

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING

URBANA PLAN COMMISSION

APPROVED

DATE: Thursday, August 23, 2001

TIME: 7:30 P.M.

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Christopher Alix, Randy Kangas, Gerrit Knaap, Michael Pollock, Joseph Rank, Bernadine Stake

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Alan Douglas, Marilyn Upah-Bant

STAFF PRESENT: Tim Ross, Planner; Elizabeth Tyler, Planning Manager

OTHERS PRESENT: Ralph Ager, Jill Baer, Danielle Chynoweth, Fred Cobb, Chris Diana, John Hoffman, Napoleon Knight, Bob Leach, Mark Musselman, Tim Ols, Esther Patt, Sarah Paxton, Virginia Stahl, Ann Talbott, Jane Wiles, Ruth Wyman

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

Chair Pollock called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. Roll Call was taken, and a quorum was declared present.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

Chair Pollock requested that the New Public Hearing Cases 1792-T-01 and 1793-DA-01 be presented before the Old Business Case on Policy Recommendation to City Council on UCSD Long-Range Plan. There were no objections from the Plan Commissioners.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Knaap motioned to approve the minutes from the August 9, 2001 regular Meeting and the Special Joint Meeting. Mr. Alix seconded the motion. Both sets of minutes were then approved by unanimous vote.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

- Addendum to Staff Memorandum dated August 17, 2001
- Proposed Amendments to the 1995 Carle/Urbana Development Agreement – Carle Presentation to the Urbana Plan Commission
- Letter from Elizabeth Tyler to Bob Leach
- Letter from Marilyn Bruce to the Plan Commission and Community Development Commission
- Letter from Marie & Owen Glissendorf
- Exhibit “A”: Zoning Map of the Expansion of MIC Special District
- Letter from Bob Leach to Chair Pollock
- August 16, 2001 Excerpt of Draft Minutes from the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee in regards to the Urbana-Champaign Sanitary District’s Long-Range Facility Plan

5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

6. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chair Pollock opened the issue of notification for Plan Cases 1792-T-01 and 1793-DA-01. Bob Leach, of United Citizens And Neighbors (UCAN) wrote a letter to Mr. Pollock concerning a question of notification. The letter noted clauses in the Carle Development Agreement calling for forty-five day notification and that UCAN and the immediate neighborhood around Carle had not received that notification. Upon receiving the letter from Mr. Leach, Mr. Pollock then looked in the Development Agreement. He found some vagueness as to whether that clause applies to only the updates and amendments that happen at the time of the updates or whether that clause applies to update amendments at any time. Mr. Pollock continued to say that his understanding was that clause applies to any amendment. Carle sent out a notification to 550 residents and property owners in that neighborhood as well as members of UCAN. That notice met the forty-five day requirement and has been interpreted by the City Attorney and Acting Zoning Administrator as having met the notification requirements.

Mr. Pollock posed two questions to the Plan Commission. Those questions are:

1. Does the clause in the Development Agreement require that notification?
2. Is the notification that the City of Urbana staff sent adequate to open the cases at this meeting?

Mr. Pollock commented that it was his understanding after talking with Mr. Leach that there are members of UCAN who do not believe that the notification from the City of Urbana staff met the requirements of the agreement. He stated that he told Mr. Leach that even if the cases were opened, that the Plan Commission would more than likely be willing to delay any decision making process to the following meeting to allow UCAN members a chance to meet and address any opposition to any part of the plan.

Mr. Alix asked if the announcement from Carle was being held forth as the notification? Ms. Tyler replied that was the earliest notice. Since then, staff has sent out subsequent notification. Mr. Alix remarked that the Carle announcement did not appear to be a notice of a pending Plan Commission action. Ms. Tyler referred to the language in Section 4.1.7 of the Development Agreement and stated that according to that language, the requirements were met. Mr. Alix argued that the Carle announcement did not include any maps or legal description as the City of Urbana's notices usually do. He felt that the notice should indicate that it is from the City of Urbana. The Carle announcement was not even correct. It states that the proposal places the house at the east corner of Church and Orchard.

Mr. Kangas asked who attended the Carle meeting to represent the City of Urbana? Mr. Ross replied that he, Joe Smith, and Alderman James H. Hayes attended the meeting.

