Urban Design Review Board

MINUTES

Thursday, February 18, 2016

Regular Meeting:
3:00 PM, Jesse Lowe Conference Room – 3rd Floor
Omaha/Douglas Civic Center
1819 Farnam Street

Meeting Minutes: This document states the minutes of cases before the Urban Design Review Board at their Public hearing and Administrative meeting held on Thursday, February 18, 2016.

Certification of Publication: Urban Design Review Board Administrator certifies publication of this agenda in the Daily Record, the official newspaper of the City of Omaha on Monday, February 18, 2015.

Members Present: Jeffrey Elliott - Chair
Robert Peters – Vice-Chair
Christian Christensen
David Ciaccio
Brinker Harding – Non-Voting Ex-Officio Member
Larry Jobeun (Present but not a part of the Board)
Jay Noddle
Gerald Torczon
Philip Webb

Members Not Present: Kurt Cisar
Katie Underwood

Staff Present: Jed Moulton, Manager of Urban Design & Preservation
Dave Fanslau, Assistant Director – Urban Planning
Todd Swirczek, Planner – Urban Design
Alan Thelen, City Law
Clinette Warren, Recording Secretary

Administrative Item:

Approval of September 17, 2015 Meeting Minutes.

Mr. Webb moved to APPROVE the minutes. Mr. Cisar seconded the motion.

AYES: Peters, Christensen, Cisar, Underwood, Webb, Elliott

MOTION CARRIED: 6-0
Private Projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UD-16-001</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Wall materials and Sidewalk width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom McLeay</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>1234 South 10th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill Rowhouses</td>
<td>Request:</td>
<td>Waiver of Section 55-935 and 55-924</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the Urban Design Review Board (UDRB) meeting held on January 21, 2016, Tom McLeay and Nate Gieselman (RDG) appeared before the Board.

Mr. McLeay stated that the project is comprised of 36 row houses, including 7 units along 10th Street that were under construction at the time. He stated that one of the goals of the project was to keep the price point low so that they could be more affordable to buyers. He noted that 10th Street is part of the NCE (Neighborhood Conservation/Enhancement) district. The units were not meant to be identical; there are several choices for options, color and materials. There were 3 issues that the applicant wished to discuss with the Board: 1) the applicant explained that there was an issue with the requirement from the City that the exterior of the row houses, especially the units not on 10th Street, consist of brick. The applicant felt that brick was not required. 2) In order to keep the prices of the units down, the applicant proposed reducing the upper parapets. 3) The last issue was with the width of the sidewalk. It was believed that the required width was not necessary.

Mr. McLeay noted that there was not an abundance of brick exteriors on the single-family, residential properties in the surrounding neighborhood. Most of them were sided or stucco. He referred to Section 55-607(a) which stated that the brick requirement was for non-residential use types. He stated that the project was a single-family, for-sale residential use. He added that the only brick exteriors belonged to commercial properties. Buyers of the townhomes had the option of using brick or cement panels. The applicant proposed making only the corner units brick; however, that option was rejected by the City. He was also concerned about brick being required for 11th Street although it was not a part of the NCE district. He felt that the brick requirement was being forced on the developer.

Mr. Gieselman addressed the issue with the parapets. The applicant requested that the parapets be reduced. In response to Mr. Webb, Mr. McLeay stated that the parapets as originally proposed would significantly impact the final cost of the project.

Mr. Gieselman proposed installing 5’ sidewalks and having them connect with the 4’ sidewalks in the neighborhood, but putting in 7’ sidewalks in front of the angled parking where cars would overhang.

Jed Moulton, Manager of Urban Design & Preservation, explained the purpose of the NCE overlay. He stated that this project did not fit the definition of a single-family, detached project but was actually an attached, multi-unit property. He explained that the majority of the attached, multi-unit residences in the surrounding area had a brick masonry exterior. He agreed that the brick requirement did not need to apply to every façade on every building in the project; however, it did apply to those along the perimeter. The Planning Department also felt that more brick was required than what the applicant was proposing and that the parapets should remain to improve the appearance of the overall project but were not required. In addition, he stated that the applicant was proposing to use too much cedar on the exterior and that is should be used as a miscellaneous accent material. He stated that there was some confusion that resulted because the project was presented one unit at a time instead of as a whole. The Planning Department’s recommendation was to include the required amount of primary material,
reduce the amount of cedar, have the wall material requirements apply to the entire perimeter of the project, and to allow the 5’ sidewalks in the areas requested by the applicant not abutting on street parking.

In response to Mr. Noddle, Mr. Moulton explained that the project had not been considered as a whole but was initially reviewed as just one unit. At that time, the Planning Department had not yet received a comprehensive presentation of all facades. Mr. Noddle noted that the board was being presented with just one phase of the project, whereas the TIF review was for the entire 36-unit project. He felt that the board should have been presented with plans for the entire project. Dave Fanslau, Assistant Director – Urban Planning, confirmed the details of what the Planning Board and City Council approved with regards to this project. There was also discussion about what permits had been issued for the project.

Mr. Noddle stated that he would have an issue with applying different requirements for portions of the same project. He was in support of reducing the width of the sidewalk by perhaps tapering it down in certain sections. He felt that any new residential structure should adhere to the same guidelines and principles.

There was some discussion about the parapet requirement. It was determined that the original plans included parapets. Mr. Moulton explained that even without the parapets, more primary materials on the exterior would be necessary.

Mr. Webb stated that he would be willing to lay the case over to give the applicant the opportunity to work out any issues with the Planning Department. The applicant was advised that they would need to maintain the amount of brick that was originally proposed.

Mr. Peters directed the applicant to make the necessary changes to bring the project into compliance with City standards. Mr. Torczon added that economic hardship on the part of owner did not have a bearing on the quality and higher standards that are expected from projects of this nature.

In conclusion, Mr. Noddle suggested that the applicant take a month to determine which building permits were needed, to remove parapets from the design if they preferred and to work on the design of the south sides of the two buildings on the south. He also directed him to present a design for the tapered sidewalks. Mr. McLeay stated that he believed that all issues could be worked out with the Planning Department so that there would be no need to re-appear before the Board.

Mr. Torczon moved to LAYOVER for until the next scheduled meeting. Mr. Peters seconded the motion.

AYES: Peters, Ciaccio, Christensen, Noddle, Webb, Torczon, Elliott

MOTION CARRIED: 7-0

Adjournment:

It was the consensus of the Board to adjourn the meeting at 4:27 p.m.

Clinette Warren, Planning Department
Recording Secretary