

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING**

**URBANA PLAN COMMISSION**

**APPROVED**

**DATE:** November 20, 2014

**TIME:** 7:30 P.M.

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

---

**MEMBER PRESENT:** Maria Byndom, Andrew Fell, Tyler Fitch, Lew Hopkins, Dannie Otto, Bernadine Stake

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Corey Buttry, David Trail

**STAFF PRESENT:** Jeff Engstrom, Interim Planning Manager; Kevin Garcia, Planner II; Teri Anzel, Planning Administrative Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Carol McKusick, Harold & Teresa Whitlatch

---

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

Chair Fitch called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. The roll was called, and he declared that there was a quorum present.

**2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA**

City staff requested that the items under New Public Hearings be heard and considered before the amendment to the bylaws under Old Business. The Plan Commission approved the change.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the November 6, 2014 meeting was presented to the Plan Commission for approval. Ms. Stake moved to approve the minutes as presented. Ms. Byndom seconded the motion. Mr. Fitch requested the following corrections be made:

- Page 9, Last Sentence – Remove the word “not”
- Page 10, First Line – Change “never” to “not”

The minutes were then approved by unanimous voice vote as amended.

#### 4. COMMUNICATIONS

- Email from Carol McKusick regarding the Plan Commission Bylaws

#### 5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

#### 6. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

**Case No. 2014-A-06: Annexation agreement for a 5.19-acre tract of property north of Perkins Road and east of Cooks Lane**

**Plan Case No. 2245-M-14: A request by Harold Whitlatch and Teresa Westenhaver to rezone a 5.19-acre tract of property north of Perkins Road and east of Cooks Lane from Champaign County CR (Conservation Recreation) to City AG (Agriculture) upon annexation.**

Chair Fitch opened these two cases together since they are related. Kevin Garcia, Planner II, presented these two cases to the Plan Commission. Using Exhibit A, he showed where the subject property is located just outside of City limits but within 200 feet of the nearest sanitary sewer connection, which is at the corner of Perkins Road and Cooks Lane. He talked about the benefits for the City of Urbana and for the petitioners to enter into an annexation agreement.

He explained that part of the proposed annexation agreement is a rezoning of the proposed site from County CR, Conservation Recreation, to City AG (Agriculture). Normally, when a property that is zoned County CR is annexed into the City the zoning converts to CRE, Conservation-Recreation-Education. However, in this case the petitioners plan to build a single-family home on the subject property, which is not allowed in the CRE Zoning District, so the petitioners are requesting that their property be converted to AG should they ever be required to annex. In addition to building a house on the lot, they would like to raise some peacocks, rabbits, and maybe some other small animals. They also would like to produce some hay or corn on the southern part of the proposed site. All of these uses would be allowed by right in the AG Zoning District.

He noted that the 2005 Comprehensive Plan designates the future land use of the proposed site and surrounding properties as "Rural Residential". Rural residential is intended primarily for single-family residential development in areas with unique natural features and is commonly in areas beyond the corporate limits and on larger lots.

Mr. Garcia reviewed how the La Salle National Bank criteria pertain to the proposed rezoning. He read the options of the Plan Commission and presented City staff's recommendation for approval. He stated that he would answer any questions that the Commission had and pointed out that the petitioners were in the audience to answer questions as well.

Chair Fitch asked the Plan Commission if they had any questions for City staff.

Ms. Stake stated that she did not feel that the AG Zoning District fits well with the residential use. Mr. Garcia replied that the property is five acres, and the petitioners intend to build a single-family house and raise some fowl. The surrounding area is low-density residential with some agricultural uses. It is quite rural in its use as it is. City staff and the petitioners had discussed rezoning the property to R-1 upon annexation, but that would only allow the petitioners to raise animals on a small scale. The Comprehensive Plan calls for “rural residential” uses, and City staff believes that the proposed uses of the applicants would fit into rural residential. The problem is that the City has not created a rural residential zone. So, City staff tried to figure out what existing zoning districts most closely fit with rural residential, and they feel it would be the AG Zoning District. If the Plan Commission wanted to limit the uses allowed on the proposed site, then they could add language to the annexation agreement. Ms. Stake stated that we do not have a definition for “small animals”. She felt that “rural residential” is a good idea. She does not want this residential area to be ruined.

