlan 2040 through a formal adoption process. Subarea plans can serve as an official guide for elected decision makers, individuals and various City or County departments to promote improvements in areas such as land use, housing, transportation, parks and recreation, public safety, infrastructure and the built and natural environments.

P. 2.4 - Generation Y, the children of the Baby Boomers (those born between 1977 and 1004) also express a desire for a more urban setting that includes access to transit, proximity to amenities such as shopping and dining, and smaller dwellings that don't require a great deal of time spent on maintenance.

P. 2.5 - The City of Lincoln and the University of Nebraska have undertaken several major efforts in the West Haymarket, Antelope Valley and Innovation Campus areas over the past decade that include and encourage the development of residential infill and redevelopment projects.

P. 2.8 - Mixed use redevelopment, adaptive reuse and well-designed and appropriately-placed infill development, including residential, commercial and retail uses, are encouraged.

P. 2.9 - More compact, dense development clusters allow for savings in public infrastructure cost and improved accessibility to jobs, goods and services.

P. 4.4 - The community has also expressed its interest in good urban design through the Neighborhood Design Standards for infill development in older residential neighborhoods.

P. 4.8 - The project site is near the I-180 Primary Entryway Corridor.

P. 6.1 - The primary focus for new dwelling units is the "Greater Downtown" which includes Downtown property, Antelope Valley, the Haymarket and Innovation Campus.

P. 7.2 - Guiding Principles.

Provide flexibility to the marketplace in siting future residential development locations.

Strive for predictability for neighborhoods and developers for residential development and redevelopment.

P. 7.8 - New construction should continue the architectural variety (in existing neighborhoods), but in a manner that is sensitive to the existing neighborhoods.

P. 7.8 - Residential redevelopment in existing neighborhoods tends to occur naturally without public intervention over a long period of time, as individual properties become obsolete or are acquired piecemeal by private or nonprofit developers.

P. 7.9 - Strategies for Redevelopment in Existing Neighborhoods.

Promote the preservation, maintenance and renovation of existing housing and neighborhoods throughout the city, with special emphasis on low and moderate income neighborhoods.

Maintain and enhance infrastructure and services in existing neighborhoods.

Encourage increased density of existing apartment complexes and special needs housing where there is land available for additional buildings or expansions.

Recognize that broad economic diversity within existing neighborhoods encourages reinvestment and improves quality of life for all residents while acknowledging the need for affordable housing. Preserve, protect and promote the character and unique features of urban neighborhoods, including their historical and architectural elements.

P. 7.10 - Detailed Strategies for Existing Neighborhoods.

Similar uses on the same block face

Similar housing types face each other: single family faces single family, change to different use at rear of lot

Redevelopment and infill should strive for compatibility with the character of the neighborhood and adjacent uses (i.e., parking at rear, similar setback, height and land use).

Encourage a mix of housing types all within one area

Encourage retention of single-family uses where appropriate in order to maintain mix of housing

Maintain existing pattern of streets for connectivity

Encourage alley access and shared driveways to parking areas in order to reduce interruptions to pedestrian traffic, to preserve on street parking capacity, and to reduce automobile conflict points

P. 10.18 - The BNSF railroad is shown near this site on the Existing Rail Lines Map.

P. 12.16 - **Subarea Planning.** The Comprehensive Plan provides broad guidance for achieving the community's stated Vision. Putting details to the Plan takes additional effort. One means of doing this is through the preparation of subarea plans. Subarea plans offer greater details about the intended future of an area of the community - including land uses, infrastructure requirements, and development policies and standards. Many of these subarea plans are prepared by the City-County Planning Department, while some are prepared by other agencies and departments.

ANTELOPE VALLEY REDEVELOPMENT PLAN SPECIFICATIONS:

P. 44 - **Antelope Valley Projects.** Enhancement of residential neighborhoods with proper balance of new residential housing products and reinvestment in quality housing stock.

P. 48 - **Future Market Potentials.** Development must be made possible but also guided through the adoption of targeted but flexible planning and zoning regulations and initiatives tailored to the area. Modifications in the zoning regulations should be adopted for Antelope Valley that includes flexible setback requirements, density maximums and other policies that encourage specific development types but also make the area attractive to developers.

P. 49 - **Market Assumptions.** The Redevelopment Plan assumes a projected build-out as shown below:

Townhouse: 424 units

Single Family: 360 units

Multi Family: 2,085 units

P. 50 - The studies completed by Concord and ERA suggest a demand for high quality multi-unit housing, for students on and off-campus, young professionals, empty nesters and others seeking to live and work in a vital, walkable urban environment. This market demand will help drive the redevelopment process as new high quality residential environments are infused into Lincoln revitalizing the community.

P. 54 - This area is shown as Medium Density Neighborhood and Low Density Conservation District on the Future Land Use Map.

P. 55 - **Neighborhoods.** New construction will be invited and encouraged provided primary emphasis is given to the preservation of existing buildings. The design of such new space should enhance and contribute to the aesthetic character and function of the existing buildings and the surrounding neighborhood form.

P. 60 - **Medium Density.** While current quality housing structures should continue, this category envisions replacement of lesser quality housing structures with new quality housing products. These blocks are to have a higher density to capitalize on the public improvements by providing greater activity and overall sense of community. This category should fade in density and character to blend seamlessly with the adjacent neighborhoods.

P. 63 - **Low Density Conservation.** The Conservation District designation means more emphasis should be placed on renovation rather than new construction. New housing products would be allowed, but generally only to replace the

lesser quality housing structures that cannot be economically updated. All new and renovating construction should meet design criteria to ensure fulfillment of the traditional neighborhood ambiance.

P. 66 - **General Principals.** More choices, new residential products, compaction, unique attributes, easy walking distance, open spaces, public spaces, conservation, economic development, commercial buildings, economic restructuring, sustainability, public services, regional services, broad support, participation, public decisions and incentives.

