

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING**

**URBANA PLAN COMMISSION**

**APPROVED**

**DATE:** December 19, 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

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Carey Hawkins-Ash, Bernadine Stake, Marilyn Upah-Bant

**STAFF PRESENT:** Elizabeth Tyler, Director of Community Development Services; Jeff Engstrom, Planner II; Rebecca Nathanson, Planning Intern; Jen Gonzalez, Community Development Staff; Brad Bennett, Senior Civil Engineer

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Bryan Bradshaw, Marcus Harris, Carol McKusick, Roger Meyer, 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**

Mr. Fell moved that the Plan Commission approve the minutes of the December 5, 2013 meeting as presented. Mr. Hopkins seconded the motion. The minutes were then approved unanimously by the Plan Commission members.

**4. COMMUNICATIONS**

- Proclamation by the Mayor for Michael Pollock Day

- Updated Staff Recommendation for Plan Case No. 2218-PUD-13 and Plan Case No. 2219-PUD-13
- Revised Site Plan for Plan Case No. 2218-PUD-13 and Plan Case No. 2219-PUD-13
- Revised Preliminary Plat for Plan Case No. 2217-S-13

## 5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

### **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. Elizabeth Tyler, Director of Community Development Services, referred to the Revised Site Plan that was handed out prior to the meeting. She presented the changes made to the Site Plan reflecting comments and discussion by the Plan Commission members at their previous meeting on December 19, 2013. Changes include the following:

- Apartments being relocated further away from the residential homes in the adjacent neighborhood to the west. They will now be located in the center of the proposed development. This will give a more articulated facade from Windsor Road and will benefit scale differential with the surrounding neighborhood.
- The new plan removes the encroachments and reduces the right-of-way setbacks. The road will still be a public road and fit within a 40-foot right-of-way, which will allow for a 5-foot parkway along the side for landscaping and utilities.
- There will also be additional walkways that allow for a more expansive pedestrian network.
- A private alley will be provided that egresses out onto Windsor Road. This also helps with the encroachments and will provide better proximity of parking spaces to the units. This will not be a full access. It will only be accessible from Windsor Road by emergency vehicles. The Fire Department is supportive of this change.

These changes will result in reduction or elimination of some of the waivers that the petitioner was requesting in the previous Plan Commission meeting.

Jeff Engstrom, Planner II, presented a brief update on the tax benefits that the City could realize from the proposed development. After construction of the entire development is completed, the City's property tax would be about \$40,000 per year. The Urbana School District would get about \$155,000 per year.

Ms. Tyler concluded the staff report by saying that Planning staff has met with the engineer, architect and owner of the proposed site. There is good support for the revised Site Plan from the City's Planning staff as well as the City's Engineering staff and Fire Department. The City staff are definitely interested in infill development and optional housing choices in the City of Urbana.

Chair Fitch opened the hearing up for Plan Commission questions to City staff.

Mr. Otto inquired about the height of Building A. Mr. Engstrom replied that they would be two and one-half stories or 32 feet high. The architect would be able to answer this more accurately. Ms. Tyler added that the standard height limit for single-family residential is 35 feet.

Mr. Otto asked if the rear-yard setback was conforming. Mr. Engstrom said yes.

Mr. Fell stated that site conditions often require 6 inches more in height. He asked if the City should give them a maximum height of 52 feet, seven inches. Mr. Engstrom replied that the conditions for previously approved Planned Unit Development (PUD) allowed the height to be as tall as necessary which gave them more leeway. Ms. Tyler liked the idea of giving some leeway but not leaving it open.

Mr. Fitch stated that the labels for the apartment building orientation are labelled wrong. Mr. Engstrom explained that the elevations were mistakes included from the previous Site Plan.

Chair Fitch explained the procedure for a public hearing and invited the audience to speak.

