

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING

URBANA PLAN COMMISSION

APPROVED

DATE: May 19, 2016

TIME: 7:30 P.M.

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Barry Ackerson, Andrew Fell, Tyler Fitch, Lew Hopkins, Dannie Otto, Christopher Stohr, David Trail, Daniel Turner

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Maria Byndom

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Alea Agrawal, Bette Anderson, Thomas Baker, Clare Barkley, Trevor Birkenholtz, Tad Boehmer, Liz Cardman, Ralph Dady, Sean Dady, Charles Davies, Paul Debevec, Megan Dietrich, Russell Dietrich, Beverly Fagan, Karen Fresco, Charlotte Hall, Colette Hamann, Rhett Hasty, Paul Hixson, Max Kanerum, Jo Kibbee, Youngjin Kim, Ed Maclin, Mary McGuire, Becky Mead, Greg Millage, Mrs. Pierre Moulin, Alice Novak, Elizabeth Ohr, Peggy Patten, Karen Perrine, Elizabeth Plewa, Diane Plewa, Michael Plewa, Lori Raetzman, Mario Vailati Riboni, Jacqueline Rickman, Ruth Ross, Steve Ross, Erik Sacks, Steven Scher, Dorothee Schneider, Leslie Sherman, Stephanie Sofinski, James Stori, Adrienne Strohm, Jessie Wang, Karl Weingartner, Liesel Wildhagen, Maryalice Wu

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

Chair Fitch called the meeting to order at 7:31 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 5, 2016 Regular Meeting were presented for approval.

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

4. COMMUNICATIONS

Correspondence regarding Plan Case Nos. 2276-PUD-16 and 2277-PUD-16 received from the following as of 05-19-2016 at 5 p.m.

- Deborah Allen and Howard Schein *email*
- Maria and Ryan Bailey *email*
- Trevor Birkenholtz *email*
- Steve Clough *email*
- Lynn Coulston *email*
- Ralph Dady *email*
- Casey Diana *email*
- Beverly Fagan *email*
- Beverly Fagan *email*
- Beverly Fagan *email*
- Beverly Fagan *image email*
- Karen and Alain Fresco *email*
- Edwin and Elizabeth Goldwasser *email*
- C. K. Gunsalus and Michael Walker *letter*
- Katie Hunter *email*
- Deborah Katz-Downie *email*
- Robert Krumm and Jennifer Hines *email*
- Louise and T.J. Kuhny *email*
- Ed Maclin and Beth Darling *email*
- Stuart Martin *email*
- Wendy Mathewson and Casey Smith *email*
- Mary Pat McGuire *email*
- Pierre Moulin and Marie-Pierre Lassiva-Moulin *email*
- George Ordal *email*
- Esther Patt *email*
- Peggy Patten and Todd Kinney *email*
- Michael Plewa, Elizabeth D. Wagner Plewa, Rhett Hasty, Diane Plewa, Pierre Moulin, Marie-Pierre Lassiva-Moulin *email*
- Ann Reisner and Richard Brazee *email*
- Andrew Scheinman *email*
- Evelyn Shapiro *email*
- Leslie Sherman *email*
- Lois Steinberg *email*
- James Stori *email*
- Eunice Weech *email*

- Maryalice Wu *email*
- Google Earth photos of the model of the proposed building and elevations illustrations submitted by the applicant
- LaSalle Confronts the PUD handout submitted by Liz Cardman and Paul Debevec

Correspondence regarding Plan Case Nos. 2276-PUD-16 and 2277-PUD-16 received from the following on 05-19-2016 between 5 p.m. and 7 p.m.

- Gwendolyn Derk and Kima Kheiolomoom (*email*)
- Brian Dill (*email*)
- Graham Huesmann (*email*)
- Scott Lux (*email*)
- Martha Wagner Weinberg (*email*)

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 re-opened the public hearings for these two cases together since they pertain to the same properties. Mr. Fell recused himself from the case due to a conflict of interest. He is the architect for the proposed project.

Lorrie Pearson, Planning Manager, presented a brief overview and summary of the project. She began by showing on a map where the four properties were located and mentioned that the properties fall within the Lincoln-Busey Corridor Design Review Overlay District. The proposed project would need to seek additional approval for the design of the project from the Design Review Board, and a meeting is scheduled for June 1, 2016 at 5:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers. She talked about the proposed project noting the size, parking location, materials to be used and a plaza. The applicant has requested five waivers regarding Floor Area Ratio (FAR), building height, open space ratio, the number of required parking spaces and the front yard setbacks along both Lincoln Avenue and Nevada Street. She noted that City staff requested continuing the case to June 9, 2016. The neighborhood responses brought up some issues that would require more time for City staff and the applicant to address.

