Meeting Notes	
reFORM	**reFORM Joint Committee Meeting** October 2, 2013; 11:30 a.m. County/City Building, Room 113
Members in Attendance:	Pat Anderson, Cathy Beecham, Jon Carlson, Michael Cornelius, Curt Donaldson, Mike Eckert, Tim Gergen, Dave Johnson, Danay Kalkowski, JoAnne Kissel, Rick Krueger, Jeanelle Lust, Sam Manzitto, Don Nelson, patte Newman, Michelle Penn, Dennis Scheer, Scott Sullivan, Lynn Sunderman, Zach White, Derek Zimmerman. Dan Klein and Don Linscott absent.
Others Present:	Marvin Krout, David Cary, Ed Zimmer, Brandon Garrett, Christy Eichorn, Stacey Hageman, Sara Hartzell, Michele Abendroth (Planning Department)

I. Welcome – Marvin Krout

The meeting was called to order at 11:34 a.m. David Cary welcomed everyone and introduced Marvin Krout. Krout thanked everyone for serving on the committee and noted that this is a public meeting. He explained that this proposal has been worked on for several months. Several presentations have been made during that time, and the main feedback received is that "the devil is in the details". They believe there is opportunity to look beyond what is written. They hope the committee will challenge staff and help reformulate the proposal. There is an emerging new market for new development to occur through infill and redevelopment and not just growing out of the edge of the city. We can take advantage of the interest and excitement that is brought from the recent downtown development. There is also a savings to taxpayers to utilize the existing infrastructure. As we are growing, we are losing some of the charm and identify of the community. When we look at design standards, they are trying to preserve that character.

a. Staff Introductions

Cary introduced Planning Department staff who will be working on this effort. Christy Eichorn will be lead staff for the Zoning Barriers Committee, and Brandon Garrett and Stacey Hageman will be lead staff for the Design Standards Committee.

b. Logistics

Cary briefly reviewed the general information regarding the committee, including the date, time and location of the meetings; and that parking passes for the parking garage are available.

II. Meeting Content and Materials Overview

Cary briefly reviewed the content of the binders that were distributed to the members; these items include the contact information sheet, today's agenda, invitation letter, meeting schedule, committee structure, and the draft report and change page.

III. Committee Member Introductions

c. Name and Representation

Members of the committee introduced themselves and identified their affiliation.

IV. Purpose of Our Effort

Cary explained what we hope to accomplish during this effort. We want to gain an understanding of the proposal and share ideas and concerns of the proposals. Proposals are intended to move forward as a package, and we are striving for general consensus.

V. Subcommittee Assignments

Cary provided a list of the members on each of the subcommittees, which are Design Standards Committee and Zoning Barriers Committee.

d. Topics to be Covered

The Zoning Barriers Committee will look at Chapter 1 of the draft document, and the Design Standards Committee will look at Chapter 2. Both committees will look at screening and landscaping requirements as well as necessary zoning changes.

VI. Schedule of Meetings

Cary provided a list of the meeting dates for each of the subcommittees.

VII. Power Point Overview of the reFORM Proposal

Cary explained that a lot of research and several presentations to outside agencies and inter-departmental staff have been done. Cary stated that there have been some exciting projects in and around downtown in the past five years. While downtown is very important to the city, there are other areas that are important too. They want to take this energy and the higher level of design and have a ripple effect to the rest of the community. They want to provide choices in housing and amenities for all sectors of the population. A lot of what is in the Comprehensive Plan is the building block of the reFORM proposal. It is important to create places that people want to be, so placemaking is a critical piece of the proposal. The focus of the reFORM proposal is on mixed use, infill and redevelopment in nodes and corridors. There are four chapters in the proposal: 1. Remove Zoning Barriers; 2. Reestablish a Sense of Place in our Commercial Centers; 3. Reinforce Landscape/Screening Requirements; 4. Realign Zoning Map with Development Goals.

Chapter 1: In the first chapter, we want to make sure there is more flexibility in commercial development. To do this, we want to revise parking standards, streamline the project review

processes, apply PUD tool to smaller development sites and provide flexibility for waivers, allow more opportunities for residential uses in commercial zoning districts, and expand options for residential infill.

Chapter 2: There are design standards in place already, but there is a wide range of what design standards resulted in, so they want to raise the base level of what to expect with all of our commercial developments. We also want to establish site development standards that make commercial and mixed use development more walkable. We want to create building design standards that make development more aesthetically pleasing.

Chapter 3: We want to achieve desirable and permanent screens/ buffers. Part of this is to provide better enforcement of the standards. We also want to require more parking lot trees. Another change is to enhance buffers between incompatible uses.

Chapter 4: There are zoning changes that need to occur as well, which include establishing B-3 and H-2 zoning in "Corridor" areas; and establishing B-2, B-5, and H-4 zoning in "Center" areas.

