

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING

URBANA PLAN COMMISSION

APPROVED

DATE: February 18, 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, Lew Hopkins, Dannie Otto, Christopher Stohr, David Trail, Daniel Turner

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Tyler Fitch

STAFF PRESENT: Lorrie Pearson, Planning Manager; Jeff Engstrom, Planner II; Kevin Garcia, Planner II; Christopher Marx, Planner I; Teri Andel, Administrative Assistant II; Brandon Boys, Economic Development Manager; Craig Shonkwiler, Assistant City Engineer

OTHERS PRESENT: Rita Black, J.B. Curry, Laura Huth, Gabe Lewis, Margaret Miller, Dennis Roberts, Nancy Uchtmann, Jeff Yockey

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

In the absence of a chair, Lew Hopkins called the meeting to order at 7:34 p.m. Mr. Fell moved to nominate Lew Hopkins as Acting Chair for the meeting. Mr. Otto seconded. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote. Roll call was taken and there was a quorum of the members present.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

There were none.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the February 4, 2016 Regular Meeting were presented for approval.

Mr. Ackerson moved to approve the minutes as presented. Ms. Byndom seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

Regarding Plan Case No. 2268-M-16

- Email from Laura Huth

Regard Plan Case No. 2272-CP-16

- Plan Document Changes dated February 16, 2016
- Email from Charlie Smyth dated Wednesday, February 17, 2016
- Email from Charlie Smyth dated Thursday, February 18, 2016

5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

There was none.

6. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

7. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

Plan Case No. 2268-M-16: A request by the Urbana Zoning Administrator to rezone 305 and 307 East Elm Street, 205 South Urbana Avenue, and 306 and 308 East Green Street from R-5, Medium High Density Multiple-Family Residential Zoning District, to B-4, Central Business Zoning District.

Acting Chair Hopkins opened the case. He reviewed the procedure for a public hearing. Jeff Engstrom, Planner II, presented this case to the Plan Commission. He began by explaining the purpose of the proposed rezoning request and by describing the subject properties noting the current zoning, current land uses and the future land use designations of each subject property as well as for the surrounding properties. He reviewed how the proposed zoning relates to the goals and objectives of the 2005 Comprehensive Plan and to the goals and strategies of the 2012 Downtown Urbana Plan. He discussed a preliminary idea for the construction of a mixed-use development on the subject block. He reviewed the development regulations in the B-4 Zoning District.

Mr. Engstrom introduced Brandon Boys, Economic Development Manager, to the Plan Commission. Mr. Boys outlined the process for redeveloping the proposed site and stated that the City of Urbana would need to create a new Tax Increment Financing (TIF) District.

Mr. Engstrom resumed his presentation by reviewing how the proposed rezoning pertained to the La Salle National Bank criteria. He read the options of the Plan Commission and presented City staff's recommendation for approval. He noted the email that City staff received from Laura Huth regarding the case.

Acting Chair Hopkins asked the Plan Commission members if they had any questions for City staff.

Mr. Hopkins questioned if the proposed rezoning request was the only item for the potential future development that would be brought to the Plan Commission for review. The creation of a potential new TIF District and a redevelopment agreement with a perspective developer would not be the purview of the Plan Commission, correct? Mr. Engstrom said that is correct.

Mr. Hopkins asked for clarification about the individual properties and the required front yard setbacks. Mr. Engstrom explained that once the individual properties are all rezoned to B-4, the entire block would be considered one zoning lot because the Zoning Ordinance allows adjacent properties with the same zoning to be combined if under the same ownership without being replatted. Once the individual properties are combined into one zoning lot, there would be four front yards. According to the Section VI-5.C of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance, any yard in the B-1, B-2, B-3, B-4, B-4E, IN-1 and IN-2 District that adjoins, abuts, or is situated across a dedicated right-of-way of 100 feet or less in width the R-1, R-2, R-3, R-4, R-5, R-6, R-6B or R-7 District shall be the same as that required in the latter District.

Mr. Hopkins wondered if the alley on the block would be vacated. Mr. Engstrom replied yes.

Mr. Hopkins pointed out that Urbana Avenue is currently unimproved. He wondered if it was listed in the Capital Improvement Plan. Craig Shonkwiler, Assistant City Engineer, stated that it is not currently in the five-year CIP. However, they have talked about potentially making improvements to Urbana Avenue as a TIF project in conjunction with the redevelopment of the block.

Mr. Fell inquired if the intent of rezoning to B-4 was to allow a developer to build by right rather than requiring a Planned Unit Development (PUD). Mr. Engstrom said yes. Mr. Fell asked if it was to streamline the development process and avoid a few public hearings. Ms. Pearson replied that the 2005 Comprehensive Plan envisioned developing this block with something that was consistent with the B-4 Zoning District.

Mr. Stohr expressed concern with the underground parking. He asked what depth the storm sewer is for this area. Mr. Engstrom stated that he was not sure but that the developer would have a professional engineer who would make the parking work.

