

MEETING MINUTES

URBANA DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

DATE: April 16, 2009

APPROVED

TIME: 7:30 p.m.

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Alice Englebretsen, Ben Grosser, Michael McCulley, Shirley Stillinger, Art Zangerl

MEMBERS ABSENT: Chris Hartman

STAFF PRESENT: Robert Myers, Planning Manager; Rebecca Bird, Planner I; Teri Andel, Planning Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT: Adam Coens, Ryan DeWerff, Andrew Fulton, Victor Johnson, Michael Kinate, Diana Martinez, Gary Olsen, Laurel Wilson

This being the first meeting of the Design Review Board for the Lincoln-Busey Corridor, Rebecca Bird, Planner I, gave a brief overview of the meeting process.

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

Chair Zangerl called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m. Roll call was taken and a quorum was declared present.

Mr. Grosser moved that Art Zangerl serve as Temporary Chairperson for this meeting. Mr. McCulley seconded the motion. The Design Review Board members approved the motion by unanimous vote.

Mr. Grosser moved that the Design Review Board temporarily approve the proposed By-Laws. Ms. Stillinger seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

There were none.

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINTUES

There were no minutes to approve.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

6. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

7. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case No. LBDRB-2009-01: A request by Nabor House Fraternity for design approval for a proposed new fraternity house at 1002 South Lincoln Avenue and 805 West Iowa Street located in the R-7, University Residential, and the R-3, Single and Two-Family Residential Zoning Districts.

Rebecca Bird, Planner I, presented this case to the Design Review Board. She spoke about the request for design approval of a new fraternity house. She explained the review process for a Planned Unit Development in the Lincoln-Busey Corridor. She discussed the conditions of the existing structure at 1002 South Lincoln Avenue pointing out that it has been expanded onto both the front and the back significantly as well as a third level has been added. The lot at 805 West Iowa Street is vacant. She talked about the current zoning of both lots.

She referred to the proposed site plan and reviewed the proposed layout of the two properties. She explained the intent of the Lincoln-Busey Design Guidelines and discussed how the proposed development complies with the following design elements: 1) façade Zone; 2) patterns and rhythms; 3) roof lines; 4) materials; 5) window and door openings; 6) outdoor living space; 7) building orientation; 8) parking area and 9) sustainability.

She read the options of the Design Review 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 recommends that the Design Review Board approve Case LBDRB-2009-01 with the following conditions:

1. *Construction of the proposed building and parking lot shall be in conformance with the approved plans and architectural renderings as submitted. Any*

significant deviation from these plans and architectural renderings as submitted shall require consideration by the Design Review Board.

2. *A final Planned Unit Development plan must be approved with no significant deviation from the plans and architectural renderings approved by the Design Review Board.*
3. *The development be completed in full conformity with all applicable provisions of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance and Development Regulations.*

Mr. Grosser asked for clarification on the actual height of the proposed fence. Ms. Bird replied that the fence on the proposed site plan will be six feet high everywhere.

Mr. Grosser wondered if six-feet is mandated by code elsewhere as the maximum height fence height. Mr. Myers stated that fences can be taller than six feet in rear and side yards. Mr. Grosser stated that if the Design Review Board wanted to place a limit on the height of the fence in the proposed plans, then they should probably do so as a condition to the approval of the plans.

With no further questions from the Design Review Board for City staff, Chair Zangerl opened the hearing up for public input.

Michael Kinate, petitioner, and Gary Olsen, architect, approached the Design Review Board. Mr. Kinate explained that he is the Vice-President of the Nabor House Fraternity, which technically owns the two properties. They lease it to the active students living in the house.

Mr. Olsen remarked that Ms. Bird had provided a thorough overview of the project. He stated that he and Mr. Kinate would answer any questions that the Design Review Board may have. He pointed out that the fraternity went to great lengths to meet with neighbors and City staff. The plans that have been submitted are a reflection of those meetings.

