The meeting was called to order at 11:30 a.m.

Mr. Derek Miller, Long Range & Mobility Planning Manager, addressed the Board to introduce a new item which will be at the beginning of each pre-meeting beginning next month. Various topics will be covered in a 15 minute presentation each month including explanations of various aspects of planning, such as TIF requirements. Mr. Miller stated that the current schedule is subject to change and that suggestions for additional topics are welcomed.

#6 Mr. Don Seten of the Planning Department explained that the applicant has, or will, demolish two structures currently on the property and plat it into one lot. The developer plans to build a four story apartment building, with two, 2-bedroom apartments on each of three levels and one level of parking. Urban Design staff have reviewed the design and finds it is acceptable.

#7 *Ms. Karnes recused herself and left the room* Mr. Don Seten of the Planning Department stated that this request is to designate the area shown on the map as a CRA (Community Redevelopment Area) which will make it an eligible area for TIF projects. He explained the requirements for the designation and answered several questions from the Board and staff members present. *Ms. Karnes returned to the room following the end of this discussion*

#1 & #2 Mr. Eric Englund, Acting Assistant Director, advised that these two requests will be on the Administrative Meeting portion of the agenda.

#1 The Preliminary Plat was recommended for approval by the Planning Board on October 2, 2019 and was approved by City Council on November 26, 2019. The applicant is still working on one of the conditions of approval, otherwise, the final plat is identical to the preliminary plat.

#2 *Ms. Karnes recused herself & left the room.* Mr. Englund stated that the Planning Board had recommended approval of the preliminary plat at the November 6, 2019 meeting and the City Council had approved it on January 7, 2020. The department is satisfied that conditions
have been met and recommend approval of the final plat. *Ms. Karnes returned to the room following the end of this discussion*

#3 & #4 Mr. Englund stated that these two requests which had been laid over at the request of the applicant at the December 4, 2019 meeting, should be heard together, but voted on separately at the public meeting. He explained the reasoning for including the additional addresses in the Future Land Use portion was to clean up the FLU which had not been updated with prior rezoning approvals. Mr. Englund answered questions from the Board members and explained some details of the proposed project.

#5 Mr. Englund reminded the Board that this request had been laid over at the December 4, 2019 meeting. Mr. Robert Laroco, Planning Board Administrator, handed out a revised recommendation report. Mr. Englund advised that James from Public Works will be available at the public meeting to answer questions.

#8 & #19 Mr. Englund stated that these two requests should be heard together but voted on separately at the public meeting. He advised that the staff put both items on the Consent Agenda, but #8 is for approval and #19 is for layover. Mr. Englund explained some of the history of the area as well as history of other projects which had been proposed there.

#9 & #20 Mr. Englund stated that these two requests are both on the Consent Agenda for approval and should be heard together but voted on separately at the public meeting. He explained that the applicant wishes to build one single family residence on the 36 acre property. The request will plat the property into one lot and the Special Use Permit is due to the property being in the North Hills ED.

#10 Mr. Englund advised that this request was on the Consent Agenda for approval. He explained that this would have been on Administrative, but for the Amendment to the Mixed Use Development Agreement.

#11 Mr. Englund stated that this request is for 77 acres to be developed into 109 single family residential lots. The developer is requesting a couple of waivers and, following a traffic study the applicant will be responsible for any improvements required.

#12 - #15 & #18 Mr. Englund stated that all of these rezoning requests were on the Consent Agenda for approval.

#16 Mr. Englund stated that the site plan for this request needs to be reworked for landscaping and will require a waiver from Zoning Board of Appeals.

#17 Mr. Englund stated that the department has received some opposition from the neighborhood, mostly regarding setbacks. Discussed the change to the requirement for 10% office space in the Mixed Use area.

The Planning Board pre-meeting adjourned at 1:17 p.m.
Mr. Greg Rosenbaum, Chairperson, called the meeting to order, introduced the Planning Board members as well as the Planning Department staff, and explained the Planning Board’s public hearing procedures. Mr. Rosenbaum advised those in attendance where to find a copy of the Nebraska Open Meetings Act in the Legislative Chambers.

PUBLIC HEARING AND ADMINISTRATIVE MEETING

Subdivisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>REQUEST:</th>
<th>LOCATION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Preliminary and Final plat approval of NATARJAN FARM, a minor plat outside the city limits (property is located within the ED-North Hills Overlay Resource District)</td>
<td>6550 Rainwood Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the Planning Board meeting held January 8, 2020, this request was placed on the Consent Agenda. Ms. Karnes motioned for approval of the Preliminary Plat, subject to the following conditions:

1. Receive a permit from the Douglas County Engineer’s Office for any new or revised driveway connections to Rainwood Road.
2. Compliance with Section 55-901 of the Zoning Ordinance for the North Hills Environmental Resources Overlay District.

In addition, Ms. Karnes motioned for approval of the Final Plat, subject to the conditions of Preliminary Plat approval.

Mr. Rosacker seconded the motion which carried 7-0.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>REQUEST:</th>
<th>LOCATION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>C10-20-007 (D)</td>
<td>12. C10-20-008 AZ Sutton Place, LLC</td>
<td>Preliminary and Final Plat approval of SUTTON PLACE REPLAT 4, a minor plat inside the city limits, with rezoning to expand the ACI-4 Overlay District</td>
<td>7205 and 7215 Ontario Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the Planning Board meeting held January 8, 2020, this request was placed on the Consent Agenda. Ms. Karnes motioned for approval of the expansion of the ACI Overlay District and approval of the Preliminary Plat, subject to the following conditions:

1. Construct sidewalks along Ontario Street and 72nd Street.
2. Dedication of right of way to one foot behind new sidewalks or 12.5 feet from back of the curb and providing the dedication on the plat.

In addition, Ms. Karnes motioned for approval of the Final Plat, subject to the conditions of the preliminary plat approval, and submittal of an acceptable final subdivision agreement (if necessary) prior to forwarding to City Council.

Mr. Rosacker seconded the motion which carried 7-0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>REQUEST:</th>
<th>LOCATION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>C10-20-010 (D)</td>
<td>Michael J. Hall</td>
<td>Rezoning from R4(35) to R4</td>
<td>4252 Corby Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the Planning Board meeting held January 8, 2020, this request was placed on the Consent Agenda. Ms. Karnes motioned for approval. Mr. Rosacker seconded the motion which carried 7-0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>REQUEST:</th>
<th>LOCATION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>C10-20-011 (D)</td>
<td>Nathan Birch</td>
<td>Rezoning from R4(35) to R4</td>
<td>2120 South 48th Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the Planning Board meeting held January 8, 2020, this request was placed on the Consent Agenda. Ms. Karnes motioned for approval. Mr. Rosacker seconded the motion which carried 7-0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>REQUEST:</th>
<th>LOCATION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>C10-20-014 (D)</td>
<td>Patrick Garber for Robot Alpha, LLC</td>
<td>Rezoning from GI to CC (property is located within and ACI-1 Overlay District)</td>
<td>3301 Leavenworth Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the Planning Board meeting held January 8, 2020, this request was placed on the Consent Agenda. Ms. Karnes motioned for approval. Mr. Rosacker seconded the motion which carried 7-0.

**Special Use Permits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>REQUEST:</th>
<th>LOCATION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>C8-20-015 (D)</td>
<td>Vintage Homes</td>
<td>Approval of a Special Use Permit to allow development in the ED-Environmental Resources Overlay District</td>
<td>6550 Rainwood Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the Planning Board meeting held January 8, 2020, Ms. Karnes motioned for approval, subject to the following:

1. Provide an erosion control plan indicating that the slope at the 1,276-foot contour east of the proposed pool is structurally sound without an intervention to stabilize it. If the slope is determined unstable, provide a stabilization plan to mitigate the variability of said slope.
2. Provide silt fencing along the east end of the site during construction.
3. Compliance with the submitted plans.

Mr. Rosacker seconded the motion which carried 7-0.
ADMINISTRATIVE MEETING ONLY

Subdivisions

1.  C10-19-216
    C12-19-217
    Loren Johnson, Celebrity Homes
    Omaha

    REQUEST:  Final Plat approval of DEER CREST (Lots 1-171, Outlots A-F), a subdivision outside city limits, along with rezoning from AG to R4

    LOCATION:  Southeast of 114th and State Streets

At the Planning Board meeting held January 8, 2020, Mr. Eric Englund, Acting Assistant Director, stated that the preliminary plat for this first phase was recommended for approval by the Planning Board on October 2, 2019 and approved by City Council on November 26, 2019. The first phase includes 171 single family lots and 6 outlots, the entire project will include 323 single family lots.

Mr. Englund noted that the applicant will need to continue to coordinate with the Parks and Public Works departments regarding the sewer plan south of the site for an acceptable alignment which will be shown in the final subdivision agreement.

Mr. Englund advised that the department recommended approval of the rezoning and of the final plat subject to the submittal of an acceptable subdivision agreement.

Mr. Rosacker motioned for approval of the rezoning from AG to R4 and approval of the Final Plat, subject to submittal of an acceptable final subdivision agreement prior to forwarding the request to the City Council. Ms. Karnes seconded the motion which carried 7-0.

2.  C10-19-214
    C12-19-215
    Royce Enterprises, Inc.

    REQUEST:  Final Plat approval of ESTATES AT LOVELAND, a subdivision inside city limits, along with rezoning from R2 to R4

    LOCATION:  Southeast of 87th and Pacific Streets

*Prior to discussion of this case Ms. Karnes advised that she was recusing herself and left the chambers at 1:45 p.m.*

At the Planning Board meeting held January 8, 2020, Mr. Eric Englund, Acting Assistant Director, advised that the preliminary plat was approved by City Council at their meeting on January 7, 2020. He stated that the final plat is identical to the approved preliminary plat, and will redevelop the existing seven properties into eighteen single family homes. Mr. Englund stated that a detailed tree mitigation plan will be part of the final subdivision agreement and a note will be added to the final plat regarding compliance with that mitigation plan prior to forwarding to City Council for final approval.

