

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING

URBANA PLAN COMMISSION

APPROVED

DATE: April 10, 2003

TIME: 7:30 P.M.

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Christopher Alix, Alan Douglas, Laurie Goscha, Lew Hopkins, Michael Pollock, Bernadine Stake

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Randy Kangas, Marilyn Upah-Bant, Don White

STAFF PRESENT: Rob Kowalski, Planning Manager; Michaela Bell, Planner; Teri Andel, Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT: April Getchius, Scott Kunkel, Beth Steege, Susan Taylor

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

The meeting was called to order at 7:35 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 March 6, 2003 meeting. Mr. Hopkins seconded the motion. The minutes were then approved as presented by unanimous voice vote.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

- 2003 Urbana Comprehensive Plan Update Study Guide

5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

6. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

Plan Case #1853-SU-03: Request by Gregory Place, LLC for a Special Use Permit for a mixed-use development known as the East Campus Commercial Center located on the west side of Gregory Place between Oregon Street and Nevada Street.

Rob Kowalski, Planning Manager, presented the staff report for this case. He introduced the case by talking about the history of the East Campus Commercial Center. He gave a brief description of the development site and of the surrounding area. He discussed the proposed East Campus Commercial Center, the structure and design of the development, the site design, parking and the proposed uses. He reviewed 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 Urbana Plan Commission. He stated that staff's 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 during the public hearing, staff recommended that the Plan Commission recommend approval of the proposed special use as presented to the Urbana City Council, for the reasons articulated in the written staff report with the following conditions:

- 1. The Developer shall consult with City staff indicating the exact commercial uses that will be located within the commercial space. City staff shall confirm that the uses are permitted in the CCD Zoning District and that adequate parking is accommodated to satisfy the development regulations.*
- 2. That the development on the property be in substantial conformance with the Site Plan labeled as Exhibit "E" in the written staff report.*
- 3. Evidence that off-site parking be provided prior to conditional use permits being issued.*

Mr. Alix commented that in the past, it had been the position held by the University of Illinois (U of I) that they are not subject to zoning ordinances in the City of Urbana in regards to land that was owned by the U of I. He asked Mr. Kowalski to describe how this issue related to this case. Has the U of I, in effect, consented to jurisdiction with regard to this parcel or with regard to this parcel and the parcel, which would contain the parking? Mr. Kowalski replied on the issue as a whole, he would reply "no". However, this was a very unique proposal in that the U of I would own the land; however, the development would be a private development. Considering the uniqueness of the case, it was agreed that the case would go through the process of rezoning and special use permit review.

Mr. Alix inquired as to who would be the holder of the special use permit? Mr. Kowalski stated that the special use permit would be issued to the developer, Gregory Place, LLC. Mr. Alix asked if in effect, it was the opinion of the City Attorney that the University believed that they could do whatever on the land regardless of zoning, but the private developer would be bound by Urbana's zoning regulations as long as the developer was holding a long-term lease on the land? Mr. Kowalski responded that was the City's approach to this project.

Mr. Alix was curious to know what enforcement options the City would have in the future if the University decided to build a classroom on the other side of the street or cease providing the parking for the proposed development. If the developers special use permit was contingent on providing additional parking, then we would be creating a situation where the developer would only be able to comply with the provisions of the special use permit at the pleasure of the University. He foresaw a potential issue with this. Mr. Kowalski stated that was a potential scenario. If a future development came up or conditions changed, and the parking that the developer had been committed to would not be available, then the City would have to relook at the special use approval and find out if there were other accommodations that could be made to satisfy the parking requirement or could the special use be adjusted to reduce the amount of required parking. It would be a bridge that staff would cross when they got there. The developers were only required to show that they have a commitment for the parking spaces now. Mr. Alix struggled with trying to construct an additional condition that would require the parking be provided when it seemed like there was not a clear party against whom that condition could be enforced. It could not necessarily be enforced on the developer, because the University would be providing the parking spaces for the developer. It could not be enforced on the University, because the University was not consenting to jurisdiction of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance. He wondered if they were creating a condition that the City could not enforce. Mr. Kowalski mentioned that April Getchius would explain more of the development agreement between the developer and the University and how the parking would work. Like changes of use or changes in the building, the City would view parking as something that was the responsibility of the developer, who would run and maintain the proposed development. His general understanding was that if the parking spaces were taken away, then the University would be in violation of the agreement that they have with the developer. In that case, the City would go to the developer and ask where the developer would provide the additional parking. If additional parking was not available anywhere else, then the City would need to revisit the case to find out what they want to do about it.