Mr. Trail inquired about the parking requirements for the potential 198-unit building. Mr. Engstrom stated that there are no required parking spaces in the B-4 Zoning District.

Mr. Trail questioned how wide the sidewalks would be for a development like this. Mr. Engstrom answered by saying that the development had not been designed as of yet. The minimum required width of a sidewalk pavement is five feet.

Mr. Stohr asked if there was a traffic plan to accommodate increased traffic from the potential development. Mr. Engstrom noted that they were not that far in the process of redeveloping the block, so he was unsure if there were any plans to improve the infrastructure at this time.

Mr. Trail questioned if the entrance/access to the proposed block would be negotiable with regards to what street it is located on. Mr. Engstrom replied that everything was negotiable at

this stage in the redevelopment process; however, the developer mentioned a possible entrance to the underground parking being along South Urbana Avenue due to the topography of the site.

Mr. Trail wondered if the City would make improvements to Vine Street to make it more pedestrian friendly. Mr. Engstrom said yes; however, no details have been worked out at this time.

With no further questions for City staff, Acting Chair Hopkins opened the hearing up for public input.

J. B. Curry, representative of TWG Development, approached the Plan Commission. He talked about the company. He explained the process they had followed in submitting a proposal for development. He talked about the company's ideas for a potential new development and stated that everything is negotiable at this point. Further questions pertaining to the potential new development were raised and some concerns were shared by the Plan Commission members.

Laura Huth approached the Plan Commission. She stated that she is enthused about the proposed rezoning and future development of the block. This was envisioned back when she sat on the City Council. The developer is open to talk to and share ideas and seems committed to our community. If the City does this project right, then we could see potentially see more projects happening in the future. So, she urged the Plan Commission members to vote in favor of the proposed rezoning.

Dennis Roberts approached the Plan Commission. He stated that he did not have an issue with rezoning the properties and the lots being combined into one zoning lot. He expressed his concerns for future development of the block including the following: erosion of residential neighborhood, setback requirements for all sides of the block, grass and tree plantings in setback areas, crosswalk on Vine Street at Green Street, quality of construction materials and review of site plans.

Margaret Miller approached the Plan Commission. She pointed out that the vacant lots on the block were once all full of single-family homes. She stated that the developer met with the neighborhood and although they have a lot of positive ideas about green space and setbacks, she still had concerns about there being no minimum open space requirements and setbacks. If the proposed lots are rezoned and something happens and for some reason TWG Development cannot build, then another developer might come in and not follow what TWG Development has said they would do.

With no further comments or questions from the audience, Acting Chair Hopkins closed the public input portion of the hearing. He, then, opened the hearing for Plan Commission discussion and/or motion(s).

Ms. Byndom questioned if the City would have any recourse if for some reason TWG Development could not develop the block. Ms. Pearson replied that the City of Urbana would still own the block. In order for anyone to develop on the block, it would require a public process.

Mr. Hopkins wondered at what point in the process ownership would transfer to the developer. Mr. Boys explained that ownership would occur after the execution of a redevelopment agreement. It is unlikely that the developer would not develop the property after taking ownership; development will be required in the agreement for the developer to maintain ownership. The deed would automatically revert back to the City in the event that the development could not proceed.

Mr. Otto moved that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 2268-M-16 to the City Council with a recommendation for approval of the rezoning request as presented. Mr. Turner seconded the motion.

Mr. Trail expressed concern about the lack of commercial being proposed in the potential development, especially with it being a downtown development. Mr. Otto commented that if there were a stronger market for commercial, then the developer would surely devote more space for it. We cannot create the demand for commercial space in a rezoning request. He believed that the developer would be happier if there were more of a demand for commercial space, because it generally brings more money per square foot.

Mr. Hopkins wanted to emphasize on record the discussion because this would be the only opportunity for the Plan Commission to give input on the potential development project. He will vote in favor of the proposed rezoning, but very unhappy about doing so. The B-4 Zoning District is problematic because it has no height restriction and a 9.0 Floor Area Ratio (FAR). There could potentially be an 18-story building on half the site; however, he does not feel that this would happen because the City of Urbana owns the property and can negotiate with the developer. It is essential that the negotiated development agreement has the transfer of ownership contingent on the development actually being built.

The second issue is that a new TIF District should be designed in particular to improve Urbana Avenue from Main Street to Washington Street. A new TIF District should also include the improving pedestrian crossing of Vine Street to Lincoln Square.

A potential development of the block should be 4 stories, not 18. The setbacks should be appropriate to the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Stohr inquired what the actual setbacks would be. Mr. Engstrom stated that along most of East Elm Street, all of Urbana Avenue and all of East Green Street, the required setbacks would be 15 feet. There would be no setback required for along Vine Street.