Mr. Otto stated that Illinois has a right to farm legislation. He asked if the City’s zoning supersedes the State’s legislation. The Farm Bureau and other organizations have been concerned that cities not inhibit their right to have confinement agriculture. He asked what the restrictions are on the activities in an urban agriculture zone. Mr. Fitch replied that there is a whole range of uses. Some of the permitted uses include cropping, general agriculture, commercial breeding, farm equipment sales and service, plant nursery or greenhouse, roadside produce sales stand, and elementary or junior high school. He stated that they could talk about the uses more during Plan Commission discussion. Mr. Otto wanted to have the entire list of uses read into the record, so that everyone knows what could occur if the City approves the rezoning request.

Mr. Fell wondered if there were any other island properties that were located out of the City of Urbana that have been annexed. Mr. Garcia explained that the proposed case is for an annexation agreement, which means the property will not be annexed until it becomes contiguous with the City limits. The agreement is for 20 years, so annexation of the subject property into City limits may never happen.

Mr. Fell asked if we disregard the farming aspect of the application, is there any zoning district that would allow the petitioners to build their house without requiring the annexation agreement. Mr. Garcia explained that any time a property owner applies for a permit from the Champaign-Urbana Sanitary District (UCSD) to hook into the sanitary sewer system and their property is within the extra-territorial jurisdiction (ETJ) area, then they are required to sign an annexation agreement. This is a long-standing agreement between the City of Urbana and UCSD.

Mr. Fell inquired if the petitioners subdivided the lot and moved the location of where they wanted to build their home so that it was not within 200 feet of the existing sewer connection, then would they still be required to connect to the sanitary sewer system. Mr. Garcia stated that the State of Illinois’ requirement for connecting to an existing City sewer system is more restrictive than the City’s requirement in that the State requires connection if a property is within 300 feet of an existing sewer connection. The City of Urbana needs to amend the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance to meet the State’s statute. He did not believe that the petitioners would be able to subdivide the subject property and build their home outside of the 300 feet. Mr. Engstrom added that the current Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance would require them to extend the sewer to the property line.

Mr. Fell wondered when something ceases to be a garden and becomes a farm. Mr. Garcia replied that the Zoning Ordinance says that the smallest farm is 5 acres. He is not sure how big a garden can be. Mr. Engstrom pointed out that the City would consider the property to be primarily a residential use and all the quasi agricultural uses to be accessories to that. Mr. Fell wondered if it was a big garden, then could it be just the opposite of that. Mr. Engstrom said maybe.

Mr. Otto asked if the property was zoned R-1 and they had a big garden plot and sold some sweetcorn off it, would that be in violation of the R-1 Zoning District. Mr. Garcia stated that the only agricultural uses allowed in the R-1 Zoning District is cropping. The petitioners would like to have some livestock, such as peacocks and a couple of horses. It is the non-cropping uses that make City staff believe the R-1 Zoning District would not be appropriate. He pointed out that the property is currently zone County CR, which would convert directly to City CRE, which would allow all agricultural uses. It is because the petitioners want to build a house on the property that they have to seek a different zoning than CRE.

Mr. Fell wondered if a conditional use permit could be granted to allow the petitioners to build a house in the CRE Zoning District. Mr. Garcia said no. The CRE Zoning District does not allow residential uses at all, and the petitioners' home would be the primary use of the property.

Mr. Fell asked if the sanitary connection was at the corner of Perkins Road and Cooks Lane. Mr. Garcia said yes. Mr. Fell questioned if all the surrounding properties are under annexation agreements then. Mr. Garcia said no. Most of the properties that already have homes on them have been around for a while. The subject property has not had a house on it for a very long time.

Ms. Stake questioned whether there was any other CR zoning in the area. Mr. Garcia replied that the swath going west and northeast are all zoned County CR Zoning District. The problem is that the City's CRE Zoning District does not allow the same thing that the County CR Zoning District allows. In terms of converting to a district that the City currently has, the AG Zoning District is the closest zoning district that matches the uses in the County CR Zoning District. Mr. Engstrom added that the property would remain County CR until it is annexed into the City, if it is ever annexed into the City.

There were no further questions for City staff. Chair Fitch read the procedures for a public hearing. He, then, opened the hearing up for public input.

