

## 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, December 8, 2020.*

**NAME OF GROUP:** PLANNING COMMISSION

**DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING:** Wednesday, December 16, 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, Cindy Ryman Yost and Dennis Scheer; Tracy Corr, Deane Finnegan and Cristy Joy absent; David Cary, Steve Henrichsen, George Wesselhoft, 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 December 2, 2020.

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

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

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

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

**DECEMBER 16, 2020**

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

**The Consent Agenda consisted of the following item: Comprehensive Plan Conformance 20016.**

There was no ex-parte communications disclosed.

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

Campbell moved approval of the Consent Agenda item, seconded by Edgerton.

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

Vice Chair Beckius called for **Requests for Deferral**.

**ANNEXATION 20014**

**TO ANNEX APPROXIMATELY 74.74 ACRES, ON PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT 10400 VAN DORN AND 2300 SOUTH 98TH STREETS**

**AND**

**CHANGE OF ZONE 20038**

**FROM AG (AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT) TO R-3 (RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT) ON PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT 10400 VAN DORN STREET**

**AND**

**SPECIAL PERMIT 20047**

**TO ALLOW FOR A CUP (COMMUNITY UNIT PLAN) WITH 510 PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DWELLING UNITS ON APPROXIMATELY 137 ACRES, WITH REQUESTED WAIVERS, ON PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT 10400 VAN DORN AND 2300 SOUTH 98TH STREETS**

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**DECEMBER 16, 2020**

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

**Staff Recommendation:** Three-week deferral.

The Clerk noted that the applicant has requested to defer Items 4.2a - Annexation 20014, 4.2b - Change of Zone 20038 and 4.2c - Special Permit 20047 for three weeks to the regular Planning Commission hearing on January 6, 2021.

Campbell moved to grant the request for a 3-week deferral for public hearing and action on January 6, 2021, seconded by Edgerton and carried 6-0: Ball, Campbell, Edgerton, Ryman Yost, Scheer and Beckius voting 'yes'; Corr, Finnegan and Joy absent.

**Registered to Testify via Zoom:**

1. **Zuben Bastani, 2000 S. Colorado Blvd., Denver, CO, testified via Zoom teleconference,** stating that he would like to defer his testimony to the January 6, 2021 Planning Commission hearing.
2. **J. Bastani, Phoenix, AZ, testified via Zoom teleconference,** stating that he would like to defer his testimony to the January 6, 2021 Planning Commission hearing.

3. **Brian Vanis, 10221 A Street, testified in opposition via Zoom teleconference,** stating that he would like to defer his testimony to the January 6, 2021 Planning Commission hearing.

**Opponents:**

4. **Darin Rich, 1733 S. 105<sup>th</sup> Street, Camelot Acres Homeowners Association President,** came forward and stated in general they are against this CUP (Community Unit Plan) in the Fire Ridge Development. He explained that there are 510 lots within the development and the density is too high with the duplexes that they have planned. This development does not fit with the character of the neighborhood, which has larger homes and acreages. Rich stated that the MoPac Trail is located near the Phase 5 lots and they are requesting a condition be added that would include landscaping and trees as a shield between the development and the trail. He stated that they would also like the condition added that 98<sup>th</sup> Street would be paved before this development starts and the construction equipment would be required to use 98<sup>th</sup> Street and not 105<sup>th</sup> Street, which is privately owned by the homeowners association.

Campbell asked when the development moves forward if they would be improving the gutters and curbs on 105<sup>th</sup> Street, which is privately owned by the association. Rich stated that he was unsure of when that may happen, and further stated that the association had just spent \$170,000 a few months ago to resurface the road, which is why they want to keep the traffic to a minimum and construction equipment off the road. There is a public access easement on 105<sup>th</sup> Street and they do expect the City/County to take this road over at some point.

Public hearing on this proposed development will be continued on Wednesday, January 6, 2021.

