

## MEETING RECORD

*Advanced public notice of the Planning Commission meeting was posted on the County-City bulletin board and the Planning Department's website. In addition, a public notice was emailed to the Lincoln Journal Star for publication on Tuesday, November 24, 2020.*

**NAME OF GROUP:** PLANNING COMMISSION

**DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING:** Wednesday, December 2, 2020, 1:00 p.m., Hearing Room 112, on the first floor of the County-City Building, 555 S. 10<sup>th</sup> Street, Lincoln, Nebraska.

**MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Lorenzo Ball, Tom Beckius, Dick Campbell, Tracy Edgerton, Cristy Joy and Dennis Scheer; Tracy Corr, Deane Finnegan and Cindy Ryman Yost absent; Steve Henrichsen, David Cary, Paul Barnes, Geri Rorabaugh and Rhonda Haas (via broadcast) of the Planning Department; media and other interested citizens.

**STATED PURPOSE OF MEETING:** Regular Planning Commission Hearing

Vice Chair Beckius called the meeting to order and acknowledged the posting of the Open Meetings Act in the room.

Vice Chair Beckius requested a motion approving the minutes for the regular meeting held November 18, 2020.

Motion for approval of the minutes made by Campbell, seconded by Edgerton and carried 6-0: Ball, Campbell, Edgerton, Joy, Scheer and Beckius voting 'yes'; Corr, Finnegan and Ryman Yost absent.

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

#### **PUBLIC HEARING & ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION**

##### **BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION:**

**DECEMBER 2, 2020**

Members present: Ball, Campbell, Edgerton, Joy, Scheer and Beckius; Corr, Finnegan and Ryman Yost absent.

**The Consent Agenda consisted of the following items: Annexation 20012, Annexation 20013, Change of Zone 17030C, Change of Zone 20035, Change of Zone 20033 and Street & Alley Vacation 20005.**

There was no ex-parte communications disclosed.  
There was no ex-parte communications disclosed relating to site visits.

Items 1.2a and 1.2b, Annexation 20013 and Change of Zone 20035, were removed from the Consent Agenda for a separate public hearing.

Scheer moved approval of the remaining Consent Agenda items, seconded by Joy.

Motion carried 6-0: Ball, Campbell, Edgerton, Joy, Scheer and Beckius voting ‘yes’; Corr, Finnegan and Ryman Yost absent.

**ANNEXATION 20013**  
**TO ANNEX APPROXIMATELY 4.84 ACRES AND ADJACENT RIGHT-OF-WAY INCLUDING THE REMAINING PORTION OF LOT 122 AND SOUTH 98TH STREET, ON PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT 8455 SOUTH 98TH STREET**  
**AND**  
**CHANGE OF ZONE 20035**  
**FROM AG (AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT) TO H-3 (HIGHWAY COMMERCIAL DISTRICT), ON PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT 8455 SOUTH 98TH STREET**

**PUBLIC HEARING:** **DECRMBER 2, 2020**

Members present: Ball, Campbell, Edgerton, Joy, Scheer and Beckius; Corr, Finnegan and Ryman Yost absent.

<b><u>Staff Recommendation:</u></b>	Annexation 20013	Conditional Approval
	Change of Zone 20035	Conditional Approval

There was no ex-parte communications disclosed.  
There was no ex-parte communications disclosed relating to site visits.

**Staff Presentation:** Steve Henrichsen, Planning Department, came forward and stated the project is named 8455 Place and is proposing an annexation and rezoning to allow for the redevelopment of the former residential property located on the west side of 98<sup>th</sup> Street and the north side of Highway 2. The area is 4.84 acres and was developed with a single-family family dwelling unit until its removal about a year ago. It is adjacent to the city limits on the north and it borders the Southlake residential development. The applicant has agreed to preserve the existing tree mass along Highway 2, which does a lot to help with the entryway into Lincoln and it is anticipated that there will be a sign for any of the commercial uses developed on the site, if approved. Henrichsen stated that this is not an area that you would want to develop something that would generate high traffic. The applicant has agreed to put in an appropriate turn lane for this site and to the conditions listed in the zoning agreement.

Edgerton stated that in the correspondence received there was mention of the screening and significant tree removal on the site. Henrichsen stated the site has several trees within the

property, as well as the trees along Highway 2, and to proceed with the development of the site, the developer would need to remove most of the trees within the site.

