

MEETING RECORD

Advanced public notice of the Urban Design Committee meeting was posted on the County-City bulletin board and the Planning Department's website.

NAME OF GROUP: URBAN DESIGN COMMITTEE

DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING: Tuesday, January 4, 2022, 3:00 p.m., County-City Building, City Council Chambers, 555 S. 10th Street, Lincoln, NE.

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Mark Canney, Emily Deeker, Jill Grasso, Peter Hind, Tom Huston and Michelle Penn; (Gil Peace absent).

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Stacey Hageman, Paul Barnes and Teresa McKinstry of the Planning Dept.; Dana Schmidt from Concorde Management; Mike Gengler with Studio 951 Architects; and interested citizens.

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

Chair Penn then called for a motion approving the minutes of the regular meetings December 7, 2021. Motion for approval made by Huston, seconded by Hind and carried 6-0: Canney, Deeker, Grasso, Hind, Huston and Penn voting 'yes'; Peace absent.

MAD48 REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT:

January 4, 2022

Members present: Canney, Deeker, Grasso, Hind, Huston and Penn; Peace absent.

Stacey Hageman stated that this redevelopment project is located at N. 47th Street and St. Paul Avenue. This project is for some row houses that are being proposed.

Dana Schmidt stated that they are proposing seven row houses on some existing land that they are partnered on. There would be two 3-bedroom units and five 2-bedroom units. All the units would have a two car attached garage. On the site plan, they are still working on the parking to accommodate the existing property. They believe they have plenty of space for the required parking. The site plan shows a placeholder at this time. They are working with REGA Engineering on the site plan. These houses would be for sale. They are planning on incorporating the missing middle income funds so they would have to fall within the sale price of \$165,000.00 to

\$275,000.00. To help accommodate this, they would be asking for TIF (Tax Increment Financing) to keep the pricing under the limit.

Mike Gengler showed the design. He explained that the proposal is for seven rowhouses. They would face 47th Street. The primary material would be textured stucco with cedar shiplap siding in the entryway. They are also proposing a Juliet balcony on the main side that would be composed of plate steel. The rendering doesn't reflect the roofline condition exactly. Rather than having a straight sawtooth plane, they are planning on having a secondary. The main roof is an 8/12 pitch. The secondary roof is 3 and 12. The ridgeline with jack rafters would be below the peak of 8 and 12. The rear and side materials would be vinyl siding. The stucco would be taken around the corner to a logical stopping point and then transition into the vinyl siding. This would go around both ends. The stucco wraps about ten feet from the front to the sides and then transitions to vinyl siding.

Grasso understands that the transition will be on the north and south side. Gengler stated she was correct. The Juliet balcony protrudes about 30 inches out with a glass guard rail. These will not be functioning balconies, just a balcony to walk out on with French doors. Each unit would have its own front stoop for patio furniture separated with a fiberglass planter. Hind sees that these are raised up approximately three risers. Gengler noted he was correct. They are about 20 inches from sidewalk.

Hind asked if this is proposed to have a shingle roof. Gengler replied yes. They are proposing asphalt shingles.

Hind asked if this would have a gable end at St. Paul Avenue. Gengler replied no. The secondary ridge line is below the main sawtooth. The secondary line terminates at the ends.

Penn noted that the plan shows no windows on that side. Gengler stated that they have incorporated windows on the end units to get some additional light. They are limited with the units for windows on the front and back, sized for egress purposes.

Canney is interested to see how this abuts to the public sidewalk. Typically, a public sidewalk is four feet in width. He wondered what the experience would be for the homeowner to have the public interface so close. He asked if there is some flexibility to do a setback. Gengler responded yes, a small setback would be worthy. They have to be mindful of the commercial behind the building that we don't pinch the parking. Canney inquired if the parking behind the building is a shared parking lot with the commercial space. Gengler replied yes. Canney understands there is no green space in the back. Schmidt would foresee some landscape islands. They are still working on the landscaping plan.

Grasso asked if the residents will be sharing the same entry off St. Paul Avenue with the commercial. Schmidt stated they are still working through that as well. In talking with Wynn Hjermsstad of the Urban Development Dept., we have looked at keeping the existing entry where it is and possibly adding another on St. Paul Avenue for the rowhouses. He doesn't know if that is feasible. Gengler noted that the alley is also an access point for the townhomes, on the north side. He doesn't believe there is any plan to vacate the alley.