Gary Olson, Michelle Olson and Ryan Olson approached the Plan Commission to speak. Mr. Gary Olson thanked the Plan Commission for their comments at the previous meeting and City staff for meeting with him and his team and helping to brainstorm the improvements to the proposed PUD plan. He gave a presentation on the following:

- Aerial View of the Surrounding Neighborhoods with an inlay of the proposed Site Plan in the middle.
- Revised Site Plan – pink buildings represent two-story townhomes, the blue building represents the apartment building and the yellow buildings represent one-story townhomes
- Setbacks from Windsor Road to the townhomes and to the apartment building
- Illustration of the view from Windsor Road showing the scale of the height of the apartment building compared to the height of the townhomes.
- Various unit options planned for the development
- Quality of materials that will be used
- Townhomes Units – Layouts
- Apartment Building includes grade level parking, elevator, patios on first floor, balconies on upper levels, cathedral ceiling on third floor.
- Site Elevation and Front Elevation
- “ModulArchitecture”

Brian Bradshaw, of BKB Engineering, joined the meeting via Skype. He reviewed some of the changes made to the Site Plan. The changes include the following:

- Pavement Plan
  - *Gray*: Cul-De-Sac and Public Street (same as previously proposed)
  - *Red*: Private driveway and parking spaces. They added over a dozen public parking spaces for visitors in the revised Site Plan.

- *Purple:* Porous pavement system that looks like grass; however, it will be able to handle large emergency vehicles
- *Curb modifications*
- *Blue:* Sidewalk. Adding 200 feet more of sidewalk in the revised Site Plan.
- Utility Plan works out better with new layout in that it allows them to provide a loop around the site and connect back into the 12” water main, which will improve the pressure for the fire hydrants and improve the water quality for the residents.
- Watershed Plan – stormwater basin is a different shape, but can hold the same amount of water as before

Mr. Gary Olson stated that they hoped to begin construction in the Spring of 2014.

Mr. Fell asked if they planned to berm up against the back of the apartment building with the parking vents and would this impact what happens in the basin. Mr. Olson replied the berm would level off at the bottom of the parking vents and slope down both sides.

With no further public input, Chair Fitch closed the public hearing and opened the case for Plan Commission discussion and/or motion(s).

Mr. Hopkins moved that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 2218-PUD-13 to the City Council with a recommendation for approval. Mr. Otto seconded the motion.

Mr. Hopkins moved that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 2219-PUD-13 to the City Council with a recommendation for approval including the waivers as recommended by City staff. Mr. Otto seconded the motion.

Mr. Fell recommended a friendly amendment to the motion that the Plan Commission increases the maximum height in Waiver #7 to 52’7” because things can happen that vary the height of the building during construction. Mr. Hopkins and Mr. Otto agreed the amendment.

Mr. Fell asked if City staff was comfortable with the wording “shall be as necessary” in Waiver #3 and Waiver #4. Mr. Engstrom said yes. Ms. Tyler stated that they are trying to follow the PUD Ordinance, which asks them to call out waivers.

Ms. Byndom asked if the units were accessible to persons with disabilities. Mr. Olson responded that the apartment building units and the townhome units are handicap accessible; however, some of the townhomes have a second floor, which would be accessed by stairs.

Roll call on the motion for Plan Case No. 2218-PUD-13 was as follows:

Ms. Byndom	-	Yes	Mr. Fell	-	Yes
Mr. Fitch	-	Yes	Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes
Mr. Otto	-	Yes			

The motion was approved by unanimous vote.

Roll call on the motion for Plan Case NO. 2219-PUD-13 was as follows:

Ms. Byndom	-	Yes	Mr. Fell	-	Yes
Mr. Fitch	-	Yes	Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes
Mr. Otto	-	Yes			

The motion was approved by unanimous vote.

Mr. Engstrom stated that these two cases would be forwarded to the City Council on January 6, 2014.