Roll call was taken on the motion and was as follows:

Ms. Byndom	-	Yes	Mr. Fell	-	Yes
Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes	Mr. Otto	-	Yes
Mr. Stohr	-	Yes	Mr. Trail	-	Yes
Mr. Turner	-	Yes	Mr. Ackerson	-	Yes

The motion passed by unanimous vote. Mr. Engstrom noted that Plan Case No. 2268-M-16 would be forwarded to the City Council as recommended by the Urbana Plan Commission on March 7, 2016.

Plan Case No. 2272-CP-16 – A request by the Urbana Zoning Administrator to adopt the 2016 Urbana Bicycle Master Plan as an amendment to the 2005 Urbana Comprehensive Plan.

Acting Chair Hopkins opened the public hearing for this case. Kevin Garcia, Planner II, presented this case to the Plan Commission. He began by explaining the planning process that the Champaign County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC) followed in creating the proposed updated plan. He reviewed how the proposed plan update relates to the goals and objectives of the 2005 Comprehensive Plan. He introduced Gabe Lewis from CCRPC.

Mr. Lewis approached to update the Plan Commission on the communications that they had received since the Joint Meeting with the Urbana Plan Commission, the Urbana Sustainability Advisory Commission, and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission on December 3, 2015. He then reviewed the changes that were incorporated into the updated plan from those communications. These changes were handed out prior to the start of the meeting. Additional comments and changes not listed on the handout included labelling the trails on the platted areas owned by Menards, maintenance of streets and bikeways, separated bike lanes, sharrows, and a pilot bike lane project. He mentioned that the Urbana Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission approved the changes with the condition that CCRPC develop an executive summary.

Mr. Garcia read the options of the Plan Commission and presented City staff's recommendation for approval. However, they felt that some additional time to review and incorporate the changes suggested by the Urbana Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission and to complete the executive summary. Ms. Pearson mentioned two written communications received from Charlie Smyth.

Mr. Otto asked City staff to address some of the concerns that Mr. Smyth expressed in his communications. Mr. Garcia replied that from his understanding of the two communications, Mr. Smyth would like to allow more time for review of the visioning statement and executive summary. Mr. Hopkins added that there are some very specific changes Mr. Smyth wants to make. It would not make sense for the Plan Commission to make a recommendation to City Council at this meeting until they know what the City Council wants. Therefore, he suggested continuing the case to a future meeting.

With no further questions for City staff, Acting Chair Hopkins opened the public input portion of the hearing and asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak on this case.

Jeff Yockey approached the Plan Commission. He stated that a well done executive summary would help navigate the plan. He agreed the extra time would be beneficial.

With no further public input, Acting Chair Hopkins closed the public input. He, then, opened the case for Plan Commission discussion and/or motion(s).

Mr. Otto moved that the Plan Commission continue this case to April 7, 2016. Ms. Byndom seconded the motion.

Mr. Trail commented that the plan was not as ambitious as he would like for it to be, and he did not feel that this would be corrected with the additional time. He believes that this plan is one of the key documents for making a transition for alternatives to people owning vehicles.

Voice vote was taken and no members opposed, so the motion passed by unanimous vote.

8. NEW BUSINESS

Plan Case No. 2273-M-16 – Annual Update of the Official Zoning Map

Acting Chair Hopkins opened this item on the agenda. Christopher Marx, Planner I, presented this case to the Plan Commission. He reviewed the changes that were made to the Zoning Map throughout the year since it was last updated and officially approved.

Acting Chair Hopkins asked if the Plan Commission members had any questions for City staff. There were none, so he asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak about this case. With there being no one in the audience to provide public input, Acting Chair Hopkins opened the case for Plan Commission discussion and/or motion(s).

Mr. Stohr moved that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 2273-M-16 to the City Council with a recommendation for approval. Mr. Fell seconded the motion. Roll call on the motion was as follows:

Mr. Fell	-	Yes	Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes
Mr. Otto	-	Yes	Mr. Stohr	-	Yes
Mr. Trail	-	Yes	Mr. Turner	-	Yes
Mr. Ackerson	-	Yes	Ms. Byndom	-	Yes

The motion passed by unanimous vote. Ms. Pearson noted that this case would be forwarded to City Council on March 7, 2016.

9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There was none.

10. STAFF REPORT

Ms. Pearson reported on the following:

- Plan Case No. 2271-M-16 – An omnibus rezoning was approved by City Council as recommend by the Plan Commission.
- Champaign County Case No. CCZBA-819-AT-15 – A request to allow parking in the County CR district was reviewed by City Council and they voted in favor of defeating a

resolution of protest with the same condition as recommended by the Plan Commission with regards to a parking garage not being allowed.

- Champaign County will be proposing to separate the two uses of parking garage and parking lot.
- Upcoming Cases – Master Bicycle Plan Update
- Citizen Planner Workshop will take place on April 27th.

11. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lorrie Pearson, Secretary
Urbana Plan Commission