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CONFORMANCE 20017**  
**TO REVIEW AS TO CONFORMANCE WITH THE 2040 LINCOLN-LANCASTER COUNTY**  
**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, A PROPOSED NEW SOUTH OF DOWNTOWN REDEVELOPMENT AND**  
**STRATEGIC PLAN, WHICH WOULD SERVE AS A GUIDE FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES**  
**WITHIN THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN AREA. THE PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT PLAN AREA**  
**CONSISTS OF 263.5 ACRES, MORE OR LESS, BOUNDED BY SOUTH 10TH STREET, SOUTH 17TH**  
**STREET, A STREET, AND L STREET**

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**DECEMBER 16, 2020**

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

**Staff Recommendation:** In Conformance with the Comprehensive Plan

There was no ex-parte communications disclosed.

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

**Staff Presentation:**

**David Cary, Planning Department,** came forward and stated that this is for the South of Downtown Redevelopment and Strategic Plan. This plan is a combination between a redevelopment plan that Urban Development works on because of the type of work activity that is involved and a strategic plan that involves a lot of planning. There has been a lot of great effort done with the neighborhood to the South of Downtown to get to this point, and there has been a lot of conversation regarding this area. Cary stated he wanted to point out this is not the Planned Unit Development (PUD), which is another step that will take place in the future. There has been discussion about the PUD being the zoning mechanism used that would allow more flexibility on lot development and the mixed uses in the plan. It was felt that there needed to be more time to do outreach to the neighborhoods to continue the dialogue and make sure that they have a PUD they everyone involved felt good about.

**Applicant:**

**Dan Marvin, Urban Development,** came forward and stated that this is a combination of a redevelopment plan that meets state's statute requirements and they would need to offer Tax Increment Financing (TIF) and a strategic plan that helps guide those efforts. Marvin stated that during the discussion on Affordable Housing Action Plan that came before this board, a key component to this was recognizing that additional funds are needed to go into the rehab of existing rental properties. He shared if they ask the property owner for the funding, the consequence could be that they raise the rent charged. They want the existing units in Lincoln to be improved but it needs to be done in a way that does not create a hardship on the tenants in those buildings. In the past, a District TIF would be created and used for improvement. In this case, TIF could be used to rehab existing buildings and try to coordinate as much funding to rehab without having an adverse effect on the residents that live in the neighborhood.

Marvin shared that they have recognized with the Housing Action Plan, that even as creative and flexible as the current zoning system is within the City of Lincoln, there are difficulties on how to build buildings with the setbacks. The PUD for this neighborhood will be an important tool in helping to assisting in those redevelopment efforts. There are many lots that are either narrow and long or square and they may not conform with the current zoning standards. Marvin explained that it is thought a PUD will be another tool to use by creating flexibility in redeveloping those lots in a way that best fits the neighborhood. Urban Development has been taking efforts to revitalize this area for a long time and has added a bicycle lane on 11<sup>th</sup> Street and block grants received paid for lights added from J to A Streets. Marvin stated that they would like to include alleys and streetscape design in the rehab of this area to make it desirable, habitable and an affordable area in Lincoln to live.

Edgerton asked when the redevelopment plan is in place, how they will prioritize the work that will be done. Marvin explained a property owner could ask for assistance with rehab and the use of TIF funding and then this plan would be used as a guiding document for the discussion on the appropriateness of the redevelopment for that particular property. The use of a District TIF financing tool could also be used to help provide a loan in some cases, but most likely they would be done as grants for façade and other improvements.

Campbell asked why this plan does not go to both sides of 9<sup>th</sup> Street, and if one side was in another neighborhood group. Marvin stated that the borders would be difficult to identify, and it could be in another neighborhood, and he further stated that Shawn Ryba could better answer this question.

Ball shared that this is a great plan. He inquired about displacement and how this will impact the current residents in the area when potentially there will be a change in the zoning, housing and rent, and he further inquired what considerations would be given. Marvin shared that the plan has more material included than would typically be seen to address concern of displacement. This has been a long concern of the neighborhood residents. The goal is to create funding for the rehab of buildings in a way that does not trigger rent increases, which would cause displacement.

