

MEETING RECORD

NAME OF GROUP: URBAN DESIGN COMMITTEE

DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING: March 3, 2020, Conference Room 210, County-City Building, 555 S. 10th Street, Lincoln, NE.

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Amber Brannigan; Emily Deeker, Tammy Eagle Bull, Tom Huson, Gill Peace and Michelle Penn; Mark Canney absent.

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Ed Zimmer, Collin Christopher and Teresa McKinstry of the Planning Dept.; Lynn Johnson and Nicole Fleck Tooze of Parks and Recreation; Dan Marvin and Dallas McGee of Urban Development; Zach Wiegert and Ashley Solt of Goldenrod Companies; Brian Murch, John Badami and Brian Crawford of DLR Group; Cristy Joy and Trevor Watson of Archi + Etc.; Fred Hoppe, Jake Hoppe and John Hoppe Jr. of Hoppe, Inc.; Robert Wittler of Ayars & Ayars, Inc.; Nate Buss of Olsson Associates; Matt Wills of Studio 951; Ann Post of Baylor Evnen; Sheehan Hepburn of TR Hepburn; John Newcomer; Scott Wieskamp of Lincoln Public Schools; Evan Killeen from Lincoln Children's Zoo; and Matt Olberding from Lincoln Journal Star.

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

Penn then called for a motion approving the minutes of the regular meeting held February 4, 2020. Motion for approval made by Deeker, seconded by Huston and carried 6-0: Brannigan, Deeker, Eagle Bull, Huston, Peace and Penn voting 'yes'; Canney absent.

NEBRASKA INNOVATION CAMPUS HOTEL REDEVELOPMENT:

Members present: Brannigan, Deeker, Eagle Bull, Peace and Penn; Huston declaring a conflict of interest; Canney absent.

Zach Wiegert wants to share the latest developments.

Brian Murch stated that the last time this was presented to this committee, they were just starting to create the hotel project. It has become a Tribute hotel, a "soft branded" hotel from Marriott. They have engaged Archrival to help create the narrative of the guest experience. They want to tell a story about what is Nebraska. He thinks Archrival did a great job. Originally, they used inspiration of the elements. He presented some slides of the proposed materials; glass, metal and contrasting materials. As the materials were curated, it was about the context. They started to gravitate towards some of the existing brick buildings. They took those and created a blend. They used inspiration from

some of the other buildings. The theme was Nebraska. Each guest room may have a story. They started to explore a newer updated version of the hotel design. There is a courtyard space around Innovation Drive. The hotel and restaurant management program from the University of Nebraska will be part of this, along with a test kitchen and classroom space. The front canopy is cantilevered off the building. At the top of the hotel will be the Founders Room. It will be a meeting space that can be catered and set up for different events throughout the year. They wanted this to connect with the plaza across the street. There is no curb necessarily, they wanted this to feel more like a plaza space. The test kitchen and maintenance space are toward the back of the building. Wiegert noted they are going to sell coffee from The Mill so they don't complete with them across the street.

Zimmer stated that the redevelopment agreement has been approved. We felt this was different enough that it should be reviewed by Urban Design Committee.

Murch stated that second level is a fitness center, office spaces and guest rooms. The third and fourth floor will be guest rooms. They took the big idea of windows and made it more of a statement at the corner. The original design had a large podium up front. The new design has the façade pulled back with a canopy over the entrance. Another concept they have done on other hotels is a folding glass door to connect the inside and outside. That will work on the patio. They believe the new design for windows is much more effective. He showed the elevations.

Penn commended Murch for a good presentation.

Wiegert stated the groundbreaking is set for March 19, 2020. The goal is to be open by June of 2021.

Zimmer stated this will be a recommendation to Urban Development, for recommendation to the Mayor.

Huston assumes they went through the University with this design. Wiegert replied yes. The full backing of the University will be behind this in terms of branding. This is a great project.

Penn inquired what drove the big change of the look. Murch stated they talked about contrast. The story always helps the design. Once they got the design team involved, they looked at options. Telling the agricultural story started to inspire us. Penn finds this unusual. Usually something is changed due to budget. Wiegert understands that you don't want to show too much color or scale. This is a 50 year project. It will be there for along long time.

Peace likes the reconfiguring, and getting the drop-off is fantastic. He likes the bigger windows. A lot of work has been done. In his personal opinion, there were some things about the first design that he liked. It's a great project for Innovation Campus. The first design version had some things that he felt were more consistent with Innovation Campus. It was more modern, a little more clean. He liked the first iteration. The second thing, a nice thing Innovation Campus has going for it is simple masonry blends. The new additions are clearly not that. It easy to make the distinction between old and new. Murch thinks they are taking some more classic material and giving it roots.

