MEETING RECORD

NAME OF GROUP:	PLANNING COMMISSION
DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING:	Wednesday, June 27, 2012, 1:00 p.m., Hearing Room 112 on the first floor of the County-City Building, 555 S. 10th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska
MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:	Leirion Gaylor Baird, Greg Butcher, Michael Cornelius, Dick Esseks, Wendy Francis, Chris Hove, Jeanelle Lust, Lynn Sunderman and Ken Weber; Marvin Krout, Steve Henrichsen, Brian Will, Tom Cajka, Sara Hartzell, Jean Preister and Teresa McKinstry of the Planning Department; media and other interested citizens.
STATED PURPOSE OF MEETING:	Regular Planning Commission Meeting

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

Cornelius then requested a motion approving the minutes for the regular meeting held June 13, 2012, as corrected. Motion for approval, as corrected, made by Francis, seconded by Hove and carried 6-0: Gaylor Baird, Butcher, Cornelius, Francis, Hove and Weber voting 'yes'; Esseks abstained; Lust and Sunderman absent at time of vote.

CONSENT AGENDA
PUBLIC HEARING & ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION
BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION: **June 26, 2012**

Members present: Gaylor Baird, Butcher, Cornelius, Esseks, Francis, Hove and Weber; Lust and Sunderman absent.

The Consent Agenda consisted of the following items: **SPECIAL PERMIT NO. 12025.**

Ex Parte Communications: None

Francis moved approval of the Consent Agenda, seconded by Weber and carried 7-0: Gaylor Baird, Butcher, Cornelius, Esseks, Francis, Hove and Weber voting 'yes'; Lust and Sunderman absent at time of vote.

Note: This is final action on Special Permit No. 12025 unless appealed to the City Council by filing a letter of appeal with the City Clerk within 14 days of the action by the Planning Commission.

COUNTY CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 12015,
AMENDMENT TO THE COUNTY ZONING RESOLUTION,
and
COUNTY MISCELLANEOUS NO. 12004,
AMENDMENT TO THE COUNTY LAND SUBDIVISION RESOLUTION,
TO ADD THE DEFINITION AND PROVISIONS FOR
AG PRESERVATION LOTS.
PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION: June 27, 2012

Members present: Butcher, Francis, Gaylor Baird, Sunderman, Lust, Hove, Esseks, Weber and Cornelius.

Staff recommendation: Approval

There were no ex parte communications disclosed.

Staff presentation: **Sara Hartzell of Planning staff** explained that both of these text amendments address very similar issues involved with subdivision in the county in the AG district. This proposal is in response to a request from the County Board late last year during the Comprehensive Plan update process. There were several concerns raised, one being the issue of 20-acre lots being the requirement for residential development out in the county, and another issue being the community unit plan (CUP) density bonuses with lack of a bonus for smaller size CUP's.

The County Zoning Resolution currently identifies the AG district as having a 20-acre minimum lot size, resulting in an overall density of 32 dwelling units per square mile. This was established during the 1979 zoning code update when the state definition of a farm was at least 20 acres and producing at least $1,000 of agricultural products. Since that time, the Comprehensive Plan has been changed directing us to look at alternative ways to split off smaller parcels and still maintain that overall density of 32 dwelling units per square mile and 1 dwelling unit per 20 acres, while maintaining some access management for safety on county roads.

Further, Hartzell suggested that more recently, the issue of financing residential development on large parcels has come up. Many people have called with concerns about not being able to get mortgage loans on larger parcels.

Hartzell then discussed the existing alternatives available to build on less than 20 acres: 1) there are many grandfathered lots in the county, whereby prior to 1979, you could split off 5 acres without subdivision; there are quite a few lots created during that time that are still considered legal lots; 2) a provision for splitting off the farmstead is available as long as the structure passes the minimum housing and sanitation requirements; 3) there is a provision for clustering the dwelling units on smaller parcels in a CUP, while preserving

some farm land; in 2005, the provision was added to create two small lots when you have 40 acres, with 30 acres maintained as an unbuildable outlot.

Hartzell stated that there are three primary goals to be considered: 1) maintain the overall density of 32 dwelling units per square mile, or one dwelling unit per 20 acres; 2) manage access to county section and one-half section line roads to reduce county maintenance costs and improve safety; and 3) preserve agricultural land. Other goals to be considered are to provide flexibility; use a subdivision process that could be approved administratively; provide a way of tracking subdivisions so that the overall density goals can be attained while still respecting personal property rights; and make sure that subdivisions done today do not create barriers to future subdivision should conditions change.