Mr. Englund stated that the department recommended approval of the rezoning and the final plat subject to the conditions in the recommendation report.

Mr. Moore motioned for approval of the rezoning from R2 to R4 and approval of the final plat, subject to submittal of revised mylars and an acceptable final subdivision agreement prior to forwarding the request to City Council. Mr. Morris seconded the motion which carried 6-0-1, Ms. Karnes recused.

*Ms. Karnes returned to the chambers at 1:47 p.m.*

(HOLD OVER CASES)

Master Plan Referrals
3. C3-19-229
Elko Properties & Planning Department on behalf of the City of Omaha

REQUEST: Approval of an Amendment to the Future Land Use Element of the City’s Master Plan from Low density residential to High density residential (laid over from 12/4/19)

LOCATION: 4906, 4908, 4910, 4912 and 4914 Davenport Street

4. C10-19-239
C11-19-224
Elko Properties

REQUEST: Rezoning from R4(35) and R7 to R7, along with approval of a PUR-Planned Unit Redevelopment Overlay District (laid over from 12/4/19)

LOCATION: 4912 and 4914 Davenport Street

At the Planning Board meeting held January 8, 2020 the applicant, Mr. Steve Elkin of 999 South Logan Street, Denver, Colorado. Mr. Elkin began by stating that he owns approximately 1,000 apartments in Omaha and surrounding suburbs, as well as many other properties he has purchased, remodeled, developed, improved or donated throughout the past ten to fifteen years in Omaha. He stated that he wanted to let people know that he is not an outsider coming in to develop a property then leave it, he still owns every piece of property he has purchased in the past ten to fifteen years and has a vested interest in seeing the City continue to grow and improve. He stated that he also owns properties in the Denver area which he has owned for 30+ years as well.

Mr. Geoff DeOld, 1717 Vinton Street, appeared before the Board as the architect for the project. Mr. DeOld stated that the Future Land Use amendment will allow them to create a higher density housing project in the Davenport Street area, which he believes will support the goals of the city for development along the new rapid transit corridor as well as promoting infill development in the neighborhood. He advised that the rezoning request will “clean up” the zoning map on the block as both properties on either side of the project site, and most others, are already zoned R7. Mr. DeOld stated that they had chosen to utilize the Planned Unit Redevelopment Overlay District (PUR) tool rather than requesting multiple waivers from the Zoning Board of Appeals and it allowed the developer to work closely with the department on design details.

Mr. DeOld stated that the project would develop 21 apartment units, including 5 studio apartments and 16 one-bedroom apartments as well as 1:1 onsite parking. The waivers included in the PUR will include side, front, and back yard setbacks consistent with the street wall on Davenport Street. Mr. DeOld stated that they have been working with planning staff in following the infill guidelines developed by the Planning Department and have adjusted the design according to those guidelines and recommendations with regards to the roof, windows, and materials to make it more attractive than some of the “slip-in” buildings present in the neighborhood with features like an entrance directly connected to the sidewalk to make it more welcoming from the street. He stated that since the layover from the December Planning Board meeting, the development team had worked further with city staff on the design and layout of the project and described the various phases a development design goes through.

Mr. DeOld stated that the neighborhood, and entire Dundee area, had a very eclectic mix of building and architecture types and he had counted least 14 different architectural styles present including Queen Anne, Italian Renaissance Revival, Prairie, Vernacular and Modern styles. He stated they consciously do not try to “mimic” historic styles, simply because they tend to look like cheap copies and are not aesthetically pleasing. They do attempt to make modern style buildings with features which are compatible with others in the neighborhood, such as the larger windows, gable style roof, and selection of materials.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. DeOld stated that there had been email correspondence and
Mr. Scott Dobbe of Omaha By Design, 618 South 11th Street, appeared before the Board in support of the project. Mr. Dobbe stated that no development project is perfect and Omaha By Design encourages collaboration between developers and community members. He stated, however, that he and Omaha By Design, believe density and design are two broad issues which apply to most development, and specifically to this proposal. Mr. Dobbe stated that Omaha By Design supports the City’s goals in increasing density in the core of the city and building for a sustainable and livable future through growing appropriate levels of density. He stated that one way to accomplish this was through creating housing options in desirable neighborhoods, such as Dundee, which leads adds walkability and leads to reduced dependence on personal automobiles. Mr. Dobbe stated that this is particularly a factor in this development project due to the fact that the proposed building will be within two-tenths of a mile of a new rapid transit bus station which represents the City’s biggest investment in public transportation in a generation. Mr. Dobbe stated that he believes density could be increased in this neighborhood in an acceptable way. He explained that the project site is on two lots, one of which is currently vacant and one of which has a single housing unit on it. He pointed out that increasing the density on those two lots to 21 will add 20x more people with access to jobs, schools, and businesses in the surrounding area and they will be utilizing transportation in the area; will be patronizing local restaurants and other businesses; keeping storefronts occupied and active; increasing entrepreneurship and economic development through small business ownership which draws from the increased density. Mr. Dobbe stated that all of these benefits of increased density occur with far less than a 20x increase in the cost of providing city services and it is a very efficient way of paying for police and fire services as well as sewer, snow removal, and other valuable city services.

Mr. Dobbe states that building design is a subjective subject. As an architect and a Dundee resident, he believes the proposed design is a handsome addition to the neighborhood he lives in; however, others may disagree with his opinion of the design of the building and may have different ideas about design compatibility with the neighborhood. Because there are so many different subjective opinions, he believes it is best to look at the few objective guidelines which are available. Including the City’s own infill guidelines, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation, which is considered one of the leading authorities on these matters, and they speak to the matter of being “compatible, but differentiated”, which is really the best that should be expected from infill design. Mr. Dobbe stated that he loves the 100 year old buildings with all of their unique design features, but trying to develop something exactly like that today would be so expensive due to the costs of labor and materials, that it would be counter to the infill goals. He also stated that, in trying to mimic the past, sometimes you end up with something that looks like a bad photocopy of a truly wonderful building. Mr. Dobbe stated that in striving for comparability, some of the things they look for are how the building addresses the street, i.e. is there a front door rather than a slip-in as other buildings do on the street; does it respect the context of the neighborhood, it matches the setbacks of adjacent properties, it minimizes surface parking which is something that has been a problem with some past developments; with regards to building form they ask “does it take cues from other buildings in the neighborhood” which is created by the gable roof shape, relatively simple and straightforward form and use of materials, the use of a sub-divided scale which creates the look of two faces on the façade. Finally, Mr. Dobbe stated that the quality of materials and landscaping used in the project provide those important details that matter with infill development and which will be continually addressed throughout the process of working with the City on this project. In closing, Mr. Dobbe stated that Omaha By Design sees this project as a step forward in addressing the goals of increased density, walkability, and sustainability through the details of design which are compatible but differentiated by being respectful of its context and true to its time.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Dobbe stated that Omaha By Design is not directly involved in the actual design of the project. He stated that they have spoken with the members of the neighborhood associations, community members, and they have looked over and commented on some of the early design
drafts with the development team.

Ms. Sarah Nelson, 4806 Underwood Avenue, appeared before the Board in opposition. Ms. Nelson advised that she is co-president of the Dundee-Memorial Park Neighborhood Association which was opposed to the removal of the single family home and that she personally disagrees with the assessment that the existing home should be removed because it is dilapidated. She stated as evidence of the condition of the home, the fact that in 2016 the home was sold for $125,000. She asked that the Board take into consideration that this location is on a residential, not arterial, street. Ms. Nelson stated that she was pleased with Mr. DeOld speaking with them at their neighborhood association meeting and appreciated his willingness to listen to their concerns and answer their questions; they were pleased with the use of brick, and the gable roof but it was not enough. She advised that, according to the City’s Urban Design handbook, new development should be designed to conserve and/or enhance the historic character of existing urban districts and the association does not feel that the design meets either of those criteria. She described some of the architectural elements of existing buildings along Davenport Street such as wrap-around covered porches, roofs with gables and dormers. She advised, however, that also along Davenport it is evident that a lot of things have been done “to it” rather than “for it”, such as slip-ins, and apartment buildings. Ms. Nelson stated that they are open to having development in the neighborhood, they just prefer it to look more like what they want.

Ms. Mary Green, 5106 Western Avenue, appeared before the Board in opposition. Ms. Green stated that she, and others, live in Dundee because they like older homes and she prefers that everything possible be done to preserve the existing home at 4914 Davenport Street which she stated was built in 1911. She stated that she does support density and infill; however, housing should remain at the scale of the current homes. Ms. Green stated that she would be comfortable with turning the existing home at 4914 Davenport Street into a duplex or something else of the same scale. She stated that she is concerned about the size of the proposed development, as well as the design which she believes is unattractive. She understands the desire for increased density but believes the building should be more like what she finds to be attractive and she believes it is the job of the Planning Board to strive to preserve the unique characteristics of the older homes and buildings which make the neighborhood popular. She stated her belief that it is important for the Planning Board to help the residents maintain the grace and charm of the neighborhood rather than enabling the neighborhood to further decline by allowing the development of unattractive, large buildings.

