

MEETING MINUTES

URBANA DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD

DATE: January 13, 2005

APPROVED

TIME: 7:30 p.m.

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Brian Adams, Betsey Cronan, Michael McCulley, Art Zangerl

MEMBERS ABSENT Jennifer Gentry, Laurie Goscha, Chris Hartman

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Rich Cahill, Rev. Jong & Michelle Ham, Rev. Don Mason, Gary Olsen, Sung Jin Park, Steve Ross, Marya Ryan, Christel Spellmeyer, Richard Underwood, Nancy Wehling, James Yoon

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

Rob Kowalski, Planning Manager called the meeting to order at 7:31 p.m. Roll call was taken and a quorum was declared present.

2. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON AND VICE-CHAIRPERSON

Mr. Kowalski explained that the first order of business would be for the Development Review Board (DRB) to elect a Chairperson. Ms. Cronan moved that Art Zangerl serve as Chairperson. Mr. Adams seconded the motion. The Development Review Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

3. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

There were none.

4. APPROVAL OF THE MINTUES

There were none.

5. COMMUNICATIONS

- Letter from Nancy Wehling
- Letter from Marya Ryan
- Letter from Scott Cochran
- Letter from James Klein
- Letter from Ronald Cramer
- Letter from Kevin Hunsinger

6. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

7. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

8. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

DRB-2004-01: Development Review Board consideration of a proposed addition to the First Presbyterian Church located at 608 West Green Street in the MOR, Mixed-Office Residential Zoning District.

Paul Lindahl, Planner, presented this case to the Development Review Board. He described the proposed addition and noted that it would be used primarily by the Korean Mission Center. He explained the process through which the First Presbyterian Church of Urbana and the Korean Mission Center had been through, which began with a neighborhood meeting. The Historic Preservation Commission reviewed the case regarding the impact of the proposed addition on the adjacent local landmark, the Ricker House. The Zoning Board of Appeals also reviewed the project in terms of a variance request.

He went on to discuss the existing house located at 608 W. Green Street that the church was planning to demolish to allow room for the expansion. He reviewed the DRB Rules of Procedure as specified in Section XI-12.A.3 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance, which the Board should follow. He also talked about the site plan review criteria touching on the concerns of compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood, parking and access, screening and landscaping, and design and site review. He reviewed staff's analysis of the proposed development's compliance with the MOR Design Guidelines, including the Façade Zone, Building Orientation & Patterns, Massing and Scale, Openings, Outdoor Living Space, Materials, Parking Areas, Landscaping and Commercial Site Design.

Mr. Lindahl read the options of the Development Review Board and presented staff's recommendation, which was as follows:

The First Presbyterian Church building represents an architectural design that is unique within the M.O.R. district. Constructing an addition to this building presents an interesting design question of compatibility with the main structure versus a compatible design with other types of structures in the district. It is the opinion of staff that the proposed addition incorporates an appropriate design consistent with the Design Guidelines and also includes a site design that is consistent with the intent for the district as a whole.

Without the benefit of additional findings or testimony that may be presented at the public hearing, staff recommended that the Development Review Board approve the proposed church addition with the following conditions:

- 1. Construction of the addition shall be in conformance with the approved site plans and architectural renderings. Any significant deviation from these plans shall require consideration by the Development Review Board.*
- 2. The existing mature trees in the front yard, the parkway and the west property line shall be preserved. Prior to a building permit being issued, a landscape plan shall be submitted and approved by the City Arborist indicating the location of these trees and demonstrating that the addition will not critically damage existing root structures. In the course of this review the City Arborist may inspect existing vegetation to determine their existing health and viability. Removal of any existing vegetation based on the recommendation of the City Arborist is authorized.*
- 3. Prior to a building permit being issued a Certificate of Exemption must be completed in order to shift a portion of the northern property line 8.0 feet north as shown on the site plan.*

Mr. Zangerl asked for clarification regarding the variance request heard by the Zoning Board of Appeals. Was it approved? Mr. Lindahl stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals forwarded a recommendation for approval of the variance request to the Urbana City Council for final deliberation and approval.