Mr. Alix understood that the special use permit was being requested to cover any types of uses that are permitted by special use permit within the Campus Commercial District (CCD) zone. In other words, no matter what type of business would occupy the spaces in the future, the developer would not come back to the City to request amendments or modifications to the special use permit. Mr. Kowalski replied that was how staff decided that they wanted to handle this. Perhaps staff could have crafted the district to be more in line with the Planned Unit Development (PUD) standards, where there would be a number of uses that would be allowed by right in the District, but the development itself would have to go through a special use permit process. Mr. Alix asked if the City was not putting themselves where staff would have to review every change of lease in the development or could be seen as obstructing the ability of the developer to lease a space to a particular tenant? Mr. Kowalski replied that was correct.

Ms. Stake questioned if the parking commitment between the University and the developer was only for now? Mr. Kowalski answered that the commitment was perpetual that they have parking that meets the requirements of the development. Ms. Stake expressed concern about the parking. It occurred to her that in addition to the fact that the developer would not have their own parking and would use parking that the University already has, the University already does

not have enough parking, so that the proposed development would be impacting the neighborhood nearby. She inquired why the developer could not build more underground parking in the proposed area to solve the parking problem? Mr. Kowalski replied that the developer had maximized the underground parking, which they could do on the site, absent having multiple stories underground of parking, which would be extremely expensive to do. The parking, which the developer would be providing underground, matched the footprint of the building and would provide for about 60 spaces. In the long-term, the University's Master Plan plans to provide more parking in the area that would help alleviate this problem, which is a short-term problem. It would accommodate for a Phase II on the other side of the street that would have the same parking demands. The City's concern was that the proposed development has the required number of parking spaces, and City staff was satisfied now that they do.

Mr. Pollock noted that one of the conditions was that the City reviews all of the commercial uses that were planned for this to make sure that they are on the list and that everyone agrees that the uses are conforming. He asked if when those uses change, would the University or the developer be required to come back and let the City know that there was a new tenant and carry that on for each change of tenants? Mr. Kowalski responded that each new tenant would be required to get a Certificate of Occupancy at the administrative level to open a new business. He explained that when a new business opens in town, a Certificate of Occupancy is requested and signed off by the Building Inspector. Planning staff wants to meet with the developer and talk about all the proposed uses to be located in the building.

Scott Kunkel, of JSM Development, mentioned that parking was a significant issue from their standpoint as well. They were concerned about any development they do and make sure that they have the parking available to them. Parking is a marketing issue. The project would be difficult to market effectively unless there is adequate parking accompanying those sites, so that was an important issue from their standpoint as well.

He noted that there were several documents and agreements that exist between the University and them that specifically deal with the issue of parking and put upon the University, the requirement that over the term of the ground lease, which could be either 50 or 75 years depending upon whether an option is utilized, that the University would be required to provide the necessary parking to them. He wanted an absolute assurance that parking would be available.

Mr. Alix inquired if the parking provided by the University would be dedicated parking for the East Campus Commercial Center? Mr. Kunkel replied that was correct. There is some flexibility of whether the parking would be in the lot across the street or a different lot. This was to help work with the University on where their parking demands are. Nonetheless, the University would have to provide the total count of parking that the proposed development would need to get up to the requirements for the zoning district.

Mr. Alix asked if the parking would be posted? Mr. Kunkel responded that his understanding was that it would be parking for the proposed project only, and it would be posted. Mr. Alix questioned if this would be recorded as a parking easement or something that indicates that they would have the right to use it? Mr. Kunkel replied that was correct and that the duration would

be concurrent with the duration of the grounds lease. Mr. Alix stated that satisfied his concern that in the area of enforcement, that in effect, JSM Development could be put in a position where the City had to enforce an action against them for not providing enough parking when they did not have the ability to provide that parking. Mr. Kunkel commented that from a purely business standpoint, it was a critical issue to them that they were 100% confident that they would not be in a situation where five years from now they would have a building that was no longer a viable structure because the parking disappeared. Mr. Alix asked if that requirement was couched in the same language as the requirement for the parking, so that parking has to be within 600 feet. Mr. Kunkel replied yes.