Mr. Knaap asked Mr. Ols how a forty-five day extension would affect Carle? Mr. Ols replied that the guest house is a tremendous need and that the case is straightforward. Nothing has changed since the study session as far as the presentation or the requests. Secondly, there were a number of members of UCAN at the meeting, which Carle held in July. The presentation at the July meeting went into great detail. Ms. Tyler commented that the City of Urbana's official notice was published on August 8th.

Jane Wiles, UCAN, stated that one of UCAN's concerns was the way that they were notified. Members of UCAN did not realize that the notice from Carle was an official public notice. The purpose for the Carle/UCAN Agreement was for communications on proposed language. She added that she just received the proposed language right before the meeting started. She remarked that the members of UCAN need more than two weeks to review this. However, she was not sure if they needed a full forty-five days.

Mr. Alix asked Ms. Wiles if she attended the July 24th meeting at Carle and the August 9th study session held for the Plan Commission and Community Development Commission. Ms. Wiles replied that she had attended both meetings, and Carle had presented the guest house. She mentioned that UCAN was concerned with expansion of the medical campus and the loss of affordable housing.

Ms. Tyler remarked that there had been three types of notice given, which are:

1. Carle's announcement of the first neighborhood meeting held on July 24th.
2. The City of Urbana published notice in the News-Gazette, and
3. Notices were mailed out to the property owners and residents within a 250-foot radius of the proposed site.

Ms. Tyler stated that the question is whether proper notice was given. She discussed this issue with the Assistant City Attorney, and he felt that proper notice was given. But then the practical question is whether the time clock is workable for the people interested in the case.

Mr. Alix inquired as to what the procedure was for filing a late notice. Ms. Tyler stated that according to the Development Agreement this was an extraordinary notice requirement that uses the term "good faith effort". It is a flag saying that people involved will do their best to get notice out in forty-five days. If the Plan Commission believes that there was not a good faith

effort, then the proper procedure would be to start the process over again by publishing a new 45-day notice and mailing a notice to the entire area instead of only to the residents and property owners within the 250' perimeter of the sites. This process would take about sixty days to complete. However, if the Plan Commission believe that notices were sent out with a good faith effort, then the Commissioners could extend the decision process or continue on with the decision process at this meeting.

Mr. Kangas motioned to open the public hearing regarding these cases with an agreement that the Plan Commission would not vote on them until the next meeting. Mr. Knaap seconded the motion.

Mr. Ols commented that UCAN's concern was that another three to four weeks would help the members of UCAN get together and discuss any concerns. He asked if those three to four weeks could have been started when the last public notice was published on August 8th. The forty-five days would end in the middle of September, which would be agreeable to Carle. The public hearing could be opened at this meeting, and then the Plan Commission could extend the hearings until the September 20th Plan Commission meeting at which time the Plan Commission would take action on these cases.

Mr. Knaap requested to amend the motion to include a "gentlemen's" agreement that the Plan Commission would not send this to the City Council for another two Plan Commission sessions. The motion was passed by a 5 ayes – 1 nay voice vote.

Plan Case 1792-T-01, Request by the Zoning Administrator to amend portions of the Zoning Ordinance related to the expansion of the Medical Institutional Campus (MIC) Special District to include a proposed guest house use.

Plan Case 1793-DA-01, Proposed Amendments to the Development Agreement Between the City and Carle Foundation related to expansion of the MIC Special District and permitted demolitions outside the MIC.

Plan Cases 1792-T-01 and 1793-DA-01 were discussed together since they are related to the same project.

Mr. Ross gave the staff presentation. He gave a brief introduction and background on the proposed guest house, demolition of a housing structure at 809 North Orchard Street for replacement with a handicapped-accessible visitable home, and demolition and replacement of other deteriorated residential structures. Mr. Ross reviewed the addendum to the staff memorandum dated August 17, 2001. He reviewed the Comprehensive Plan goals, objectives, and policies related to this text amendment. He addressed the LaSalle National Bank Criteria.

Mr. Ross addressed the amendment to the Development Agreement submitted by Carle. He reviewed portions of the draft agreement. Those portions included:

1. Article I: Demolition and Replacement of Residential Structure at 809 North Orchard.
2. Article II: Addition of Properties to Medical Institutional Campus Zoning District.

3. Article III: Demolition and Replacement of Other Residential Structures.
4. Five-Year Inspections.
5. Tax-related issues.