Ms. Cronan questioned if the demolition of the existing house had already been approved. The DRB did not have any say over demolition, correct? Mr. Kowalski answered by saying that was true. The demolition permit had been issued a number of weeks ago. None of the zoning districts restricts the demolition of structures.

Reverend Don Mason, Senior Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Urbana, mentioned that he had served the church for the last 15 years. The church has been located on this site for almost 150 years. He pointed out that there were several members of the church present at the meeting.

Reverend Mason pointed out that one value that was personally important to him was the multi-cultural diversity, and it was this diversity that attracted him to the community 15 years ago. It

was a value of the First Presbyterian Church of Urbana as well. They have shared a relationship with the Korean Church of Champaign-Urbana for 30 years. They believe that two churches are better than one in mission and in meeting the needs of the community. They also believe that what was happening was not only unique in the community, but across the country as well.

He noted that after a time of study and discernment, both churches signed a covenant relationship, an agreement, that they would become partners in mission for the indefinite future. Partners are to meet the needs of the community and to share a multi-cultural witness. One specific and tangible outcome of sharing is to work together to provide and construct a new addition to the property.

The two churches share a commitment to serve the whole City of Urbana. They chose to stay in the center of town and not move to the outskirts. Although it would be easier by relocating to the outskirts of town to provide parking, expansion and growth, and more programs, the First Presbyterian Church of Urbana and the Korean Church of C-U wanted to give attention to the needs of the whole community near the center of town by providing a daily nursery school, three 12-step programs, a boy scout troop, food closet, language school, music lessons, and a place for non-profit and civic groups to meet. The two churches believe in this mission, and they believe that the mission will be greatly strengthened by the construction of the Korean Mission Center.

Pastor Jong Ham, Pastor of the Korean Church of Champaign-Urbana, stated that he has served 10 years of ministry at the church. He pointed out that 90% of the church members were students. As a minister, he is excited about the Korean Mission Center project. He believes that the neighborhood community will be more beautiful.

James Yoon, of 1804 Winchester in Champaign, explained why the Korean Church of Champaign-Urbana wants to expand, which is because their membership has grown quite a bit. Their membership has almost doubled in the last ten years, which he feels is owed in part to the strength of the programs at the University of Illinois (U of I) and to the attractiveness of the City of Urbana. He believes that it is a wonderful enrichment in cultural experience for the largely international student congregation to be located near the U of I and near the center of the city. It adds to the cultural diversity of the City of Urbana. Being located near the U of I and near the center of Urbana works wonderfully for the Korean Church because most of the congregation is international students who live near or on campus. It is very convenient for the members to commute.

He stated that the decision to remain in their current location rather than relocate to the outskirts of town is supported by both church's members and leaders. There are currently about 500 to 600 Korean members. Although he expects their programs to become more vibrant as a result of the proposed new addition, he does not expect any increase in the parking problem because many of the members do not drive. He pointed out that they are a dynamic congregation, which meant that more than two-thirds of the congregation turns over every two to three years.

Gary Olsen, Managing Architect and owner of Olsen & Associates Architects, feels it is a privilege to work with both churches on this project. He will answer any questions that the DRB might have.

Mr. Zangerl asked if any substitutive changes to the proposed plan would mean that it would need to come back to the DRB for review. Also, he did not remember the wall/fence element being included in the site plan shown to the Historic Preservation Commission. Mr. Olsen said that the wall/fence had been included in the proposed plan since the beginning. He was not sure where the comment in the written staff report came from. They hoped that the bids to construct the fence would be affordable. The fence would emulate the fence on the east side of the existing church building. Mr. Kowalski added that the comment came from the neighborhood meeting that the church hosted. One of the comments that residents had at that meeting was that the fence did not have an "urban look" and should be changed. The representatives from the church had not completely decided on the fence, and it was something that could be changed.