Mr. Pollock inquired if the University's Master Plan called for a deck where these spaces would be? Mr. Kunkel replied that he believed there was to be a deck in the same block; however, Ms. Getchius would be better equipped to talk about where the deck would be. The Phase II issue that Mr. Kowalski had mentioned was somewhat incumbent upon the parking deck being built first, because the concept behind the parking deck would be to replace the surface parking capacity that currently exists in the lot across the street from the proposed development. Mr. Pollock was concerned that when the parking deck was being built over a period of a year and a half, where do the 100 parking spaces go? Mr. Kunkel responded that they would not infringe upon the surface parking lot while JSM Development would be building the proposed building.

Ms. Stake commented that there was a lot of difference between 50 and 75 years. Mr. Kunkel stated that the initial ground lease would be for 50 years. However, there was a 25-year option that JSM Development could exercise during the first 49 years of the 50-year term. The ground lease spells out all the details of the additional rent they would pay, etc. The minimum that JSM Development had committed for to the University was 50 years, but they have the potential to lease it for an additional 25 years beyond that if they choose to. Ms. Stake asked if the parking agreement was for 50 years as well? Mr. Kunkel answered by saying that was correct, and that all the terms that are incorporated into the ground lease automatically extend the parking agreement as well, if JSM Development should choose to extend their lease.

Mr. Kunkel presented some visuals of the proposed development, which included an area plan, a site plan, the lower level plan, the ground level plan, the second level plan, the second through fourth lever plan, an elevation view from the east and the north, and view of the developed site from Gregory Place. He discussed each plan as well as follows:

- *Area Plan:* He described the buildings surrounding the proposed lot and pointed out where the service parking area would be located. He noted that the footprint sized the proposed building at a little over 30,000 square feet.
- *Site Plan:* He noted that JSM Development would like to create more of a higher density urban sort of environment that would be pedestrian oriented. They envision the main commercial level would have a significant sort of a streetscaping component to the sidewalks and the private land areas adjacent to the sidewalks to create the wider, pleasant sort of pedestrian promenade.
- *Lower Level Plan:* He stated that this would be for the underground parking garage with the access off of Nevada Street. There would be approximately 60 parking spaces with both stair and elevator access to the upper levels. It would be

a secure parking area for the enjoyment of the residents and commercial tenants in the building.

Mr. Douglas inquired about how many of the 60 parking spaces would be dedicated for the residents? Mr. Kunkel replied that they generally do not dedicate parking spaces for one or the other. JSM Development's initial focus is on the apartment units and would make the parking spaces available to the apartment residents. As excess parking capacity would be available, JSM Development would make them available to the commercial tenants.

- *Ground Level Plan:* He noted that the first floor commercial level would be a little over 21,000 square feet of leaseable space. The space would be divided as tenants present themselves. JSM Development would provide each tenant with the square feet that they are looking for. He pointed out the main entrance for the residential users on the second, third, and fourth floor. He mentioned that the residents would have both elevator access and stair access at that point. The resident mailboxes would be located there as well.
- *The Second, Third, and Fourth Level Plans:* He noted that these levels would be for the apartments. There would be a combination of one and two-bedroom units. There would be 54 two-bedroom units and 42-one bedroom units. They expect to attract a more sedate type of resident and would like to see a lot of grad-students. He pointed out the reason that the residential footprint was setback an additional amount from the retail footprint was to provide some additional relief to the buildings to the west. There would be a courtyard in the middle for the benefit and enjoyment of the residents on all three levels.
- *Elevation view from the East and the North:* He mentioned that they had applied the University of Illinois's design guidelines to this project. The guidelines addressed issues of exterior materials, proportions, detailing roof slopes, etc. So, JSM Development developed a building that would use the University's blend (red brick), some substantial limestone detailing, and steeper roof pitches.

