



**CITY OF LA VISTA**  
**8116 PARK VIEW BOULEVARD**  
**LA VISTA, NE 68128**  
**P: (402) 331-4343**

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**JUNE 18TH, 2020 6:30 P.M.**

The City of La Vista Planning Commission held a meeting on Thursday, June 18, 2020 via Zoom, which included video and teleconferencing options. Chairman Kevin Wetuski called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. with the following members present: Kevin Wetuski, Mike Krzywicki, Gayle Malmquist, Kathleen Alexander, John Gahan, and Patrick Coghlan. Members absent were: Harold Sargus, Jason Dale, Mike Circo, and Josh Frey. Also, in attendance were Bruce Fountain, Community Development Director; Cale Brodersen, Assistant Planner; Meghan Engberg, Permit Technician, and Pat Dowse; City Engineer.

Legal notice of the public meeting and hearing were posted, distributed and published according to Nebraska law. Notice was simultaneously given to all members of the Planning Commission. All proceedings shown were taken while the convened meeting was open to the attendance of the public via teleconference. Governor Pete Ricketts issued Executive Order No. 20-03 – Coronavirus – public meeting requirement limited waiver. Such order allowed for the governing body to meet by telephone and video conferencing. Notice of the phone number was given to the public through the City of La Vista website and through social media and was posted at the entrance of the meeting facility.

#### **1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Wetuski at 6:30 p.m. Copies of the agenda and staff reports were made available to the public.

#### **2. Approval of Meeting Minutes – May 21, 2020**

*Malmquist* moved, seconded by *Alexander*, to approve the May 21<sup>st</sup> minutes. **Ayes: Krzywicki, Gahan, Wetuski, Alexander, Coghlan, and Malmquist. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Circo, Sargus, Dale, and Frey. Motion Carried, (6-0)**

#### **3. Old Business**

***None.***

#### **4. New Business**

##### **A. Planned Unit Development – Lot 2 Southport East Replat Two – CPM-SFI Southport, LLC**

- i. **Staff Report – Cale Brodersen:** Brodersen stated that the applicant, CPM-SFI Southport LLC, is looking for an amendment to an existing Planned Unit Development Site Plan for Lot 2 Southport East Replat Two, which is located southeast of the intersection of Giles Road and Southport Parkway. Brodersen said that this site plan contains two buildings, which would include a fast food restaurant with a drive-thru and a sit-down restaurant with a drive-thru. He mentioned that initial Planned Unit Development Ordinance was approved in December of 2005 and was then amended

in November of 2016, but the development proposal has since changed, which is why they are meeting on the proposed amendment now. Brodersen said that when Staff initially received this site plan, one of their concerns regarded the traffic and the potential stacking of cars in the drive-thru for the proposed fast food restaurant onto Southport Parkway, but the applicant worked with them pretty extensively to produce an alternative site plan which allows for more stacking length. The applicant also submitted a traffic queuing analysis which demonstrated that the site plan as proposed can adequately accommodate the traffic that will be generated from the proposed uses. Brodersen said that the applicant also worked with them to improve the pedestrian connections on the site, so that pedestrians moving around the lot or to the lot from surrounding developments can move safely. Staff recommends approval of the Planned Unit Development Site Plan Amendment for Lot 2 Southport East Replat Two, as the request is consistent with La Vista's Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

- ii. **Applicant Presentation-** Philip Niewohner from Olsson, spoke on behalf of the applicant. He said that they are looking for approval on the amendment to the PUD, which is an update to the amendment done in 2016, so that they may be able to put in a fast food restaurant with drive thru and to potentially, in the future, put in a sit down restaurant as well. He then invited the commission and public to ask any questions they may have.

Fountain added that the City Engineer did review the traffic queuing study and is also available to answer questions.

Krzywicki asked how many cars can stack before it would back up to the Southport Parkway entrance.

Niewohner said that they were looking at it in terms of how far it would stack into the parking lot with respect to the adjacent hotel parking. He said that length is 8 cars and in order for it to stack onto Southport Parkway, it would be another 5 cars.

Krzywicki asked if they would have 2 different directions that cars would be pulling into the queue from.

Niewohner confirmed that vehicles could enter the drive-thru from two different directions, based on how they enter the site.

Krzywicki asked for clarification on the stacking amounts.

Niewohner said that from the drive-thru window to the edge of curb of the actual drive-thru itself would be 8. The stacking amount from Southport Parkway to the drive-thru entrance would be an additional 5 cars.

Krzywicki asked what the turning radius is coming off Southport Parkway to make that U-turn to drive into that stacking.

Niewohner said that the radius is 14' and that they did look at what the minimum U-turn radius was and did turn that into the City staff to show them that it was possible.

Krzywicki said that he used to work for a place that looked at the turning radius and said that pickup trucks usually require about a 42' turning radius to be able to make a clean turn and asked if a full-size pickup would be able to make a clean turn in there.

Niewohner said that he believed so and that they use a typical car length, which has an inner radius of about 30'.

Krzywicki said that in this part of the country there are a lot of pickups and that he is a little concerned about that not being a wide enough radius to accommodate the trucks.

Krzywicki asked if there are already 6 or 7 cars backed up to southeast using the longer stacking, would it block cars if there is a pickup truck coming in from Southport and would it prevent them from going around and coming in from the other direction.

Niewohner said that he doesn't believe that it would. He mentioned that there would be 2 or 3 different routes to help maneuver vehicles through the site. He said that if they absolutely had to, they would have the ability to swing out a little wider to make the turning radius.

