

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING
URBANA ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

DATE: August 18, 2004
TIME: 7:30 p.m.
PLACE: Urbana City Building
400 S. Vine Street
Urbana, IL 61801

APPROVED

MEMBERS PRESENT: Herb Corten, Anna Merritt, Joe Schoonover, Charles Warmbrunn, Harvey Welch

MEMBERS ABSENT Paul Armstrong

STAFF PRESENT: Rob Kowalski, Planning Manager; Paul Lindahl, Planner; Teri Andel, Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT: Bryan Johns, Thomas Kamm, Susan Taylor

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

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. The roll call was taken, and a quorum was declared present.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

There were none.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Warmbrunn moved to approve the minutes from the July 21, 2004 meeting as presented. Mr. Corten seconded the motion. The minutes were approved as presented by unanimous voice vote.

4. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

Note: Chair Merritt swore in members of the audience who wanted to speak during the public hearings.

6. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

ZBA-04-MAJ-09 and ZBA-04-MAJ-10: Two requests for major variances filed by Clark-Lindsey Village to permit a 100% increase in letter size height from 6-inch letters to 12 inches on two identification signs.

Paul Lindahl, Planner, introduced the request for the two major variances by explaining that the purpose for the requests were to permit a 100% increase in letter size on two identification signs, one on the new gateway type wall at the entrance on Windsor Road and the other sign would replace the existing sign on the southeast corner of Windsor Road and Race Street.

He briefly described the proposed site and surrounding properties, noting their land use. He discussed Section IX-5.B.3 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance and reviewed the variance criteria from Section XI-3 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance as they pertained to these two requests. He read the options of the Zoning Board of Appeals and stated that staff's recommendation was as follows:

Based on the findings of the variance criteria outlined in the written staff report, staff recommended that the Urbana Zoning Board of Appeals recommend approval of the proposed variances as requested to the Urbana City Council.

Mr. Warmbrunn inquired if the signs would be lit up at nighttime. Mr. Lindahl replied that it might be better directed toward the representatives of Clark-Lindsey Village.

Mr. Warmbrunn questioned how big the letters on the University of Illinois sign across the street were? Mr. Lindahl answered that he had not looked at that particular sign. Mr. Warmbrunn asked if the letters on the existing sign at the southeast corner of Windsor Road and Race Street were 12-inch letters? Mr. Lindahl stated that those letters were 14 inches. Therefore, the new letters would be smaller than what already existed.

Bryan Johns, Landscape Architect with Clark-Lindsey Village, approached the Zoning Board of Appeals. He remarked that they were planning to enhance the streetscape in the area. They wanted to improve the community by having a welcoming sign that would help identify their main entrance. In the past, many people would overshoot the main entrance. The gateway would be a means of bringing people in and would probably improve the traffic flow as well.

Mr. Corten asked if the main entrance was off of Windsor Road? Mr. Johns replied that was correct. Mr. Corten commented that if he were a stranger to the area, he would not know that was the main entrance.

Mr. Warmbrunn asked Mr. Johns to speak to the issue of wanting neon back lighting. Mr. Johns responded by saying that the letters would be a dark bronze aluminum that would be offset from the limestone wall, so that the letters would be 4 to 6 inches out. Behind the letters would be a

LED light, which would form a halo of light around the letters. Mr. Warmbrunn questioned if there would be a light behind each letter? Mr. Johns said yes. Ms. Merritt remarked that a person would be able to see the signs at night, because they would be lit up. Mr. Johns agreed.

Mr. Corten moved that the Zoning Board of Appeals recommend approval of the two major variance requests to the City Council. Mr. Schoonover seconded the motion. The roll call was as follows:

Mr. Corten	-	Yes	Ms. Merritt	-	Yes
Mr. Schoonover	-	Yes	Mr. Warmbrunn	-	Yes
Mr. Welch	-	Yes			

The motion was passed by unanimous vote. Rob Kowalski, Planning Manager, noted that the cases would be reviewed for approval by the City Council on Tuesday, September 7, 2004 at 7:30 p.m.