Beckius asked Mr. Marvin to be more specific on what would be done to minimize disruption, because the plan seems to indicate the primary method of limiting disruption would be to simply implement this over a period of time, and he further asked if there were other methods that they envision. Marvin explained that they would continue to use TIF funds, and if someone is wanting to do rehab within a particular building, they would create a TIF increment within the building. The proposed redevelopment plan would come before this board, which could identify a threshold in terms of rent increases. He shared that there have been several projects that have come before this board and in the redevelopment plan there is a cap on the amount of rent that can be charged as long as the TIF is enforce, which would be for 15 years. This would limit the amount of rent to 60 percent of the area median income. Beckius asked if they anticipate the limits would be on projects receiving Tax Credit Housing funds, or any project receiving TIF within the district, or would this be on a case-by-case basis. Marvin stated this would be a case-by-case basis and they have not yet crafted policy on this yet.

**Shawn Ryba, 1516 Sunburst Lane, South of Downtown Community Development Organization (SDCDO)**, came forward and shared that they have been working to develop the framework for all community development efforts in a portion of Everett and the Near South Neighborhoods. The boundaries for the area are roughly 10<sup>th</sup> Street to 17<sup>th</sup> Street and A Street up to K and L Streets. About 5,200 people reside in the area and the housing is made up of 90 percent rental properties. The community development activities they have focused on are workforce development, affordable housing, neighborhood safety, infrastructure improvements. Some of the work already done includes creating a community space called the Art Hub, there is a BikeLNK kiosk at 13<sup>th</sup> and F Streets, they have brought in turning lanes, bike lanes, safer crosswalks on 13<sup>th</sup> Street, and they have also created the first Community Land Trust in the State of Nebraska. He shared that the beautiful thing about these accomplishments is that they are based on listening to the residents. They have knocked on over 3,000 doors, co-hosted and hosted several community conversations, block parties, countless community events, and they have attended every meeting they were invited to. This plan is just a beginning point and it will evolve over time. Ryba emphasized that they have talked and listened to as many people as

they possibly could who reside in the neighborhood and will continue to have these conversations to see what they are wanting in their community.

Campbell asked why this plan does not go over to 9<sup>th</sup> Street and if it is because it is a different neighborhood. Ryba explained that area is the South Salt Creek Neighborhood and they have respectfully declined to be involved with this initiative. Campbell said a lot of what is generated in this plan would be very applicable to 9<sup>th</sup> Street and on over to the west. Ryba explained that they wanted to start small and figure out things first. He shared that everything they have learned from the South of Downtown could be applied in various other neighborhoods.

Ryba shared in response to the displacement comments made earlier, he too is scared about displacement, and a major concern of the residents who live in the area is the possibility of displacement and gentrification. The city is deficient in having the tools needed in place to prevent and mitigate displacement and they need to work closely with residents to come up with a mitigation plan. Beckius shared his concerned as well and stated this is the most difficult item to come before him as a Planning Commissioner, in almost five years, and it is because of the potential displacement issues.

#### **Proponents:**

1. **Andrew Neill, 811 N Street**, came forward in support and stated the current pandemic has affected everyone; however, few people have been as affected as the residents living in an officially neglected and marginalized area as the South of Downtown Community. It is estimated that roughly 30 percent of renters in Nebraska are at risk of eviction, which would be an unprecedented catastrophe during normal times, but even more so during the ongoing pandemic. The SDCDO has done an incredible job speaking with the community and listening to their needs and desires. He shared that there is a risk for displacement, but the proposal put forth with a rent cap of 60 percent of the area median income, is a good first step in addressing this risk.
2. **Peter Katt, 6400 Artisan Way**, came forward in support. He stated that there is nothing in this plan that anyone should be opposed to, but it could be better. He shared that he has been working, looking and investing in the Near South Neighborhood for 20 years. He shared that this document will make absolutely no difference in what happens in the neighborhood over the next five years. There is a lack of “funny money”, which is what he calls tax credit funds, TIF funds, grants and loans. He shared that “funny money” plays an important part in moving forward with community redevelopment, however, there is not enough to fix what ails the south neighborhood. He explained that the fundamental problem with the Near South Neighborhood is the lack of private market investments in the area. Until this problem is solved and the area is made attractive for the private sector to invest in, it will not and cannot get better. The city, county and state do not have the funds to fix the problems. Katt suggested that the restoring of the marketplace in the neighborhood would make a difference, but the reason they are not investing is because this plan sets out not less regulation, but more. Katt shared that for the Near South Neighborhood to succeed, there needs to be a plan that makes a difference.

