

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING

URBANA PLAN COMMISSION

APPROVED

DATE: May 10, 2007

TIME: 7:30 P.M.

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jane Burris, Tyler Fitch, Lew Hopkins, Michael Pollock, James Ward, Don White

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Ben Grosser, Bernadine Stake, Marilyn Upah-Bant

STAFF PRESENT: Robert Myers, Planning Manager; Jeff Engstrom, Planner I; Teri Andel, Planning Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT: Brian Adams, Scott Dossett, Mary Kent

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

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

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

There were none.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Ward moved that the Plan Commission approve the minutes from the April 19, 2007 meeting as presented. Mr. Hopkins seconded the motion. The motion to approve the minutes as presented was approved by unanimous voice vote.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

- Letter from Susan Flickinger
- Letter from Scott Dossett regarding HEUNA's changes to the proposed NCD Text Amendment
- Letter from Bernadine Stake regarding Plan Case No. 2023-T-06

- Information Sheet titled “Proposed Enforcement Strategies”
- “The Commissioner” – A Publication of the American Planning Association

5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

Plan Case No. 2023-T-06: A request by the Zoning Administrator to amend Article XII of the Zoning Ordinance to add Section XII-6, Neighborhood Conservation Districts, to establish the procedures for a designation of Neighborhood Conservation Districts.

Robert Myers, Planning Manager, said that the West Urbana Neighborhood Association (WUNA) is holding their regular meeting tonight and that they plan to discuss “Neighborhood Conservation Districts” as an agenda item. However, WUNA has not requested that the Plan Commission hold off on making a recommendation regarding this case. Chair Pollock stated that the Plan Commission could, if so desired, postpone taking any action until the next scheduled Plan Commission meeting so they would have the opportunity to review what WUNA comes up with. Although, he would like to continue to keep the case open, take public input, have the Plan Commission discuss it and then Commissioners could decide if they want to make a recommendation to City Council.

Mr. Myers gave an overview of the Historic East Urbana Neighborhood Association’s (HEUNA’s) recommended changes to the proposed Neighborhood Conservation District (NCD) text amendment. There appears to be two main changes, which are: 1) to take NCDs out of the context of the Historic Preservation Ordinance and make it a stand alone district and 2) to send letters to the property owners once the City Council has approved a NCD and if 60% of the property owners responding within 30 days are in favor of what the City Council has approved, then a NCD would automatically be granted.

He had a question of whether or not HEUNA consciously included the word “shall” when talking about design guidelines. At the previous Plan Commission meeting, some people felt design guidelines should be optional.

He stated that there are two options for the Plan Commission, which are to make a recommendation to the City Council either in favor of the proposed text amendment (with or without changes) or against the proposed text amendment. The City Council could take up the matter and approve the text amendment with or without changes or deny it. If the City Council denies the proposed text amendment, City staff would consider gathering input from WUNA and HEUNA and incorporate their ideas into the text amendment and come back to the Plan Commission and City Council at another time. Another option of the Plan Commission is to take two more weeks to review HEUNA’s ideas about NCDs and input any ideas that they like into the proposed text amendment. He mentioned that WUNA has expressed in writing their support for the proposed text amendment that was presented about six weeks ago.

Chair Pollock opened the public hearing to hear input from members of the audience.

Scott Dossett, of 501 East High Street, stated that he is the Recording Secretary for HEUNA. He explained that HEUNA members have gotten together to talk about NCDs amongst themselves

to provide some input to City staff. HEUNA members do not feel like their voices are being heard regarding NCDs. He highlighted some of the issues that HEUNA members have with the proposed text amendment. Those issues are as follows:

1. They believe that having the Historic Preservation Commission as the lead commission on this effort is not the optimum use of the Historic Preservation Commission's talents and would not lead to the optimum operation of a NCD that would benefit the neighborhoods. NCDs have little to do with historic preservation, but rather are meant to prevent the demolition of their neighborhoods. HEUNA is concerned about buildings that have a huge massive front with only one window and perhaps a stairwell. Therefore, they feel a group of representatives from several different commissions would make a more apt body to review NCDs.
2. Owner approval clauses. He mentioned that it would be harder for someone to get approval of a NCD than it is to get approval of a historic district given the way the proposed text amendment is written. We have to find a way if we are going to have an affective NCD to get the property owners to speak out. Sixty percent quotas will kill any NCD proposals in the HEUNA area. He did not even feel that a NCD proposal in WUNA would be approved by 60% of their property owners. HEUNA members recommend allowing a mail-out vote procedure.
3. Strong design review should be required of NCDs. He suggested that there be a sliding scale of the amount of review and the number of permits required for the type of work done in a NCD with a "1" being the least amount of review and required permits and a "4" being the maximum amount of review and the most number of permits required.
4. Be careful when tying the proposed text amendment into the Urbana Zoning Ordinance. It is really difficult to make an ordinance clear, to tie it into the existing ordinances and gathering public input. He asked the Plan Commission to be patient in making decisions when it comes to text amendments and creating new ordinances.

