

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, January 27, 2026.

NAME OF GROUP: PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE, TIME, AND PLACE OF MEETING: Wednesday, February 4, 2026, 1:00 p.m., Hearing Room
112, on the first floor of the County-City Building, 555 S. 10th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska.

IN ATTENDANCE: Dick Campbell, Maribel Cruz, Brett Ebert, Gloria Eddins, Bailey Feit, Cristy Joy, Rich Rodenberg, Cindy Ryman Yost, David Cary, Steve Henrichsen, Shelli Reid, and George Wesselhoft of the Planning Department, media, and other interested citizens.

STATED PURPOSE OF MEETING: Regular Planning Commission Hearing

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

Chair Joy requested a motion approving the minutes for the regular meeting held January 21, 2026.

Motion for approval of the minutes made by Campbell; seconded by Eddins.

Minutes approved 7-0: Campbell, Cruz, Ebert, Eddins, Joy, Rodenberg, and Ryman Yost, voting "yes". Ball and Feit absent.

Chair Joy asked the Clerk to call for the consent agenda items.

CONSENT AGENDA

PUBLIC HEARING & ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION:

February 4, 2026

Members present: Campbell, Cruz, Ebert, Eddins, Feit, Joy, Rodenburg, and Ryman Yost. Ball absent.

The Consent Agenda consists of the following item: Special Permit 05002A.

There were no ex parte communications disclosed.

There were no ex parte communications disclosed relating to site visit.

Campbell moved approval of the Consent Agenda; seconded by Eddins.

Consent Agenda approved 8-0: Campbell, Cruz, Ebert, Eddins, Feit, Joy, Rodenburg, and Ryman Yost, voting "yes"; Ball absent.

Note: This is Final Action on Special Permit 05002A and Preliminary Plat 25003 unless appealed by filing a Notice of Appeal with the City Council or County Board within 14 days.

PRELIMINARY PLAT 25003, TO PLAT 6 SINGLE-FAMILY LOTS AS PART OF AN ADJUSTMENT OF EXISTING LOTS FOR RECKNOR ESTATES, WITH WAIVERS, ON PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT S. 190TH STREET AND ROKEBY ROAD/HIGHWAY 2.

PUBLIC HEARING:

February 4, 2026

Members present: Campbell, Cruz, Ebert, Eddins, Feit, Joy, Rodenburg, and Ryman Yost. Ball absent.

Staff Recommendation: Conditional Approval

There were no ex-parte communications disclosed.

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

Staff Presentation:

George Wesselhoft, Planning and Development Services Department, 555 South Street, Lincoln, NE, came forward and stated that the subject property is in eastern Lancaster County at the northwest corner of Rokeby Road and South 190th Street, near the Otoe County line. The request involves the reconfiguration of six existing lots on approximately 31.34 acres into the same number of lots. Proposed lot sizes would range from approximately 4.16 acres to 6.84 acres, compared to existing lot sizes ranging from approximately 4.29 acres to 5.7 acres.

Wesselhoft stated that access would be provided by a new private street connecting to South 190th Street, resulting in a single access point. Wesselhoft noted that this configuration would eliminate multiple potential driveways that could otherwise occur under the existing lot arrangement. Wesselhoft further explained that the Lancaster County Zoning Regulations allow for the enlargement and alteration of nonconforming lots, and the proposed lots would continue to meet the minimum three-acre requirement for private sewage disposal systems, as well as applicable subdivision and setback requirements.

Wesselhoft reported that a groundwater study was submitted and indicated adequate water quantity to support domestic wells for the proposed development. Wesselhoft noted that the staff's primary concern with the application relates to the requested waiver from the maximum block length requirement of 1,320 feet. While the proposal otherwise complies with zoning regulations and the Comprehensive Plan, staff recommended denial of the block length waiver.

Wesselhoft explained that staff prefer providing multiple access routes for residents and emergency services, whereas the proposed design would result in a single access point. Wesselhoft noted the presence of a drainageway and floodplain west of Lots 21, 22, and 23, and indicated that a future connection to the east, toward Recknor Estates, would be the most viable long-term option. Wesselhoft also stated that sole access to a heavily traveled roadway, such as Highway 2, is not in the best interest of residents or the traveling public.