## 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.**

Chair Fitch opened this case. Jeff Engstrom, Planner II, presented this case to the Plan Commission. He began by stating that Brian Bradshaw gave a good overview presentation during the previous Planned Unit Development (PUD) cases in terms of utilities, access, pavement and stormwater detention. He noted that City staff handed out a copy of the Preliminary Plat prior to the start of the meeting. He explained that because there are waivers being requested by the petitioner, rather than the Plan Commission approving or denying the Preliminary Plat, they will forward the case to the City Council with a recommendation. The waivers are as follows:

- Allow seven lots to not have frontage on a public street; and,
- Allow the access portion of a lot to be less than 20 feet wide; and,
- Allow reduced right-of-way width for a public street; and,
- Allow the detention basin to be located within 8 feet of the right-of-way; and,
- Allow street with no public sidewalk; and,
- Allow a private alley

He presented staff's recommendation.

Chair Fitch opened the case up for Plan Commission questions for City staff.

Mr. Otto asked if the branch off the circle drive is considered a private alley. Who would maintain this alley? Mr. Engstrom answered yes; it will be a private alley and will be maintained by the homeowner's association. There will be one homeowner's association for the entire development.

Chair Fitch explained the procedure for a public hearing and opened the case up for public input. There was none, so Chair Fitch closed the public hearing and opened the case up for Plan Commission discussion and/or motion(s).

Mr. Fell asked if the City would require an easement for the storm sewer that will run down the private alley. Mr. Engstrom replied that an easement would be required as part of the final plat.

Mr. Hopkins moved that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 2220-S-13 to the City Council with a recommendation for approval of the Preliminary Plat and the requested waivers. Mr. Fell seconded the motion. Roll call on the motion was as follows:

Ms. Byndom	-	Yes	Mr. Fell	-	Yes
Mr. Fitch	-	Yes	Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes
Mr. Otto	-	Yes			

The motion was approved by unanimous vote. The case will be forwarded to the City Council on January 6, 2014.

**7. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS**

There were none.

**8. NEW BUSINESS**

**Plan Case No. 2220-S-13: A request by Marcus Harris for a waiver of Section 21-42.B of the Urbana Subdivision and Land Development Code regarding storm water management requirements for the 8.38-acre subdivision, Country Side Second Subdivision, which is located immediately northeast of the intersection of Anthony Drive and Cottonwood Road.**

Chair Fitch opened this case. Mr. Fell recused himself due to a conflict of interest. Chair Fitch explained that according to the Plan Commission bylaws this action does not affect the quorum established to conduct the meeting. Of the four voting Plan Commission members, they will need three votes in favor of a motion for it to pass.

Jeff Engstrom, Planner II, presented this case to the Plan Commission. He gave a brief background of the history of the proposed site and the previously approved plat. He discussed the proposed request to waive the storm water management requirements of Section 21-42.B of the Urbana Subdivision and Land Development Code. He reviewed the petitioner’s justification for the waiver. He presented staff’s recommendation.

Elizabeth Tyler, Director of Community Development Services, explained that the rural subdivision was platted many years ago in a sub-standard way and has not been built out. The proposed subdivision is an improvement in terms of the lot sizes and the access. There are people interested in purchasing some of the lots, but the petitioner is not able to provide all of the urban improvements to the subdivision and make it happen. The petitioner is able to provide a road but not the storm water detention. From a market standpoint, the petitioner would not be prepared to build a whole detention basin. From her understanding, without approval of the proposed waiver, the petitioner does not feel that the subdivision would be able to be completed. She pointed out that when reviewing rural subdivisions, it is difficult to apply the City’s one-size-fits-all subdivision requirements for urban subdivisions.

Mr. Fitch asked if there is another option other than the detention basin to provide drainage for the proposed site. Brad Bennett, Senior Civil Engineer for the City of Urbana, replied that there are several types of detention that they could provide. There is wet storage, such as the big ponds in the Stone Creek Subdivision, and dry detention where there is a depressed area that water is allowed to be temporarily pond in. In more urban dense areas, there are underground detentions. The idea about requiring stormwater detention is that when there is a heavy rainfall there is a place to store the runoff temporarily and allow it to discharge at a lower rate over a longer period of time to mitigate the downstream impacts.