With regard to subdivisions, Hartzell explained that some of the text is being rearranged for ease and clarity. The provisions for AG Preservation Lots has been added – the requirements are that they maintain the overall density of one dwelling unit per 20 acres; limited to 80 acres or less, and 4 buildable lots. Parcels larger than that still have CUP opportunity. Buildable lots must be at least 3 acres and, according to the state health and city/county health department regulations, the three acres must be outside of any floodplain area or right-of-way; the lot size is limited because the remainder of the land must be at least 75% of the total. Access to the lots is taken off of a single shared driveway in a public access, utility and maintenance easement of 60 feet in width, which is the minimum width of a local road; the subdivider must agree to dedicate at least 50' of right-of-way on any section line or half section line road that abuts the development, providing full 100' width for grading and drainage.

There are also amendments to the CUP chapter. Currently, the density bonus is 20% by preserving agricultural land, environmental resources, etc. There is some language about density penalties related to small CUP's for residential districts that is being removed. The staff is recommending that the reference to the "county energy standards" be deleted because no standards were ever adopted, and the reference to the federal low income housing provision is being deleted as it is very unlikely to ever be used in the county.

The staff is recommending that the bonuses for AG and AGR be maintained. It is being recommended that the AG CUP's that preserve at least 70% of the land would qualify for a 25% bonus rather than 20% bonus. The method of calculation of the density bonus is being changed. Currently, the calculation is not rounded up or down. The recommendation is to round up when the calculation is .5 or greater.

Because the AG Preservation Lots have some special requirements and allowances, special design standards are being proposed which support the shared access, the width of the access and the dedication of the roadway in front of the property.

This proposal also recommends eliminating the county administrative subdivision permit (CASP) process and allowing final plats without a preliminary plat. Often in the county,

there are relatively small subdivisions and the preliminary plat process was onerous. The final plat requirements have now been changed and are now approved by the Director of Planning, so we no longer have the full review process by the public bodies and public hearing process. The need for the CASP is not there anymore. The time it takes is the same as a final plat. The application fee is the same as a final plat. Even the requirements are very similar. The lack of similarity is the end of the process – the CASP ends with a permit allowing the subdivision; the final plat ends up with subdivided land. It is being recommended that the CASP is no longer needed and that final plats without a preliminary plat be allowed under the same conditions.

Esseks referred to the provision regarding minimum lot size of 3 acres in order to deal with the needs of wastewater treatment, and inquired about the exception smaller lots may be approved when an easement exists on adjacent land providing a minimum of 3 acres. He is concerned about one-acre lots. Can the adjacent land be farmed? Hartzell explained that the state requires 3 acres for individual sanitation systems. The zoning has a minimum lot size of one acre in AG. What has been done in the past and what we are proposing suggests that if you want to subdivide less than 3 acres, you can do so as long as you maintain an easement of 3 acres outside of that area that can be used to replace a failed system. That land cannot be built upon, but it can continue to be farmed. And even after a lagoon or septic you could continue to farm the area around it.

Esseks then referred to the amendment to Article 14 and asked Hartzell to give an example of a CUP that preserves 70% as an unbuildable outlot. Hartzell suggested that with 160 acres (one quarter section), you could do a preliminary plat of 8 lots. Under the old calculations, you could have 38 units. The new calculations bump that up to 40 units. And 40 is kind of a magic number for county roads because we figure 10 trips per day per household = 400. That is the line where the County Engineer starts to look at improvements to the road because of increased traffic.

There was no testimony in opposition.

COUNTY CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 12015
ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION: June 27, 2012

Francis moved approval, seconded by Sunderman.

Cornelius pointed out that the Planning Commission was briefed on this legislation extensively. This is in response to the County Board's request and it appears to be a good compromise.

Motion for approval carried 9-0: Butcher, Francis, Gaylor Baird, Sunderman, Lust, Hove, Esseks, Weber and Cornelius voting 'yes'. This is a recommendation to the Lancaster County Board of Commissioners.

COUNTY MISCELLANEOUS NO. 12004
ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION: June 27, 2012

Hove moved approval, seconded by Francis and carried 9-0: Butcher, Francis, Gaylor Baird, Sunderman, Lust, Hove, Esseks, Weber and Cornelius voting 'yes'. This is a recommendation to the Lancaster County Board of Commissioners.