Ms. Stake asked if there would be a door for each business or if the commercial space would be like a mall? Mr. Kunkel responded that there would be a door for each business to the exterior. It would not be in a mall kind of setting where people go to an interior common space and from that move to the individual businesses.

Ms. Stake inquired about how wide the pedestrian way would be? Mr. Kunkel replied that there was a six-foot setback that they had to maintain, which would be added to the City sidewalk that was there and the additional parkway space, so there would be about fifteen or sixteen feet for the pedestrian way.

- *View of the developed site from Gregory Place:* He noted that this view would be what you would see as you look down Gregory Place with the building progressing down to the south and to the west. The drawing showed more substantial detailing that was being proposed.

Ms. Stake questioned if there would be trees and how big? Mr. Kunkel stated that they were still working on that, and that would be something that they would have to work out with the City of Urbana, because any trees they planted would not be on their property.

Mr. Alix inquired where the access would be for the courtyard? Mr. Kunkel replied that the access would be on the second floor (first floor of the residential area). Mr. Alix inquired if it would be the roof of the first floor and opened above with a balcony railing to the west? Mr. Kunkel replied that was correct. Mr. Alix questioned if the access would be common? Mr. Kunkel stated that was correct.

Mr. Alix questioned where the dumpster would be located? Mr. Kunkel showed where the dumpster would be on the drawing of the site plan. Mr. Alix inquired if there would be a loading dock? Mr. Kunkel stated that there would not be a loading dock.

Mr. Alix asked what Mr. Kunkel's position was on vacating Gregory Place? Did he think it would be an asset or a liability? Mr. Kunkel was not sure how they felt. To some extent JSM Development would like to "test the waters" and see what the response would be of the retailers that would be in the area and how street parking was working. Their initial plan was that Gregory Place would be maintained in street parking for the time being, and they will revisit it. When Phase II comes along, they will again take another look at how Gregory Place fit into the plan. Mr. Alix asked if Mr. Kunkel realized that the University could come to the City of Urbana seeking to vacate Gregory Place with or without JSM Development's blessing? Mr. Kunkel commented that he understood that it was intended to be vacated. Mr. Kowalski added that the City of Urbana had already agreed to vacate Gregory Place under a previous agreement. It would not be City right-of-way for much longer. Mr. Alix stated that Gregory Place would be vacated and transferred to the University in its present form. Mr. Kunkel stated that was right. Mr. Pollock questioned when Gregory Place is vacated, would meter revenue go to the University? Mr. Kowalski answered that was correct on regarding Gregory Place; however, there are some City meter revenues on the existing parking lot on the site, and through the agreement have agreed to relocate to the Jimmy John's lot.

Mr. Pollock asked if Mr. Kunkel had thought about the possibility of putting all the parking diagonal in front of the businesses? Would that give them more parking spaces? Mr. Kunkel replied that they have thought about that, and it would give them more parking spaces. It would be more preferable to them to do this; however, they are still in a discussion state with the University on that issue.

Mr. Pollock inquired about how many of the apartments and on what levels would be handicap accessible? Mr. Kunkel responded that when JSM Development has an elevator installed in a building, they actually have a requirement that 100% of the units are handicap adaptable. This means that all the structural components within the unit that are necessary for an individual who might need some special accommodation would already be there and in place.

April Getchius, Assistant Director of Planning Design and Campus Planner for the University of Illinois, noted that the University was very excited about the proposed development. It was an opportunity not only to provide the City of Urbana an exciting development, but also, this area of

the campus was becoming more and more the public area with Spurlock Museum, Office of Admission and Records, and Krannert Center for Performing Arts. With this being an area where visitors are being drawn, along with the existing residential components, and the residential neighborhood east of Lincoln Avenue all provides a good mix of opportunity for this type of development and a good opportunity for the residents and visitors that come to the area.

The Board of Trustees have seen this design and approved it. The University hopes to have the agreements finalized by May 1, 2003, the developer begin construction on June 1, 2003, and occupancy available in August, 2003. The City and the University have carefully over the years crafted a list of uses for the Campus Commercial District. In terms of the zoning, the CCD District have been very much modeled on the same kind of relationship that is established with the Research Park, that is there is a long-term land lease and design guidelines, but it is on the developer to comply with the zoning and building codes of the City.