Harold and Teresa Whitlatch, petitioners, approached the Plan Commission to speak. Ms. Whitlatch stated that they bought the property because they wanted to have a rural property to build a house on and to do some husbandry of peacocks and horses. There is a pond on the property and acreage that has been farmed for hay. They may want to grow hay as well. She noted that there is a big piece of the property along Perkins Road that is not buildable because it has electrical lines over it. The property is currently zoned County CR, which allows all of the uses that they want. When they started to build the house, they came upon the sewer issue. So, they met with City staff and found that the City's residential and conservation zoning districts do not fit all the uses they would like to be able to do. However, the City's AG Zoning District does fit.

Ms. Stake asked how many animals they planned to have. Ms. Whitlatch said that she did not know. Some of them will be small animals. They cannot have a hog farm because there is not footage space and buildings to do so. There are restrictions that they will have to abide by.

Ms. Stake wondered how close the subject property is to its neighboring properties. Ms. Whitlatch replied that everyone lives on five acres or more. Some of the neighbors have animals. Mr. Whitlatch added that the closest neighbor is probably 150 yards away. He went on to say that they would like to have about 6 peacocks, a few chickens, and about 25 to 30 rabbits. He is getting older and doesn't want to do a whole lot of work. He just wants to live there and have fun. Ms. Whitlatch pointed out that they would be under the restrictions of the agriculture zone, so there would be certain things that they could not do.

Mr. Fell asked if they had bought the subject property with the intention of building a house without knowing that they had to connect to the sanitary district. If they could choose between connecting to the sanitary sewer system and installing a septic system, what would be their choice? Mr. Whitlatch replied that the area is not conducive to installing a septic system. Mr. Fell asked if they had looked into installing a multi-flow system. Mr. Whitlatch stated that he is not interested in all of that. He likes the idea of connecting to the City sewer system.

Mr. Fitch asked City staff if it is a contractual requirement for the petitioners to have to sign an annexation agreement. Mr. Engstrom said yes. The City of Urbana has an intergovernmental agreement with the Champaign-Urbana Sanitary District. Mr. Fitch inquired if there were any exception or waiver procedures built into the agreement. Mr. Engstrom replied not that he was aware of.

Mr. Hopkins stated that he was trying to think of a way to accomplish this that works for the City of Urbana and for the petitioners. It seemed to him that there may be a way to write into the annexation agreement a category for a rural residential zoning district that City staff would eventually add to the Zoning Ordinance. It could be easily done by taking the AG Zoning District and specifying the permitted uses in that district that will not be allowed on the subject parcel through the mechanism of the annexation agreement. The annexation agreement goes with the deed for the property, so it will be applied to future owners as well.

From his understanding, chickens and peacocks are already allowed in the R-1 Zoning District. Mr. Whitlatch responded saying that his understanding is that people can only have hens, no roosters.

Ms. Whitlatch commented that she wants to be allowed to have the uses without having to wait for the City to create a new zoning district. Mr. Hopkins replied that it may not matter to the petitioners about what uses are allowed and are not allowed, but they may not always be the owners of the property. There are many uses in the AG Zoning District that the City would not want to allow on the subject property in the future. Ms. Whitlatch responded that the City could always rezone the property in the future if they wanted to. Mr. Hopkins stated that it is not that easy to rezone a parcel. Rezoning only happens when there is a trigger.

Mr. Fell inquired as to who pays for the connection to the sanitary sewer system. Mr. Engstrom explained the petitioners would pay for it to begin with, but if the sewer system gets expanded to

other properties in the area, then the petitioners could recapture some of the funds. The UCSD would maintain ownership of the sewer.

Mr. Fell asked if the property owners to the north and across Cooks Lane want to build houses, then they would have to enter into annexation agreements with the City as well, correct? Mr. Engstrom said that is correct. Mr. Garcia stated that he was contacted by two of the property owners within the 250-foot notification radius. They expressed their approval of the sanitary sewer system being extended because Cooks Lane is not good for having septic systems.

Ms. Byndom asked if other property owners who want to hook into the sanitary sewer system would have to pay to do so. Mr. Engstrom said yes, and the petitioners in these cases would be able to re-coop some of their money.

With no further questions for the petitioners, Chair Fitch asked if there were any other members of the audience who wished to speak either in favor of or against. There were none. So, Chair Fitch closed the public input portion of the hearing and opened it for Plan Commission discussion and/or motion(s).

Mr. Fitch commented that there are no waivers from the intergovernmental agreement, but he wants the petitioners to enjoy their property. Mr. Otto wondered why the Plan Commission would want to waiver from the intergovernmental agreement. The City of Urbana wants annexation agreements and over time for the properties around the fringe to become part of the City. It is good for them to be connected to the sanitary sewer system and to the City water.