Campbell shared he is having a hard time understanding how Mr. Katt is in support of this plan when he wants it to go way beyond what the plan dictates. Katt stated that there are many unknowns in this plan, but it does ignore the important role that the marketplace needs to play, which is why this plan is incomplete. Katt shared that years prior, he had started to create a private plan for the Near South Neighborhood, which was a group of several participants and was called "Block by Block". The idea was to have a grid of the area needing to be redeveloped and "funny money" would be invested in the center block that was targeted, which would in return would encourage investments on the surrounding blocks that touched the center block. Campbell asked if this method would have led to gentrification of the neighborhood. Katt said absolutely and it needs to because this is a neighborhood with 90 percent renters and that is a fundamental problem.

Ryman Yost stated that one of the concerns raised earlier was about displacement, and one of the challenges the City of Lincoln has is affordable and quality housing for individuals that are not able to own a home. Several families on the waiting list for housing now are homeless and the list is growing. Understanding that this is not a priority for you or your area of focus, but if the area is developed and is made owner-occupied, how is the city going to address the displacement of the 94 percent of renters in the area. Katt stated he is a huge fan of affordable housing and that there have been many missed opportunities to make it better, and he further stated he would be coming before this board on plans of what can be done on affordability. He shared that affordability is not solved by a neighborhood not getting better, and if restrictions are imposed how many investors will look at the Near South Neighborhood when they hear rent control. No investor will go down that path. Katt stated that there is an affordable housing problem and a Near South quality-of-life problem, and these are two separate issues that should not be lumped together or they are both doomed for failure. Katt suggested that the private sector needs to make investments and with owner-occupied people living in the area, it will help improve the quality-of-life for everyone.

- Kile Johnson, Johnson Flodman Guenzel & Widger, 1227 Lincoln Mall, testified in support via Zoom teleconference**, stating he is the Chairman of South of Downtown Coalition Steering Committee, which was formed to do community outreach, get participation in idea sharing, and determine priorities. The committee was a coalition of neighborhood residents, nonprofits, philanthropic organizations, business and governmental partners. Johnson stated that five subcommittees were formed: Affordable Housing, Economic Engagement, Finance Investment, Human and Cultural Services and Property Owners. These subcommittees were made up of residents, experts, leaders, nonprofit agencies and governmental entities who came up with Community Land Trust, Opportunity Zones and Housing Tax Credits, which are tools that can be used. Zoning density issues were discussed in the PUD, which would help with the displacement issue. Gentrification is a major concern but by using some of these

“funny money” devices, as Mr. Katt referred to them, there are ways that property owners, including the owners of rentals, can improve their properties and reduce their costs without raising rent a benefit of affordable housing. These committees and subcommittees reviewed, developed and considered over 100 strategic ideas and suggestions. There were three meetings held for the area residents and the community at Everett Public School to review the proposals that would help determine priorities.

4. **Anna Graff, 344 S. 18<sup>th</sup> Street, testified in support via Zoom teleconference,** stating that the South of Downtown is already an amazing place, but this plan can help improve the quality-of-life, make sure people have access to affordable housing and reduce racial inequality. She shared the focus on racial equity is vital and is glad that it is highlighted in this plan, because housing is a big way that racism has been and continues to be exacerbated. Graff shared if there is not a focus and effort to work towards racial equity it would continue to perpetuate that inequality. She explained a way to increase access to affordable housing and prevent displacement would be to have a form of commodification housing, which the South of Downtown has been working on with the Community Land Trust. Expanding the Community Land Trust would make a difference and have an impact on the area.

No one came forward in opposition.