Ms. Getchius noted that in terms of parking, that when the Zoning Ordinance governing the CCD District, the residential component was increased for parking requirements over that what is normally required in other districts. The residential requirement for this district was intentionally elevated for parking because of parking concerns and concerns that people who have had in the neighborhood over the years.

The University of Illinois is committed to provide parking over the long-term. It was not in the interest of the University to see this development threatened or failed in anyway. They certainly want to make it successful not only for the environment for that end of campus but also for the use of the visitors, their staff and the community in general. It would be in the University's benefit to see this operation succeed as well.

The vacation of Gregory Place is scheduled and upcoming. It was part of the \$2.9 million agreement for a series of vacations in the north campus.

She pointed out that the University went through the "Request for Proposal" process and included City staff in that process. The University is thrilled with JSM Development and what they have proposed. She believed that this proposal would be a benefit to the campus, to the community and the City of Urbana.

Mr. Douglas asked Ms. Getchius to speak to the congestion of the area with regards to Oregon. It seemed like they were talking about it being pedestrian friendly; however, they would be inviting more cars in with parking decks, etc. Ms. Getchius commented that when you look at the Campus Area Transportation Plan, there is a lot of congestion in the center of campus. The University has made some changes to try and discourage people. In that vein creating a development where there is residential, commercial, and University uses, hopefully, there would be less incentive for people to get in their cars and drive to a restaurant or bookstore, because those services would be offered in this development. In terms of the longer scale, there is a need for additional parking in the campus as areas are limited in terms of where the University can grow and provide new services and new academic services. Therefore, the University has to accommodate that. By pulling those uses together in a concentrated location and placing a

parking deck on the edge of campus, it will keep many from pulling traffic back into the heart of campus and on Goodwin.

Mr. Hopkins questioned if Gregory Place was being vacated between Illinois and Nevada? Ms. Getchius replied no, that it would only be vacated one block length between Oregon and Nevada. Mr. Hopkins inquired if it was the intention of the vacation to take cars off the street and make it a pedestrian way? Ms. Getchius stated that the intent was two fold. From a standpoint of the long-range plan of the area and the development and the fact that it was University land underlying the development, then it was in the University's interest to have control of that street and have the parking configuration. The long-term plan also shows the development as becoming a pedestrian mall at some point. The developer said there was some interest in having some parking that may be an opportunity to accommodate both. It would depend on the long-term success of this development, before the University would go to Phase II. Mr. Hopkins felt that a pedestrian mall would be a bad idea. If the University has the right-of-way and the land on both sides and Phase II is on the second site, then the University would have control of the right-of-way. There could even be double diagonal parking. It seemed to him that for the commercial liability, the University would have pedestrians walking from Krannert, the local residents, and the whip-off/pickup traffic from Lincoln Avenue. A pedestrian mall made no sense to him. There is not some massive pedestrian traffic, and it is not a through street. Why take the cars off of it? Ms. Getchius commented that the intent was to look at it long term. The other intent was to not prohibit if the University would decide that some form of pedestrian or some reduction in right-of-way might be appropriate, that nothing prohibits that either. The University needs to take the time to decide what would work best from a market standpoint. Mr. Hopkins questioned if there initially was no intention to make it a pedestrian in short term? Ms. Getchius replied that it would come with Phase II, which would be several years down the road.

Mr. Pollock inquired if Phase II included additional building? Ms. Getchius responded that Phase II was always envisioned as a sort of a mirror image of the proposed building on the east side. The only exception would be a couple of trees that the University would need to protect on the north end. The parking deck would be east of Phase II. Mr. Pollock commented that if the University puts in a pedestrian mall as opposed to doubling the parking, then they would not have any commercial success. Mr. Alix reiterated that the failure of pedestrian malls to attract traffic to businesses was well documented (i.e. the Neil Street Mall in Champaign and the State Street Mall in Chicago). He could certainly see, that once Phase II was developed, where the street could be narrowed to put diagonal parking on one side with a bulge out to make it easier for pedestrians to cross the street or the notion of having a restaurant with outdoor seating that could be on one side that might require the University to reconfigure the right-of-way could be integrated into Phase II. Ms. Getchius felt that it was important to mention that the University had been talking about this for so many years that the term "pedestrian mall" had one connotation at one time and a different connotation now. It was too early to commit to what it would look like.