Chair Fitch explained the procedure for the public hearing and opened the hearing up for public input.

Marcus Harris, petitioner, talked about his previous plans to develop the proposed site. He stated that he has some people interested in purchasing lots. The problem is if they start to install a rainwater detention system, it adds to the cost of development. If the cost of the development goes up, then the lot price goes up. This similar to what happened with the Brickhouse Subdivision, and they have yet to sell a lot.

He understands the importance of a stormwater management. He feels that the proposed site does drain. There is a good elevation change from the wooded section to the west down to the east. There is a tile system along Cottonwood Road that drains into the Saline Branch. He argued that because of the large lots, he did not feel that stormwater runoff would be an issue. He hoped to get a waiver or compromise so that he can complete the subdivision as planned.

Roger Meyer, of Berns, Clancy and Associates, stated that he is the Engineer for the proposed subdivision development. He discussed the data he had obtained for the area north of the proposed site for various other projects, and he noted that stormwater detention is absolutely the wrong thing to do in this location. He stated that the proposed development is unique in that it is located close to the Saline Branch. If they would provide a detention area on each lot, it would decrease the value of each lot.

He talked about C values in the Land Development Manual on Table 14.7. For residential, the C value should be in the vicinity of a .30 to a .50 for single-family. The City of Urbana staff uses a C value of .40, which is a reasonable number for a 1/3 of an acre lot in town. It is not really appropriate for 1-acre lots in the rural areas. He, then, talked further about his calculations with regards to impervious surfaces, grass and lawns, cultivated land and wooded areas. When he does the math, his C value for pre-developed areas are essentially the same as the C value for post-developed areas. He also evaluated the existing storm sewer farm tile system, and it can accommodate a ten-year rainfall event. Any rainfall in excess of a ten-year rainfall event would create surface water. However, just as in the City limits, he does not design all of the storm sewer systems to contain all of the rainfall and allow some of the stormwater to surface flow during these significant rainfall events. A fifty-year storm event will produce approximately 15% more runoff than a ten-year event. It is his opinion that ditches are more than adequate to accommodate the 15% extra runoff. The proposed development would not hurt anything. In fact, it would slightly improve things, but they would not improve things as much as the Subdivision Ordinance would want.

He noted that a five-acre parcel of land would be exempt from the stormwater management requirement. The proposed site has half the impervious surface that a five-acre parcel would be able to have by right. Just because they are above the five acres, they fall into a much stricter stormwater management issue.

Mr. Hopkins understood that one of the petitioner's arguments for not providing a stormwater management system is because the proposed site is downstream from the City of Urbana relative of the Saline Branch. Mr. Meyer said that is correct.

Mr. Hopkins asked for clarification on another argument that there is a second watershed routing issue regarding ditches and a farm drainage tile. Mr. Meyer explained that years ago before the Interstate 74 was constructed there was a farm tile that extended from south of where Interstate 74 is currently located to the Saline Branch to the north. This farm drainage tile was along the edge of the road. When the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) designed Interstate 74, they did not want the drainage tile under the fill for the overpass, so they constructed a storm sewer which extended from south of the Interstate 74 ramp northerly along the western side of Cottonwood Road to Anthony Drive, then diagonally across Anthony Drive to an existing field tile that they were abandoning further south. From there north, it is still the original 15" diagonal farm tile. So, there is a closed system that IDOT put in from the inlets south of Interstate 74, which is from 1800 feet north to the Countryside Second Subdivision. With it being a closed system, the only water that gets into it is what infiltrates into it as a tile and the water that flows into the inlet south of Interstate 74; however, since it is a storm sewer system, water should not be able to infiltrate into it as a tile.