Brannigan thinks this was a great idea to begin with. She likes the changes. The service center that wraps around has great big windows. She inquired what the plan is to ensure the people in the structure enjoy the space. Deeker noted that was her comment from last time. She wonders what the people next door will look at. Murch responded that they took the guest tower and gave it a little contrast. There has been a lot of conversation on what they do with the space.

Zimmer stated that we looked at this when it came in and the dumpster side is a ways back. Those opportunities need to be down and away. He pointed out the truck berth.

Eagle Bull commented it's not better or worse, but she liked the well defined first floor of the previous design, along with the articulation of the entry. She asked about the material behind the canopy. Murch thinks this feels a little more earthy. Eagle Bull pointed out the white material being shown. She suggested that perhaps it could be more to the entrance. It tends to blend in a little. Murch stated that they traced the openings with LED light. Wiegert believes the comment about the white material is a good point. They can do a study model and flip the white over to the entrance. Eagle Bull noted the canopy will be more apparent as well.

ACTION:

Peace made a motion for approval of the project as presented, seconded by Brannigan and carried 5-0: Brannigan, Deeker, Eagle Bull, Peace and Penn voting 'yes'; Huston declaring a conflict of interest; Canney absent.

ANTELOPE TOWER REDEVELOPMENT:

Members present: Brannigan, Deeker, Eagle Bull, Peace and Penn; Huston declaring a conflict of interest; Canney absent.

Cristy Joy wants to share the vision of the project. 14 sites are being rehabbed with a five-story mixed use residential building. For the redevelopment plan, they targeted an underutilized site. They encouraged mixed use. They want to create additional opportunities for housing. The first floor is commercial space. The upper floors are 93 workforce housing units at an affordable housing rate. They are west of the Nelnet offices and a block or so east of where the State is planning their new four story building. The corners have been enhanced. There are multiple material uses. The site does have some significant slope to it. It sets itself up nicely for some vertical aspects. As they start to go towards other forms of transportation, they have left a future area to master plan the space. There are balconies and a shared space. There will be a fitness space for tenant use. The entries are accessible and user friendly. They have met the design standards. There is the potential for an outdoor restaurant or patio space. They looked at the interplay of the materials, how it creates a balance but not symmetry, creates a sense of scale but also creates a pedestrian and vehicle friendly site.

Nate Buss stated there are a couple of things they have gone through recently with the City regarding access points on K Street and L Street. Your first view is that you can get into the space easily. Everything they are doing is unique. Downtown doesn't really have a landscape plan for parking.

They are doing all the current screening and shading requirements. They want to continue the pedestrian flow. There is a change for the outdoor patio to be along the north or south. They have separated trash on both ends. This is a redevelopment project. They are meeting current water detention and watershed requirements. This will be permeable pavement.

Peace questioned if the developer tried for any street parking. Buss responded that it was discouraged.

Brannigan inquired how many parking stalls per apartment will there be. Buss replied one per bed. Brannigan wondered if that fills up the lot. Buss stated there will be 116 beds and 178 stalls on site. There is one to one provided, along with commercial. John Hoppe Jr. thinks there are people that will leave their car there all day.

Joy stated they tried to move truck traffic and garage traffic off the main roads. A lot of it is an early morning delivery concept.

Eagle Bull questioned if the windows will be real, not spandrel. Joy stated that all the windows are now active. They have looked at having store fronts to the parking side.

Deeker thinks the east and west side are important. The west side looks kind of like back of house. Joy stated that right now, they show a railing and steps. It could change.

Penn asked if there are standards for openings. Zimmer stated this is subject to the Downtown Design Standards, with Urban Design Committee as the appeal body. There is language about the principal entrance being oriented to the street. The language of transparency talks about a minimum of 50 percent. It is not the retail 70 percent standard. There is a Downtown Design parking lot standard. He believes this probably meets it. This is screening with transparency.

Eagle Bull asked if the applicant has thought about doing a dock. Deeker would like to see something that engages the street a little bit. It would provide a consistent treatment across. She finds it a little confusing on what is the main entrance. She thinks it sets it up for a lot of confusion on what is happening on the building. Eagle Bull agrees. It looks like back of house.

There was a discussion about the location of the crosswalks on K Street.

Penn pointed out that the applicant is requesting a height waiver to 67 feet. Buss stated that 57 feet is the height in this area.

