

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

DATE: November 16, 2005
TIME: 7:30 p.m.
PLACE: Urbana City Building
City Council Chambers
400 S. Vine Street
Urbana, IL 61801

APPROVED

MEMBERS PRESENT: Paul Armstrong, Herb Corten, Anna Merritt, Joe Schoonover, Nancy Uchtmann

MEMBERS ABSENT Anna Merritt, Charles Warmbrunn, Harvey Welch

STAFF PRESENT: Robert Myers, Planning Manager; Paul Lindahl, Planner I; Matt Wempe, Planner I; Teri Andel, Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT: Tom Harrington, Bruce Krueger, Howard Wakeland

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

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Corten moved that Paul Armstrong serve as Acting Chair for the meeting in the absence of Anna Merritt. Mr. Schoonover seconded the motion. The Zoning Board of Appeals agreed unanimously.

Mr. Armstrong mentioned that there were new microphones on the dais. He explained how to use them for when the Board members wanted to make comments or ask questions.

The roll call was taken. Mr. Armstrong declared a quorum present.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

There were none.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There was a request to change the spelling from Manger to Manager on page 2, 2nd paragraph from the bottom, of the minutes for the October 19, 2005 meeting. Ms. Uchtmann moved to approve the minutes as corrected. Mr. Corten seconded the motion. The Zoning Board of Appeals approved the minutes by unanimous vote.

NOTE: Mr. Armstrong swore in members of the audience who were planning to testify during any of the public hearings.

4. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

- ☐ Copy of an aerial photo for ZBA Case No. 05-MAJ-06 and Case No. 05-MAJ-07
- ☐ Revised copy of the Rules of Procedure for the Zoning Board of Appeals.

5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

6. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

ZBA-05-C-03: Request filed by Devonshire Realty for Conditional Use Permit to establish multiple buildings on a single lot along Fairlawn Drive between Vine Street and Anderson Street in the R-5, Medium High Density Multiple Family Residential Zoning District.

Matt Wempe, Planner I, presented the case to the Zoning Board of Appeals. He began by giving a brief description and background of the proposed site. He talked about the purpose for the proposed conditional use permit request. He discussed the parking requirements and the location of the access drives. He noted the table in the written staff report that outlined the zoning and existing land uses of the surrounding properties. He reviewed the requirements for a conditional use permit according to Section VII-2 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance. He summarized staff findings, read the options of the Zoning Board, and presented staff's recommendation, which was as follows:

Based on the evidence presented in the written staff report, and without the benefit of considering additional evidence that may be presented during the public hearing, staff recommended that the Zoning Board of Appeals approve the proposed conditional use permit in case ZBA 05-C-03 along with the following conditions:

1. *That the development shall closely resemble the submitted site plan attached as Exhibit F, unless amended to meet parking or other requirements of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance. Any significant deviation from the site plan will require an amendment to the conditional use permit, including further review and approval by the Zoning Board of Appeals.*

2. *That the development shall meet all applicable standards and regulations of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance and the Urbana Subdivision and Land Development Code.*
3. *That the petitioner shall submit a parking and access plan.*

Mr. Corten inquired if drainage and sewage had been considered with the construction of the new buildings. Mr. Wempe responded by saying that drainage had not been looked at, because the petitioner had not submitted a drainage plan to accommodate the increased impervious area. However, a drainage plan would be required by the Urbana Subdivision and Land Development Code. Therefore, the petitioner would need to submit their calculations to the Urbana Engineering Division to determine any additional capacity or improvements.

Mr. Corten stated that cases are usually brought to the Zoning Board of Appeals after their designs are complete. He wondered if there was a reason as to why this case was brought before them before all the plans have been submitted. Mr. Wempe noted that the case was brought forward because the petitioner wanted to move ahead. The first hurdle in the entire process of building the proposed units was getting permission to actually build more than one new unit. The petitioners realize that they will probably have to come back for additional variance approvals. City staff will be working with the petitioners on this.

Mr. Corten noticed that the picture of what the proposed units would look like shows a garage at both ends of the building. He asked how people would access the garages that would not be facing the street. Mr. Wempe explained that there would be 20 units that would not have an attached garage.