P. 72 - **Neighborhood Enhancements Projects.** Improve important pedestrian and vehicular corridors, investigate existing housing or buildings which should be preserved, investigate existing housing which has been negatively impacted by past modifications, identify existing housing of acceptable quality, but needing maintenance improvements, identify existing properties in key commercial areas with land values that are lower than average, identify the few instances of blighted and dilapidated housing, purchase and clear the property, and either replat it to adjacent property owners or redevelop it into new mixed density housing.

P. 73 - **Residential Redevelopment and Housing Rehabilitation.** For the Neighborhood Enhancement Principles to be implemented, it will require site acquisition, relocation, demolition, construction and site preparation.

P. 73 - **Acquisition of Substandard Housing and Commercial/Industrial Structures.** Substandard housing and commercial/industrial structures contributing to substandard and blighting influences in the Redevelopment Areas, including structures that are inconsistent or incompatible with existing land uses, will be acquired and parcels made available for redevelopment.

P. 74b - **Streetscape Project in the North Bottoms Neighborhood.** The Plan identifies a streetscape project on 10th Street, between the viaduct (just to the south of Charleston Street) and extending to Military Road. Project elements include decorative lighting, sidewalk replacement, trash receptacles, bike racks, and landscaping, all in the City's right-of-way.

P. 82 - **North Bottoms University Parking Lot Area.**

- New medium density residential opportunities
- Easy access to campus
- Site will not be available until after the "X" Street Bridge and related roadways are complete
- Need to address floodplain issue

P. 82 - **10th Street-North Bottoms Main Street.**

- Lincoln's "Greenwich Village"
- Mixed-Use retail area integrating commercial and residential uses in the same building

P. 82 - **North Bottoms South Edge.**

- New medium density residential opportunities
- Need to address floodplain issue
- Need to relocate existing business
- Recreation area
- Easy access to campus
- Passive Park/Open Space buffer area from I-180

P. 91 - **Future Utilities and Infrastructure.**

- Water System. As new redevelopment projects are identified, the City will need to carefully determine if the existing water system can handle the new projects.
- Sanitary Sewer System. Similarly, a detailed sanitary sewer capacity study should be conducted to identify specific needs and projects, particularly on a case-by-case basis as redevelopment project occur.

P. 96 - **Sidewalk Repair Program Map.** Sidewalk repairs have been completed throughout the North Bottoms Neighborhood.

P. 105 - **Focus Areas.** Focus areas are an important neighborhood revitalization strategy that concentrate public and private resources in small neighborhood areas (12 to 30 blocks). Portions of all the Antelope Valley Neighborhoods

(North Bottoms, Clinton, Malone/Hawley, Downtown, Woods Park and Near South) have or are implementing Focus Area strategies.

NORTH BOTTOMS NEIGHBORHOOD FOCUS AREA ACTION PLAN:

P. 5 - The biggest land use issue facing the North Bottoms Neighborhood is the conflict between residential and industrial areas.

P. 5 - Housing adjacent to the industrial area is largely rental and in poorer condition than owner occupied housing to the north. Expansion of the industry into a residential area, with no buffers, generally contributes to blighting conditions and neighborhood deterioration.

P. 11 - **Focus Area Strategies.** Reduce land use conflicts. If industrial uses move out of the neighborhood, encourage replacement with a green space buffer.

TOPOGRAPHY: The site is relatively flat. The high point is on the northwest and slopes slightly to the southeast.

TRAFFIC ANALYSIS: Y Street is accessed off N. 10th Street via the “slip road” on the west end of the block. Y Street and N. 12th Street dead end on the east.

PUBLIC SERVICE: Fire stations near this site are located at 1801 Q and 1440 Adams Street.

REGIONAL ISSUES: A North Bottoms Neighborhood Focus Area Plan was completed in 2002. Regional issues identified in the plan include overcrowding in rental housing units, increasing walkability and pedestrian safety, reducing the number of cars parked in yards, eliminating upholstered furniture outdoors, reducing trash and litter, curtailing large parties and improving traffic circulation and parking.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS: This property is located within the Salt Creek floodplain. New residential development on this site must be elevated one foot above the base flood elevation. Residential development should also meet the “No Net Fill” condition, if it is a TIF-assisted project.

The project site is also located near the BNSF railroad. A minimum separation of 300 feet from the railroad to residential units is recommended to provide a protection zone from chemical spills.

AESTHETIC CONSIDERATIONS: This location is subject to the Neighborhood Design Standards.

ALTERNATIVE USES: Keep the single-family dwellings or allow uses under the existing B-3, R-4 or I-1 zoning districts.

ANALYSIS:

1. The applicant is requesting a change of zone from B-3 Commercial District, R-4 Residential District and I-1 Industrial District to R-8 Residential District on approximately 2.2 acres. The property is located on the north side of Y Street between N. 10th Street and N. 12th Street.
2. The Comprehensive Plan shows this property as Urban Density Residential with Commercial uses fronting on N. 10th Street.

3. The existing land use is single-family dwellings, and the existing residential zoning is R-4 Residential District. The R-4 district allows a density of 17 dwelling units per acre for two-family dwellings and allows approximately 14 dwelling units per acre in an R-4 Community Unit Plan. If approved, the R-8 zoning district would allow a density up to 79 dwelling units per acre.
4. Existing R-8 zoning is located on approximately 18 acres south of Lincoln Mall on the southern edge of Downtown. The R-8 district is a high-density district that transitions the mixed-use and high-density nature of Downtown Lincoln into the adjacent residential neighborhood. The R-8 zoning district serves as the first step-down from high density Downtown zoning into the less dense residential zoning districts. Three examples of existing R-8 zoned properties are listed below:
 - a. 1111 H Street: 29 units on 0.33 acres. This equals 87 units per acre.
 - b. 1130 H Street: 54 units on 0.74 acres. This equals 73 units per acre.
 - c. 640 12th Street: 15 units on 0.09 acres. This equals 166 units per acre.