He is of the opinion that the AG Zoning District is the closest analog to the current County zoning. As a City, we may want to look at some of the characteristics of the current AG Zoning District and tighten the allowed uses up. He does not see much risk with the proposed annexation agreement and rezoning.

Mr. Fell believed that there are people who live in the area specifically because they do not want to live within the City limits. Approving this would kind of spider web the sewer system into the area and force people, who do not want to live inside the City limits, to annex into the City at some point in the future. He feels that it would be more appropriate to rezone the property in some way that allows the petitioners to build their house without having to enter into an annexation agreement.

Ms. Stake loves animals and being out on the farm. However, she was concerned that by approving the rezoning the City would be allowing the petitioners to do husbandry of animals close to neighbors that do not like it. It is a residential area for people.

Ms. Byndom asked if the two property owners that contacted City staff wanted to hook up to the sanitary sewer system, would they also be required to enter into an annexation agreement. Mr. Garcia clarified that the two property owners that contacted him only expressed concern about whether the petitioners planned to install a septic system. They were excited to hear that the sanitary sewer connection would be extended up Cooks Lane. The property owners did not express a desire to hook up to the sanitary sewer system. In fact, he believed one of the two was already connected. The area is not suited for septic systems.

Mr. Fell asked what prompts an annexation agreement. Mr. Engstrom explained that connection to the sanitary sewer system prompts an annexation agreement.

Mr. Otto recalled the background between the two cities (Champaign and Urbana) and the UCSD. There was a problem with developers planting subdivisions not contiguous to the cities and then paying to hook into the sanitary district. They were using the benefits of the metropolis but not paying the taxes. So, the cities entered into the intergovernmental agreement with the UCSD. Mr. Fell agreed that it is a good thing; however, he does not understand why a property owner does not have the choice to install a septic system if he/she wants and build a house without entering into an annexation agreement. Mr. Garcia stated that it is a state requirement, and it is also a requirement in the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

Ms. Byndom agreed with Mr. Otto. She believed that it fits with the Comprehensive Plan designation of "Rural Residential". The area is not suited for septic systems. In addition, the value of the property might increase with being connected to the sanitary sewer system.

Chair Fitch summarized the Plan Commission's discussions. The decision is either to grant the petitioners' request or to accept the request with some language added into the annexation agreement that removes or limits some of the uses that are currently allowed in the AG Zoning District. He did not feel that the Plan Commission was in the position to change the AG Zoning District or to create a Rural Residential Zoning District during this meeting.

The existing City CRE Zoning District does not allow people to do anything except to have quasi-public uses. The R-1 Zoning District depends on how the City views the big garden vs. small farm and what kind of animals would be allowed. It sounds like the petitioners want to do more than what is allowed in the R-1 Zoning District. The AG Zoning District is a closer fit to how they want to use the property. The concern though is that there are some uses allowed in the AG Zoning District that might not be compatible with a residential use.

Mr. Hopkins wondered in what sense the annexation agreement was before the Plan Commission. Mr. Engstrom stated that the annexation agreement was before the Plan Commission because it contained the rezoning. Since the annexation agreement was before the Plan Commission, they had the ability to change the language in the agreement if they wanted. City staff did the negotiations and hopefully came up with something that the City Council can accept.

Mr. Otto expressed concern with dragging this case out. The petitioners have a builder, are willing to pay the expenses for connecting to the sanitary sewer system and are willing to enter into an annexation agreement. The petitioners are willing to do what the City has asked to meet code. The City went through last year and tried to clean the Zoning Ordinance up and failed to do so with regards to the AG Zoning District and the uses allowed in it. Just because the City failed, it should not delay the petitioners from proceeding with their plans. He could not see how the City could tell the petitioners that they have to wait.

Mr. Otto moved that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 2245-M-14 and Case No. 2014-A-06 to the City Council with a recommendation for approval. Mr. Hopkins seconded the motion.

Mr. Fell stated that he planned to vote against the annexation agreement not on the basis that he disagrees with anything the petitioners want to do. Their plans are fine, and he is in favor of their plans. He planned to vote against the agreement because there are people who live in the area that do not want the City boundary to extend out to their properties. Now the sanitary sewer connection will be extended up Cooks Lane and anyone wanting to hook into it or anyone who wants to build on their property will be forced into an annexation agreement with the City. He does not feel that this is right.