Mr. Otto asked if the Plan Commission should consider the criteria for the Lincoln-Busey Design Review District. Ms. Pearson explained that the specific guidelines for the Lincoln-Busey Design Review District are in the purview of the Design Review Board. The Plan Commission is responsible for broadly looking at the plans.

Mr. Otto stated that one of the key terms used in the application and in the written staff memo is “flexibility”. He asked for a definition and what the limits are. Ms. Pearson replied that the Zoning Ordinance does not define a minimum or maximum on any of the zoning regulations in terms of what could be requested for flexibility.

Mr. Otto wondered if City staff had any analysis or opinion when looking at the minimum development standards of FAR, building height and open space ratio. Ms. Pearson stated that City staff did not have any analysis of the waivers being requested other than what was provided in the written staff memo.

Chair Fitch reviewed the procedure for conducting public hearings. He opened the hearing up for public input. He invited the applicant to speak about the proposed project.

Adrienne Strohm, representative for the applicant, approached the Plan Commission to speak. She stated that the applicant agrees with the City staff's request for a continuance given the neighborhood's concerns as well as the City staff's comments.

Using Google Earth software, she showed a model of how the proposed building would look in the neighborhood. She pointed out that the new building would be set back farther from Lincoln Avenue than the existing buildings are. She also showed the elevations of the proposed building in comparison to the other buildings along Lincoln Avenue. She noted that the other buildings along Lincoln Avenue are all apartment buildings or fraternities/sororities; none are single-family homes. She mentioned that they would like more time to conduct a survey of the elevations of other buildings in the area. She asked if the Plan Commission had any questions.

Mr. Otto asked what things beyond minimum code requirement the applicant was planning to offer in exchange for the flexibility of the five waivers. Ms. Strohm mentioned the large plaza in the front of the building. They would also provide more bicycle spaces than required as well as setting the building back further from Lincoln Avenue than what the existing buildings are.

Mr. Otto asked if they planned to provide an easement to the City for the plaza. Chair Fitch stated that it is a condition for approval that was recommended by City staff.

Mr. Otto stated that one of the conditions for a Planned Unit Development is to offer a wider variety of housing than what is already available. He asked what the proposed development would offer with regards to this. Ms. Strohm said that the majority of the buildings in the area are group houses. The proposed development would be different in that it would be mostly efficiency and one-bedroom apartments. They would be more professional than other rental properties that offer space for students.

Mr. Otto inquired what the applicant plans to do to go beyond the minimal code requirements with regards to green construction. Ms. Strohm stated that she would need additional time to accurately answer this question. She mentioned that there was a lot of green space along the ground level and they plan to keep the big tree that currently exists on one of the properties. Mr. Otto stated that he would want something more concrete than a plaza in exchange for the five waivers the applicant had requested.

With no further questions for the applicant, Chair Fitch asked if anyone else would like to give input.

Bette Anderson approached the Plan Commission to speak to speak in opposition. Using Exhibit A, she pointed out her home. She had to get permission from her neighbors and the City to put two additions onto her house, and she had to conform to all of the zoning requirements.

She mentioned that the City of Urbana is located on swamp land. As University buildings were constructed along the west side of Lincoln Avenue, flooding began. This year, City staff removed several trees in the area causing more flooding and rats to come out. She has also had to deal with City sewage in her home. No one knows where the underground waterways are located. She expressed concern that the size of the proposed building would create additional issues of flooding, sewage backing up into her home and more rats.

Liz Cardman and Paul Debevec approached the Plan Commission to speak in opposition. They presented a slide show reviewing the following LaSalle criteria:

- 1) LaSalle #1: The existing uses and zoning of nearby properties
- 2) LaSalle #2: The extent to which property values are diminished by the particular zoning restriction
- 3) LaSalle #3: The extent to which public health, safety and welfare are promoted
- 4) LaSalle #4: The relative gain to the public as compared to the hardship imposed upon the individual property owner
- 5) LaSalle #5: The suitability of the subject property for the zoned purpose
- 6) LaSalle #6: The length of time the property has been vacant
- 7) LaSalle #7: The care which a community has undertaken to plan its land use development
- 8) LaSalle #8: The Community need for the use proposed by the applicant

Mr. Debevec quoted the nomination for the American Planning Association (APA) Great Neighborhood Award as follows, “*Making a great neighborhood isn’t magic but, as West Urbana shows, it takes a community where residents are involved with their neighborhood and plan for its future.*” He stated that the proposed PUD would be detrimental to this goal and they asked that the Plan Commission deny the application.

