

MEETING RECORD

NAMES OF GROUPS: HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION & URBAN DESIGN COMMITTEE

DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING: Thursday, November 4, 2:00 p.m., Mayor's Conference Room, 2nd Floor, County-City Building, 555 S. 10th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: **HPC:** Cathy Beecham, Jim Johnson, Jim McKee and Bob Ripley. **UDC:** Mike Eckert, JoAnne Kissel, Michelle Penn and Mary Anne Wells.

ADDITIONAL PARTIES IN ATTENDANCE: Deena Winter from the *Lincoln Journal Star*, Kyle Fisher, Lincoln Chamber of Commerce; Ed Zimmer and Michele Abendroth, Planning Department; Ken Smith and Dan Marvin, Urban Development

STATED PURPOSE OF MEETING: Joint meeting of Historic Preservation Commission and Urban Design Committee on West Haymarket redevelopment.

The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. The Nebraska Open Meetings Act was acknowledged.

Adoption of meeting record from joint meeting of Oct. 15, 2009

Zimmer noted a change in the record to reflect that Michelle Penn was in attendance at the meeting. A motion was made and seconded to adopt the minutes of the Oct. 15, 2009 joint Historic Preservation Commission and the Urban Design Committee with the amendment as noted by Zimmer. The motion carried unanimously.

Zimmer stated that the Integrated Development Plan (IDP) has been completed and asked if the Committee sees areas that need more attention and if the document can be used as a guide. There is a suggestion of a design review process but that would often be reflected in redevelopment agreements, so the Committee might focus on how the combined bodies participate in design reviews. This is going to be a process over many years. He picked out some broad areas that might cover those issues and ones that might be missing in the IDP. He provided a draft document of these topics.

Zimmer noted that the ordinances states that the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) reviews designated historic district issues and the Urban Design Committee (UDC) reviews public/private design projects.

Eckert stated that due to time efficiencies, it may be best to jointly review projects.

Ripley asked about the probable timeline for reviewing projects. Zimmer stated right now it is a process issue as there are no projects to review currently. He doesn't believe they will be meeting jointly in the next five months, but there could be several projects for joint review over the next five years.

Penn stated that she has not determined what staff is asking the group to do jointly. Zimmer stated that the question is what public design review process with these two bodies undertake. Or, in other words, Is the document an acceptable guide to use for design review?

Ripley feels it would be advantageous to have joint meetings throughout the process as he believes having the perspective of the UDC would be beneficial. He feels it would be good to meet jointly at critical points, preferably early, at a middle point and prior to construction.

Marvin stated that they are working on a timeline and the immediate step is the removal of some railroad tracks. There is additional infrastructure work that needs to have some attention. He believes that we would not likely start seeing structures going up until late 2011. For the arena, the architectural drawings would probably be finalized by early 2011.

Kissel stated that she is more concerned about the redevelopment agreement and the things that would be in there such as festival space, canopies, the views, open spaces, etc.

Ripley asked if the IDP is an approved planning document. Zimmer stated that it is not yet, and it is open for input.

Beecham moved to make an addition to the IDP to include a joint HPC/UDC design review process with meetings early, at a mid-point and prior to construction; it was seconded by Johnson

Wells stated that she feels it is important to see the final construction documents as well.

Kissel stated that the unique thing is the transition between the spaces, and she wants to make certain that there is a buffering between the spaces. She hopes there are good contextual drawings. Wells stated that it is important to have everything identified in the plan, so it is a cohesive plan and doesn't look like something was an afterthought. Ripley stated that the success or failure of this project in terms of the Haymarket will be the connectivity.

Penn stated that there are a lot of great ideas in the IDP such as civic art and a playground, but she is concerned about how you get people to really do it. Johnson stated that this joint committee could recommend to the City Council or Mayor that a developer should have to put in public art or other projects.

Penn stated that the things she feels are important to both committees are the urban functions and the spaces between the buildings.

Eckert asked if this is similar to a Comprehensive Plan. Zimmer stated that it is. Eckert asked if this joint body will develop more concrete design standards before or after the vote. Marvin stated that they are working on a redevelopment agreement which talks about phasing and TIF uses. He is looking for direction as to what the role of UDC/HPC is after a redevelopment agreement is adopted. What do we put in the redevelopment agreement to give the joint body that role? Ripley believes this document should be an attachment to the redevelopment agreement. We don't want to give too much specificity, but enough so the developers know the expectations and how to base their fee on something that is realistic. Wells stated that she agrees with that.

Kissel stated that there is going to be natural differing motivations such as from a developer and a designer, which is fine. They are trying to get the supporting documents in place to support the values that we want.

The motion carried unanimously.

Eckert asked if this we need to move relatively quickly if we want to add sections to the IDP. Marvin stated that on the Traction development, they are not likely to be in the ground doing anything at the earliest in the fall of 2013. Eckert questioned if this joint body has a necessary role in the redevelopment agreement which is more of a legal document.

Kissel stated that we don't want to create a super-regulatory group that makes it difficult to get a project through, but to have an addendum to a document doesn't seem quite right either.

Zimmer stated that the joint body could recommend the IDP be adopted as a subarea plan because so much of this is a public project. He believes this makes it much more comfortable with the redevelopment agreement. Eckert agrees and a subarea plan makes it much more binding.

Marvin asked how much latitude there is to make changes to the plan and still be compliance with a proposed subarea plan. He provided an example of a bike path moving or changing the number of lanes in an access road. Zimmer stated that there could be a section that states this is a subarea plan but dimensions and details will not be built from it. It would show the best available information. He believes it is a mistake when the detail is confusing. Zimmer added that in the example, changing the number of lanes in a road would still be in compliance because the road is still there.

Wells asked if there are zoning regulations that we need to be aware of. Zimmer stated that it is mostly zoned I-1. If the IDP were adopted, it would supercede the Downtown Master Plan.

The next suggested meeting date is the first Wednesday in December.

Marvin noted that they would like to have the redevelopment agreement go to City Council in December. The vote whether to place the item on the ballot would be in December at the earliest and February at the latest.

Zimmer asked that comments on the IDP be submitted to him prior to the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:44 p.m.

F:\FILES\PLANNING\UDC\MINUTES\2009\091104 UDC HPC.wpd