Mr. Ross reviewed the summary of staff findings from the staff report and read the options of the Plan Commission. He stated that based on the evidence presented in the discussion, and without the benefit of considering additional evidence that may be presented at the public hearing, staff recommended that the Plan Commission recommend approval of both the proposed amendment to the Zoning Ordinance and Development Agreement, as presented herein, with the following conditions:

1. 702 and 704 North Coler be excluded from the proposed expansion unless language to restrict the properties to guest house use only is added to the proposed language.
2. "Guest house for patients' families" be changed to read "guest house for patients' visitors" wherever it appears in the proposed amendment to the Development Agreement.
3. An additional payment in lieu of taxes be made for the guest house properties.

Ms. Stake questioned if the Plan Commission could approve the guest house and not approve the rezoning of the other two properties. Mr. Ross replied that if the other two properties are approved as well, that they would have the same restrictive language as the guest house.

Ms. Stake inquired as to how the demolished homes would be replaced. Mr. Ross responded that Carle has assured the residents of those houses that they will be relocated and will not have to pay additional rent. Ms. Stake questioned whether it was in the Development Agreement between Carle and the City of Urbana that Carle would replace any residential structures that they demolish. Mr. Ross commented that if a house is torn down, then Carle does have to replace it according to the language of the Development Agreement. Carle would not be able to tear down any residential houses unless they were unfixable.

Ms. Stake asked who decides whether there will be a charge to use the guest house. Will the rest of the funding come from Carle Foundation, since the guest house would be owned by Carle? Mr. Ross responded that would be a good question for Carle Foundation.

Ms. Stake asked if there was space available in the MIC District to build instead of crossing Church Street to build? Mr. Ross replied that Carle felt the proposed site for the guest house would be the most appropriate. The space in the MIC District is intended to be used for medical expansion.

Mr. Alix inquired as to what language was in the Development Agreement that restricts Carle from demolishing houses? Does this proposed amendment give Carle what they need in terms of being able to demolish the houses on 702 and 704 North Orchard Street to build the guest house? Mr. Ross responded that if the properties are in the MIC District, only a building permit would be required for Carle to demolish and put up any of the uses permitted. Mr. Alix questioned that as the MIC District expands in any direction, by virtue of that rezoning, the City of Urbana is giving Carle permission to demolish houses? Mr. Ross replied that was the intent of the amendment.

Mr. Alix asked if the City of Urbana requires a certain amount of parking per building? Mr. Ross replied that the parking has not been an issue with Carle, since they provide so much parking for the Carle facilities. Mr. Alix inquired as to if the petitioner were requesting to not to have to have parking on-site, would the City of Urbana require them to have parking on-site? Mr. Ross replied that there might be adequate parking spaces in other places. Mr. Alix felt that the parking spaces are the only real issue he has with the guest house. He does not feel that having ten to twelve parking spaces at the guest house would fit into the residential characteristic of the neighborhood. Ms. Tyler remarked that consistent with the Zoning Ordinance, the City of Urbana is requesting that parking be provided on-site for the guests using the guest house. Alternating off-site parking could be provided within 600 feet. She noted that his kind of use would benefit from on-site parking for check-in and convenience. Mr. Alix questioned whether the City of Urbana was requesting additional parking for the guest house? Mr. Ross replied that the City of Urbana is requesting parking be provided on site or the surrounding area. Mr. Alix commented that he was asking questions in regards to parking because it would be inappropriate for him to object to Carle wanting to put twelve parking spaces on the proposed site if the City of Urbana had told them that they had to.

Mr. Alix questioned as to whether the payment in lieu of tax was derived from the assumption that the guest house would be similar to a hotel? Ms. Tyler answered that it would take the form of a service agreement. Mr. Alix showed concern that sends a mixed message since it is in the MIC and serves a medical related use, and the City of Urbana is being careful to amend the MIC to classify that this is a medical related use. On the other hand, the City of Urbana is saying that since the guest house is similar to a hotel and is not really a medical related use, then the City should charge hotel tax. It sends a wrong signal.

Ms. Stake commented that she did not feel that there needed to be twelve parking spaces. Two handicapped parking spaces would be all right, but twelve seems to be a lot especially when there are two parking garages.

Mr. Knaap inquired as to what if someone else wanted to buy up property in that neighborhood and demolish the housing structure? Mr. Ross replied that the Development Agreement only applies to Carle. The owner would just need a demolition permit from the City of Urbana.

The meeting was then turned over to Carle to give their presentation. Mr. Ols introduced Dr. Napoleon Knight and Dr. Mark Musselman.