Maryalice Wu approached the Plan Commission to speak. She pointed out that she owns and resides in the only single-family residence on the block. She expressed her objection to the proposed PUD development stating that it does not meet any of the conditions for being a public interest and does not even come close to conforming to the 2005 Comprehensive Plan for the Lincoln-Busey corridor. It only serves the financial interest of the developer. The proposed development is a strong threat to the quality and stability of the neighborhood.

Regarding the Lincoln-Busey corridor, City documents state the following: “*Preserve the uses as they now exist while precluding further encroachment of higher density buildings into this unique residential area.*” She mentioned that none of the buildings on the west side of Lincoln Avenue should be used to compare the proposed development to existing buildings in the neighborhood.

Her specific objections to the proposed development are as follows:

- 1) The proposed mega development would be completely out of character with the neighborhood.

- 2) The five-story mega structure would bring permanent shade on many of the surrounding houses.
- 3) There is no precedent for any such mega development in this historic neighborhood.
- 4) There would be a perverse incentive for owners of rental houses to neglect them in the hope of having their properties purchased by developers with deep pockets.
- 5) Density and congestion in the neighborhood would get out of hand.
- 6) The values of single-family homes would continue to decrease.

She summarized by saying that the residents in the neighborhood strongly believe in a development that would fit into the neighborhood. The State Street area has been recognized nationwide as an exemplary neighborhood by the APA, and the University of Illinois is a leader in the area of sustainable development. It would be a travesty to allow the construction of a five-story mega complex.

Charlotte Hall approached the Plan Commission to speak in opposition. She mentioned that she is a landlord and receives many calls from perspective tenants who want to live in this area because of its particular character. It is a calm, quiet area close to the University of Illinois. She believed that allowing a building of the proposed size would change that character, and she does not want to see the character of the neighborhood changed.

Steve Scher approached the Plan Commission to express his objections to the proposed PUD development. He is concerned about the height of the proposed new building, and after hearing the applicant's presentation, he is now worried about the mass of the building as well.

When he looks at Exhibit A, he sees many single-family homes, especially on the north side of Nevada Street. He agreed with Ms. Wu in that the University buildings to the west should not be allowed in the comparison values. He added that parking is an issue and most grad students own cars. He ended by saying that it is not the responsibility of the City or the neighborhood to make exception to a developer for making bad business decisions. People should know what the zoning limitations are when they buy properties.

Michael Plewa approached the Plan Commission to speak in opposition. He read three excerpts from the 2005 Comprehensive Plan. For West Urbana, it says the following:

- 1) *"To preserve the existing zoning protections"*
- 2) *"New development to respect traditional physical development patterns"*
- 3) *"To preserve these uses as they now exist while precluding further encroachment of higher density buildings into this unique residential area"*

This is a unique residential area that received an APA award in 2007. The proposed PUD development will change the character of the neighborhood.

He expressed his concern about the use of the proposed plaza. A plaza would not be a gift to the City. This is the worst insult he had experienced during his entire time of living in the City of Urbana.

James Stori approached the Plan Commission to speak. He argued against a statement in the written staff report that states, "*The application is generally consistent with the goals, objectives and future land use in the 2005 Comprehensive Plan.*" This is blatantly untrue. As Mr. Plewa cited three excerpts from the 2005 Comprehensive Plan, there is no justification for a PUD that violates the Comprehensive Plan, City staff should not be supporting the proposed PUD in this neighborhood and the neighborhood should not have to come to City officials to argue about it over and over again.

Mary Pat McGuire approached the Plan Commission. She summarized the email that she had submitted and was made part of the packet of Communications that was handed out prior to the start of the meeting.

Thomas Baker approached the Plan Commission to speak in opposition. He expressed concern about the safety of pedestrians crossing at Nevada Street and Lincoln Avenue. If the proposed application is approved, then there would be many more people crossing at this intersection.

If the proposed application is approved, he asked when the project would commence. He has a legal lease from September, 2016 to July, 2017 for 809 West Nevada Street.

Steve Ross approached the Plan Commission to speak in opposition. He mentioned that his family, grandparents and parents, have owned the house at 805 South Busey Avenue for about 75 years. The house directly abuts the property at 806 South Lincoln Avenue.

