

MEETING RECORD

NAME OF GROUP: URBAN DESIGN COMMITTEE

DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING: Wednesday, May 8, 2013, 3:00 p.m., Room 214, County/City Building, 555 S. 10th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: JoAnne Kissel, Gill Peace, Michelle Penn and Michele Tilley.

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Peter Hind, Scott Sullivan and Mary Anne Wells absent.

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Karen Nalow and Heather Keele (Clark Enersen); Jordan Pascale (Journal Star); Marvin Krout, Ed Zimmer, Sara Hartzell, Stacey Hageman & Michele Abendroth (Planning Department)

STATED PURPOSE OF MEETING: Regular Meeting of the Urban Design Committee

JoAnne Kissel called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m. The Nebraska Open Meetings Act was acknowledged.

Adoption of meeting records from the UDC meetings of April 10 and April 18, 2013

Tilley moved approval of the meeting records of April 10 and April 18, 2013, seconded by Penn. Motion carried 4-0. Kissel, Peace, Penn and Tilley voting 'yes'; Hind, Sullivan and Wells absent.

Pedestrian wayfinding signs for Downtown area (The Clark Enersen Partners/West Haymarket Infrastructure design team)

Keele began by stating that the design team is working on the content of the kiosk and pedestrian wayfinding signs for the downtown area. They are using the topper. The guide sign has the option for up to four destination points. For the kiosk, the idea is to do some guide signing at the top. When they were establishing parameters, they looked at precedents of several cities. They are making the graphics very easy to read and using significant architectural footprints as guide points. The destinations that appear on the sign are the arena, Harris Iron Horse Park, Lincoln Visitor Center, Canopy Street, downtown, Haymarket Park, Ice Center, UNL campus, event parking lot, Haymarket District, Lied Center, Centennial Mall and Nebraska History Museum. Tilley asked about the reason some of the destinations are named and some are not. Nalow stated that there are different types of sponsorships. Parks typically do not change sponsorship, but an arena can change names. They are still working through this, and they are here for comments and suggestions. Keele stated that it is expensive to change out the signs, and they would like feedback on the naming. Tilley stated that she believes that there should be consistency in naming.

Keele explained the concept for the map graphic on the kiosk which is a "heads up" graphing technique. The direction that you are facing is up on the map. They are working on the graphics for the Haymarket District, and they will apply those strategies across the districts. They have developed a graphic to identify destinations with a red square. The streets are shown in gray and any destination that is within a 5-minute walk from your current location is shown in red. They are showing city parking structures with the City's logo, which is the orange circle with a P. They worked a lot within their groups on how to

identify accommodations, which they are showing with an H in a gold circle. They have also identified the University in green.

Penn asked if hotels will be identified by name. Keele stated that the name will not be shown because the name could change. Nalow added that the parameter used was to include public destinations and not private ones.

Kissel commented that these are pedestrian signs and asked why the hotels would need to be on there. Zimmer stated that wayfinding signs are typically for visitors, so those things would be helpful.

Peace asked if they have done mock-ups and asked people how they feel about not having north up. He prefers to have north up on a map. Penn agreed that is confusing to not have north up.

Peace asked if DLA has a position on including private destinations on the kiosk. Nalow stated that they have not met with DLA yet on this subject, but plan to do so.

Zimmer stated that he feels that the walking circle does not register as a walking distance. He suggested putting a circle around the 5-minute walking area as well as a circle for a 10-minute walk.

Peace asked about the curve in the kiosk. Keele stated that they are trying to play off the juxtaposition of old and new. They want a nod to the historic district as well as to look forward to the future. They also want a nod to the historic flowing prairie grasses and the straight line of the railroad.

The Committee would like to ensure that there is enough value difference in colors so the signs can be read. *(As amended 6/12/13)*

Sidewalk vending applications:

- a) Jason Leuck, Leucky's Dawg**
- b) Tyler Larson, Hawaiian Ice**
- c) Tyler Watson, Pro Dog cart**
- d) Richard Boucher, vendor cart**

Zimmer stated that when an application is received for a sidewalk vendor, they must be reviewed by the Urban Design Committee. Four applications have been received, and he presented photos of each of the carts. All of the applications meet the requirements, and he is recommending approval of all four.

Penn commented that Richard Boucher's cart is charming, but it appears the canopy may be worn or very soiled.

Penn moved to approve all four applications with the stipulation that Richard Boucher provide evidence that the canopy is in good condition; it was seconded by Tilley. Motion carried 4-0. Kissel, Peace, Penn and Tilley voting 'yes'; Hind, Sullivan and Wells absent.

Staff report/misc.

Hartzell reported on the results of the recent Planning Assessment Survey. The purpose of the survey was to gather data on public opinion on several planning topic areas and generate some interest in participating in a focus group. They also wanted to reach out to our constituents and ask them about the service of the Planning Department and what we can do to improve.

Hartzell explained that there were 440 responses and about 25% of those indicated an interest in participating in a focus group. There were several topic areas including land use, downtown, housing,

community character, attractiveness, natural resources, and transportation and mobility. Two questions were asked: “How important are each of these issues in creating and maintaining the kind of community in which you would like to live?” and “How well do you think Lincoln and Lancaster County are doing in addressing these issues?” All but one of the questions fell short on how we are doing in relation to how important it is. There was also an open-ended question to respond to each of the topic areas. The responses greatly varied with each end of the spectrum represented. Respondents were then asked questions about the quality of the service they received.

Hartzell asked the Committee the following question: “In general, what have you seen in terms of the growth of Lincoln?” Comments by the Committee included the following: There is a lot of downtown excitement; there is a lot of retail on periphery, N Street and South 27th Street; there is a lot of neighborhood revitalization; many homes are being restored in Near South; there are great pockets of investment; in the last 5-10 years, great things have happened including the arena, Antelope Valley, the UNL Master Plan, Fallbrook, Village Gardens, and filling in the urban edges; in the last 6 years, there has been great leadership, not only in government but also in business; Mayor has been instrumental in moving things forward; in the past, development has been government driven, but that is starting to shift now and we are finding the middle.

Hartzell then asked, “What do you see as the Committee’s role in the process of development?” Responses from the Committee included the following: To review and advise on projects that are urban or have city funding; to be the public voice; to bring our collective expertise together to improve projects; to raise the bar; and to be the appeal board.

General comments by the Committee were that there is a difference in the scope of the two committees when meeting jointly with the Historic Preservation Commission. Each group has their own charge based on the focus of their group. Zimmer stated that perhaps it would be best to identify the question that each committee should answer prior to the joint meeting.

Another comment was that projects need to come to the Committee early enough to make a difference. Timely review is very important for the Committee to be able to do its charge. It would be great if there was a master schedule of projects coming down the pike to review, so we can have a timely review. This will also reduce the risk of projects coming to the Committee at the eleventh hour.

It is also important for the developers to bring the most current and complete design drawings to present to the Committee.

It is important that the advice the Committee gives is timely to assure that the process is helpful and positive. Perhaps it would be beneficial for the Chair to meet with the applicant before a project is brought to the Committee to identify issues of concern. *(As amended 6/12/13)*

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

**Please note that these minutes will not be formally approved until the next meeting of the Urban Design Committee. **