

MEETING RECORD

NAME OF GROUP: URBAN DESIGN COMMITTEE

DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING: Wednesday, April 9, 2014, 3:00 p.m., Room 214, County/City Building, 555 S. 10th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: JoAnne Kissel, Gill Peace, Michelle Penn, Scott Sullivan, Michele Tilley and Mary Anne Wells.

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Josh Berger and Jennifer Brinkman (Tetrad Property Group); Shawn Diedebich (The Clark Enersen Partners); Ron Larson and Matt Metcalf (Davis Design); Ken Fourgeron (Speedway Properties); Darl Naumann (Ayers & Ayers); Mark Hunzeker and Derek Zimmerman (Baylor Evnen); Kevin Abourezk (Lincoln Journal Star); Wynn Hjermstad (Urban Development); Marvin Krout, Ed Zimmer, Stacey Hageman & Michele Abendroth (Planning Department)

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

Chair JoAnne Kissel called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m. The Nebraska Open Meetings Act was acknowledged.

Adoption of meeting record of UDC meeting of March 12, 2014.

Penn moved approval of the meeting record of February 12, 2014, seconded by Tilley. Motion carried 6-0. Kissel, Peace, Penn, Sullivan, Tilley and Wells voting 'yes'.

Building IV, Nebraska Innovation Campus (TIF-assisted project, project team).

Larson stated that this project is for a greenhouse complex at Nebraska Innovation Campus--the old State Fair Grounds. The structure consists of a 30,000 square foot headhouse and 15,000 square feet of greenhouse that is attached to it. The greenhouses are mechanically cooled. The initial build-out will be two greenhouses. In the future, they will add on additional greenhouses. Shipping and receiving will be on the north end. There is a recessed dock and an at-grade dock. The entrance building will be brick masonry façade materials. The windows allow for a lot of natural light.

Kissel stated that the front of the building is internal to the campus. The public impact of the building is not the same as the campus impact of the building. Metcalf stated that it is critical to maintain unimpeded sunshine to the south, so the roadway is a natural barrier. Nothing can ever be built to shade the greenhouse.

Sullivan asked about the LEED equivalency. Larson stated that a mechanically cooled greenhouse will never meet LEED equivalency.

Krout stated that the design team has asked to waive the street tree planting requirements. They are worried that it creates a psychological barrier in trying to market the greenhouse to tenants. Planning staff has agreed to 15-20' trees instead of shade trees, but the design team does not want to put in any trees. It is a long length of frontage along Salt Creek Roadway that is planned for eventual greenhouse construction, so he is interested in hearing their argument today. Berger stated that parallel to Salt Creek Roadway is a utility corridor. It is a shade issue, and it is also a utility issue. They want the waiver for the areas directly adjacent to the greenhouses. Tilley asked what the span of all the buildings is. Berger stated that it is approximately 600 feet. Metcalf added that mechanically cooled greenhouses are special and are used for recruiting top scientists. The stigma of trees by the greenhouses is a real factor. Berger added that there is interest in these greenhouses because they are mechanically cooled and because they are state-of-the-art facilities.

Wells stated that she is not opposed to not having street trees, but she would recommend some low landscaping to soften the area. Kissel agrees, as there has to be some compromise because it will break the rhythm of the street trees along this roadway.

Kissel asked what the requirements are for the distance the trees need to be away from the greenhouse. Berger stated that it is a perception issue as well as a shade issue. They are requesting a waiver for any side of the building with access to sunlight.

Berger stated that there is a 6' drop from the building to the sidewalk. Sullivan stated that there is an opportunity for some tiered landscaping or berms.

Tilley stated that she thinks the landscaping is a great idea, but she is reluctant to sign off on waivers for wherever they think trees would shade the building.

The Committee requested that the team come back with a landscaping plan.

Penn stated that she likes the architecture. She is fine with there being no trees as long as they have an alternative landscaping plan.

Sullivan moved that the Committee is in favor of the architecture, but they would like to see a landscape plan at a future meeting, seconded by Tilley. Motion carried 6-0. Kissel, Peace, Penn, Sullivan, Tilley and Wells voting 'yes'.

