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MEMBERS PRESENT: Mike McMeekin, Chair
Robert Peters
Rachel Jacobson
Gerald Torczon
Larry Jobeun, Alternate
April Rice, Alternate
Leanne Ziettlow, Alternate
Anna Nubel, Non Voting Ex-Officio Member

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT: Dave Ciaccio, Vice Chair
Timothy Holland
Jay Noddle

STAFF PRESENT: Chad Weaver, Assistant Planning Director
Mike Leonard, UDRB Administrator (outgoing)
Trina Westman, UDRB Administrator (incoming)
Debbie Hightower, Recording Secretary

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 MEETING

Public Case for Discussion & Approval:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UD-11-010</th>
<th>REQUEST: Approval of Exterior Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bucky's Gas Station</td>
<td>LOCATION: 40th and Dodge Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Troy Panagiotis, Omaha Neon Sign Company appeared before the board to present the request. Mr. Panagiotis stated that when applying for the building permit he was told that EIFS was allowed but the proposed material was not allowed. The proposed material would be aluminum, non-corrosive panel with a stucco-type paint finish that adheres to the aluminum. The proposed exterior material would replace the blue awning on the front of the building. Mr. Panagiotis offered to answer any questions.

Mr. Peters questioned whether there would be down lighting all the way around the building. Mr. Panagiotis answered that there will be an LED down light every 6”-8” to illuminate the property. The proposed aluminum product is not approved but instead of wood and styrofoam the product would be a longer lifetime product. Ms. Nubel asked how much longer the aluminum product would last. Mr.
Panagiotis answered that aluminum never rusts or deteriorates but the finish would have a 20-year life expectancy. Ms. Rice asked if there was any way to decrease the 8’ size. He indicated that when the blue awning is removed, the wall behind is not finished. The purpose is to tie into the main façade of the structure with the 8’ height. The blue awning would be removed and the proposed material would go over the rugged rib of the roof.

Chad Weaver, Assistant Planning Director, indicated there are three types of materials (primary, secondary and trim). Essentially, this type of material may be more durable than some of the proven materials but is considered trim and is deemed inappropriate because of the amount used. The way the metal panel is constructed and fastened could be used as a trim piece according to code. The recommendation would be to use a different material or significantly reduce the proposed material.

Mr. Peters asked Mr. Weaver what the reduced size or the percentage would need to be. Mr. Weaver responded that it would depend on how it was designed and the visual impact would be less of a percentage. It would be hard to cover the existing mansard and the portion that is unfinished with the proposed material and keep it within the trim category.

Ms. Rice questioned the length of the front façade. Mr. Panagiotis indicated that the front façade is 79’ and the side elevations are 41’. Mr. Peters stated one issue is that the material would be in the trim category but is being used as a sideboard and wraps the entire building. Mr. Peters suggested submitting different options and visually softening the look within the commercial district. Mr. Panagiotis stated he is willing to compromise and address different options.

Ms. Rice questioned the length of the front façade. Mr. Panagiotis indicated that the front façade is 79’ and the side elevations are 41’. Mr. Peters stated one issue is that the material would be in the trim category but is being used as a sideboard and wraps the entire building. Mr. Peters suggested submitting different options and visually softening the look within the commercial district. Mr. Panagiotis stated he is willing to compromise and address different options.

Mr. McMeekin stated the purpose of the board is to assist with implementing the code and not design buildings. The Urban Design guidelines are not black or white but the board is used to determine the gray areas.

Mr. Panagiotis questioned if the issue is the aesthetic nature of the building and the size of the façade or is the proposed material being addressed.

Mr. Peters indicated that the material is a trim material therefore a portion of the canopy needs to change.

Mr. McMeekin stated the code has primary and complimentary materials with no definitive percentage but this is very close and is not an accepted primary material. Mr. Weaver stated the material would still be considered trim material and would fall within the trim category.

Ms. Jacobson stated that she would argue that the proposed material is not only about the size but would be the most visual part of the building. Ms. Rice added that the articulation of the façade is extremely uniformed and non-dimensional versus the existing three-dimensional that expresses the entrance of the establishment. Ms. Ziettlow expressed concern with regard to the longevity of the requested system.

Mike Leonard, UDRB Administrator, City Planning, indicated that the litmus test for acceptability of EIFS or any other product goes beyond the physical appearance. There are three criteria by which material is judged. EIFS also has to follow the criteria including how the material is applied and how the material is detailed appropriately.

Mr. McMeekin stated the presented material is the core issue but the aesthetics of the material is visually becoming the primary material on the building which is not allowed by the code. The material must be scaled back to where it is no longer the primary material.

In response to Mr. McMeekin, Mr. Weaver indicated that if the project could be designed to a point where the material would be considered trim and not primary or complimentary material. The other option would be for the board to decide if the aluminum panel is an adequate substitution for EIFS and is scaled down enough to where it would be complimentary and not primary.
Mr. Jobeun moved to LAYOVER. Laid over for 30 days until the next meeting on July 21, 2011 to allow time to address the items regarding primary versus complimentary, durability, appearance and the construction methodology of proposed wall material. Ms. Jacobson seconded the motion which carried 6-0.

Approval of Proposed Best Practice:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REQUEST: Street Lighting Standards for Urban Design Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Chad Weaver, Assistant Planning Director, indicated that the department will be perfecting and analyzing the street lighting standards and updating the board of the progress.

Mr. McMeekin requested that the four conditions be included in the motion and addressed as soon as possible.

Mr. Peters moved to APPROVE. Mr. Jobeun seconded the motion which carried 6-0.

Request for Administrative Disposition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REQUEST: Brine Building – Addition to Street Maintenance Facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION: 96th and F Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chad Weaver, Assistant Planning Director, stated the request is a small addition to a relatively large site that is not readily visible. The department requests administrative disposition.

Ms. Jacobson moved to APPROVE. Approval of administrative disposition. Mr. Peters seconded the motion which carried 4-0.

Proposed Ordinance Change:

| REQUEST: Green Parking Areas (perimeter landscaping) – Section 55-928(e) |

Chad Weaver, Assistant Planning Director, stated the request would provide some options in the code for constraining sites with relatively small parking in urban parts of the City as opposed to trying to achieve the entire 15' landscape area. The department recommends approval to avoid possible waiver situations.

Mr. Roberts moved to APPROVE. Ms. Ziettlow seconded the motion which carried 6-0.

| REQUEST: Exterior Wall Materials – Section 55-935(1) |

Chad Weaver, Assistant Planning Director, indicated that the department is attempting to refine the code in relation to materials and create a test that will categorize primary or complimentary materials.

Mr. Jobeun questioned the impact of exterior wall materials on apartment complexes or townhouses. Mr. Weaver stated that presently there are no restrictions on apartment complexes but the department would be in agreement to discuss it further. There will be no material guidelines for single family homes.
Mr. Jobeun moved to LAYOVER. Laid over for 30 days until the next meeting on July 21, 2011 for further discussion. Ms. Ziettlow seconded the motion which carried 6-0.

**ADMINISTRATIVE ITEM:**

Mr. Peters moved to APPROVE the meeting minutes of April 21, 2011. Ms. Jacobson seconded the motion which carried 3-0.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

It was the consensus of the Board to adjourn the meeting at 4:15 pm.

Debbie Hightower, Planning Department  
Recording Secretary