Mr. McMeekin, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m., introduced the Urban Design Review Board members as well as the Planning Department staff, and explained the UDRB’s public hearing and administrative meeting procedures.

Public Case for Discussion & Approval:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UD-10-005</th>
<th>REQUEST:</th>
<th>Elkhorn Fire Station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Omaha</td>
<td>LOCATION:</td>
<td>Atlas &amp; D St., Elkhorn, NE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the Urban Design Review Board meeting held on April 15, 2010, Mike Oestmann, City of Omaha Facilities Management, Ms. Cristy Joy and Monte Taylor with Archi + etc. appeared before the board and presented material regarding the construction of Elkhorn Fire Station #77.

Mr. Oestmann stated the members of the team are the Elkhorn Suburban Fire District, City of Omaha, Archi + etc., TD2, Inc. and Ayars & Ayars, Inc. During the Fahey administration and after the annexation of Elkhorn, the City of Omaha and the Elkhorn Suburban Fire District entered into an interlocal agreement to construct a fire station at the 203rd and Atlas location. The interlocal was assigned to Facilities Management to do the bidding, design and construction. Elkhorn brought the funding to the table at a maximum of $2,000,000. During the process, there was interest in going with the Political Subdivision Construction Alternative Act because the Elkhorn Suburban Fire District falls within that and decided to use the Design Build process with Ayars & Ayars. There is a desire to build a good quality fire station based on the quality of material and workmanship used on other fire stations.

Ms. Joy presented a tour of existing fire stations within the City of Omaha, site investigation, design committee meetings with Elkhorn and the fire departments that will occupy the building and the control of the pricing and budget creation including design, site development and building costs. The budget includes furnishings, plates, pans, bedding, etc. and the project management costs. The Elkhorn Fire Station was designed after Fire Station No. 3 located at 3126 South 16th Street with the setting being urban and residential in feel and nature. The location has an R4 zoning and the use is designated as a fire station. The site entry point will be located off Atlas Street, the least path of travel by other vehicular traffic. The design incorporates the entire turning of trucks and all type vehicular traffic on site. The
layout includes the house lots in the rear yard area focusing on the slope of the site, drainage collection, detention ponds and the creation of green spaces on all sides of the fire station.

The facility will be a 10 sleeping room facility with the capacity for four crew shift changes, fitness room, reading room and day room along with the public spaces. The site plan submitted includes the entire truck turn around, parking outside of the firetruck way, the use of the green perimeter toward the street side, screening different portions of the site and the creation of green spaces and detention areas with a more natural landscaping component. The natural look and residential feel will keeping the building very friendly.

The exterior includes an accent banding of the fire house red color, top banding is precast component at the top cap with white overhead doors as utilized in all Omaha fire stations. The gutters and downspouts will match the color of the building. The hollow metal frame doors will be painted the same neutral color as the EFIS. All sleeping rooms will have egress windows. The exterior lighting will be located on the eave of the entry and on the overhead fire doors. The asphalt shingle roof has a 50-year warranty. The outdoor patio space will include a natural gas connected grill, outdoor furniture and storage. All real costs including components such as flagpoles and exterior lighting is included within the $2,000,000 budget. Ms. Joy opened the meeting up for discussion, comments and constructive criticism.

There were no opponents present.

Mr. Moulton stated that he has worked with the design team, the project has been reviewed and the City of Omaha recommends approval.

Mr. McMeekin questioned the city's project management cost. Mr. Oestmann stated the city has contracted with a project manager who is a contracted employee who works within the Facilities Management office but is not paid by city funds.

Mr. Holland questioned the use of EIFS on a civic structure. Ms. Joy stated that EIFS was selected after reviewing several alternatives in relation to cost, design parameters and visual impact. Mr. Oestmann confirmed that several other fire stations have recently used the EIFS material.

Mr. Peters questioned the EIFS parameters for a commercial building. Mr. Moulton stated that the General Building Guidelines for a non-retail building states that EIFS cannot be below 8' on the average.