SPECIAL PERMIT NO. 1335C
AN AMENDMENT TO THE HOMESTEAD PARK COMMUNITY UNIT PLAN, TO REDUCE THE REAR YARD SETBACK ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT 734 GLACIER TRAIL.
PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION: June 27, 2012

Members present: Butcher, Francis, Gaylor Baird, Sunderman, Lust, Hove, Esseks, Weber and Cornelius.

Staff recommendation: Denial.

There were no ex parte communications disclosed.

Staff presentation: **Tom Cajka of Planning staff** explained that this is an application to reduce the rear yard setback from 20' to 9' in order to enclose a deck for an all-season sunroom. The main house today is built up to all of the setbacks for this lot. The current rear yard setback is 20', determined by 30' or 20% of the lot depth, whichever is less. The lot depth is 100', so the rear yard is 20'. The enclosure of the deck would result in the 9' setback. Cajka submitted that most of the houses in the surrounding area have even larger setbacks, some as much as 40', and at least 20'.

Cajka stated that the applicant is requesting this special permit to enclose the deck to provide protection from the weather and elements for their daughter who is in a wheelchair who accesses the house by the deck on a walkway along the side of the house. The Planning staff is recommending denial because there are other avenues to cover the deck that would not require reduction of the setback, such as a temporary awning. Reducing the setback to 9' to basically enlarge the house would be out of character with the neighborhood.

Lust inquired about other options, such as building a roof over the deck. Cajka stated that a wood-built roof that is attached to the house would still require a reduction of the setback because it would be considered a structure. There are retractable type awnings that would be removable, or those that have frames that are not actually attached to the house.

Esseks believes this to be a rather difficult decision. The owners really want this change to accommodate their disabled daughter, so then we have to balance the interests of the owners and the daughter versus the broader interests of the community and the people in the neighborhood. Why do we need a 20' setback? Cajka stated that it is a requirement of the zoning ordinance to allow green space and space between structures rather than covering too much of the lot with impervious surface. This is a land use issue. If this house was not within a CUP, the only avenue they would have would be a variance through the Board of Zoning Appeals. The intent for the special permit to reduce setbacks in a CUP was to allow houses to be bigger and closer to the lot lines. In the past, we have reduced setbacks for decks if they were next to open space, and those were always unenclosed decks.

Francis believes there are other developed areas that have less setbacks and, as pointed out, this is more for an accommodation for their handicap daughter. She believes it is more about accommodation than land use. Francis inquired about other newer areas that have 9' setbacks or smaller. Cajka acknowledged that there have been townhome-type developments on smaller lots, but he was not sure about the setback. That is usually in a larger area with the developments being the same type.

Francis also observed that the house abutting to the back seems to be smaller with quite a bit of yard space. If this is approved, she believes there would still be plenty of green space between this owner and their neighbor.

The side yard setback is 5'.

Proponents

1. DaNay Kalkowski appeared on behalf of the applicants, Dwight and Margaret Wilson, 734 Glacier Trail. The Wilson property is located within the Homestead Park CUP and this is a request to reduce the rear yard setback to 9' to construct a sunroom where they currently have a deck. She clarified that the Wilson's daughter does access the home in a wheelchair via the rear yard, but that she does not currently reside at the home. She has in the past, but she is a frequent visitor and makes multiple trips to this home weekly. They want to enclose the deck to protect from elements, provide better access into the home and make the space more livable year around.

Kalkowski disagreed with the Planning staff conclusion that reduction of the setback would not be in character with the neighborhood. This neighborhood contains a lot of diversity in regard to the shapes and sizes of the homes, the orientation of the homes to each other and the size and configuration of the rear yards – there is no "cookie-cutter." It is widely diverse. Kalkowski showed photographs depicting the different orientations, yards, etc.

Kalkowski also advised the Commission that prior to submitting the application, Mr. Wilson did talk to each of his abutting neighbors, and none of them had any objection. After

submitting the application, he talked to each of his neighbors personally, who each signed a statement indicating they are not opposed to this request. He has the signature of both the owner and tenant of the home to the west. The neighbors do not believe this request would have a detrimental impact on their use of their lot. For that reason, Kalkowski does not believe that this reduction is going to have a substantial impact on the character of the neighborhood.