Wesselhoft further explained that adjoining Lot 23 currently shares access from Highway 2 through Lot 22, and that multiple lots under the same ownership, as well as additional lots to the west, utilize this access point. Wesselhoft stated that the staff report includes a recommended condition of approval requiring a public access easement within a separate outlot to provide a private roadway connection between Lots 2 and 3, Block 1, extending to Lot 23, along with revisions to the grading plan to reflect the private roadway. Wesselhoft noted that the private roadway would not be required to be paved and could be rock surfaced, resulting in minimal additional development costs.

Wesselhoft concluded by offering to answer questions from the Commission.

Staff Questions-

Campbell asked Wesselhoft to explain again where the second access point would be located.

Wesselhoft responded that, based on the proposed preliminary plat, the connection would be to the southwest through adjoining Lot 23. Wesselhoft explained that Lot 23 currently shares access with Lot 22 to Highway 2, and that additional lots to the west also utilize the same access point.

Campbell asked whether staff were suggesting a connection through Lot 23 to the existing driveway shared with Lot 22.

Wesselhoft confirmed that the connection would be to Lot 23, which could allow, in the long term, additional lots beyond Lot 23 to potentially utilize access, although the immediate benefit would be to Lot 23.

Campbell asked whether the connection would hook up to Rokeby Road or Highway 2 through Lot 23.

Wesselhoft confirmed that the connection would link to Lot 23, which currently has access to Highway 2.

Campbell asked for confirmation that the proposal would allow traffic to travel through Lot 23 to Highway 2 rather than exiting onto South 190th Street.

Wesselhoft clarified that the proposal would only affect the plat in question and would not create a new easement on Lot 23 at this time, noting that an easement could occur in the future if Lot 23 or nearby lots are redeveloped or reconfigured.

Chair Joy asked if there were any additional questions from the Commission; there were none.

Applicant:

Mike Eckert, Civil Design Group, 8535 Executive Woods Drive, Suite 200, Lincoln, NE, came forward and appeared on behalf of RLM Enterprises. Eckert stated that while he generally agrees with Planning staff, his client requested that he address a dispute regarding the proposed access road. Eckert explained that the right-of-way for the new private road has been shown and represents the logical location for access from the road being built. Eckert noted that strictly measuring block length in this area would not meet the standards but acknowledged that the County applies block length requirements liberally in consideration of topography and other site-specific issues.

Eckert explained that the project is located on the county line in eastern Lancaster County, outside of typical development tiers, and that the land drains toward the Missouri River rather than the City's treatment plant. Eckert added that the client is primarily pursuing the access adjustment to create more marketable lots and that if the request is not approved, the project would likely proceed as originally planned.

Eckert noted that multiple lots currently share access points, including one existing access to Highway 2 through Lot 22, and that adjacent properties in Otoe County also do not meet Lancaster County block length requirements but function with similar access. Eckert emphasized that the proposal would reduce the number of driveways along South 190th Street and would align with existing traffic patterns.

Eckert explained that one lot currently contains a house, and that several additional lots would share the proposed access point. Eckert noted that if the State, through NDOT, requires closure of access in the future, options for rerouting access could be implemented at a reasonable cost. Eckert estimated that grading, seeding, and rock surfacing an extension to accommodate future access would cost approximately \$50,000, and that the access would provide a second point of egress in the long term once adjacent subdivisions are developed.

Eckert concluded that, given the rural location, the established NDOT access points, and the reduction in driveway conflicts along South 190th Street, a waiver from the block length requirement would be reasonable. Eckert offered to answer any questions from the Commission.

Staff Questions-

Campbell asked about a subdivision shown on the maps, noting that it appeared to be Evergreen Drive, and inquired whether it was in a separate county.

Eckert explained that South 190th Street serves as the county line between Lancaster and Otoe Counties, and that the subdivision in question is in Otoe County. Eckert stated that the development uses a community sewer system and explained that a Lincoln developer located the project outside Lancaster County in response to the creation of impact fees. Eckert noted that the subdivision accesses South 190th Street at multiple points and identified nearby residences with access to adjacent section roads.

