

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING

URBANA PLAN COMMISSION

APPROVED

DATE: May 19, 2005

TIME: 7:30 P.M.

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Laurie Goscha, Lew Hopkins, Michael Pollock, Don White

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Randy Kangas, Bernadine Stake, Marilyn Upah-Bant

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Carrie and Peter Borich, David Crow, Pastor Ron Payne, Paul Tatman

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 was none.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. White moved to approve the minutes as presented from the May 5, 2005 meeting of the Plan Commission. Ms. Goscha seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.

4. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

6. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

7. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

Annexation Case Number 2005-A-07 – Annexation Agreement between the City of Urbana and the First Baptist Church for a 5.44-acre tract of property located on the west side of Philo Road approximately 440 feet south of Trails Drive extended; and

Plan Case Number 1933-M-05 – Request to rezone approximately a 5.44-acre tract of property located on the west side of Philo Road approximately 440 feet south of Trails Drive extended from Champaign County AG-2 to City of Urbana R-2, Single Family Residential upon annexation.

Rob Kowalski, Planning Manager, presented these two cases together to the Plan Commission. He gave a brief introduction of the history of the First Baptist Church. He talked about the proposed annexation and rezoning requests. He described the proposed site and the adjacent properties noting their land uses and zoning designations. He discussed the proposed development, the subdivision and General Area Plan, and the Annexation Agreement provisions. He pointed out the list of La Salle National Bank criteria in the written staff report that pertained to a comparison of the existing zoning with that proposed by the petitioner. He noted the summary of staff findings and the options of the Plan Commission in the written staff report, and 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 forward these two cases to the Urbana City Council with a recommendation for approval.

Mr. Kowalski introduced David Crow, of Tatman Enterprises, Inc. and Pastor Ron Payne, of the First Baptist Church.

Mr. Hopkins questioned if the Plan Commission was also considering the Special Use Permit as part of the Annexation Agreement. Mr. Kowalski said yes. If the Plan Commission felt that there were any special caveats necessary as part of the special use, then they could be included in the agreement.

Mr. Pollock asked for clarification if staff was not recommending any special use permit additions in terms of requirements. Mr. Kowalski replied no. Mr. Pollock asked if the Plan Commission wanted to recommend requirements for buffering, then now would be the time to do so. Mr. Kowalski said that was correct.

Ms. Goscha asked if the bordering properties would stay zoned as County Agriculture for right now. Mr. Kowalski said yes. The annexation would only be for the 5+ acres. Ms. Goscha

inquired if there were any buffering requirements for Agriculture and R-2, Single-Family Residential. Mr. Kowalski did not believe that there were any.

Mr. Hopkins wondered if the 5-foot side-yard setback requirement was a normal expectation. Mr. Kowalski said that it was a side-yard setback requirement in the R-2 Zoning District.

Mr. Hopkins asked if the 80-foot right-of-way would be sufficient for a multi-use path considering the crossing of the existing multi-use path would be south of the north boundary line of the proposed property. Mr. Kowalski said that 80-feet was the widest right-of-way that the City had, with the exception of High Cross Road or Windsor Road. Eighty feet was the typical right-of-way width for an arterial road, even though Philo Road was not designated as an arterial road right now.

Ms. Goscha inquired if there were any landscaping or screening requirements between a church and a R-2 zoning district. Mr. Kowalski said no. If it would be a business use rather than a church use, then there would be requirements for landscaping.

Ms. Goscha remembered that there was a certain ratio of trees depending on the size of the parking lot. What was that ratio? Mr. Kowalski answered by saying that there was a requirement of one tree per nine spaces. The proposed plan may not accurately show exactly how many trees would need to be planted. When the petitioner submits for a building permit, then the plans would have to meet the City's codes. Ms. Goscha added that the trees would not be required around the perimeter, but just somewhere in the vicinity of the lot. Mr. Kowalski stated that was correct. He noted that the two lots would be owned by the church and developed together. Ms. Goscha commented that right now it would not matter because there would be agriculture all around the proposed property. However, if the surrounding properties become zoned residential, then what would the value of the parcel next to the proposed parking lot really be if there were no visual screening between the two.

