

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING**

**URBANA PLAN COMMISSION**

**APPROVED**

**DATE:** August 4, 2005  
**TIME:** 7:30 P.M.  
**PLACE:** Urbana City Building  
400 South Vine Street  
Urbana, IL 61801

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Laurie Goscha, Benjamin Grosser, Marilyn Upah-Bant, James Ward, Don White  
**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Lew Hopkins, Randy Kangas, Michael Pollock, Bernadine Stake  
**STAFF PRESENT:** Elizabeth Tyler, Director of Community Development Services; Paul Lindahl, Planner I; Matt Wempe, Planner I; Teri Andel, Secretary  
**OTHERS PRESENT:** George and Nancy Boyd, William Campo, Bernard Coffey, Lisa Denson-Rives, Ray Elliot, George Friedman, Merle Ingersoll, Jr., Christine McCormick, Rick Mills, Art Russell, Kelly Strube, Susan Taylor

---

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

The meeting was called to order at 7:32 p.m., the roll call was taken, and a quorum was declared.

In the absence of Chair Pollock, the Plan Commission decided that Mr. White and Ms. Goscha would share in serving as substitutes. Acting Chair White began the meeting by following the agenda items.

**2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA**

There were none.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Grosser requested a change to the minutes of the July 21, 2005 meeting of the Plan Commission. On Page 15 – Fourth Paragraph, he requested that the word “make” be deleted from the last sentence. Ms. Upah-Bant moved to approve the minutes as corrected. Mr. Ward seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.

**4. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS**

- Letter from Dax Neal of Redfish Outdoor Advertising regarding Plan Case No. 1944-T-05
- Revised Annexation Agreement for Plan Case No. 1948-A-05
- Updated County Staff Report for CCZBA 453-AM-04
- Supplemental City Staff Report for CCZBA 453-AM-04

**5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS**

There were none.

**6. OLD BUSINESS**

There was none.

**7. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**Plan Case No. 1944-T-05: A request to amend the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Urbana Section IX-10, Outdoor Advertising Sign Structures Moratorium, Creating a 300-day Extension of the 365 Day Moratorium on OASS – Plan Case No. 1907-T-04**

Elizabeth Tyler, Director of Community Development Services Department, presented this case to the Plan Commission. She noted the letter from the Redfish Outdoor Advertising Company stating their support of the proposed extension. She mentioned that the current moratorium was due to expire later in September of 2005. Staff will need several more months to complete the work needed to propose a text amendment to the Zoning Ordinance regarding changes to the sign regulations. The Plan Commission held a study session regarding some of these possible changes at their previous meeting on July 21, 2005. Staff planned to present the study session to the City Council on August 15, 2005 to get their feedback as well. With the feedback from the two study sessions, staff believes that they could begin to craft a model alternative to bring before the Plan Commission and City Council in a second round of study sessions. Then, staff would begin to work on crafting the text amendment.

Mr. Ward pointed out that Ms. Tyler referred to the extension of being for 300-days; however, the written staff report says “up to” 300 days, which was an unspecified amount of time. He asked her to explain the difference. Ms. Tyler responded by saying that at some point, staff would want to take up to 300 days to be complete, so they would be able to install a new amendment without worry about running out of time.

Lisa Denson-Rives, representative from Adams Outdoor Sign Company, mentioned that her company would like to continue to serve this community, and they supported the City of Urbana’s stated goals, including: 1) to protect property values, 2) establishment of reasonable standards for the use of signs in the community, and 3) the desire to maintain and encourage business development. Adams Outdoor Sign Company looked forward to working with the City of Urbana to craft a sign ordinance to preserve the City’s aesthetics and enhance business activity and success with promoting the charitable endeavors of the community. She stated that

Adams Outdoor Advertising was in favor of extending the moratorium for an additional 300 days.

Mr. Grosser moved that the Plan Commission forward a recommendation of approval of the case to the Urbana City Council. Mr. Ward seconded the motion. The roll call was as follows:

Mr. Grosser	-	Yes	Ms. Upah-Bant	-	Yes
Mr. Ward	-	Yes	Mr. White	-	Yes
Ms. Goscha	-	Yes			

The motion was passed by unanimous vote.