Ms. Uchtmann expressed concern about whether the eight additional buildings would destroy the atmosphere of Fairlawn Village making it less desirable. Will the proposed new buildings decrease the value of the existing buildings? Will there be more problems created to maintain the existing units? When driving through Fairlawn Village, she noticed that the street side had been maintained much better than the back side of the units. Mr. Wempe said that the petitioner could speak to the marketability of the proposed sites. As far as impacting the neighborhood, there would still be several large courtyards even after the petitioner constructed the new units. The proposed site was zoned for medium high density multiple families, and it was currently not being used to its highest and best use. Although there would be additional buildings, the petitioner would still be maintaining some of the things that make Fairlawn Village unique, such as the larger open spaces.

Ms. Uchtmann questioned whether there would be enough green space to meet the open space requirements if the driveways are put in along Fairlawn Avenue. Mr. Wempe noted that the driveways shown on the site plan would be roughly 45 feet wide. The City Engineer had expressed some concern with the width, so it will be something that the staff and the petitioner will discuss. There was really no requirement for this though. The open space requirement was roughly calculated for the entire site, and there would be substantial green space throughout the site.

Tom Harrington, of Devonshire Realty, addressed the Board to answer any questions.

Mr. Corten inquired as to how the existing units were being used – rented or purchased. Mr. Harrington stated that the existing units were all rental units now. Mr. Corten asked if it was considered low income or medium income housing. Mr. Harrington replied that it was considered medium housing with some graduate student housing. Mr. Corten questioned whether the proposed new units would attract a different group than what currently resides there now. Mr. Harrington believed that the new units would be marketed at a higher price than the resale of the existing buildings.

Mr. Corten inquired if the units would be generally air-conditioned as well as automatic heating. Mr. Harrington said yes. He mentioned that the new units would sell for \$120,000 to \$130,000 per unit.

Ms. Uchtmann wondered why the petitioner was planning to build 45-foot wide driveways. Mr. Harrington was not sure that they were planning this. The site plan showed the driveways coming straight out from the units to the street. At this point, we were just looking at a general site plan. When they get to the building permit process, they will define how wide the driveways would actually be. He believed that they would be more like a standard driveway to that size unit, which is about 25 feet, and it would flair out to the building.

Mr. Corten commented that this appeared to be a very attractive area for families with children in that the schools were so closely located. Mr. Harrington agreed.

Ms. Uchtmann inquired if the petitioner had a concern about decreasing the ambience of the area. Mr. Harrington believed that the proposed new units would increase the ambience of the area. It is fairly low and spread out now, but with the proposed new buildings being different heights, it would create more of a village atmosphere. The existing buildings were rehabilitated about 12 years ago with new siding. The new plan involves new roofing, shutters, fencing and patios on the existing buildings. Then, the existing buildings should match the look of the new construction.

Mr. Corten inquired if the converted apartments would sell for less. Mr. Harrington replied by saying that the one bedroom units would sell for \$65,000 to \$70,000, and the two bedroom units would sell for \$80,000 to \$90,000.

Mr. Corten asked if the petitioner experienced students attending the University of Illinois to purchase apartments rather than renting them. Mr. Harrington saw that in some instances, parents bought units for their children to live in. It was very hard to find anything to purchase for under \$100,000. Therefore, they felt there would be a good market for the proposed and the existing units. The petitioners felt that the area would be better served by home ownership rather than trying to continue to maintain an apartment complex.

Mr. Corten questioned if there would be lots accorded to each of the units sold. Mr. Harrington replied no. These would be considered condominiums, and there would be a homeowner's association to maintain the grass and snow removal.

Ms. Uchtmann commented that from Fairlawn Avenue, one would see the four garages. Mr. Harrington said that was true for some of the units. Ms. Uchtmann stated that four garages consisted of a lot of concrete. Mr. Harrington remarked that if you went down a similar stretch of street in a residential area, there would be far more garages and concrete than what would be in the stretch at Fairlawn Village. He pointed out that they planned to add additional garages for each of the existing units, which would help the parking situation.

Mr. Corten inquired if every unit would have an indoor garage, even though it might not be heated. Mr. Harrington replied by saying that most of the units would have a garage, some would be attached and some would be detached.

Robert Myers, Planning Manager, noted that the central question was the number of buildings on one lot. Would it be reasonable to expect that 150 – 160 unit apartments be in one building or could it be in more than one building? Typically, the Zoning Ordinance only allows one building on a lot for a principal use. Here an existing apartment complex already exists with a number of buildings on one lot.

