

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING

URBANA PLAN COMMISSION

APPROVED

DATE: March 4, 2004

TIME: 7:30 P.M.

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Christopher Alix, Alan Douglas, Laurie Goscha, Michael Pollock, Bernadine Stake, Marilyn Upah-Bant, Don White

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Lew Hopkins, Randy Kangas

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Mike Martin, Esther Patt

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

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 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 February 19, 2004 meeting of the Plan Commission as presented. Ms. Goscha seconded the motion. The minutes were approved as presented by unanimous voice vote as presented.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

6. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

7. OLD BUSINESS

Plan Case # 1878-T-04: Text Amendment of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the requirements in the B-1, Neighborhood Business Zoning District.

Rob Kowalski, Planning Manager, presented a brief update for this case to the Plan Commission. He pointed out the changes made to the proposed text amendment as recommended by the Commission at the last meeting. He noted that an asterisk next to a “C” in the Table of Uses meant that if the use proposed was less than 2,500 square feet of gross floor area, then the use would be permitted by right. 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 at the public hearing, staff recommended that the Plan Commission recommend approval of the proposed text amendment to the Zoning Ordinance.

Chair Pollock inquired with the proposed changes to Table IX-1. Standards for Freestanding Signs, if two or three businesses could share one freestanding sign? Mr. Kowalski replied yes. In fact, staff would encourage it.

Regarding one of the proposed changes that a freestanding sign would not be allowed within 50 feet of any residential district, Ms. Goscha asked for clarification. Her understanding was that B-1 Zoning Districts were in residential areas. Mr. Kowalski stated that only bigger lots would be allowed to have a freestanding sign. Smaller lots would not be permitted due to their size.

Mr. Alix inquired what the difference was between a jewelry store and a shoe store? He was unable to understand the logic that determined how the permitted zoning for the various types of retail uses was arrived at. He understood that some uses were expected to have longer hours of operation, which would make them different from other similar uses. Mr. Kowalski stated that this was a good point. It went back to the difference between performance base and use base zoning. There could be a jewelry store that was 2,000 square feet or one that was 52, 000 square feet. The same could apply for a shoe store. He stated that there were some uses that were not permitted at all, but could potentially be perfectly acceptable, depending on their design and location. Mr. Alix argued that the standard that was constructed in the change to the Zoning Ordinance as related to square footage was a step in the right direction. He recommended that staff look at Table V-1. Table of Uses again and try to apply this standard universally across all types of low to medium impact retail businesses.

Mr. Pollock stated that he could see some logic in the difference between a shoe store and a jewelry store. With a jewelry store, the owner would be dealing with some very small items, and it would be possible to do a pretty good size business in a pretty small space; whereas, he could see a shoe store requiring more space. Ms. Upah-Bant commented that she saw a difference in

the amount of time that people would spend in a jewelry store and a shoe store. It was more a matter of the traffic. Mr. Alix replied that was true. The only legitimate reason the City would have to make a distinction between the classifications was if there was some externally visible difference in what would happen such as traffic, noise, hours of operation, or number of trips, etc. He believed that if there was a businessman looking to open a shoe store and another businessman looking to open a jewelry store, then both businessmen would be looking at the same types of buildings, in the same type of neighborhood, and approximately the same size of buildings. The City wanted to make it easier to operate small businesses, but provide more protection against operating larger businesses that would have an adverse affect on the neighborhood.

Mr. Kowalski mentioned another way to look at it was by looking at the recent trends in some of the different types of uses of the types of stores that were being opened. Staff took the approach in determining whether the uses were permitted, required a Conditional Use Permit, or required a Special Use Permit by trying to pick which uses would most likely be proposed as having an impact based on similar stores in the community.

