Mr. Ciaccio, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

PUBLIC MEETING:

Private Cases for Discussion & Approval:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McDonald’s</td>
<td>Approval of Section 55-925 Build-to/Set-back Frontage Type C for a Commercial Building in an ACI-2 District and support of a waiver of the minimum zone dimension from 45’ to 25'-6&quot;.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5/17/2012:
At the Urban Design Review Board meeting held on May 17, 2012, no one appeared before the Board in support of the request.
Jed Moulton, Urban Design Manager, explained that since Dodge Street is a high-volume and high-speed corridor, it might be impractical to establish a relationship with the street. He noted that there would be improvements to the roadside edge, which would include wider sidewalks and the required landscaping. The Planning Department concluded, based on the context of the project, that the request would be permissible.

Mr. McMeekin expressed that he would like a representative present to address questions from the Board about the project, particularly because of the proposed full parking lot at the front of the building. He suggested having McDonald's consider a plan that would bring the building closer to the street with the parking more concentrated on the south.

Mr. Peters made a motion to lay the case over until the June 21, 2012 meeting of the Board to give the applicant the opportunity to appear and provide other alternative site plans. Seconded by Mr. McMeekin.

AYES: Peters, Torczon, McMeekin, Joebeun, Ziettlow, Jacobson

Motion approved: 6-0

7/19/2012:
Vicky Stadther of McDonald's appeared before the Board. Jed Moulton, Urban Design Manager, stated that the project was reviewed by the Board at their May 17, 2012 meeting (see above). This location is near both the Papio Trail and Dodge Street. At their last meeting, the Board concluded that the business should be repositioned closer to Dodge Street in order to reinforce the sidewalk and street edge.

Mr. Moulton said that he and McDonald's had researched repositioning the building. However, they encountered a number of problems with this. He presented a new site plan which incorporated some of the suggestions of the Board, including the relocation of the drive-through lane and a patio positioned in relation to the adjacent Papio Trail. Mr. Moulton concluded by stating that the Planning Department recommended approval of this site plan.

Mr. Holland thanked McDonald's for working with the Planning Department to come up with a revised site plan for their project. The Board suggested additional alterations to the site, including a connection to the sidewalk on the eastern side of the building, reinforcing the landscaping on Dodge Street, making changes to the trash enclosure, and the installation of a bike rack.

Mr. Moulton stated that the applicant would also need a waiver to exceed the minimum setback requirement due to a newly discovered error in the code. He explained that an amendment to the code is currently planned which will correct this mistake; however, the applicant needs a waiver from the Board today in order to be in compliance.

Motion by Mr. Holland to approve the plan as presented, along with the comments from the Planning Department, with the following aforementioned stipulations; namely, 1) a sidewalk being added to the eastern edge of the building heading north toward Dodge Street, 2) installation of landscaping hedge approximately 36” high on the northern edge of the drive and 2’ from the edge of the curb to allow for the placement of snow, 3) reinforcement of the baseline along Dodge Street to include shade trees of the same species spaced about 25’ on center, 4) elimination of the small landscaped half-circle on the northeast corner, 5) the trash and grease enclosure should be of the same materials as the building, and 6) installation of a bike rack. Also, a recommendation to approve the waiver to exceed the minimum build-to setback requirement of 45’ to 25.6” was given. (Please note: Conditions 1 – 5 listed above are recommendations to the Planning Director.). Second by Ms. Ziettlow.

AYES: Peters, Jacobson, Noddle, Torczon, Rice, Ziettlow, Holland, Ciaccio

Motion carried 8-0.
Brett Schmitz appeared before the Board. Jed Moulton, Urban Design Manager, stated that this project was reviewed by the Planning Department. Mr. Moulton stated that this location is an existing structure; the applicant wishes to create a new façade for the building in keeping with their other locations in town. He added that the proposed stucco and/or cultured stone materials for this façade are not currently approved for use under Urban Design requirements, which mandate that imitation materials must compare to their real counterparts in both appearance and durability.

Mr. Moulton stated that an additional issue exists in the applicant’s proposal to apply stucco to the other sides of the building. Mr. Schmitz countered, stating that the stucco will cover approximately the front 14’ feet of each side of the building, in order to complete the look of the façade.

Mr. Moulton continued by stating that his division, in addition to reviewing the proposed design and materials, also had to take into account the area in which the business is to be located. This location is near Midtown Crossing; a highly urbanized corridor which has utilized quality materials. thus, the context of the design for Quality Urgent Care’s new façade must also weigh into their recommendation to the Board. Mr. Moulton commented that the applicant is seeking a waiver so as to be able to move on to the Zoning Board of Appeals. He stated that it was the opinion of the Planning Department that the current proposed materials were unacceptable. He stated that his department has not yet been able to come to a consensus on alternate solutions for this property, adding that the plans submitted by the applicant were not clear.

Mr. Schmitz disagreed with Mr. Moulton’s statement regarding the quality of the proposed materials at this location. He commented that the proposed stone is 1 ½” thick and carries a life span of 50 years. Mr. Schmitz added that this material is being used in other locations around Omaha, citing McDonald’s as an example. Trina Westman, UDRB Administrator, commented that this information was not evident in the plans submitted. Mr. Moulton stated that it was within the Board’s power to support the request, but added that it was not only the cultured stone material that had been called into question for this property.

Mr. Holland stated that he has a difficult time accepting the use of faux stone in this location considering that it is adjacent to a multi-million dollar development (Midtown Crossing), which utilizes higher quality materials. Other recent developments in the area have been using materials in keeping with the tone of the area. He concluded that in this case, allowing the current design and materials would set an unacceptable precedent for this area of town.

Mr. Moulton discussed that section of the code dealing with quality of materials, commenting on the challenges faced by his department in dealing with the various types of building materials currently available. He invited Mr. Schmitz to submit samples of the specific materials that he intends to use to the Planning Department.

Mr. Peters asked the applicant why he chose not to use materials that meet current Urban Design standards. Mr. Schmitz stated that other materials suggested had greatly exceeded their budget for the project. Mr. Peters inquired as to whether Mr. Schmitz’ architect had suggested any other materials that would both conform to design standards and meet the business’ budget. Mr. Schmitz stated that he had not yet found other materials; his only input had been from Ms. Westman, who had suggested brick as a possible building material. Mr. Peters suggested that the applicant consult with some of the City’s design professionals, postulating that they may be able to come up with a solution that would be acceptable to all parties involved. Mr. Peters suggested that more investigation into alternative materials was called for before he would feel comfortable supporting the applicant’s requests.
After some additional discussion, it was determined that the proposed products do in fact conform to current design standards, however, the Board felt that this type of design was not appropriate for the proposed location. Mr. Schmitz was encouraged to seek advice from design professionals in order to create an acceptable façade for his business. A waiver request was no longer required, and the request was withdrawn by the applicant.

Motion to place case on file by Mr. Peters. Second by Mr. Holland.

AYES: Peters, Jacobson, Noddle, Torczon, Ziettlow, Holland, Ciaccio

Motion carried 7-0.

**ADMINISTRATIVE ITEM:**

Motion by Mr. Holland to approve the May 17, 2012 meeting minutes. Second by Mr. Peters.

AYES: Peters, Jacobson, Noddle, Torczon, Ziettlow, Holland, Ciaccio

Motion carried 7-0. Meeting adjourned at 3:35pm.

Clinette Warren, Planning Department
Recording Secretary