Mr. Alan Rowch, 4908 Chicago Street, appeared before the Board in opposition. Mr. Rowch stated that he had been at the meeting last month when this case was laid over and he wished to reiterate the points he had made at that time. He stated that he had lived in the neighborhood for 40 years and appreciated the history Mr. Elkin had within the City of Omaha and the conversations with the developers at the neighborhood meetings. Mr. Rowch provided photos he had taken of the neighborhood in order to illustrate the love that the residents all feel for the area and to show some of the features he felt were unique to the Dundee area which he believes is one of a kind and known world-wide. Mr. Rowch stated he understands not trying to mimic the past, but he believed the developer should do more in terms of a “nod to the past” and he is concerned about the demolition of the existing home. He also feels there should be a conversation with all of the neighborhoods regarding the new rapid bus system to see that all are sharing equally in the development. In closing, Mr. Rowch advised the Planning Board to go forward with wisdom and not allow the loss of the “heart and soul” of the city.

Mr. Dan Rock, 307 South 53rd Street, appeared before the Board in opposition. Mr. Rock stated that he and the other neighbors have appreciated the cordial nature of the conversations with the developer, however, he still opposes the project. He advised that the vacant lot is zoned R4 and was the site of a single family home which burned down and was never rebuilt. He stated that the other lot is a residential, single family home. Mr. Rock pointed out that the properties on either side of it were all zoned R7 and the slip-in apartment buildings, which were built in the 1960’s and 1970’s, tore up the neighborhood. Mr. Rock stated that he wants to have the slip-in’s reverted back to single family homes in the style of the homes that they replaced and new development should be similar to those homes. He stated he was concerned about the
percentage of impervious coverage which he felt was side to side and that the Amendment to the Future Land Use Element would make it more like R11 or something extremely dense. Mr. Rock stated that the developer is intentionally trying to not blend into the neighborhood by proposing a very modern building with no detail. Mr. Rock was concerned that there were only 21 parking stalls being proposed for the 21 apartment units, which he felt would be insufficient for the residents of the building and would provide no parking for visitors to that building. He stated that he does not support this design.

Mr. Fred Wolf, 5003 Davenport Street, appeared before the Board in opposition. Mr. Wolf explained that he had lived and worked in the area of 50th and Dodge for much of his life and feels very connected to the area. He stated that Dundee is experiencing “historical duress”. Mr. Wolf spoke about several projects which had been proposed in that area in the past which never were developed because the tenacity of the neighborhood residents, such as a NP Dodge tower, a Safeway store, and a Walgreens. He stated that if any of the changes had been made it would have been devastating for the Dundee area. Mr. Wolf stated that the issue is not development, it is what is being developed. He stated that a duplex or maybe a four-plex would be welcome. Mr. Wolf ended by stating that there have been changes since 1963, but that the area still looks pretty much the same and they want to keep it looking the same.

At the request of Ms. Karnes, Mr. Geoff DeOld returned to answer her questions about the development phases and design changes to be made. Mr. DeOld explained that they are into the schematic phase of the project, for example, talking with window designers regarding the design of the window such as should one part be operable or should all parts be operable; how it fits into different types of wall materials, the depth of the window, and things of that nature. In the current phase, designs are gone over with contractors, budgets are being determined, and they are working with materials manufacturers. He stated that they are not at a clear level of refinement, however, such as the style of window lentils is yet to be determined. As the design is further developed, there will be decisions made regarding elements such as the entryway, landscaping, among other things. He stated that the materials such as the ground floor detail, could be something that they are willing to change, however, the brick areas will remain brick but they have not completely determined the tone of the brick and it is something they would be willing to bring samples to the neighborhood to get their opinions of which type or tone of brick they prefer. He stated that they are open to discussions with the neighbors, however, they will not be taking Queen Anne characteristics and tacking them on the building. He stated that there is depth in the plan which can be discussed within the scope of a modern style building and the infill guidelines.

At the request of Mr. Moore, Mr. Steve Elkin returned to answer some questions regarding their commitment to working with the neighbors to reach a compromise. Mr. Elkin stated that if the residents would like to designate a couple of people to represent the neighborhood who could provide input with their design team and city staff, he would certainly be willing to meet with them. Mr. Moore stated that he was aware that it will be impossible to please everyone in the neighborhood, however, he appreciated Mr. Elkin’s willingness to include them in the conversations. Ms. Karnes also stated that she appreciated the respectful way in which Mr. Elkin and his team had discussed these issues with the neighborhood residents and at the meeting.

Mr. Pate inquired as to whether the design team had considered a more vintage looking design for the building because, in his opinion, the contemporary design does not fit well with the neighborhood. Mr. Geoff DeOld responded to the question by stating that the bulk of the design is driven by the intended use and number of units they plan, and costs. He added that there is just not room, within the setbacks, to add the vintage features such as dormers. Mr. Pate inquired whether they believed that adding some vintage features may enable the developer to demand higher rents. Mr. Steve Elkin, the applicant, stated that it is a hard question to answer because rents are driven by the market. He stated that his reputation shows a pride in ownership and a willingness to have dialogue with the neighborhood. He explained some building features that could possibly be changed or included which have worked well on other projects, such as varied brick colors or other building materials and he has confidence they will be able to incorporate some features which will allow the building to fit in better and be more pleasing to the neighborhood. He stated
that he takes pride in the ownership of his buildings which includes being cost-conscious, sensitive to the neighborhood, and being a good neighbor. Mr. Pate encouraged Mr. Elkin to encourage having conversations with the neighbors.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Geoff DeOld stated that there are no covenants governing the project. He added that infill guidelines in historic neighborhoods do require more attention to details and craft, as well as high quality materials, and are where the development team would look for inspiration with regard to incorporating some elements which are compatible with the more historic structures in the neighborhood, without trying to mimic them. Ms. Sarah Nelson, Co-President of the Dundee-Memorial Park Neighborhood Association returned at the request of the Board and stated that there are no neighborhood covenants but that the home being demolished contributed to the historic district due to its covered porch and four-point gable roof. She stated that they would like the building to look more like the “Kirk Davies building” on Underwood across from “Pitch” which she said had a “human scale”, the roof was set back and the neighborhood loved it because it did not look too modern. Ms. Nelson stated that the design being proposed should be different. Mr. Moore pointed out that the developer had offered to work with one or two representatives of the neighborhood on including more elements in the building, but that the building would not be everything they wanted, which he felt was a good step forward. Mr. Pate agreed, as did Ms. Nelson.

Mr. Rosenbaum asked for Mr. Eric Englund, Acting Assistant Director, to address the issue of setbacks and buffer yards as they related to this building. Mr. Englund stated that currently, half of the property is zoned R7 and the other half is zoned R4(35). If the entire site was zoned R7, typically the buffer yard to the R4(35) and R5(35) properties to the north would be 30 feet based on the height of the proposed structure. However, Mr. Englund pointed out that based on the existing depth of the lot, the zoning code allows for a reduction when it is less than 150 linear feet. Since this property is 136 feet in depth, the buffer yard is reduced from 30 feet to 13 feet, per the zoning code; the PUR application is requesting to reduce the 13 feet down to five feet from the parking area and the actual building would be fifteen feet from the property line. In response to a question from Mr. Rosenbaum, Mr. Englund confirmed that it would be allowable within the zoning code for the building itself to be only 15 feet from the property line without the parking area in between. Mr. Englund stated that there is no buffer yard requirement to the east, west or south because all of those properties are already zoned R7 and R8. The PUR application would include a number of waivers which are common considering the zoning code was developed for a more suburban application. The setback changes requested are for the front yard from 35 to 25 feet, the interior side yard setbacks from 12 to 10 feet, and the rear setback from 25 to 15 feet. Other waivers include perimeter landscaping, impervious coverage, site area per unit, and the buffer yard reduction as discussed.

Mr. Englund, Acting Assistant Director, stated that regarding the Future Land Use amendment which would change from low-density residential to high-density residential, there are two properties to the east which have R7 zoning which have multi-family buildings in existence which are also being included in this application in order to reflect the existing R7 zoning and multi-family use. As justification, Mr. Englund pointed out that anytime there is a change to the Future Land Use element, the applicant provides documentation which either proves there is an error on the map or how the project use would benefit other components of the Master Plan. In reviewing the documentation, the staff is in agreement with the improvements to the concept element, land use element, and urban development element.

Mr. Englund stated that the staff recommends approval of both requests, however, they would be supportive to further meetings if the Board prefers a layover to revise elevations or for guidance of specific elements they are looking for, the department would be supportive of that motion. Mr. Englund reminded the Board and others in attendance that the City Council makes the final determination regarding approval of the project, the Planning Board makes a recommendation only.

Specifically regarding agenda item #3, C3-19-229, Mr. Moore motioned for approval. Mr. Morris seconded the motion which carried 7-0.
Specifically regarding agenda item #4, C10-19-239 and C11-19-224, Ms. Karnes motioned for layover. Mr. Morris seconded the motion which carried 7-0.

Vacations

|   | C14-19-242 Planning Department on behalf of the City of Omaha | REQUEST: | Vacation of the east/west alley, west of North 28th Avenue, between Binney Street and Maple Street abutting Lot 91, Block 0 of Gises Addition and Lots 3-11 and 13, Block 0 of Remington Subdivision (laid over from 12/4/19) |

At the Planning Board meeting held January 8, 2020, Mr. Eric Englund, Acting Assistant Director, advised that representatives from Public Works were present if needed for additional information or to answer questions. Mr. Englund stated that since the Board had laid the case over in December, Public Works has been in contact with the applicant and has informed them of the payment which would be required if this vacation were to be approved. He explained that only one of the abutting property owners had requested the vacation and would be solely responsible for payment of fees related to the vacation such as appraisal fee and payment of the vacated property; however, all four of the northern abutting property owners and the property owner at 2910 North 28th Avenue will share in the resulting vacated property which will become part of their individual parcels.