Penn would like the applicant to explain the site plan where it shows some boxes at the back. Gengler stated those are placeholders for the condensing units. Each unit will have its own condensing unit.

Penn understands they are keeping the alley. It almost looks like the applicant is intruding on it. Gengler pointed out that until they get an accurate survey of the lot, this site plan is an approximation. Their intent is to stay out of the alley. Huston noted that it raises less issues if you stay out of the alley.

Grasso asked if there is an elevation of the south side. Gengler does not have one. Grasso stated that she would be very careful of what that side looks like. The street is the town center and she would hate to see something on the main traffic pattern. Gengler stated they have since incorporated windows into the end unit.

Penn inquired if the plan is for traditional stucco or EIFS. Gengler responded the plan is for EIFS. They will have extended concrete to the ground.

Huston pointed out that EIFS is prohibited downtown. This isn't downtown, but he would encourage placing it on the list for Citywide standards.

Hind stated that in concept, this is a nice plan. The face on N. 47th Street is fine. He has some issues turning the corner on St. Paul. It is important to consider that corner and how the materials turn the corner. You need to keep in mind how the building is elevated off the ground. He thinks the issue of the south elevation is problematic. The vinyl siding, from his perspective, is problematic. He won't vote in support of anything with vinyl siding getting public funds. The EIFS needs to be kept from the ground. He wondered about the long term maintenance issues of the Juliet balconies. Gengler would probably have them powder coated. Hind would be concerned how they weather over time. He thinks the Committee needs to see this again with materials and colors. He would encourage something other than vinyl. He asked what the windows will be. Gengler responded probably an Anderson 100 series. The rendering is showing the windows as black. Hind noted there have been a few developments with off the shelf vinyl windows that can look pretty rough after a few years. The applicant needs to consider how the building will look over time.

Grasso would second those concerns. It looks like the drainage is coming off the front of the building. What happens when it hits the ground? Gengler pipe it straight to the storm sewer. Grasso would like to see this again when it is a little more formed. This part of town has a lot of potential. The south elevation what it looks like is important. This lot has been empty for a long time and she would hate to see something that doesn't speak to this part of town.

Canney would suggest activating the front side. He offered kudos for taking advantage of the street .

Huston stated that in the big picture, this is the kind of housing we need to promote. It is in line with the Comprehensive Plan. There has been a lot of investment in and around this neighborhood. He thanked the applicant for the investment, but believes we need to see something that is more fleshed out.

Deeker would encourage a survey. She would like to see that everything will fit along with the condenser units. She encouraged the applicant to think about where people would sit and what they would be using. She doesn't know you need the island in the back parking. The front could use some more space. She echoed the concerns of the other members. The committee has had previous concerns with vinyl and EIFS.

Hind sees an opportunity on the south side running to the east of some screening that could happen from the garage doors to the east. He thinks that some landscaping shrubs or something else would help to make it feel like a courtyard. This could be the kids back yard. He believes it would be a worthwhile effort. Those are the kind of details we would like to see.

Penn had a concern on the street facing elevation. The committee will need to know what it will look like and the transition of EIFS to the siding. We also need to look at the view down the street. It is important. She loves the design. The concern is not so much as what is missing, as what is happening around the corners. She is not overly concerned about the alleyway. She would like to see some attention to the side facing St. Paul Avenue.

Hind believes that in concept, this is a great project. Penn agreed. She believes this is something that Urban Design Committee would support overall. She thinks it just needs some refining.

ACTION:

Hind moved to continue public hearing to the next regular meeting of Urban Design Committee on February 1, 2022, seconded by Huston and carried 6-0: Canney, Deeker, Grasso, Hind, Huston and Penn voting 'yes'; Peace absent.

STAFF REPORT:

Hageman hopes to have the first draft of the annual report available for review at the next meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned 3:30 p.m.

<https://linclanc.sharepoint.com/sites/PlanningDept-Boards/Shared Documents/Boards/UDC/Minutes/2022/010422.docx>