Dr. Knight works in the Emergency Department. From his point of view, he sees the guest house as something that is very needed, very valuable, and as a valuable service to the patients and their families that Carle serves.

There are three guest rooms located in the hospital; however, those guest rooms are filled up rather quickly. Most of the time, there are loved ones of the patients in the waiting rooms and/or resting on hospital gurneys in the Emergency Rooms. Family members need a restful, peaceful place to relax and get some rest. The guest rooms in the hospital are noisy with people hustling by to do their jobs.

Dr. Knight spoke in regards to the parking issue. The last thing a family member or friend visiting a patient who is critical and may be dying wants to do is worry about parking.

Dr. Musselman spoke to the Plan Commission in regards to taking care of families with children who have rare childhood cancer. Those children will spend weeks at a time receiving care and treatment to help them recover. The parents need to be strong and well rested. The guest house would be a perfect solution. It would be a place similar to a home setting where they could get away for a few minutes or get a good night's rest, yet still be close enough where they could be back by their loved ones side if needed within minutes.

Mr. Ols began his portion by reviewing the overhead presentation of the following:

1. Medical Institutional Campus (Map)
 - A. Pink represents Carle's main buildings
 - B. Yellow represents house to be replaced
 - C. Green represents property that Carle owns
 - D. White represents property that Carle does not own
 - E. Black represents where guest house will be located
2. Proposal I: Housing Replacement
 - A. Replace 809 with accessible home
 - B. Customized design
 - C. Future 1:1 replacements
 - D. Safeguards

At that point, Mr. Ols turned the presentation over to Ann Talbott, Immediate Past President of the Carle Auxiliary. She was in charge of the planning sessions with the surrounding neighborhood regarding these cases. Ms. Talbott also researched the funding options for the guest house.

Ms. Talbott continued the overhead presentation by discussing the following:

1. Proposal II: MIC Expansion for Guest House
 - A. Carle Auxiliary recommended
 - B. Auxiliary supported
 - C. Assuming a portion of annual operating expenses
2. Proposal II: Necessity for Guest House
 - A. Reasons for Guest House
 - B. Patient/Family Need
 - C. Family Reasons
3. Proposal II: Guest House Operations
 - A. Free of charges/donations accepted
 - B. Welcomed for 5 days/renewable reservation
 - C. Selection at the discretion of the house officer
4. Proposal II: Not Your Typical Guest House
 - A. CCTV, computer, phone linkages to hospital
 - B. Special services provided by Auxiliary
 - C. Access to kitchen facilities
5. Proposal II: Guest House Exterior Features

- A. Ideal location
- B. Style
- C. Main entrance to face hospital
- D. Side porch/windows with park view
- 6. Proposal II: Guest House Interior Features
 - A. 12 guest rooms with private baths
 - B. 2 ADA compliant guest rooms
 - C. Elevator to second floor
 - D. Caretaker apartment
 - E. Communal kitchen
 - F. Dining Room with park view
 - G. TV/living room with fireplace
 - H. Laundry facilities

Mr. Ols resumed the overhead presentation by discussing the following:

- 1. Guest House Site Plan
 - A. Corner of Orchard and Church
 - B. \$1,000,000, 7500 square-foot home
 - C. Utilizes two lots
 - D. Allows views of park
 - E. Adjacent parking
 - F. Adjacent lots
- 2. Proposal II: Guest House Location Selection
 - A. Ideal placement
 - B. Quick access
 - C. Tranquil settings
 - D. MIC options not optimum
- 3. Proposal II: Guest House Greater Community Benefit
 - A. \$1,000,000 in new construction in Urbana
 - B. Will abide by EAV Development Agreement provision
 - C. Tax exempt as hospital service
- 4. Proposal II: Guest House City/Neighborhood Benefits
 - A. Replaces aging houses with new, attractive home
 - B. Extends hospital landscaping across Church Street
 - C. Enhances Urbana's image and reputation for hospitality
 - D. Increases spending in Urbana
- 5. Proposal II: Guest House City's Concern
 - A. Will not compete with local hotels
 - B. Area hotels offer "hospital discounts"
- 6. Proposal II: Guest House Neighbors' Concerns
 - A. Affordable housing/accommodations for about 500 rather than for two families
 - B. For displaced tenants to be relocated
 - C. Location in 1995 Development Agreement/ master site plan 5-15 year expansion area
 - D. No increased traffic