While they appreciate the fact that the architect reduced the rear-yard setback from the required 7 feet to 24 feet and designed the southeast end of the proposed building to have cut outs that reduce the mass, they would rather see a by right 35-foot tall building located at a by right 7-foot distance from the property line.

Just because the developer is planning to spend \$12 million dollars on the proposed project, the Plan Commission is not obligated in any way to approve a project with these specific waivers. He read the goals from Section XIII.3.C of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance, which states, "*To coordinate architectural styles, building forms and building relationships within the development and the surrounding neighborhood*" and "*To promote infill development in a manner consistent with the surrounding area*". In the application, the applicant frequently compares the project to the buildings to the west across Lincoln Avenue and not to the buildings directly to the east. Unfortunately for the neighbors the project is not being proposed across Lincoln Avenue. A smaller building would still add a substantial amount to the property tax income for the City without robbing adjacent properties of their value.

Paul Hixson approached the Plan Commission to speak in opposition. He stated that it is important for the City of Urbana to honor its commitment to the West Urbana neighborhood through the Lincoln-Busey Corridor Design Review District, the Downtown to Campus Plan, and the 2005 Comprehensive Plan.

He mentioned that he walks every day in the neighborhood. When he heard about the proposed project he began circling the block to get a feel for the effect the proposed development would have on the neighborhood. If you start at the block where the Twin City Bible Church is located

and walk north past some sororities, some attractive three story apartment buildings, and then there would be a very long, very tall, out-of-scale building.

The proposed project is putting the West Urbana neighborhood at a tipping point. The quality of life will seriously be affected all the way to Race Street if the project is approved as currently proposed. If the project would be scaled back to meet the requirements of the three documents mentioned before, then it might be compatible with the neighborhood.

Mario Vailati Riboni approached the Plan Commission to speak in opposition. He resides at 807 West Nevada Street. He expressed concern about the shade that the proposed building would provide over the Gamma Alpha Society house. He and the other residents in the house have put in many hours making improvements to the house they reside in and feel it would be negatively impacted by the size of the proposed development.

Russell Dietrich approached the Plan Commission to speak in opposition. He and his wife chose to live in Urbana because they do not want to live in the City of Champaign. He recommended that if the applicant wants to construct a building similar to those in Champaign, then he should build it in the City of Champaign, not in Urbana. He also recommended restoration over demolition, because the existing buildings are beautiful.

Diane Plewa approached the Plan Commission to speak. She has lived in Urbana for 30 years and recently purchased a house with her husband in the West Urbana neighborhood. It is a diverse neighborhood and can be difficult to accommodate everyone. There are families with young children, retirees, college students, etc. One reason the City has a Zoning Ordinance is to serve the best interest of the neighborhoods. She does not see the proposed building serving the greater neighborhood. Therefore, she is opposed to the PUD application.

She pointed out that on the model the applicant's representative presented earlier in the meeting the proposed building is by far the largest building on the model. It is substantially larger, so she doesn't understand how the applicant thinks the building would fit right into the neighborhood.

She mentioned that she lives on a block with three frat houses and sororities and many group houses. Every year the students switch out...sometimes there are polite, respectful and considerate groups of students and sometimes there are not. Even when the really good groups live in the group houses, the noise and parking issues increase. While some surveys may show that there is a reduction in the number of students asking for parking permits, when students are in town, there are no parking spaces left on her street.

Colette Hamann approached the Plan Commission to speak in opposition. She mentioned that she lives at 804 South Lincoln Avenue. She loves living there with her roommates. They recently broke into the attic and discovered that there could easily be two or three more bedrooms located there. There is enough room for three more bedrooms in the basement as well. If the applicant could just restore the house and make use of the attic and the basement for additional bedrooms, he could make more money. Please do not demolish her home.

Ralph Dady approached the Plan Commission to speak. He stated that he likes being a resident of the West Urbana neighborhood. It is a unique community and has been recognized as such due to

its character, the housing and the opportunity that West Urbana offers. He expressed concern that the proposed PUD would present a significant change and would set a precedent.

Once the City sets a precedent for large scale buildings, he believed that other developers would attempt to exceed or meet the size of the proposed building. This goes against the Comprehensive Plan.

He also expressed concerns about safety (particularly for pedestrians and bicyclists), water drainage, traffic increase, additional parking issues and the impact on surrounding property values. He believed that most people who live in the West Urbana neighborhood do not want to see it change.

