

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING

URBANA PLAN COMMISSION

APPROVED

DATE: October 24, 2002
TIME: 7:30 P.M.
PLACE: Urbana City Building
400 South Vine Street
Urbana, IL 61801

MEMBERS PRESENT: Christopher Alix, Laurie Goscha, Lew Hopkins, Randy Kangas, Bernadine Stake, Marilyn Upah-Bant

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Alan Douglas, Michael Pollock

STAFF PRESENT: Libby Tyler, CD Director; Rob Kowalski, Planning Manager; Tim Ross, Senior Planner; Michaela Bell, Planner; Teri Andel, Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT: Nancy Anderson, Tom Anderson, Jeannie Berns, Tom Berns, Kwon Eeuha, Melissa Headley, Jim Merz, Alice Novak, Esther Patt, Wayne Shaw, John Stifle, Susan Taylor, Jerry Timothy, Yu Xiao

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

The meeting was called to order at 7:34 p.m., the roll call was taken, and a quorum was declared.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

There were none.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Stake moved to approve the minutes from the meeting held on October 10, 2002. Mr. Alix seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by unanimous vote.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

- ***Resident Survey Final Report:*** Rob Kowalski, Planning Manager, commented that this was a part of the Comprehensive Plan Update. This is a summary report on a resident survey that

a class at the Urban and Regional Planning Department of the University of Illinois did for the City of Urbana. The students surveyed 360 homes door-to-door.

5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

6. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

Plan Case #1842-SU-02: Request for a Special Use Permit to establish an 8,675 square-foot addition to the gymnasium/education building within a proposed master site plan at the Urbana Assembly of God Church, located at 2502 South Race Street.

Tim Ross, Senior Planner, gave the staff report for this case. He began by introducing the proposed Special Use Permit request and explained that the purpose of the new addition is to provide additional classroom space, with a space for youth church service activities. He noted that the Master Site Plan was included in this proposal. Mr. Ross gave a brief background and history of the Urbana Assembly of God Church regarding the Master Site Plan. He described the site and the surrounding properties and noted the zoning and land uses of each. He talked about the building materials that would be used on the new addition and about the setback requirements. Mr. Ross discussed the requirements for a Special Use Permit according to Section VII-6 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance. He summarized staff findings and read the options of the Plan Commission. He noted that staff recommendation was as follows:

Based on the evidence presented in the discussion of the written staff report, and without the benefit of considering additional evidence that may be presented at the public hearing, staff recommends that the Plan Commission recommend approval of the proposed Special Use Permit and Master Site Plan in this case as presented with the following conditions:

- 1. That the proposed addition be constructed in substantial conformance to the design indicated on Exhibit H, Perspective Drawing of Proposed Addition.*
- 2. That the existing dead trees on the lot be removed and that the trees be replaced to bring the existing parking lot into compliance with tree planting requirements of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance, as determined by the Zoning Administrator and the City Arborist.*
- 3. That the City Engineer approves the drainage plan for the Master Site Plan.*
- 4. That the proposed Master Site Plan be approved, subject to further review prior to the public hearing, but that an additional Special Use Permit be requested prior to construction of any buildings or structures not in substantial conformance to those shown on Exhibit I, Proposed Master Site Plan.*

Mr. Alix questioned the relevancy of some of the language in Condition #4. Mr. Ross explained that when the staff memo was being prepared to be mailed out, staff had just received the Master Site Plan and wanted to further review it prior to the public hearing. Staff is not changing the

recommendation as a result of the additional review. City Engineering Division was still looking at the Master Site Plan. So far, they have not expressed any comments to indicate that the proposed youth building would not be compliant.

Ms. Stake inquired about signage and outdoor lighting. Mr. Ross stated that the church had not discussed any outside lighting; however, the Urbana Assembly of God Church would be required to not shine any outdoor lighting directly into any of the surrounding residential properties. In regards to signage, there have been no requests for any additional signs on the property. If a request came in, then staff would look at whether the request was compliant with zoning.