Mr. David Lacey, 14810 Highway 36, Bennington, Nebraska, appeared before the Board as the fiancé of the applicant and property owner at 2863 Binney Street. He stated that he was speaking on behalf of the property owner as the Board may not be able to understand her English. Mr. Lacey stated that there was a fence in the back of the property which they have improved and there is also a fence across the alleyway. It was their assumption, due to the fencing, that the alley was already closed and they had been told by others on the block that the alley was closed up to 30th Street. It was not until they were in contact with the City that they determined that only ½ of the alley was closed and the part behind their property was not vacated. Mr. Lacey stated that at some point, the property owner at 2866 Binney, which is an empty lot, came through and tore down the fence to access his property from the alley. Once the fence had been torn down the applicant contacted the City to find out if it was legal for them to put the fence back up and that is when they learned that the ½ of the alley which includes the back of their property was not vacated.

Mr. Mitchell (sp.?) Payne, 2866 Binney Street, appeared before the Board in opposition. Mr. Payne stated that he had been at the meeting in December and was still opposed to the vacation of the alley. He stated that he had lived on that block his whole life and had been taking care of that property for most of his life. He advised that he uses the alley to access the vacant lot at 2867 Binney Street where he has set a POD in which he stores his lawn mower, snow blower, and other equipment. Mr. Eric Englund, Acting Assistant Director, clarified with Mr. Payne that the property was vacant with no permanent structures and Mr. Payne stated that this was the case. Mr. Englund advised that the Zoning code did not allow for vehicles, equipment or Pod type structures to be placed or stored on vacant lots in residential neighborhoods and that he could be cited for a zoning violation if that is what he was utilizing that lot for. Mr. Englund stated that this had nothing to do with the vacation request, but that he did not want for Mr. Payne to get into any problems with zoning inspectors. Mr. Payne advised that he would move the items over to the property where his house and other buildings were at.

In response to questions from Ms. Franklin, Mr. Payne stated that he drove his vehicle down the alley to access the property at 2867 in order to maintain that property. He agreed with her statement that if the fence were to be restored, it would impede his ability to drive to the property through the alley. Mr. Payne stated that he preferred to use the alley because people drive too fast on the street.
In response to additional questions from the Board, Mr. Payne stated that he does not believe the alley should be blocked with a fence and he does not understand who the neighbors are and why they can block the alley. Mr. Englund again explained the vacation process and went to the podium to go over the aerial photos and explained to Mr. Payne that currently the alley is owned by the City; if the vacation was approved by the Planning Board and approved by City Council, the City of Omaha would no longer own the alley. He explained that the property resulting from the vacation would be added to the property of the adjacent owners, including Mr. Payne and that it would move their property lines to incorporate that additional property into their boundaries but that he would no longer be able to drive down the alley from 28th Avenue. Mr. Englund explained the application process and the criteria used by the City to determine whether it is an alley which they are willing to vacate. Because this is an alley that does not go through, it is already ½ vacated, it is a grass alley that is not improved with gravel or concrete, and there are no garages or driveways which are accessed through the alley, the City is willing to vacate the alley and sell the property to the abutting property owners to add to their property and increase the size of their parcels. Mr. Payne was still confused about the process and the outcome so Mr. Englund again explained that no one would be taking any of his land, trespassing on his property, or taking anything of his; instead he would be gaining a small portion of land which had been the alley and would now be a part of his property at 2867 Binney Street. Mr. Payne stated that the other property owners are slumlords and he wants to know why the City is blocking all the alleys to allow slumlords to have additional property and to prevent other property owners like himself from accessing their own property. He stated that he felt the City was doing favors for the applicant and that the City is showing preference to that property owner over him. He asked whether this alley could not be subject to a “grandfather” clause which would make it his property since he had taken care of parts of it for a large part of his life. Mr. Englund stated that it was, and always had been, City owned property which the City has the right to sell if it meets certain criteria, which this does. Mr. Payne stated that he had been maintaining the property, had put up the fence and had torn down the fence and the alley was his property.

Mr. Rosenbaum stated that these type of cases are not unusual and that sometimes there are cases where the neighbors have maintained the property but did not own it. He stated that the City does own the alley property and that if they do vacate it, a portion of that land will become part of Mr. Payne’s property. Mr. Payne stated that he still felt the alley property was his to begin with and he felt it was wrong for the City to take it from him.

Mr. Eric Englund, Acting Assistant Director, stated that the application for vacation was consistent with City policy regarding vacation of unneeded or excess right-of-way. He advised that if there are any utility easements which need to be retained they would have to be coordinated with the Public Works Department. Mr. Englund stated that the department staff recommend approval subject to the condition listed in the recommendation report.

Mr. Pate motioned for approval, subject to the applicant working with the Public Works Department regarding the need for any utility easements. Mr. Moore seconded the motion which carried 6-1, Ms. Franklin dissenting.

(REGULAR AGENDA)

Master Plan Referrals

| 6. | C3-20-002 Planning Department on behalf of the City of Omaha | REQUEST: Approval of the PACIFIC HEIGHTS TIF Redevelopment Project Plan | LOCATION: 1217 and 1219 Pacific Street |

At the Planning Board meeting held January 8, 2020, Mr. Don Seten of the Planning Department appeared before the Board to discuss the details of the request. Mr. Seten stated that the applicant proposes an infill
A redevelopment project on the south side of Pacific Street a little to the east of 13th Street in the Old Market area. He stated that the site had previously been two separate parcels with single family homes on each of them, both homes had been in poor condition and were demolished. Mr. Seten described the request to develop a new apartment building with six 2-bedroom apartment units. The building will have three levels of apartments sitting atop a one level garage with 13 parking stalls. Mr. Seten pointed out that the building design is very contemporary, as is the building next to the proposed site. He stated that the developer, Zan Properties, had worked very closely with Urban Design staff in the Planning Department who approved the design. Mr. Zac Atchley was the project manager. Mr. Seten stated that the total project cost was $2,200,000 and the TIF support requested was $267,122. He advised that the project meets the requirements for the City's TIF program, complies with the Master Plan, and is an appropriate land use for the area.

Mr. Brent Beller, 11440 West Center Road, appeared before the Board on behalf of the applicant, Mr. Zac Atchley. Mr. Beller stated that he believed this was a good use of previously neglected properties and a good use of TIF funding. In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Beller stated that they had held two neighborhood meetings in 2019 and that he had not received any negative feedback at or after those meetings.

No one appeared in opposition.

Mr. Eric Englund, Acting Assistant Director, stated that the department recommended approval.

Mr. Rosacker motioned for approval. Ms. Karnes seconded the motion which carried 7-0.

| REQUEST: Approval of the 72nd and Center Southwest Community Redevelopment Area (CRA) |
|-----------------|------------------------------------------|
| LOCATION:       | Southwest of South 72nd Street and West Center Road |

"Prior to discussion of this case Ms. Karnes advised that she was recusing herself and left the chambers at 3:18 p.m."

At the Planning Board meeting held January 8, 2020, Mr. Don Seten of the Planning Department, began by explaining the purpose of a CRA-Community Redevelopment Area designation, the criteria for designating an area as a CRA, and presented a map of the City showing the locations of all currently existing CRA's. Mr. Seten explained that the reason CRA designation is important is because it opens up the area for redevelopment projects to be eligible for the City's TIF-Tax Increment Funding program. He explained that the area currently on the agenda is to create a new CRA within census tract number 69.06. Mr. Seten explained that the department does a CRA study when they receive a request from a party which is interested in redeveloping a parcel or a property and feels they are going to need TIF funding to complete the project. He advised that in this case, a request was received from a party who is interested in redeveloping a parcel at the southwest corner of West Center Road and 72nd Street which was previously occupied by Quality Inn and a cocktail lounge known as the Shark Club. The applicant asked the department to complete an analysis of the eligibility of the site for CRA designation; planning staff has proceeded with the analysis and studied census block group two of census tract 69-06.

Mr. Seten explained the criteria listed in the relevant state law and the information analyzed by staff used in determining eligibility for the CRA designation. Because the eligibility is determined by census data, it makes sense to use census geography in the study. The criteria for designating an area can be found in Nebraska Community Development Law which uses the terms “blighted” and “substandard” areas and gives a clear definition of each as well as the criteria to be used to determine whether an area meets those standards. Mr. Seten explained that in order to receive the CRA designation, the subject area must meet the definition of both substandard and blighted. In the case of this study area, staff found that the entirety of block group two met the criteria defining “blighted”; primarily this was because the area has experienced
a loss of population and because the buildings in the area primarily exceed 40 years in age. The area is primarily made up of single family homes which were mostly built in the mid-1950’s. Mr. Seten stated that there were other criteria within the definition of blighted which were not found in this neighborhood, but it still met the definition because of the criteria that it did meet. He explained that the substandard designation primarily relates to the built environment in the area such as the condition of buildings and infrastructure. The definition speaks about declining, deteriorated, and aging buildings and infrastructure. Mr. Seten stated that the department uses two different approaches in reviewing a potential CRA area for compliance with the definition of substandard. First, they do an extensive “windshield survey” by driving through the area looking for things like boarded up buildings, overgrown vacant lots, and neglected properties. In addition, staff use building condition data from the County Assessor, which categorizes buildings by their condition. The categories used by the Assessor are Very Good, Good, Average, Fair, Poor, and Worn Out. Using this approach, staff determined that one building was in “Worn Out” condition and most of the buildings are in “Average” or better condition. Mr. Seten advised that typically they would look for a fairly large proportion of buildings in the “Fair”, “Poor”, or “Worn Out” categories in order to designate an area as substandard; in this area they found only 16 out of 327. He stated that, in reviewing the assessor’s data, staff determined that most of the properties in the area are pretty well maintained and staff found on the “windshield survey” that most of the area is in pretty good shape. Following the survey, staff determined that, while the entire area met the “blighted” criteria, only the property at the northeast corner of the study area met the definition of substandard as laid out in the Community Development Law and Planning Department staff recommends only designating that specific portion of the area as a new CRA.