Mr. Peters stated the building is very evident that it is a fire station but the garage doors seem higher than what is necessary. He stated he was concerned that the “red racing stripe” around the building does not fit with the residential character of the neighborhood.

Ms. Joy stated the building height at eave is 21’ therefore the apparatus bay was made as low as possible based on the requirements for the recently purchased fire engine/ladder truck. Mr. Peters questioned Mr. Oestmann on the typical height for the doors on the apparatus bays. Mr. Oestmann stated the door sizes will be checked and can be kept to a minimum. Mr. Peters questioned the stark white apparatus bay doors. Mr. Oestmann stated the white door is standard and the fire department would like to keep the color of the doors consistent. Ms. Joy responded that the red stripe is a colored accent CMU.

Mr. Holland questioned the test of time for the shingle roof. Mr. Peters questioned the repair frequency for the roof shingles. Mr. Oestmann stated there were no roofing issues on any other asphalt-shingled buildings during two previous storms.

Mr. Peters questioned the decision for hard surface for turn around vehicles as opposed to using the money to enhance the materials on the building. There seems to be a lot of hard surface that is pushed back into the site. Ms. Joy indicated that there was a two to three week study completed to review multiple traffic patterns and the sloping nature of the site to minimize the amount of paving with regard to getting in and out of the facility. Mr. Oestmann stated there is also concern for enough parking in the parking lot when there is a call during shift change.

Mr. Holland questioned whether the building could be closer to the street therefore allowing the vehicles
Mr. Holland agreed but was concerned about comprising the life of the building and materials relative to buying more concrete.

Mr. Weaver stated that the suburban location is not in a district that would usually prescribe a front on the street. The parking is probably in advance of the required code but would not be looked at how it is staffed at one time but the capacity based on the size of the building.

Mr. Moulton stated the planning department recommends approval subject to the following: 1.) provide masonry piers at corners of ground level screening; 2) provide curbed node on south parking lot peninsula for landscaping and tree planting; 3.) provide rooftop or ground screening of mechanical equipment (if required); and 4.) acquire necessary Conditional Use Permit.

Mr. Moulton stated there is serious concern that the decibel rating for a generator would be in compliance. Ms. Joy and Mr. Oestmann assured the board that the generator would be in compliance.

Ms. Joy stated the landscape is not all native but there are areas that will be watered by the fire station occupants. There will be berming on site because of the cut and fill ratios.

Mr. Holland stated he was concerned that the appearance of the structure looks too much like a house as opposed to a true civic structure with regard to the roofline. Ms. Joy stated the sleeping rooms were added to the rear therefore bringing the scale of the roofline down.

Mr. Holland asked whether the EIFS was used for insulating value. Ms. Joy stated there is a double width block system with structural, insulation and decorative block. Mr. Holland questioned the need to add EIFS to the block on the outside of the building. Ms. Joy answered that the EIFS was a design aesthetic with a cost savings of approximately $12,000. Mr. Holland stated he was concerned about the long-term sustainable solution for EIFS on a civic structure with regard to code qualifications, wind load, etc.

Mr. Moulton suggested a solution could be a modern stucco on a hard board with more durability and less moisture problems. Ms. Joy stated several other options were considered and priced.

Mr. McMeekin stated the board’s responsibility is to review the quality of design without respect to a budget. He questioned if there were any other aspects of the building design for flexibility to redistribute the funds in other ways.

Mr. Oestmann stated there is an interior quality standard that must be met. Ms. Joy stated that the ADA requirement is for 12 ADA approved bathroom facilities with regard to bedrooms and bays. Every two sleeping rooms must have an accessible bathroom.

Mr. Holland questioned if it is possible to reduce the door height of the two side overhead doors. Ms. Joy agreed to reconsider the door height.