VIII. Current Changes to the Proposal

Cary explained that there have been some changes proposed to the draft report due to the feedback received. The changes include removing the Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) proposal as well as removing the Community Unit Plans (CUPs) proposal. Other changes are regarding parking requirements, setbacks in H-2, on-street parking, prohibited building materials and removing the rezoning of some areas from I-1 to H-2.

IX. Round Robin

e. Each Committee Member Provide a Question or Comment for Staff to Consider

Eckert stated that he wants to make sure we get some market application to the things that are going to impinge leasing and selling, but at the same time, try to be open to these things.

Nelson would like a status report on downzoning because all of these are ultimately embedded in the business community's philosophy regarding deintensifying or intensifying land uses and judicial review.

Newman stated when she thinks of all battles there have been in the neighborhoods, she wondered if there is going to be a specific category for mixed use. People want consistency and want to know what they are dealing with if they are next to this district.

Kalkowski stated that she is concerned about the practical implication. We all want beautiful development but that comes with a cost. We need to balance that with how we are going to provide affordable housing and economic development.

White echoed Kalkowski's comments. From a practical standpoint, it looks great, but from a private sector and a real estate sales perspective, we need to have balance. There are certain things that other cities can do well, but maybe we can't in Lincoln.

Anderson stated that we need to keep in mind what is surrounding us. We need to have a way of looking at if the addition or new construction is the right fit for that area.

Cornelius stated that he sees this process as an extension of the Comp Plan process, where many of these issues were discussed and examined in a very detailed way, and he wants to be part of that.

Kissel stated that Urban Design Committee is at the other end of the process, so this is a bookend process before it gets there.

Sunderman stated that he would like to have a package that encourages private investment and get away from the TIF financing that we seem to moving toward. With regard to affordable housing, design standards increase costs which will have a ripple effect to current developments.

Krueger stated that if you keep things simple, people can determine what is the best use for their land. These details are important, but he questioned how we deal with the inherent contention of ideas within the document.

Zimmerman stated that on the practical side, demand for infill, demand for services in town, but practical issues with lot sizes are kind of competing issues. We want things to look nice, but there is the cost issue.

Lust echoed what Cornelius said. During the Comp Plan process, we identified several things that were barriers to what we wanted to accomplish, so she is anxious to work through those things.

Donaldson stated that on the North 27th Street corridor, they had the benefit of the TIF district which guided development. With the end of the TIF funding, we need something in place and some guidance.

Penn stated that so many of these things are applicable to the projects that come to the Urban Design Committee. One of the things about design professionals is giving them latitude to design in a profound way, but also giving them guidance. She believes it is important to provide direction so that we can filter some of the projects that just slip through.

Sullivan is curious to hear input regarding the Downtown Design Standards and what we have learned in the last five years and to see how it will guide us in the future. The health food store on N. 48th is a good example to keep in mind as we filter through this.

Carlson stated that he is glad that ADUs and CUPs are taken out of the proposal, so the focus can stay on the design standards. For the proposal to change B-1 to B-3, he questioned if that opens up a potential opportunity for B-1 to become something useful for historic neighborhoods.

Manzitto stated that as a contractor and developer, it is reassuring to have those guidelines in place. It helps clients know that their neighbor's building will have the same quality, and that will be advantageous to the city in the long run.

Scheer stated that he believes the devil is in the details. As we develop details, it is important to not lose track of the bigger vision.

Gergen stated that the details need to be flexible but yet rigid to the bigger vision. We need to encourage the city to invite other departments like the Law Department and Building & Safety to the discussion. He wondered if we could make some of these items administrative, which may scare us off because it may require an amendment to the City Charter. But let's not get scared off and bring in the Law Department right away if that's what we need to do. Building & Safety is always our biggest hangup, because they are very black and white.

Johnson stated that we need to be careful with the design standards not to make them too detailed and that we need to leave the latitude for the designers to design. He would hope that the design standards are more quality based than prescriptive. There are some great examples around the country that are done very well, but maybe don't meet a prescriptive set of design standards.

Anderson asked how this process is going to mesh with other standards that are already there. Cary stated that it will apply to new projects and would not be retroactive. Eichorn stated that we would look at the existing standards and see where there are gaps. On South Street, there are guidelines but there is nothing enforceable.

Krueger stated that as a private person, he would have partners in government so that he doesn't go through the process negotiating a deal and then there may be a problem at the codes department level. Beecham stated that once we have these in place, she asked how we communicate this with the entire community so that it is there in the planning stages instead of getting hit at the 11th hour.

X. Next Meetings for Each Subcommittee

Cary noted that the Design Standards Committee will meet on October 9 and the Zoning Barriers Committee will meet on October 16.

XI. Public Comments

There we no public comments.

XII. Wrap Up

Cary thanked the members for their participation and for being here today.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:42 p.m.