

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING

URBANA PLAN COMMISSION

APPROVED

DATE: December 5, 2013

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, Marilyn Upah-Bant

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Carey Hawkins-Ash

STAFF PRESENT: Elizabeth Tyler, Director of Community Development Services; Jeff Engstrom, Planner II; Teri Andel, Planning Secretary; Brad Bennett, Senior Civil Engineer; Scott Tess, Environmental Sustainability Manager

OTHERS PRESENT: Linda Bauer, Bryan Bradshaw, Marty Grant, Richard Guerard, Tom Jordan, Darrel King, Tom Kirk, Carol McKusick, Gary and Michelle Olsen, Ryan Olsen

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

Chair Fitch called the meeting to order at 7:31 p.m. The roll was called, and he declared that there was a quorum of the members present.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

There were none.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Upah-Bant moved that the Plan Commission approve the minutes of the November 7, 2013 and the minutes of the November 21, 2013 meetings as presented. Mr. Fell seconded the motion. The minutes were then approved unanimously by the Plan Commission members.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

- Letter from Jennifer J. Sackett Pohlenz from Clark Hill PLC in opposition of Plan Case No. 2216-SU-13
- Southwind RAS, LLC PowerPoint Presentation for Plan Case No. 2216-SU-13

5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

Plan Case No. 2216-SU-13: A request by Southwind RAS LLC for a Special Use Permit to establish a Recycling Center and for a Conditional Use Permit to allow two principal uses on a lot at 910 – 1000 West Saline Court in the IN-2, Heavy Industrial Zoning District.

Mr. Fitch opened the public hearing. He asked if the Plan Commission would be considering only the Special Use Permit or if they would be considering the Conditional Use Permit as well. Jeff Engstrom, Planner II, answered that the Plan Commission would be considering both. The Conditional Use Permit is wrapped into the Special Use Permit approval.

Mr. Engstrom began the staff presentation for this case by explaining the purpose of the Special Use Permit and the Conditional Use Permit requests. He noted the zoning, existing land use and future land use of the subject site and of the surrounding properties. He talked about access to the proposed site and how the proposed Site Plan meets most of the zoning requirements. He also discussed the future Henson Disposal facility. He reviewed the requirements for a special use permit according to Section VII-4.A of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance. He, then, reviewed the requirements for a conditional use permit according to Section VII-2 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance. He read the options of the Plan Commission and presented staff's recommendation.

Elizabeth Tyler, Director of Community Development Services, introduced Scott Tess (Environmental Sustainability Manager) and Brad Bennett (Senior Civil Engineer) from the City of Urbana Public Works Department. She, then, addressed the letter received from Jennifer J. Sackett Pohlenz from Clark Hill PLC. She clarified that the Plan Commission was only reviewing the application for a special use permit for Southwind RAS LLC and not for the future Henson Disposal facility, which the letter talks about.

In terms of the local siting, Mr. Tess would be supervising it. On the contrary of what is written in the letter, the siting process will not supersede the zoning. Henson Disposal will need to obtain approval for their own special use permit to construct a recycling facility for construction site waste materials.

She explained that if Southwind RAS LLC went out of business and left materials on the site, the City of Urbana has the capability of cleaning up the site and billing the land owner or placing a lien on the property. Therefore, the City does not require a bond for removal of abandoned materials.

Regarding the conditional use permit, it was the Zoning Administrator's determination that it would be prudent to also grant the conditional use permit because the southern lot will only be

partially used. It is for the protection of the applicant to grant the Conditional Use Permit in anticipation that there will be two uses on the lot in the future.

Chair Fitch opened the public hearing for questions from the Plan Commission for City staff.

Mr. Hopkins inquired whether there was a fundamental or legal reason for Condition #4 under the staff recommendation or could it be deleted. He felt there was an inherent contradiction. Mr. Engstrom replied that the Plan Commission could approve the special use permit request without Condition #4.

Mr. Otto questioned whether the permit goes to the applicant, who will be a tenant, or the owner of the property. Ms. Tyler answered that the permit runs with the operation; however, if another company purchased Southwind RAS, LLC and wanted to develop in the same manner as being proposed, then the special use permit could be transferred to the new business with the Zoning Administrator's approval.

Ms. Upah-Bant asked if it is standard to get request approval of a special use permit and/or conditional use permit before getting approval from the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (IEPA). Mr. Engstrom replied yes, it has been the City's standard procedure for previous recycling centers.