Campbell inquired if the trees along Highway 2 would remain. Henrichsen said correct.

Scheer shared that his question is for the long-term future considerations and he inquired if there were any plans or desires to improve the Yankee Hill Road and Highway 2 intersection and the quick turnoff onto 98<sup>th</sup> Street improvements in the future. Henrichsen stated that there is not a specific plan for this intersection, and further stated that they did discuss this intersection with Lincoln Transportation & Utilities (LTU) who felt that with the applicant agreeing to dedicate additional right-of-way along 98<sup>th</sup> Street there would be sufficient right-of-way in this general location.

**Applicant:**

**Mike Eckert, Civil Design Group, 8535 Executive Woods Drive,** came forward on behalf of Mark Lewis and the Lewis Starostka Group, who are the proposed developers of this site, and on behalf of Roger Byrne--the existing owner. He shared that they have a couple of sites like this that sit lower than they could gravity sewer, but there is gravity sewer located on Topher Blvd. Planning staff has thoroughly reviewed the development options for this parcel and prepared for the annexation of this land with the implementation of utility easements in the adjacent Southlake 10<sup>th</sup> Addition, Outlot 'A', that will be utilized for the sewer and water main taps for this site. The developer will need to force main the sewer up and will be responsible for those costs. The Planning Department would support this site being commercial with the condition that this site is restricted to just having one lot and not subdivided, and the site would be a low traffic generator.

Eckert stated there is a need for an area similar to a trade center that would have space for contractors to have small offices, a breakroom and storage areas for their equipment. They have had some discussions with the surrounding neighbors that were slow moving due to the recent holiday, but they have made some commitments to not disturb the tree line that is within 15 feet of the property line. There is a 20-foot setback in this area and that will still leave 5 feet for the footings. The developer will need to do an extended footing as a retaining wall on the back of the buildings and capture the drainage that comes between them. Eckert stated they are making a pledge to Tyler Miles on behalf of Mr. Lewis and himself to fill in the existing gap with a full-sized coniferous tree to provide better screening on his property.

Scheer asked if there would be a second wall behind the building, because preserving trees can be tricky and they need space. Eckert said no, and they have had the trees checked, which are in a single line with 7- to 8-foot trunks. He shared that they have some flux and they could move the buildings a couple of feet, if needed.

Campbell shared that one of the comments received had concerns with them using metal roofs. Eckert stated that he is unsure of what is planned for the roofs, but another facility of theirs in

Grand Island has pitched roofs. Eckert stated that they would take into consideration the comment received on metal roofs.

Scheer asked what the height of the roof would be. Eckert shared the Grand Island facility is 15- to 20-feet. The buildings will be single story with a 12-foot door, which will face the interior of the project.

Ball inquired what would be stored at this site. Eckert stated it would be used for contractor services and provide a place for businesses to store inventory, equipment, have a small office space and will not be a rental storage for the public.

Campbell asked if the building by the detention area would be moved and located by the other two buildings. Eckert said yes that is something they would do, which would still allow for the required parking ratios for the buildings size.

No one came forward in support.

**Opposition:**

1. **Tyler Miles, 9685 Topher Blvd.,** came forward and stated that they received a notice a week ago and he immediately began a dialog with everyone involved in this proposed project. He shared that he has gone through the LPlan 2040, which gives citizens a guideline of what to expect with the relationship between the city, developers and citizens. What was presented today is a step forward, because the screening does matter -- it needs to remain in place to protect the visual aesthetics. Miles stated this area is an entryway for Lincoln and asked if metal roofs on these buildings is truly what the city wants people to see as drive into Lincoln. He shared that everyone needs to come together and decide to go with something more aesthetically pleasing and approve the screen that was discussed by Mr. Eckert.

Campbell asked Mr. Miles if he was comfortable with them leaving the north row of cedar trees and the trees along the highway. Miles shared he is comfortable with what had been discussed, because it was not something that had been approached until 15 minutes prior to this hearing.

2. **Helen Colosimo and Dr. Mathew Barlow, 8120 S. 97<sup>th</sup> Street, testified in opposition via Zoom teleconference,** stating that they had purchased their home without physically seeing it first because they lived out of state. She shared that they were not included in the public mailing notice and from their house they can see the work that has been done in the area. She shared that they found out about this because Mr. Miles came to their neighborhood and informed them of this proposed project. Colosimo stated that their concerns are similar to what has already been presented. She shared that they also have concerns with what this would do to their property value and an increase in traffic in the area. Colosimo explained that she had done research of the surrounding area prior to purchasing their home and liked the agricultural view that this location offered, which is one of the reasons for their purchase. Barlow stated that their main

concerns with this project is that it needs to be aesthetically pleasing, their property value, additional traffic with some of it being larger vehicles in the area, and the ability to sell the remaining lots that are connected to or adjacent to the development.