**Plan Case No. 1948-A-05: Annexation Agreement between the City of Urbana and Elmer and Betty Weemer for a 3.22-acre tract of property located on the southeast corner of Airport and Brownfield Roads.**

**Plan Case No. 1948-M-05: Request to rezone approximately a 3.22-acre tract of property located on the southeast corner of Airport and Brownfield Road from Champaign County C-R, Conservation-Recreation to City of Urbana R-2, Single-Family Residential upon annexation.**

Matt Wempe, Planner I, presented these two cases together to the Plan Commission. He stated that this is an annexation agreement and that the property would not be annexed until it becomes contiguous to the city limits. The Weemers' septic tank is failing, and they are in the process of connecting to the Urbana-Champaign Sanitary District (UCSD).

Mr. Wempe talked about some of the conditions of the proposed annexation agreement. He noted the current County zoning and the proposed City zoning when the property is annexed. He, then, answered any questions that the Plan Commission members may have had.

Mr. Grosser noticed that the term of the proposed annexation agreement was 20 years. What would happen if the City did not annex the Weemers' property within the next 20 years? Ms. Tyler stated that City staff could renew the annexation agreement. She mentioned that this particular property may take a very long time before it annexes because of sanitary sewer and other limitations. The proposed annexation agreement can also be called a pre-annexation agreement. She stated that they were not currently rezoning the property. The proposed rezoning was merely to allow what City staff felt would be the most appropriate zone to occur at such time as the annexation takes place.

Ms. Tyler explained that it was an important provision from the City's agreement with the UCSD that they do not provide sewer connections unless there was a pre-annexation agreement in place. Staff looked at the Comprehensive Plan, and in this case, the C-R, Conservation-Recreation Zone did not appear to be appropriate for the current and future land uses. Staff wanted to correct the zoning now as part of the pre-annexation agreement.

Ray Elliot, of 2609 North High Cross Road, stated that he has several acres that border the Weemers' property. He remarked that he did not want any of this area to become incorporated

as Big Grove, become part of the City of Urbana, or anything else that would change the area in any way from the unincorporated rural area that it has been for many years. The area is great as it is, which was the reason why he moved to the area. There was something to be said about preserving some things and leaving them alone. It seemed to him that there were plenty of opportunities for people who want to live in the city to do so.

He described the area with the Saline Branch Drainage Ditch to the south crossing under High Cross Road among a mature growth of trees on both sides of the road that adds to the aesthetic beauty of the area. To the north was Clements Cemetery, where early pioneers, who settled this country, were buried. Some of the people buried in this cemetery even served in the Revolutionary War. Across the road from the cemetery was Brownfield Woods, which was a virgin part of the Big Grove owned by the University of Illinois for research and teaching purposes. All of this creates a beautiful pastoral area that preserves some of the early look that was rapidly being taken over by suburbia and the urban sprawl. Large chunks of farmland all around this area give way to housing developments, supermarkets, parking lots, gas stations, etc. So called "progress" is inevitable, but he saw no benefit for the people in the North Urbana area to be annexed to the City of Urbana or have any pre-annexation agreement. Granting this proposed agreement to annex next door to his property would only guarantee that someone else would come along with another reasonable request to annex.

Merle Ingersoll, of HDC Engineering, represented the petitioners. He stressed that this was a proposal for a pre-annexation agreement. The Weemers came to him because their septic tank had failed. There was no possibility of providing another septic system. The proposed property is within a certain distance that allows the Weemers to extend the public sanitary main to their property. In doing so, the standard procedure was that the Weemers had to apply for a pre-annexation agreement with the City in order to get a permit to connect to UCSD's septic system. This was required by the UCSD, as well as the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (IEPA). The Weemers do not have much choice. Mr. Ingersoll stated that the Weemers are strongly in favor of the proposed pre-annexation agreement and rezoning, because if the City does not grant these two requests, then the Weemers would be without a septic system. Therefore, he strongly urged the Plan Commission to recommend approval.

Mr. White inquired if this would open up the area where other people would be able to hookup to the UCSD sanitary system if they had problems with septic/drainage fills. Mr. Ingersoll replied by saying that only one other home owner had property between the Weemers' property and where the end of the sanitary sewer line currently was located.

George Friedman, of 1115 Newbury in Champaign, mentioned that he owned the adjacent triangular property immediately to the west of the Weemer property. He expected that in the near future, he would be asking for a pre-annexation agreement in order to hookup to the extended sewer line. Therefore, he supports the petition of the Weemers.

Ms. Goscha questioned how Mr. Friedman's land was being utilized, commercial or residential? Mr. Friedman answered by saying that his son and daughter-in-law currently lived on the property, so it would be considered residential.