Two of the above R-8 zoned properties exceed the permitted density of the R-8 district, which is 79 units per acre. These properties are likely pre-existing uses.

The projects listed above are adjacent to O-1, R-7 and B-3 zoning districts. None of these properties abut a low or medium density residential zoning district, and the R-8 zoning is appropriate for this location. The project site in North Bottoms is adjacent to R-4, P and I-1. Due to the sensitive nature of this site and its surroundings, this change of zone recommendation is conditioned upon approval of the special permit for a Community Unit Plan in order to provide additional site specific review. The R-8 district will allow the appropriate density for this location, and the CUP would allow site specific site and building design review to reflect adjacent, sensitive land uses.

5. The Antelope Valley Redevelopment Plan shows the south boundary of the North Bottoms Neighborhood as Medium Density Residential, and the core of the North Bottoms Neighborhood is identified as Low Density Conservation. The Antelope Valley Redevelopment Plan recognizes the “edge” of the neighborhood should be treated differently, and that there is opportunity to develop this site while conserving the single-family character within North Bottoms.

The Antelope Valley Redevelopment Plan states that Medium Density blocks are to have a higher density that transition into the adjacent neighborhoods. The development proposal recognizes the goals of the Antelope Valley Redevelopment Plan by introducing a higher density development along the edge of North Bottoms that transitions into the adjacent neighborhood. The R-8 zoning district is appropriate at this location and would assist the core of the North Bottoms Neighborhood by providing a transition between Downtown and the industrial/railroad areas to the south and the single-family homes to the north. This edge is unique and should be treated differently in order to help preserve and enhance the single-family homes in the North Bottoms Neighborhood.

6. The North Bottoms Neighborhood worked with the Urban Development Department to draft a Focus Area plan in 2002. The Focus Area plan identified the conflict between residential and industrial areas as the biggest land use issue in the North Bottoms Neighborhood. The proposed change of zone will help alleviate the land use conflict by clearly defining a

transition between the industrial/railroad and residential areas. Industrial zoning adjacent to residential dwellings will be removed with this action, which will also reduce potential land use conflicts.

7. The approval of the change of zone should be conditioned upon approval of the special permit for a Community Unit Plan (CUP). The CUP allows for additional design review that the R-8 zoning does not allow on its own, including important building design criteria and right-of-way improvements which are recommended by staff and the Urban Design Committee.
8. The Comprehensive Plan is an outline of the community's shared vision for the future. The Comprehensive Plan establishes broad goals that provide guidance for land use decisions and other actions that determine the future of Lincoln and Lancaster County. Subarea planning for neighborhoods or other small geographic areas can address issues at a more refined scale than can be included in Comprehensive Plan. Subarea plans can serve as an official guide to promote improvements in areas such as land use, housing, transportation, parks and recreation, public safety, infrastructure and the built and natural environments.

The North Bottoms Neighborhood is a unique enclave of mainly single-family homes encased by I-180, Salt Creek Roadway, Antelope Valley Parkway and Highway 6/Sun Valley Boulevard. The North Bottoms Neighborhood is considered part of Greater Downtown and is situated adjacent to the University of Nebraska campus, Haymarket and Downtown proper. Given several recent redevelopment proposals, consideration should be given to updating the 12 year old redevelopment plan for the North Bottoms Neighborhood, beyond the site in question. An updated plan would bring consensus among the residents, the City and developers and would provide an expectation of the future land use goals for North Bottoms.

Prepared by:

Paul Barnes, Planner
402-441-6372
pbarnes@lincoln.ne.gov

DATE: May 14, 2014

APPLICANT/CONTACT: ESP, Inc.
601 Old Cheney Road, Suite A
Lincoln, NE 68512

DEVELOPER: Elsey Partners
1532 College Avenue F19
Manhattan, KS 66502

OWNERS:

William and Linda Bryant
PO Box 7
Panama, NE 68419

Steven and Mona Spratlen
4340 Washington Street
Lincoln, NE 68506

James Hauk
6127 NW 10th Street
Lincoln, NE 68521

Michael Petrovich
1023 Jones Street, Apt. 602
Omaha, NE 68102

Marla Salyer Mikesh
1052 Y Street
Lincoln, NE 68508

Brian Mihulka
1108 Y Street
Lincoln, NE 68508

Metrolam, LLC
517 E. 23rd Street
Fremont, NE 68025

TK Investment Properties, LLC
11811 Cedar Street
Omaha, NE 68144

Walter and Christine Bleich
1062 Y Street
Lincoln, NE 68508

DJ Salia Investment Properties, LLC
901 Oak Street
Lincoln, NE 68521

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CONFORMANCE NO. 14011,
CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 14011
and
SPECIAL PERMIT NO. 14008
THE 1100 Y STREET COMMUNITY UNIT PLAN (CUP)**

PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION:

May 28, 2014

Members present: Beecham, Cornelius, Corr, Harris, Weber, Scheer, Sunderman and Hove; Lust absent.

Staff recommendation: A finding of conformance with the Comprehensive Plan on the amendment to the redevelopment plan; approval of the change of zone; and conditional approval of the special permit, as revised on May 28, 2014.

There were no ex parte communications disclosed.

Staff presentation:

1. Wynn Hjernstad, Community Development Manager of the Urban Development Department, spoke on the redevelopment plan amendment. Amending the redevelopment plan is the first step in the process of acquiring tax increment financing (TIF) under the state statutes.