Campbell asked if they were comfortable with the trees remaining on the left side and along Highway 2. Barlow said comfortable yes, but they have concerns that a subcontractor may accidentally remove trees that are not to be removed. Best intentions are great but things may happen, and he is concerned that the contractor would just say it is too late, they are gone. Campbell stated that if the developer is willing to add another requirement to the development to add additional trees on the north end to help with their view. Barlow said yes if they keep what trees are currently there and add additional trees to ensure that the area is aesthetically pleasing.

**Staff Questions:**

Campbell inquired if the Planning Department has had time to work out the new requirement that Mr. Eckert had discussed or if this is something they should assume will be added before it goes to City Council. Henrichsen stated that moving forward this will have an additional condition added that the trees in the northern 15 feet would remain. Campbell inquired if it could also be added that any of the holes would be filled in and should a tree die it would be replaced. Henrichsen stated they could add that the gap would be filled in that is located by Mr. Miles property line, and he further stated he wanted to point out that the last testifiers' house is shown to have eight lots between them and the tree line of the proposed site, so adding additional trees for screening on the far eastern end would not make a difference when the lots are developed. Campbell stated if they were to add trees to the eastern end it would help with the sale of those lots that are on that end. Henrichsen stated they could certainly have discussions with Mr. Eckert about adding trees to the eastern end. The current understanding is that they would retain the northern 15 feet of trees and put in an additional tree by Mr. Miles property line to fill in the gap, which otherwise would not have been required because the trees met the screening requirements.

Scheer asked about the language that would be used in the agreement on preserving the tree line. Henrichsen stated that the City Attorney's Office would be working on the exact verbiage that would be used, and typically it would say preserved.

Joy asked where the required turning lane would be located. Henrichsen stated it would be located as far north as possible for the southbound right-hand turn lane into the site and then there will be a center turn lane as well.

Ball asked about the risk of erosion near the retaining wall located behind the buildings where the lower grade is. Henrichsen stated there is a condition that they submit a grading and drainage plan to the satisfaction of LTU's Watershed Division and they would be looking at the grading plan in more detail.

**Applicant Rebuttal:**

Eckert stated Mr. Henrichsen had mentioned that Mr. Barlow's property is quite a bit to the north, which was measured to be 650 feet away and that is why they had not received a notice. Overtime, there will also be eight more houses and backyards with trees between their property and the property line of the proposed project. Eckert explained that 98<sup>th</sup> Street is a mile section road and a major arterial street and would someday be a 4-laned road with a center turn lane. He explained that the tree line in the eastern portion of the site does have several volunteer trees on the end and the right-of-way will be next to that existing line. Eckert did apologize to Mr. Miles for the delay in getting him some of the information requested, which was due to the holiday.

Campbell state that the less grading done in the area is better for the trees because their root system only goes down 2 to 3 feet and outward 2 to 3 times their height. Eckert stated that they would take caution during the construction of the buildings to minimize the impact on the existing trees.

Edgerton moved to close the public hearing on this item, seconded by Joy and carried 6-0: Ball, Campbell, Edgerton, Joy, Scheer and Beckius voting 'yes'; Corr, Finnegan and Ryman Yost absent.

**ANNEXATION 20013****ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION:****DECEMBER 2, 2020**

Campbell moved approval, seconded by Edgerton.

Scheer stated the annexation makes perfect sense and meets all the criteria and is not controversial at all. Scheer explained with the change of zone he was less sure of his approval when reading through the staff report, but with Mr. Eckert's reaching out and discussions with Mr. Mile's on his concerns was helpful and there may be future opportunities to continue those discussions. Scheer stated that Mr. Eckert's ability to add the preservation of the trees is a really big deal, and he further stated that he is comfortable with where they are at with this. When you take into account the grade change and the grade drop and the preservation of the trees, this property is really difficult to be used any other way. This use fits in a good way and will for a long time, and it also fits well as an entryway procession to Lincoln but, in the future, this area will most likely not continue to be an entryway as development continues in the area.