7. Proposal II: Carle Response to Staff Report
 - A. Carle agrees to the term “patient’s visitors” vs “patient’s family”
 - B. Carle agrees to zone the four properties for “current use of Guest House use”
 - C. Carle believes that payment in addition to taxes will cause excess burden on charitable project

8. Recommendation
 - A. Approval of amendment to allow replacement of expended homes with new homes of similar rent
 - B. Approval of Guest House rezoning with EAV taxes as mutually agreed in 1995

Mr. Knaap asked what the objective was for seeking approval of Proposal I? Mr. Ols replied that there were two objectives, which are: 1) to address the 809 house which was left of the 1995 Agreement and to be allowed to demolish housing structures that fall below sixty percent of the estimated value of the property. Mr. Knaap asked if Carle had sought to demolish any property since the 1995 Agreement? Mr. Ols replied that Carle has only demolished the properties listed in the agreement with one exception of a property in which there was a fire.

Mr. Knaap inquired as to why Carle wants to include the four lots in the MIC District zoning? Is it for expanding parking? Mr. Ols replied that there are issues with how the guest house will fit into the neighborhood and relate to the park. Carle may need to encroach on the two lots to help create a buffer between the guest house and the neighborhood and/or park. Although there are no immediate plans to expand the guest house, it may be determined somewhere down the road that twelve rooms will not be enough. Carle will have space to expand the guest house.

Mr. Knaap asked if Carle had considered having the guest house face the park? Ms. Talbott answered that was a consideration; however, Carle Auxiliary felt it would more beneficial for guests walking in the middle of the night back and forth to the hospital to be able to see where exactly they are headed.

Ms. Stake inquired since the guest house service will be free to the guests, then who will fund it? Will Carle Foundation own the guest house? Mr. Ols replied that Carle Foundation would own the guest house. Ms. Talbott added that the Carle Auxiliary would donate \$50,000 a year for upkeep and care of the guest house. Ms. Stake asked if that would take care of maintenance and staffing the guest house with a caretaker? Ms. Talbott replied that the \$50,000 would take care of a portion of the expenses, and Carle Foundation would fund the rest of the expenses. Ms. Stake asked what the estimated expense was per year? Mr. Ols answered that Carle estimated the expenses to be around \$100,000 per year. Carle anticipates that some guests will be inclined to donate money towards the guest house.

Ms. Stake questioned whether Carle believed that by building the guest house across the street would destabilize the area of the community? Mr. Ols replied that Carle did not feel that way. From Carle’s perspective, the guest house would be a buffer between Carle and the neighborhood.

Mr. Alix inquired as to what Carle feels the service life would be for the guest house? Mr. Ols responded that the depreciation in terms of finances would be forty years. Mr. Alix asked how that compared to the depreciation schedule for the more permanent buildings such as the hospital and the parking garages. Mr. Ols answered that the depreciation schedule varies from one building to the next from twenty to forty years.

Jill Baer, of 703 North Orchard Street, approached the Plan Commission. She mentioned that she is a resident of one of the houses to be torn down, and she did not receive any notice of the lease not being continued. Ms. Baer stated that she would continue to be a tenant of Carle housing. Some of the houses that she was shown were not suitable.

Ms. Baer remarked that she has experience with the neighborhood, and it is unique and has a sense of being a community by itself. There is a low noise that can be heard throughout the park. She does not want the extra traffic located that close to the park and the neighborhood. Ms. Baer felt that there are other potential spaces for parking.

Ms. Stake asked if the houses that she was shown were Carle housing? Ms. Baer replied that the houses belonged to Carle. However, she had been informed that the houses had to be cleaned and the walls painted before Carle would rent them out.

Mr. Ols responded to the remark about the low noise coming from the chillers for the hospital. There were complaints from the neighbors, so Carle had the sound levels measured. The sound levels were well within acceptable limits. However, Carle put blankets on the chillers to reduce the sound level, and it seemed to help.

Bob Leach, of 910 North Broadway, spoke on behalf of United Citizens and Neighbors (UCAN). He commented that the change in zoning to the north of Church Street to a MIC zoning district would be consistent with the expansion plans for a five-year period.