Chair Fitch outlined the procedures for the public hearing for the audience.

Rich Guerard, representative for Southwind RAS, LLC, introduced Tom Kirk (owner of the property) and Tom Jordan (Engineer from Foth Infrastructure). He, then, gave a brief PowerPoint presentation. He talked about the objective of the special use permit request, which is to allow the use of recycling asphalt shingles. The zoning use must be approved before they can apply for any IEPA permits. He explained the process of recycling asphalt shingles and talked more about the two permits they need to apply for from IEPA. He also talked about the following environmental benefits of recycling asphalt shingles: 1) Costs less for a roofer to bring the asphalt shingles to a recycling facility than to take them to the landfill. Asphalt shingles are the third largest source of construction land fill material each year and 2) Provides Green technology by recycling valuable petroleum in the shingles and using the Recycled Asphalt Shingles (RAS) mixture in making asphalt for paving roadways.

He mentioned that there is no heat or chemicals used in the recycling process. No environmental issues either. He stated that all of the equipment except for the scales will be portable and can be moved from site to site as needed. The noise level will be equivalent to a large truck, the only dust will be contained in the chopper by spray bars, and the entire site will be paved to avoid any mud or contamination of mixing the products.

Mr. Hopkins asked if Henson Disposal owns both parcels. Mr. Guerard said yes. The reason for the special use permit is because Southwind RAS, LLC will be leasing one parcel and part of the second one, and they will be sharing the access drive to the properties.

Mr. Otto asked about stockpiling and safeguards that can be taken to keep vandalism from happening. Mr. Guerard responded that they are allowed by the IEPA to stockpile for small periods of time. The maximum pile size is 7,500 tons, which could be as high as 30 feet and measure 60 feet x 60 feet. The Illinois Tollway and Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) both use the recycled product in their asphalt paving mixtures. To maintain a contract with either business, Southwind will be required to provide the full amount needed for a project, so there will be some stockpiling happening. The recycled product has a short lifespan because the asphalt can re-gel; therefore, they generally will need to move the material rather than store it for long periods of time. The maximum number of days they would be allowed to store most finish products is 60 days. Pre-processed materials can be stored longer. The product is not combustible unless there was a tremendous fire, so they are not concerned about vandalism.

Ms. Byndom asked how long the process takes. Mr. Guerard replied that Southwind will be able to process a load in a couple of days. The process would start in the south end and move north.

Marty Grant, from Allied Waste Transportation, asked the Plan Commission to allow City staff time to officially respond to the letter from Jennifer J. Sackett Pohlenz, counsel for Allied Waste before making a final decision. He recently received notice of this public hearing and turned it over to his counsel. Mr. Engstrom replied that City staff is required to send out a notice of the public hearing to the neighboring property owners/tenants 10 days prior to the meeting date. In this case, the notice was sent to the owner of Allied Waste in Phoenix. City staff caught this and then phoned Allied Waste to notify them of the meeting because there was no local address to send the notice to. He recommended that the Plan Commission forward a recommendation to the City Council from this meeting. City staff will then respond to Ms. Pohlenz's letter before the next City Council meeting, where the final decision will be made.

Carol McKusick, of 1907 North Cunningham Avenue, spoke to the Plan Commission. She stated that the written staff memorandum does not really show the location of the proposed site. It also does not make clear whether the petitioner would be allowed upon approval of the proposed special use permit request to begin operations. She did not see how it would be possible for them to begin operations without the scale and other equipment. Mr. Fitch explained that the petitioner would first need to get approval of two permits from the IEPA before commencing operation.

Ms. McKusick asked if the future construction recycling facility, Henson Disposal, would be affected by Southwind RAS, LLC. Ms. Tyler responded that any land use can impact the adjacent land next to it. When Henson Disposal submits development plans and a special use permit request, then the City will have an opportunity to review their plans.

Mr. Guerard re-approached the Plan Commission. He stated that they are asking the Plan Commission to make a recommendation tonight to City Council. There is no reason to wait. The letter from Ms. Pohlenz addressed the future Henson facility. Southwind RAS, LLC needs to proceed with this request in a timely manner because they do not want to miss out on bidding on a contract with IDOT. Timing is of the essence. Any delays could result in them losing a whole year of business at the proposed site, which would greatly impact them.