Edgerton echoed her fellow commissioner's comments and shared she, too, had concerns as she read through the staff report and public comments about needing additional screening added to the agreement, which had been discussed and agreed to prior to today's hearing. Edgerton stated she appreciates citizens that are engaged and involved in the process to bring this forward and that the parties were amenable on how they bring this together and have it work for both sides and is in support of both motions.

Scheer shared with Mr. Miles that he has a future as a Planning Commissioner because his earlier comments were great.

Beckius echoed Commissioner Scheer's comments and shared that Mr. Miles presentation was astounding and a good example for those who want to come and testify in a public hearing. Beckius explained that Mr. Miles had mentioned earlier in his testimony that the guiding principles of a Comprehensive Plan are a contract between all parties involved in some way, shape or form, and further explained that Mr. Miles will be the eyes and ears on the ground for this development moving forward. Beckius stated that he thinks the development of this parcel makes sense with the way that it is being proposed and that it is a decent development to live next to compared to what other developments have had to live next to. The impact will be minimal when this project is complete, and the worst case might be that later in the evening someone is throwing around tools. The tree preservation to the adjacent neighborhood and along what is currently Highway 2, in the long term, prevents additional development to the site because site lines are really important to a higher intensity use and with the site lines from Highway 2, which is forever preserved by a tree mass it wont be as an intensive use as it could be.

Motion carried 6-0: Ball, Campbell, Edgerton, Joy, Scheer and Beckius voting 'yes'; Corr, Finnegan and Ryman Yost absent.

#### **CHANGE OF ZONE 20035**

#### **ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION:**

**DECEMBER 2, 2020**

Campbell moved approval, seconded by Joy.

Campbell made a motion to add the condition that Byrne shall preserve and maintain the existing tree masses that serve as screening along the north boundary of the property adjacent to the residential lots immediately adjacent to the property and shall also be responsible for filling in gaps in the tree masses where required to effect adequate screening, second by Joy.

Campbell stated that Mr. Eckert brought forward a working element and has worked with a number of people with in the past 24-hours to bring this to a resolution. Campbell stated he, too, had great concerns when reading the staff report but, based on today's testimony and the willingness to add the additional condition, has made a huge difference on this site, and he congratulated them on their work.

Motion to amend carried 6-0: Ball, Campbell, Edgerton, Joy, Scheer and Beckius voting 'yes'; Corr, Finnegan, Ryman Yost absent.

Main motion, as amended, carried 6-0: Ball, Campbell, Edgerton, Joy, Scheer and Beckius voting 'yes'; Corr, Finnegan and Ryman Yost absent.

#### **TEXT AMENDMENT 20007**

**TO AMEND ARTICLE 4.005H OF THE LANCASTER COUNTY ZONING REGULATIONS RELATING TO FARM WINERY, TO ALLOW CRAFT BREWERY AS ACCESSORY TO A FARM WINERY**  
**PUBLIC HEARING:** **DECEMBER 2, 2020**

Members present: Ball, Campbell, Edgerton, Joy, Scheer and Beckius; Corr, Finnegan and Ryman Yost absent.

**Staff Recommendation:** Approval

There was no ex-parte communications disclosed.

There was no ex-parte communications disclosed relating to site visits.

**Staff Presentation:** **Steve Henrichsen, Planning Department,** came forward and stated this is to amend Article 4.005h Farm Winery to allow microbrewery as accessory use to a farm winery and with the condition that the sales from the microbrewery are not over 25 percent of the gross wine sales. Additional revisions were included in the text amendment by the County Attorney, and these revisions reformat and revise the text but don't substantially change the initial provisions. Henrichsen stated that allowing microbrewery as accessory to farm winery could help ensure the success of these businesses. Henrichsen explained that Dale Lilyhorn has an existing winery, which he has been trying to sell and over the summer interested parties had contacted him asking if Lancaster County allowed accessory beer sales with the winery, and when they were told no, they were no longer interested. He stated that this text amendment allows craft brewing as a minor element of the operation and the wine would continue to be the main operation for the site. Microbreweries themselves are typically located in urban areas near customers and are closer to manufacturing operations.

Edgerton inquired about the 25 percent of gross sales condition and asked who at the county would request the sales receipts. Henrichsen stated that typically requests would come into the Planning Department or Building & Safety and at that point they would check to see if there was some merit to the complaint. If there was merit to the complaint, they would contact the County Attorney's Office, who would ask to see their sales receipts for the past six months for both beer and wine.