Mr. McCulley inquired what the height of the piers would be. Mr. Olsen mentioned that the fence was shown in a perspective drawing. The fence was already in existence on the east side. They would be tying the existing fence in to the new fence. The fence would not be high and was not intended to keep people out. The purpose of the fence was to create a framework to the open yard.

Mr. McCulley stated that there had been discussion regarding changes in the bay windows. Did the site plan show the approximate elevations that the church was intending? Mr. Olsen replied that the elevations shown on the handout were of the latest drawings relating to the three elevations. This was how they proposed to build the new addition at this time. There would be a slate roof, all copper downspouts and guttering system, redwood used in the soffit area and in some siting areas, and fieldstone would be used where fieldstone is shown on the current drawings.

He pointed out that the glazing would be found in the existing building, which was built around 1963. Even though it was not 50 years old, he would like to have the Historic Preservation Commission look at making it a historic landmark, because it was quite unique and quite well-received. It was also something that a fairly prominent architect, A. Richard Williams, originally designed.

Mr. Zangerl stated that the Historic Preservation Commission had made some suggestions to preserve the trees. Mr. Olsen responded by saying that they welcomed the chance to walk the site with the City Arborist to look at the trees that would remain, which are shown on the current drawings. The two churches plan to plant more trees and plantings in the future.

Mr. McCulley questioned what the pitch would be on the roof of the proposed new addition. Mr. Olsen stated that it would be 13/12. It would be greater than 45 degrees. If they used the same pitch as that on the existing building, the ridgeline of the proposed addition would be as high as the ridge of the existing sanctuary.

Mr. McCulley asked if it was their intent to match the materials used between the two buildings. Mr. Olsen said yes, as best they could, they intended to match everything.

Mr. Zangerl noted that the Historic Preservation Commission did not have a problem with the pitch of the roof of the ridge that ran east west. They were more interested in the pitch of the bay area. Mr. Olsen replied by saying that the pitch of the bay area would be 8/12. It would have a narrower bay, so it would not be as high as the ridge in the back.

Mr. Zangerl inquired if there was an issue with adding more windows in the bay area. Mr. Olsen stated that the proposed bay area would emulate a wing on the east side, which included the pastors' offices. The proposed bay area would be for the pastor's office of the Korean Church and a meeting area. To have more windows than being proposed would not follow the function inside. Mr. McCulley clarified by saying that they proposed the bay area to balance the west side to the east side. Mr. Olsen stated that it would not exactly balance. However, it would have a straight wing and end in a circular shape just like on the east side. They also were proposing the bay area to blend in with the Ricker House, which had a bay area in the rear of the house.

Ms. Cronan was concerned that the Development Review Board was focusing on the Green Street streetscape, which she found lovely and complimented the architect and churches for their choice of materials. However, they were also talking about lopping eight feet off of a nice house that fronted on Elm Street. She was aware that the church had plans in the future to remove the house. The intent of the MOR was to reuse existing buildings. She worried about how this would change Elm Street. Mr. Olsen explained that the reason they did this was to set the proposed new addition back as far as they could. It was the result of what they thought would be the minimum expansion to set the proposed addition back eight more feet, which made a difference.

Mr. Adams commented that the Development Review Board kept talking about architectural compatibility. The only thing he had heard was how the proposed addition would be consistent with the existing church. He wondered if there had been any thought given to the larger MOR District. He believed most of the churches in the MOR area were designed in gothic style or gothic revival style. Were there any other potential candidates for the proposed addition that were considered as likely additions that would fit more in with the larger historical architectural setting of the MOR district? Again, short of promoting reuse of some of the older buildings, one concern of residents living in the area was that the City maintains some of the historical uniqueness of the architecture in Downtown Urbana. Mr. Olsen replied that there was a history of architecture in the older buildings on the north end of the proposed site. The major decision was made 42 years ago when the front of the church was designed. It made sense that they extend the existing theme to the new addition, especially since both of the churches would be sharing the space. With respect to being compatible with other structures in the MOR Zoning District, they planned to set the new addition back as far as they could to keep the massing to what they needed without going higher than necessary. Obviously they would use similar materials that they were connecting to. If they changed materials to a gothic revival style, then people would question their decision to do that as well.