ZBA-04-MAJ-11: A request for a major variance by Laura Greene to allow for an increase in the maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 0.40 to 0.45 at 510 West Michigan Avenue in the R-2, Single Family Residential Zoning District.

Mr. Lindahl presented the staff report for this case to the Zoning Board of Appeals. He explained that the petitioner's reason for applying for the variance was to build additions on her home and her garage. He described the proposed site, noting the zoning designation. He reviewed the variance criteria according to Section XI-3 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance that pertained to the request. He read the options of the Zoning Board of Appeals and stated that staff's recommendation was as follows:

Based on the findings outlined in the written staff report, staff recommended that the Urbana Zoning Board of Appeals recommend approval of the proposed variance, as requested to the Urbana City Council.

Mr. Schoonover noticed that the new addition on the house would have a 5-foot setback to the property line. What was the setback for the garage to the property line? Mr. Lindahl answered by saying that it was 2-1/2 feet. He added that because it was a detached garage, it was permitted to encroach into the required side-yard setback.

Mr. Schoonover inquired how many feet the addition on the garage would be? Ms. Merritt commented that the expansion on the garage would be towards the house. Mr. Lindahl replied that the expansion on the garage would be 5 feet by 21 feet.

Mr. Schoonover asked how many feet there would be between the proposed addition on the house and the proposed addition on the garage? Mr. Lindahl believed that there would be about 5 feet.

Mr. Corten questioned if the architecture of the additions would favor the architecture of the existing house? Mr. Lindahl referred the question to the architect.

Tom Kamm, architect for Laura Greene, approached the Zoning Board of Appeals to answer questions. He explained that they were proposing to add an additional 5-1/2 feet to the south side of the existing garage. It would be used for storage. He verified that the distance between the two proposed additions would be about 6 feet. As to the character of the proposed addition to the house, he noted that the existing house was stucco and the existing garage was wood. They planned to use a mixture of stucco and wood on the proposed addition on the house to blend the two. They would keep the proposed two-story addition on the house with the massing of the existing house.

Mr. Corten asked if the new patio would be covered or not covered? Mr. Kamm replied that the new patio would not be covered. He explained that the existing patio would be removed and a new patio put in. He added that as part of this project, they were planning to build a balcony with stairs on the northwest corner to provide an access from the Dining Room down to the patio. He pointed out that the balcony did not figure into the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) calculations, because "balcony spaces", by definition in the Zoning Ordinance, are not counted as part of the gross square footage.

Mr. Corten commented that this plan reminds him of a mother-in-law apartment. Mr. Kamm responded by saying that was not what the intent of it was. This was actually two families combining that needed additional space for a piano studio and two additional bedrooms.

Mr. Corten inquired if there were any questions about the residence being a single-family dwelling. Ms. Merritt commented that it was for a blended single-family. Mr. Kowalski remarked that the variance would not give any approvals to the petitioner to use it any other way than as single-family residential. If there were a desire in the future, for the petitioner to use the proposed addition on the house in some other way, then the petitioner would have to get another approval for that.

Mr. Schoonover moved that the Zoning Board of Appeals recommend approval of this variance request to the City Council. Mr. Welch seconded the motion. The roll call was as follows:

Ms. Merritt	-	Yes	Mr. Schoonover	-	Yes
Mr. Warmbrunn	-	Yes	Mr. Welch	-	Yes
Mr. Corten	-	Yes			

The motion was passed by unanimous vote. Mr. Kowalski noted that the case would be heard by the City Council on Tuesday, September 7, 2004 at 7:30 p.m.

7. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

8. NEW BUSINESS

There was none.

9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There was none.

10. STAFF REPORT

Mr. Kowalski reported on the following:

- **Previous Cases:** The FAR variance requests for the Ridge, the variance request for the house at Mumford and Vine Street, and the variance request in the height for the sign for the First Presbyterian Church were all approved by the City Council.
- **Next Scheduled Meeting:** There might be one case to be heard on September 15, 2004.

11. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 7:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

**Rob Kowalski, Planning Manager
Urbana Zoning Board of Appeals**