Scheer asked if there was any reason why an accessory use like this was not part of the original text. Henrichsen stated that until this last summer the Planning Department had never had anyone ask about having a microbrewery with a winery.

Joy inquired what the 25 percent was based on and why that amount was selected. Henrichsen stated the goal is for the microbrewery to be an accessory and a minor portion of the total sales and when looking at alcohol sales within the city's zoning ordinances and how it was defined, this was the typical range allowed.

Beckius asked if they would only be able to sell their products and not name brand products like Budweiser. Henrichsen said correct, because they are not wanting these wineries to become a bar or tavern.

**Applicant:**

**Dale Lilyhorn, 3110 W. Branched Oak Road, Raymond, testified via Zoom teleconference,** stating that he is not interested in opening a microbrewery himself, but he is wanting to sell his winery so that he can retire. He shared that potential buyers are no longer interested in the winery when they learn that they cannot sell beer in Lancaster County at the winery. With this passing, a potential buyer could expand the winery operation by putting in a microbrewery.

No one came forward in support or opposition.

Campbell moved to close the public hearing on this item, seconded by Joy and carried 6-0: Ball, Campbell, Edgerton, Joy, Scheer and Beckius voting 'yes'; Corr, Finnegan and Ryman Yost absent.

**TEXT AMENDMENT 20007**

**ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION:**

**DECEMBER 2, 2020**

Campbell moved approval, seconded by Joy.

Campbell stated that this make a lot of common sense and he agrees that there are several individuals that go to wine tastings and would rather have a beer, and he further stated that these uses are very compatible.

Scheer said he agrees.

Beckius shared that he agrees with his fellow commissioners' comments. Down the road, as things progress, there could be someone that would want to distill liquor on site in this type of setting, which would be exciting as well.

Motion carried 6-0: Ball, Campbell, Edgerton, Joy, Scheer and Beckius voting 'yes'; Corr, Finnegan and Ryman Yost absent.

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT 20002**

**TO AMEND THE 2040 LINCOLN-LANCASTER COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO ADOPT THE "33RD & CORNHUSKER SUBAREA PLAN". AMENDMENTS TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN INCLUDE: ADDING REFERENCE TO BOTH PLANS IN CHAPTER 12, UPDATING THE FUTURE LAND USE MAP, UPDATING THE MIXED-USE REDEVELOPMENT NODES MAP, UPDATING THE COMMERCIAL CENTERS MAP, AND VARIOUS UPDATES TO CHAPTER 10 TO CONFORM WITH ASSOCIATED AMENDMENTS TO THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN. THE SUBAREA PLAN IS GENERALLY BOUNDED BY NORTH 27TH STREET AND DEADMAN'S RUN ON THE WEST, SUPERIOR STREET ON THE NORTH; NORTH 48TH STREET ON THE EAST AND THE PROPERTIES**

**IMMEDIATELY SOUTH OF CORNHUSKER HIGHWAY ON THE SOUTH, AND THE PROJECT AREA IS APPROXIMATELY 590 ACRES**

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**DECEMBER 2, 2020**

Members present: Ball, Campbell, Edgerton, Joy, Scheer and Beckius; Corr, Finnegan and Ryman Yost absent.

**Staff Recommendation:** Approval

There was no ex-parte communications disclosed.

There was no ex-parte communications disclosed relating to site visits.

**Staff Presentation:** Paul Barnes, Planning Department, came forward and stated this is for an amendment to the 2040 Lincoln/Lancaster County Comprehensive Plan. This is to incorporate the 33<sup>rd</sup> Street and Cornhusker Highway Subarea Plan. This application originally came before this board in 2018 and was unanimously approved, but prior to City Council's action being final this application was withdrawn to re-evaluate the roadway alignment, which is the Railroad Transportation Safety District (RTSD) project led portion of this. He shared that the subarea portion of this plan includes the updated street alignment, minor map updates to match the alignment, text updates but, essentially, it is the same plan as was previously brought before the Planning Commission. Barnes stated that the subarea details were presented at the Planning Commission briefing on November 18, 2020.