Mr. Kinate commented that the Nabor House Fraternity has been working with Mr. Olsen on this project for three years now. They selected Mr. Olsen because of his knowledge and expertise in historic preservation. Based on the unique character of the Lincoln-Busey Corridor, they wanted to hire an architect that would incorporate a new fraternity into an existing neighborhood.

Mr. Olsen commented that the proposed fraternity will reflect many of the Georgian-style buildings located on the University of Illinois campus as well as the scale of many of the large homes in the neighborhood. One of the major changes from the existing fraternity is that the front of the building will face Iowa Street rather than Lincoln Avenue. There will be an access door on the side along Lincoln Avenue for the residents' use only.

Chair Zangerl inquired as to what a "bio-swale" is. Mr. Olsen defined bio-swale as a place where water from the parking lot is diverted into. Water there soaks into the ground and some run off into the street.

Ms. Englebretsen wondered if the rain garden would be depressed. Mr. Olsen explained that water will settle in the rain garden. The rain garden will serve as a natural holding area rather

than going through pipes and other ways of doing storm drainage. The ground will be higher around the fence so that the rainwater does not go into the neighbor's backyard.

Mr. McCulley noted that there is a bus stop in front of the old Garcia boarding house. The bus stop serves as a place of social interaction. Mr. Kinate talked about the Garcia house and discussed the facade of the proposed fraternity house.

Mr. McCulley stated that because of the nature of the design elements and criteria that the Board is reviewing, it would be a good idea for City staff to ask the petitioner for an abbreviated schedule of finishes and windows, etc. With this case, the Board members had to search through the various documents to find this information. Ms. Bird responded that normally staff would include the information if it is provided by a petitioner; however, in this case, this information was not available on any of the drawings that were submitted. Mr. Olsen mentioned that the windows on the proposed new fraternity would be one-inch, insulated glazing with low-e lighting (not true divided lights).

With no further comments or input from the audience, Chair Zangerl closed the public input portion of the hearing and opened the case to Design Review Board discussion and/or motion(s). He reminded the Board members that any motion should include findings of fact.

Mr. Grosser moved that the Design Review Board approve Case LBDRB-2009-01 with the three conditions recommended by City staff and with the Summary of Findings listed in the written staff report. He added a fourth condition that the fencing be limited to six feet in height in accordance with the stated intention of the developer. Ms. Stillinger seconded the motion.

Mr. Grosser commented that this is a great way to start the Design Review Board. He previously heard of this case in the form of the Planned Unit Development when it went before the Plan Commission. This being a case in a sensitive development area of Urbana, he was expecting neighbors to show up and have opposition. He has been none, and he feels this is a credit to the developers and the designers of the proposed project. Clearly, they have done their homework prior to the Plan Commission public hearing and the Design Review Board public hearing by speaking with neighbors, making changes to plans and designing the project in accordance with the Lincoln-Busey Design Guidelines which were then in draft form. So, he is pleased with the proposed plans and is looking forward to seeing this significant improvement to the two lots and to the Lincoln-Busey Corridor.

Ms. Stillinger believes that one of the best things about the Design Review Board is that it gives the neighbors an opportunity to comment on any future developments in their neighborhood. She pointed out that her backyard abuts the proposed property. The Nabor House Fraternity and Mr. Olsen have been very open in meeting with the neighborhood and making some adjustments at the neighbors' requests. As a result, the neighbors are not upset about the proposed development, and neither is she.

Mr. McCulley stated that the Design Guidelines are clear. They follow logically. He feels the analysis was very good.

Ms. Englebretsen remarked that she is impressed with the proposed development plans. She likes the environmental elements (rain garden, geo thermal, etc.) that they have put into the plans.

Chair Zangerl congratulated the Nabor House Fraternity and Mr. Olsen on putting together a stellar application. This is exactly the type of plans that they were hoping to see in the Lincoln-Busey Corridor.

Mr. Olsen commented that there has not been a Planned Unit Development constructed in the City of Urbana for many years. This case is the first case for the Design Review Board to review. He is looking forward to breaking new ground next time he comes back with another project as well.