Hjernstad showed the location of the proposed project. The “slip road” that will be referenced from time to time is a little road coming off of 10th Street that is really just a slip-in road and is not declared city right-of-way at this point. With the railroad tracks, it is a challenging site. Hjernstad also showed the site plan showing Y Street and the slip road. The building is situated as such because of the railroad tracks. The City has a policy of not locating residential development within 300’ of a railroad track, thus the building was moved back to accommodate that standard. What is being proposed is 126 units with 163 parking stalls including 72 bike racks. In terms of TIF, some of the improvements which could be pursued include continuing to pave Y street; constructing a connector at 12th Street up to Charleston; paving the alley; constructing a median on 10th Street that would restrict left turns out of the project; constructing sidewalk along Y Street as well as 12th Street; storm sewer; sanitary sewer; street trees; and lights. These are improvements that are part of the project, but in terms of the redevelopment process these are items eligible for TIF.

Hjernstad advised that the developer has had neighborhood meetings, one with the adjacent property owners and then one that was neighborhood-wide. The proposal has also been reviewed by the Urban Design Committee (UDC), which did approve it, subject to returning to the UDC once the developer has more design items in place. The UDC suggested more parking lot screening and moving the building to provide more separation to the neighborhood to the north.

Hjernstad observed that it will be a tall building and putting it right up to the alley with single-family adjacent could be a big barrier. What the developer has done with the building is a “step” design so that it steps up as you move away from the single-family and from the alley, and they have done shade studies so that the shade of the building will not block out the single-family houses. The total

cost of the project is 7.8 million dollars with approximately \$700,000 in TIF (these are preliminary numbers).

If the Planning Commission finds the amendment to be in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan today, Hjermsstad advised that the plan amendment will go on to City Council for approval at the end of June. They are just beginning to work on the redevelopment agreement which goes to the City Council which spells out how TIF will be used, with construction to begin shortly after City Council approval of the agreement in August.

Beecham inquired as to the procedure if the UDC is not happy with the changes that come back. Hjermsstad noted that UDC is advisory. **Marvin Krout, Director of Planning**, came forward and explained that UDC is advisory to the Mayor, so the Mayor will consider their recommendations as he goes through the negotiations on the TIF. In the CUP, there are references that do set the pattern in terms of setbacks and elevations and building materials.

2. Paul Barnes of Planning staff addressed the change of zone and CUP special permit. The change of zone is for the block north of Y Street currently zoned B-3, R-4 and I-1, and the proposal is to change the zoning to R-8, which is the highest density zoning district for residential in Lincoln. R-8 districts are primarily located near the south edge of Downtown. In this case, R-8 is a transitional zone between the traditional mixed use Downtown to the more traditional single-family neighborhood, which can be seen on the south end of Downtown. There are railroad tracks that are heavily used to the south; Salt Creek Roadway, which is considered part of greater Downtown; adjacent to UNL campus; and some additional industrial uses to the south and west. Barnes suggested that this could be considered somewhat of a transitional zone already.

The CUP includes a request to waive the front and rear yard setbacks, reducing the front yard to zero feet for the building and the parking lot along the 10th Street slip-road and along Y Street and continuing to the east and wrapping around the parking lot. The rear yard setback reduction to 8 feet is for the rear of the building. There is discussion that a portion of Y Street would be vacated; however, that is not part of today's discussion. If Y Street is vacated, that would allow the building to shift to the south, creating more of a setback between the building, the alley and the residential houses to the north.

Barnes further explained that the CUP allows not only for the reduction in setbacks, but allows us to incorporate some of these design issues to the site and to the building that may otherwise cause a sensitivity to the adjacent neighborhood. The building elevations show a "step back" approach with a taller portion of the building along Y Street and then a step down to about 22 feet along the alley side. The building overall would be 4-5 stories, the fifth being a two-story mezzanine-type loft unit on the south. The exhibit specifies materials which would be used on the building, i.e. brick and mortar on the north side and more modern materials on the south.

Barnes pointed out that there is a revised staff recommendation to state that the building footprint and parking spaces shown on the site plan are conceptual and that minor adjustments could be made.

Cornelius inquired whether there was any response from the owners of the property currently zoned R-3 and R-4 to this zoning change. Barnes advised that the developer has all of the properties north of Y Street under contract.

Harris noted that the Comprehensive Plan shows this site as commercial and urban density residential on the future land use map, so urban density residential appears to fit right in. What about the commercial designation? Is there a conflict there? Barnes responded, stating that the future land use map in the Comprehensive Plan generally shows the properties fronting on 10th Street as commercial. The intent is that if a property were to redevelop and propose a commercial use, that would be supported. The Comprehensive Plan does not tie it to commercial only, but it is used as a guide.

Beecham inquired whether there has been any feedback from the property owners that front on Charleston. Barnes indicated that the Planning Department has not received any communications.

Proponents

1. Chris Elsey, Elsey Partners, 1532 College Avenue F19, Manhattan, Kansas, presented the proposal. Elsey Partners is a student housing development company, and they are primarily interested in this site because they want to promote walkability in this community. What he originally proposed was a substantially larger project of potentially three phases, with upwards of 1,000 beds, but that was not well accepted by the North Bottoms neighborhood. He has transitioned and moved the project to the current location on Y Street, which is sort of isolated and is on the east side of 10th Street. It does have the slip-road that comes off of the bridge, which is currently the only way in and out of the property. Elsey is proposing to add the connection to 12th Street along to the east. Elsey acknowledged that he did have some concerns from the neighborhood previously and he was hopeful that this site would be more isolated from the rest of the neighborhood.

Elsey is attracted to this area because of easy walking distance, right off the pedestrian bridge, to the University, West Haymarket and Haymarket Park, and all the amenities around the arena. Elsey confirmed that he does have the entire block under contract. contingent upon approval of this project.

Elsey stated that it is on a 2.5-acre site, with a mix of one-, two- and three-bedroom apartments. Elsey Partners is a student housing developer, but these are not 4-bedroom and 4-bath suites. There are some one- and two-bedroom apartments. He would not prohibit other young professionals or empty nesters from living in these apartments, but he believes there will be a high percentage of students in this complex.