Zimmer stated that downtown has throughout the B-4 zoning, the ability to ask for height above the base map. Buss added that the uniqueness of this lot is that it is downhill from the next lot. He does not believe it will appear taller.

Penn thinks this is an important corner of the city. She wonders if there isn't a better way to engage the pedestrian landscape. She sees this being a very active space. West Haymarket is very pedestrian and a great space. She thinks this could engage a little more. It is a main traffic pattern coming in.

It's a new traffic pattern going north. This is a great spot to do something special. She would still consider engaging the corner to the pedestrian to attract even more people to the building.

Brannigan pointed out that down the block is Code Beer Co. and Craft Axe Throwing. Penn added that there are some great up and coming spaces in the area. This is the end piece.

Joy stated there are four active facades since this is such a busy traffic space.

Peace would like to look at the Antelope Valley façade. There looks to be a vent. Hoppe Jr. stated this is a vent for a restaurant space. Peace thinks it would be great to not have any exposed hoods on Antelope Valley Parkway. He thinks this is an important street. He agrees that this looks like back of house now. This is an important street with the traffic and the potential for lots of pedestrians. He is excited about this project. This is important to have this land occupied. He thinks the Antelope Valley Parkway façade needs to be treated like a front. He likes the idea of a dock. He would like to see the opaque doors eliminated, along with any hoods and treat this like a front. Now there is a white stucco board material wrapped with horizontal metal panel. He loves the approach. It's a little hard to tell what is happening at the entry. The parking side creates the entry. He would like to see a similar approach on the other side. It seems a little underwhelming. He would like to see the residential door acknowledged on this side as well. He is in favor of the height waiver. He would suggest to use it. He would suggest making the parapet four feet taller to hide the condensers. He likes the corners a little higher and would take all the parapets a little higher.

Peace would love to see them work on this a little more and bring it back. Huston stated the height waiver and plan amendment will appear before Planning Commission on April 7, 2020. Zimmer stated the key to the design is the redevelopment agreement.

Joy stated that they can deal with the concepts talked about today. They can come back with that translation.

Penn stated that the entire committee is supportive of the height waiver. They would like to see more development of the first floor side. This is such an important corner of the city.

ACTION:

Eagle Bull recommended approval of the height waiver and the concept as presented, with the note that there are concerns about the building face on Antelope Valley Parkway and the first floor engaging the street more, and the suggestion to hide the mechanicals on the roof with possibly a taller parapet, seconded by Deeker carried 5-0: Brannigan, Deeker, Eagle Bull, Peace and Penn voting 'yes'; Huston declaring a conflict of interest; Canney absent.

13TH & O REDEVELOPMENT:

Members present: Brannigan, Deeker, Eagle Bull, Peace and Penn; Huston declaring a conflict of interest; Canney absent.

Matt Wills pointed out that this is in the downtown area. People do things to buildings that age and things get covered up. They see this all over the place. That has happened to these poor buildings. There is a panel that they would like to take off and tuck point the brick.

Huston pointed out that this is part of the redevelopment project, working on this façade.

Zimmer pointed out a horizontal element on the building that is beautiful. Wills acknowledged that if there is a masonry element that they find, then it would stay. The last piece is the Subway tenant spot. That space is pushed back a little. They would bring it back to the door.

Zimmer wanted to know how the brick will be treated without destroying it. Wills would lean on the Parks Service tuckpointing standards. He has been involved in painstaking tuckpointing where you can't use power machines.

Peace wanted to know how this is done without blasting. Zimmer responded that you do some exploring and if it won't explore and if it won't come off, you repaint it a sympathetic brick color. He is confident this is in good hands.

Wills stated that he did a project in Hastings that looked like brick. It turned out to be concrete. He worked with Endicott to put thin brick on the building. He is not using that as a possibility, just noting a solution.

Penn wondered what is going on with the windows. Wills noted those would be replaced. He believes a double hung or single hung.

Zimmer pointed out this is a TIF (Tax Increment Financing) project. The streetscape project is coming. Huston added that 16th and O St. is nearing completion and they agreed to make a donation to streetscape enhancements.

Peace questioned if they plan on keeping the existing awnings or if they are using this as a chance to do something more consistent. Wills understands this is more than just the condo project. It is not addressed in this project. Awnings and street fronts are not addressed in this job.

Peace thinks it will be fantastic to get this cleaned up and brought back. Penn thinks this is a great use of TIF money.