Roll call on the motion was as follows:

Ms. Englebretsen	-	Yes	Mr. Grosser	-	Yes
Mr. McCulley	-	Yes	Ms. Stillinger	-	Yes
Mr. Zangerl	-	Yes			

The motion was approved by unanimous vote.

8. NEW BUSINESS

Adoption of the By-Laws

Rebecca Bird, Planner I, presented the proposed by-laws to the Design Review Board. The proposed by-laws originated from the MOR-Development Review Board by-laws and were modified to conform to the regulations and standards of the Design Review Board in the Urbana Zoning Ordinance and in the Design Guidelines. The draft by-laws have been reviewed and approved by City legal staff.

Mr. Grosser stated that the by-laws provide a five minute limit for each audience participant to speak. Ms. Bird explained that this is generally part of the by-laws and is used when a large number of people need to speak. Under regular circumstances the DRB could allow more than five minutes without limiting others from speaking. Both the MOR- Development Review Board and City Council follow this rule. Mr. Grosser wondered if it is in the Plan Commission by-laws. Ms. Bird said she would have to research this.

Mr. Grosser understands the reasoning for a five-minute limit at the City Council meetings; however, for the various boards and commissions meetings, where they can investigate issues at length, it is important to not restrict people. Obviously, the Chair of each board and commission would have discretion to stop someone when they get off track or if they are repeating something that someone else previously mentioned. It is a little friendlier when there is a neighborhood concerned with the design issues of a building to allow them time to speak and not place a time limit on them.

Mr. McCulley stated that if there is a limitation, then people will know how long they have and can prepare a presentation. The Chair of each board and commission has the prerogative to allow someone to speak longer. Robert Myers, Planning Manager, noted that this regulation is helpful when there is a room full of people and a case is controversial. It is during these times when following the Rules of Procedure or by-laws are really important. The Chair can always suspend the rules on an individual or blanket basis if need be.

Ms. Bird pointed out that the five minute limit is for audience participation. This rule does not apply to public hearings. She mentioned that she spoke with the City's Legal Counsel about this issue when she was rewriting the Historic Preservation Commission's by-laws. Counsel said that it is useful to include language that states the Chair can set the time limit at the beginning of the public hearing. However, this particular language has not been added to the proposed by-laws. Mr. Grosser commented that even though this particular language is not in the proposed by-laws, the Chairperson could still set a time limit at the beginning of the meeting for how long each person has to speak.

Mr. Zangerl suggested that they use the draft by-laws and see how they work. Mr. McCulley stated that they are similar to the MOR-Development Review Board By-Laws which seem to work. He added that the proposed by-laws are based on Robert's Rule of Order.

Mr. Grosser moved that the Design Review Board permanently adopt the proposed by-laws. Ms. Stillinger seconded the motion. Roll call on the motion was as follows:

Ms. Englebretsen	-	Yes	Mr. Grosser	-	Yes
Mr. McCulley	-	Yes	Ms. Stillinger	-	Yes
Mr. Zangerl	-	Yes			

The motion was approved by unanimous vote.

Mr. Grosser moved that Art Zangerl be nominated to serve as Chairperson of the Design Review Board for the term of one year at which time he could be re-elected to serve another year. Mr. McCulley seconded the motion. Roll call on the motion was as follows:

Ms. Englebretsen	-	Yes	Mr. Grosser	-	Yes
Mr. McCulley	-	Yes	Ms. Stillinger	-	Yes
Mr. Zangerl	-	Yes			

The motion was approved by unanimous vote.

9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There was none.

10. STAFF REPORT

Robert Myers, Planning Manager, reported on the following:

- ❖ Nabor House Fraternity Project is the first Planned Unit Development under the City's new Zoning Ordinance. A request for PUD approval will go before the Plan Commission and the City Council. He talked about the benefits of a planned unit development.

11. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCulley moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Stillinger seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 8:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Myers, Secretary