

**PLANNING COMMISSION RECORD**  
**Briefing Session**

**NAME OF GROUP:** PLANNING COMMISSION

**DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING:** Wednesday, June 22, 2005, 12:00 Noon, Room 113, First Floor, County-City Building, 555 S. 10th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska

**MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Mary Bills-Strand, Jon Carlson, Gene Carroll, Dick Esseks, Roger Larson, Melinda Pearson (arrived at 11:26 a.m.) Lynn Sunderman and Tommy Taylor; (Gerry Krieser absent)

**OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Marvin Krout, Kent Morgan, Steve Henrichsen, Duncan Ross, David Cary, Mike DeKalb, Daniel Avery and Michele Abendroth (Planning Department); Roger Figard and Mike Brienzo (Public Works and Utilities)

**STATED PURPOSE** Staff briefing on the **Comp Plan/Long-Range Transportation Plan Assumptions**

Steve Henrichsen called the meeting to order at 11:07 a.m. He stated that today's focus is to complete the first step of the Comp Plan/Long-Range Transportation Plan process by determining the assumptions. Then we can move on to the second step which is to determine the future service limits. He informed the Commission that Duncan Ross will present each of the assumptions and then allow time for discussion after each assumption is presented.

Duncan Ross stated that today the Commission members will be asked to validate the demographic and development assumptions. He reviewed the Comprehensive Vision statement which includes the following six core areas: *One Community Vision, Quality of Life Assets, Economic Opportunity, Environmental Stewardship, Downtown Lincoln - the Heart of our Community, and Interaction between the Comprehensive Plan and the Citizens*. Staff is recommending that we retain the assumptions that were adopted in 2002.

Bills-Strand stated that she believes we need to address the affordability of housing. Henrichsen stated that the statement of *diverse housing opportunities* in the *Quality of Life Assets* was intended to be an all-encompassing term including affordable housing.

Sunderman asked about the core promise and noted that he would like to add the word *growing* community at the end of the paragraph to indicate that we are not a static community but a growing one. Bills-Strand and Larson stated that they agree. There was general consensus to make this change.

Bills-Strand noted that she would like to add affordable housing to the *Quality of Life Assets*. It was agreed to change the statement to read "*diverse and affordable housing opportunities*". There was general consensus to make this change.

Sunderman added that he would like to change the *Economic Opportunity* statement to read “seeks to improve *physical and* technological infrastructure.” There was general consensus to make this change.

Sunderman suggested adding in the *Quality of Life Assets* statement the following “the conservation of *existing neighborhoods and creation of new neighborhoods* are fundamental to this plan.” There was general consensus to make this change.

Bills-Strand asked about identifying downtown as the heart of the community, specifically as the entertainment center. Larson stated that he feels the statement should remain as it is. Carlson stated that his opinion is that the downtown needs to be the focus and the most important part of the City. Pearson questioned the significance of identifying downtown as the *heartbeat of the community* and asked if that specific wording is stronger than the statement that *downtown remains a special place*. Carlson suggested changing “heartbeat” to “heart”. There was general consensus to make this change.

Ross continued by noting that the Comp Plan is made up of the vision, policies, goals, principles, strategies, existing conditions and assumptions. He also noted that the Comp Plan is similar to a Business Plan.

He then stated that the assumptions will be used to define the amount of land needed to accommodate growth, provide a basis for traffic analysis and transportation modeling, and determine public infrastructure requirements. It also ties into capital improvement programming. Population is a key part in developing the Comprehensive Plan and assumptions. The key interrelationships are industrial land, transportation system, dwelling units, land use, jobs, students, parks, and shopping needs. It is important to keep a realistic balance for the assumptions over the next 25 years. Once population assumptions are determined, we can forecast how many people, housing units and jobs we need to accommodate. Then we can determine how much and what type of growth can be accommodated within the future service limit. Next is to determine where expansion will occur based on the amount and location of land that will need to be urbanized outside of the current future service limit.

The update will move the planning period to 2030; determine land, roads, community facilities and utility needs over a 25-year planning period; and accommodate future urban growth areas beyond the 25-year period.