ACTION:

Penn made a motion for approval, seconded by Peace and carried 5-0: Brannigan, Deeker, Eagle Bull, Peace and Penn voting 'yes'; Huston declaring a conflict of interest; Canney absent.

2400 Q REDEVELOPMENT:

Members present: Brannigan, Deeker, Eagle Bull, Huston, Peace and Penn; Canney absent.

Ann Post, attorney for the applicant (TR Hepburn), is assisting with the redevelopment process to get TIF for the project. 2400 Q is currently a vacant corner where they want to construct a 12-unit apartment building. They want to build rental housing with a low income component.

Architect Jon Newcomer stated this is a smaller building than the Hepburns are used to. It will replace a building that stood on this land for nearly 100 years before it was removed in 2017. It was affordable housing, 12 apartments as well. The Hepburn interests own the rest of the block, including an assisted living building to the north which is three stories and another to the east which has two stories and a garden level. The new building will be slab on grade construction. It was designed to best take advantage of the views. Elements will break the façade and reduce the visual scale. Hip roofs and gable roofs are common in the area.

The main, west entrance doesn't project but will have a porch covered by a canopy however. He was instructed to design the building in maintenance-free materials. He is proposing brick on all four sides. The "accent" elements on the north, west and south sides would use fiber cement. He will make sure to be compatible with the buildings on either side. The roof would be asphalt shingle. He is proposing a glass entry and aluminum store front.

Post noted this will be market rate rental housing with commitments through the redevelopment agreement to offer a certain minimum of affordable units as well as to accept Section 8 vouchers for some of the apartments on the block.

Penn asked about the units. Newcomer replied the building will be a combination of one, two and three bedroom units. Zimmer showed the floor plans. Newcomer stated there is access throughout the building. Committee members expressed concern that the west entrance is not accessible.

There was a discussion of the west elevation in regard to the Neighborhood Design Standards. The proposed building is more than 50 feet long. The standards require some relief for such buildings to break up the visual mass. This is comparable to others within the block, but doesn't meet the strict language of the design standards. The standards also reference the buildings across the streets (24th & Q), where smaller houses exist. Zimmer noted that the alley side has two points of relief (gables and cement-board "half-timbering") but only one on the west side. The committee all agreed that they would prefer to see the west elevation broken up like the south elevation, with the roof line and design.

Penn asked about parking. Post stated that the project will appear before Planning Commission on April 1, 2020 to amend (extend) the Antelope Square PUD (Planned Unit Development) to reduce the parking requirement on the 2400 Q site to one stall per unit. This is in the center of town. They feel that would be reasonable to accommodate. Huston added that parking can be governed within the

PUD. Zimmer added that the PUD across the street has the same parking standards. Affordable housing is the attraction of this project for the City.

Peace wanted to know about the height limit. Zimmer stated it is 35 feet. This is well under that. Newcomer believes this is 29 feet. Post pointed out that assuming this gets approved into the PUD, we can add more height. We don't need it, but it would be there. Huston noted that the PUD gives you more flexibility, but you can't exceed the height limit.

Eagle Bull questioned if there is any requirement to have accessible units. Peace believes with 12 units, it has to be accessible. Newcomer stated that from his experience, he always makes sure doorways are wide enough. Members noted with concern the inaccessibility of the west, main entrance. Newcomer acknowledged that the drawing reflected an earlier idea of providing basement parking which has been eliminated; therefore the building probably can be lowered several feet to reduce or eliminate steps at the entrance.

Peace asked about the technical piece of affordable housing. Post stated that affordable housing as part of the redevelopment agreement would have a number of units that would rent as part of that. The number of units have a price of 60 percent of median income according to HUD (Housing and Urban Development). Zimmer added that the agreement would also add a commitment to accept a certain number of Section 8 housing vouchers. Post noted that Section 8 can be hard to obtain and sometimes tenants can't find someone who will accept the voucher. She further added that they are open to incorporating a ramp on this building. Newcomer stated there are no common laundry facilities. There will be a laundry space in each unit.

ACTION: Huston moved approval as presented, noting the comment specifically regarding accessibility to the entry and keeping the neighborhood perspective in mind with the west elevation, seconded by Brannigan.

Peace commented that it will be fantastic to have something built on this lot finally. If this project was being built and didn't have to come in front of us, he would give a big round of applause. Given that, with TIF money, the overall design should be more refined. There are some buildings in the area that really paid attention to the scale and design. There are some row houses a block and a half away that paid attention to scale. He would much rather this reflects the recent projects than large apartment blocks that are there already. It looks like it fits into the existing neighborhood, but he feels that the newer stuff that has been built should be the example. If this didn't have a hip roof and sat at grade, he thinks you could do three level, perhaps sixteen or eighteen units. Before he votes yes, he thinks the architecture, scale and proportion should be figured out a little more. He would also like to see what the materials are. He thinks this is a little premature.