Ms. Stake preferred to see the drainage plans. Mr. Ross noted that there were some drainage plans submitted to the Engineering Department. A lot of the plans are calculations. Ms. Stake stated that she was wondering where the well water would drain. Mr. Ross replied that in the Master Site Plan, it shows that the land would be developed so that the water would flow to the southeast where a detention basin would be constructed.

Ms. Goscha questioned if Condition #4 suggested that a Special Use Permit would not be required if a future building was in substantial conformance? Mr. Ross replied that was correct. Staff was recommending that if the church wants to do something similar to this proposal, they would not be required to get a Special Use Permit.

Mr. Kangas noted that the chart did not show a curb cut along Windsor Road. He asked if there would ever be a curb cut there? Mr. Ross responded that he was not sure if a curb cut was possible along Windsor. Mr. Kangas asked if a curb cut would be considered a substantial change to the Master Site Plan and require the church to acquire a Special Use Permit? Mr. Ross replied that was correct.

Wayne Shaw, architect for Abris, Ltd. representing the Urbana Assembly of God Church, noted that he had some drawings to illustrate where the church currently was in their planning process. First, he wanted to address some of the questions that had been asked by the Plan Commission.

1. In regards to the outside lighting, the church would shield any lighting that would be on the proposed building or the site, so that it would not shine toward the residential neighborhoods.
2. The church has not planned any new signage for the site either in the proposed youth addition or in the Master Site Plan.
3. With regards to the drainage, there is not a large drawing on that subject; however, the church submitted a study that was performed by HDC Engineering, Inc. to the City Engineering Department.
4. Regarding the curb cut along Windsor Road, the church researched this idea a while back and found that it would require a deceleration lane and would be too expensive.

Mr. Shaw referred to the drawings while he talked about future changes that the church planned to make. He pointed out that the detention basin would be located on the southeast side of the parking lot. He noted that the parking lot was now finished. He discussed what building materials

the church planned to use. He presented a sketch of the proposed floor plan, and explained that the proposed addition would be used primarily for youth education. He stated that there would not be any windows along the north or the east sides of the proposed addition. He mentioned that he had met with Steve Cochran, City Building Inspector, to ensure that the proposed building would meet all building codes. He presented illustrations and noted the elevations of all three areas of the proposed building.

Mr. Alix inquired what the raised roofline on the north elevation was for? Mr. Shaw commented that the north elevation was like a raised dormer. The church wanted a higher ceiling over the stage area to allow for some lighting.

Mr. Shaw continued to show a sketch of another future building. He explained that after the proposed youth education building was finished, the church would like to expand the sanctuary. He showed the Plan Commissioners where the future sanctuary would be located on the property. Mr. Shaw worked out the tree layout with the City Arborist on the Master Site Plan as well. Although the church would be required to provide thirty-three trees, they would provide almost twice that amount. The church's concept is to have trees around the site and some shrubbery along Windsor Road, so that a passerby would not be able to see "a big sea off asphalt." The Zoning requirement requires one tree per every nine stalls. This does not create a very aesthetic layout and also creates a problem with snow removal. He worked out other locations where the trees will be in groups of two at the end of each parking bay. The church plans to use Cyprus trees in the detention area.

Mr. Alix asked if any of the trees in the proposed plan were the same trees that were in the short-term site plan? Mr. Shaw replied that most of the trees would be new trees. However, along the north property line, the church was planning to save those trees.

Mr. Shaw showed a sketch of what the Urbana Assembly of God Church would look like once all of the future expansions were finished. He noted that the outside of each building would match the other buildings with regards to building materials.

Ms. Stake questioned whether the church's area would have brighter lighting than that in the residential area? Mr. Shaw responded that the church would not be changing the lighting in the current parking lot at this stage. He did not foresee any other lighting, particularly on the north side of the building, unless there were a couple of lights for security purposes only.

Ms. Goscha inquired what the ridge heights would be on the proposed gymnasium and on the future sanctuary? Mr. Shaw answered that the height of the gymnasium would be approximately forty-five feet. There is a height restriction in the R-3 Zoning District of thirty-five feet. The height of the sanctuary building would be about fifty-one feet tall. Ms. Goscha asked what the pitch on the roof would be? Mr. Shaw replied 5-12.

