Meeting Minutes: This document states the minutes of cases before the Urban Design Review Board at their Public hearing and Administrative meeting held on Thursday, February 21, 2019.

Certification of Publication: Urban Design Review Board Administrator certifies publication of this agenda in the Daily Record, the official newspaper of the City of Omaha on Monday, February 11, 2019

Members Present: Jeffrey Elliott – Chair
Robert Peters – Vice-Chair
Matthew Schafer
Philip Webb
Dawaune Hayes
Kristine Karnes

Members Not Present: Michael Riedmann
Kurt Cisar
Jay Noddle
Katie Underwood

Staff Present: Jed Moulton – Urban Design Planning Manager
Tim Fries – Urban Design Review Board Administrator
Alan Thelen - City Law
Lisa Agans - Recording Secretary

Pre-Meeting minutes:

At the pre-meeting of the Urban Design Review Board, held on February 21, 2019 at 2:30 p.m., the Board and City staff briefly discussed the agenda items.

Mr. Tim Fries advised that agenda item number 3, case UD-19-003, was withdrawn at the request of the applicant. Since this was requested after the advertisement had appeared, it was left on the agenda. Mr. Alan Thelan, City Law Department, advised that the Board Chairman would need to state for the record that the case had been withdrawn, no vote would be needed.
Mr. Fries advised that, due to Mr. Elliott recusing himself from the vote on agenda item #2, UD-19-002, there would not be a quorum to vote on the case. Per Mr. Thelan, if desired, the Board could still hear testimony and discussion about the case for information purposes, but no action or vote could be taken without a quorum.

The Board discussed various aspects of agenda item #1, UD-19-001. Concerns expressed included the possibility of setting precedent with a yes vote on this request, as well as discussion about the viability of the Urestone as a primary material with regards to code requirements. The Board discussed concerns about the lack of information regarding long term use, durability, and appearance of the proposed material. Discussion also included questions about why the applicant wanted to cover up genuine, painted brick, with artificial brick rather than repainting, as well as other faux brick/stone materials which could be used.

The pre-meeting adjourned shortly prior to the start of the regular meeting.

**Administrative Item:**

Mr. Peters moved to adopt the minutes of November 15, 2018 Urban Design Review meeting minutes. Mr. Schafer seconded the motion.


**Private Projects:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UD-19-001</th>
<th>Name: Buchanan Energy BP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Troy Panagiotis/Omaha Neon Sign Company</td>
<td>Location: 5003 Dodge St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request: Consideration of Urestone Panels for use as a primary material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the Urban Design Review Board (UDRB) meeting held on February 21, 2019, Mr. Tony Panagiotis appeared before the Board on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Jed Moulton, Urban Design Planning Manager, appeared on behalf of the City. Mr. Panagiotis provided a brief overview of the Urestone material regarding its durability, provided a sample and a brochure for the Board to see the quality of the material, installation techniques, and how it looks installed. He also responded to questions from the Board. In response to questions from Mr. Elliott and Mr. Hayes, Mr. Panagiotis stated that the material is considered to be a cleaner fix than repainting the existing brick and would require less maintenance over time. In response to questions about the longevity of the product, Mr. Panagiotis stated that the material was used in Las Vegas as well as at the Disney theme parks, however he did not have information regarding the durability of the product over time but stated he could reach out to the manufacturer to find out.

Mr. Webb stated that he was concerned they would be setting a precedent if they allowed this applicant to use this material as a primary product when it did not meet the standards in the code, particularly since there was no information regarding the long-term durability of the product. He stated that he could not approve a deviation from the code for a product they had so little information about. He stated that he would like to see information about the use in the field and long term durability, mostly
only for future consideration regarding the codified standards.

Mr. Panagiotis inquired as to whether the Board could be supportive of a faux stone material as a primary material. Mr. Jed Moulton, Planning Department, stated that various types of faux stone were allowed within the code. Mr. Hayes stated that he was concerned about how this was going to look as the primary material which was intended to be used all over the building. Mr. Panagiotis stated that they were attempting to create a 1920’s look for the building. Mr. Webb stated that he observed they were trying to achieve a variation of the “subway tile” popular in that time period.

Mr. Webb moved to deny the request, but urged the applicant to find alternative product which would produce the same result. Mr. Schafer seconded the motion.

AYES: Webb, Schafer, Peters, Elliott

MOTION CARRIED: 4 – 0.

At the Urban Design Review Board (UDRB) meeting held on February 21, 2019, Mr. Larry Jobeun, 11440 West Center Road, appeared on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Jed Moulton, Urban Design Planning Manager, appeared on behalf of the City. Mr. Jobeun began his presentation by providing a diagram and aerial photo of the project site. He stated that the applicant wishes to orient the new business towards Top Golf to create something similar to an entertainment which would tie together Top Golf and the other restaurants in the area. He stated that the new buildings will be oriented to a new internal street rather than to 102nd Street, which none of the other businesses are oriented to. Mr. Jobeun stated that in order to achieve a look which would be aesthetically pleasing from the back of the building, the architect had created a 4-sided building, which looked the same whether a person was looking at the front or the back of the building. He pointed out on his aerial photo the locations of the various parking areas and other businesses which would all be tied together with this project. In response to a question from Mr. Peters, Mr. Jobeun stated that the elevation between 102nd Street and the project site is basically flat.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Jobeun stated that the configuration of the streets, islands, and signals will help traffic to flow into and out of the area at the entrances to the various buildings. Mr. Jobeun stated that issues such as easements would be up to the City to determine and that the pedestrian sidewalks are required by the subdivision agreement. Mr. Peters stated that he was concerned about the visual impact of having the drive thru, garbage bins and other “back of house” items facing onto 102nd Street. Mr. Schafer recommended rotating the whole building to have it facing Top Golf to the north. He stated that, from a landscaping architecture viewpoint, it would be preferable to have the public on the north and west sides of the building for better circulation. Mr. Jobeun stated that they would have the patio seating facing traffic if they rotated it.