Barnes explained that the Subarea plan overall covers an area from about 27<sup>th</sup> Street to 48<sup>th</sup> Street, including properties just south of Cornhusker Highway and the railroad and properties just north to Superior Street. The main components to the Subarea Plan is an analysis of the subarea's existing physical conditions, demographic, economic conditions, and outlining the short and long recommendations for land use, development, redevelopment, transportation and utility infrastructure, mobility, economic sustainability, and aesthetic enhancements. Another main component of the Subarea Plan is the Future Land Use Plan. He noted that the Future Land Use Plan is just a guide that is used and adopting or recommending approval of the Subarea Plan does not change the zoning or property rights that exist today. However, zoning may change over time as development and redevelopment occur within the subarea.

The Subarea Plan recommends creating a mixed-use environment and supports a range of housing types and sizes throughout the subarea; prioritizes nodal development at key intersection; provides additional access to greenspace; establishes transition zones between different land uses; recommends development of new guidelines for development; and conserves the Salt Creek floodplain in the area. A complement to the Subarea Plan is the Corridor Enhancement Plan, which is a document that identifies potential opportunities within the public right-of-way.

Barnes shared that there was some pre-2019 outreach, which was rather extensive and started with the Planning and Environmental Linkages study that was completed in 2016. An Advisory

Committee was established with stakeholders from the public and private sectors. There were three public open houses, a design charrette and a visioning session as well as an online survey. This project has been posted on the website with all related materials and there was a social media campaign with detailed information about the process. Additional outreach has taken place since this item was last before the commission. Barnes shared that there have been one-on-one stakeholder meetings with business and property owners, residents, local community leaders and the public at large. The Advisory Committee held meetings in May 2019 and May 2020, and they were provided with updates periodically outside of the meetings.

**Kris Humphrey, RTSD (Railroad Transportation Safety District) Project Manager**, came forward and stated that currently they are working towards their 60 percent plan submittal that will be submitted the first part of next year. They are also currently working on their environmental document, which will have public hearing in Fall 2021 and then it will come back for review with the appropriate agencies and then signed in 2022. She shared that they continue to work in coordination on other projects in the area like the Deadman's Run Project and a couple of local projects.

Barnes shared that the RTSD projects will continue their own schedules to be developed. Barnes noted that the Subarea Plan is flexible and designed to respond to future changes, so if there is an additional change in the RTSD project or alignment that could be made in reflecting the Subarea Plan and the projects can remain independent and on their own paths.

Campbell inquired about the cost of the project and where they are with putting funds aside. Humphrey stated that currently there is a Memorandum of Understanding between the RTSD, the State of Nebraska and BNSF (Burlington Northern Santa Fe). There is a certain amount that BNSF is required to contribute and the remaining funds would be split between local RTSD, federal and state funds, 1.5 percent of Lincoln on the Move funds and they will be applying for grants. Campbell asked if they were on target to get the funding needed. Humphrey shared when the 60 percent plan is submitted, and the cost estimated is updated they will have a better idea of the funding needed.

No one came forward in support or opposition.

Campbell moved to close the public hearing on this item, seconded by Scheer and carried 6-0: Ball, Campbell, Edgerton, Joy, Scheer and Beckius voting 'yes'; Corr, Finnegan and Ryman Yost absent.

#### **COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT 20002**

#### **ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION:**

**DECEMBER 2, 2020**

Campbell moved approval, seconded by Joy.

Campbell shared that with the briefing that was given on this area, this makes a lot of sense to have the coordination with all the parties on what is being done.

Scheer stated that this plan had been unanimously approved previously, and the changes that have been made are great improvements and he is in support.

Edgerton commended everyone involved in the project, and she shared that the transparency and the information available online is extraordinary. She stated this is a great resource for the community and allows the public to keep track and understand what is going on as things move forward.

Motion carried 6-0: Ball, Campbell, Edgerton, Joy, Scheer and Beckius voting 'yes'; Corr, Finnegan and Ryman Yost absent.

Vice Chair Beckius stated at this point we generally invite anyone wishing to speak on an item not on the agenda to come forward and do so. However, we are suspending this portion of the hearing until further notice. If you do have comments please direct them to [Plan@lincoln.ne.gov](mailto:Plan@lincoln.ne.gov) or by calling 402-441-7941.

Edgerton moved to adjourn the Planning Commission Meeting of December 2, 2020, seconded by Campbell and carried 6-0: Ball, Campbell, Edgerton, Joy, Scheer and Beckius voting 'yes'; Corr, Finnegan and Ryman Yost absent.

Meeting adjourned 2:39 p.m.

Note: The Planning Commission will not formally approve these minutes until their next regular meeting on Wednesday, December 16, 2020.