Elsey pointed out that he has pushed the building back as far as possible to the south to create more of a buffer to the neighbors to the north. There will be street trees and landscaping, and the building was moved to the south. The UDC was concerned about screening of the parking lot and the headlights, so a median was added to the parking lot to create screening to the neighbors to the north.

Elsey also pointed out that in this block along Charleston Street, it appears that there are only two owner-occupied's on that stretch and the remainder are rental units. He believes that this fact conveys that this is an appropriate location because there is a demand needing to be met with the existing demographics, particularly in this block.

Elsey showed images depicting that the building is stepped down from the south to the north. This basically reduced the bedroom count by 50, from 260 beds to 210 beds.

A shadow study was conducted with the winter solstice and that is how they determined the angle of the building. It will have no more shadow occurrence than a two-story building. They are proposing a landscape entry plaza on the south.

Beecham referred to the minutes from the UDC about how this will add to a historic area. She asked Eley to address what has been done to blend in with the historic character. Eley stated that they will accomplish that with the materials on the back side of the building. Most of those homes along Charleston are predominantly siding, but we wanted to keep kind of a higher-end feel. There will be siding on the back of the building mixed with brick. Beecham wondered about windows/glass on the north side. Eley acknowledged that there is some glass on the entry portion, and there are two-story apartments on the upper floor which will have larger 8x12 windows on the top. Beecham does not want the neighbors on Charleston to be looking at a solid wall in their back yards.

Eley noted that they did not incorporate any balconies. The interior court yard includes a swimming pool so that the community space is located within the interior of the building to keep things isolated.

Corr asked whether the applicant was looking at both sides of Charleston Street. Eley's answer was, "yes".

Harris referred to the photographs and rendering and asked whether those assume the vacation of the alley. Eley explained that the mockups do incorporate vacation of 10 feet of the Y Street right-of-way. The right-of-way on the west half where the road is paved on Y Street is significantly larger than on the east half, so that is where they are proposing to be granted some of the right-of-way.

Corr asked how many of the houses on the Y Street side are owner-occupied. Eley confirmed that he currently has those under contract, but there are three owner-occupied.

Corr noted that Urban Development talked about electric sub-metering for responsible energy consumption. Eley explained that this was an attempt to not put 120 meters on the back of the property, so there is sub-metering where you can put one meter on the back and put just a little donut around the cable to monitor the usage by the residents. However, LES is not going to allow the sub-metering. There will be a meter, and Eley Partners will receive an individual bill and assess it to the tenants. They intend to place a cap on the use of electricity for the tenants. The electric bill will be part of the rent. If the tenant exceeds the cap amount, they will be required to pay the additional amount separately. He wants to encourage responsible energy use. It has been found that DVR's and flat screen televisions actually have a pretty high load that people do not realize. The tenants will be so advised.

Support

1. **Walt Bleich**, 1062 Y Street, a 30-year resident of North Bottoms and one of the affected landowners, testified in support. When he was first contacted by Eley, he did not have any interest in selling; however, during the negotiations they made a very fair offer which was hard to turn down, i.e. twice what the house is worth, so he has a vested interest in this project. He understands the opposition and suggested that a lot of it seems to be based on nostalgia, looking at the way the neighborhood used to be in the past and not the way it is today. The block has three

owner-occupants. A fourth person whose parents own the house is living there. All of those houses are on contract. There are already students living in those houses. He believes this project may alleviate a lot of the problems that he has seen by having these students living in the neighborhood. Philosophically, he is in tune with this kind of project. We need to move as a society more to vertically developing residential housing rather than simply spreading out and gobbling up good agricultural land. We need to revitalize the neighborhood. He does have some concerns with TIF transferring the tax burden to existing taxpayers, but he understands that seeking TIF has to do with improvements requested by the City or restrictions on the kind of project they want. His concern about TIF is alleviated by those improvements.

In terms of redevelopment, Bleich suggested that Lincoln is at a crossroads. We are heading toward a redevelopment brick wall with our natural resources, especially water. He understands there might be some long range plans by the City to find new water resources, but we need to either start to look at capping new redevelopment or we need to move forward with another pipeline. That discussion needs to happen as soon as possible.

2. Brian Mihulka, owner of 1108 Y Street, testified in support. He believes this is a good development, especially with the location near the railroad tracks. It is also a good transition and most of the houses are rentals at this point anyway.

Opposition

1. Wendy Thrasher, 806 Y Street, testified in opposition. She was also opposed to the original project. She believes that there is a lot of neighborhood opposition to this second project as well. At one of the neighborhood meetings in the beginning, Elsey continued to portray this as “student housing,” but when pressed, he defined it as “young urban professional housing”. Thrasher takes issue with the inappropriate placement of such a modern looking building in a historical district. There is a sign right by Y Street that glorifies the North Bottoms Neighborhood. A number of people living there actually built and kilned the bricks that built the Haymarket District downtown. She believes that this type of project is very disrespectful in that regard.

Thrasher also stated that she does not find fault that it would be beneficial to have more housing in the area to accommodate UNL students and workers in the Downtown area. But, she would like to preserve this historical neighborhood of the North Bottoms. If this is truly being portrayed as “student housing”, there needs to be a disclaimer that they are willing to rent to anyone. If portrayed as “infill housing,” it would be possible for a family to rent an apartment in this building.

Thrasher believes the plan needs more green space for children, such as a small playground. Urban professionals do tend to have young children and they need some place to play.

Thrasher also takes issue with restricting the electrical usage and including that as part of the rent. It might perhaps even be unconstitutional. TIF will put a burden on the taxpayers. The property owners/neighbors have wanted that area improved for quite some time and now approximately one-fifth of this apartment building expense will be TIF.

With regard to parking, Thrasher stated that Elsey represented to the neighborhood at their last meeting that he would only have 70 parking spaces. Now suddenly it is more than 70. She has a hard time understanding the applicant and how quickly he is changing things.