Mr. Peters moved to LAY OVER until the May 20, 2010 meeting to allow applicant time to respond to the following: 1.) explore alternatives to the use of the EIFS material on the exterior; 2.) explore the utilization of a masonry material that is not split faced CMU; 3.) review the possible revisions to the site plan to minimize the areas of hardscape including the maneuvering areas for the vehicles; 4.) additional landscaping primarily along the residential exposures; 5.) explore alternatives to the reduction of the two bays that do not require the additional height to house the fire trucks; and 6.) the recommendations of the planning department: provide masonry piers at corners to ground level screening; provide landscaping and trees curb nodes; provide rooftop screening for mechanical units; and acquire the necessary conditional use permits. Mr. Holland seconded the motion which carried 4-0.
Request for Administrative Disposition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UD-10-006</th>
<th>REQUEST:</th>
<th>Hummel Park Day Camp Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Omaha</td>
<td>LOCATION:</td>
<td>11808 John J. Pershing Drive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the Urban Design Review Board meeting held on April 15, 2010, Jed Moulton, Urban Design Manager, City of Omaha stated Parks & Recreation submitted a review form for a project in Hummel Park. In brief, three older buildings in disrepair would be demolished and replaced with a new facility. Based on the location of the building which did not have an urban design presence, the design is suitable to recommend for administrative disposition.

Mr. Holland stated he would prefer that the project come before the board. Hummel Park is a unique situation but it would set an undesirable precedence if it did not come before the board. Mr. Peters stated he is encouraged with the direction of the project but additional ideas would need to be reviewed.

Ms. Jacobson agreed that the project is a recreational facility for public use and would need to come before the board.

Mr. Holland moved to DENY the request for administrative disposition. Ms. Jacobson seconded the motion.

Mr. Peters stated the board does not have the ability to consider the department’s administrative process and suggested a lay over.

Mr. Holland withdrew his motion. Ms. Jacobson withdrew her second.

No action was taken by the board.

DISCUSSION ITEM:

Rules of Procedure

Mr. Moulton stated the department is working toward developing an official policy on the process of review for publicly funded projects. Over the last year, there are certain conditions and situations that have occurred. The Rules of Procedure can be changed at any time by the board and adjusted accordingly, if necessary. One issue that is developing throughout the process is that the planning department is in the position of administering the board therefore numerous questions are fielded with regard to what is expected from the board. This board does not yet have a hard municipal code or true ordinance framework.

Mr. Peters asked Mr. Moulton for clarification because the Urban Design regulations are in place. Mr. Moulton stated that unless a project is zoned accordingly within a district or publicly funded project is within these districts, then applying the urban design ordinances is a voluntary gesture and not legally binding. As with the case of the fire department, it could be voluntary criteria.

Mr. Peters stated that any publicly funded project shall meet the intent or the directions established by the regulations.

Mr. Moulton stated there is no framework or criteria for the review of publicly funded projects. There can be standards developed to meet the objectives for good quality design in the City Omaha but there is confusion with regard to expectations. He questioned whether to defer to the board or provide direction for projects and if so, will the board override it? Should there be a design by committee process, reviewed by the board and could that be detrimental to projects when the process may be six or more months? The proposed policy will make the distinction that the planning department’s qualified personnel can guide the project, Urban Design Review Board will review the project in terms of broad civic goals of the public good and public stewardship of funds at a level that is higher than the specific design details. The proposed language could be: 1) publicly funded projects are well designed and exhibit the objectives of design quality and enduring value as expressed in the City of Omaha Master Plan; 2) that the review
and ensure that the design objectives of public entities funding such projects are in line with the objectives of the Omaha Master Plan; and 3) to ensure that publicly funded projects are maximizing public benefits. The goal would be to affect a project with the general design objectives early on in the process.

Mr. Peters recommended a discussion at a pre-meeting with the participation of all board members before a public discussion.

**ADMINISTRATIVE ITEM:**

Approval of February 18, 2010 and March 18, 2010 Meeting Minutes

**ADJOURNMENT:**

It was the consensus of the Board to adjourn the meeting at 4:25 pm.

Debbie Hightower, Planning Department
Recording Secretary