

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING

URBANA PLAN COMMISSION

APPROVED

DATE: June 9, 2016

TIME: 7:30 P.M.

PLACE: Urbana City Building
Council Chambers
400 South Vine Street
Urbana, IL 61801

MEMBERS PRESENT: Barry Ackerson, Maria Byndom, Andrew Fell, Tyler Fitch, Christopher Stohr, David Trail, Daniel Turner

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Lew Hopkins, Dannie Otto

STAFF PRESENT: Lorrie Pearson, Planning Manager; Christopher Marx, Planner I; Teri Andel, Administrative Assistant II

OTHERS PRESENT: Alea Agrawal, Bette Anderson, Liz Cardman, Paul Debevec, Linda Lorenz, Diane Plewa, Mario Vailati Riboni, Adrienne Strohm, Jack Voltz

1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL AND DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Chair Fitch called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. Roll call was taken and there was a quorum present.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

There were none.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the May 19, 2016 regular meeting were presented for approval.

Mr. Turner moved to approve the minutes as presented. Mr. Trail seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

Regarding Plan Case Nos. 2276-PUD-16 and 2277-PUD-16

- ❖ Email received from Mary Pat McGuire and Richard Nelson/Pierre Moulin and Marie-Pierre Lassiva-Moulin/Maryalice Wu
- ❖ Email requests from the following people to add their names to the email above:
 - ❖ Deborah Allen and Howard Schein
 - ❖ Andrew Alleyne
 - ❖ Amy and Matthew Ando
 - ❖ Sara Bartumeus and Victor Font
 - ❖ Daniel and Deborah Bodony
 - ❖ Willard and Anne Broom
 - ❖ Richard and Jayne Burkhardt
 - ❖ Tamara Chaplin
 - ❖ Peter and Lynn Coulston
 - ❖ Copenhaver Cumpston
 - ❖ Gwendolyn Derk and Kima Kheiolomoom
 - ❖ Aaron Ebata and Carolyn Butterfield
 - ❖ Angie Estes
 - ❖ Bev and Peter Fagan
 - ❖ Tom Faux and Robin Kearton
 - ❖ Karen and Alain Fresco
 - ❖ Mark and Susan Frobish AND Rose Grobstein
 - ❖ Gary Gladding and Victoria Christensen
 - ❖ Edwin (Ned) and Elizabeth (Liza) Goldwasser
 - ❖ Arlynn Gottlieb and Ron Rothschild
 - ❖ Tina Gunsalus and Michael Walker
 - ❖ Theresa Herman and George Uricoechea
 - ❖ Kristy Higgs and Bill Mermelstein
 - ❖ Laura and John Hill
 - ❖ Graham Huesmann
 - ❖ Kate Hunter and Jens Sandberger
 - ❖ Deborah S. Katz-Downie and Stephen R. Downie
 - ❖ Sylvie Khan
 - ❖ Diane P. Koenker
 - ❖ P. A., Kyle J. and F. B. Kroha
 - ❖ Louise and T. J. Kuhny
 - ❖ Harry Liebersohn and Dorothee Schneider
 - ❖ Ed and Beth Maclin
 - ❖ Stuart Martin and Sally Duncan
 - ❖ Sarah McEvoy and Huseyin Sehitoglu
 - ❖ K. S. McKinn
 - ❖ Becky Mead and Tim Stelzer
 - ❖ Dan and Crystal Newman
 - ❖ Jean Paley
 - ❖ Stephen and Catherin Parente

- ❖ Peggy Patten and Todd Kinney
- ❖ Michael Plewa and Elizabeth Wagner Plewa
- ❖ John Polk and Rebecca Stumpf
- ❖ Lori Raetzman and Charles Davies
- ❖ Bruce Reznick and Robin Sahner
- ❖ Bruce and Hiroko Schatz
- ❖ David Scherba and Rebecca Swartz
- ❖ Leslie Sherman
- ❖ Lois Steinberg
- ❖ Rebecca Stumpf
- ❖ Steve and Stephanie Sutton
- ❖ Leon and Alice Waldoff
- ❖ Ruth Wyman and Juan Alvarez
- ❖ Email received from Casey Diana and Ralph L. Langenheim
- ❖ Email received from Karl Weingartner
- ❖ Letter of Withdrawal submitted by Chris Saunders