Mr. Leach mentioned that concerning the house at 809 Orchard Street, UCAN had urged Carle to request an amendment to the original City/Carle Agreement to allow for demolition and replacement of that house. He stated that UCAN felt that the proposed guest house was a good idea, and that Carle Auxiliary should be commended for their volunteer work on this project. Carle does not need approval from the City of Urbana to build the guest house in the MIC District. Mr. Leach addressed the rezoning request of 702 and 704 Orchard by saying that UCAN does not support the zoning change. Concerning the relocation of medical students, Carle does not approval from the City of Urbana to move the medical students from one rental property to another. However, UCAN does not support the zoning change of 701 and 703 Coler. UCAN felt that any house being considered for demolition should come before the City of Urbana in the form of an amendment to the Carle/City Development Agreement on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Alix questioned that UCAN was supportive of the guest house and opposed to the rezoning of all four lots to the MIC District zone. Mr. Leach replied that was a fair statement. He added that UCAN had not had a chance to meet to discuss this case thoroughly. It would require a special meeting. Mr. Leach commented that what would make the park nice for the guest house is also what makes the park nice for the neighborhood. The neighborhood keeps being left out of the decision-making process regarding the neighborhood. One thing that was encouraging was

when Mr. Ols made the comment that the guest house would act as a buffer between Carle Hospital and the residential neighborhood.

Ralph Ager, Director of Security at Carle Foundation Hospital, addressed three issues that he experiences every day. The first issue was with families in the waiting rooms. He commented that it was not uncommon in terms of the intensive care waiting rooms to have twenty to forty people. Those people are there all night sleeping in chairs or laying down on the floor with pillows and blankets. The guest house will provide a place where these people can get rest, yet at the same time be close to their loved ones. Secondly, the guest house will contribute to family and friends being able to support each other, whether it is for happiness that a loved one was getting better or for sorrow that a loved one passed away.

The third issue was in regards to the proposed parking spaces by the guest house. Guests might need to get up before sunrise and leave. They would have to walk to the parking garage in the dark if there were no parking spaces near the guest house. It would come down to a safety and security issue for the people staying in the guest house.

Mr. Alix asked what would be different for other guests of patients at the hospital needing to feel safe and wanting to park close? Mr. Ager answered that the front door is staffed until midnight. After midnight guests are directed to the emergency room entrance, where people entering are screened before coming in. Ms. Stake commented that Carle needs connections between the parking garages and the hospital and the clinic. Mr. Ager remarked that Carle does provide an escort for people to their vehicles.

Mr. Ols commented that a member of UCAN was involved in the early part of Carle's planning of this project. Carle is trying to do everything they can to be good citizens.

Chair Pollock suggested moving the Plan Commission discuss regarding this case to the next meeting. There were no objections.

6. OLD BUSINESS

Policy Recommendation to City Council on UCSD Long-Range Plan (Refer to July 19, 2001 Memorandum)

Ms. Tyler began her presentation by stating that the purpose for the Plan Commission and the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee to review this case is to give input to the City Council, because the long-range plan does effect and pertain to the Comprehensive Planning process. She handed out a draft of the last Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee minutes regarding the UCSD long-range plan for the Plan Commission to review.

She continued with the presentation by reviewing the introduction of the staff memorandum from July 19, 2001. Ms. Tyler then assessed the staff recommendation, which was prepared jointly by Bill Gray, Public Works and herself. She commented that the report includes staff recommendations that are broken into four parts, which are:

1. Staff recommends endorsement of the facilities planning area, interceptor sewer service area plan, and treatment facilities long-range plan components of the UCSD Long Range Plan.
2. Staff does not recommend endorsement of the financial plan as it is currently envisioned with respect to the connection rate structure in general.
3. Staff recommends that the District begin now to evaluate future expansion needs that may be necessary in the Northeast basin.
4. Staff recommends that the District consider environmentally friendly approaches and technologies in current and future expansion plans.

Ms. Tyler mentioned the issues, problems, and some of the discussions that the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee had with the staff recommendations.

Mr. Knaap stated the problem with the differential pricing is that if the people in the new sewage treatment plant area are charged more than the people in the current treatment plant area, then there would be an incentive to not develop in the new plant area and to develop in the old plant area. That would not be an efficient price structure. He went on to say that if expanding the southwest plant was delayed, there would be some cost savings accrued. He would like the City of Urbana to ask the Sanitary District to calculate what the savings would be. Until the Plan Commission has those calculations, the Plan Commission cannot effectively address the question of whether they can make a recommendation. Ms. Tyler mentioned that this question had been brought up at the previous meetings regarding this case. Although the answer from the Sanitary District is vague, it may be the best answer that the Sanitary District can give. Mr. Knaap commented that the question should not be dropped, because it is a huge investment over a multi-year period.