Thrasher believes that the North Bottoms is a residential neighborhood and a historic residential neighborhood and it should stay that way. She strongly urged that the Planning Commission to table this proposal for further consideration.

2. Annette McRoy, 1142 New Hampshire, testified in opposition. She expressed confusion on this project because the City has worked very hard to preserve older neighborhoods over the years. In fact, the Neighborhood Design Standards were written a few years back for the core neighborhoods. She suggested that this project reverts all of the work that has been done over the years to protect our core neighborhoods. She understands it is private property. Since Elsey is going to own all of the property, is this the highest and best use of the property? She understands the housing stock may not be the best, but it was someone's home; it provided housing for students and young families.

McRoy stated that she does believe in redevelopment, but she does not understand how an urban apartment building fits in with an older neighborhood. She believes it is infill. She acknowledged that the project done along Vine Street turned out very well and that there are areas to do this. However, there are roads that have not yet been widened; we have not changed the Comprehensive Plan; we have not changed the long range plans; we have not included money in the CIP to do that because it would change the character of those neighborhoods. North Bottoms is a low to moderate income neighborhood, but it is her home and the home of a lot of other people. We need housing in the city to fit everyone's budget. McRoy takes offense that the North Bottoms is mostly rentals. She has met the nicest people in those rental projects. She grew up in North Bottoms. The neighbors have worked really hard to help change the stereotype of the North Bottoms. Now, to bring in an urban apartment building with young professionals and students, turns it backwards to where it was going. She cannot imagine anyone would allow putting an apartment building like this in the Near South. Yet, we are doing this to an area in which taxpayers' money has been spent to turn it around.

McRoy advised that the North Bottoms Neighborhood Board has not voted on this project. The developer held two neighborhood meetings. There were a lot of questions about traffic flow from the residences. The neighbors are concerned about the traffic from 12th Street into the neighborhood. There will be more people going into the interior of the neighborhood. Charleston is very narrow today. There is no parking on one side of the street today. Adding more cars will not be ideal.

With the developer showing a phase two of this project, McRoy believes they see this neighborhood as a dollar sign. They plan to buy properties on Charleston so it will keep creeping and creeping.

Corr asked how many attended the neighborhood meetings. McRoy thought that perhaps 30-40 people attended. Corr understands that the traffic concerns were number one. Were there other concerns? McRoy stated emergency vehicles being able to get into the area; TIF; does it fit? Those neighbors with which she has visited want what is the highest and best use going forward. She has some experience working with infill housing, and she believes we could choose to do something better. It appears that we are bending every rule to make this project work, so it really does not fit in with what the neighbors had in mind.

3. Alan Burbach, 1200 Claremont, which is two blocks north of where the traffic will come out, testified in opposition. There are only two ways out - across the neighborhoods to 14th Street by the Devaney Center or head back towards 10th Street. He suggested that half of the traffic will

probably head toward 14th Street and go across the neighborhood. His property is somewhat removed from the building, so his primary concern is the traffic, especially on the narrow streets where you cannot get a car through if parking is allowed on one side of the street.

Burbach finds it odd to remove housing to put in an apartment complex and then calling it a “transition”. The transition is more from Memorial Stadium to the neighborhood and less about the Downtown.

Staff questions

Beecham asked staff to address the traffic issues. Barnes advised that the applicant did provide a technical memo looking at the traffic impacts and driving habits of a university campus in Minnesota. It was provided to Public Works; that study said that for a student housing type of development, there would be approximately 1/3 of the amount of traffic than a traditional apartment complex. Public Works reviewed that study and accepted their methodology and analysis, and did not require a traffic study.

Corr then asked staff to address the parking requirements. Barnes stated that the applicant is meeting the parking requirements. It is based on the number of dwelling units. There are 126 dwelling units proposed and the parking lot would provide 162 spaces. The requirement for R-8 is 1/dwelling unit regardless of the number of bedrooms. The code does not base parking off of bedrooms, only the use and the zoning district.

Beecham assumes that student housing means unrelated individuals living together, with many of them not sharing a vehicle. The numbers being provided do not deal with that issue. Barnes stated that there is a special permit for dwellings for nonrelated persons, and that is when you have more than 3 nonrelated people living together, which is a different CUP application. There is a parking requirement for that special permit of one space per resident, but this is not that type of special permit.

Response by the Applicant

With regard to the architectural character of the building, Elsey stated that the architect worked pretty hard and it did go before the UDC, and that’s a pretty tough crowd with seven other design professionals on that board and they did recommend approval of the project. Quite honestly, some of them really appreciated the architectural character and the response to the different historic characteristics with the materials on the project.

With regard to the parking requirements, Elsey pointed out that they are also providing 72 bike stalls. Based upon an in-house parking study at Elsey’s own complexes in Kansas and Oklahoma, it has been determined that the parking lots there are 1:1 ratio and 60% full on average and 80% at maximum, so he believes the parking requirement is justified and feasible.

Hove clarified that the parking ratio is 1:1 per bedroom at other locations, and the proposal here is 1 per unit.

Beecham questioned the conditions required by UDC. Elsey advised that the UDC had concerns about screening of the parking lot to the north and moving the building to the south with more landscaping. This has been shown but part of the right-of-way will need to be vacated to achieve that.

Elsey also observed that he has received a lot of feedback from the owners of the lots to the north and a lot of them are interested in potentially selling. So Elsey will be discussing with Planning and the UDC what the north side would potentially look like if there would be a phase two to this project. That would be an R-4 zoning, which would be significantly less than this project. He will be suggesting 2-story townhomes, but he wants to work through that with city staff. Any discussion on phase two is preliminary at this time.

Given that we are considering this particular project as creating a transitional buffer, Cornelius pointed out that Elsey is on record saying that any phase two that involves the north side is going to be sensitive to the historic neighborhood and more in keeping with the existing properties. Elsey agreed.