Christel Spellmeyer, Administrative Assistant for the First Presbyterian Church of Urbana, explained in further detail why the church was not preserving the house on Green Street. In 2003, Illinois Power responded to a gas leak on the property. When there was further investigation by A & R Mechanical Contractors, they realized that due to both the asbestos and

the duct work that went through the masonry of the home, the stability of the home would be in question if they upgraded to a new furnace and would be very costly. The existing furnace system was more than 100 years old. These problems were the reason why the Korean Church of Champaign-Urbana moved out in June of 2003.

The First Presbyterian Church of Urbana has done everything they could think of to preserve the home. When they began steps to remove the home, they had contacted the Preservation and Conservation Association (PACA) to come in and remove certain things as well as contacting Occupational and Health Administration (OSHA) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). They followed all the regulations that they could. This was not a hasty decision made by the churches. The home on the outside may look beautiful, but on the inside there were a lot of problems that the church could no longer feasibly maintain.

Mr. Zangerl noted the written communications that the Development Review Board had received at the meeting. Ms. Cronan pointed out that the two letters in opposition were written by nearby neighbors and the four letters in favor of the new addition were from business and property owners, who do not live in the area.

Marya Ryan, of 1 Buena Vista Court, reviewed some of the issues she had mentioned in her letter to the Development Review Board. She was primarily concerned about the existing parking and traffic problems in the neighborhood, particularly on the Elm Street side and the potential for the new addition to exacerbate those problems. She noted that there was a fairly high-density residential use in the area, and parking was not terribly easy to find. Although when there were no activities going on at the church, her guests could find parking within a block or around the corner from her home.

When the church built the newer parking lot, it helped to alleviate some of the parking problems, but it had not resolved the problem completely. There were times when there were empty parking spaces in the parking lot, and yet on-street parking would be jammed up. She even had people who parked in her driveway, so this was not a trivial matter. This had quite a bit of impact on her day-to-day life, because the churches have activities through the week as well as on Sundays.

The other problem that she noticed was the traffic itself with people coming and going. Elm Street was not built to be the kind of street to take that much traffic. Getting in and out of her driveway during busy times at the church was very tricky. There was a mix of traffic with vehicles, pedestrians, and children.

Ms. Ryan pointed out that although some of the members of the Korean Church of Champaign-Urbana walked to church, many of them drive. With a congregation of 500 to 600 people, there were only about 100 parking spaces available for them to use. The congregation had already outgrown the existing buildings. She suggested that they were outgrowing the neighborhood as well. The city should be working with the churches to find a better, more appropriate location. It was already too high intensity of a use for the neighborhood. Buena Vista Court, in addition to being a historic district, was zoned R-2, Single-Family Residential. They have a lower intensity usage.

It was a mistake to think that the church's only alternative to being in the center of town was to be out on the outskirts of town. A few blocks down in Downtown Urbana, there were a number of underutilized buildings. There were other parcels that might be redeveloped that would be more appropriate, because they were away from residential use. On Philo Road, there were a number of empty buildings and empty lots that were begging for redevelopment. She sympathized with the churches' desire to be near the center of town and their wanting to draw from the University of Illinois. However, she thought that there were existing alternative sites that would present a more appropriate land use than the existing site.

She agreed that there was value and benefit in having cross-cultural interaction. She believed that it was healthy for both the individuals and for the community to have those kinds of organizations and those kinds of opportunities. She wanted to make an addendum to her letter that she wrote, because she did not feel that she had accounted for this.

Ms. Cronan inquired if designating some parking spaces on Elm Street as suitable only for residents and/or their guests would solve some of the problems. Ms. Ryan stated that it would certainly alleviate some of the parking problems, however, it would not do much of anything for the traffic problems.

Ms. Cronan questioned if Ms. Ryan's guests could park on Springfield Avenue. Ms. Ryan replied by saying that it was an option; however, it was a little bit further away.