Mr. Hopkins questioned whether the Countryside Second Subdivision would contribute to the flow of the tile. Mr. Meyer said yes, it would. There is a proposed street with a storm sewer system to accommodate drainage for the street. The storm sewer system ties into the existing tile. Their desire is to collect their water and put it into the tile and let it run downstream.

Mr. Hopkins gathered that the issue is whether there enough capacity in the 15" farm tile from an inlet that the petitioner is relying on to the Saline Branch for the volume of their drainage to flow before the peak flow based on the rest of the upstream water shed south of Interstate 74 at some concentration time for some storm. Mr. Meyer said yes. His understanding is that the City staff does not feel that the petitioner can get enough of the drainage runoff from the subdivision downstream before the Interstate drainage runoff gets there. He believes that if they provide detention areas to collect storm water from the subdivision, then they will be depositing more water into the existing tile system when the water from Interstate 74 comes through.

Mr. Harris pointed out that there is a standard ditch line along Cottonwood Road and Anthony Drive. So, there is in essence a detention already on top of the farm tile system. Hopkins asked if the petitioner planned to route the ditches. Mr. Meyer stated that the ditches are in need of maintenance, so they are planning to clean the ditches as part of the subdivision. He did not independently calculate the ditch flow, because he was only putting 15% of a 50-year storm in the ditches.

Mr. Otto asked if they had access to tap into the farm tile. Mr. Harris stated that he talked to the Road Commissioner, Jim Prather, and to the Tile Commissioner, Warren Rittenhouse, and both gave him permission to have access to the tile system.



Mr. Bennett clarified City staff's position by saying that the C factors are not critical to the argument. The Ordinance is written is if a subdivision is over 5 acres, then they need to provide a detention. City staff's concern is the downstream capacity. Based on the information submitted by Berns, Clancy & Associates, they are showing for a 5-year design that the tile would be taking the water surcharge to 6-1/2'. The way the Ordinance requirements are written they are supposed to pass the 5-year post development storm in their storm sewer system under gravity conditions; not under 6-1/2' of pressure head on, which is what the petitioner and his representatives are showing.

For a new site being developed, the City requires the developer to route the 50-year flow into the detention basin. They can do it with the storm sewer system under surcharge condition. The proposed site cannot even get the 5-year post development storm to the Saline Branch under gravity conditions, so City staff has some concerns about their ability to route the 50-year storm off the site down to the Saline based on the calculations submitted.

Mr. Otto asked if the petitioner were to provide a storm water detention system, where would it be located. Mr. Meyer replied that the only practical place would be to locate it on the northwest corner of the subdivision. This would make the proposed Lot 11 less than desirable. Mr. Harris added that there is an option of underground storage, but this would be extremely costly. He talked about how the requirement to provide a street rather than constructing a shared driveway increased the cost of constructing the subdivision. If they have to construct a detention system also, this would only make it financially unfeasible to construct the subdivision.

Mr. Otto questioned what the two land owners to the north have to say about the proposed waivers. Mr. Harris said that he had spoken with them, and they do not feel that it will have an impact on their properties. Mr. Meyer talked about how the lawns will absorb more water than agricultural land would. He did not feel that the proposed subdivision without a detention system would have a negative impact on the neighbors.

Mr. Harris stated that he would prefer to leave it up to each future individual owner to determine the method used for providing a detention system on their own lot. Mr. Hopkins asked City staff if there can be conditions on a waiver. One condition could be to require a bond or covenant that deals with 10, 40 or 80 years from now when they have to size the storm drain on Cottonwood Road to handle development on both side of the road. He believes that at that time, there will be improved methods of providing a detention system for a larger area rather than providing eight, tiny hard-to-maintain and hard-to-design detention ponds. He recalled the Walmart Subdivision when the City required the use of regional detention requirements. Mr. Bennett stated that Walmart provided their own on-site detention behind the store. In addition, they had a barrow pit leftover that they turned over to the City of Urbana as a regional detention. Ms. Tyler added that it was built as part of a settlement to a lawsuit. Mr. Bennett went on to say that there is a regional detention by the Holiday Inn off of Lincoln Avenue. It collects stormwater from several adjacent properties that had previously paid money to the City to pay for the construction of a basin.