Ms. Tyler presented a little more background on the City's agreement with the UCSD. The agreement dated back to the early 1990s. This agreement required the City of Urbana and the City of Champaign to have pre-annexation agreements to allow the sanitary sewer hookups. This was based on the principle of providing sanitary sewers in the urban areas. This did not mean that there were areas outside of the cities which do not have sanitary sewers. This area was one of them. Therefore, the proposed pre-annexation agreement was not about the City of Urbana reaching out and grabbing areas that were rural. It is to make sure that areas that are sewered in the future are incorporated. It was an important planning principle that the City of Champaign, the City of Urbana and the UCSD brought into their agreement.

The agreement has worked very well for the City of Urbana in keeping compact contiguous growth around the City. In this case, it was true that the petitioners really had no choice. It was a health and safety issue for the petitioners.

Ms. Goscha inquired if City staff was working on creating a new rural residential zoning category. Ms. Tyler responded by saying that was one of the implementation items of the 2005 Comprehensive Plan. There were other zoning categories under commercial that needed to be created as well.

City staff felt that the R-2 Zoning District was the most appropriate for the proposed property considering today's zoning classifications. She mentioned that there were several homes on the proposed parcel, which was why there was a subdivision requirement. It could be very well be that, when the owner annexes the proposed property, there may be a better zoning classification; in which case, it would come back to the Plan Commission and the City Council with the more appropriate zone at that time. Ms. Goscha added that she was not sure if the proposed property would fall under "rural residential" with the number of structures on it. Therefore, she believed it would be appropriate to go with the R-2 Zoning District.

Ms. Upah-Bant asked staff to explain what might prompt annexation of the proposed property. Ms. Tyler responded by saying that the only thing that would prompt annexation of the proposed property would be contiguity to the City limits. The City cannot reach out beyond the City limits. So, looking at where the proposed property is located, one would see that there are many properties that would need to be annexed first.

Mr. Ward stated that since property must be contiguous to the City limits in order to be annexed and the proposed property was not any where near the City limits, then he did not see anything in granting this proposal that would accelerate the annexation of the area to the City. It seemed to him to be quite neutral in terms of whether the proposed property would ever be annexed into the City.

Mr. Grosser inquired if there ever had been a case where the desire to connect to UCSD's sewer system had a domino-effect to make an area contiguous. Ms. Tyler replied that there was perhaps a little bit of this effect possible for some of the properties in the Scottswood area, but it was very minor. There are several pre-annexation agreements with owners in the area, but they were scatter-shot throughout. She did not feel that they comprise an annexation strategy in and of themselves. Although the Scottswood area was surrounded by the City of Urbana, it was a large area that the City did not intend to annex any time soon.

Ms. Goscha moved that the Plan Commission forward these two cases to the City Council with a recommendation for approval of both. Mr. Grosser seconded the motion. The roll call was as follows:

Ms. Upah-Bant	-	Yes	Mr. Ward	-	Yes
Mr. White	-	Yes	Ms. Goscha	-	Yes
Mr. Grosser	-	Yes			

The motion was passed by unanimous vote.

## 8. NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Goscha took over the position of Acting Chair. Mr. White recused himself from the following case, because he had already publicly expressed an opposition to the proposed Champaign County rezoning.

### **CCZBA 453-AM-04: Request by William and Peggy Campo to amend the Champaign County Zoning Map to change the zoning district designation at 2305 East Oaks Road, Urbana, from AG-2, Agriculture to B-1, Rural Trade Center.**

Paul Lindahl, Planner I, presented this case to the Plan Commission. He began by noting the written communications that were handed out prior to the meeting. One was a supplement to the written staff report from the City, and the other communication was an update to the County's written staff reports.

The County update summarized the results of the County Zoning Board of Appeals meeting that was held on July 28, 2005, and City staff had just received the update earlier in the day. Basically, the County Zoning Board of Appeals had made a recommendation to deny approval of the proposed rezoning case.

In the original written staff report to the Plan Commission, City staff findings were based upon conditions that the County had proposed to place on the minor automobile repair business activities should the rezoning be granted. As a result, City staff originally had recommended that the Plan Commission and the City Council defeat a resolution of protest of the proposed rezoning from County AG-2 to B-1.