Mr. Seten stated that, typically, when they do these CRA studies, the department prefers to declare a larger area as a CRA and try to avoid small areas like this one. In this case, staff determined that there was a necessity for declaring this small area as a CRA due to the badly deteriorated condition of the property which would make it very difficult to redevelop. Mr. Seten stated that because of the difficulty and expense which would be encountered in trying to redevelop that one area, the staff decided it would be appropriate to give just that property the CRA designation in order to make it eligible for TIF support. Mr. Seten explained that if the location was not immediately adjacent to another designated CRA, neither Planning Department staff, nor the TIF committee would have supported the designation. He stated that the proximity of this small area to another designated Community Redevelopment Area was critical in the analysis of the project.

Mr. Seten stated that a neighborhood meeting was held on December 12, 2019 which was well attended. He stated that the majority of people who attended the meeting agreed that the property needed attention and they did not appreciate the condition it was currently in. Some people did express concern about what may be developed on the property. Mr. Seten reminded the Board that any project which is submitted would have to go through the TIF committee and be recommended for approval by the Planning Board and approved by the City Council as well. The current request is only for the CRA designation and not any particular project.

Mr. John Blumenthal, 1700 Farnam Street, appeared before the Board on behalf of Meridian Development, which he stated was a potential developer for the property. He stated he was available to answer questions from the Board.

No one appeared in opposition.

In response to questions from Ms. Franklin, Mr. Seten stated that Community Redevelopment law does not mandate any percentage of future residential development to be subsidized for lower income residents as she is concerned about the amount of TIF funding being used to subsidize the development of residential projects which are targeted at residents with the ability to pay very high rents. Mr. Seten stated that the real purpose of the CRA designation and TIF funding is to bring new, economic vitality to a neighborhood or an area which has not been seeing reinvestment, so the interest is more in creating economic redevelopment or infill redevelopment incentive than any other public purpose. He added that the City of Omaha does have Home funds, and CBDG funds and a strong affordable housing program which is run by the Planning
Department. He explained that the largest stock of affordable housing within Omaha, or any city in the nation, is existing housing stock in older neighborhoods. Mr. Seten pointed out that there are homeowner rehab programs and rental rehab programs for people who rent to lower income residents, which are separate from the TIF program but are also run by the Planning Department. Ms. Franklin stated that she is concerned that the TIF program and CRA designations are incentives for development in blighted and substandard areas of the city, yet affordability is not required to be a consideration. Mr. Seten stated that she was correct, and also pointed out that it is a consideration if the developer would like to utilize Low Income Tax Credit program. He advised that the CRA designation has no impact on eligibility for CBDG or Home funds.

Mr. Morris inquired whether there was a concern of setting a precedent in which other developers may now come forward using this case as an example of the department making these small designations. Mr. Seten replied that very few, if any, other areas are going to have the same conditions of being immediately adjacent to another CRA, and the very deplorable shape of the existing building, both of which were deciding factors for the department in making this designation.

Mr. Eric Englund, Acting Assistant Director, advised that the department recommended approval.

Mr. Moore motioned for approval. Mr. Pate seconded the motion which carried 4-2-1, Ms. Franklin and Mr. Morris dissenting; Ms. Karnes recused.

*Ms. Karnes returned to the chambers at 3:36 p.m.*

*Ms. Agans, Recording Secretary, left the chambers at 3:45 p.m. and did not return, Ms. Debbie Hightower, Executive Secretary, Planning Department, arrived at 3:45 to replace Ms. Agans, and remained to the end of the meeting.*

**Subdivisions**

*Mr. Rosenbaum advised that agenda item #8 (C10-19-251, C12-19-252) would be heard together with agenda item #19 (C11-19-255) but both requests would be voted on separately.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.</th>
<th>C10-19-251</th>
<th>REQUEST: Preliminary Plat approval of LAKE LIVIN, a subdivision outside city limits, with rezoning from AG to R7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C12-19-252</td>
<td>LOCATION: Northwest of 168th and Fort Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodsonia Acquisitions, LLC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19.</th>
<th>C11-19-255</th>
<th>REQUEST: Approval of a PUD-Planned Unit Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodsonia Acquisitions, LLC</td>
<td>LOCATION: Northwest of 168th and Fort Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the Planning Board meeting held January 8, 2020, Mr. Larry Jobeun, 11440 West Center Road, appeared before the Board on behalf of the applicant to discuss the details of the request. Mr. Jobeun advised that the applicant, Jeff Elliott, and consulting engineer, Brad Huyck of TD2 were at the meeting to answer questions if necessary. Mr. Jobeun stated that they had been in agreement with the recommendations of the department to approve the rezoning and preliminary plat on agenda item #8 and layover the Planned Unit Development on agenda item #19; however, since they were removed from the Consent Agenda, he would briefly discuss the project and be available to answer any questions that came up.

Mr. Jobeun stated that the site was approximately 28, undeveloped acres; a preliminary plat had been approved by City Council on February 14, 2017 which called for the site to be developed with 80 multi-family units, 28 townhome units and 9 commercial/retail mixed lots. However, the current request is for the
development of three lots and three outlots for drainage, greenspace and open space. He stated that this is proposed to be a phased development and provided a diagram to illustrate the portion of the northwest corner of 168th and Fort Streets. Mr. Jobeun stated that everything along 168th Street and Fort Street would be developed in phase two and would include five buildings with a total of 268 market rate units. He pointed out the location of 168th Avenue within the development and stated that development along that area would be phase one which would consist of four buildings housing a total of 310 market rate units. The total project cost is approximately $65,000,000 and will include a clubhouse and pool. Mr. Jobeun expressed his belief that the rezoning is “down zoning” as it would be all residential including the nine lots which had been preliminary platted for commercial/retail and mixed use development. He stated that the project meets all the site regulations and parking requirements. He stated that the applicant was in agreement with the department’s conditions of approval for this agenda item.

Mr. Jobeun stated that eight to ten people had attended their neighborhood meeting in November, 2019 and most of the feedback had been favorable though there were some concerns expressed by residents who reside near the proposed site for building 3. Mr. Jobeun pointed out the location of the home of one of those residents which would look over Outlot B, which was to be a detention basin, and stated that this resident was the one who had asked that this item be removed from the Consent Agenda. He reminded the Board and those present that, as a designated Outlot, the lot would never be buildable and nothing could be developed on it which means this resident’s view of the lake will remain unobstructed. In addition, Mr. Jobeun pointed out that the building people expressed concern about would be approximately 140 feet from the property line to the actual building and there would be three stories on the north side of the building and four stories on the south side of the building. He stated that the elevation and grade changes in this whole area drops down about 90 feet from 168th Street towards the western portion of the site. Mr. Jobeun explained that on the north side of the property, there is an approximate 12 foot drop in elevation/grade between the single family homes and the garages and apartment building. He stated that the building will be three stories on that same side and that with the twelve foot elevation drop it will be effectively two visible stories on that end of building #3. He advised that the remaining buildings will be tucked away from the residential subdivision to the north, and that the area was already platted as a mixed use center but the requested zoning change would be less impactful on the neighboring subdivisions.

Mr. Terry Davis, 5720 North 169th Street, appeared before the Board in opposition. Mr. Davis stated that he questioned the need for an apartment complex of this size in that area citing a survey which showed a Omaha’s apartment vacancy rate was above the national average and that the proposed development is out of character for the rural area. Mr. Davis stated that his second concern is about the infrastructure in the area and advised that Fort Street, 168th Street, and 180th Street are all two lane streets. He stated his belief that the amount of traffic generated by the increased density proposed for this development would put a large strain on the infrastructure. Additionally, Mr. Davis stated he was concerned about the effect this development would have on property values and that the applicant had provided a Harvard study which showed little to no effect on property values with the development of multi-family housing; however, he stated that study was based on less valuable properties than those in the area of this development. Mr. Davis pointed to a student thesis produced in 2002 at the University of Nebraska-Omaha which stated that the impact of apartment complexes on property values of single family dwellings west of I-680 in Omaha increases the closer the dwellings are to the apartment development. Finally, Mr. Davis stated the he is concerned about the negative effects the concrete, light and noise pollution of an apartment complex will have on Flanagan Lake and the waterfowl such as Canadian geese, ducks, pelicans, cranes, and trumpeter swans which all migrate through that and graze in the fields around the lake.

Mr. Matthew Caniglia, 4253 North 188th Circle, stated that he is a contractor and is opposed to this project. He stated that the clients just recently signed a contract for Lot 82 and the plans had recently gone through City Council. He stated that he agrees with much of what Mr. Davis stated. In addition, he stated that lot 82 and lot 84, which he is under contract to purchase, are $90,000 to $100,000 lots and the homes going on them will be valued between $500,000 and $750,000 and he believes that the apartment building nearest those lots will negatively affect the view. He stated that he is not opposed to the entire development, he is
asking whether that building three could be redesigned or replaced with a smaller structure so the view from those two lots would not be affected. He stated that the lot which had been purchased and the one under contract for purchase had been purchased with the understanding from the previous/current owner that there would be unobstructed views of the lake from those lots. Mr. Caniglia stated that his clients were now considering not building a home on that lot due to the way that building design will affect their view of the lake.