Ms. Upah-Bant remarked that by the time the sanctuary is finished, the church would be substantially bigger than it is now. She asked if the church anticipated any increase in vehicular traffic? Does the church expect an increase in the congregation size? Mr. Shaw answered that by the time the projects have been completed, the church anticipates an increase in the size of the

congregation and in vehicular traffic. However, the traffic would still be entering the church property from Race Street and not from Windsor Road.

Ms. Upah-Bant asked if the parking lot would accommodate the increase in the congregation as well? Mr. Shaw stated that the required parking for a 1,000-seat sanctuary would be 200 spaces. The church wants to have 286 parking spaces. Currently, the church is only required to provide 90 spaces; however, there are 215 parking spaces.

Mr. Alix inquired as to why the church provided more parking spaces than required? Mr. Shaw responded that the zoning requirement ratio is one car to five seats in the sanctuary. The church believes that they need more in the realm of one car to every three or four seats in the sanctuary.

Ms. Goscha inquired as to whether the homes in the residential neighborhood to the north of the church were mostly one-story homes or two-story homes? Mr. Shaw answered that most of the homes would be considered to be two-story. Ms. Goscha asked what Mr. Shaw believed the roof ridge of the average homes would be? Mr. Shaw guessed that the roof ridges were between twenty-two feet and twenty-four feet.

Jim Merz, Business Administrator for the Urbana Assembly of God Church, responded to the question regarding the size of the congregation. He noted that the existing sanctuary holds about 450 members. They have two services and have about 750 members in the congregation as of now. The parking lot is full, especially for the second service. The church allows forty-five minutes between the two services to help empty out the parking lot for the members who attend the second service.

Tom Berns, who lives in a duplex immediately north of the proposed youth building, approached the Plan Commission to speak in favor of the proposal. He and his neighbors met with the deacons of the Urbana Assembly of God Church on October 27, 2002. They discussed the proposed addition, reviewed the Master Site Plan, and found the current proposal to be more able to adequately address the concerns of the residents who live on the north side of the church. He was satisfied to know that there would be no sheet metal siding on the building addition. He believed that with no windows on the north or east sides, it would help keep the noise level down and the light from shining in their homes and yards. Any lighting that neighborhood residents would see would be shielded and directed away from the neighborhoods.

Mr. Berns commented that the neighbors appreciate the church in trying to save the trees along the north side. Some of the neighbors offered to have the big Ash tree attended by a professional arborist. Residential concerns of other landscaping had previously included the maintenance of the fence between the north residential neighborhood and the church. This issue was resolved during that meeting as well by the church granting the neighbors permission to maintain the fence.

Mr. Berns noted that the neighbors felt that the height of the proposed educational building/gymnasium was reasonable. He felt that the proposed use of the building addition would be a reasonable accommodation for the neighborhood. The increase in parking would not affect the neighborhood. The Master Site Plan shows reasonable growth in the future. He would like to continue to have a good relationship with the church, because the Urbana Assembly of God

Church has been a good neighbor. The neighbors requested that the letter summarizing their meeting between the neighborhoods and the Urbana Assembly of God Church be submitted on record to the City staff.

Nancy Anderson, of 106 Whitehall Court, stated that she was pleased to see a Master Site Plan. She supported the proposed building addition. However, she had two concerns, which were as follows: 1) Increase in traffic due to the increase in the size of the congregation and 2) Height of the gymnasium being twice that of the residential homes.

Mr. Ross commented that the trend over the years has been that the zoning requirement for parking for a church is not enough for what the church needs or wants. Churches need more parking than what is required. Mr. Alix inquired as to whether staff plans on modifying the Zoning Ordinance? Mr. Ross believed that it was an issue that staff would look at. Mr. Alix added that there seemed to be a trend toward larger and larger congregations. Small neighborhood churches are giving way to the larger, more regional congregations. Therefore, he felt it would be appropriate for the City to bring an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance to address this issue.