Chair Pollock believed that if the Plan Commissioners were unhappy with the mix or thought that there was an inequality, based on the type of business that would be considered, then perhaps, they should take some of the asterisks out of the Table of Uses rather than adding more restrictions. Mr. Alix was not proposing to change anything at this time; however, he felt it was worth raising the issue that if the purpose of the amendment was to introduce the 2,500 square-foot criterion as a way of slouching towards performance-based zoning, then it would seem that the it would be more universally applied. He believed that the B-1 Zoning District text was more broken than many of the other zones; however, the proposed text amendment for the B-1 Zoning District was better than what currently existed.

Mr. Kowalski noticed that there was an error in the proposed changes to Table V-1. Table of Uses. He pointed out that a shoe store required a Conditional Use Permit all along. The proposed change would be that if someone wanted to open a shoe store that was less than 2,500 square feet, then it would be permitted by right. The proposed change would not be going from permitted to requiring a Conditional Use Permit.

Mr. Alix liked this better. He would feel even better, based on the list in the Table of Uses, if everything other than a video store would be permitted by right if 2,500 square feet or less, and by Conditional Use Permit if greater than 2,500 square feet.

Ms. Upah-Bant stated that she would support it. It seemed ridiculous to think that someone could build a giant shoe store in the MOR, Mixed Office Residential Zoning District, but the B-1 Zoning District would only allow a small shoe store.

Mr. White moved that the Plan Commission forward the case to the City Council with a recommendation for approval including fixing the typo. Mr. Douglas seconded the motion.

Ms. Goscha expressed her concern about the maximum area of a sign allowed, which was 32 square feet and equivalent to a 4 foot by 8-foot sign. This seemed to be over-bearing when

talking about a small site and a small neighborhood business. She would be more comfortable with being more restrictive on the sign by limiting the maximum area, and then allowing a variance if it seemed prudent. Mr. Kowalski stated that the sizes of the B-1 lots are what made some of the changes difficult. He named several different B-1 businesses ranging in lot sizes from the lot in Beringer Commons that is 7 acres to Sunshine Grocery on a 5,000 square lot. He could see the argument for business owners on bigger lots needing bigger signs. Ms. Goscha felt that they should start with the most limiting factor, which would be the minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet. A 4-foot by 8-foot sign would be pretty offensive to the surrounding neighbors. People could go bigger if it would be reasonable through a review process. She suggested a 2-foot by 2-foot sign. Mr. Pollock felt that would be too small. Ms. Stake agreed with Ms. Goscha.

Mr. Alix stated that a 2-foot by 2-foot sign was the size of a "For Sale" sign, which would be pretty small for a business. He felt that there would certainly be B-1 lots where a 32-square foot sign would be appropriate. However, he did have an issue with a 16-foot high sign that was 2-foot wide. This would not seem to satisfy the intent of the lot. He believed that a maximum dimension would be appropriate as well.

Ms. Upah-Bant inquired what the ruling was regarding signage on the building itself? Mr. Kowalski answered by saying that a business would be allowed to use 10 percent of the area of the wall-face for signage and not to exceed 150 square feet maximum.

Mr. Alix said that he was comfortable with the required 50-foot to a residential lot line restriction. He commented that a 32 square foot sign was big; however, he did not feel that it would be too big for new lots being developed as B-1. If there were existing lots zoned as B-1, then it might be hard to find room on the lot to put a 32 square-foot sign.

Ms. Goscha gave an example of a B-1 lot going in on Michigan Avenue on a lot approximately 60-feet wide. Would it be appropriate for a 32 square foot sign to go into that area? Mr. Pollock tried to imagine what the chances of a lot in the middle of a residential area were of being rezoned to B-1. Although there were some existing B-1 lots spread throughout the City, he felt that if new B-1 areas were to happen, then they would happen as a result of new developments in subdivisions where developers would be willing to allow B-1 areas to be amenities to the neighborhood. He was less concerned about someone wanting to open a B-1 business in the middle of an existing neighborhood. As they look at encouraging businesses, businesses do look at signage as being "life-blood". Most of the B-1 businesses that exist could accommodate the maximum size allowed. If they decided to lower the maximum, he was unsure of how they could reasonably decide on a different size. Ms. Goscha replied that she only suggested a size for discussion only.