Trevor Birkenholtz approached the Plan Commission to speak in opposition. He agreed with the comments that his neighbors and friends had already made. He added that the rules and regulations have been put into place for particular reasons. He stated he would like to hear from Mr. Fell directly why as someone who has been charged as a member of the Plan Commission to uphold the rules and regulations has designed a building that is in complete violation of them. So, rather than recusing himself from this process, he would like for Mr. Fell to address the neighbors personally or release all communication that he has had with the other members of the Plan Commission and with the developer on these properties.

Chair Fitch responded that because Mr. Fell is both the architect for this case and serves on the Plan Commission, he had to recuse himself for having a conflict of interest. Therefore, he cannot comment or address the neighbors. As for any communications to the Plan Commission, there has been none.

Max Kanerum approached the Plan Commission. He mentioned that he lived at 804 South Lincoln Avenue in 2011. The property is unique in fostering community for students. The property is like a brotherhood or sisterhood that has murals inside and is passed like a baton through time. It draws so many unique people and perspectives that would be cutoff or ended if the building is demolished. It serves as a gateway from campus to West Urbana.

Rhett Hasty approached the Plan Commission to speak in opposition. He talked about his personal experience with the West Urbana neighborhood. He asked that the Plan Commission not allow the proposed PUD.

With no further comments in opposition, Chair Fitch asked the petitioner to approach the Plan Commission.

Chris Saunders, of Green Street Realty, approached the Plan Commission to answer any additional questions.

Mr. Fitch asked if there was a timeline for the project if it is approved. Mr. Saunders replied that their leases with current residents end in August, so they would not demolish the buildings until then. The architect still needs to design the entire building. They have only submitted schematics, floor plans and renderings at this point. He planned to have the project completed in the Fall of 2017.

Mr. Otto asked what he planned to offer in exchange for flexibility with granting waivers. Mr. Saunders replied that there are a lot of energy codes that they will need to follow with new construction to even meet the standards. Windows and insulation are required to be very efficient. Also, they plan to enclose all of the parking underground, which is not a requirement. The requirements for a planned unit development require more than the Zoning Ordinance itself.

They planned to build a community plaza and the project would provide a substantial tax benefit to the City equivalent to the building of 50 homes worth \$200,000. The City offers free tax money to any developer who builds within the Enterprise Zone. He could get a tax break for up to five years on four lots, and he is not asking for that. Building a project that would bring about \$160,000 into the community every year is giving something back to the community.

Chair Fitch asked if the Plan Commission had any further questions for the petitioner. There were none. He, then, closed the public input portion of the hearing. He stated that the case would be continued to June 9th, and he would reopen the public input portion at that time. He asked if the Plan Commission members had any additional questions for City staff.

Mr. Otto wondered why the project requires a PUD other than because it meets the minimal requirement of being on half an acre. It appears that the applicant wants to build a project that he would be allowed to build by right if the properties were rezoned to B-3, General Business, or B-4, Central Business, which he did not foresee being approved. Therefore, he did not see anything with this project other than an attempt to circumvent the zoning. Ms. Pearson replied that this is the application that City staff received. After reviewing that application, City staff felt that it is generally consistent with the 2005 Comprehensive Plan in some ways. However, the written staff memo states that there are some areas where additional information and analysis is needed such as the FAR, etc.

Mr. Otto questioned if City staff had inquired about plans for energy efficiency and other things that are required for a PUD. He wanted to know where the plus was that wasn't required other than the community plaza. Ms. Pearson stated that she did not have any information with regards to green building. In terms of the benefits, City staff has not completed their analysis. Perhaps some of the additional information that they requested will allow staff to do that. Elizabeth Tyler, Director of Community Development Services, added that there are many options in doing a PUD. It is not the City staff's job to design a project. City staff provided the entire Ordinance, talked about the PUD and provided the amount of analysis that they could.

She pointed out that with the exception of one of the proposed parcels, the others were shown as "*High Density Residential*" in the 2005 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map. For the Plan Commission's analysis, it would be appropriate to consider what is "*high density residential*" in terms of the 2005 Comprehensive Plan.

When the City staff revised the PUD Ordinance years back, they wanted to find a way to promote innovative solutions to challenging situations. So, they included a lot of goals. She felt that more work needed to be done to show how the proposed PUD may or may not conform to those goals.

There are two processes that need to happen. The Design Review Board will review the design of the proposed building and the Plan Commission reviews the bigger picture. City staff felt it

would be better to begin with the Plan Commission's review before taking it to the Design Review Board.