Ms. Erin Strunk, 744 North 58th Street, appeared before the Board stating that she is a real estate agent at the meeting to voice her opposition on behalf of her clients who are currently under contract to purchase lot 82 to build a home valued at approximately $600,000. Ms. Strunk stated that her clients were excited to have the view of the lake which will be gone with the development of these apartment buildings. She stated that, like Mr. Caniglia, she is asking that the one building be moved or redesigned in order to allow her clients to retain the view of the lake. In response to a question from Mr. Morris, Ms. Strunk stated that there are, indeed, other lots available for purchase but that her clients believed this view of the lake was better than at those other lots. Mr. Pate inquired as to whether the clients understood at the time they chose this lot that something would be developed on the applicant's property. Ms. Strunk advised that they did not think it would ever be anything which would obstruct their view since they are up on an incline.

Mr. Matt Caniglia, 4253 North 188th Circle, returned to state that he had received two previous preliminary plats, one of which had some mixed use and some residential; the second one was mostly residential with possibly some small commercial development along the outer major streets. He stated that these plats were what they looked to when deciding to purchase lots 82 and 84, and the information he gave his clients was also based on that information. Mr. Caniglia stated that he was concerned that this project had gotten so far and he had not heard anything about it until two weeks ago when he received the notification from the Planning Department. Mr. Caniglia confirmed to Mr. Pate that he had chosen those two specific lots due to the view of the lake which made them premium lots, and the information they were given about the placement of the outlots made them the only lots with unobstructed views.

Mr. Bill Williams, 16724 Ogden Circle, appeared before the Board in opposition. He stated that his home backs up to 168th Street and looks out towards the lake and they had been excited watching the lake being built. He stated that he wished to express his opposition to entire corner being built up with three story apartment buildings which will obstruct his view of the lake. He stated that he is concerned about the increased traffic which will make travel even more difficult and will add to the maintenance problems along those streets as well.

Mr. Larry Jobeun, 11440 West Center Road, returned at the request of Mr. Rosenbaum to address the concerns expressed. Mr. Jobeun stated that they are required to prepare a traffic study and will be required to make any public improvements deemed necessary by that study. He stated that he believes, as well as Public Works, that required improvements will likely be minimal due to the amount of increase traffic flow anticipated with this proposed project. He pointed out that 168th Street, Fort Street, and HWS Cleveland Boulevard, are all major arterial streets. Mr. Jobeun stated that part of the recommendation report from the Planning Department pointed out that the development of the lake removed over 300 acres of developable land and that in order to be able to afford to make improvements and to maintain the streets, there needs to be density. He pointed out that the removal of the possibility of development on 300 acres of land meant that the corner could be built with increased density without adding much, if any, impact to the arterial street system which was installed when those 300 acres were still available for development.

Regarding concerns about the views, Mr. Jobeun stated that the north side of building #3 would be set 140 foot back from the property line, and at the bottom of a 12 foot drop in elevation. He pointed out that the drawings showed that building as a garage with two levels of apartments being built on top of it. He stated that the top of the building is approximately 42 feet in height and accounting for the 12 foot drop in elevation will make that 30 feet in height visible from the higher elevation, which is lower than the average, two-story residential home which is generally between 32 and 36 feet or more if there is a pitched roof.. He stated
that they had been mindful of the views and protected them to the extent they could while producing the project they wanted. Mr. Jobeun stated that if it had been developed as a mixed use area, it could have included retail/commercial buildings of a similar size or larger.

Mr. Rosenbaum inquired whether the north end of building 3 could be lowered any further, Mr. Jobeun stated that they had not considered that at the time of the meeting so he could not answer the question. He reiterated the fact that with the change in elevation, the visible 30 feet portion of the building would be lower than that of a two-story residential home, and the entire 42 feet would actually be similar to the height of a two-story home with a pitched roof. Additionally, Mr. Jobeun pointed out that from 168th Street where Mr. Williams home was located, there was a more significant drop in grade, nearly 90 feet, between the street and the lake, which meant that Mr. Williams would be looking over the top of them as he looked towards the lake from his back yard.

Mr. Pate stated that in breaking down the total project costs by unit, it comes to approximately $115,000 per unit which is over the average for Omaha. Pate inquired about how Mr. Jobeun knew there would be demand for that many units in order to validate the cost and stated that he assumed the rent would be very high. Mr. Jobeun stated that the units would be rented at market rates and reminded Mr. Pate that there would be a traffic study and public improvements would be required on Fort Street or 168th Street, and the developer would be building 168th Avenue, extending HWS Cleveland Boulevard, and extending the trail system, as well as other public improvements the developer is required to pay for, all of which were part of the $65,000,000 project costs. Mr. Jobeun pointed out for Mr. Pate that the project was privately funded and would not be part of a Sanitary Improvement District, meaning the developer would be responsible for all of the costs. Mr. Pate inquired as to whether, since it is such a large development, the developer could not make some sort of compromise in that one building in order to provide a better view for the people who would be impacted.

Mr. Jobeun stated that since the applicant had already accepted the layover for item #19 which was the Planned Unit related to this preliminary plat and rezoning, they would be willing to layover this case as well to see if they could not come to some sort of compromise regarding building #3.

Mr. Eric Englund, Acting Assistant Director, clarified that Mr. Jobeun was advocating to layover both cases rather than just one. Mr. Jobeun stated that he thought that was the best idea so the development team would have time to look over the unit count, design, costs, and other things to determine what, if anything, could be done with building #3 to make it more agreeable to the neighboring residents. Mr. Englund stated that the department had originally recommended approval; however, staff would be comfortable with a layover for agenda item #8 as well. He advised those present that there was no way of knowing at the meeting how long it would be until the request came back onto the agenda but the department does not send out new notices if it is on the agenda the following month. He recommended people who were interested could call or visit the Planning Department to find out the status of the case in a couple of weeks. If it will be more than a one month layover, the department will mail out new notices.

Specifically regarding agenda item #8, C10-19-251 & C12-19-252, Mr. Pate motioned for layover. Ms. Franklin seconded the motion which carried 7-0.

Mr. Jobeun stated that the applicant was in agreement with the department’s recommendation for a layover of agenda item #19 to allow time to work out issues relating to HWS Cleveland Boulevard as it wraps around between the project site and Flanagan Lake and the extension of the Boulevard. In addition, as a part of the project, the applicant will be extending the trail system to Flanagan Lake. Since they had agreed to layover the preliminary plat and rezoning as well as this PUR request, Mr. Jobeun stated that they would try and have the details of both cases worked out to be back on the agenda at the same time.

Mr. Englund stated that the department recommended layover of this Planned Unit Development request.
Specifically regarding agenda item #19, C11-19-255, Mr. Pate motioned for layover. Mr. Moore seconded the motion which carried 7-0.

| 10. | C10-17-046  
C12-17-047  
180 Maple, LLC | REQUEST: | Final Plat approval of ANTLER VIEW EAST (Lots 12-20, Outlots F-H), with rezoning from AG and DR to MU and a Major Amendment to the Mixed Use District Development Agreement for Antler View East |

| LOCATION: | Southwest of 180th Street and West Maple Road |

At the Planning Board meeting held January 8, 2020, Mr. Bradley Huyck of TD2, 10836 Old Mill Road, appeared before the Board on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Huyck stated that he had spoken with the gentleman who had pulled the request off the Consent Agenda and determined that he was not necessarily opposed to the project, he had received notification from the Planning Department and wanted information about what was going on near his home on the east side of 180th Street. He stated that after his conversation, he was of the belief that the gentleman was seeking information about the 180th Street project which was being done by Douglas County. Mr. Rosenbaum stated that Mr. Eric Englund, Acting Assistant Director could help him with those questions.

Mr. Thomas Lubash, 3306 North 179th Street, appeared before the Board. Mr. Lubash stated that he was looking out his back window and saw men digging holes and marking, noticed there are boring machines out there and he just wanted to know what they were doing. He wanted to know if there was going to be a wall along 180th Street and the location of the pole line relative to his home.

At the request of Mr. Englund, Mr. Ryan Haas of the Public Works department came forward to address the concerns of Mr. Lubash. Mr. Lubash stated that he wanted printed copies of the designs to see what is going on there. Mr. Englund advised that they could get the contact information for the person at Douglas County to Mr. Lubash. Mr. Haas stated that he does not have the project details for the Douglas County project but would speak with Mr. Lubash and make sure he had the contact information to get the information he wanted.

Mr. Eric Englund, Acting Assistant Director, stated that this is the final plat for the second phase of the development including lots 12-20 and outlots F-H, as well as a Major Amendment to the overall Mixed Use Agreement for Antler View East. He stated that there was a combination of office and commercial lots which are part of the project and the Major Amendment is due to changes in use and orientation of some of those lots. Mr. Englund advised that the department recommended approval subject to the conditions listed in the recommendation report.

Mr. Morris motioned for approval of the rezoning from AG and DR to MU, subject to submittal of an acceptable final mixed use district development agreement prior to forwarding the request to the City Council and approval of the final plat subject to addressing the following items prior to forwarding to City Council:

1. Submittal of an acceptable final subdivision agreement.
2. Placing a note on the final plat stating that there shall be no direct access from any lot within the subdivision to 180th Street.
3. Extend the Emmet Street median further west to restrict the Lot 19 access to a right-in/right-out only.
4. Submittal of an updated tree mitigation plan showing a map scale and counts of each species.