Mr. Corten moved that the Zoning Board of Appeals approve the requested condition use permit along with the conditions recommended by staff as amended during this hearing. Mr. Schoonover seconded the motion. Roll call was as follows:

| | | | | | |
|--------------|---|-----|----------------|---|-----|
| Mr. Corten | - | Yes | Mr. Schoonover | - | Yes |
| Ms. Uchtmann | - | Yes | Mr. Armstrong | - | Yes |

The motion was passed by unanimous vote.

ZBA 05-MAJ-06 – A Major Variance to encroach 8 feet into the required 15-foot front-yard setback on Main Street in the B-3U, General Business-University Zoning District.

ZBA 05-MAJ-07 – A Major Variance to encroach 10 feet into the required 15-foot front-yard setback on Harvey Street in the B-3U, General Business-University Zoning District.

Paul Lindahl, Planner I, presented these two cases together to the Zoning Board of Appeals. He began by explaining the purpose for the two requested major variances. He described the proposed site and the properties in the surrounding area. He talked about the B-3U, General Business—University Zoning District and the Urbana Comprehensive Plan’s Future Land Use classification of Campus Mixed-Use. He reviewed the variance criteria from Section XI-3 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance that pertained to the two cases. He read the options of the Zoning Board of Appeals in both cases. He presented staff’s recommendations for each variance request, which were as follows:

ZBA-05-MAJ-06:

Based on the findings outlined in the written staff report, and without the benefit of considering additional evidence that may be presented during the public

hearing, staff recommended that the Urbana Zoning Board of Appeals recommend approval of the variance to the Urbana City Council for Case #ZBA-05-MAJ-6 with the following conditions:

- 1. That with respect to front yard setback the development on the site must generally conform to the site plan submitted with the application.*
- 2. The project shall conform to all other applicable Zoning and Building Code regulations including Open Space Ratios and parking module dimensions.*

ZBA-05-MAJ-07:

Based on the findings outlined in the written staff report, and without the benefit of considering additional evidence that may be presented during the public hearing, staff recommended that the Urbana Zoning Board of Appeals recommend approval of the variance to the Urbana City Council for Case #ZBA-05-MAJ-7 with the following conditions:

- 1. That with respect to front yard setback the development on the site must generally conform to the site plan submitted with the application.*
- 2. The project shall conform to all other applicable Zoning and Building Code regulations including Open Space Ratios and parking module dimensions.*

Ms. Uchtmann asked what the setback of the apartment building directly to the south along the Harvey Street side and along the West Main Street side. Mr. Lindahl answered by saying that the setback appeared to be 15 feet along both streets.

Ms. Uchtmann inquired as to what the setback was for the apartment building at the corner of Main Street and Gregory Street. Mr. Lindahl explained that staff did not actually measure the setbacks of these other apartment buildings. However, staff believes that the apartment buildings were constructed at the required setback of 15 feet.

Mr. Corten inquired about the design on Exhibit F. Mr. Lindahl explained that Exhibit F shows the ground level. Most of the area is taken up with parking. However, there would be two apartment units built on the ground level as well. These two apartments would conform to the American Disabilities Act requirements for handicap accessibility.

Mr. Corten asked what Unit 1 would be. Another apartment? Storage? Mr. Lindahl stated that the petitioner would have to answer this question. He was not sure whether this space would be empty or not.

Mr. Corten questioned if the rest of the building would be on top of the ground level. It would all be apartments? Mr. Lindahl said that was correct. Mr. Myers pointed out that the dotted line going around the parking area and the two proposed units indicated the envelope of the building above the parking level.

Howard Wakeland, petitioner, addressed the Zoning Board of Appeals to answer any questions that they may have.

Mr. Corten asked if Mr. Wakeland intended to use Unit 1 as a storage area. Mr. Wakeland stated that the area labelled "Unit 1" on Exhibit F had not been designated as anything yet. It could be used as a storage space or as an additional apartment unit. It will not be built in the first phase. He pointed out that the mechanical room would be located in the basement under the first/ground level apartments.