Mr. McCulley asked if Ms. Ryan had problems finding a parking space or was her concern more for her guests finding parking spaces. Ms. Ryan answered by saying that her concern was for her guests visiting her, because she has a parking space in the back of Buena Vista Court.

Mr. McCulley mentioned that the issues that Ms. Ryan had brought up were more zoning issues than issues that the Development Review Board would address. Had these issues been addressed at the Zoning Board of Appeal's meeting? Mr. Lindahl said yes. However, the current parking provided by the church in their three lots met the requirements of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Ryan explained that the reason she brought the parking and traffic issues up to the Development Review Board was to show that the land use, the intensity of the land use and the appropriateness of the land use for the MOR Zoning District were issues that the Development Review Board addressed.

Mr. Kowalski pointed out that in the proposal, there was no proposal for a new parking area, so the Development Review Board did not need to review any access drives or traffic flow. However, one criterion was the impact to the neighborhood in general. It should be part of the Board's consideration as the new addition and any new traffic it may generate. This was also one of the considerations that the Zoning Board of Appeals gave when they considered the overall size of the new addition and the impact it would have on the neighborhood.

Steve Ross, of 609 West Green Street, noted that he lived directly across the street from the proposed new addition. He mentioned that he was also a member of the First Presbyterian

Church of Urbana. As a homeowner and a church member, he had mixed feelings about the proposal.

As a homeowner, he was sorry to see yet another home being demolished near him. He was also sympathetic to his neighbors, who were disappointed that the church razed two houses along Green Street in the 500 Block for parking.

On the other hand, he understood that the current building was a limiting factor for the Korean Church of Champaign-Urbana. As a church member, he wanted the Korean Church to stay with the First Presbyterian Church as a reflection of their Christian unity rather than relocating to another site.

He appreciated the maintenance of the large front-yard setback, that the roofline would be lower than the sanctuary and lower than the existing house, and that half the bulk of the building would be below ground. He felt that what was missing in the design and in the MOR Design Guidelines was that the front door was hidden off to the side. The most prominent projection one would be a blank brick wall. For a mission center, he thought it should be opening, welcoming and inviting and not question where the front door was. So, he suggested that the church bring that front door out.

Mr. Ross commented that when he could sit at his kitchen table, look down his hallway, out his front door, across the street, into the current building, and see the Korean congregation meeting, it was a great feeling of community. So, he thought the new addition would benefit from having an opening in the front where other people walking down the street could see that the congregation was gathered there.

Mr. McCulley asked whether Mr. Ross wanted the proposal to be more open or whether he wanted it to be built at all. Mr. Ross stated that as a homeowner, he was resigned to the new addition being built. As a member of the congregation, he was pleased with it, but had some suggestions about making the front door more visible and making activity inside more visible to people outside. He likes the activity in the neighborhood of people walking up and down the sidewalks.

Mr. McCulley stated that he heard from the church that the new addition would be to accommodate their present activities. The concerns from the neighbors sounded like fears that the church would expand their activities and their congregation. Did the church intend to increase the size of the present congregation or to better serve the present congregation without an expected increase in the size of the membership? Mr. Yoon clarified that the present facilities were not enough for the current level of activities of the Korean Church. The congregation's needs were not being met in the present 607 West Elm Street, so they had to make creative adjustments with the First Presbyterian Church. Many times it meant compromising a lot of activities. The two congregations are never there at the same time.

As to the growth of the Korean Church congregation, it depended on what happens at the U of I and what happens in Korea. There were four other Korean-American congregations in town. They have grown naturally because there was a great interest on the part of the Korean students

coming to the United States and to the U of I. He did not foresee the congregation growing phenomenally large beyond what they have. The Mission Center would primarily address their immediate needs and give them breathing room.

With regards to the parking situation, he believed that the problem existed prior to the proposal. He did not feel that the project would increase the problem.