2. Dwight Wilson, the applicant, stated that he has looked at several options but the average person does not understand what a family has to go through with a family member that is wheelchair-ridden, He has looked into awnings, but they have a brace that comes off the side of the house, and when the awning is rolled out the arm would stick out on both sides of the deck. One arm would completely cover the wheelchair ramp and the other arm would cover the steps going down into the back yard. He has also considered awnings with poles but they do not appear to be very substantial. One of the main reasons he wants to enclose the deck is to be able to clean the snow off of the wheelchair before taking his daughter into the house in the wintertime. In addition, Wilson stated that he is no longer physically able to scoop the snow. He has lived in this house for 17 years with no intent of moving, and at least one or two times every winter, there has been at least 1.5 feet of snow on the deck that has to be removed to get his daughter into the house. He has gotten as much as 3' of snow in the back yard. He cannot use the snow blower on the deck. He has also considered other accesses to the front door, but it would require at a least a 40' ramp.

Kalkowski then addressed the staff analysis that approval of this application would set a poor precedent, stating that she understands the need by staff to make that statement because we do not want to encourage every homeowner to apply for something like this. However, Kalkowski submitted that the special permit process is just not that easy and it is an expensive process. So you have to have a pretty valid reason to move forward with it. The Wilsons believe they have a distinguishable set of facts that justify the use of the special permit process and it is available because they are part of a community unit plan. They have the legitimate purpose to provide safe and reasonable access to all members of their family, and they have the consent of all of their neighbors. The Wilsons believe they have met the burden to justify this request, and they agree with the conditions of approval if this is approved, limiting the reduction to the area of the deck.

Lust inquired whether this home was built by the applicants. Kalkowski stated “yes”. Lust then confirmed that the daughter was in a wheelchair when they built the house, and the deck and ramp were put on the back of the house when it was built. Kalkowski concurred.

Esseks agreed that it makes a lot of sense to make an exception for a safe passage into the house, but here we are talking about the entire deck and turning it into a multi-function, multi-purpose room. That is where he has some trouble with this application. If it were just for safe passage he would not be so concerned. Kalkowski pointed out that the Wilsons do have the deck there and are utilizing it today as a function of their space within their lot.

To put an enclosure for something less than that could serve the purpose but would not allow them the total use that they have today.

Hove confirmed that none of the surrounding neighbors object. Kalkowski advised that the five neighbors directly abutting have signed a statement indicating no opposition.

The existing deck is 10 x 12.

Cornelius suggested that even if this were going to be something smaller than 10', we would still be here discussing this because it is currently built out to the setbacks.

There was no testimony in opposition.

Gaylor Baird asked staff to discuss the concern about setting a precedent. Cajka stated that the concern is that more applicants would come forward with any sort of what they feel to be a unique circumstance for reducing the setbacks. These requests have been approved for decks next to open space, but there needs to be a line where you draw how close one house should get to another house. He agreed that these requests are reviewed on a case-by-case basis, but there may be other people who think they may also have the rationale to ask for a reduction.

Esseks stated that he is searching for a way to justify this. We are talking about a small space providing a safe passage for someone who is seriously disabled. But if we are talking about opening up the entire back of the house for adding on to the house for multi-purpose reasons, he thinks that it is a bad precedent.

Gaylor Baird inquired whether there is some language that addresses this kind of circumstance where the vast majority of houses are not designed to accommodate people with disabilities. How do we look at these issues? Rick Peo, City Law Department, approached, suggesting that there is another provision in the Lincoln Municipal Code called a “reasonable accommodation” process for people with disabilities. That might be the process to make accommodation for the handicap or disabled person’s ability to utilize the dwelling. In other words, he suggested that the special permit process might not be the most appropriate way to present this case. Maybe reasonable accommodation would have been better, avoiding the precedent issue. They would have to reapply and come back to the Planning Commission. The standard of review is somewhat different, looking at the need to accommodate the needs of a disabled person to have reasonable use of a home.

Lust confirmed that Peo is saying that there might be reasons why we wouldn’t approve this special permit, but that does not preclude the applicant from reapplying under “reasonable accommodation”. Peo agreed.

Butcher wondered whether the disabled is required to be a resident of the home under the “reasonable accommodation” process. Peo stated that he would have to review that

legislation. She would still be a family member and he believes it potentially would be applicable.

Cornelius again pointed out that if the property were not in a CUP, the recourse that this family would have would be the Board of Zoning Appeals for a variance. But they are here today because the CUP exists and that opens the avenue for the special permit. Cajka agreed.