Campbell noted that the development could create confusion due to the use of the name Evergreen Drive in the adjacent subdivision.

Eckert responded that the development matches the existing naming convention.

Campbell noted that the staff recommendation, or the Department of Transportation's recommendation, was not to label the roadway Evergreen Drive on the Lancaster County side.

Eckert responded that he was not aware of an issue and acknowledged that he should be more familiar with the staff report.

Wesselhoft came forward and stated that the name Evergreen Drive exists elsewhere in Lancaster County and that, for 911 emergency response purposes, the roadway name should be changed to avoid confusion. Wesselhoft noted that the condition in the staff report reflects this requirement.

Campbell stated that the roadway would be named Evergreen Drive on the Otoe and Cass County sides and would have a different name on the Lancaster County side.

Wesselhoft confirmed this.

Eckert stated that the intersections would align for geometric and safety purposes.

Feit asked who would maintain the small section of roadway if the project were built.

Eckert responded that this presents a challenge. Eckert explained that the county engineer, with approval from the county board, now requires that all interior subdivision roads located outside the three-mile jurisdiction be private and maintained by the homeowners' association (HOA). Eckert stated that this differs from the previous standard, under which roads could be petitioned to become public once 60 percent of the lots or a minimum of six lots were developed. Eckert noted that under the current requirement, the HOA would be responsible for road maintenance, including snow removal and rock maintenance, even if the road is not used for an extended period, creating an additional burden for residents.

The request is for a reconfiguration or adjustment of 6 existing lots on approximately 31.34 acres. The 6 existing lots will be reconfigured into the same number of lots. The proposed lot sizes range from 4.16 acres to 6.84 acres for the new lots. The existing lots range from 4.29 to 5.7 acres. Access will be from a one private street that will connect to South 190th Street. There will be a single access point, which will be South 190th Street. This will eliminate multiple potential driveways that could occur now under the existing lot situation.

Wesselhoft explained that the Lancaster County zoning regulations do all for enlargement and alteration of lots allow for existing lots which do not meet the current height and lot requirements, so these lots are being adjusted under provision under the county regulations. They will still need three acres, which is required for a private sewage disposal system. Subdivision and setback requirements would also have to be met.

Wesselhoft mentioned that a groundwater report has been submitted. The groundwater report indicates that there's adequate water quantity to support the domestic water wells within the proposed development. The one area where there's disagreement with the applicant is the request of block length waiver. Otherwise, this proposal meets all the requirements and would be consistent with the regulations and the Comprehensive Plan. The request is for a waiver from the maximum block lanes requirement of 1320 feet. The staff recommendation is to deny that for multiple reasons. The first of which is that two routes to reach any property is always a desirable situation for both the residents for emergency access without the typical street connection these lots will only have one access point. There's a drainage way in floodplain to the west of lots. 21, 22, 23 and access to the east to Recknor Estates is the most viable in the long term.

Wesselhoft presented an exhibit that showed the existing lots and the other lots referenced. There are existing lots to the West, including lot. 23, which is abutting directly to the southwest. Another reason for recommending denial is that the sole access would be to a busy high-speed highway. Highway 2 is not in the best interest of the traveling public or residents. The adjoining Lot 23 shares access from Rokeby Road through Lot 22, these lots are under the same ownership, however, for additional lots directly to the west, also use the same access point. The public access could benefit multiple lots.

Wesselhoft mentioned that the staff report under the conditions of approval 1.1.8 has a condition that states to show a public access easement in a separate outlot for private roadway between Lots 2 and 3, Block 1 from the new private roadway to Lot. 23. So this is related to the a lot length requirement. The access does not have to be paved. The county allows private roadways to be rock surfaced.

Feit asked whether the main road off South 190th Street would also be privately maintained. Eckert responded that all roads within the subdivision, including the main road and the stub, would be private, noting that this requirement is a county decision.

Campbell asked whether, if the stub were not constructed at this time and Lot 23 were later subdivided, it would be possible to create the stub at that time.