Mr. Hopkins stated that the immediate effect of the Countryside Second Subdivision will be no change of what was there before. However, the longer term issue is as there is more development, then the management of detention on this channel will be relevant. So, how do we

deal with this over time? A typical way of doing this is bonding more requirements for future deferrals, such as with sidewalks. What is legal binding that they do have to provide the feature and pay for it? Ms. Tyler replied that it is through recording the document that makes it legally binding. It is similar to an easement, in which it is another responsibility of ownership. Hopefully, people are aware of what they buy.

Mr. Bennett explained that it is very difficult to retrofit a stormwater detention into a development after it has been constructed. It would be expensive for property owners later on to have to pay for upsizing the pipe or trying to build a detention area somewhere within the existing subdivision. If they do a regional detention facility, then they would need to get the property owners to commit to it up front rather than asking how much each property owner would be willing to pay.

Mr. Hopkins stated that another option for granting a waiver is for the City to set a maximum impervious area per lot. He did not feel that this would help a lot because the issue from the Ordinance point of view that the waiver is about is a 50-year storm event.

Ms. Tyler summarized her understand of the discussion of other options. She mentioned the petitioner talking about cleaning the roadside ditches and suggested that this be listed as a condition.

She expressed concern about the impact on adjoining neighbors and owners of facilities. Because subdivision plats do not have public hearings and because the plat has already been approved, City staff would want to make sure that anyone who could potentially be impacted, such as the Township and the Saline Branch District, understands the subdivision waivers.

Ms. Tyler talked about drainage deferral versus sidewalk deferral. It is easier to approve a sidewalk deferral because everyone knows that the sidewalk will be installed in the right-of-way. If the Plan Commission is interested in some middle ground, then maybe there is a way to identify proper detention location. Mr. Meyer stated that it would make more sense to upsize the storm sewer system at a future date when the other areas develop than to put in detention this close to the downstream and to the watershed. Mr. Bennett noted that the big difference between a sidewalk deferral and a detention deferral is that installing a sidewalk at a later date may cost a several thousand dollars. However, installing a detention may cost the homeowner tens of thousands of dollars and if it means upgrading the capacity of the tile, then it could be hundreds of thousands of dollars. One of the reasons the City requires all of the infrastructure to go in is because it is priced into the lot, and a home buyer knows exactly what they are getting into. It is hard to come back years later and ask for \$10,000 or so to put in a detention.

Mr. Meyer talked about a seminar situation where drainage detentions caused an increased flooding downstream on farmland. He had a similar experience in Pleasant Valley a few years ago. It makes sense for properties close to the outfall to not be detained, so that the upstream detained water does not reach the site simultaneously with the local detained discharge.

With no further audience input, Chair Fitch closed the public input portion and opened the case to Plan Commission discussion and/or motion(s).

Ms. Byndom understood this to be a cost issue. If the petitioner doesn't build the detention, then the cost would be deferred to the future home owners. Mr. Fitch stated that if the petitioner is required to construct a detention, then the cost would be absorbed into the sell price of each lot. Mr. Bennett explained that the cost of a lot includes all of the infrastructure incorporated as part of the development, which is why a lot will often sell for \$30,000 to \$60,000. The developer, not the City, is responsible for these infrastructure costs, and he/she passes the cost along to the buyers.

Mr. Otto stated that the real interest is protecting the neighbors downstream from this proposed subdivision. Ms. Tyler replied that the only recourse option for an adjoining neighbor would be civil law. Mr. Otto asked if the State of Illinois has any requirements regarding stormwater management plans. Mr. Bennett added that there would be no state wide drainage permit or regulatory permit that the petitioner would need to receive from the State of Illinois. Ms. Tyler added that the detention requirements are modern, which is why the City has so many subdivisions without detention basins. She reiterated that if the Plan Commission wants to defer detention management, then she recommended that they require an outlot for a future detention basin.