Mr. Rosacker seconded the motion which carried 7-0.

| 11. | C10-20-005  
C12-20-006 | REQUEST: | Preliminary Plat approval of SANCTUARY RIDGE, a subdivision outside the city limits; |
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Lanoha Pacific, Inc.  
with waivers to Sections 53-9(9), Sidewalks and 53-8(2g), Streets; along with rezoning from AG to R4 (portions of the property are located within the FW-Floodway Overlay District).

LOCATION:  Northwest of West Center Road and 222nd Street

At the Planning Board meeting held January 8, 2020, Mr. Larry Jobeun, 11440 West Center Road, appeared before the Board on behalf of the applicant and advised that John Coolidge of Lamp Rynearson, the consulting engineer, was present as well. Mr. Jobeun stated that this project location is a unique piece of property in that there is approximately a 150 foot drop in elevation through the property from West Center Road to the Elkhorn River, and when he went with Ryan Haas of the Public Works department, they had to use 4 x 4 vehicles to access the property. The applicant proposes to develop 109 single family lots on approximately 77.5 acres. He advised that the anticipated value of the homes in the Sanctuary Ridge development is between $450,000 to over $1,000,000. Mr. Jobeun stated that they are also requesting rezoning to R4 along with some waivers which were in the recommendation report since it is in the Elkhorn Special Development zone which encourages the preservation of the natural environment as much as possible. Mr. Jobeun stated that the applicant was pleased with the recommendation for approval of the rezoning, waivers for grade, sidewalks, streets and the preliminary plat. He expressed concern that the report did not include a recommendation regarding the waiver for additional cul-de-sacs. Mr. Eric Englund, Acting Assistant Director, explained that the waiver for cul-de-sacs is not required due to language in the code regarding grade which allows staff to determine if additional cul-de-sacs are allowable; in this case due to the steep grades present the department has determined that the additional ones are permissible and do not need a waiver.

In response to a question from the Board, Mr. Jobeun pointed out the location of the existing home and the access to that home. He stated that Outlot B will provide access to the public street for that residence.

Mr. Jamie Meyer, 20920 West Center Road, appeared before the Board. Mr. Meyer pointed out that his home was the existing home which the Board had asked about. He stated that he is not necessarily opposed to the development, he is just concerned about what he should expect during the development and building process. Mr. Meyer stated that his main concern is about the width of the new driveway to the development and how it will affect his driveway, which is also pretty new. His second concern is regarding the grade variations; his home is located at one of the lowest points and he is concerned that the grading will cause excess water runoff onto his property. Mr. Rosenbaum inquired as to whether Mr. Meyer currently has a septic system and whether they will be linking in to the new sewer system for this development. Mr. Meyer stated that he was not certain at this point about whether he would or not. He stated that he does not know how all that would work with what pipe or material would need to be put in and how it would affect him with the City water since he currently has his own well. Mr. Meyer stated that he likes the idea of going on City water service, and his children are excited that there may be other children nearby for them to play with since they are currently pretty isolated, he is just not sure of the process and how it will affect his home and property.

Mr. Larry Jobeun returned at the request of Mr. Rosenbaum to address the concerns of Mr. Meyer. Mr. Jobeun stated that to the best of his knowledge, the outlot which would provide access would be 20 feet wide, he compared this to the width of the average city street which is 25 feet wide. He stated that after discussing the access with Mr. Coolidge, the engineer, he was assured that Mr. Meyer would have unimpeded access to his property at all times throughout the process. He also stated that, while Mr. Meyer would not be required to connect to the MUD water, sewer and gas system, he is welcome to do so if he chooses because the new infrastructure will all be public. Mr. Jobeun reassured Mr. Meyer that the developer will be required to ensure no additional water runoff will impact his property. In fact, he advised that the water situation will most likely improve with the installation of the new street and sewer system. Mr.
Jobeun stated that they would get Mr. Meyer’s contact information and would welcome him contacting them with any concerns throughout the process so that they could work with him on the issue.

Mr. Eric Englund, Acting Assistant Director, stated that the ideal scenario would be for Mr. Meyer to perhaps allow his property to become a platted lot with this development, however, it is not required and is something he could discuss with the applicant and development team. Mr. Englund stated that, considering the grading challenges, the department is in agreement with the waivers for sidewalks and streets, which includes the cul-de-sacs. He stated that the applicant would be required to remain in contact with Public Works and meet any state standards as well during the process. Mr. Englund stated that the department recommends approval subject to the conditions in the recommendation report.

Mr. Rosacker motioned for approval of the rezoning from AG to R4; approval of the waiver of Section 53-9(9) Sidewalks, for 227th Circle along Outlot A and Lot 42; and 229th Street along Outlot F and Lot 6; approval of the waiver of Section 53-8(2) Streets and alleys, maximum grade for local streets to exceed 10%; and approval of the Preliminary Plat, subject to the following conditions:

1. Include the abutting floodway property adjacent to the Elkhorn River in the plat and located within an outlot.
2. Either include the property adjacent to Lots 22-24 (22920 WEST CENTER RD) in the plat to meet the frontage requirement, or coordinate with Planning and Public Works on potential alternative strategies.
3. Provide for all necessary traffic calming measures, including those on all streets longer than 1000 feet.
4. Place a note on the plat that there shall be no direct access to West Center Road or Skyline Drive from any lots or outlots.
5. Provide a 4-foot wide paved median on the 229th Street approach.
6. Acquire the property for the northern part of the Gold Street ROW on its approach to Skyline Drive. Either record a paper ROW dedication concurrently with the plat, or include the full width of the ROW on the plat.
7. Provide the standard cross section for the Gold Street approach to Skyline Drive (one 16 foot inbound lane, a 4 foot paved median, and two 12 foot outbound lanes).
8. Provide for any improvements to Skyline Drive as identified in an approved traffic memo, subject to City and NDOT review.
9. Obtaining all of the appropriate permits from Douglas County.
10. Verify with NDOT that there is sufficient area within Outlot G to accommodate their future adjacent intersection improvements; adjust the Outlot boundaries if necessary.
11. Construct all West Center Road improvements identified by NDOT.
12. Coordinate with Public Works on an acceptable GO paving plan.
13. Provide temporary turn-arounds at the terminus of all temporarily dead-ended streets.
14. In the subdivision agreement, provide a provision that each lot owner shall pay a separate Sanctuary Lift Station Fee at the time of building permit, in addition to the standard Interceptor Sewer Fee.
15. Provide an extension of Outlot D to connect to Gold Street between Lots 25 and 26, and provide a paved access (constructed concurrently with the street improvements) between Gold Street and the lift station. Coordinate with Public Works Sewer Maintenance on the width requirements of the outlot extension, and on the design requirements of the paved access.
16. Coordinate with Public Works on the design of the lift station.
17. Submit the 30% design report for the sanitary sewer to the Public Works Design Division per Section 2.14 of the City’s Wastewater Collection Systems Design Manual.
18. Submit storm sewer design computations and final plans must to the Douglas County Engineer for review that relate to the handling of roadway and site drainage along the development boundary adjacent to Skyline Drive.
19. Provide for sidewalks along all street frontages not included in the waiver request.
20. Compliance with all applicable stormwater management ordinances and policies; including providing for a no net increase in stormwater runoff and treatment of the first ½ inch of stormwater for water
quality.

21. Provide for the use, ownership, and maintenance of the outlots in the subdivision agreement.
22. Submit a letter of approval from Douglas County for a Noxious Weed Plan.
23. Place proposed building envelopes on the Final Plat, slope analysis exhibit, and tree canopy analysis.
24. Place a note on the Final Plat indicating minimal grading will be allowed for residential driveways.
25. Submit an acceptable tree mitigation/planting plan.
26. Submit a letter from Douglas County Emergency Management confirming that acceptable emergency warning is being provided for the area.
27. Coordinate with City staff on an acceptable debt ratio.

Ms. Franklin seconded the motion which carried 7-0.

Rezonings

| 13. | C10-20-009 Regan Pence, Lamp Rynearson | REQUEST: Rezoning from R2 and CC to GO (property is located within an ACI-2 Overlay District) | LOCATION: 3206 South 71st Street |

At the Planning Board meeting held January 8, 2020, the applicant, Mr. Regan Pence of Lamp Rynearson, 14710 West Dodge Road, appeared before the Board. He stated that there is a future project at this location which will make this into an office, he stated that at this time it has not been determined whether it will be a new build or an adaptive re-use. Mr. Pence advised that currently the R2 zoning is an island surrounded by CC and GO with an ACI-Overlay, and CC with no overlay, so they this rezoning would make it more consistent with the adjacent properties so that it is ready to go for the future project. He advised that since it is an ACI-2 Overlay District, they would have to go through the Urban Design Review process in order to move forward with any future project.

Mr. Brian Riley, Chef and Operating Partner of Spezia Restaurant, 3125 South 72nd Street, appeared before the Board in opposition. He stated that as his business sits directly behind this location, he is concerned about the future of the building. Mr. Riley stated that he read in the newspaper that this property could, potentially, become a 4-story office building, which could affect his business depending upon the location of the building and where the parking would be for those offices. He stated that his restaurant already has limited parking and is currently also currently paying to utilize the parking lot next to his business and would prefer to keep that arrangement if the applicant builds a new building and increases their parking lot. Mr. Riley stated that the notification he had received from the Planning department indicated that the new business would utilize the existing home, which is not at all what was reported in the newspaper. He is also concerned that during the process city services such as water and utilities would be shut down which would directly affect his business as has happened with other projects near his location.