Regarding Plan Case No. 2279-SU-16

- ❖ Letter from Michael F. Plahonvinsak, P.E., Updated Site Plan and a Survey

Other Communications Received

- ❖ Letter from Berns, Clancy and Associates submitted by Bette Anderson

5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

Plan Case Nos. 2276-PUD-16 and 2277-PUD-16 – A request by Andrew Fell on behalf of Vision Housing, LLC for preliminary and final approval of a Residential Planned Unit Development at 802, 804 and 806 South Lincoln Avenue AND 809 West Nevada Street in the R-4, Medium Density Multiple Family Residential, and R-5, Medium High Density Multiple Family Residential Zoning Districts.

Chair Fitch announced that the applicant, Chris Saunders, submitted a letter stating that his requests for a preliminary and a final Planned Unit Development had been withdrawn. The letter of withdrawal is listed under Communications.

6. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

7. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

Plan Case No. 2279-SU-16 – A request by Insite RE, Inc. on behalf of PI Tower Development, LLC for a Special Use Permit to construct a 90-foot monopole telecommunications tower with antennas and a telecommunications equipment enclosure at 2000 North Cunningham Avenue.

Chair Fitch opened this item on the agenda. Christopher Marx, Planner I, presented this case to the Plan Commission. He began by noting the handouts that were passed out prior to the start of the meeting and listed under Communications in these minutes. He stated the purpose for the proposed special use permit request and described the proposed site noting the zoning, current land use and future land use as well as for surrounding adjacent properties. He discussed the zoning requirements related directly to telecommunications towers under Section XIII-1 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance. These requirements were regarding the following: 1) Maximum Height and Minimum Setback; 2) Tower Separation Distance; 3) Colocation; 4) Aesthetics; 5) Landscaping; 6) Security Fencing; and 7) Lighting. He reviewed the requirements for approval of a special use permit according to Section VII-4 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance. He presented City staff's recommendation for approval including five conditions and introduced the applicant.

Chair Fitch reminded the Plan Commission members that municipalities can regulate the location of cell towers; however, they are precluded by federal law from considering the effects of microwave transmissions.

With no questions for City staff, Chair Fitch opened the hearing for public input.

Jack Voltz, applicant on behalf of PI Tower or Parallel Infrastructure (PI) and Verizon Wireless, approached the Plan Commission to speak. He mentioned that Verizon Wireless would be the anchor carrier and would have antennas to the centerline of the 90-foot monopole. Using Exhibit G, he talked about the cellular coverage area. Exhibit H identifies problems with collocating additional Verizon antennas on existing cell tower facilities. He explained details of the site elevation and pointed out that the tower is designed to accommodate three additional carriers. With regards to the conditions recommended by City staff, he had already spoken with PI and they agree to submit landscaping and paving plans when they file for a Building Permit. He stated that he would answer any questions.

Mr. Trail asked if Verizon performed the testing. Mr. Voltz replied yes. Exhibit G only shows existing towers that have Verizon antennas collocated on them.

Mr. Trail inquired if there were other towers in the area. Mr. Voltz said that there were 15 towers in total, three of which currently have Verizon antennas.

Mr. Trail asked what frequency they would use. Mr. Voltz answered PCS, AWS, and LTE.

Mr. Trail wondered about building penetration. Mr. Voltz replied that none of these frequencies would penetrate.

Mr. Trail inquired if any other carriers were interested in collocating on the proposed tower. Mr. Voltz stated that they have not advertised to see if any additional carriers are interested at this point. They want to secure the approval of constructing a tower first. Mr. Trail expressed concern that this would only end up being a tower for Verizon antennas.

Mr. Trail asked if they proposed tower would carry any older frequencies. Mr. Voltz replied that he did not know. He could only answer questions about the plans that were submitted.

Mr. Fell asked for clarification about the lease area. Mr. Voltz explained that Parallel would own the tower and would lease out areas to the carriers including Verizon. Carriers generally do not own cell towers. So, Parallel is leasing a 60' x 60' area from a land owner. Verizon intends to lease an area of 20' x 36' from Parallel for their generator and steel platform upon which their equipment cabinets would be located.