Mr. Lindahl explained that the County Zoning Board of Appeals did not endorse the proposed conditions in their final determination, because they did not believe that the conditions would ensure compatibility with the surrounding land uses. Because the County Zoning Board of Appeals had made a recommendation to deny approval of the proposed rezoning case, the proposed conditions were no longer directly attached to an approval. Therefore, if the proposed rezoning case were to be approved by the County Environment and Land Use Committee and forwarded to the Champaign County Board without the proposed conditions, then City staff believed that the rezoning from County AG-2 to B-1, Rural Trade Center, would be incompatible with the goals and objectives of the City of Urbana's Comprehensive Plan designation of residential for the proposed area.

When County areas are annexed into the City, there was a direct conversion table that staff uses to show the change from County zoning to City zoning. County B-1, Rural Trade Center, would convert to the City's B-1, Neighborhood Business Zoning District. There were a number of uses in the County B-1 that would only be found in the City's AG (Agriculture), IN (Industrial) or B-3 (General Business) Zoning Districts. For this reason, the direct conversion would not be a good match for the concept of "neighborhood business" as the Urbana Zoning Ordinance defines it.

Mr. Lindahl discussed the conditions that were originally proposed. He summarized staff findings, read the options of the Plan Commission, and presented staff's recommendation, which was as follows:

*Based upon staff's findings and to maintain compatibility of land development in the City's Extra Territorial Jurisdiction with the City's Comprehensive Plan, staff recommended that the Plan Commission forward a recommendation to City Council that they pass a resolution of protest of the proposed rezoning from County AG-2 to B-1.*

William Campo, petitioner for the proposed County rezoning case, said he came to the Plan Commission meeting thinking that City staff was recommending that the Plan Commission defeat a resolution of protest. He was then struck with the news that the City staff had changed their recommendation.

Mr. Campo pointed out that there was an existing building that had been located on the proposed property for at least 50 years. The building has been used by different businesses in the past, and he wished to continue using the building for business purposes. He noted that there really were not any neighbors that had problems with the current business occupying the building.

He pointed out that the existing building/property was overlooked when zoning was enacted back in 1973. The building was obviously used for business purposes. Why not allow him to continue to use the building for business purposes? He did not plan to add anything by building additions or expanding. They only want to run a business in a building that had been there for a long time.

He mentioned that since the proposed building/site was currently being used as an automotive repair business, then they would be willing to install screening for the neighbors. However, no one had actually complained about the tenant or how the tenant operates his business.

Mr. Campo expressed that in order to get the full use of the building, then the property needed to be rezoned.

Bernard Coffey, of 1 Persimmon Circle, mentioned that he was the tenant operating an automotive repair business in the existing building at 2305 East Oaks Road. He had been in the automotive business for 25 to 30 years and had extensive experience in heavy equipment. He stated that his business had been located on the proposed property for about a year and a half. He always tries to give to the community. He understood the concern of the people in the area and enjoyed working with them. Many of the people in the area have been clients of his business.

He went on to say that he enjoyed where he was. He was not too much of a city person anymore. He liked the peacefulness of the country. He would like to keep operating his business in the proposed building. However, he did not plan to be in the building forever. His business had grown continuously for the last three years.

Mr. Coffey was willing to work with Mr. Campo on creating a win-win situation. He was willing to do what he could to improve the site by providing screening, etc. He was only asking to be able to work. He made a living at repairing the finer automobiles and enjoyed it.

Art Russell, accountant for Mr. Coffey, mentioned that the prior occupant, Jim Goodman, had a sheet metal shop in the proposed building. He did work for some of the local farmers and for outsiders. Mr. Goodman never had to have the property rezoned in order to operate his business. He thought the reason why Mr. Campo had to rezone the property was because Mr. Coffey had a few cars sitting on the property. He agreed that screening would be necessary. He thought that maybe if they had screened the property when Mr. Coffey first opened up his business, then no one would have known that an automotive repair business was located there, except for Mr. Coffey's sign on the front of the building.

There were no loud noises coming from the building. The machine shop may have made more noise. As mentioned earlier, the building was at least 50 to 60 years old, and businesses have occupied the building all this time.

Mr. Russell stated that Mr. Coffey moved his business here about a year and a half ago. Mr. Coffey had out-grown the site where his business was previously located. Many of his clientele followed him to the current location. Now, to make him move again in a 3 year time frame, Mr. Coffey would need to ensure that his prior clientele could follow him in order to be successful. Customers do not like when a business keeps moving. Denying the proposed rezoning would be a detriment to Mr. Coffey's business and to him to earn a livelihood.