Tom Kirk, co-owner of the proposed site and of Henson Disposal, stated that the process for getting permits will take two years. He believes that Allied's biggest concern is that Henson Disposal will be their competitor offering the same service for this area. Their facility in Normal, Illinois has no violations. They keep approximately 100 tons of material there every day.

Ms. Stake questioned how long it would take to respond to the letter. Mr. Kirk stated that he felt most of the questions had been asked and answered.

Ms. Byndom asked if Southwind RAS, LLC and Henson Disposal had any affiliation with each other. Mr. Guerard answered that there is no affiliation other than Southwind RAS, LLC plans to lease 1000 West Saline Court and part of 910 West Saline Court from Henson Disposal.

Chair Fitch closed the public hearing and opened the case up for Plan Commission discussion and/or motion(s).

Mr. Hopkins moved that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 2216-SU-13 to the City Council with a recommendation for approval including the conditions as recommended by City staff with the deletion of Condition #4. Mr. Otto seconded the motion.

Mr. Hopkins explained the reason for deleting Condition #4 in the recommendation to City Council. The Special Use Permit is for the particular use by a lessee, and the Conditional Use Permit goes with the land. The Southwind RAS, LLC will begin their operation in less than the two years that it takes Henson Disposal to acquire permits for their use. The Southwind RAS, LLC use cannot be made conditional upon the approval of a particular use on the other half of 910 West Saline Court that occurs two years later. It has to be contingent only on any other compatible uses within zoning that could go on that half of the parcel. Because the lease is for an area of land for a period of time, it should work. The Conditional Use Permit

Ms. Tyler felt that City staff has other ways to control the sequencing, so if there is a logical problem with Condition #4, then City staff would not have an objection to deleting it.

Ms. Upah-Bant asked if it would make more sense to require Henson Disposal to request the Conditional Use Permit when they are ready to submit development plans. Tyler stated that City staff discussed this and feels that it is prudent for Southwind RAS, LLC to request the Conditional Use Permit.

Mr. Otto thought initially that this would be more complicated than what it is. The scope of the piles in relative to other uses in the area, this is an easy decision for him with the knowledge that the IEPA will do their jobs well. He felt that the Plan Commission should move forward because the case has been properly notified and the letter in opposition refers to Henson Disposal and not Southwind RAS, LLC.

Mr. Fell asked if City staff was okay with the dumping of run-off from the asphalt into the storm sewer. Mr. Bennett replied that he reviewed some of the information submitted on the Site Plan. The petitioner has submitted a Storm Water Management Plan, and there is a detention pond planned for the south area that all the water will run off into. The City does not require any

water quality requirements in the Stormwater Ordinance. It would not be much different than water runoff from a department store parking lot. The petitioner will need to keep the material from washing into the stormwater sewer system.

Mr. Jordan explained that they designed the site so that it flows off to a swale on the east side of the proposed site. Inside the swale there is an aggregate ditch check to filter out particular materials that might find their way down towards the storm sewer system. It is intended to pick up any particulates that might get into the stormwater runoff prior to them getting to the stormwater detention basin.

There is a 1% chance of a 100-year event happening in any given year. The concern in stormwater runoff and stormwater quality is more addressed in the annual event or the more current events that happen several times a year. It is pretty common in design to filter out any particulates for stormwater quality in the more frequent events and allowing for the infrequent events in detention.

Roll call on the motion was as follows:

Ms. Byndom	-	Yes	Mr. Fell	-	Yes
Mr. Fitch	-	Yes	Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes
Mr. Otto	-	Yes	Ms. Stake	-	Yes
Ms. Upah-Bant	-	Yes			

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Plan Case No. 2218-PUD-13 & Plan Case 2219-PUD-13: A request by Gary Olsen on behalf of Verdant Prairies, LLC for preliminary and final approval for a Residential Planned Unit Development for a 4.01-acre parcel at 704 East Windsor Road in the R-3, Single and Two-Family Residential Zoning District.