#### **Staff Questions:**

Scheer asked how the South Haymarket area could be tied together with other area projects to help bring continuity to the area. Cary explained that Commissioner Scheer has brought up a good point, and there are different neighborhood plans adjacent too or slightly overlapping. The South of Downtown Plan that was adopted has good implementation happening in the area and for these parts to work together it will be important to have input and participation from the residents and leaders in those neighborhoods. At some point, they could engage the neighborhood to see what their vision is and how they might fit into this. The South of Downtown which is seeing some implementation happening that will carry over and provide some momentum to the South of Downtown Plan. Cary stated there will be a future discussion/work effort for the South Salt Creek Neighborhood. The recently adopted Downtown Plan is another piece to this puzzle and its relationship with South of Downtown being the closest neighborhood that could interact with the Downtown Plan. The strengths and features of the downtown area is different than its urban neighborhood to the south, but they all interplay with each other and are looking to make sure it makes sense.

Edgerton asked about the earlier comments made by Mr. Katt with regards to this plan being a good document with many great ideas but does not have the structure that will allow anything concrete to move forward. Marvin shared that when people come to Lincoln, they are shown the jewels of the community, the Haymarket. Marvin stated the Haymarket vision was created in a master plan and there have been millions spent in the area, and he further stated that he is unsure that he agrees with Mr. Katt's earlier statement. He shared that they would not allow

“funny money” to go towards the destruction of affordable housing, but that does not mean that they have banned ownership in the South of Downtown area. If someone wanted to invest in the area, they could do all the rehab they want to a building and charge whatever rent they wanted. Marvin explained that they have not changed the prior rules--they still apply, but the question is will there be overarching goals put in place to help guide departments who administer TIF funds to use that would protect the amount of affordable housing that is in our community. Marvin explained this has been done in different types of neighborhoods and they expect to do the same in this area, because it is an attractive area with greenspace that is walkable, and it has more of a residential feel than the downtown. Cary shared there is a strategy and a vision for the future in the Downtown Master Plan and versions of that have been in place for over 20 years, and if you look at the projects Urban Development keeps bringing forward, there is investment happening. Cary stated he wanted to speak to the concerns of displacement and that this plan is the right thing to do, and that doesn't mean the door is going to shut on investments, but they will be careful with how those investments are being used, what the role of the city is, and that the voices in the neighborhoods are being heard. They will continue to assess and watch what is happening instead of letting it happen without understanding what the impacts are.

Beckius asked what data the city would be using to measure the outcomes this plan is anticipated to generate and how affordable housing would be impacted in the neighborhood. Cary stated that they do want to be data driven and to have the ability to point to information to say this is or is not happening, and then talk about the impact that it is having and the strategy on how to deal with it. There is a lot of information on the renter and owner-occupied that is the building block of the discussion, that they already have. Part of this is being attuned to the level of effort that is needed to know what is happening and to keep up on the data. Cary shared this is part of what Mr. Ryba does and having a community development corporation is a great asset for this neighborhood. Marvin shared that the rehab dollars put into a project are trackable numbers and the action plan has shown that older apartments tend to have more complaints to Building & Safety. To a degree, this could create a multi-pronged strategy to work cooperatively with the landlords and, over time, there should be fewer complaints to Building & Safety, not more--this would be a data point to look to. He shared that they also have data points on what the average rent rate is in various neighborhoods and this can be tracked to see if the rents are changing in an adverse way that would affect that population. Beckius said this information would be useful and that this plan has been years in the making and this has been a discussion point for years around the city. He shared that he does not think there is any reason the data should not be included in the report and there should be a standard to which this report states the number of affordable housing units the redevelopment area needs to stay at and not drop lower than. He shared that maybe it would be okay if the home ownership increases in the area, because those data points are easy to track. Beckius asked if this plan will have an accountability aspect or will it be, we are going to try. The same could be said about minority displacement within the neighborhood as well. We know it can be tracked, but it is not part of the plan and it is not part of the strategic plan either, other than to reference it. There are no tracking metrics to follow and there could be, and Beckius shared that he wonders if there shouldn't be.