Mr. Pollock stated that when the City of Urbana does other annexations and developments and there was to be a road or other facilities that would border on a site, the City would required when the road or other facilities get built that the adjoining landowners pay for a portion of it. In this case, there is a multi-use path suggested on the north side of the proposed site. Was there any discussion on the part of staff of having the people who own and develop the residential area pay for part of the costs of building the path? Mr. Kowalski replied no. Staff did not have that discussion. The City's practice has been to get the costs paid by grants that the City had applied for or in a much larger scale development, where the City could incorporate the trail into the development some how. He pointed out that the location of the trail was a little arbitrary right now. It may end up being right on the property line or it may be a little further north. Mr. Pollock inquired if there was an available option for the City Council to require a cost-sharing on the part of the property owner should the path be developed adjacent to the property. Mr. Kowalski said that it would be a little cleaner if the path was to be part of the proposed property. The City could ask the petitioner to dedicate some part of the land. Mr. Pollock understood this to be difficult since the proposed church would be the first development in this area. Eventually, however, there will probably be residential development around the proposed lot that would be

interested in some type of screening or protection from a parking lot, especially if there would be evening activities going on.

Paul Tatman, petitioner, presented some background on the First Baptist Church. He believed that the church should remain in the City of Urbana, because it had been located here since 1837. He clarified that one acre would be used to develop the parsonage on, and the other four acres would be used for the church development. The church building would be a 5,000 square foot structure, and it would be designed to be expandable.

Mr. Pollock inquired about the time frame for the construction of the initial phase. Mr. Tatman replied that they were prepared to start construction as soon as they got the zoning approved.

Peter Borich, of 1505 Marc Trail Drive, commented that he was not opposed to a church being developed on the proposed site. However, he was concerned about what would happen to Philo Road. When you head south on Philo Road toward the proposed church, there was a significant rise where you cannot see over it until you almost get to the very top. With the speed limit being 45 mph, there was a potential for a major traffic and accident problem. He believed that the status of the roadway itself needed improvement, because it was not equipped to handle the amount of traffic that would potentially go back-and-forth because of the addition of a church. Therefore, some suggestions would be to decrease the maximum speed due to the rise in the road, reconstruct the road to be able to handle heavier traffic load, and have some type of warning signs about traffic exiting and entering on the other side of the rise.

Ms. Goscha inquired where about Mr. Borich would approximate the peak of the rise to be located. Mr. Borich said that the peak of the rise was roughly 30 to 50 yards north of Marc Trail Drive. Mr. Pollock asked if the peak was roughly where the Pomology Tract would end. Mr. Borich said that was correct.

Mr. Pollock questioned whether this portion of Philo Road was under the City of Urbana's discretion to change the speed limit. Was reconstruction of this part of Philo Road on the City's Capital Improvement Plan? Mr. Kowalski answered by saying that Philo Road adjacent to the South Ridge V Subdivision and adjacent to the proposed annexation and rezoning would be within the City's jurisdiction. When the City annexes property, they annex the roadway as well. The City would have the ability to change the speed limit for this area. The township would be responsible for the road south of the South Ridge V Subdivision, so the City would want to coordinate with the township on what an appropriate speed limit would be.

Mr. Kowalski went on to say that as far as improvements to the road, he did not believe that there were improvements scheduled in the City's current Capital Improvement Plan for Philo Road. The City's Engineer, Bill Gray, did review the plan and did not think that the traffic counts from the church as it was being proposed would warrant initial improvements right away. He felt Mr. Borich was right in that there was more of a long term issue of road improvements as the area develops more.

Mr. Hopkins asked if the City's Engineering Department had looked at the site layout including the curb cuts for the parsonage parcel and the church parcel relative to distance from the Marc

Trail Drive intersection. Mr. Kowalski commented that the City allowed up to curb cuts per lot. He explained that the placement of the curb cuts for the parsonage lot may slide a bit to match the best location in terms of where Marc Trail Drive is, etc. There would be a Civil Engineering Plan Review of more detailed construction plans for the proposed development.

Mr. Pollock inquired if there was interest from the City in making sure that they have the option to require that the curb cuts be on both sides of Marc Trail Drive, was there an option beyond the Special Use Permit where the City could require this not to happen? Mr. Kowalski said yes.