Ms. Goscha asked if they were writing the amendment to the B-1 Zoning District based on what they think was going to happen, how the Plan Commission was operating, and how the market was going or were they trying to do something that would stand the test of time? Mr. Pollock responded by saying that the whole B-1 experience was a conflict in that they want to be restrictive to protect the neighborhoods and yet they want to be flexible to encourage businesses to locate on existing B-1 lots and perhaps build new B-1 areas.

Ms. Stake commented that was why she believed that it was too broad of a brush. They were trying to think of new B-1 areas, which would probably be located in areas that would be less objectionable to the neighborhoods and would have buffering. However, they were also trying to fit B-1 areas into existing neighborhoods. They were trying to accomplish two problems with one zoning of B-1. She felt that there should be a new zoning for the neighborhoods that already exist.

Mr. Alix stated that when thinking about the most sensitive B-1 zone, which would be one of the existing small B-1 parcels that was in one of the predominantly residential neighborhood that already existed, he did not believe that they would ever see another one. If it did happen, then where would they put the sign? It would not be allowed in the public right-of-way. It would not be allowed within the setbacks. It would not be allowed within 50 feet of any residential use. The only place would be in the used space that would be occupied by the building. He did not see a 32 square foot sign would be any higher intensity use than the building itself. Mr. Kowalski used the Sunshine Grocery as an example. If they wanted to put up a freestanding sign, then the sign would have to be put right next to the building, which would not be advantageous to the business. The wall sign would have the same effect as a freestanding sign on this lot. Mr. Pollock mentioned that freestanding signs were expensive, and he would be surprised to see existing B-1 sites spend the money to put up a freestanding sign.

Mr. Alix felt that relative to the scale of a commercial building, the maximum size allowed sounded bigger than it really was. When standing up close to a street sign or stop sign, they are a lot bigger than they look from a distance.

Roll call on the motion was as follows:

Mr. Alix	-	Yes	Mr. Douglas	-	Yes
Ms. Goscha	-	Yes	Chair Pollock	-	Yes
Ms. Stake	-	Yes	Ms. Upah-Bant	-	Yes
Mr. White	-	Yes			

The motion was passed by unanimous vote.

8. NEW BUSINESS

Plan Case # 1881-S-04: Combination Preliminary and Final Plat of The Ridge Subdivision at the southwest corner of Amber Lane and Myra Ridge Drive.

Mr. Kowalski introduced the case to the Plan Commission by describing the proposal and the proposed site. He talked about the surrounding properties. He explained the two requests for waivers, which were as follows:

1. Waiver from Table A to allow the reduction of the right-of-way and pavement width for Lydia Court. Request to reduce the required right-of-way width from 60 feet to 50 feet. Request to reduce the required street width from 31 feet to 25 feet.

2. Waiver from Section 21-37(A)1 requiring sidewalks on both sides of the street. The developer is proposing a sidewalk entirely on the west side of Lydia Court West and partially on the east side.

Mr. Kowalski discussed the drainage and utilities for the proposed site. He read the options of the Plan Commission. He stated that staff's recommendation was as follows:

Staff recommended that the Plan Commission forward this case to the City Council with a recommendation to approve the Preliminary and Final Plats of The Ridge Subdivision along with the requested waivers.

Mr. Alix inquired if there was a preliminary plat or site plan for the Meijer tract? Mr. Kowalski replied that there was not any subdivision plat; however, there was a site plan when the development was approved back in 1997.

Mr. Alix asked what aspects of the Meijer development would be fronting on the back of the proposed development? Mr. Kowalski believed that the Meijer store had been approved to front on Windsor Road, and the curb cuts on Amber Lane would feed to the back of the Meijer building and to a side entrance that would go around to the front of the building. It would be the side of the end of the Meijer building that would be facing the proposed development.