Mr. Fitch opened these public hearings together. Mr. Engstrom gave a staff presentation to the Plan Commission. He began with a brief explanation of the proposed project and requests for approval of a preliminary and final Planned Unit Development (PUD). He stated the differences between the previous approvals for the proposed site and the proposed development. He noted the zoning, existing land use and future land use of the subject property and of the surrounding properties. He reviewed some of the goals and objectives of the 2005 Comprehensive plan that pertain to the proposed development. He reviewed the Site Plan. He discussed the nine general goals and the requirements for a planned unit development. He also discussed the permitted uses and minimum development standards. He reviewed the criteria, according to Section XII-3 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance which the Plan Commission should consider when making a recommendation to the City Council. He read the options for each case and presented staff's recommendation.

Mr. Otto asked who would own the perimeter sidewalk. Would it be public access? Mr. Engstrom stated that the sidewalk would be on private property; however, there would be an

easement. Gary Olsen, applicant, added that sidewalk in the northwest corner is an existing easement, which he plans to continue.

Mr. Otto assumed that there is a good planning reason to have the subdivision requirements. Why should the City waive those requirements? Mr. Engstrom explained that the waivers are an artifact of the requirement for separate parcels. The proposed waivers were not needed with the previous planned unit development approval because it was all on one parcel. Mr. Otto asked why the City still has the requirements for single parcels. Mr. Engstrom replied that it is about the density and the requirements for the individual lots. Ms. Tyler added that the City offered a planned unit development because it offers special case development without rezoning or doing a different platting. Not all the regulations in the Zoning Ordinance are going to be met; however, the development regulations do not apply when it is a PUD. The City is still required to identify the areas where there are deviations from the development regulations. The developer gets flexibility on development regulations and also gets some flexibility on uses. In exchange, the City and the community gets a higher level of design, environmental features, protections for surrounding properties, and ways to deal with situations like this where you have an infill but you want to maintain a low zoning to fit in with the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Otto stated that there is a restricted height of 51'7" for Building 101. He asked what the sense of scale would be for the adjacent lots (Lots 356 and 357). Would they be jumping from a one-story ranch type to 51 feet? Mr. Engstrom replied that City staff would look into this.

Mr. Fell addressed Mr. Otto concern about waiving regulations that are normally required for a development. Some of the variances being requested are due to the geometry of how the development is laid out. For instance, one of the waivers is for a driveway that is 100% of the lot width. The Zoning Ordinance will only let you have a driveway that is a certain width or a certain percentage of the lot. In order to access the circle drive, the front yard is only their driveway because it is a little access. Another instance is with the townhomes to the south. An interior townhome has no side yard, so in a planning perspective, it is no different to give the end units no side yards.

Mr. Otto asked the setbacks at the end of the townhomes to the south. The streets will be deeded over to the City. Will these setbacks be deeded as well? Mr. Engstrom stated that the entire right-of-way will be deeded over to the City, which is the reason the lots cannot expand farther for deeper side yards. He estimated the setback on the west side of the south townhomes to be about 15 feet. He noted that the City could reduce the right-of-way setback in the subdivision plat approval.

Mr. Fitch reviewed the procedure for the public hearing.

Mr. Olsen introduced his team, which were as follows: Ryan Olsen, Assistant on the Presentation; and Bryan Bradshaw, of BKB Engineering, Inc.

Mr. Olsen gave a presentation on the following:

- Aerial View of Existing Site

- Aerial View of Proposed Site Plan
- Proposed Site Plan
- Villas – Five Unit Plan
- Five Unit Elevations
- Enlarged Unit Elevations
- Townhouse Unit Plan – Four Unit Plan
- Townhouses – Partial Front Elevation & Brick Fence
- Townhouses – Side (West) Elevation
- Townhouses – Partial Rear (South) Elevation
- Apartment Plans – Grade Parking Level
- Apartment Plans – Floor Plan
- Apartment Plans – Rear (West) Elevation
- Apartment Plans – Side (South) Elevation
- Apartment Plans – Front (East) Elevation
- Low Impact Design Components
- ModulArchitecture
- Examples of Modular Developments in the City of Urbana

Mr. Bradshaw presented on the following:

- Pavement Plan
- Utility Plan
- Drainage Plan – Existing Watershed Plan
- Drainage Plan – Proposed Watershed Plan

Mr. Olsen addressed an earlier question about the construction of the infrastructure. He stated that the cul-de-sac and the entry drive will be constructed by the developer and maintained by the City.

Ms. Upah-Bant wondered how many people in total could live in the proposed development. Mr. Olsen answered that there would be 46 units. Mr. Engstrom added that the legal limit for a dwelling unit is three unrelated people plus one family.