Mr. Alix commented that the Plan Commission might be doing a disservice to look at the long-range plan from an equity standpoint. He believed that the Plan Commission should look at what their objectives are, one of which is to encourage smart growth by encouraging development at lowest overall cost on a system wide basis.

Mr. Alix stated that another concern he had was that in the past UCSD had not anticipated expansion. Therefore, he would express general agreement with the long-range plan, but encourage UCSD to look at their pricing structure with regard to whether it could be changed to encourage smart growth and to allow UCSD to be prepared for maintenance and future expansion. Mr. Knaap believes that one of the key principles to smart growth would be to utilize existing infrastructure capacity first, and then pricing it appropriately so that it would be efficiently used.

Mr. Pollock felt that UCSD was striving to not let this happen again. They are taking a look at the pricing to prepare for future expansion needs.

Mr. Kangas commented that he was not convinced that pricing structures and the incentives included influences whether developers build and where. He stated that he likes the idea of flat rates throughout the community.

Mr. Alix believed that it was not the Plan Commission's job to analyze the pricing structure. The Plan Commission should only articulate their concerns and ask UCSD to take a look at those concerns.

Mr. Alix moved to support the long-range plan as presented with the additional recommendation that the UCSD evaluate changes to their funding model to encourage efficient growth and provide for future expansion. Mr. Rank seconded the motion.

Mr. Knaap stated that the question is about the choice of the expansion. In general, there is excess capacity in Urbana, and it is near capacity in Champaign. UCSD needs to increase the capacity in Champaign. At some point, the capacity will need to be increased in Urbana, while Champaign will have excess capacity. It will be a continuous cycle. There will always be excess capacity in either Champaign or Urbana. Mr. Pollock replied that having excess in capacity might be the best way to go. To equalize the capacity in both the basins might be impossible.

Mr. Kangas asked what would happen if Champaign was at capacity? Mr. Knaap replied that development and growth would occur where there was excess capacity and would be delayed where the capacity was full. Mr. Alix had trouble with saying stop growth in southwest Champaign because the southwest plant is at full capacity, while development continues to grow in areas served by the northeast plant until capacity is equalized.

Mr. Kangas questioned whether it is the demand for housing that is driving the wider basin problem or is the opposite happening. Mr. Knaap replied that currently UCSD's capacity decides where growth occurs. Mr. Pollock remarked that his understanding was that the southwest plant is at capacity or exceeds it. Without the expansion, development and growth in that area will come to a halt.

Mr. Alix could not support a recommendation where the Plan Commission is saying that maybe growth should be halted in a third of the community, while waiting for the other two-thirds of the community to catch up in terms of the sewer capacity. Mr. Knaap stated that the extent of the community was defined by the sewer system. Mr. Alix disagreed by saying that the extent of the community was defined by distribution of all public services including police, fire departments, schools and transportation. Mr. Knaap replied that the third of the community that would be served by the extra capacity does not exist yet. Mr. Alix commented that the land exists, and people own the land. People have the right to develop the land. Mr. Knaap responded that was true for the entire County. However, the sewer sheds are what determines where development will occur.

Mr. Kangas commented that he was not sure what the calculated number would mean. Mr. Knaap replied that the amount of savings for delaying the expansion of the southwest plant has the potential to change the dynamics of the long-range plan discussion.

Mr. Alix stated that the question is what does the Plan Commission wish to accomplish by asking UCSD to consider changing their pricing structure. He would like to accomplish a way that UCSD would be prepared for the next future expansion of their facilities.

A vote was taken on the motion, and the motion was passed by a 4-2 voice vote.

8. NEW BUSINESS

There was none.

9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There was none.

10. STAFF REPORT

Ms. Tyler gave a staff report as follows:

- 1) The Beringer Commons Annexation Agreement Amendment and subdivision plats were approved by the City Council.
- 2) There will be a reception/recognition for Dr. J. Barry Howell at 7:00 pm on September 6, 2001 preceding the Plan Commission meeting.
- 3) The next Downtown Plan Steering Committee meeting will be on August 28, 2001 from 4:00 pm to 6:00 pm at the Urbana Civic Center.

11. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 11:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth H. Tyler, Secretary
Urbana Plan Commission