Derek Zimmerman appeared on behalf of Chris Elsey in rebuttal pertaining to the issue of Comprehensive Plan conformity, stating that one of the major goals of the Comprehensive Plan is to promote infill within the greater downtown area, and this project does that. He also pointed out that under the R-8 zoning, there are more units that could be allowed than are being proposed. This project is 48 less units than allowed in R-8. Another goal of the Comprehensive Plan is to move properties out of the floodplain, and these properties which are currently in the floodplain will be taken out of the floodplain because of this project.

With regard to transition, Zimmerman pointed out that in the neighborhood focus area action plan for North Bottoms, one of the primary concerns was the conflict between industrial and residential. The industrial on the eastern portion will go away. There is property to the south with railroad tracks and other industrial uses, and this project will provide a buffer and greater separation to the neighborhood to the north.

Beecham asked Urban Development whether the redevelopment plan for the North Bottoms is the last time the city talked to the neighbors. Hjerstad recalled that there was a focus area, which is different from the redevelopment plan. Redevelopment plans are spelled out in state statute to get to TIF. Focus area plans (target area plans) are something that the City did and the North Bottoms focus area plan might have been done in about 2002. The focus area plans were initiated by Urban Development working with other departments. The idea was that it had to be a neighborhood association that wanted to work with the City and had to be low to moderate income to qualify for CDBG. The main reason that the focus area plans have gone away is because CDBG federal funds were cut and are no longer available. In the focus area plan, Urban Development did work with the neighborhood to identify short term (3-5 years) improvements that could be done. These focus area plans were very much lead by the neighborhoods. As a result of the focus area plans, sidewalks were repaired, alleys were graveled, neighborhood signs were installed, there were some park improvements, housing improvement programs, etc. She recalled that a partial streetscape on 10th Street was not completed because there was not enough funding, but they did do the lights and street trees.

Beecham believes that the Near South focus area plan included a long term vision. Was there anything like that in the North Bottoms plan? Hjerstad could not recall exactly but she believes

there was an overall vision for the neighborhood that recognized how much of the neighborhood had become rental but still wanting to maintain the character of a historic, single-family neighborhood, although she also recalled that there was the recognition that the neighborhood is changing and how best to keep some of the character of the neighborhood. Hjermstad pointed out that this neighborhood has not been designated historic, but it is eligible.

Beecham asked whether there is anything preventing the neighborhood association from engaging with Urban Development to take a fresh look at it and update the focus area plan. Hjermstad advised that there are less people in Urban Development and about half as much funding so it's a matter of resources, but Urban Development staff could attend meetings and do whatever possible to be a resource.

TEXT AMENDMENT NO. 14004

ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION:

May 28, 2014

Cornelius make a motion to approve, seconded by Scheer.

***(Editorial Note:** The comments on this particular motion pertain to the entire 1100 Y Street Project package, including TX14004, TX14005, CPC14011, CZ14011 and SP14008].*

Cornelius comments that this is about as complicated a package as the Commission has seen in a very long time, and it required a great deal of deliberation and consideration and he expressed appreciation for everyone's comments. When he read the text amendment regarding R-7 and R-8 and CUP's, Cornelius was concerned because of the city-wide application and the way this seemed to be a fairly sweeping change. Often the Commission is given a chance to deliberate in advance with a briefing, etc. But we did not in this case. One of the things which allayed his concerns was that R-7 and R-8 re limited in their use, i.e. small, any kind of CUP is by special permit and will come before the Planning Commission – a lot of checks and balances. It is actually putting greater restriction on these developments, but we are in effect creating a new R-8 zone to apply this project to. That gives him pause. R-8 is defined as a transition zone between higher intensity use and other residential. In this case, we have train tracks and industrial, the stadium, the campus and what is historically single-family residential on the other side.

Then he started reading the request for the special permit, and he tried weighing the pro's and con's. This is a residential neighborhood with a lot of rentals, but that's okay; and this is a high impact project. Otherwise, we would not need the text amendments. This does create a transitional area between the existing uses and the historical single-family residential area. We also heard that the area has a reputation for party houses and that this will change the character of this area that is affected – it turns it inward and reduces the size of the residences, and that is a good thing. It is relatively high-end rental and the residents will have to care somewhat about where they live. It is pedestrian oriented. It checks a lot of boxes when talking about the Comprehensive Plan conformity – high density infill; removing property from the floodplain; and redevelopment in an area that might otherwise have problems developing.

On the con side, Cornelius acknowledged that it has an impact on a lower density neighborhood with residential properties that are low to moderate income and those properties might feel put

upon by having this right on the edge of the neighborhood. It requires a number of variances in spite of the proposed text changes. That gives him concern. And it is a radical change from existing conditions. Is that a bad thing? Cornelius is not sure that it is.

On balance, Cornelius stated that he is more in favor than against this package. If he were facing these challenges in his neighborhood, he might appreciate this project. He would be concerned about phase 2, but that's a future thing that will come before this body. And, rest assured, this body will take into consideration the historical character of the neighborhood.

Scheer generally agreed with Cornelius, and he does not want to lose sight of the fact that for about 4 years, this community has had ongoing discussion about tools and ways to make things like this happen. This is what that looks like in reality. He is really pleased about the fact that we are to this point and actually doing something that we have been talking about for 3-4 years.

Harris agreed with what has been said. She commented that the Commission usually has a little more background on issues like this and she still feels that she would benefit from a little bit more background on the parking requirement and the ability to increase or decrease, especially with final action. She would be more comfortable delaying the parking requirement portion only. She needs to understand better how the text amendments affect the zoning in general.

Beecham expressed that she is concerned about this project because right now our design standards are based on matching the pre-existing neighbors on the block. She thinks that approving a project like this that is demolishing all of the houses on the block is setting a precedent to get around the design standards. We do have projects coming into older neighborhoods that take up an entire block and we need to address this issue. It could undermine the purpose of the design standards.

