

## BRIEFING NOTES

**NAME OF GROUP:** PLANNING COMMISSION

**DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING:** Wednesday, June 8, 2016, 1:45 p.m., Bill Luxford Studio, Room 113, County-City Building, 555 South 10<sup>th</sup> Street, Lincoln, Nebraska.

**MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Tracy Corr, Maja Harris, Chris Hove, Dennis Scheer, Lynn Sunderman and Ken Weber; (Cathy Beecham, Michael Cornelius and Jeanelle Lust and absent).

**OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:** David Cary, Paul Barnes, Mike Brienzo, Brandon Garrett, Kellee Van Bruggen, Stacey Groshong-Hageman and Teresa McKinstry of the Planning Dept., Rick Haden, Jenny Young and Kyle McLaughlin of Felsburg Holt & Ullevig.

**STATED PURPOSE:** Briefing on “**Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update and LPlan 2040 Comprehensive Plan Proposals**” by Planning staff.

Chair Chris Hove called the meeting to order and acknowledged the posting of the Open Meetings Act in the back of the room.

David Cary welcomed everyone and reviewed the agenda for the briefing.

### LRTP Update

Jenny Young stated that they have been working hard the last couple of weeks. Revenue forecasts were developed based on funding sources. It shows how revenue is expected to increase over time at about 2.5 percent per year. She reviewed the Project Prioritization Process for Capital Roadway Projects and the allocation of remaining flexible funds. There are five scenarios that were looked at. We are moving forward with the hybrid scenario which is technology, rehabilitation and intersections. The online survey has generated almost 700 responses. The public input shows the most interest in investment priorities of 1) maintaining existing streets; 2) expand and improve transit services and; 3) building new streets and highways. The draft hybrid scenario has been divided into sections. Construction activities includes all committed projects, developer commitments, intersection safety and capital construction projects. Maintenance activities is another piece. It includes systems operations and maintenance and road and bridge rehabilitation. The third piece is transit and trail projects. The last piece is Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) and Technology. Planning Commission members had expressed an increased desire for more focus on transit and IT. They took that information back the LRTP Oversight Committee.

Rick Haden presented a display of the public input priorities for updating trail projects. The highest priority was 14<sup>th</sup> Street Protected Bikeway from K Street to R Street. He reviewed some of the other top priorities. These were based on 521 public responses. We took the public input and took it back to the scoring committee. They made some minor adjustments. He presented the final scoring for the trail projects. Young explained that the public input was added to the project scoring. Haden continued that as far as the cost, the total is 29.44 million for trail projects. There will be a best fit for the funding that is available. The Rock Island Connection rated highly. He believes it is being considered by the Railroad Transportation Safety District (RTSD). Total roadway capital projects are 273.65 million dollars. Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects already committed to are 75.97 million dollars, developer commitments are 25.55 million dollars. That leaves 172.13 million dollars for discretionary spending. There are five projects that were committed to in the CIP. There were four developer commitments. We asked the public to vote on roadway capital projects as well. The East Beltway was the highest rated. Second highest was the widening of Highway 2. Third was S. 40<sup>th</sup> St. and Normal Blvd.

Hove observed that it seems there is substantially more interest in some projects over others. Young stated that projects with a lot of support get a bump in the scoring. We didn't over emphasize. We want to get a balance.

David Cary stated that the East Beltway, as an example, is in need of a lot more funding. We keep this in mind when putting together a plan. This needs to wait for implementation until more funding is received, while acknowledging there is public interest. There needs to be money from the state and/or the federal government.

Haden stated that roadway project scoring is ranked. N. 48<sup>th</sup> Street was ranked first, Highway 2 from Van Dorn to Old Cheney was second. The committee spent quite a bit of time on these projects. Young added that in looking at project costs, the list showed 2016 project costs. When you start to look at year of expenditure costs, we are using a five percent per year inflationary cost. Your funds don't go very far. We talked about what it would look like if we took an alternate approach. We used the travel demand model to understand what we would really get by widening Highway 2, for example. You would gain more vehicles using the road, get a reduction in congestion and gain an average daily travel speed of two miles per hour. This is an average time savings per vehicle of about three minutes. It costs \$46,000,000.00 to get that savings.