Beckius shared that it seems almost as if we are setting ourselves up for a lot of redevelopment plans for a lot of different neighborhoods across the city as opposed to having one standard for older neighborhoods and trying to tackle it this way. Beckius shared as an example if there are two different neighborhoods apart from one another, will there be a different PUD that they will have to try to understand in order to build. Cary said great question and comment, and this has been discussed and there are different ways to handle it. He shared that the design standards for older neighborhoods is more city wide, although it does not cover the entire city. They have learned with this effort that there is a strong desire for the neighborhood to not only be unique but to show that there is an understanding of what this neighborhood is like and what their goals and objectives are. There will be differences and you will not be able to do the same thing everywhere. Cary shared that under this model, he personally and professionally feels it is acceptable because you will end up with more buy-in from the neighborhood. There will be more investment and activity in the neighborhood because the stakeholders are trying to implement the plan that is in place. Cary stated that he is comfortable with potentially having different PUDs because there will be an understanding after going through efforts like this as part of the process to know what that neighborhood vision truly is. Cary shared that Beckius' point is well taken, that it can ultimately become confusing if you want to try to do different projects in different areas of the city, but hopefully by being clear with the expectations and the visions, that will not be the case.

**Wynn Hjernstad, Urban Development**, came forward and apologized for being late explaining she had read the agenda incorrectly. She stated that she did want to comment on the discussion relating to the data and how they will evaluate. One of the things written into this plan that is unique and not in any other plans, which is the idea of putting together an implementation team that meets once every other month to evaluate and set the priorities. Beckius shared that he was excited to see that mentioned, and he asked what mechanism is in place to ensure that this happens. Hjernstad explained that the commitment of the city by the adoption of this plan and the commitment that Urban Development has shown over the last few years working in the South of Downtown. She stated that they have invested too much to say they are done and to walk away. She shared that some of the work that Prosper Lincoln has done led to the creation of the South of Downtown Community Development Organization and this is another tool or element that keeps this going. Beckius shared when looking at other communities and their strategic plans that may or may not have been implemented sometimes the overall success is the stability of the strategic plan partnership and whether or not that partnership continues. Beckius stated that when a PUD comes forward, he will need to ask what happens if the strategic partner goes away, because at the end of the day, the PUD would stay, and all other things may not happen. Hjernstad stated as Mr. Johnson had discussed earlier with the all of the committees formed and the stakeholders involved that there is so much momentum now with everyone that is involved in this effort they would not let the city walk away.

Beckius said this question will be difficult because there is currently not a PUD, but the framework for the potential PUD coming forward, and he asked about the quick reference in the staff report in regards to design standards for this neighborhood and if they anticipate more

design standards down the road for this area. Cary stated certainly this could happen, but he could not say that it would necessarily happen with the PUD. There has been discussion on how to make sure that the PUD sets the stage for reinvestment on the lots that are nonconforming and to allow for some level of reconstruction to happen because, under the current regulations, it cannot happen or they are limited to what can be done. They are focused on the small single-family or maybe a duplex type of setting for reinvestment with less emphasis on the multi-family side. He shared that they have not gotten that far yet with this PUD, but those conversations will continue, and design standards could certainly be a part of this discussion. Beckius asked about their discussions on the conversion of or potential conversion of living space to live-work space when this area is adjacent to the Central Business District, which has hundreds of thousands of vacant square feet available. Cary stated there is an idea that in certain areas and not the entire footprint that there will be a focus on trying to get the live-work multi-use type of setting for a start-up idea. When a start-up business gets to a certain size, it will need to be moved and the downtown area may be the next step for that business. The idea is to have this type of activity in certain locations in the plan area. Marvin shared that there were conversations on if there was a way that someone could have a studio that could be a live-work space, because maybe it is prohibited at their current location and this would be a way for them of offset costs. In other communities, the transitional live-work units in neighborhoods worked well.