Ms. Stake commented that she was excited about the possibility of having commercial there. However, she was still concerned about the parking. She inquired about how full the University parking spaces were now? Ms. Getchius replied that the times that she was out on the site, the parking lot immediately east have not been filled to capacity. In addition, there are other spaces that are available in other lots around the area that could accommodate the development. It is the

University's intent and commitment to make sure that the proposed development would have the space provided to meet Urbana's Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Stake worried about the 100 spaces committed to the proposed development that would take up spaces in the area and push people to park further east in the residential area. Ms. Getchius responded that most of the people who currently park in this area work 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., and there are other opportunities for 8-5 employee rental parking. She understood that there were still spaces available in Krannert's garage facility.

Ms. Goscha mentioned that she saw many good aspects of this building, yet she still had a couple of concerns. Her major concern was the scale of the building particularly dwarfing the sorority to the west and the apartment building to the west. One positive that she saw in the elevation was the trees that helped to diminish the scale. Was there any plan to plant trees in the proposed area to reduce the scale of the building? Ms. Getchius answered by saying that the University would certainly work with the developer to do that. Some of them would be in the City's right-of-way on the north, but they have always talked about the component of the proposed development being the streetscape. Typically, the City does a cost share for something like this. Perhaps, the University could do a cost share as well for this project. There are some substantial trees on the east side that would be protected. In fact, the master plan for this project shows the building jogging so that it would avoid those trees.

Ms. Stake inquired how the Plan Commission would be sure that there would be trees? Ms. Getchius stated that she would talk to the landscape architect and the developer. Trees are something that everyone wants, because it has been envisioned all along. Mr. Kunkel added that one of the developer's responsibilities was to submit to the University a landscaping plan for the project. They have to have a landscaping plan put together that not only addresses physically within the site area that they would be leasing, but also on the adjacent side areas as well. Ms. Stake commented that would mean that the University would decide. Mr. Kunkel replied that was correct. There was a section that was being contemplated that was not part of the Gregory Place vacation, which would be the portion on the north side of the proposed site. For that portion on the Oregon right-of-way, the developer would be coming back to the City to get them involved. Mr. Kowalski pointed out that the Plan Commission could make a recommendation that the staff work with the developer to review landscape plans as well. Mr. Pollock inquired if the City of Urbana had the ability to enforce those plans once the land no longer belongs to the City? Mr. Kowalski said yes. Mr. Pollock asked if the ability to have the City require that dependent on City owned land being involved? Mr. Kowalski responded that the Plan Commission could make a recommendation as part of the special use permit that additional landscaping be required.

Ms. Goscha inquired where the developer would be placing the mechanical units and how they are dealing with the acoustic privacy to the residents to the west? Mr. Kunkel stated that the University would make access available to the developer to the steam and chilled water loops that are located near the site. Therefore, there would be some small-scaled pumps that would be located in the parking level that would provide circulation. Ms. Goscha wondered if those pumps would be enclosed in a separate room or would they be open to the parking deck? Mr. Kunkel replied that the pumps would be enclosed just for a security standpoint.

Ms. Stake felt that the developer should consult with the City staff on landscaping, which would include the number and species of trees. Ms. Goscha questioned if Ms. Stake would say in general conformance with what the Plan Commission had seen at this meeting in terms of quantity? Ms. Stake believed that was a good addition. Mr. Alix thought it might already be addressed by the requirement that the development be in substantial conformance with the Site Plan. It would already be part of the special use permit. Mr. Pollock agreed.

Ms. Goscha questioned if staff went through the public hearing notification process for this case? Mr. Kowalski answered yes. The 250-foot requirement did not result in many notices. There were five or six property owners. In addition, Mr. Kunkel, Ms. Getchius and he held discussions with the sorority to talk about the size and scale of the building, how the building would affect the sorority, and how their parking would be affected. The sorority was looking forward to the project being completed. They expressed concerns about the construction and the disturbance it would create, but they also understand that was unavoidable.

Mr. Douglas moved that the Plan Commission forward this case to the City Council with the recommendation of approval including the three conditions recommended by staff and the additional recommendation requiring City review of the landscape plan when it is completed. Ms. Stake seconded the motion.