Hove questioned if you increase truck traffic or how this is calculated. Young answered that this assumes the South Beltway.

Harris wondered about the numbers being considered with the South Beltway. Cary noted that in either scenario, the South Beltway happens whether we widen Highway 2 or not. The South

Beltway is committed and will be built. The South Beltway will remove some truck traffic from Highway 2 and over time, the Beltway will be used for some daily travels, but Highway 2 will be used and congested regardless. Young added that we are looking at what we gain by widening Highway 2.

Young noted they have been investigating an alternative approach. Some improvements could be made by doing signal progression and intersection spot improvements. We have been working with Lonnie Burkland at Public Works to understand the level of benefits that would be gained by this approach. We think it is somewhere between a fifteen and twenty percent reduction in congestion.

Scheer wondered if some items are capable of doing at least that well or better. He has a problem of two miles per hour and three minutes. Is that significant to drivers? Young replied that we feel that this can be done. This was an interesting exercise. The end numbers were similar to the fifteen to twenty percent that Burkland had talked about. A preliminary fiscally constrained roadway capital project list was created. The Oversight Committee decided to first do a corridor study for Highway 2. The N. 48<sup>th</sup> St. project is listed, as well as interim improvements to Highway 2, along with S. 40<sup>th</sup> St., Yankee Hill Rd., S. 56<sup>th</sup> St., N. 84<sup>th</sup> St. and O St.

Cary urged the Commissioners to look at the list. This is what we can afford to do. It is an eight project list with the existing revenues that we have. Young added that developer commitments and committed projects are another eight. Cary agreed. It is 16 projects total.

Young stated that we would like to take this fiscally constrained list, run it through the program model and see what benefits are gained.

Weber doesn't see any big surprises. Lincoln needs a fast way to get from north to south. There is no good road to do that. Haden believes that was reflected on some public comments received.

Young stated they will be back in a few weeks with more information.

### Comprehensive Plan Proposals

Cary stated that at the end of these proposals, we will be asking for formal direction from the Planning Commission.

Brandon Garrett reviewed the Growth Tiers. There is the existing city, Tier 1, Priority A, B and C, Tier II and Tier III. The existing city is more of the built out areas within city limits. We have adopted certain assumptions for infill. Tier I in general is all of the land between existing city and the future service limit. There is quite the variety of areas. This would be the focus of 80

percent of our residential growth. Tier I, Priority A is all land either annexed or part of an approved preliminary plan. They have come through Planning Commission. A lot of them are currently under development. We had some proposals that included a request to move to Tier I, Priority A. Once you have a proposal approved, you are already in Tier I, Priority A. Tier I, Priority B is areas where future plan approvals should be prioritized based on infrastructure availability. These are areas that don't have approved plans. It is just outside city limits. These are areas where we are actively planning our infrastructure. We could get to a lot of these projects in the six year CIP. Tier I, Priority C is areas where future infrastructure needs to be planned yet. Within this area we have active long term utility planning. Tier II is beyond the year 2040. These are areas where future infrastructure needs to be planned yet. There are no preliminary plans. In the next Comprehensive Plan, Tier II will basically turn into Tier I. Tier III Area Growth is areas beyond 2060. These are based on drainage basins where Lincoln could grow. Little effort is being made to plan infrastructure and there are no preliminary plans. There are things you can do by right in AG Agricultural zoning. Tier III is 131 square miles. Lincoln is currently 95 square miles.

Harris questioned if there is a natural progression for something to move from one tier to another. Garrett responded that everything is reviewed and evaluated. In some cases, it is a very logical progression. Cary added that in five years when we open the plan to 2050, assuming we keep growing, the areas will all expand.