Mr. Hopkins recalled issues with the Brickhouse Road Subdivision. Ms. Tyler confirmed his recollection. The big debate was with the sanitary sewer connection, but it did raise an issue with rural subdivision standards. It included waiver requests for sidewalks and street width.

Ms. Byndom asked if the neighbors to the east were notified of this case. Mr. Engstrom said no. For a subdivision plat, there is no requirement for public hearing. City staff sends out the plat out for review by the Township and drainage district.

Mr. Hopkins noted that he would like to either continue the case or vote against the waiver request with the intention of sorting out a solution. Ms. Tyler stated that by continuing the case, it would allow City staff more time to contact adjoining neighbors and to try to meet with the petitioner again to talk through other possible solutions or approaches. Mr. Hopkins preferred to continue the case. Mr. Fitch reviewed the criterion from Section 21-7 or the Urbana Subdivision and Land Development Code. He stated that he would like to continue the case as well. Mr. Otto agreed with Mr. Hopkins and Mr. Fitch.

Mr. Hopkins moved that the Plan Commission continue Plan Case No. 2220-S-13 to the next meeting on January 9, 2014. Mr. Otto seconded the motion. Roll call on the motion was as follows:

Ms. Byndom	-	Yes	Mr. Fitch	-	Yes
Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes	Mr. Otto	-	Yes

The motion was approved by unanimous vote.

**9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

Carol McKusick, of 1907 North Cunningham Avenue, asked when the current Zoning Ordinance became effective. Mr. Engstrom replied September 16, 2013. She pointed out that it cannot

become effective until ten days after it has been published and publishing can take up to 30 days after its date of passage.

Ms. McKusick asked how many people receive paper packets. Mr. Engstrom replied that there are around 25 people who receive paper packets. There are some people who prefer to receive it electronically. The packet is posted on the website on the same day that they are mailed out, which is generally the Friday before the Plan Commission meeting.

Ms. McKusick asked about the timeline for amending minutes. Mr. Fitch stated that due to some meetings being cancelled, if the Plan Commission needs to amend the minutes, it could take two to five weeks later. The amended minutes would be placed on the agenda and placed on the website with the rest of the packet.

Ms. McKusick commented that she did not believe that the Plan Commission should cancel meetings because there are other non-case items that the Plan Commission should attend to such as the Draft minutes. If Plan Commissioners have corrections to the minutes in the first meeting that they consider them for approval, there is a sticky note feature on Acrobat that a person could use to suggest corrections. She talked about a correction that she would have suggested to the December 5, 2013 meeting minutes.

## **10. STAFF REPORT**

Ms. Tyler gave a staff report on the following:

- Thanked Jen Gonzalez for filling in for Teri Andel
- Introduced Rebecca Nathanson, Planning Intern

Mr. Engstrom reported on the following:

- Southwind RAS, LLC Special Use Permit including a Conditional Use Permit was approved by City Council.
- Long Range Transportation Plan – City staff continues to work on this in cooperation with CUUATS and the Champaign County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC).
- Park District Trails Plan – City staff is working on a trails plan for the Urbana Park District. CCRPC is leading this effort and will provide opportunity for the public to submit input.
- The Urbana Bicycle Plan Update – CCRPC is also working on updating this plan. There will be a public meeting in January, 2014 to allow public input.
- The Greenways and Trails Plan – Champaign County staff is in the process of updating this plan, and it will be brought to the Plan Commission and the City Council as an element of the City's 2005 Comprehensive Plan.

## **11. STUDY SESSION**

There was none.

**12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Elizabeth H. Tyler, FAICP, Secretary  
Urbana Plan Commission