Mr. Alix questioned what buffering issues would arise if Meijer were to develop their tract? He assumed that Meijer would be responsible for providing buffering. Would the proposed development not have to provide any buffering since it would be a lower intensity development? Mr. Kowalski stated that there were some existing pine trees that had been planted on the west side of the proposed site that would act as a buffer.

Mr. Alix noticed that the proposal showed the fire hydrant to be at the west end of the development. He asked if the turnaround met requirements for turning around fire equipment? Mr. Kowalski stated that the Fire Department had already looked the preliminary and final plats for the Ridge Subdivision, and they were satisfied with the ability to turnaround. It would have to meet the required pavement width for fire equipment to be able to turnaround.

Ms. Stake wondered if staff had taken into consideration the request by the MTD, Mass Transit District. Mr. Kowalski replied that staff had spoke with MTD quite a bit about their needs for the area. The letter that MTD had written was based on the original sidewalk proposal, which was different than the current proposal. MTD was familiar with the new layout and believed it served their needs. MTD's primary goal was a mid-block walk to help people get to either Myra Ridge Drive or Amber Lane for bus service. It was not projected that a MTD would have a bus stop on Lydia Court West.

Ms. Upah-Bant did not see where Lots 104A and 105A would have access to a sidewalk? Mr. Kowalski mentioned that the developers were planning to extend the mid-block sidewalk down to connect to the driveway for Lot 104A, so people could walk up to the mid-block walk without having to walk through the grass. Lot 105A residents would walk across their driveway to the sidewalk to the east leading to Myra Ridge Drive. Mr. Alix inquired if it was the developer's

intent to have a sidewalk connection to every driveway? Mr. Kowalski said yes. It was a request that staff had made.

Ms. Goscha asked if staff anticipated people parking on the street? Mr. Kowalski stated that parking would be allowed on one side of the street. Which side of the street that parking would be allowed on would be determined at the time of construction.

Mr. White expressed concern for small children and riding toys. He was concerned about children walking on the street to go visit other children down the street in the subdivision. Even though he understood the developers not wanting to put more sidewalks in because of the expense and the fact that they would take up green space, he believed if parking was going to be allowed on one side of the street, then there should be a sidewalk running from Lot 105A along the west to the mid-block walk. Ms. Goscha stated her concern was for the children as well, but also for accessibility.

Mike Martin, of the Atkins Group, commented that they believed that there would be very little traffic in this subdivision, and they also did not believe that there would be very many children. He mentioned that their goal with the proposed development was to provide a subdivision that was functional and had a lot of green space. They tried a fresh approach with the sidewalk system. Their intention with the proposed sidewalks was that every resident would be able to walk out of their driveway and get on a sidewalk to walk to Myra Ridge Drive or Amber Lane. This was due to the request made by MTD and also they found that many people walk in the neighborhood.

Mr. Martin explained that the Atkins Group was not trying to avoid constructing anything. They built a sidewalk around the dry detention basins that was not even required. They were only trying to come up with a sidewalk system that would work. If the Plan Commission would rather have a sidewalk from Lot 105A to Lot 104A, then the Atkins Group would propose to eliminate the mid-block sidewalk, even though they felt it would be more functional. He mentioned that they were open to suggestions, and if the Plan Commission would rather reroute the sidewalk, then the Atkins Group could certainly do it.

Mr. Pollock really liked the idea of a mid-block walk and that MTD would have a use for it. Would the developers have a problem with putting in a short stub sidewalk from the mid-block walk to Lot 104A's driveway? Mr. Martin replied no.

Ms. Stake did not feel that the problem of children riding their tricycles had been solved. She did not want children on Myra Ridge Drive or Amber Lane, so they would want sidewalks within the subdivision for children to be safe. She believed that there should be a continuous sidewalk.

Mr. Pollock pointed out that the Plan Commission had a choice between the mid-block sidewalk or a sidewalk along Lot 104 and Lot 105. Ms. Stake commented that the Plan Commission was always talking about walkable communities, but when they get to development, they do not provide for it. Mr. Pollock mentioned that the Plan Commission did not have the ability to require more than what the Zoning Ordinance required the developers to do.