Krzywicki said that he did read some things in the Staff Report about there being cross parking agreements on adjacent parking lots and asked for confirmation on this being correct.

Niewohner said that is correct.

Krzywicki asked if that meant they would be able to drive across the hotel's lot to come around the other side.

Niewohner said that is correct.

**iii. Public Hearing- Wetuski opened the public hearing.**

Andrew Willis spoke on behalf of the hotel owner, Southport Lodging, LLC. He said that the owners have some pretty significant concerns about this site plan, mainly the traffic and parking issues, some of which had already been discussed. He said that this all stems from the Cross Easement and Use Restriction Agreement from 2016 and that there is some shared parking and shared drives across these 2 lots. He said that one of the issues with the parking specifically, is that this site plan has only 119 stalls and shared parking and that the site plan would remove some of those shared stalls and the hotel relies on them. Willis said that the hotel is concerned that there will now only be 80 parking stalls and potentially 2 drive-thru restaurants which

will increase the traffic significantly. He said that part of the hotel's concern is the additional traffic coming through the hotel parking lot while people are trying to unload/load their cars. Willis said that the cross-easement agreement essentially said that the hotel has approved the site plan that was attached to that cross easement or anything substantially the same, but otherwise, the developer of this lot needs to get the hotel owner's written approval. He said that this plan is substantially different than what was set forth in that agreement. He then noted that the 2016 amendment to the PUD where the site plan was approved, that there was originally a drive-thru coffee shop that was planned for that site and they took that out because of concerns with that drive-thru. He said that hotel really sees how this will have a substantial detrimental effect and that they can't handle that additional traffic.

Jamie Saldi spoke on behalf of the applicant and in response to Willis. He said that they have been part of the development team since 2016. He said that their site plan has changed a little bit, however, working through this site plan with the City, they feel like it's a good site plan, but they completely understand the hotel's concerns. He said that the hotel has been looking over the site plan the last couple of weeks, and they really haven't had the chance to effectively sit down and go over the whole thing up until today's meeting. Saldi said that they did send them the site plan and the traffic study and were looking for some more dialogue in the next couple of weeks.

Willis said that the hotel owners would like to see something built there and would like to sit down and discuss it. He said that the timing just hasn't worked out and when the hotel saw the plan, they were able to really see that it was much different than what was originally planned. He said that the hope is that they can sit down with the developer and come up with something that works for everyone.

Saldi agreed and said that they would be willing to do that.

**Wetuski closed the Public Hearing.**

- iv. **Recommendation: Krzywicki moved, seconded by Gahan, to recommend tabling this agenda item until the July 16<sup>th</sup> meeting to allow time for the developer and hotel ownership to meet and resolve the issues. Ayes: Krzywicki, Gahan, Wetuski, Alexander and Malmquist. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Circo, Sargus, Dale, and Frey. Motion Carried, (6-0)**

**B. Zoning Ordinance Amendment – Sections 2.20, 7.01, and 7.03 (Signs)**

- i. **Staff Report – Cale Brodersen:** Brodersen stated that staff are proposing some changes to the Zoning Ordinance regarding signage, specifically sections 2.20, 7.01, and 7.03. He said that there a couple of different things compiled into these proposed changes. The first is that there are currently 3 different sign types that are not allowed in the La Vista Zoning Ordinance that have been proposed and that staff feel, after doing research, are appropriate in certain circumstances in La Vista. These

include; roof signs, blade signs, and marquee signs. These changes introduce the circumstances for the use of the 3 new sign types in the Mixed-Use City Centre District. Brodersen said that there are some other changes that clean up and provide clarification to some existing sign types. The last major change exempts public school facilities from the signage requirements. He said that this is done by other communities in Nebraska, and that La Vista already exempts their public facilities, but schools do not currently fall under the Zoning Ordinance's definition of public facilities. This amendment would allow public schools to be included in this exemption, and utilize some signs that are currently unavailable to them due to their common placement in residential districts. Staff recommends approval of the proposed zoning text amendment.

- ii. **Public Hearing: Wetuski opened the public hearing.**

**Wetuski closed the public hearing as no members of the public came forward.**

- iii. **Recommendation: Krzywicki moved, seconded by Coghlann, to recommend approval of the proposed zoning text amendment. Ayes: Krzywicki, Gahan, Wetuski, and Alexander. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Circo, Sargus, Dale, Malmquist, and Frey. Motion Carried, (5-0)**

## **5. Comments from the Floor**

No members of the public were present.

## **6. Comments from the Planning Commission**

None.

## **7. Comments from the Staff**

Brodersen said that this will be the last digital Planning Commission meeting as we are now required by statute to go back to in person meetings so they're more accessible to the public. He said that we will follow council's lead and have set up chambers in the gym in the community center. Brodersen said that the commissioners and members of the public will be spaced at least 6 feet apart. Everyone is encouraged to wear a mask. He said that there will be more information coming and that we will be meeting in person for the July 16<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Brodersen said that at the August 6<sup>th</sup> meeting, we will be presenting on the CIP and related projects.

Fountain said that they will encourage the public and commission to wear masks to the July 16<sup>th</sup> meeting, but will not be requiring them. He said that we will have them available to anyone who wants one.

**8. Adjournment**

Wetuski adjourned the meeting at 7:03 p.m.

Reviewed by Planning Commission:

---

Planning Commission Secretary

---

Planning Commission Chair

---

Date