Ross continued by reviewing the historic population trends for the County. Factors affecting population change are net natural increase and net migration. Staff presented two options from which to base population forecasts. The first option is to use the 2000 census, and the second is to use the 2004 census estimates. Staff recommendation is to use the 2000 census base with a growth rate of 1.5% compounded annually. Carroll stated that he believes the 1.5% projection is too high and should be around 1.3%. Pearson stated that she believes it is realistic to remain at 1.5%. Sunderman stated that he agrees with Carroll, but also feels that 1.5% is realistic. Carlson remarked that it depends on what development density number is used. Larson stated that he believes 1.5% is a realistic estimate, and he would rather err on the upside. Henrichsen stated that the staff recommendation was based on the number of building permits issued and the LES and water accounts.

A short recess was taken at 12:09 p.m., reconvening at 12:13 p.m.

General consensus was reached on the first assumption by those Planning Commission members present to remain at the 1.5% growth rate for the County.

The second assumption relates to the City/County population split. Staff recommendation is to retain the current split of 90% in the City and 10% in the County. The 10% County split is further divided into 6% non farm acreages, 3% incorporated towns/villages and 1% agricultural. Bills-Strand stated that she is comfortable retaining the current split. There was general consensus from the Commission members present to retain the current split of 90% in the City and 10% in the County.

Employment growth is the next assumption. Employment growth is converted into land needs. Between 1990 and 2000, the annual employment growth rate was 2.46%, total employment growth was 33,518 employees, and the annual average employment increase was 3,352 employees per year. County employment composition is broken into the following categories: commercial at 46%, industrial at 33%, public sector at 20% and other at 1%. Commercial employment is tied to the use and expansions of retail complexes, office building, business parks, and service centers. Industrial employment drives the need for additional industrial land and includes construction, manufacturing, trade, transportation and utilities. Public employment is tied to the use and expansions of existing public facilities as well as new office and service buildings. Staff recommendation is to retain the employment growth assumption of commercial employment at 2% per year, industrial employment at 2.5% per year and the public sector employment of 1.5% per year. Carlson suggested that perhaps we need to be more specific about what the categories include. Ross stated that more descriptive categories will be developed. Larson stated that he believes we need to overstate the industrial because we have had a shortage of industrial land. There was general agreement among the Commission members present to retain the current employment growth assumptions of commercial employment at 2.0% per year, industrial employment at 2.5% per year, and public sector employment at 1.5% per year.

The fourth assumption is development density and new growth areas. New residential subdivisions are developing within a range of about 1 to 13 dwelling units per residential acre. Residential subdivisions in the new growth areas of Lincoln develop at about 3 dwelling units per total acre within a typical square mile and 4 dwelling units per residential acre. This assumption addresses non-residential, public right-of-way, parks and other public uses. It is utilized to evaluate raw land needs to determine the boundary of the future service limit. Staff recommendation is to retain the 3 dwelling units per total acre and 4 dwelling units per residential acre, which will continue the existing residential patterns and land consumption rates. Bills-Strand stated that we are seeing an increasing in popularity of townhomes, yet people are complaining about congestion and that schools are overcrowded. She does not feel that we can increase the density; we need to let economics do it. Carlson stated that if we are concerned about efficient use, we need to be consistent between raw land use and existing neighborhoods. Larson asked how we are going to maintain the same density in the acreages. Bills-Strand stated that the build-through model will allow planning for that type of situation. General consensus was reached to retain the 3 dwelling units per total acre and 4 dwelling units per residential acre and to continue the existing residential patterns and land consumption rates.

The fifth assumption is development in the established areas. It is assumed there will be no significant increase in dwelling units throughout other existing neighborhoods. We are assuming that there will be additional development and dwelling units in the downtown and Antelope Valley redevelopment areas. There was general agreement among the Commission

members to retain the current assumption.

Henrichsen stated that the next step is to determine the future service limit scenarios on July 20<sup>th</sup>. The goal is to create three different scenarios. The Commission will then narrow the selection to a single draft by November 2005. He also noted that July 1<sup>st</sup> is the deadline to receive proposals for additions to the future service limit and changes to land use.

The meeting concluded at 12:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michele Abendroth  
Planning Department