Mr. Alix asked if the City of Urbana would issue a permit to build something taller than thirty-five feet? Mr. Ross answered that the maximum height is thirty-five feet, but that is the average height at grade. It is possible that a pitch could extend higher than that if part of the roof is also below the maximum height. Mr. Alix asked if the requirement is an average of thirty-five feet over the entire ground area of the building? Mr. Ross believed that was the way that it was calculated. The Building Safety Division in Community Development Department of the City of Urbana performs the calculations and issues the building permits. Mr. Alix questioned if that included the individual sub-building or would the sub-building bring the average down to allow the construction of a much higher peak on the gymnasium building? Mr. Ross answered that each building would need to independently meet the building height. Mr. Alix asked if the proposed building addition would consider three buildings? Mr. Ross stated that he believed that was true.

Ms. Stake moved that the Plan Commission forward this case to the Urbana City Council with the recommendation for approval with the four conditions listed in the written staff report. Ms. Goscha seconded the motion. She questioned the language of Condition #4. Did the Plan Commission wish to make the minor wording change? Mr. Alix noted that Condition #4 would read as such: *That an additional Special Use Permit be requested prior to construction of any buildings or structures not in substantial conformance to those shown on Exhibit I, Proposed Master Site Plan.* Ms. Stake and Ms. Goscha agreed with the amendment. The roll call was as follows:

Ms. Upah-Bant	-	Yes	Ms. Stake	-	Yes
Mr. Kangas	-	Yes	Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes
Ms. Goscha	-	Yes	Mr. Alix	-	Yes

The motion was passed by unanimous vote. Mr. Kowalski noted that this case would move forward to the Urbana City Council on November 4, 2002.

Plan Case #1843-T-02: Request by the Zoning Administrator to amend the text of Article XII (Historic Preservation Ordinance) to add a new definition, “Noncontributing” and to add a “Level of Review Table” for Noncontributing and Contributing Structures, and to make other minor changes to the Urbana Zoning Ordinance.

Michaela Bell, Planner, reported on this case by presenting a brief introduction and background regarding the proposed text amendment. She explained that the request for a text amendment came from the Urbana City Council last July. It stemmed from the February, 2002 application that was submitted to designate a historic district in the West Main Street area. She reviewed the proposed changes, which were as follows:

1. Amend the definition of “Contributing” to be more consistent in verbiage to the proposed definition of “Noncontributing”.
2. Add a definition for “Noncontributing”.
3. Add language to “Certificate of Appropriateness” to clarify the scope of the certificate of appropriateness for both contributing and noncontributing property owners and directs the reader to the proposed project level of review tables for further information.
4. Add “Project Level of Review Tables.

She summarized staff findings and read the options of the Plan Commission. She noted the staff recommendation 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 at the public hearing, staff recommended that the Urbana Plan Commission recommend approval of the proposed text amendment to the Urbana City Council.

Mr. Alix asked if staff felt that the Zoning Ordinance, as amended with the Level of Review Tables, would still cover things that were not listed in the tables in a reasonable way? Ms. Bell responded that the intention of the tables was not to provide a list of every project. They are supposed to be a guide for property owners. If a project that was not outlined in either of the tables was proposed, then the property owner would need to apply for a Certificate of Appropriateness, and it would be reviewed by the Zoning Administrator and the Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission. Mr. Alix questioned if staff believed that the addition of the tables weakened the ordinance in terms of the Historic Preservation Commission’s ability to regulate major changes? Ms. Bell replied no.

Ms. Goscha inquired as to who determines whether or not a structure is contributing. Mr. Kowalski answered by saying that the Historic Preservation Commission would decide that during a public hearing of the proposed district.

Ms. Goscha questioned how a new property owner would know when purchasing a house whether or not the house is noncontributing, contributing, or even in a historic district? Mr. Kowalski responded that the Historic Preservation Commission had talked about some methods for notifying property owners. The City has not set anything into implementation yet as far as

sending a new letter when there is a change of ownership. It would be hard for the City to track. The City does provide plaques for local landmarks, which goes on the front of the house. Ms. Goscha commented that it would be relevant information to a person purchasing property. If they are not informed, then it might be a little offensive to find that out after the purchase. Mr. Kowalski stated that it was very similar to zoning. It would not be something that would typically show up as a deed restriction or a covenant on the property. Hopefully, most people check to find out what the land use controls and zoning requirements for a property before purchasing it.