Ms. Goscha voiced her concern over the scale of the building. She felt it was rather large next to the smaller, more residential uses, particularly the new Early Childhood Center. She appreciated the attempts that were made at articulating the façade, so that it would have some hope of a smaller scale, but the elevation was overwhelming. It appeared to her to be about four and a half stories. She was pleased that the landscaping would be required, because it would help to scale the building visually for residents.

Mr. Pollock noted that he had been watching the development of this project for a very long time. Based on what he had seen at this meeting, the proposed development was really well planned and very well designed. Just about every question that was posed, both the University and the developer had dealt with. He was looking forward to this project get in the ground.

The roll call was taken and was as follows:

Ms. Stake	-	Yes	Mr. Pollock	-	Yes
Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes	Ms. Goscha	-	Yes
Mr. Douglas	-	Yes	Mr. Alix	-	Yes

The motion was passed by unanimous vote.

7. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

8. NEW BUSINESS

There was none.

9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There was none.

Chair Pollock declared a five-minute break to allow staff time to setup for the presentation on the Comprehensive plan Update at 8:59 p.m. The meeting was called back to order at 9:04 p.m.

10. STUDY SESSION

Status of the Comprehensive Plan Update

Tim Ross, Senior Planner, presented information for the study session. He discussed the following:

- History of the Comprehensive Plan
- Current Comprehensive Plan Consists of:
 - Existing Plans
 - “Future Land Use” Map
- Steering Committee Membership
- Existing Conditions Report
- Neighborhood Workshops
- Neighborhood Workshops Target Areas
- Neighborhood Workshop Summary/Findings
- Resident Survey
- Resident Survey Results
- Vision Statement
- Final Vision Statement
- Focus Groups
- Issues and Trends Discussion
- Related Issues
- Draft Goals
 - Land Use
 - Economic Development
 - Transportation
 - Infrastructure
 - Environment
 - Public Services
 - Human Services
 - Community Heritage
 - Urban Design
- What Was Planned Next

Ms. Stake commented that on February 19, 2001, there were many people who came to the City Council and voiced their opposition to a road between Perkins Road and Anthony Drive. She wondered why that road was still on the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Kowalski explained that the road would be the completion of the trumpet interchange of University Avenue from Interstate 74 potentially connecting up to Highcross Road. It currently is not the standard cloverleaf intersection, where drivers can get off the interstate and go where they want. The access point had been shown in the existing Comprehensive Plan since 1982 as a future roadway improvement. It would not be a City project; it would be a project of the State of Illinois. The reason why it has continued to be shown on the maps, because it was currently in the existing plans. Staff and the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee would need to discuss it. His opinion that the existing plan shows for that road, but did not do a very adequate job of planning land uses around that road. Ms. Stake inquired why the City would need it? Mr. Kowalski replied that there could be many reasons, which are 1) increase access to the interstate. Ms. Stake stated that there was plenty of access by using the University Avenue exit. At one time, the City had talked about putting commercial use out there, is this still a reason for the access road? She did not see a reason for a commercial use in the residential area, because the homeowners in that area do not want the access road. Mr. Kowalski responded by saying that when the property owners had petitioned to be annexed into the City of Urbana in 2001, the request was that they be annexed in and rezoned to B-3, General Business – Commercial. That was the original proposal and had not been addressed since it was opposed. It really needs more long-term planning for those properties and for the interchange. Even though it does appear in the City's plan as being a recommended road improvement, it would still be a significant interstate interchange project that would be on a long list of projects for the State of Illinois. Ms. Stake questioned if the City makes Highcross Road a road that cannot access homeowners who live on Highcross Road, then how are they suppose to get any place? She believed that the zoning should remain residential and the interstate interchange project should be forgotten.