Campbell share the live-work units in his area are doing well and have all sold. Beckius shared he appreciates that it is working in other areas, but this neighborhood has affordability issues and they are talking about the potential of reducing living space in the area. Campbell stated that he understands his fellow commissioner's point, but this could also attract more people to the neighborhood. Ryba shared that the neighborhood is made up of different kinds of folks who are making, selling and doing things. This is just one way to keep these folks in the neighborhood where they can supplement their income, or even improve their income, potentially hire others from the neighborhood and provide services to the neighborhood. Being 94 percent rental, does not allow folks the opportunity to live-work and develop their small businesses. There are amazing people in this neighborhood, and this is something that they want, and we want to support them. In response to what Mr. Katt had mentioned about how to fix the neighborhood, he shared that he is tired of people saying this because the neighborhood is not broken. He shared it is the institutions and the policies that are broken, because they are denying residents the access to healthcare, education and housing. He shared it is important to adopt this plan, come up with more comprehensive approaches, invest in the people and invest in the property. In conclusion, he shared that he commends the board, staff and everyone that has been involved in this project and that the current discussions on gentrification and displacement need to continue.

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

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CONFORMANCE 20017****ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION:****DECEMBER 16, 2020**

Campbell moved approval, seconded by Ryman Yost.

Ryman Yost stated that she is in support of adoption and that it is in conformance. She shared that she wanted to thank Mr. Ryba and his team and appreciates the community-based approach that they are taking to look at the assets of the people who already live in the area and what they are doing. The people in the neighborhood often know best about what they need. In celebrating the gifts of the people who live there this will create a great opportunity, not only for this neighborhood, but the entire community.

Campbell shared that he too is in support. Many of the ideas they are talking about here can be found in existing neighborhoods and by bringing this to the neighborhood, they can be successful and achieve the results that they are looking for.

Scheer stated he appreciates all the discussion and the staff's ability to answer questions. He shared that he is part of the Design Committee in this community and is wanting to make sure his statement is record as part of his vote. The references in the plan document about regulation standards and the way those things are talked about in the plan. There is a desire to not make the regulations and standards more restrictive than they already are, but to simplify them and to ease them. He shared that he has worked with Ms. Hjermsstad on a project on 11<sup>th</sup> Street and when there is a document like this in place, and they are trying to figure out what the design goals are and how they can implement them in a really wonderful way for the community, this is what is important. These types of standards written in the strategic initiatives in this document really help with doing a good design. It is not restrictive to doing a good design or development it is helpful. Scheer quoted a reference from the staff report on Page 18, under the "Financing" heading, "The primary burden for revitalization of the Redevelopment Area must be on the private sector." He stated that there was a lot of discussion on how this could best move forward and if there is a place for the private sector, and Mr. Cary eluded that this must be a partnership. The document really lays out that there is a huge role here for the private sector, but it needs to be with the public sector as well. He shared that he likes the document and agrees with Commissioner Beckius and from a metrics standpoint, and it would be great to figure out how it could be part of this; maybe not in the document as it is approved, but to make sure that attention is paid to it.

Beckius said he too is in support of the document and, as stated previously, there are things in the document that are of concern. He shared he has concerns of how this will move forward and what are the metrics and data that will be used to define success. These things are not spelled out in the plan and he would have liked to see them included. As the PUD comes forward it will be interesting to see what the private sector says about some of the items listed in the plan and if they will be productive in terms of redevelopment and reinvestment here in the community. When we look at some of the things that have been identified in this plan in relation to what was approved in the Affordable Housing

Coordinated Action Plan, there are opportunities for regulations to change citywide that have been identified. He stated that hopefully, it does not take years for these changes because there are opportunities that have been identified in this plan that were not in the Affordable Housing Plan.

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

Campbell moved to adjourn the Planning Commission Meeting of December 16, 2020, seconded by Edgerton and carried 6-0: Ball, Campbell, Edgerton, Ryman Yost, Scheer and Beckius voting 'yes'; Corr, Finnegan and Joy absent.

Meeting adjourned 2:54 p.m.

Note: The Planning Commission will not formally approve these minutes until their next regular meeting on Wednesday, January 6, 2021.

F:\Boards\PC\Minutes\2020\pcm121620.docx