Mr. Fell moved a friendly amendment that the Plan Commission vote on the cases separately. Ms. Stake seconded the motion.

Mr. Otto expressed concern that Mr. Fell had an objection to decisions that were made beyond the Plan Commission’s control. Essentially, Mr. Fell wanted to deny the petitioners the right to do what they want which was in compliance with the law. Mr. Fell believed it was the same reason they vote on rezonings, which is because it might affect someone else other than the petitioners. Mr. Otto commented that if they vote no on one case and yes on the other it is the same as telling them that they cannot do what they want to do. Mr. Fitch ruled the amendment out of order because it is inconsistent with the original motion.

Ms. Byndom asked for clarification. They cannot do away with the annexation agreement because it is based on the intergovernmental agreement between the two cities and the UCSD. Mr. Fitch stated that the fact that the petitioners have to ask for an annexation agreement does not mean the City has to approve it.

Ms. Byndom stated that other property owners in the area do not have to hook up to the sanitary sewer system or sign annexation agreements just because the sanitary sewer system is extended towards them. Chair Fitch said that was correct.

Roll call was as follows:

Ms. Byndom	-	Yes	Mr. Fell	-	No
Mr. Fitch	-	Yes	Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes
Mr. Otto	-	Yes	Ms. Stake	-	No

The motion passed by a vote of 4-2. Mr. Engstrom noted that these cases would be forwarded to the City Council on Monday, December 1, 2014.

Mr. Otto requested that City staff present the zoning background for AG and introduce ways to improve it to the Plan Commission at a future meeting.

**7. OLD BUSINESS**

**Update to the Plan Commission’s Official Bylaws**

Chair Fitch re-opened the bylaws for review and consideration. He noted the written communication that was received from Carol McKusick. Jeff Engstrom, Interim Planning Manager, presented a revised version of the bylaws to the Plan Commission. He mentioned that

City staff discussed the questions that the Plan Commission had at the previous meeting with the City Attorney, and following are his answers:

1. *Can the Chairperson direct questions to the petitioner instead of the opponents asking questions directly?* The City Attorney's answer is yes. The Plan Commission can write this into the bylaws. However, he warned that it could become cumbersome if the questions are not relayed word for word.
2. *Who decides if a question is relevant?* The City Attorney's answer is that the Chair is the one to decide if questions are relevant or not.
3. *Is the petitioner/applicant bound to answer questions?* The City Attorney's answer is no, but felt it would speak to the creditability of the petitioner/applicant if he/she decided not to.
4. *What latitude does the Plan Commission to have to change the bylaws? Are there state laws that require certain rules for public hearings?* There are not state laws that spell out rules for public hearings. It is entirely up to the City and the Board/Commission to make up their own rules. City staff researched other boards' and commissions' bylaws and found that the Plan Commission's bylaws are similar to them.

Mr. Engstrom reviewed the changes that were made to the bylaws since the previous meeting. He stated that according to the existing bylaws, the Plan Commission could not vote to approve the amendment to the bylaws at this meeting.

Chair Fitch wondered when adding language in Article VI.6 to clarify that the Chairperson decides what questions are relevant, if they should use similar wording as in Article V.5. Mr. Engstrom responded saying that it was not the City Attorney's opinion that they needed to clarify this.

With no further questions for City staff, Chair Fitch opened the item up for public input.

Carol McKusick approached the Plan Commission to speak. She talked about how the following:

- It seems there is a problem with following the bylaws in general. It makes it hard to get interested in changing them.
- If there is muddiness during public hearings about how Robert's Rules of Orders from the current bylaws apply, in the discussion of the bylaws there is not that muddiness. This is a good thing, because it would good for the Plan Commission to get better democracy and better records through electronic meetings that can do Robert's Rules.
- She explained how someone could mark up and post notes on a pdf of the bylaws. She understands that the bylaws belong to the Plan Commission. She just wanted to share changes she recommends.
- Two Commission members had made comments in previous meetings about changing the bylaws to match what they practice. She suggested that maybe the Plan Commission should practice the law first.
- Existing bylaws do not allow the Chairperson to direct questions from proponents and opponents to the petitioner/applicant. If there is an interpretation problem, then it is up to the Plan Commission and perhaps they should take a vote on the issue rather than asking the City Attorney for direction.