Ms. Cronan inquired if the number of activities offered would increase. Mr. Yoon said yes. In regards to the parking situation on the weekdays, there was never a problem through the week. The parking lots never fill up through the week. Parking on Sunday mornings and afternoons was a bit different situation. He pointed out that there were a lot of high-density multi-family apartment units located near there. On Saturday evenings, students have their friend come over, so the streets are almost filled when he gets to church on Sunday. This, in addition to the traffic of people coming to church, adds to the difficulty of parking. Even with an increase in the church's activities, the parking problem would not increase, because they do not have the same level of participation as they do with Sunday services.

Nancy Wehling, of 2 Buena Vista Court, shared in Ms. Ryan's concerns. In addition to Ms. Ryan's previous statements, Ms. Wehling pointed out that she frequently had seen church members parking in the yellow "No Parking" zone on the south side of Elm Street, west of Orchard Street. This yellow zone was there for safety reasons.

Cars parked illegally and increased traffic because of church activities do not create a good situation, especially when there are children crossing the street with their parents. It disheartened her that the letters in favor of the new addition were being considered. Two of those letters were written by developers who tear down residential houses to build rental properties. Since 1988, she had seen many structures demolished. Now, here is another addition with a huge footprint being proposed. This is not the neighborhood they want to live in. Everyone wants to live in a safe, quiet place. The proposed new addition would have a negative impact on their quality of life in Buena Vista Court.

Rich Cahill, of 307 South Orchard, commented that he was glad to see the new Development Review Board up and running and have a good set of criteria to judge proposals by. He went on to talk about a different part of the parking issue. He stated that there were student rental properties on the east side of Orchard, which he noted the parking spaces were filled up by the students well before the church members arrive. It was true that someone was parking in the yellow zone at the corner of Orchard and High Streets. Very often they block the driveway of the house directly to the east of him.

He went on to talk about the design of the proposed new addition. He serves on the Historic Preservation Commission, and noted that one of the new elevations gave him a better sense of how the new addition would tie into the existing church. Given what was there, he believed it would be tasteful. After talking at the PACA Board meeting with Robert Nemeth, he understood why the church would not want to tie the two rooflines together. It would not work with the type of material being used.

One thing that was long overdue was that the First Presbyterian Church should reach out more to the neighborhood. The neighborhood meeting that was held was the first meeting between the church and the surrounding neighbors. Many suggestions were heard at the meeting for better landscaping, need better communications, open up the fence or get rid of it (because it states that this was the church's space), and/or maybe build an area for neighbors and church members to wait for the MTD bus on the corner of Orchard and Green Streets. The church could be a better neighbor.

Don Mason re-approached the Board to share a commitment that the church was making. They have heard some of the neighbors' concerns about poor communication. The church was committed to correct this with door-to-door visits. Also, they will make every effort to communicate with their members that parking illegally was not a way to make good neighbors. Another effort they plan to make was to give high priority to landscaping throughout the entire church campus.

Mr. Zangerl suggested that they also encourage routes of ingress and egress from the parking lots to make the flow of traffic smoother, to encourage parishioners to utilize the parking lots more, and to avoid using Elm Street if possible. Mr. Mason said that this sounded reasonable to him.

Ms. Cronan questioned if there were any incentives or disincentives that the Development Review Board could write into the approval to convince the church to maintain the house at 607 West Elm Street. One of the biggest concerns heard by residents in the area was that people who do not maintain their homes could not afford to fix or repair problems that have escalated over the years and end up demolishing these homes. The Development Review Board does not have any control over homes being demolished; however, the intent of the MOR Zoning District was to preserve some of the older homes. She would like to know what the church planned to do with the house at 607 West Elm Street. Mr. Mason replied that the Board of Trustees had made a major decision to invest in improvements for 607 West Elm Street. A great deal of work had been done already. The inside of the house had been completely restored. They intended to utilize the building in the future and to make it hold up to the elements and be of good quality.

Mr. Mason mentioned that he noted that he liked the idea of a shelter for church members and members of the community waiting for the bus on the corner of Orchard and Green Streets. The church had already talked to MTD about this.

Richard Underwood, associated with the First Presbyterian Church, talked about the parking issues. He believed that the primary reason for the parking issues on Sundays was because it was the one day of the week that their neighbors were not allowed to park in the church's parking lots. He mentioned that the church's presence in the area did not aggravate the parking problem any. In fact, it alleviates it six days out of seven.