Speedway Sporting Village (TIF-assisted redevelopment project).

Diedebich stated that the Speedway Sporting Village site is 62.5 acres near Park Boulevard. Good Life Fitness is a neighboring facility. The project entails the creation of a youth sports complex. There would be 5 buildings including an indoor soccer facility and a sports training performance facility. There is also a trampoline facility, a banquet/basketball facility and retail space. There is an LES substation on the site. The project would have a private roadway system with a large amount of parking and 10 sports fields primarily for soccer. They would be nine grass fields and one artificial turf field. The soccer facility is a pre-engineered metal panel

system. There will be a covered deck which will hold a large quantity of spectators to get them out of the elements. The intent is that all the buildings will be metal. They presented a rendering from the overpass on Van Dorn.

Zimmer stated that this is a redevelopment project with TIF assistance so they are advising the other review bodies on the urban design aspects of the project.

Wells asked what age group the fields will be used for. Diedebich stated that it will be for ages 3 up to adults, but the fields are sized for 10-18 year olds. Wells asked if these will support a tournament. Diedebich confirmed that they will. Wells asked if there will be a traffic light at Van Dorn. Hunzeker stated that they have talked about the possibility of a traffic light, but they are uncertain at this point whether the traffic study will warrant a signal. They do not think it will in the first year. Wells asked about drainage. Hunzeker stated that the amount of grading that needs to be done is minimal. They will need to bring in a little bit of fill. They are exceeding the standard requirements for grading in a floodplain.

Kissel asked what the retail will be. Fougerson stated that they don't know yet, but they expect it to be something related to sports, such as sports apparel, or maybe a restaurant.

Kissel asked about the parking. Hunzeker stated that the parking is oriented toward the soccer facility, trampoline facility, and basketball facility. They are in excess of what is required, and they think they have enough surplus parking for major events.

Kissel asked about screening requirements in conjunction with the parking. Hunzeker stated that they are not proposing to screen the parking lot. They are proposing to waive the screening from the roadway so they do not block the view to the facilities as it is very hard to see. They are putting in shade trees.

Tilley asked about signage. Hunzeker stated that there will be signs. The signs for the buildings will be on the sides of the buildings. There will be a sign that will direct people to the Park Boulevard entrance. Penn stated that signage is so important, and she believes that is a great place for the TIF money to go. Penn asked what the TIF money is being used for. Naumann stated that it is dependent on the infrastructure going to the site. Very little of it is for the buildings, so signage could be a part of it. Hunzeker stated that by the time we construct all the roadways and infrastructure, they will use most of the TIF money.

Sullivan stated that it was his impression that all TIF projects have to meet LEED certification. Hjernstad stated that they do not require they meet LEED standards. Sullivan asked why it is not being considered similar to other TIF projects. Hjernstad stated that it comes down to the uses of the buildings. Diedebich stated that they are trying to make this building as energy efficient as possible. They are using insulated panels; the overhang provides a natural block of sunlight; there are skylights in the building; and they are using low-flow plumbing. Sullivan stated that this is a lot of square footage, so he asked why we aren't saying this needs to be LEED equivalent. Hjernstad stated that when they have used TIF for energy efficiency, it has

been for enhancements. Hunzeker stated that there is a tremendous amount of public infrastructure, which is the highest priority of every redevelopment agreement, and it is a significant public benefit.

Wells stated that it is a really good project and asked them to consider the layout so there is enough space for bleachers and setback from the parking lot. She also commented that the best orientation for a soccer field is north-south.

Sullivan moved approval of the project as submitted, seconded by Penn. Motion carried 5-0. Peace, Penn, Sullivan, Tilley and Wells voting 'yes'; Kissel abstaining.

Misc. and staff report: schedule of up-coming meetings, up-coming items.

Zimmer reminded the Committee that next month our meetings will move to the first Tuesday of the month.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

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

M:\plan\UrbanDesignReview\UDC\MINUTES\2014\140409.docx