It seemed to Mr. Russell that most of the County Zoning Board of Appeals was in favor of the rezoning until they heard that the State's Attorney office would not endorse the conditions recommended. He did not understand why they could not put the proposed conditions on Mr. Coffey's business and approve the rezoning. The building and Mr. Coffey's business would clearly not enhance or detriment the City's ongoing plan of what would happen in years to come. He could not imagine that the City of Urbana's long-term goals would look any shorter than 20 or 30 years down the road. The property could revert back to AG-2 when Mr. Coffey's business goes away. Mr. Campo bought the building/property with the intention of using it for business purposes.

Mr. Lindahl reminded the Plan Commission that the recommendation of the Champaign County Zoning Board of Appeals to not recommend the rezoning was done without conditions or stipulations. So, officially there are no longer those conditions on the table. As it stands now, if the rezoning was approved, then the proposed property would have the potential to have any type of business that would be permitted in the County B-1 Zone. Some of those potential uses would not be compatible with the residential land use that the Urbana Comprehensive Plan contemplates for this area in the future.



Ms. Upah-Bant asked if the petitioner would be allowed to have a car repair shop in the building or not. Mr. Lindahl explained that it could be used as a car repair shop if the property was rezoned. If it was not rezoned, then minor automobile repair was not permitted in County AG-2. Mr. Coffey would have to move his business. They have been in violation of the County Zoning Ordinance every since they located there.

Mr. Grosser inquired if it would be possible to recommend no protest against the rezoning on the condition that the County Board decides to reinstate the previously proposed conditions on the automotive repair business. Ms. Tyler mentioned that the Plan Commission had forwarded conditional "no protests" and conditional "protests" before. It was difficult in a case where there were some extenuating circumstances, and it is on the edge of the planning area. The City would like to preserve their protest rights for big issues, because it is one body of government saying to another body of government that they think an issue was enough of a violation that they were going to force a higher number of required votes. So, the City has had several cases where they have worked on language to mitigate or show the path for how the City could be satisfied.

Furthermore, Ms. Tyler pointed out that to place conditions on a certain use and have the zoning revert back after that use is no longer there was not a customary planning and zoning practice in the State of Illinois. Therefore, she was not surprised at the State's Attorney position. Different jurisdictions will take different approaches, and the City of Urbana needed to respect that the County zoning was a very different world than municipal zoning. The County deals with many types of land use compatibility problems and enforcements. She mentioned that if the Plan Commission could think of ways to modify or make suggestions, then it would be okay to do so. In the past, it has been helpful for the County.

Mr. Ward asked for clarification on what the State's Attorney office said. He understood that the State's Attorney was raising the issue of whether conditions could be imposed. Ms. Tyler said that the City's practice for zoning was that they do not condition zoning. You have to take a zoning district in its entirety. The City does not partake in "contract" zoning. It is only legal in some states.

Mr. Ward understood that the County was willing to approve the rezoning as long as they felt that they could place conditions on the rezoning. Once the County learned that this was questionable, then they changed their position. It seemed to him that the City was in a position to respond to what the County had recommended. The County Zoning Board of Appeals made a recommendation without conditions because of some questions about the legality of those conditions. Really, the City's zone of discretion was somewhat limited. The proposed rezoning did not have anything to do with what the people have testified about. It was a larger legal issue.

Ms. Goscha commented that it appears that the petitioner had attempted to do the right thing. Mr. Campo knows that his property was not in compliance with the County Zoning Ordinance, and he was trying to rezone his property. She appreciated this, because there were plenty of landowners who do not want to do this. However, restrictions cannot be placed upon approving the rezoning. She inquired what recourse was there for the owner. Ms. Tyler said that it seemed to her to be the end of the road. Over the last several months, the County had tried to rezone the proposed property to a higher zone of B-3. There were neighbor protests against the types of uses that

could occupy the building/property. B-1 appeared to be something that could conceivably be consistent with the residential area, particularly with the restrictions. Now, the restrictions have been removed, and the whole line of argument had fallen apart. Mr. Lindahl added an important note that many of the people who testified stated that they had no problem with Mr. Coffey's business. They were concerned about what might happen in the future when Mr. Coffey's business no longer existed.