Beecham also cautioned about saying, "they are rentals, therefore they are expendable." A house that is a rental can be turned back into owner-occupied; a house as a rental can be a good neighbor; we do not want to assume that a rental house is not a valuable house.

However, despite those two things, Beecham stated that she does like the project because it is at the edge and not in the middle of the neighborhood; it is adjacent to a busy street; it is buffering the railroad; and she appreciates the fact that the developer has worked to alleviate the scale and tried to use some materials that will blend better with a historic area. She would agree that the parking issue could be delayed.

Corr commented that the text amendments gave her concern because it has city-wide ramifications. But, her concerns are somewhat alleviated because one must have a large area of land to work with and that will not happen very often in the city core. But, when someone purchases the whole block face, the design standards go out the window. She prefers the porches and the neighborhood look.

Then with the special permit, Corr commented that we have all known about some of the problems that North Bottoms has been challenged with – the party houses, litter, etc. – and she believes this project will help alleviate some of that. The only reason she will support is because it is on the edge and it is giving the buffer between an industrial use and the residential housing; however, moving on to the next street, Charleston Street, is going to have to meet some of those neighborhood design standards. She wishes that this was more neighborly; it's going to have to

stay rental and that is a disadvantage she does not like. However, she has concluded that the buffer and transitional outweigh some of the other negatives.

Motion for approval carried 7-1: Beecham, Cornelius, Corr, Weber, Scheer, Sunderman and Hove voting 'yes'; Harris voting 'no'; Lust absent. This is a recommendation to the City Council.

TEXT AMENDMENT NO. 14005

ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION:

May 28, 2014

Cornelius moved approval, seconded by Scheer and carried 7-1: Beecham, Cornelius, Corr, Weber, Scheer, Sunderman and Hove voting 'yes'; Harris voting 'no'; Lust absent. This is a recommendation to the City Council.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CONFORMANCE NO. 14011

ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION:

May 28, 2014

Cornelius made a motion to find the proposed amendment to the Antelope Valley Redevelopment Plan to be in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan, seconded by Scheer.

Motion carried 8-0: Beecham, Cornelius, Corr, Weber, Scheer, Harris, Sunderman and Hove voting 'yes'; Lust absent. This is a recommendation to the City Council.

CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 14011

ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION:

May 28, 2014


Cornelius moved approval, seconded by Scheer and carried 8-0: Beecham, Cornelius, Corr, Weber, Scheer, Harris, Sunderman and Hove voting 'yes'; Lust absent. This is a recommendation to the City Council.

SPECIAL PERMIT NO. 14008

ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION:

May 28, 2014

Cornelius made a motion to approve, with conditions, as revised, seconded by Sunderman and carried 8-0: Beecham, Cornelius, Corr, Weber, Scheer, Harris, Sunderman and Hove voting 'yes'; Lust absent. This is final action, unless appealed to the City Council within 14 days.



2013 aerial

Change of Zone #: CZ14011
N 10th & Y St

One Square Mile:
 Sec.23 T10N R06E


Zoning:

- R-1 to R-8 Residential District
- AG Agricultural District
- AGR Agricultural Residential District
- O-1 Office District
- O-2 Suburban Office District
- O-3 Office Park District
- R-T Residential Transition District
- B-1 Local Business District
- B-2 Planned Neighborhood Business District
- B-3 Commercial District
- B-4 Lincoln Center Business District
- B-5 Planned Regional Business District
- H-1 Interstate Commercial District
- H-2 Highway Business District
- H-3 Highway Commercial District
- H-4 General Commercial District
- I-1 Industrial District
- I-2 Industrial Park District
- I-3 Employment Center District
- P Public Use District


Area of Application

Zoning Jurisdiction Lines

Lancaster County Jurisdiction



10TH & 'Y' APARTMENT CHANGE OF ZONE EXHIBIT 'B-3', 'R-4', AND 'I-1' TO 'R-8'



E.S.P.
CONSULTING
ENGINEERS

601 OLD
CHENEY RD.
SUITE 'A'
LINCOLN
NEBRASKA
68512



File No. 14-0045

April 29, 2014

Mr. Marvin Krout
Director of Planning
Paul Barnes, Planner
City of Lincoln/ Lancaster County
555 South 10th Street
Lincoln, NE 68508

RE: 1100 Y Street
SPECIAL PERMIT/ COMMUNITY UNIT PLAN

Dear Marvin,

On behalf of My Prime Place, Inc., we are submitting the above mentioned application for your review. 1100 Y Street is a proposed Special Permit/Community Unit Plan on 2.2 acres located at 10th and Y Streets. The site is currently zoned B-3 on the west, R-4 in the center and I-1 on the east.

The project will consist of 125 apartments and an adjacent 160 stall parking lot (125 stalls required per Section 27.67.100, Figure 27.67.020) intended for UNL student housing. Public water and sewer exist along the site.

We are requesting the following waivers to the zoning requirements and design standards:

1. Building setback distances per zoning requirement Table 27.72.120 (b). The restrictions imposed by the setback distance from the railroad and by the height restrictions required the building footprint to increase to the point of not fitting inside the R-8 setback distances.

023

2. Access proximity per Access Management Policy, Chapter VI, Section A. Access to the east end of the proposed parking lot has less than 50 feet of separation between access points and the abutting alley to the north. This is necessary to create non-restrictive traffic flow inside the parking lot and allow more parking spaces.

The developer is requesting vacation of the north 10 feet of the Y Street right-of-way where it is currently 83 feet wide for building and landscaping purposes.

The owner's signatures are on the attached Purchase Contracts.

Please contact me if you have any questions, comments or concerns.

Sincerely,



Dale Smith, PE
ESP, Inc.

CC: Chris Elsey

Enclosures: Special Permit Application
Application Fee of \$2,204.40
Owner's List/Purchase Contracts
Text Amendment