Ms. Goscha asked what the concept was behind choosing fifty years as a reasonable number of when something is historic or not so historic? Mr. Kowalski replied that Alice Novak would probably be able to answer that question.

Mr. Hopkins could not find mention of identification of contributing versus noncontributing in the Zoning Ordinance. He asked if there was anywhere where the existence of this distinction other than in the definitions? Ms. Bell stated that when an application is submitted that properties will be identified through the process as to which are contributing and which are noncontributing. Ms. Tyler read Section XII-4 F.3 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance, which is stated as follows: *The Preservation Commission shall identify all contributing and noncontributing buildings, structures, sites or objects within the proposed historic district that are listed in the application.*

Mr. Hopkins understood that the Level of Review Tables would replace most of Section XII-6. The tables do not include all the words in Section XII-6 that would be replaced. He asked if staff was clear that the words being deleted from the ordinance would not matter to the City? Ms. Bell replied yes. Mr. Kowalski added that the first task of the Historic Preservation Commission was to put this Section into a table form. During the following two meetings, the Commission tweaked it to be more useful.

Ms. Upah-Bant inquired if there was a particular case that prompted this amendment? Mr. Kangas answered that some of these amendments were a response to the Main Street Historic District nomination. There were some complaints that it was not clear of what property owners could and could not do. By putting the information in a table form, it helps clarify this to people. There were some complaints that the property owners did not know whether they should be for or against the nomination, because they did not know what the rules were. Sometimes looking at a table is a lot easier than looking at a paragraph. He added that City Council wanted to go back and revisit some areas of the Historic Preservation Ordinance.

Mr. Kangas mentioned that when he bought his house, he knew what the property was zoned; however, he did not know what the zoning meant. Most people probably do not even know what zoning district they are in.

Mr. Kangas continued by saying that from his experience, when a historic district is nominated, there is an investigation to determine whether it should be determined that it is a historic district. The nomination starts the process where it is determined what properties are contributing and noncontributing. Ms. Tyler added that there are public notices that are sent out to all the

property owners of a nominated historic district. The City provides plaques to mark districts and landmarks.

Alice Novak, Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission, explained that the fifty-year rule comes from the National Register of Historic Places. It is completely arbitrary. The Commission uses the fifty-year rule typically because it is the national standard that has been set by the National Park Service. It is a typical provision in historic preservation ordinances. The National Park Service decided that there needed to be a span of time to be able to look back at something.

Ms. Alix inquired as to whether the fifty-year rule was relevant to somewhere other than in the Level of Review Tables? Ms. Novak stated that when the Historic Preservation Commission were looking at defining noncontributing buildings, they felt that there were three categories of noncontributing, which are: 1) modern buildings, 2) vacant lots, and 3) buildings that are fifty years old or older that may still have some character left, but may have been considered noncontributing because they had artificial siding, etc. The Commission felt that those buildings that were still old, but not considered contributing, needed a different kind of review process, because they still might have the potential to become contributing if someone were to do a rehabilitation on the building.

Mr. Alix asked if the Historic Preservation Commission could nominate and designate a contributing structure regardless of its age? Mr. Kowalski replied that was correct as long as the structure was determined to be contributing.

Ms. Novak mentioned that the Historic Preservation Commission tried to respond as best as they could to the directive from the City Council. During the Main Street meeting, the Historic Preservation Commission discovered more needs for clarification of the Historic Preservation Ordinance as they continue to use it. Therefore, they tried to go down the different aspects of buildings, look at what was really important, and maintain character in potential historic districts. They tried to distinguish a different process for the different categories of buildings.

Mr. Kangas commented that the ordinance was the result of an effort of a large group of people over a period of years. There will occasionally need to be corrections for things that the group did not think of at that time. Ms. Novak added that there are over 100 historic preservation ordinances in the State of Illinois. Not all of them are binding review that would require a Certificate of Appropriateness, but most of them are. Most communities do not define noncontributing buildings.

Ms. Goscha noticed a typo in the definition of noncontributing. It should be consistent with the definition of contributing to include the word "site".