Mr. Fell questioned the engineering of the top 30 feet of the tower if it should fall. Mr. Voltz explained that the monopoles are designed to collapse upon themselves in the event of a severe wind event. There is a 30' fall zone radius, so if the entire pole should fall, it would fall within the leased area.

Mr. Stohr questioned how deep the foundation would be for the tower. Mr. Voltz replied that the foundation would be at least 30 feet.

Mr. Fitch inquired what the requirements would be for removing the foundations if the tower needed to be torn down. Mr. Voltz stated that from his experience, in the lease agreements, sometimes there are clauses that would require a tower company to remove five to eight feet below grade.

Mr. Fitch questioned whether the applicant intends to remove an existing tree on the proposed site. Mr. Voltz said that they plan to keep the tree in the southeast corner.

Mr. Stohr commented that the proposed tower would be located close to an entrance ramp onto Interstate 74. In the case of a tornado, he asked about the monopole being pulled up out of the ground. Mr. Voltz replied that the foundation would be at least 30 feet into the ground so he believed it would be extremely unlikely for a tornado to rip the tower out of the ground.

Mr. Turner inquired about the lifespan of a cell tower. How long is a typical lease? Mr. Voltz explained that it would be a 30 year lease with 5 years for the initial term and 5 year additional extensions. As for the lifespan, there are cell towers that are almost as old as he is.

Mr. Trail wondered if the tower company had to post a bond to have the tower removed should they go bankrupt. Mr. Marx replied that the Zoning Ordinance requires the tower owner to post a bond equivalent to the cost of demolition or removal.

Mr. Trail stated that he read about an increase in the number of injuries and deaths of people working on these towers. Does a monopole have a better record than other types of towers? Mr. Voltz could not answer because it is out of his purview. He mentioned that the monopole would be constructed following all of OSHA's standards and regulations. Once it is constructed, there would be almost no maintenance except for the addition or removal of antennas.

There was no further input, so Chair Fitch closed the public input portion of the hearing and opened it up for Plan Commission discussion and/or motion(s).

Mr. Trail explained his reasoning for the line of questions he asked. He would have liked to see something that would have looked at all of the towers rather than just this one. He wondered if the City would end up with a lot of towers that would need to be removed.

Mr. Fitch asked City staff how tall street lights and telephone poles along Cunningham Avenue are. Ms. Pearson replied that some of the lights along Lincoln Avenue are in the 40 to 50 foot range, and she believed that the poles along Cunningham Avenue were similar.

Ms. Byndom moved that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case N. 2279-SU-16 to the City Council with a recommendation for approval including the five conditions as suggested by City staff. Mr. Ackerson seconded the motion. Roll call was as follows:

Ms. Byndom	-	Yes	Mr. Fell	-	Yes
Mr. Fitch	-	Yes	Mr. Stohr	-	Yes
Mr. Trail	-	No	Mr. Turner	-	Yes
Mr. Ackerson	-	Yes			

The motion was passed by a vote of 6 to 1. Ms. Pearson noted that this case would be forwarded to City Council on June 20, 2016.

Plan Cases No. 2282-PUD-16 and 2283-PUD-16 – A request by Highland Green, LLC for preliminary and final approval of a residential Planned Unit Development at 401 and 403 East Kerr Avenue.

Chair Fitch announced that these two cases were withdrawn. The proposed development does not require a Planned Unit Development.

8. NEW BUSINESS

There was none.

9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

- ❖ Bette Anderson approached the Plan Commission to speak about large buildings be proposed in the Lincoln-Busey Corridor. She consulted with Don Wauthier at Berns, Clancy and Associates. She mentioned the letter she received from them and had submitted into the Communications for this meeting. The letter confirms her discussions with her father when she was a young child. There are undersized storm and sanitary sewers in the area. There are other issues such as parking in the area as well. She plans to share her findings with the City Council and request that infrastructure be addressed when a future development is proposed.

10. STAFF REPORT

There was none.

11. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 8:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lorrie Pearson, Secretary
Urbana Plan Commission