

MEETING RECORD

NAME OF GROUP: HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING: Thursday, August 15, 2019, 1:30 p.m., Conference Room 214, 2nd Floor, County-City Building, 555 S. 10th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska.

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE Melissa Gengler, Jim Johnson, Greg McCown, Liz Bavitz and Greg Newport; (Jim McKee and Nancy Hove-Graul absent).

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE Ed Zimmer, Stacey Hageman, Rhonda Haas of the Planning Department; Ann Post, Matt Wills, Zeb Lund and Russ Bayer; and Matt Olberding of the Lincoln Journal Star.

STATED PURPOSE OF MEETING: Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Chair McCown called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. and acknowledged the posting of the Open Meetings Act in the room.

McCown requested a motion approving the minutes for the meeting of July 18, 2019. Motion for approval made by Johnson, seconded by Newport and carried 5-0: Gengler, Johnson, McCown, Bavitz and Newport voting 'yes'; McKee and Hove-Graul absent.

The opportunity was given for persons with limited time or with an item not appearing on the agenda to address the Commission.

Peggy Brown, 11700 N 176th Street, Waverly, came forward and stated that she applied to be on the Historic Preservation Commission in the past. She stated that close to her residence there was a historic overlay that was approved. She explained that she is not against the historic overlay, but is against the way that it was done. She stated that there was no county input on this item and the applicant didn't even contact her. She stated that someone from the county needs to be on this board.

Ed Zimmer, Planning Department, explained that the Historic Preservation Commission Board is not self-appointing, but this is something that they are working towards.

Brown stated that she wants someone this lives outside the city in the rural county on the board.

McCown thanked Ms. Brown for attending the meeting.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR 803 O STREET, THE HUBER BUILDING, IN THE HAYMARKET LANDMARK DISTRICT

PUBLIC HEARING:

August 15, 2019

Members present: Gengler, Johnson, McCown, Bavitz and Newport; McKee and Hove-Graul absent.

Ann Post, Baylor Evnen Law, 1248 E. O Street, came forward and stated this project is the redevelopment of the Huber Building. She shared that the first floor would remain the same with this project and the redevelopment will start on the second floor where there will be 6 residential condominium units, and there are plans for a unique deck space on the roof with awnings for some of the windows.

Matt Will, Studio 951 Architects, 800 P Street, came forward and stated that he was hired by owner Russ Bayer to do the renovation for this building. He stated one of the things to notice about this building is the brick arches over the windows and the vintage signage on the building, which will not be changed. The arches of the windows will still be visible when someone walks up to the building even with the awnings installed. The roof-deck concept is something that you can see in a couple of places in the downtown area. The second floor units will be on the luxury side and not something for typical students, and the roof-deck will be an amenity for those units. He explained the roof-deck would not cover the entire roof area. There will be one larger deck area, and some smaller private decks.

Gengler inquired if the awnings would be on both sides of the building. Will stated that there is not a need for awnings on the north side, and he stated he is not wanting to take away from the Huber sign.

Gengler inquired about comments that the entire building would need to be repointed and what the impact might be from the repointing. Will stated they do not plan on repointing everything, but what is done will need to be done carefully and skillfully.

Gengler asked about one of the floor plans that shows the freight elevator being removed, and asked if this was to gain second floor for square footage. Will stated that was correct, and that it is on the alley side of the building. Gengler stated that it seems like that would be a much better side to get the rooftop access for the deck rather than having the two large additions on the rooftop on such prominent corners of the building. Will stated there is another existing elevator in the building and that elevator would be extended. He shared there would be elevator access and two sets of stairs that go up.

McCown inquired if the rooftop pergola height was the same across the public area as the private deck areas. Will stated that the private decks are the same and the pergola was raised 2

feet for the large deck area. McCown asked what the height was for above the decks. Will stated 9 feet for the private decks and 11 feet for the larger deck. McCown inquired about moving the smaller decks back so that they would be away from the edge of the roof, which would minimize the look of the roof feature's height. Will stated that the structural engineer is wanting the smaller decks back from the edge, but the roof pitches to the alley, and they are not wanting to put the decks on a slope. In the current plans the decks are 4 feet back from the roofs edge with a 42 inch railing.

Newport inquired if the awnings over the windows are for historic reasons or if there were other reasons for the awnings. Will explained that they would be doing some shading and a slight bit of weather protection for the window. He stated that he is not trying to dress the building up, but the awnings over the windows in the historic photos looks nice.

Newport did stated that he would also like for the roof structure over the decks to be back from the edge another 4 feet.

McCown asked if the boards on the top would let the sun coming through or if it would be a solid surface, and if they were even necessary. Will shared that the boards would let the sun through and were not over the entire deck area. The part of the deck that is closest to the edge is open to the sky.

Bavitz inquired about the access structures that would be built on the roof and if the same materials would be used. Will said yes, it would be all brick.

Gengler stated as a historic rehab you might consider making the rooftop addition smaller and less visible. She explained with the additional access structure on the rooftop if they were recessed just a little to cast a small shadow, so it does not appear to be one large mass going up.

McCown stated that he does not feel that a certificate of appropriateness can be issued with questions still out there, and he stated that he would like to see something that minimizes the look from the street.

Russ Bayer stated that the project will not move forward if they are unable to get TIF dollars or if they are required to move the deck back or reduce its size. He stated that they have done an analysis of what can be done on the roof to stay within the guidelines. The occupancy capacity of all spaces available on the roof is limited to 49 on the large deck and 9 to 12 on the private decks. He stated that access to the view is critical for this project to move forward and if you move back too far you see nothing.

McCown stated that he has concerns of what is seen from the street level. Bayer stated that they can look at setting back where the roof begins and he stated that he would be willing to

look into a different covering. Will stated that he would look at the placement of the decks for the rooftop to move this forward.

Bayer stated that the certificate of appropriateness is important and is needed to move this project forward. Post stated that the certificate of appropriateness is not needed right now, but they are wanting to know the overall support of this project.

ACTION:

Zimmer suggested that they could make a comment on the use of TIF dollars for the rehab of this building, replacing windows, tuckpointing and shifting it from its current use to residential. This will give the Planning Commission a positive signal for the next set of hearings. He stated that HPC could speak to the use of TIF funds for this project and then ask to have this project come before HPC again when more of the details have been worked out.

McCown stated that would be a good place to start, and that he would like to see the same elevations with a few adjustments. He stated he is wanting to see what this building would look like without the awnings and with the roof elements included.

Newport stated with the comments of this meeting they are headed in the right direction and it is good to see this building being fully used.

Bavitz stated that she supports the idea for the use of TIF funds to help move this project forward, and she asked if there was something that HPC could do to help the owner get the TIF funding with the idea that they would need to come back to HPC. Zimmer stated that an affirmative recommendation on use of TIF funds could be the motion for today's meeting to continue to move this forward.

Newport moved that the Commission support the application for TIF financing. Seconded by Johnson and carried 4-0: Members present: Johnson, McCown, Bavitz and Newport voting 'yes'; Gengler abstained; McKee and Hove-Graul absent.

MISCELLANEOUS:

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:31 p.m.