Mr. Kowalski mentioned that one of the other considerations that staff gave to the proposed development was the market it would attract to. Staff felt that even if the subdivision attracted older people, the residents would probably not use the sidewalks in this small subdivision to exercise. They would be more likely to use the regional detention pond across the street to walk for exercise. This was another reason that staff felt it would be good to have quality connections from all the units to Myra Ridge Drive.

Mr. Douglas inquired what the industry width was for sidewalk? Mr. Kowalski replied that the City's requirement was 4 feet.

Mr. Douglas asked Mr. Martin to review the reasoning for the waiver request for the reduction of the street from 31 feet to 25 feet. Mr. Martin stated that the subdivision development would be very localized, and there would be no through traffic. There would be very few units that would actually use the street. He did not believe that there would be parking on the streets. In fact, the Atkins Group requests in the covenants that home owners do not park on the street or allow their guests to do so either. It made sense to the Atkins Group to reduce the size of the streets, so that they could reduce the cost of construction. In return, they planned to pass that savings along to the people purchasing the units.

Mr. Pollock inquired as to whose choice it would be whether the parking would be made available or not? Was that up to the developers or would it be up to the City? Mr. Kowalski replied by saying that the City and the developers would work cooperatively together. If the developers did not want any parking on the street, the City would consider that proposal. If it were a private street, the developer would be allowed to restrict parking on the street.

Ms. Stake commented that guests would have to park on the street. Mr. Martin said that there would be no need for guests to park on the street with the driveways being as long as they have planned. There would be adequate parking in the driveways. Ms. Stake questioned if there would be adequate parking for a resident to have a party? Mr. Martin replied by asking if anyone ever has adequate parking for a party? Ms. Stake wanted to know if it would be safe to have parking on the street. Mr. Kowalski responded by saying that there was a similar example in Savannah Green, where the streets are 25 feet wide with parking allowed on one side of the street. Ms. Stake wondered how wide the state streets were. Mr. Kowalski replied that in most cases, the streets were 25 feet wide as well and allows parking on one side. He added that the state streets were more through streets and have a much higher volume of traffic.

Mr. Alix asked what would happen when the Meijer store was developed since The Ridge Subdivision would be developed first? Mr. Martin said that it should not be a surprise to anyone purchasing a home in the proposed development. They mention the fact that Meijers owns the adjacent lot in their sales literature. The Atkins Group did plant some pine trees last year to allow some time for the trees to grow before Meijers decided to build on their lot. He added that the Atkins Group knew that the subdivision units needed to be marketable. Therefore, they intend to have a landscaped buffer that would make the units even more marketable.

Mr. Alix inquired if Meijers decided to build, would the Atkins Group prefer to have a fence built between The Ridge and Meijers? Mr. Martin said that they preferred landscaped buffers more so than fences, because it was a softer surface. The Atkins Group was not that fond of fences. However, they could not prevent Meijers from constructing a fence on their property. Mr. Alix explained that he was only looking at what the City should do at this point to try to mitigate the impact, because it was unusual that the City had the opportunity to look at a development like the proposed that would be going adjacent to where the City knew what would be built next to it. As long as the developers were comfortable with the screening, then there was nothing that the City could do to impose more buffering. Mr. Martin commented that the Atkins Group would probably provide more than what the City could propose because of their investment in the area, and they want to make sure that it was successful.

Ms. Goscha questioned what would be accessible route for a resident at Lot 109B to get to Myra Ridge Drive? Mr. Kowalski replied by saying that a resident at Lot 109B would have the option of taking a sidewalk down to the south and then going out to Myra Ridge Drive or take the path from A to B, cross the street, and use the mid-block walk to Myra Ridge Drive. In the first layout, the developer considered the idea of having a crosswalk in the street. Ultimately, staff did not feel that would be necessary for a street of such low volume that this one would have. Ms. Goscha felt more satisfied that the stub street would be in the right-of-way.