Ms. Goscha felt that more study should be done relative to the parsonage entrance in particular because it seems to be the one closest to the peak in the rise on Philo Road. She assumed that Engineering would be looking at topography as well as location of other streets. Was this correct? Mr. Kowalski said yes. Ms. Goscha commented that this was something the Plan Commission did not need to put into their recommendation to the City Council then. Mr. Kowalski added that the curb-cut for the parsonage lot would be exclusive to the use of the parsonage. It would in a sense a single-family home, so it would not have that much traffic entering and exiting.

Ms. Goscha wondered if a 5-foot setback would be enough from the parking lot to the property line, given that eventually a single-family home was proposed to be there. Could there be a significant buffer constructed or built in a 5-foot setback? She suggested a buffer of shrubs or trees. Mr. Kowalski stated that this would be an appropriate recommendation for the Plan Commission to make on the Annexation Agreement.

Ms. Goscha inquired if the church really needed as many parking spaces as being proposed. Would it create a problem if the Plan Commission increased the setback from 5-feet to 10-feet? Mr. Tatman replied that it would financially effect the church's position. He felt that the parking was essential. He reassured Ms. Goscha that 5-feet would be enough to plant shrubs or pine trees, etc. He commented that most all of the churches in town were mixed in the residential neighborhoods and had no screening. Ms. Goscha agreed that was true of church buildings. However, when the parking lots became bigger, then the City started requiring more screening or buffering, because that was what the neighbors were opposed to.

Mr. White wondered what type of lighting would be used in the parking lot. Mr. Tatman said that they planned to use three lows, three poles, low sodium and facing down.

Pastor Ron Payne approached the Plan Commission to talk about the church. He commented that they intended to be a church in the community. Their purpose in locating on the proposed site was to be a service to the community. Whatever they can do to fit in and make it easy on the neighbors would certainly be something they would want to do. One of reasons for relocating to the proposed site was because the surrounding area would be developed eventually.

Mr. Hopkins questioned if the City had already planned a multi-use path from Windsor Road south on Philo Road. Mr. Kowalski replied yes. The existing path went up to the Deerfield Trails Subdivision on the east side of Philo Road, and it would be extended further south along the South Ridge Subdivision. Mr. Hopkins asked if the existing portion of the trail was

connected to the trail going east-west. Mr. Kowalski replied yes. There would be a trail on the northern most part of the South Ridge Subdivision, which would run east from Philo Road. Mr. Hopkins went on to say that if this was the high point, then it might be the most logical crossing for the trail. Mr. Kowalski responded by saying that he realized that the map showed a potential bike trail at the far south end of the Pomology Tract, but a more likely scenario would be that it cross near Marc Trails Drive. It would be the preference to have the trail cross at an intersection as opposed to the middle of the road.

Mr. Hopkins moved that the Plan Commission forward Annexation Case No. 2005-A-07 to the City Council with the recommendation of approval along with an amendment that states, "At such time as development occurs to the south, the special use permit will require that vegetation buffering be provided for the headlights of vehicles in the parking lot". Ms. Goscha seconded the motion. Roll call was as follows:

Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes	Mr. Pollock	-	Yes
Mr. White	-	Yes	Ms. Goscha	-	Yes

The motion was passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. Hopkins moved that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 1933-M-05 to the City Council with the recommendation of approval. Ms. Goscha seconded the motion. Roll call was as follows:

Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes	Mr. Pollock	-	Yes
Mr. White	-	Yes	Ms. Goscha	-	Yes

The motion was passed by unanimous vote. Mr. Pollock announced that these two cases would go before City Council on June 6, 2005.

8. NEW BUSINESS

There was none.

9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There was none.

10. STAFF REPORT

Mr. Kowalski reported on the following:

- **Preview of Upcoming Cases** included the following:
 1. Hazard Mitigation Plan Public Hearing
 2. Capstone Condos Special Use Permit
- **2005 Comprehensive Plan Celebration** is planned to be held Thursday, May 26, 2005 at Silvercreek at 5:30 p.m.

11. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

Chair Pollock adjourned the meeting at 8:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rob Kowalski, Secretary
Urbana Plan Commission