Mr. Kowalski reminded the Development Review Board that the consideration of the Board was with the five criteria listed in the written staff report and with the MOR Design Guidelines. The Board's consideration was really for the proposed new addition and not necessarily for other parts of the existing church such as existing parking problems. He mentioned that any future proposals on Elm Street or anywhere else would need to go through this same process.

He reviewed the procedures of the remaining of the meeting. He explained that it was now time for the Board to discuss the case. Following the discussion, there should be a motion, which includes the Board's findings. The Board would then have another opportunity to discuss the case and the motion. The final step would be the Board voting on the motion. He pointed out that the requirements for the Development Review Board were that there needed to be a 2/3 vote required to approve plans with no fewer than four aye votes. Since there were only four members in attendance of this meeting, then all four members would be required to vote in favor of approval in order for the case to be approved. If the Board denied the case, then the case would be automatically appealed to the Zoning Board of Appeals in accordance with the Urbana Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. McCulley felt sympathetic regarding the neighbors' concerns of the parking. However, he did not see how those concerns were relevant to the Board's present discussion. It did not sound like the new addition would impact the parking issue one way or another. Parking was more of a zoning issue.

As far as the massing of the proposed new addition, it would meet the intent regarding it being compatible the primary block face, because the primary block face was the church and had been for a long time. Regarding architectural style, he would rather see the style be more continuous as opposed to harkening to a different style, because there were a number of different church styles in the area. The particular style of the existing church was designed in some ways was historic. The Floor Area Ratio (FAR) would be high; however, most of it would be below grade, so it would not be setting way up into the air. Therefore, from the architectural point of view, he believed that it was met the architectural criteria.

Most residential zoning district descriptions listed appropriate uses as being parks, schools and churches. The comments regarding the church had more to do with the size of the church and whether a church of this particular size or a church that was growing might be out-growing the particular area.

Mr. Adams understood how the proposed new addition would be compatible with the existing church, but it seemed to be all the Development Review Board was evaluating the new addition in terms of. As someone who lived and chose to live in the area, he thought there was a concern amongst many of his neighbors that they want to see the existing historical, traditional architecture be maintained. None of the Board members seemed to be dealing with the issue of compatibility with the surrounding area. He felt this could set a precedent for people to use different architecture than what already existed in the district.

Ms. Cronan commented that when the City originally looked at the MOR Zoning District, one of the things agreed upon was that there was no one style that predominated in the neighborhood. Mr. Adams pointed out that the church was more of a departure from the architectural setting than from a Victorian house. Mr. McCulley noted that his house was an Italianate house built in the 1850s, which was changed to a Greek Revival in the 1890s, which he found very attractive. However, some people have suggested that he tear off the Greek Revival porch and roof.

Mr. Adams stated that he was not suggesting that every building in the downtown area should be a museum. He saw the proposed new addition as a drastic departure from the bulk of the styles in the MOR Zoning District. Ms. Cronan pointed out that it had been as such for 30 years or more. She personally found it to be striking and aesthetically pleasing. Mr. Adams said that the existing house fit in well with the neighborhood. If something were to be constructed more along those lines, he believed it would preserve the architectural integrity of the area. McCulley thought the intention of the Development Review Board was more whether a development was pleasing. There was a study of apartment buildings done in part for the MOR Zoning District a number of years ago. The study found what was pleasing to most people in terms of massing, roof slopes and breaking up of surfaces, etc.