Mr. Schoonover assumed the reason for not moving the proposed building back further from Harvey Street in Phase 1 towards the proposed building in Phase II was due to the amount of space it would take to maneuver a vehicle in the proposed parking lot. Since Unit 1 was not planned to be anything, why not move the proposed building back further away from the street? Mr. Wakeland said that the controlling measurement was parking. The parking figuration requires them to need a variance for the setback along Harvey Street.

Mr. Myers asked Mr. Wakeland to explain to the Zoning Board of Appeals why he was requesting a major variance to build one-bedroom apartments. Mr. Wakeland believed that a person who builds a unit of one-bedroom apartments is at a disadvantage when it comes to considering the parking requirements. Regardless of whether you build a one-bedroom apartment complex or a two-bedroom apartment complex, the City requires only one parking space for either. If he wanted to maximize his profits and the City's tax base, then he would be smart to build two-bedroom units. However, there were some things that he did not like about two-bedroom apartments, and there was a very good market for one bedroom apartments. Maintenance in one-bedroom apartment complex is much lower. There is less partying and alcohol, etc. Mr. Myers mentioned that the Planning Division was working on changing the zoning standard for the parking, so it would no longer be based on the size of the bedroom. It soon will be based on the number of bedrooms in a unit.

Mr. Corten inquired if the units would be rentals. Mr. Wakeland replied yes. Mr. Corten questioned how much the rent would be. Mr. Wakeland noted that his company operates a little differently than other rental companies. They believe that every apartment should have its own laundry area. Wakeland Rentals has their own computer network among all of their buildings. They also provide cable television and fully furnished apartments. With these amenities, two bedroom apartments rent for \$1,000 per month, and one-bedroom apartments rent for \$690 to \$760 per month. He noted that they have been fully rented since 1968.

Mr. Corten asked if the tenants pay their own utilities. Mr. Wakeland replied yes. The cost of the utilities depends on the tenant and how often they use electricity and water, etc.

Mr. Wakeland went on to explain that there were six houses from the corner to where Phase II would end. Only one of the six houses was worth keeping. The other five needed to be demolished. Three of the six houses are still there and will be demolished next year.

He mentioned that the company is family owned and run. His son is a master builder. They do not want the company to get too large. This is the reason why they are planning to build this in two phases.

November 16, 2005

Mr. Corten asked if the demand was great for one-bedroom apartment units. Mr. Wakeland said yes. He noted that they keep security under control. Someone is in their apartment buildings everyday. The location of the proposed new apartment building is ideal. It is close to campus. If they were not right across the street from campus, he would not be planning to build the proposed apartment building. He also pointed out that the proposed new apartment building would increase the taxes about ten-fold from what the City had been getting on these lots.

Mr. Corten asked staff if Mr. Wakeland would have to come back to the Zoning Board of Appeals with a design that is more complete. Mr. Wakeland mentioned that he had submitted final plans and was in the process of working with the City's Engineering Division and with the Building Inspector. Mr. Lindahl added that the final plans would be reviewed for all the different zoning compliance factors, building safety factors, and engineering factors.

Mr. Corten asked what the Zoning Board of Appeals was to be considering at this meeting. Mr. Lindahl said that the Zoning Board of Appeals was to decide whether or not the proposed apartment building should be allowed to encroach into the front-yard setbacks on Harvey Street and Main Street at 1014 and 1016. These two major variances were not for any part of the building that would encroach into the front-yard setback in Phase II. Mr. Wakeland would need to get another setback variance for that.

Ms. Uchtmann inquired if there would be any underground parking. Mr. Wakeland said no, because the cost is too expensive.

Ms. Uchtmann asked if Mr. Wakeland planned to have the building encroach into the front-yard setback in Phase II as well. Mr. Wakeland replied yes. He should have requested the variance request for the setback encroachment for Phase II be included in with the proposed setback variance request, but he did not think to do so.

Ms. Uchtmann questioned what Mr. Wakeland would propose to build if he did not get approval of the major variance requests. Mr. Wakeland responded by saying that was a good question. He almost had a University of Illinois (U of I) commitment to lease a building on the proposed site, but the U of I backed out at the last minute. Therefore, he would probably consider building up higher, which would add a great expense. Ms. Uchtmann remarked that in order to get the same number of apartments, Mr. Wakeland would only need to build one additional story.