Mr. Kowalski mentioned that the City of Urbana had been awarded a state grant to study in depth Highcross Road and Route 130 Corridor. The Champaign County Regional Planning Commission and CUUATS would be helping the City take a detailed look at Highcross Road and how we want to design for that road and how we want access to be on that road all the way from Ford Harris down to Old Church Road. The study will begin in July 2003 and would coincide with the Comprehensive Plan for the most part. The study would give us a lot more detail and a lot more analysis of how that road was to evolve, because regionally Highcross Road was being designated and considered as one of the primary beltway roads around the community. There would be Olympian Drive, Highcross Road, either Curtis Road or Windsor Road (this is still being discussed), and the west was still being discussed as well. Ms. Stake commented that people moved out there to get away from the commercial, and they do not want commercial out there. Mr. Kowalski stated that was an age-old land use conflict. Ms. Stake felt it was unfair to residential owners to change it now. Mr. Kowalski added that staff was at the mapping stage now. They are trying to be creative and more specific about the zoning, yet be flexible at the same time, which has been a little difficult to do. The Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee had given staff some good guidance. There are some areas of the community that would require more discussion, particularly the MOR, Mixed-Office Residential Zoning District.

Mr. Pollock inquired about the process. He asked since staff had started mapping, if staff had primarily taken the information from the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee discussions. Mr. Kowalski answered that the mapping was being done internally by staff and would be presented to the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee at the next meeting and help staff work on it some more. Mr. Pollock asked if the Steering Committee would eventually make a decision on a recommendation to present to the Plan Commission? Would the Plan Commission and the City Council be looking at alternative options for each area? Mr. Kowalski responded by saying that staff envisioned that some areas would get focused in on closer than other areas. They would want to have some options for those areas. Mr. Pollock questioned if when the Plan Commission and the City Council look at the map, then would they be talking about things that had been discussed at the staff level and the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee level in terms of different problems, different options, and different ideas? Mr. Kowalski said absolutely.

Mr. Alix commented that his biggest complaint with the current Comprehensive Plan was that it states land use on a lot-by-lot basis. It was frustrating that when the Comprehensive Plan was developed, there was not much attention paid to the notion of transition zones. The fact that there was residential at one end of the block and commercial use at the other implies to him that at some point along that block there should be a transition between residential and commercial. The Plan Commission had faced a number of situations; the most recently being the request for a parking lot for the Nabor House on Lincoln Avenue and Nevada. The residents in the neighborhood essentially were able to base a considerable amount of their justification on the fact that the lot in the Comprehensive Plan was shown as being a R-2 lot. He believed that does a disservice to the ability to the Comprehensive Plan to make intelligent land use decisions. It was intended to be a shadow of the zoning map. He hoped that as the mapping process went forward that there would be some consideration given to designating areas of the Comprehensive Plan as transition zones, identifying the areas that are more strongly associated with the zone. Mr. Kowalski stated that was the staff's intention. They do not want to have a parcel-based future land use map for the entire City. It would be next to impossible to develop it. He explained that what happened in the example was there was a specific neighborhood plan that was done, that got it down to a parcel level. Again there is a balancing act, even if the City does not do a parcel-based land use map and does something general, then the map still needs to give some kind of guidance where the City can feel generally comfortable that this was what was planned in this area. Mr. Alix had no problem with one end of a block being shown as residential and the other end of the block being shown as commercial. However, the notion that anytime there is a single-lot change to the zoning map, the City was obligated to amend the Comprehensive Plan in order to back it up, would be significantly alleviated if the Comprehensive Plan showed land use in less detail. Mr. Kowalski agreed.

Ms. Stake asked if there were differences in the input between the neighborhood workshops and the focus groups? Mr. Kowalski answered by saying that the benefit of the focus groups was that it gave staff the chance to have more technical and detailed questions answered by professionals that knew about the topic they discussed. Therefore, the focus groups were not really a form for general comments. Ms. Stake commented that the neighborhood workshops were great. Staff gave people the idea that what they had to say would make a difference. That was why she was concerned about some of the ideas that are coming out. She hoped that the maps would not be in

April 10, 2003

conflict of the people's ideas. Mr. Kowalski noted that staff intended to repeat the process of the workshops with the map. Their intent is to have the Steering Committee and staff work on the map. Staff would then present both the map and the draft set of goals to the different neighborhoods. Staff planned to advertise the next round of neighborhood workshops by sending a postcard to every mailing address in Urbana in June.

11. STAFF REPORT

There was none.

12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

Chair Pollock adjourned the meeting at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rob Kowalski, Secretary
Urbana Plan Commission