Eckert responded that it would not be possible. Eckert explained that if Lot 23 were later subdivided, the Planning Department would not require construction of the stub. Eckert stated that the State could condemn access, if necessary, but planning staff could not force the connection. Eckert added that Lot 23 likely does not contain sufficient land area to be subdivided into two lots and that a future final plat application would likely be denied due to insufficient area.

Proponents:

No one approached in support.

Neutral:

No one approached in a neutral capacity.

Opposition:

No one approached in opposition.

Staff Questions:

Eddins asked Wesselhoft to explain why the proposed road would be constructed to a location that does not currently connect to other lots.

Wesselhoft explained that Planning's recommendation is to establish an easement providing access to Lot 23. Wesselhoft stated that the road would not connect to other lots at this time, but that Lot 23 and surrounding lots could be redeveloped or reconfigured in the future, potentially like the current proposal. Wesselhoft noted that some of the surrounding lots are legal pre-1979 lots that are less than 20 acres in size, and that future reconfiguration could occur if sufficient acreage were assembled, such as the 75 acres required for a Community Unit Plan (CUP). Wesselhoft stated that the road would currently terminate at the applicant's property line, but future redevelopment could allow the road to connect to additional lots.

Eddins asked whether the road must be constructed as part of the current proposal or whether only an easement would be required for a road that might be built in the future.

Wesselhoft responded that a road would be required, but that it could be constructed as a rock road and would not be required to meet urban, paved street standards within the county.

Eddins asked whether an easement alone could be required on the land, without constructing a road until a later time.

Wesselhoft responded that the Commission could modify the conditions of approval to allow that approach, and that such a modification would be within the Commission's authority.

Chair Joy asked if any other commissioners had questions. There were none.

Applicant Rebuttal:

Eckert came forward and stated that he wanted to clarify a point regarding the easement. Eckert stated that he had confirmed with Henrichsen that the intent is for the connection to be constructed as a roadway, rather than as an easement only. Eckert explained that if only an easement were provided and the lot owners retained ownership, no-build areas would be required, which could complicate future use and create uncertainty regarding the location of a future roadway.

Eckert stated that this is a challenging decision for the Commission, but that, in his and the client's opinion, requiring a fully constructed road at this time would be prohibitively costly for the development. Eckert added that, given the low likelihood that land to the west would be subdivided in a manner that would provide access to the roadway, the proposed approach is reasonable.

PRELIMINARY PLAT 25003
ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION

February 4, 2026

Campbell moved to close the public hearing; seconded by Eddins.

Campbell moved to approve Preliminary Plat 25003, with a waiver; seconded by Eddins.

Campbell stated that it does not make sense to route traffic through Lot 23 if it were divided, as doing so would place additional traffic onto Highway 2, given the existing road network. Campbell noted that if Highway 2 were converted to an expressway, many of the existing roads would need to connect to South 190th Street or other local roads. Campbell added that eliminating multiple driveways onto the highway is preferable and concluded

that there is no need to introduce additional potential traffic through Lot 23, which shares a driveway with Lot 22 and provides direct access to Highway 2.

Eddins stated that she is not in favor of building a road to nowhere. Eddins noted that constructing a rock road that would not be maintained does not make sense, as residents could begin using the area for parking or as a driveway. Extending the road in the future could create additional issues, so building the road under these circumstances is not advisable.

Ebert agreed with Eddins and appreciated Planning for being forward-thinking on the issue. Ebert stated that building a road to nowhere does not make sense at this time, echoing Commissioner Eddins' comments.

Chair Joy extended thanks to the commissioners and proceeded to call for the motion.

Motion for approval of Preliminary Plat 25003, with a waiver, carried 8-0, with Campbell, Cruz, Ebert, Eddins, Feit, Joy, Rodenburg, and Ryman Yost voting "yes". Ball absent.

Campbell moved to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting of February 4, 2026; seconded by Eddins.

Motion to adjourn carried 8-0: Campbell, Cruz, Ebert, Eddins, Feit, Joy, Rodenburg, and Ryman Yost voted "yes." Ball absent.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:35 pm.