Mr. White liked the idea of narrow streets. He mentioned that his street was narrow, and when there are parties in his area, people parked on one side of the street. There was plenty of room for cars to get through. Regarding sidewalks, he preferred that the sidewalk would be constructed on both sides of Lydia Court West. His main concern again was children playing. If that meant giving up the mid-block walk, then that was fine.

Ms. Stake commented that there was no stormwater drainage plans to be reviewed. Mr. Kowalski explained that the stormwater plans had essentially been reviewed and approved years ago when the Atkins Group had annexed all of the properties into the City. The regional basin, which was across the street from Myra Ridge Drive, was constructed with adequate volume capacity to accept the runoff from the proposed development, runoff from the Meijers site, and runoff from the Vistas across the street. That was why there was not any detention basins required for this proposal. Stormwater would be collected from the proposed development into two storm sewer pipes that would run under Myra Ridge Drive already and take it over to the detention basin, where there would be adequate storage capacity.

Mr. Alix inquired if the cul-de-sac was the low spot? He noticed that there would not be any catch basins along Lydia Court West except for the cul-de-sac. Mr. Kowalski said yes. The Preliminary Plat showed that the end of the cul-de-sac would be the low spot. A storm sewer would take drainage out through the cul-de-sac and out of the subdivision between Lots 102 and 103.

Mr. Douglas stated that his only concern was with the sidewalk situation. He would like to see a sidewalk be constructed on both sides of Lydia Court West and the mid-block walk. Other than that he believed the proposal looked good.

Mr. Alix commented that the part of the street that the Plan Commission was debating whether or not should be served by additional sidewalks would serve a total of 7 driveways. He had a hard time imaging the street being bogged down enough with traffic or parked cars to be an impediment for someone who wanted to walk in the street or run a wheelchair or tricycle in the street. Obviously, we do not want to encourage children to play in traffic, but the potential intensity of use of the proposed street would be so low that he would not have a problem with the sidewalk plan as it was proposed. He believed it would be good to have the mid-block sidewalk to give people a shortcut up to Myra Ridge Drive. This type of development would serve a need in the area and in the community in general. He would support the proposed plan.

Ms. Goscha preferred the mid-block walk more so than the sidewalk being constructed on the east side of Lydia Court West. The mid-block walk would serve more purpose. She inquired as to who would be maintaining the mid-block walk? Mr. Kowalski stated that staff would need to work that out with the developers. It could either be private or it could become a City easement, in which the City would maintain it. The City currently maintains other mid-block walks in the City.

Mr. White moved that the Plan Commission forward the proposed case to the City Council with a recommendation for approval along with the requested waivers. Ms. Goscha seconded the motion.

Mr. Pollock questioned if the intention of the motion was to make sure that the official inclusion of the stub sidewalk was part of the proposed preliminary and final plats? Mr. White replied yes.

Mr. White moved to amend the motion that the Plan Commission request a sidewalk be constructed along the west side of 105A and 104A from the driveway at 105A to the sidewalk on the west side of 103A. Ms. Upah-Bant seconded the motion.

Mr. Alix asked if that would mean requiring the sidewalks be built as per the subdivision ordinance? Mr. White replied not necessarily entirely. There would not be sidewalks completely around the cul-de-sac. Mr. Pollock clarified that the requested sidewalk in the amendment to the motion would be in lieu of the mid-block walk.

Ms. Upah-Bant did not believe that would be fair, because it should be up to the developer, but still the City was cutting the developers quite a bit of slack by allowing them to not have to build a sidewalk along the west side of Lydia Court West. Mr. Pollock stated that according to the Zoning Ordinance, the City could require sidewalks on all the areas of the street that were not proposed, but the City could not require them to build the mid-block sidewalk. The Plan Commission was suppose to be planning for the next 50 years. People are living to be 80 years old to 100 years old. There will be older people living in the proposed subdivision with grandchildren who will visit. If they are planning to build a subdivision for older people, then they need to plan for multi-generation. There was an enormous range of riding toys that little kids would be riding on. It would be ridiculous to allow a new subdivision to go in without sidewalks.