Mr. Wakeland went on to say that the limiting criterion was parking. That was what they were talking about earlier.

Mr. Armstrong inquired if the parking along Harvey Street would be partially screened from view. Mr. Wakeland said that they would be using the same technique as they did at 204 Harvey and 203 Gregory. The City of Urbana has always seemed to be pleased with it. It will look nice.

Ms. Uchtmann asked for clarification on how it would be considered a penalty to require a parking space for each one bedroom apartment. Mr. Lindahl explained that the City's parking requirements were currently based upon the size of the bedroom(s). Bedrooms that are 120 square feet in area or less require ½ of a parking space for each bedroom. Therefore, an

apartment with two small bedrooms would require one parking space. For a one bedroom apartment, there was basically a minimum of one parking space per dwelling unit. Two bedroom apartments lease for more money. As a result, many investors do not want to invest in the cost of a single parking space of a one bedroom unit, when they could get 40% more money for a two bedroom apartment with the same parking requirement.

Mr. Corten questioned whether an amendment to the parking requirement would affect Mr. Wakeland during Phase II. Mr. Wempe mentioned that he was working on the Zoning Ordinance update. An amendment would not necessarily change, because it would assume the ratio of ½ parking space per bedroom. Single bedroom and efficiency apartment buildings would still be required to provide one bedroom per unit. It would affect the developers and property owners of two-bedroom apartments by freeing them to provide larger sized bedrooms without the penalty of having to provide more parking spaces.

Bruce Krueger, of 806 West California Avenue, stated that he owns a rental apartment building on the south side of Main Street, just east of Harvey Street. His property is zoned B-1, Neighborhood Business Zoning District. The proposed site owned by Mr. Wakeland is zoned as B-3U, General Business—University Zoning District. Development consisting of only multi-family housing is discouraged in the B-3U. He mentioned that the development on Gregory Street, between Oregon and Nevada Streets that had been approved for a variance to their setback was a multi-use building. It has businesses on the first floor and residential use above. Everything else on the block has 15 feet setbacks.

Mr. Krueger believed that the only reason for Mr. Wakeland's variance request is to be able to increase his profits and provide more taxes for the City of Urbana. He did not believe that it had anything to do with meeting the parking requirements. He felt that if Mr. Wakeland would offer to have businesses on the first floor, then it would be okay to approve the variance request.

Mr. Corten asked if Mr. Krueger was in opposition of the proposed variance request. Mr. Krueger answered by saying that he basically objected the whole proposal; however, he did have some ambivalence towards it. It seems special treatment to get a free pass on the variance when there was no benefit other than enhance taxes for the City of Urbana and profit for Mr. Wakeland.

Mr. Corten commented that in one sense it appeared to be a win-win case except that the variances are now different, and other property owners did not get these when developing previous properties in the area. Mr. Krueger said that was correct. If this is the case, then why are the ordinances in place? Why not change them for everyone? Mr. Schoonover stated that most property owners and developers probably did not realize that there was an ordinance. They might have been able to develop bigger had they chosen to ask for variances. However, some variances are denied because of the location, reason, etc. Not all variances are approved.

Mr. Armstrong pointed out that the Zoning Board of Appeals could not address issues of the past. They could only discuss and vote on whether or not to approve the proposed variance request. So, to clarify, he understood that Mr. Krueger's objection to the proposed variance request was based upon principal. It was not that this development would pose an encumbrance

on him or his property. Mr. Krueger stated that this was true. It also might set a precedent as well for other property owners and developers to ask for variances to the setback requirements.

Ms. Uchtmann felt that approving this case would set a precedent for the area. When you look at an area that has a smaller setback, it has a completely different feel and a different appearance. She believes that it is a less desirable appearance and makes the whole campus a little less desirable looking. A five-foot, seven-foot or eight-foot setback is very small from the sidewalk. It really pushes the building so close to the sidewalk that there is very little green space, and people would be essentially living on the sidewalk. Mr. Corten commented that the University of Illinois is buying up these properties at a considerable rate. The U of I will construct buildings right out to the sidewalk. Mr. Krueger noted that his understanding was that the U of I only intended to buy up to Harvey Street.