**Mr. Elliott recused himself prior to the beginning of discussion of this case.**
Mr. Peters inquired about how the internal street would be enhanced to take away from the current appearance being that of a drive aisle in a parking lot field. Mr. Jobeun stated that they have vacated the frontage road, created a public easement, and continued it on to the south to the BMW dealership and north to Nicholas Street. Mr. Peters also inquired about having the, as yet unnamed, tenant B face 102nd Street. Mr. Jobeun stated that the patio will extend all along the frontage, which would include tenant B, and orient the entire building towards the concept of an entertainment area building off of Top Golf.

Mr. Drew Snyder, Lead Developer, appeared before the Board on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Snyder stated that consideration had to be given to the imposition of private covenants which were placed by Top Golf when the deal was made. One of those covenants is that the project is limited to using only the eastern portion of the lot, which leaves them with only about four acres for the development. In addition, he stated that it is not uncommon to have Top Golf customers waiting 2 to 3 hours after signing in. Mr. Snyder stated that they were planning the project with those customers in mind who would be looking for something to do while they were waiting. He stated that with the right tenants in the buildings people will want to walk over to the businesses, particularly the outdoor patio areas, which is why they want the buildings oriented in that direction.

In response to Ms. Karnes, Mr. Jobeun stated that the south building was locked in at the same orientation. He also stated that H & H Westroads had been at the Planning Board in January to plat their lot to put it on the market. Mr. Schafer stated that the view of the building will be similar from the street regardless of which direction it is facing, but the traffic would flow better if they rotated it like he had previously described. Mr. Snyder explained that due to the covenants imposed by Top Golf, there is a public easement in place in lieu of the frontage road so that area needs to remain open, which would push all the parking to the west side of the building. He stated that they wanted the main entrances to be on the west side, facing the parking area to prevent pedestrians walking all the way around the building from the parking area.

In response to a question from Mr. Peters, Mr. Jobeun stated that Public Works would not allow them to connect the frontage road through the island. He stated that Public Works required them to install an elongated island to aid in the flow of heavy traffic through the signalized intersection. Mr. Jed Moulton stated that while he has been looking at the plan, with the question of hardship in mind, he noted that with the elongated island a person will be required to make four left turns to get to the front of the building and does not allow a turn directly to the front of the building. Ms. Karnes stated that in other areas, such as Village Pointe, the parking being behind the building is inconvenient and is why she prefers to go to another mall with more convenient access.

Mr. Peters stated that the internal main street needs to be landscaped in a way to make it appear as more than a drive aisle through the parking field in order to gain his approval. Mr. Elliott, on behalf of the developer, spoke with the Board regarding options for landscaping throughout the parking field and along that drive aisle. Mr. Moulton stated that he believed there may be some merit to taking the 30’ sidewalk and turning into more of a pedestrian promenade with landscaping to bring them into the entertainment. Mr. Schafer inquired whether the developer would be willing to produce a plan showing that 30’ area being more developed as a pedestrian area. Mr. Snyder and Mr. Jobeun stated that portions of the plans are still in the conceptual stage and some changes could be made. Mr. Hayes stated that there will need to be some sort of cross walks and breaking up the large parking area with landscaping or islands to make people want to make the walk from Top Golf to this new building and patio area.
Mr. Webb stated that as there was no quorum at this meeting to vote on this project, the applicant should work to show some of the ideas that had been discussed before the next meeting. Mr. Snyder stated that he believed they could come back to the next meeting with a better representation of some of the pedestrian areas and changes to the parking field.

Mr. Moulton asked what guarantees could be made that this project would be built as presented on this lot. Ms. Karnes asked whether both buildings were on the current application. Mr. Jobeun stated that there could be a proposed building envelope which would define where the building would have to be and how it would be oriented. Mr. Jobeun stated that the applicant does currently own the properties. Mr. Moulton suggested the applicant could show the plans at Zoning Board of Appeals to obtain a waiver based on the hardship.

It was the consensus of the Board that the applicant would return with plans showing more of the pedestrian areas.

Per Mr. Alan Thelan, City Law Department, as there was not a quorum of Board members for this project, the Board could not take any action.

**Mr. Elliott returned to join the Board at the end of this discussion.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UD-19-003</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Logan Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Levy</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>1802 Dodge St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request:</td>
<td>Support of waiver to 55-924 – Sidewalk width.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This case was withdrawn at the request of the applicant.

**Adjournment:**

It was the consensus of the Board to adjourn the meeting at 3:55 p.m.

__________________________
Jeff Elliott, UDRB Chairman

__________________________
Lisa Agans, Recording Secretary