Mr. Otto questioned what problems there would be with the proposed properties in upzoning them all to R-5, Medium High Density Multiple Family Residential. By rezoning and constructing an R-5 project, many of the neighborhood's concerns would dissipate. Ms. Tyler reiterated that the inset on the Future Land Use Map #8 states what the vision is for this particular area, which is "*High Density Residential*". The City of Urbana's medium-high density zoning districts are very different from the City of Champaign's and from what is allowed in the B-3U, General Business-University, and the CCD, Campus Commercial District. The R-5 Zoning District is very limited in height and FAR in particular.

Mr. Otto asked if the density was defined by the R-5 Zoning District. Ms. Tyler replied that the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning District designations are not equivalent. The Comprehensive Plan designations are broader and are for the long term. However, zoning is what the law is. Planning as in the Comprehensive Plan is what the vision or future is. So, the difficult task for the Plan Commission is to think through what the vision is in terms of high density residential and then to study the PUD like they have been doing and ask if the project meets the criteria, if there are conditions that could be offered, or is there a different approach.

Mr. Stohr inquired if there had been any discussion between City staff and the developer regarding stormwater detention. Ms. Pearson referred to Page 7 of Exhibit F, which is the Impervious Area Plan. The City does not require specific plans at this point in the project.

Mr. Hopkins stated that the issue of whether they want to proceed with a PUD should be separated from what they want to achieve. There are advantages to the City and to the Plan Commission for having a PUD. A PUD allows them to have a lot of discretion to negotiate with the developer about how to use a set of four or five lots. If we drive the developer away from a PUD, then we are left with a development by right, which is not inherently better than what they can work out over collaboration on a PUD.

He continued by saying that he could not see himself approving a PUD designation for the proposed project as it currently exists. He used the Windsor Swim Club as an example of how collaborating on a project ended with a good proposal. Therefore, he proposed that they keep the PUD process open and give some strong feedback.

His feedback was that the current height, the current mass and possibly the current density do not work on the proposed site. He also agreed that plaza as a function doesn't work for this place. With regards to parking, R-5 would allow the developer to construct the building on stilts above the ground level parking. Underground parking is extremely expensive to construct, and it would not happen in the R-5 Zoning District by right; however if the City wants underground parking, then we might be able to get it through a PUD negotiation.

He felt that the Plan Commission should continue the cases, but not to simply allow further analysis by City staff. He believed they needed redesign and feedback. Mr. Fitch agreed. He could not support the proposed PUD because the building would be too big. A nice building with reasonable features could be a tremendous addition to the neighborhood.

Mr. Trail stated that there is always an increasing demand for places for students to live close to universities. He believed that Urbana needed to get denser, but it is the “how” we get denser that is the big issue. There are some good aspects to the proposed PUD, and there are some not so good. This is a prime location to increase the density. If you live next to a university and try to block new development, it only means that people will start looking further out, which will increase the number of people driving.

Mr. Otto reminded the Plan Commission that there is another body that would review designs of the project such as a building on stilts. He reviewed the requirements for a PUD. He stated that the proposed project appears to be a building that would be allowed in a B-3, General Business Zoning District.

Mr. Stohr stated that he would like to see more green building information. He is also concerned about the traffic and pedestrian crossing.

Ms. Pearson stated that if there are specific suggestions or questions, the Plan Commission could address them to her and she will forward them to the developer. Chair Fitch reminded the members to email Lorrie directly and not include other members in the email so as not to violate the Open Meetings Act.

Mr. Otto stated that to get his support the project would need to be consistent with the R-5 Zoning District and follow the guidelines of the Lincoln-Busey Design Review District.

Mr. Hopkins moved that the Plan Commission continue these cases to the June 9, 2016 regular meeting with an expectation that the cases may be continued beyond that because the proposal may be altered. Mr. Otto seconded the motion. Roll call on the motion was as follows:

Mr. Ackerson	-	Yes	Mr. Fitch	-	Yes
Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes	Mr. Otto	-	Yes
Mr. Stohr	-	Yes	Mr. Trail	-	Yes
Mr. Turner	-	Yes			

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

6. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

7. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

8. NEW BUSINESS

There was none.

9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There were none.

10. STAFF REPORT

Ms. Pearson reported on the following:

- Rezoning of 805 North Lincoln Avenue was considered and denied by City Council as recommended by the Plan Commission.

11. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 9:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lorrie Pearson, Secretary
Urbana Plan Commission