- She does not like that there isn't electronic meetings because the Plan Commission cannot create their own copy. The Plan Commission has to rely on City staff to make their changes, so no one knows what it was they passed. She believed that City staff should have taken the original memo on the bylaws dated for the November 6, 2014 meeting and marked them up with the changes discussed at the meeting to present to the Plan Commission for this meeting.
- With regards to the proposed language in Article VI.6, if the Plan Commission meant to say that opponents cannot count on their questions being asked to the petitioners/ applicants, then they succeeded. If she was following the process, then she would write down her question and ask it out loud as she handed it to the Chairperson. She would want to be a proponent because opponents are not offered rebuttal.
- It is important to know what the impetus is for the City Attorney to ask the Commission to amend the bylaws. She assumed it was because of the language in the Open Meetings Act that talks about every public body having their own rules recorded.
- Article IV.7 states that the Plan Commission shall review the bylaws at least once annually. If City staff starts a review period, at the end of the year the review period should end. Robert Myers, previous Planning Manager, started the review period for the bylaws in March of 2013, so she assumed that review period ended at the end of the year in 2013. This is currently listed on the agenda as being an update to the bylaws; however, it is being stretched into a review. What is the difference between an update and a review?
- Public comment is at the beginning of the City Council meetings and they do not provide draft minutes. The Plan Commission holds public comment at the end of their meetings and do provide draft minutes.
- With regards to public comment, it would be good for the comments to be elaborated because it is a special thing and does not follow Robert's Rules.

There was no further comments or public input. Chair Fitch opened the item up for Plan Commission discussion and/or motion(s).

Mr. Hopkins suggested that the Plan Commission review the bylaws in a study session. He felt that there were still too many problems to vote on the amendment to the bylaws at the next meeting. Some of the problems are minor, but some of them are major, such as:

- Article VI should be split into two sections. Items 1 to 11 present a sequential order of procedure for a public hearing. Sections 12 to 18 are aspects of general applications to public hearings that apply to all or some of the Items 1 to 11.
- Article VI. Items 12 and 18 make no sense. He believes that #18 refers to closing the public input and it says "close the public hearing".
- Article VII.3 talks about motions including "findings of fact". He does not recall this ever happening nor does he think that they ever want to do this. Either they need to change their practices to fit the rules or they need to change the rules to fit their practices.

Chair Fitch agreed that they need a lot more discussion as well. He wondered about the mechanics of sending the proposed amendment to the bylaws to a study session. He asked City staff to add this as an item under the Study Session section of the agenda for the December 4, 2014 meeting and to continue the item under Old Business subsequent to the study session meeting.

Mr. Hopkins asked if City staff could also provide an electronic word copy that someone could type the language as the Plan Commission discusses it. Mr. Engstrom replied that can be provided.

## **8. NEW BUSINESS**

There was none.

## **9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

Carol McKusick talked about the following:

- Bill for construction and demolition sites. It should not be a red herring that there is a second business. It may or may not fall under the new rules from the State of Illinois that came out of the veto session. Just the special use permit, should be engineered broadly for poisonous chemicals. It is unlikely that the owner will be able to stop a mixture with this. Mr. Fitch stated that there is not anything the Plan Commission can do about this. They ruled on the land use aspects and the Site Plan. It is no matter a concern of the Plan Commission. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) will regulate them.
- Side path along Lincoln Avenue that was part of Exhibit A in the packet for the Active Choices comprehensive plan amendment.
- Tracking of the creation and abandonment of dumps.
- It disturbs her why the Plan Commission does not try to practice their existing bylaws while they still have them.

## **10. STAFF REPORT**

Jeff Engstrom reported on the following:

- Electronics Signs in the CRE Zoning District. City Council approved the text amendment.
- County Long Range Transportation Plan was approved by the City Council.
- County Greenways and Trail Plan was approved by City Council as recommended by the Plan Commission.

## **11. STUDY SESSION**

There was none.

Mr. Fitch requested that City staff look at alternatives to the AG Zoning District and whether the uses are appropriate for an AG district. Also, to look and see if there needs to be a separate zoning district like “Rural Residential” that has some components of agriculture and some components of a residential district.

Mr. Otto added that he would like to see some definitions for some of the terminology in the list of AG uses. Mr. Fitch agreed.

Ms. Stake would like City staff to think about residential. She believed that we are losing all of our residential. Mr. Fitch explained that they asked staff to look into adding a new rural residential friendly district.

**12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Jeff Engstrom, Secretary  
Urbana Plan Commission