Weber wondered if a large landowner wanted to develop beyond a basin and was willing to allow a large trunk line in their property, if it would be allowed. Cary believes there are a few things that could happen. If there was no way to make this work, we couldn't support it. Another scenario is the proposal could come forward with a comprehensive plan amendment. We still would want to hold to our policies. The landowner could say they want to advance the money for infrastructure improvements, but along with that we would probably process amendments to the plan. There also might be challenges for being contiguous or not, to the city. Garrett noted that we do have an exception for a potential large employer in which the city would work to get urban services to those locations.

Weber believes in some way, the city has influence in the cost of lots. Cary stated that we still have a large supply of lots out there. We have approved a lot of developments that haven't moved forward to final plat stage to be built on. We are trying to strike a balance.

Garrett reviewed the proposals and staff recommendations. Proposal A is located at S. 84<sup>th</sup> St. and Van Dorn, north of Firethorn. There is no proposed land use change. This is a growth tier change from C to B. Staff is recommending approval of this proposal. Staff might recommend expanding this area further based on feedback from Public Works. The proposed Capital Improvement Program (CIP) includes the needed wastewater improvement to serve this area.

Proposal B is located at SW. 12<sup>th</sup> St. and Rokeby Rd. The proposal is a land use change from Agricultural to Low Density Residential, with no growth tier changes. Most of the land is within Tier III, some in Tier II. Staff recommends not approving this. The project location is in the middle of one of our future drainage basins of growth. That basin could carry a substantial number of residences. Lincoln is developing in this area.

Harris understands that staff wants development to be in the vicinity of a drainage basin. She questioned if this is a question of density. Garrett replied that you want the biggest bang for your buck when you are extending into a sub-basin. If a project is filled with acreages, it makes it difficult to develop with more dense residential lots. Paul Barnes stated that without doing any changes, this applicant could do twelve or thirteen lots with a survey and a deed. If they did get a Community Unit Plan (CUP) approved, they could do thirteen to eighteen units. Garrett noted they would cluster the units and the rest would stay open land.

Garrett continued with Proposal C located at S. 70<sup>th</sup> St. and Yankee Hill Rd. The land use change is Urban Residential to Commercial and they would also like a Neighborhood Center designation. They also requested a change from Tier 1B to Tier 1A. Staff is recommending a partial approval of commercial land within the pipeline planning area and no neighborhood center designation. There is a good amount of commercial already planned or approved in the vicinity. There are already two neighborhood centers designated at this corner. We are proposing the change to commercial on the front 220 feet along Yankee Hill Rd. to account for the natural gas pipeline setback area.

Harris inquired if the applicant has been notified of this recommendation. Cary stated the applicants have been informed and are aware. We hope to work with them to help them understand our finding. Garrett added that we have already been contacted by the adjacent landowner to the east and they are concerned about what might happen adjacent to their land. They will share a vehicle access. Barnes added that all applicants were informed about today's briefing.

Weber questioned if 220 feet is wide enough for a commercial strip. Cary believes it is deep enough to do something. Garrett believes the main point is that the Health Department has recommended no residences or main structures within the pipeline planning area. We would work out those details at the time of the application.

Sunderman knows there are a couple of tall towers to the east. How do you plan around those? Barnes thinks 45<sup>th</sup> St. and Vine is a good example. The Planning Commission reviewed a proposal to move that tower to allow residential uses to be built there. We know that landowners are already talking about this area at 70<sup>th</sup> St. and Yankee Hill Road.

Garrett continued that Proposal D is located at NW 48<sup>th</sup> St. and I-80. They are proposing a land use change from Commercial and Industrial to Urban Residential and Commercial. No change

in growth tiers is proposed. This does have an approved site plan under a Planned Unit Development (PUD). They will be able to factor in a future industrial center to the west to provide adequate separation.

Scheer sees that Planning seems to agree with the basic market assumptions. Cary replied yes, there has been no interest for industrial in this area. There doesn't seem to be a market for this piece as industrial.

Sunderman agrees with the change.

Scheer left the meeting.