Mr. Pollock preferred the mid-block walk and the sidewalk be built. Perhaps, which ever sidewalk design the Plan Commission decided to go with, they could recommend or request that the developer consider doing both, but they could not make the developer do both the sidewalk and the mid-block walk.

The motion for the amendment to the main motion passed by a 4-3 hand vote.

Mr. White moved a second amendment to the motion that the Plan Commission request that the Atkins Group consider including the mid-block walk if at all possible. Ms. Stake seconded the motion.

Mr. White believed it should be up to the Atkins Group. After thinking about it for a while, they may consider it a good idea that would help sell the properties. It would give the residents in the proposed subdivision better access to that area.

Mr. Alix objected to the proposed amendment, because the plan that was proposed was a solution that worked on this parcel. It made sure that all of the residents would have access to sidewalks. If the Atkins Group determined that the mid-block walk would be appropriate, then they could add that to the subdivision without input from the Plan Commission.

Mr. Pollock clarified by saying that the amendment to the motion would require the length of sidewalk requested in the previous amendment, but would still not require sidewalks on the west side of Lydia Court West.

Ms. Stake pointed out that the Plan Commission would still not be requiring as much as the City's Zoning Ordinance would require. Therefore, she did not feel that it would be insulting to ask the developers to consider installing the mid-block walk in addition to the requested sidewalk on the west side of Lots 105A and 104A.

Ms. Upah-Bant expressed her concern about children and people in wheelchairs on the west side of Lydia Court West having difficulty getting to Myra Ridge Drive safely. Mr. Alix disagreed based on the expected amount of traffic and use of Lydia Court West. It would be essentially like walking across a driveway.

Chair Pollock believed that the mid-block walk would be better for the proposed subdivision. It would certainly be better for access to Myra Ridge Drive and the bus system. There was certainly no harm in asking the developers to consider building it. He would support the amendment.

The motion for the amendment was passed by a 4-3 hand vote.

Ms. Goscha moved to amend the motion in lieu of the previously approved motion, the Plan Commission require that the sidewalks be installed to the full extent of the subdivision requirements. Ms. Stake seconded the motion.

Ms. Goscha preferred the mid-block walk, because it would improve the flow of pedestrian traffic. However, if the mid-block walk was not going to be built, then she would like to see the sidewalks be required according to the Zoning Ordinance, so that accessibility would be met throughout the development, potentially provide an access to the future development of the Meijer store and to promote walkable neighborhoods in Urbana.

Mr. Pollock clarified that the Zoning Ordinance required a sidewalk all the way around the subdivision on both sides of Lydia Court West. However, the Zoning Ordinance would not require an access off to the Meijer tract.

Roll call on the motion to amend the main motion was as follows:

Mr. Alix	-	No	Mr. Douglas	-	Yes
Ms. Goscha	-	Yes	Mr. Pollock	-	No
Ms. Stake	-	Yes	Ms. Upah-Bant	-	No
Mr. White	-	No			

The substitute motion failed by a vote of 3-4 voice vote.

Roll call on the main motion to require sidewalks on the east side of Lydia Court West and a recommendation to include the mid-block walk as well was as follows:

Mr. Douglas	-	Yes	Ms. Goscha	-	Yes
Mr. Pollock	-	No	Ms. Stake	-	Yes
Ms. Upah-Bant	-	Yes	Mr. White	-	Yes
Mr. Alix	-	No			

The motion was passed by a 5-2 voice vote.

Chair Pollock announced that the case would go before the City Council on March 15, 2004.

9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There was none.

10. STAFF REPORT

Mr. Kowalski reported on the following:

- ✓ **B-1 Text Amendment** would be reviewed by the City Council on March 15, 2004.

11. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

March 4, 2004

12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

Chair Pollock adjourned the meeting at 9:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rob Kowalski, Secretary
Urbana Plan Commission