Mr. Dossett thinks of NCDs as overlay districts. Any kind of a NCD does not change the zoning, but it would lay over the zoning some parameters upon which design review can be done for proposed improvements.

He commented that HEUNA does not support the proposed text amendment as it is currently written, and they would encourage the Plan Commission to not support it. In summary, the initial reviewing Commission is not appropriate, the owner approval percentages are onerous, and the proposed text amendment does not drive home the objective of design review, which is really important to HEUNA.

Chair Pollock inquired as to whether HEUNA would consider any changes that need to be made to get the proposed text amendment "perfect" as being major revisions. Mr. Dossett said yes.

Mr. Ward questioned what Mr. Dossett would recommend the Plan Commission to do at this point. Would it be worth going back for one more round of revisions to try to accommodate any testimony received? Mr. Dossett replied that he felt the proposed text amendment is worthy of one more round. He was excited to see NCDs mentioned on maps in the 2005 Comprehensive

Plan. He feels it is incumbent upon a mature municipality to be able to exert its best available practices on development. He believes that the City is at a critical juncture here.

Brian Adams, of 412 West Elm Street, stated that he is associated with the West Urbana Neighborhood Association (WUNA). He stated that when WUNA expressed support of the proposed text amendment about six weeks ago, they did not know about HEUNA's concerns or suggested modifications. Therefore, he cannot speak for what other people who live in WUNA might think about HEUNA's ideas. He suggested that it might be worthwhile for HEUNA and WUNA to put their heads together to look at some of the issues more closely to figure out what would work best for both neighborhood areas. He feels that it is important to get it right and to make sure that something is put together that has been thought out and not rushed into.

In general, he feels that the concept of NCDs is good. Anything that can help his neighborhood preserve what little they have left is a positive thing.

Mr. Myers wondered if HEUNA was intending that NCDs should be required to have design guidelines. Mr. Dossett replied that during his input he probably did not discriminate very well between design guidelines and design review. He feels that there is good existing design guideline language that could be pulled out of the MOR, Mixed Office Residential Zoning Ordinance and Design Guidelines. Regarding aesthetic quality of a structure, the MOR Design Guidelines are succinct and well written. They allow for creativity. HEUNA would like to pull the MOR Zoning District over to their area as well.

Regarding design review, someone on City staff could look at proposed site plans. If a NCD only had design review, then HEUNA would be happy with NCDs. Even though his neighborhood is called "Historic East Urbana", it lacks historic buildings. However, they would like to preserve the community feel that their neighborhood has.

If the objective of a NCD is to maintain some kind of community standard, then the applicants should be able to represent that standard in some fashion. City staff should not have to go out and do a whole lot of census. There should be a mechanism by which the petitioners, similar to the petitions for a historic landmark status, talk about the attributes of the buildings or the neighborhood that they are interested in.

Chair Pollock asked for clarification on the question. Was Mr. Myers asking if the proposed ordinance should be written in such a way that different neighborhood groups could decide the level and degree of design guidelines individually? Mr. Myers replied by saying that is correct. Mr. Dossett added that each neighborhood would have a totally different perspective on the aesthetics of their neighborhood. Applicants should be able to tell on the petition what attributes their neighborhood has and what they want to keep. They should then be able to expect that the NCD ordinance would be written to help them do that.

With no further comments from members of the audience, Chair Pollock closed the public input portion of the hearing and opened it up for Plan Commission discussion.

Mr. Ward stated that his concern all along has been that the purposes of a NCD ordinance have not been addressed or carried out by the proposed text amendment as it is currently written. It has been further complicated by HEUNA's suggested alterations. He would like to see how each of the ordinance's purposes would be implemented and fulfilled in the proposed plan. He wants to see a connection. He requested that City staff provide this in the next draft, if there is going to be another draft of the proposed text amendment.

Ms. Burris stated that what HEUNA wants a NCD to be is different than what the Plan Commission is trying to make it be. It appears to her that HEUNA is talking about Purpose # 2, which is demolition and new construction. HEUNA wants to ensure that construction of new buildings resembles other existing buildings in the neighborhood and that the character of the neighborhood remains the same.