Mr. Hopkins stated that the previous PUD proposal had a strategy or theme. He assumed the proposed development will end up with a different marketing because it is a different mix of uses. He expressed concern about phasing and how the different types of units are going to be owned. Mr. Olsen said that there will be a large buffer between the townhouses and the townhomes. The plan is to build from the west side to the east side on the north half of the site. Then they plan to build four townhouse units at a time. They do not plan to build any units until they are presold.

Michelle Olsen, co-owner of the proposed property, stated that she has been doing market research, which explains the reason for constructing three different types of housing. Some baby boomers prefer to live in a villa type unit so they can down-size from what they are currently living in, not have exterior maintenance, and still have garden plots. Others prefer to rent an apartment while they decide whether they want to move into a senior living facility or purchase a

smaller home closer to where their children live. The townhomes are aimed at making the proposed development more a multi-generational community. They have also been working with the bankers who advise against condominiums.

Mr. Hopkins stated that the proposed development appears to have many small pieces that would need to be managed by a homeowner's association. Mr. Olsen said that once they have about a third of the units sold, they intend to recommend the first owners to create a homeowner's association. There may end up being more than one homeowner's association because of the common areas and different types of housing.

Linda Bauer, of 709 Scovill Street, addressed an earlier question about the duplexes to the immediate west of the proposed site. They are one story. She has mixed feelings about the proposed development. She is concerned about the drainage and how dense the proposed area will be; however, she does not have a better plan. She asked what the price range would be for the proposed units. Overall, she supports the proposed development with some caveats.

Mr. Olsen replied that some units will be in the high \$100,000s. The larger units will sell for \$235,000 to \$250,000. Mr. Bradshaw added that the site will be graded so that it slopes to the south and the storm water will drain towards the detention basin.

Mr. Otto noticed that the west side of the proposed development does not show it draining to the south. Where will the water go from the roofline of the building to the west? Mr. Bradshaw explained that there will be underground drain lines from the roofs that flow south to the detention basin. Mr. Bennett added that the way the Stormwater Management Ordinance is written regarding infill development, it does not require detention to be provided for existing impervious areas before a property is demoed. It only requires current stormwater detention requirements for any increase in impervious areas.

Mr. Fitch closed the public hearing and opened the case for Plan Commission discussion and/or motion(s).

Mr. Fell asked if they should consider requiring a sidewalk around the cul-de-sac. The petitioner is not proposing one now. Mr. Engstrom replied that this will be discussed in Plan Case No. 2217-S-13, which follows this case. Every lot will have access to a sidewalk, so City staff is supportive of waiving the sidewalk requirement around the cul-de-sac. Mr. Fell commented that a person living in the middle on the north side would have to walk an extra two blocks around the perimeter of the development to get home.

Mr. Fell expressed his concern for the following: 1) The previous PUD requests did a very good job of fronting the development towards Windsor Road; however, the proposed development application backs the long townhouse building up to Windsor Road and 2) The City approved a height waiver in the previous PUD requests for two buildings that were going to be constructed along Windsor Road away from the adjacent neighbors. The current PUD application proposes to construct a building with the height of up to 51 feet on the northern side of the lot, which will back up to the neighbors. Ms. Upah-Bant commented that it appears that the height waiver is to

allow a third story. If the developer only constructed two-story buildings, then it would meet the height requirements.

Ms. Upah-Bant stated that she realized that it is a PUD; however, it makes her uncomfortable granting so many waivers. The development regulations were adopted for a reason.

Mr. Otto referred to the Site Plan in Exhibit E. He was concerned about waiving the sidewalk along the cul-de-sac. If the reason is for safety issues of pedestrians being backed into, it is always true and not unique to this development. He asked if there is enough room for the homeowner's to back their vehicles out of the garage and park it in their driveway without encroaching on the City right-of-way. Mr. Engstrom said no.

Mr. Otto stated that there is a lot to like about the proposed development and he likes the idea of infill. On the other hand, he is concerned about the number of waivers, the height issue as Mr. Fell pointed out, and the lack of clarity on what actually will be decided to the City. Mr. Engstrom stated with the exception of the proposed height of the building to the north, it is normal to waive some of the development regulations in a PUD.