Ms. Stake moved that the Plan Commission forward this case to the City Council with the recommendation for approval. Mr. Alix seconded the motion. The roll call was as follows:

Ms. Goscha	-	Yes	Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes
Mr. Kangas	-	Yes	Ms. Stake	-	Yes

Ms. Upah-Bant - Yes Mr. Alix - Yes

The motion was passed by a unanimous vote. Mr. Kangas mentioned that this case would be heard at the City Council meeting on November 4, 2002.

7. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

8. NEW BUSINESS

Plan Case #CCZBA-344-AT-02: Request by the Champaign County Zoning Administrator to amend the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Kowalski presented this case to the Plan Commission. He explained that the Champaign County Zoning Administrator was requesting a text amendment to the County Zoning Ordinance to reorganize the ordinance in order to make it easier to use and understand. He briefly reviewed the proposed changes, which were as follows:

1. Reorganize the provisions into 13 articles in lieu of the present 14 sections.
2. Reserve sections for future new provisions.
3. Institute a new article and section numbering system.
4. Generally make grammatical and editorial changes as required by the new format and to provide greater clarity.
5. Add language clarifying the scope and effect of the ordinance.
6. Add language clarifying the definition and application of "use" as applied to lots.
7. Clarify regulations applying to the process of creating lots.
8. Add new "Conditional Use" and "Legislative Special Use" categories of use authorization to the existing "By Right" and "Special Use" categories. No uses are assigned to the new categories by the amendment and it makes no substantive changes to the Table of Permitted Uses by District.

Mr. Kowalski noted the staff findings in the written report and read the options of the Plan Commission. He stated that staff recommended that the Plan Commission forward this case to the City Council with a recommendation to defeat a resolution of protest for the proposed text amendment.

Mr. Alix moved that the Plan Commission recommend to defeat a resolution of protest to the City Council. Ms. Stake seconded the motion. The roll call was as follows:

Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes	Mr. Kangas	-	Yes
Ms. Stake	-	Yes	Ms. Upah-Bant	-	Yes
Mr. Alix	-	Yes	Ms. Goscha	-	Yes

The motion was passed by unanimous vote.

9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There was none.

10. STAFF REPORT

Mr. Kowalski reported on the following:

- ✓ Plan Case #1841-SU-02: (Special Use Permit for the construction of rental mini-warehouses) This case was approved by City Council on October 21, 2002.
- ✓ Tonight's Cases will go to the November 4, 2002 City Council meeting.
- ✓ Savannah Green Subdivision Phase 4 Final Plat will also be presented on November 4, 2002 for approval. He noted that Construx has acquired building permits for 107 of the 297 lots so far.
- ✓ Upcoming Case: There will be another Champaign County text amendment soon.
- ✓ B-1 Zoning District Text Amendment will also be presented to the Plan Commission in the near future. The City Council asked staff to take a look at this zoning district and come up with some recommendations for how it could be tweaked to be more compatible with surrounding residential areas.
- ✓ Comprehensive Plan Update: Staff just finished a round of 14 different focus group sessions with 7 different groups. Within the next two months, staff expects to have a draft set of goals and objectives. Just into the New Year, staff will be putting together a new proposed future land use map.

Ms. Stake inquired as to whether the focus groups and the neighborhood groups were in sync? Mr. Kowalski replied that staff heard many of the same comments from both groups. However, the focus groups were different in that staff asked more technical questions that were not asked of the public. The focus group titled, "Community Heritage and Urban Design", was more compatible with the neighborhood workshops.

Ms. Tyler reported on the following:

- ✓ King Park Neighborhood Center: There will be a special meeting on Monday, October 28, 2002, which was requested by Alderman Hayes. This meeting was scheduled to discuss different development options and funding opportunities for the Neighborhood Center to serve the King Park neighborhood.
- ✓ Lakeside Terrace: The Housing Authority is looking at the layouts and negotiating with a developer. City Council and Community Development staff are interested in replacing 80 of the 100 units that are available for low-income families.
- ✓ Urbana Business Association has requested an extension of the Tax Rebate Program under Build Urbana until December of 2004.

11. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

Acting Chair Kangas adjourned the meeting at 9:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rob Kowalski, Secretary
Urbana Plan Commission