Huston disagreed. This is the first City instance of the TIF money being used for affordable housing. It can't be done on this budget. Peace would still like to see a little more to the design. He thinks there are ways to think about the architecture, get affordable housing and get a design that looks a little more current. Huston agrees that there can be some façade treatment.

Deeker pointed out there is still the question of materials. Penn added the color is unknown as well. She still would love to see a little more information on this.

Huston stated the applicant could return on to Urban Design Committee on April 7, 2020 to present more information on the materials. Post stated that the Redevelopment Agreement still has time before it goes forward, but the PUD amendment is progressing first (regarding the parking). They can come back to present materials.

Brannigan stated that the overall location and intent is good. Parking is sufficient.

Huston pointed out the old B-4 standard for part of the east edge of Downtown required one stall per unit. He thinks one stall per unit is reasonable.

Penn believes that overall, the committee is supportive of bringing more affordable housing to the community.

Motion for approval, requesting a return visit to UDC with materials identified and design refinements, carried 6-0: Brannigan, Deeker, Eagle Bull, Huston, Peace and Penn voting 'yes'; Canney absent.

OTHER:

- Lincoln Children's Zoo

Nicole Fleck Tooze wanted to give an update on the Lincoln Children's Zoo. In 2016, this body reviewed the master plan for the Lincoln Children's Zoo. The master plan responded to input that they received from this group, along with others. It resolved some issues related to parking. The Parks & Recreation Advisory Board and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Committee reviewed this as well. The consolidation of the updated plan, which was the basis of moving forward, included the moving of the Parks & Recreation office. This was shown as an event green. The zoo is at the point where they have moved forward with their major expansion. That plan was also the basis of a 50 year plan with the City. They are getting ready to do more detailed work. They are working on finalizing plans for a stage structure. This will be before the Parks Advisory Board next week. They would like the committee's input.

Scott Wieskamp stated that they have a zoo school science focus program. They used us as an owner representative. This has been a huge partnership. The event space is over a large underground water tank. Lincoln Water System (LWS) has also been involved in this. They have worked out an agreement with LWS on the event space. The underground tank is still active. Much of the paving is now in place. They are going to put a stage in, which allows the zoo to hold outdoor events. Some concept drawings were shown. It is using a metal project with a standing seam roof. Fleck Tooze pointed out that the landscape plan shows evergreens. Wieskamp continued showing different options for different materials. The steel would be galvanized. They are looking for feedback on this.

Peace questioned how close they are to maxing out the buildable footprint. It looks fantastic, but it looks small. Evan Killeen stated that the stage was specked with Don Adams from Pinnacle Bank Arena. He believes it is 24 feet wide.

Peace pointed out that it looks to him like some of the stage will get rain on it. He would run the roof a little longer. You could get a natural megaphone shape. Killeen noted that BVH Architecture is the architecture firm on this.

Penn stated this doesn't look like something the zoo would do. She questioned if there is a way to make it curved or something. Killeen stated that our roots are a botanical garden. They don't want this to be a billboard. Penn just thinks there could be a little more fun element to it. Huston would like to see a rain garden or splash element where the rain falls off the roof.

Eagle Bull pointed out that the sides of the stage are usually staging areas. You might want to shield that from A Street. You could step down the corten material and make a transition.

Deeker suggested to perhaps take away a little of the landscape so you can see in and see what is going on. You want people to see the activity.

Killeen noted there is a panel with laser cut grass looking panels. Deeker noted this will be one of the first things that people see. You want it to be a little fun.

Peace thinks that corten is a cool material on paper. He doesn't think the general public understands a rusty looking steel. Killeen is very cognizant of not overusing it. Peace thinks the laser cut and shadows could be really great. Penn agrees, you could do lighting on this side. You could make it interesting and do some lighting between the layers.

Wieskamp stated that everything they have done on this project for the last three or four years has exceeded their expectations. They appreciate all the input.

- Mayor's Art Awards

Huston will be attending the Art Awards if he doesn't have a Fremont City Council meeting that night. Penn can attend if she will be in town. Brannigan can be available as well. Penn will plan on attending the ceremony.

- Zimmer will send invitations to his retirement party.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:50 p.m.