Garrett continued that Proposal E is located at S. 27<sup>th</sup> St. and Saltillo. The requested land use change is from Urban Residential to Commercial and a growth tier change from Tier 1C to 1B. The Comprehensive Plan generally addresses the alignment of S. 27<sup>th</sup> St. Staff does not recommend approval of this proposal. There is already ample commercial designated in this area. Infrastructure and the CIP is not conducive to speeding up the timeframe for this area. Separation of industrial uses and residential could be made up with future S. 27<sup>th</sup> Street right-of-way. He thinks the buffering concern can be addressed as a proposal comes through with annexation and change of zone.

Proposal F is located at N. 112<sup>th</sup> St. and O Street. This is adjacent to Waterford Estates. They are not proposing a land use change but a tier change from Tier 1C to 1B. Stevens Creek trunk sewer is in the area and ready to be extended. Staff recommends approval of this. The proposed CIP addresses extension of the Stevens Creek trunk sewer.

Proposal G is located at S. Folsom and Old Cheney. No land use change is proposed, but a growth tier change from Tier 1C to 1B is requested. Based on conversations with Public Works and Utilities, staff studied what they could change to help make this happen in a cost effective way. They found a way to extend the sewer in the proposed CIP. Cary added this also has the added benefit of serving the Southwest Village area. Garrett noted there is not a lot of acreages in this area.

Barnes believes part of the hope is to get more rooftops and you will potentially see more commercial in the area.

Garrett continued with Proposal H located at S. 82<sup>nd</sup> St. and Roca. They are proposing a change from Agricultural to Low Density Residential, no growth tier change. This is north of Hickman. Planning proposes this is appropriate for acreage development.

Cary added that countywide acreage development is identified in the Comprehensive Plan. About 100 acreage units per year are constructed countywide. By filling this in with low-density

residential, we are still within the 25 year demand schedule. Garrett also noted that paved roads and a water district are in place.

Weber asked if this is within Hickman's one mile jurisdiction. Garrett replied no. It is not within one mile, but Hickman has a Comprehensive Plan that adds on a horizon of two miles. He believes this is consistent with their plan as well.

Cary feels good about the process they have taken to reach out to land owners and developers. We feel we received a good range proposals that were submitted. Staff would like to get formal direction from the Planning Commission. This will come back for a formal process and the public will have further opportunity to comment.

Hove inquired if staff has communicated these recommendations with the applicants. Cary replied yes. He believes they all understood the findings.

Harris is concerned about the proposal on Yankee Hill Rd. Planning staff has revised the commercial area that they would be willing to support. She has reservations about that. Garrett noted that there is already approved commercial in the area. Barnes feels that if the applicant had any reservations, they would have attended today or relayed comments.

**ACTION:**

Sunderman recommended approval of moving forward with all staff recommendations, seconded by Weber. Motion failed 4-0 due to a lack of a quorum acting on the motion: Harris, Hove, Sunderman and Weber voting 'yes'; Corr abstaining; Beecham, Cornelius, Lust and Scheer absent. Cary noted that this action was meant to give staff direction on the content of these staff findings and this 4-0 vote has provided that direction.

- Cary stated that after the last Planning Commission hearing, a question came up regarding the Planning Dept. notification letters. Geri Rorabaugh with the Planning Dept. looked into it and found out that mail from the County-City building mailroom first goes to a sorting operation. This adds some extra days to the process. The Planning Dept. has decided to send everything via First Class mail so that we bypass the sorting process for notification letters. We will pay the extra cent for that cost so the letters are delivered in a timely manner.

Quiz via Kahoot

Question: The existing city plans to add how many new dwelling units by 2040?

Answer: 8,000

Question: Tier 1, Priority A represents?

Answer: Developing or annexed areas with approved plans

Question: Tier 1, Priority B represents?

Answer: Areas to be considered for approvals over the next ten years

Question: Tier I, Priority C represents?

Answer: Growth areas after 2026

Question: Tier II represents?

Answer: An area that should remain in its current state

Question: Tier III represents?

Answer: Drainage basins that could develop beyond 2060

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.