Ms. Goscha restated that the City was not trying to annex this property into the City. The property was located in Champaign County area. Should someday that residential development should occur in the area and the proposed property be annexed into the City of Urbana, would the County B-1 naturally become City B-1? Ms. Tyler said this was true. The City B-1 was more urban with more restrictions than the County B-1, which was Rural Trade Center. The proposed property was right on the edge in the Land Use Map of the 2005 Comprehensive Plan of the extent of where the City showed residential. If the proposed property were to be annexed in the future and it were compliant with the County B-1, then it could continue as a legally non-conforming use within the City. At such time that the use or business would expand, then there could be a compliance problem. Ms. Goscha added that if it maintained as an automobile minor repair shop, then it would be in compliance with the City's B-1.

Mr. Campo re-approached the Plan Commission to add that this case was really complex and on the edge. As Mr. Lindahl mentioned, his initial request was for a rezoning to the County B-3 Zone. The reason was because the definition for County B-3 was so vague as far as what is considered major and minor. The reason for requesting a rezoning to County B-1 was because it was determined through the County Zoning Board of Appeals that was basically what he wanted to do. This was the main reason that he changed his proposal from rezoning to County B-3 to County B-1.

Mr. Grosser had walked through the path of the petitioner by reading through the stack of County documents. It seemed to him that the conditions made a lot of sense in terms of the City of Urbana's perspective. It would have accommodated the tenant and owner, and it would not negatively impact the long-term interest of the City of Urbana or Champaign County. However, these conditions were not on the table any longer. He did not feel that it would be appropriate to make a zoning decision based on the current tenant. He could move out tomorrow and another business move in. He mentioned that he was somewhat conflicted, because he did not feel that there was anything wrong with the current use. He did not see a way to recommend "no protest" given the lack of the conditions.

Mr. Ward felt the same as Mr. Grosser in that he was willing to support the recommendation of "no protest" with the conditions that were previously recommended on the current use. Without the conditions, it would open up Pandora's Box in the sense that if the City did not enter a protest at this point and the County would recommend the rezoning, then it would leave the door open for all kinds of issues in the future that would not be good for the area. Therefore, he would have to support a motion for protest.

Ms. Upah-Bant mentioned that she was leaning in the same direction as Mr. Grosser and Mr. Ward. She could not see how the Plan Commission could vote "no protest".

Ms. Goscha agreed that she was conflicted as well. Here is a landowner who was trying to do the right thing. She always wanted to support small businesses in the area. Nevertheless, they could not apply conditions to the rezoning, and the Plan Commission was not supposed to look at zoning as a specific use. Instead they were supposed to look at the whole category of how the proposed zoning would affect the land parcel. County B-1 would be inappropriate in its worst case scenario. She inquired as to what would happen to the landowner/tenant if they continued to operate the automotive repair business without getting approval of the rezoning request. Ms. Tyler replied by saying that it would become an enforcement case. If they are unable to obtain the rezoning at the County Board, then the case could go to the Circuit Court.

Mr. Ward moved that the Plan Commission forward a recommendation to the City Council to pass a resolution of protest. Mr. Grosser seconded the motion.

Mr. Grosser thought of another reason why he would support the motion. The reason was because the bulk of the neighbors in protest of the rezoning were against other uses that would be allowed in the County B-1, not necessarily against the current use.

Ms. Upah-Bant was surprised that there were not any neighbors present to testify. Mr. Grosser believed this was due to the timing of the case. Ms. Tyler added that this was not a public hearing. Champaign County would have proceeded without input from the City of Urbana, so it is up to the City to schedule the case.

The roll call was as follows:

Mr. Ward	-	Yes	Ms. Goscha	-	Yes
Mr. Grosser	-	Yes	Ms. Upah-Bant	-	Yes

The motion passed by a vote of 4 ayes, 0 nays and 1 abstention.

## **9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

There was none.

## **10. STAFF REPORT**

Ms. Tyler reported on the following:

- City Council will be holding a Special Council meeting on August 8, 2005. The Barr Rezoning for 903 West Nevada was scheduled to be on the agenda and presented to the City Council. She mentioned that Mayor Lunt-Prussing and the Chancellor of the University of Illinois had met to discuss the case, and she hoped that they came to some kind of agreement about how to work together in a larger sense. The OASS Study Session will be presented to City Council as well.

## **11. STUDY SESSION**

There was none.

August 4, 2005

**12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING**

Chair Pollock adjourned the meeting at 8:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Elizabeth Tyler, City Planner  
Urbana Plan Commission