Response by the Applicant

Kalkowski commented that she has been practicing for 20 years before the Planning Commission and City Council, and this is only the second time she has been approached by a client about a waiver to the side or rear yard setback. The other instance was a side yard setback in the Williamsburg PUD. At that time, the applicant had to justify the facts and why it was unique, and it was approved, so there are opportunities to distinguish different factual situations from others when looking at a special permit. "You do it all the time. You lend that opinion and make justifications in a myriad of decisions." Kalkowski urged that this is an appropriate use of that special permit process. The applicant is requesting the 9' reduction but is happy to limit it to the deck area, which is addressed in the conditions of approval. There is no intention to do any further building. They have gone through the expense of this process and talking with their neighbors.

Esseks believes that this is reasonable as long as it is presented as a safe passageway for their daughter and not as a multi-purpose room.

Cornelius pointed out that the conditions of approval require them to revise the site plan to show a 9' rear yard setback "for the deck only", and that the applicant has agreed to accept that condition.

Gaylor Baird asked whether the applicant had considered the "reasonable accommodation" process. Kalkowski stated that they did not because this is the way she thought it would be done and believes they have the justification for it.

ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION: June 27, 2012

Francis moved approval, with the conditions as set forth in the staff report, seconded by Hove.

Francis believes this is a case of reasonable accommodation and does not set a precedent, even though the house was built 17 years ago when the daughter was already in a wheelchair. We age.

Lust stated that she is sympathetic to this family and she wants to be able to help them out. She also understands the concerns with aging. But, her concern is that this house was

built with the handicap daughter in mind; they have already built to all of the setbacks that

are available; she is concerned about setting a precedent; she believes there are ways to cover the walkway for when the daughter comes to visit that are more appropriate than building a sunroom.

Cornelius reiterated that we are here today because this parcel is part of the CUP. If this were at the Board of Zoning Appeals, they would be asking about special and unique circumstances that would justify a variance. He sees a set of unique circumstances in this case. In particular, this house is built to the envelope that is allowed. The household has as a member of the immediate family a handicap and wheelchair-bound person; the homeowners are aging; and this is an attempt to make a reasonable accommodation for them and for their daughter.

Motion for approval, with conditions, carried 8-1: Butcher, Francis, Gaylor Baird, Sunderman, Hove, Esseks, Weber and Cornelius voting 'yes'; Lust voting 'no'. This is final action unless appealed to the City Council within 14 days.

MISCELLANEOUS NO. 12009
TO REVIEW THE PROPOSED DECLARATION
OF THE HOLDREGE/IDYLWILD REDEVELOPMENT AREA
AS BLIGHTED AND SUBSTANDARD.
PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION: June 27, 2012

Members present: Butcher, Francis, Gaylor Baird, Sunderman, Lust, Hove, Esseks, Weber and Cornelius.

Staff recommendation: A finding that there is a reasonable presence of substandard and blighted conditions.

There were no ex parte communications disclosed.

Staff presentation: **David Landis, Director of Urban Development,** showed a map of the 7-acre area proposed for blight declaration, stating that, "this is not hypothetical." This declaration is in contemplation of a specific program of improvement that is now in the works. Two weeks from now, the Planning Commission will be briefed on the redevelopment plan should this area be blighted. At the same time, they will be drafting a redevelopment agreement for some redevelopment in the area, i.e. 2 three-story buildings adjoining Holdrege Street, and as part of that arrangement, the improvement of the Idylwild islands and the park.

Is this a blighted and substandard area? Yes, the report comes to that conclusion. There are nine buildings on the location and seven were found to be in a dilapidated state. The area has older stick-built wooden frame houses, making them subject to some danger with respect to fire. There is no below-ground drainage. There are areas of city right-of-way which are in fair or poor condition, as there are in some of the other privately owned areas.

There are substandard issues in the right-of-way, with curbing broken, etc.

Landis stated that after examining at the ground level, Hanna Keelan has found a substantial number of the blighted and substandard factors present in this case.

Landis indicated that they hope very much to have mixed use office, retail and potentially residential housing on Holdrege and that it will be a handsome improvement and have some ancillary benefits to the neighborhood to support this project. He agrees and believes it is a blighted area.

Lust inquired whether the houses are owner-occupied or rentals. Landis believes the developers have come to own most of the properties. Some of the structures will be removed. In fact, an older fraternity house has been brought into the project area, but is being redeveloped on its own.