Mr. Otto stated that he shared Mr. Fell's concern about the view of the building that backs up to Windsor Road. It will be a row of continuous garage doors and uninterrupted roof line that extends for the length of the building. Since it is part of the nature of a PUD for the City to be able to ask for some design features, he would like to ask that the roof be broken up with something more interesting. He wondered if it might be possible to flip the building and have the parking on the inside of the cul-de-sac. This would bring the parking to be more consistent with other parking in the development. Mr. Fitch clarified that the view would be of balconies, sliding doors, parked cars, a fence and uninterrupted roof line.

Mr. Fell asked if the City would have to maintain $\frac{3}{4}$ of each driveway since they would be located on the right-of-way. Mr. Engstrom replied no.

Mr. Fell wondered if it would make sense as Mr. Otto suggested flipping the townhouse building so it fronts on Windsor Road. The parking would be along the public street inside the cul-de-sac rather than along a private drive. Mr. Bradshaw stated that if you flip the townhouse building and put the private drive on the north side of the building, then you have a double roadway side-by-side and would not be able to put the hammerhead turnaround in the development. If the private drive is eliminated and people back out onto the street inside the cul-de-sac, then the eastern units of the building would not front on the cul-de-sac and may be lost.

Mr. Hopkins stated he felt the same as Mr. Fell. There are opportunities to clean up some of the ambiguities of who is responsible for what and how there would be access. Mr. Fitch agreed. He stated that the height of the apartment building is too tall.

Ms. Tyler stated that if the Plan Commission wanted to they could continue the case to the next regular meeting to allow time for the members to think through some of the issues and allow the petitioner time to think about some of the comments from the Plan Commission.

Mr. Otto would like to have City staff explain why they can have a two-story building that close to the street. There are reasons why the City requires setbacks around corners whether for appearance or safety. He would like for the designers and/or engineers to explain why they could not flip the building around and move the building closer to Windsor Road so the front yard becomes the detention area.

Mr. Hopkins moved that the Plan Commission continue this case to the next meeting on December 19, 2013. Mr. Fell seconded the motion. Roll call on the motion was as follows:

Mr. Fell	-	Yes	Mr. Fitch	-	Yes
Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes	Mr. Otto	-	Yes
Ms. Stake	-	Yes	Ms. Upah-Bant	-	Yes
Ms. Byndom	-	Yes			

The motion was passed by unanimous vote.

6. OLD BUSINESS

Plan Case No. 2217-S-13: A request by Verdant Prairies, LLC for approval of a preliminary plat, Verdant Prairies Village Subdivision, for development of a 4.01-acre site located northeast of the intersection of South Anderson Street and East Windsor Road in the R-3, Single and Two-Family Residential Zoning District.

The Plan Commission continued this case to the next regular meeting on December 19, 2013.

7. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

8. NEW BUSINESS

There was none.

9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Carol McKusick, of 1907 North Cunningham Avenue, talked about the minutes of the Plan Commission meeting that was held on November 21, 2013. The Plan Commission approved these minutes in conjunction with the minutes from the November 5, 2013 meeting.

There is an error in the November 21, 2013 meeting in that Teri Andel, Planning Secretary, was not in attendance; however, her name is in the minutes as having been present. In addition, the items on the agenda were not opened, yet the minutes reflect that they were.

She talked about the procedures for communications, approval of draft minutes and the cancellation of meetings. She also talked about the letter from Jennifer Pohlenz regarding Plan Case No. 2216-SU-13 and whether the letter was received before the meeting packet was sent

out. Mr. Fitch stated that the letter was received by some of the Plan Commission and a select number of City Council members on Wednesday afternoon. He immediately forwarded the letter to City staff. Photos of the Henson Disposal facility in Bloomington, Illinois were received earlier on Thursday before the Plan Commission meeting.

10. STAFF REPORT

Mr. Engstrom gave a staff report on the following:

- Annexation Case No. 2013-A-02 regarding an annexation agreement for 2110 North Willow Road was withdrawn by the petitioner.
- Rebecca Bird has resigned to move to Wokingham, England.

Ms. Tyler reported on the following:

- The City is recruiting for the Planning positions which will extend into January. If you know qualified people for the positions, please let them know.
- City Council is working a set of Council goals. Many of the goals are planning related. At some point, there will be public input, so they will come before the Plan Commission in the form of studies that Council has asked City staff to do.

11. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 10:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth H. Tyler, FAICP, Secretary
Urbana Plan Commission