Mr. Armstrong stated that they could not speculate on the U of I's intentions. He went on to say that regarding the issue of setbacks in this particular district, he believed that this district was undergoing a great deal of urbanization. He believed the setbacks would be under greater scrutiny in the future. We can already see it happen with other properties that are adjacent to the campus, such as the old Stratford Court area. The new development there has been built right directly against the street. He thought this kind of strategy was more urban in a conscious way. The strategy was to push the building close to the street edge to define the street edge.

Mr. Corten commented that setback is very important in a residential neighborhood area, but he saw this as being different.

Mr. Myers reiterated the criteria that the Zoning Board of Appeals must use to make a decision.

Mr. Schoonover moved that the Zoning Board of Appeals forward a recommendation for approval to the City Council on ZBA Case No. 05-MAJ-06. Mr. Corten seconded the motion. Roll call was as follows:

| | | | | | |
|----------------|---|-----|--------------|---|-----|
| Mr. Schoonover | - | Yes | Ms. Uchtmann | - | Nay |
| Mr. Armstrong | - | Yes | Mr. Corten | - | Yes |

The motion to approve ZBA Case No. 05-MAJ-06 was approved by a 3-1 vote.

Mr. Corten moved to that the Zoning Board of Appeals forward a recommendation for approval to the City Council on ZBA Case No. 05-MAJ-07. Mr. Schoonover seconded the motion. Roll call was as follows:

| | | | | | |
|--------------|---|-----|----------------|---|-----|
| Ms. Uchtmann | - | Nay | Mr. Armstrong | - | Yes |
| Mr. Corten | - | Yes | Mr. Schoonover | - | Yes |

The motion to approve ZBA Case No. 05-MAJ-07 was approved by a 3-1 vote.

7. OLD BUSINESS

Revisions to the Rules of Procedure

Mr. Armstrong mentioned that the Zoning Board of Appeals had previously decided to table this topic until this meeting due to not having a full representation of the Board. Again, they did not have a full representation and the Chair, Anna Merritt, was absent during this meeting. Therefore, he recommended that the Zoning Board of Appeals allow this issue to carry over to the next scheduled meeting. Mr. Corten seconded the motion.

Mr. Wempe explained that the next meeting for the Zoning Board of Appeals was scheduled for December 21, 2005. There is a concern of whether there would be more members in attendance with it being so close to Christmas Holiday. Also, there were no regular agenda items scheduled for that meeting as of yet. The deadline for an application to be submitted was only two weeks away. Therefore, if the next scheduled meeting is cancelled, then this issue would not be reviewed and voted upon until possibly January, 2006. He reminded the Board members that they would be reviewing the Rules of Procedure on an annual basis, and delaying this would bring it pretty close to the annual review. Staff encouraged the Board to make a decision at this meeting.

He noted that staff had made changes as requested by the Board over the last three months. He reviewed some of the changes that were a major concern for the Board members.

Mr. Armstrong pointed out that Ms. Merritt had previously expressed her satisfaction with the changes made by staff at the last meeting. He recalled that Mr. Warmbrunn had previously raised questions about the issue of "continuances". He believed that the language for continuances had been addressed.

Mr. Schoonover raised a question regarding Article III, Section 4, which states "*Public hearings may be held by less than a quorum of the Zoning Board of Appeals; however, such public hearings shall be continued until a quorum is present, at which time a vote may be taken.*" Does this mean that the members present without a quorum would open a case and listen to three hours of testimony and not take a vote until the next meeting when a quorum is present? The members that were absent would need to hear the testimony all over again. Mr. Wempe explained that it was more for petitioners coming from a long distance away to be able to have their testimony heard.

Mr. Schoonover moved that the Zoning Board of Appeals approve the amended Rules of Procedure. Ms. Uchtmann seconded the motion. Roll call was as follows:

| | | | | | |
|----------------|---|-----|--------------|---|-----|
| Mr. Armstrong | - | Yes | Mr. Corten | - | Yes |
| Mr. Schoonover | - | Yes | Ms. Uchtmann | - | Yes |

The motion was approved by unanimous vote.

8. NEW BUSINESS

There was none.

9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There was none.

10. STAFF REPORT

Mr. Myers reported on the following:

- **903 West Nevada** major variance request was approved by City Council.

11. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 9:23 p.m. by unanimous vote.

Respectfully submitted,

**Robert Myers, Secretary of the
Urbana Zoning Board of Appeals**