At the request of Mr. Rosenbaum, Mr. Pence returned to discuss the concerns expressed by Mr. Riley. Mr. Pence stated that he does not know where the Omaha World Herald got any information about a four-story building being developed, but that is not the intention. He stated that they are limited with what they can do there due to the small size of the property, but he did assure Mr. Riley that whatever office went in to the location would have its own parking on the site which would have to be reviewed and approved by the Planning and/or Public Works department.

Mr. Brian Riley, 3125 South 72nd Street, returned to advise that he spoke with Cindy Gonzalez at the World Herald who stated that she spoke with Brett Kane (?) for her article.

Mr. Eric Englund, Acting Assistant Director, stated that he was not aware of any development plan at the time of the meeting. He advised that the rezoning is consistent with the Future Land Use element of the City's Master Plan which designates this location for Office/Commercial use; it is also consistent with the
surrounding properties. Mr. Englund confirmed Mr. Pence’s statement that the size of the lot will limit what can be developed at that property. Mr. Englund stated that the department recommends approval.

Mr. Morris motioned for approval. Ms. Franklin seconded the motion which carried 7-0.

At the Planning Board meeting held January 8, 2020, Mr. Kyle Haase of E & A Consulting, 10909 Old Mill Road appeared before the Board on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Haase stated that the property the applicant wishes to rezone is currently vacant and the NBD zoning would be consistent with the Future Land Use element of the City’s Master Plan and would match the zoning adjacent to the west and south, east of the property is zoned R7, north of the property is the high school and is zoned R5. He stated that the applicant proposes to expand the existing parking lot which serves the needs of the Learning Community of Douglas and Sarpy County which is a government agency located across the street in the northwest corner. Mr. Haase explained the purpose and mission of the Learning Community and stated that they work with the local schools and non-profit organizations. He advised that the existing parking lot has 23 parking stalls and they are hoping to expand their parking to 40 stalls; the applicant is willing to clean up the site by removing unused curb cuts, install sidewalks, and landscaping as requested and shown on the exhibit.

Mr. Haase stated that they would be meeting with Zoning Board of Appeals at their January 9, 2020 meeting to request a waiver in landscaping requirements along the west side of the parking lot. Mr. Haase explained that they were requesting this waiver because the current right-of-way is 83 feet wide which allows 23½ feet from curb to property line, and 30 feet from the curb to the edge of the parking lot. The reduction will allow them to line up the edge of the new parking lot with the edge of the old one to create a smooth, more attractive transition. In response to a question from the Board, Mr. Haase confirmed that an adjacent property owner did utilize part of the southern portion of the parking lot as well.

No one appeared in opposition.

Mr. Eric Englund, Acting Assistant Director, stated the rezoning is consistent with the Master Plan and the proposed surface parking lot will require a Conditional Use Permit. He explained that while the waiver request is on the agenda for the Zoning Board of Appeals, because of the Conditional Use Permit, the Planning Board would have to be supportive of that waiver in order for it to be granted. He advised that staff is recommending the usual 10 feet of perimeter landscaping; though the right-of-way is larger than usual staff does not see any hardship or practical difficulty which would cause the department to support the waiver. Mr. Englund advised that one of the conditions of approval was for the applicant to submit a revised site plan to show the required perimeter landscaping. Mr. Englund stated that the department recommended approval of the rezoning from R7 to NBD and approval of the Conditional Use Permit subject to the five conditions in the recommendation report.

Mr. Morris motioned for approval of the rezoning from R7 to NBD and approval of the Conditional Use Permit to allow Surface parking in the NBD District, subject to the following conditions:

1. Removal of the three unused curb cuts on the property.
2. Submittal of a revised site plan providing the required perimeter landscaping.
3. Construct the sidewalks to standard size along 23rd Street and M Street.
4. Compliance with all applicable stormwater management ordinances and policies.
5. Compliance with all other applicable regulations.

Mr. Moore seconded the motion which carried 7-0.
At the Planning Board meeting held January 8, 2020, Mr. John Bachman of 10850 Regency Circle appeared before the Board to discuss the request. Mr. Bachman stated that they are requesting an amendment to the existing Mixed Use Development Agreement relative to Lot 7 only in the Copperfields Development. He stated that this lot was originally designated for the daycare which had chosen to move to an existing building on Lot 8 because they felt it was a better location for their business. The applicant is now proposing to designate Lot 7 for the development 16 apartment units, twelve of which would be two bedroom units and four would be 1-bedroom units, as well as a minimum of 30 parking stalls. Mr. Bachman stated that the Master Plan encourages residential uses within a Mixed Use Development and the applicant believes this is a good application of that use.

Mr. John Major, 20213 Nina Street, appeared before the Board in opposition. He advised that he is concerned about the impact the amendment allowing the construction of apartments will have on his property value. He advised that prior to purchasing his property, they researched the commercial zoning around it and would not have purchased the property if they had known apartments could have been built in the development. He stated that he is concerned because he has not seen any height or elevation plans, there were no trash enclosures that he could see on the plans which he felt could leave trash in the open and potentially mean extra garbage pick-up trips. He is concerned about the noise which will be associated with the increased density and he is concerned about the request for a reduction in setback. He stated that if this request is to be granted, he would like to see an increase in buffer yard between the commercial and residential zoning.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Major stated that he lived off Nina Street, which is south and east of this location not adjacent to Lot 7. Mr. Rosenbaum inquired about how important the 30 foot buffer yard was when they did their due diligence prior to purchasing the property. Mr. Major replied that they assumed some sort of office or retail business would be in that location as a part of the Mixed Use Development and that he had read the Agreement when he purchased his property. He stated that the reduction of the buffer yard from 30 feet to 20 feet was concerning. He stated that they would feel much better if there was some sort of commercial use at the location rather than multi-family housing. Mr. Major stated that he had not met with the developer and he was not aware of whether any of his neighbors had met with them.

At the request of Mr. Rosenbaum, Mr. Bachman returned to address the concerns of Mr. Major and the Board. Mr. Major stated that the 20 foot buffer yard had been recommended by the Planning staff and they were in agreement with that recommendation. Mr. Rosenbaum stated that he was concerned because Mr. Major did his due diligence prior to purchasing property and had relied on information that there would be a 30 foot buffer yard. Mr. Bachman pointed out that in Mixed Use Developments, buffer yards are one of the elements which have the ability to change because when the Mixed Use Agreement is drawn up, there is no specific plan for each lot, particularly 15 years ago when the original agreement was drawn up when they did not include the detail like newer agreements may do now. Mr. Bachman stated that originally they had requested a 10 foot buffer yard and reiterated that the department had recommended a 20 foot buffer yard which the applicant agreed to and will update the site plan to reflect that change. Mr. Bachman pointed out that the lot is very narrow and would not allow for the 30 foot buffer yard, which is why they agreed with the department’s recommendation of 20 feet. In response to Ms. Karnes, Mr. Bachman confirmed that staff has recommended very dense landscape screening along the east which the applicant agreed would be provided to block lights from the adjacent properties; the developer also owns a nursery so the Board can be assured there will be a lot of very nice landscaping.

Mr. Eric Englund, Acting Assistant Director, clarified the department’s recommendation for landscaping in
the buffer yard and explained the formula used to determine the landscape screening requirement. He explained that though they were recommending the 20 foot buffer yard, they were also recommending it be landscaped the same as it would have been as a 30 foot buffer yard, which would mean the screening is much more dense than it would regularly be for the 20 foot buffer yard. Mr. Englund pointed out that if the applicant chose to pull this lot out of the Mixed Use development and zone it R6 on its own, there would then be a setback requirement from the street, but no buffer yard requirement between the R6 and R5 zoning adjacent to the east. He also pointed out that the second item in the Major Amendment was to eliminate the 10% office requirement, due to the small size of the development. He stated that the department considered the civic and retail businesses already in place along with the proposed multi-family, and determined that the 10% office requirement could be eliminated in this case.

Mr. Englund stated that the department recommended approval subject to the conditions in the recommendation report.

Ms. Franklin motioned for approval of the Major Amendment to the Copperfields Mixed Use Development Agreement, subject to the following conditions:
1. Increase the buffer yard between the CC and R5 zoning districts to a minimum 20 feet with landscaping.
2. Submit five acceptable, signed copies of the agreement prior to forwarding the request to City Council.

Ms. Karnes seconded the motion which carried 6-1, Mr. Rosenbaum dissenting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Rosacker moved to approve the minutes of the December 4, 2019 Planning Board pre-meeting as written. Ms. Franklin seconded the motion which carried 6-0-1, Mr. Rosenbaum abstaining.

Ms. Franklin moved to approve the minutes of the December 4, 2019 Planning Board meeting as written. Mr. Rosacker seconded the motion which carried 6-0-1, Mr. Rosenbaum abstaining.

'ELECTION OF 2020 PLANNING BOARD OFFICERS'

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Rosacker motioned to nominate Mr. Greg Rosenbaum, for the position of Chairman of the Planning Board for the year 2020, there were no opponents. Mr. Moore seconded the motion which carried 7-0.

VICE CHAIR: Mr. Moore motioned to nominate Ms. Kristine Karnes, for the position of Vice Chairperson of the Planning Board for the year 2020, there were no opponents. Mr. Morris seconded the motion which carried 7-0.

ADJOURNMENT

It was the consensus of the Board to adjourn the meeting at 3:31 p.m.
If alternative (tape) to the agenda is needed, please advise the Board Secretary at (402) 444-5150 Ext. 2013. A 72-hour advance notice is required.