Mr. Adams explained that he tried to point-by-point go through the criteria that the Development Review Board was to use to evaluate proposed developments, and he could not find where the proposed new addition would conform to any of the criteria in a sense of the larger district. If they only evaluated the proposed new addition in terms of the existing building, which it would be attached to, then of course, it would almost be a carbon copy of the existing building. Again, in terms of the larger context, he thought the plans departed substantially from a lot of the criteria that had been set forward to preserve the feel for the downtown area. Ms. Cronan felt it met the criteria in the sense of the setback and keeping the spaciousness and the entryway to the downtown area. Mr. Adams asked if someone coming down Green Street would notice the setback and spaciousness or the architectural difference between the Ricker House and the proposed new addition and existing church. Ms. Cronan responded by saying that if the choice was between a building that would blend and was setback and keeps the spaciousness or the alternative, which was what most of the pressure in the district was for which was one of the student filing boxes that came almost up to the sidewalk, then the proposed new addition would be a far better choice.

Mr. McCulley inquired if Mr. Adams had a problem with the idea of the church building an addition or did he have a problem with the aesthetics of the proposed addition. Mr. Adams replied that he had a problem with the aesthetics of the addition. He understood the church wanting to build an addition and wanting it to architecturally blend with the existing structure. The whole style seemed out of place in the area given the bulk of the architecture in the area. Ms. Cronan agreed but stated that it had been for 30 years, so how do you reconcile. Mr. McCulley stated that there were many different styles, which was one of the issues. This was a particular style that presently some people find very pleasing, while other people have a reaction to the style that was approximately 25-30 years old. Sometimes it is just a generational thing too.

Mr. Zangerl pointed out that the Development Review Board was in a bit of an unusual situation in that they were considering an addition rather than a new development. It made the application and the criteria a little bit cumbersome. If the church tore down the house and built an independent building in its place, then the criteria could be applied more. He believed that they could come up with a real "Frankenstein" kind of structure if they tried to apply the standards of surrounding architecture to the proposed new addition. Mr. McCulley added that at one time, the National Park Service did not want their architects when building additions to do them in the same style as the prior buildings. They ended up with some very hideous historic buildings,

because they ended up with additions that did not compliment the present architecture. Ms. Cronan pointed out that the Unitarian Church on Green Street with its 1960s addition or the Methodist Church in Downtown Champaign with its modern addition to an older church.

Ms. Cronan went on to say that she felt the proposed new addition would be aesthetically very pleasing. She complimented the church on the use of high quality materials. She understood the traffic congestion problems in the neighborhood. She understood that traffic enforcement was not operational on the weekends, correct? Mr. Kowalski stated that was correct. It could be asked for, but it would be part of the regular police routes rather than parking attendants or regular parking enforcement. He felt that it would be a reasonable request.

Ms. Cronan restated that her only hesitation was that the charge of the Development Review Board was to encourage adaptive reuse, but they seemed to not be empowered to do that because demolition of properties were not considered by the Board. Mr. McCulley noted that the City was looking at alternative codes to adaptive reuse, because the buildings are very difficult to adapt to anything but apartments. Mr. Kowalski said that when the City changed the MOR Zoning District, there was discussion about the property right of the owner to demolish a structure. The only instances in the City where a property owner cannot demolish a structure by right was in a historic landmark or part of a designated historic district. They were advised very strongly that demolition is a basic property right. City staff proceeded with putting together the new regulations for the Development Review Board and the MOR Zoning District. They stopped in the middle and realized that they were making it too restrictive. They decided to make adaptive reuse projects be approved administratively.

Mr. McCulley moved that the Development Review Board approve the proposed addition based on the finding that the plans were adequately consistent with the intent of the development portion of the MOR goals and guidelines. Ms. Cronan seconded the motion.

Mr. Kowalski asked if the motion included the three conditions recommended by City staff. Mr. McCulley stated that the conditions shall be included within the motion. Ms. Cronan agreed as well. Roll call was as follows:

Mr. Zangerl	-	Yes	Mr. McCulley	-	Yes
Ms. Cronan	-	Yes	Mr. Adams	-	No

The motion failed by a vote of 3 “ayes” and 1 “nay”, since approval of a site plan required a two-thirds majority vote with no fewer than four “aye” votes.

Mr. Kowalski explained that an appeal of the case would go before the Zoning Board of Appeals.

9. NEW BUSINESS

There was none.

10. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There was none.

11. STAFF REPORT

There was none.

12. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

13. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rob Kowalski, Secretary