Butcher inquired how the potential for TIF funding interacts with the fraternity house being built currently. Landis agreed that the fraternity will be in the area. The area would allow the growth of the valuation of the fraternity to be included in the monies in the TIF. A substantial amount of that money will be spent for improvements in the right-of-way and city utilities. In the end game, there will be a very enhanced improvement for the entire neighborhood. Yes, that project would be part of the growth of TIF and that increment would be dedicated to this area, but it is at a place where we will do city building for the neighbors as well.

Esseks noted that the shape of the redevelopment area is unusual. Landis explained that part of the reason for the improvements is to make sure there are ancillary beneficiaries besides the developer. We are doing this quite specifically to improve the park and the islands, and to make North Lincoln more beautiful than it has ever been on a continuing basis with an endowment to make sure the things we do to improve will stay. The boundaries are driven by the intent to make sure the neighborhood benefits as well as the developer.

Hove inquired whether the City has had conversations with the neighbors. Landis indicated that the neighborhood association has been involved. He would anticipate that at the point of a redevelopment agreement at the City Council level, the neighborhood will be in support of the project.

Butcher inquired whether the developer owns the vacant lot to the west of Valentino's. Landis stated, "yes". Butcher has been critical in the past when we do blight studies where we designate or include areas of residential/trailer parks and then there is no guarantee that we are going to see redevelopment in those areas. He is excited to see here that the developer is taking up a majority of the area. He wants to make sure some of the outlying lots are included in the developer's plans.

Support

1. Ann Bleed, President of the East Campus Community Organization, 1315 N. 37th, testified in strong support of the use of TIF funds for the redevelopment of the Holdrege and Idylwild area. Approval would be a good example of how the Planning Commission supports the new Comprehensive Plan. According to the Plan, the city's primary strategy for residential infill and redevelopment outside of downtown is to redevelop reuse and mixed-use sites. The Plan states that redevelopment should occur with adequate roads, located and designed in a manner compatible with the existing area, promote activities of daily walking with sidewalks on both sides of the street, provide adequate facilities for parks, community gardens and encourage semi-private and public uses. This area has a long history of mixed use. The area also has a lot of low density residential and high density residential areas along Holdrege Street. Some of the low density are in a historic district and others that are not in the historic district would certainly be eligible. The street also has a boulevard and a small park. This boulevard has periodically been kept up by the neighbors as opposed to the city, and that depends on whether the neighbors are willing to pull weeds or plant flowers. The park itself is small but it is very, very well used by the fraternity house as well as the residents. This area is across the street from East Campus so the redevelopment in the area would provide a good set of commercial activities for both the residents and people on East Campus. It is not too far from Innovation Campus, so it should be considered as connected to some extent with the Innovation Campus. It should be enhanced and not allowed to go to ruin.

Bleed agrees that the area is blighted as pointed out by the study; there are a number of houses in the area that would have to be significantly rehabbed if they were going to continue to be lived in; the boulevard itself and the streets are in rough condition and need work; the actual design of the street is somewhat dangerous and as more students come to campus and more development occurs in the area, she believes we will likely see increased accidents.

Bleed went on to state that the Comprehensive Plan does support the use of public funds for this kind of redevelopment and clearly the TIF funds would be used to do that.

Bleed extended appreciation to the Mayor's office for being supportive and the neighborhood is in strong support.

Lust understands that the neighborhood is in favor of redevelopment, but she sought confirmation that Bleed believes the area to be blighted. Bleed agrees that the area should be declared blighted. The neighborhood has concerns about houses outside of this area

and along the street that are definitely not blighted. The houses close to Holdrege definitely are and the street itself is a problem. The boulevard has not been maintained by the city at all for years.

There was no testimony in opposition.

ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION: June 27, 2012

Francis moved to find that there is a reasonable presence of substandard and blighted conditions in the Holdrege/Idylwild Redevelopment Area, seconded by Butcher.

Butcher stated that he is strongly inclined to support, although he usually questions blight designations when he does not believe the areas contributing to the blight are what is going to be improved. But in this case he believes there is strong evidence of that and he will support it. He thanked the Urban Development staff for working with the neighborhood. Cornelius is very familiar with this area. He frequently walks Idylwild between the park and East Campus. The evidence in the blight study makes it clear that there is plenty of room for improvement, particularly in the public right-of-way.

Motion carried 9-0: Butcher, Francis, Gaylor Baird, Sunderman, Lust, Hove, Esseks, Weber and Cornelius voting 'yes'. This is a recommendation to the City Council.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

Please note: These minutes will not be formally approved until the next regular meeting of the Planning Commission on July 11, 2012.

Q:\PC\MINUTES\2012\pcm062712.wpd