As she looks at the purposes of a NCD, she sees how it is necessary to have the Historic Preservation Commission have overview of NCDs. If we are trying to preserve what has historically been on a lot or in a neighborhood, then they need to know what the history is and how a neighborhood is a reflection of the City's past in order to maintain that past. This information needs to come from somewhere. Also, it is her understanding that each NCD applies their own purposes to their NCD plan rather than the City dictating to the neighborhoods what their plan should be.

Mr. Ward noted that he is not suggesting that the City dictate NCD plans by any means. To be specific, he used Purpose # 2 as an example. Purpose # 2 states "*Provide for design review of new construction...*". The City cannot say that the design guidelines should be such and such; however, the City can say that there should be design guidelines, because you cannot provide design review without design guidelines.

Ms. Burris agrees with this. She just wanted to add to his previous comments that the design guidelines should come from the neighborhood proposing a NCD and not from the City.

Mr. Fitch agreed that there "shall" be design guidelines, because otherwise it would be a meaningless designation. It also needs to be clear that a NCD is not a change in zoning. He talked about the initiative and referendum percentages. The Plan Commission has talked about this a lot, and HEUNA's suggested changes moves the referendum aspect to the end. They maintain the 60%, but make it a referendum rather than a petition.

Mr. Hopkins feels that the Plan Commission should send the proposed text amendment back to City staff for reworking with as specific guidelines as the Plan Commission could provide. Some of the guidelines that he would suggest are as follows: 1) that the NCD ordinance be a separate section of the Zoning Ordinance and not included in with the Historic Preservation Ordinance; 2) that it would not have any review by the Historic Preservation Commission, but instead be reviewed by the Plan Commission; 3) that it would have a percentage to achieve initiation of a NCD proposal; 4) it would have no referendum or requirement after the fact, but instead just have a protest percentage, which is consistent with the Historic Preservation Ordinance; and 5) provide illustrations for what we mean by design guidelines.

Ms. Burris said she did not understand why Mr. Hopkins thought the Plan Commission should review NCD proposals. Mr. Hopkins feels that there are three steps, which are 1) creating an ordinance which enables the creation of NCDs, 2) application to create a NCD, which he is suggesting should be reviewed by the Plan Commission, and 3) design review by a board developed for that NCD. The Plan Commission would only be reviewing applications to create NCDs to ensure that the applicants have met the intent of the ordinance. NCDs essentially mimic the MOR Zoning District, except a NCD ordinance would add the ability for 25% of the property owners to force the City to create another MOR Zoning District, which as far as he could tell is the major purpose of the proposed text amendment.

Mr. White suggested that the Plan Commission and City staff go through the Plan Commission's list so staff can get a better sense of what the Plan Commission is thinking. Chair Pollock stated that this concerns him because it is not much different than legislating on the floor, piece-by-piece, on a proposed ordinance that has been before the Plan Commission for six months. The text amendment has changed a number of times. The goals of the proposed NCD text amendment have changed as well. The methodology is changing. Some neighborhoods want design guidelines and some do not. Now, one of the two neighborhood groups (HEUNA) that was instrumental in bringing NCDs before the Plan Commission does not even support the text amendment as it is currently being proposed. It does not do what they want it to do. At some point, the Plan Commission owes the City Council a recommendation. The Plan Commission has the options of either sending it back to staff to rework what they do not like with it or they could forward it on to the City Council with a specific list of the Plan Commission's concerns and issues. He helped represent HEUNA and tried to help the neighborhood association get off the ground when they first started. He wants this group to stay together and remain active. He knows exactly what it is that they are trying to get done in their neighborhood, but he does not believe that NCDs are the way to accomplish it.

Mr. Hopkins stated that his intent was that if the Plan Commission sends this back to City staff to rework it, then it would be most useful to give staff some rather specific feedback on parts of the proposed ordinance so they can rework it. He is not suggesting that the Plan Commission revise the proposed text amendment on the floor. He feels that this would be way beyond a useful thing to do.

Mr. White suggested that the Plan Commission go through the different controversial issues and vote on them up or down with no discussion. Chair Pollock commented that on the flip side it would make it really difficult to craft an ordinance, and it is really necessary to craft an ordinance. We want the public involved and want them making the decisions, because a part of the nature of NCDs would be determined by the neighborhoods in which they are located.

Mr. Ward had a problem with going through the proposed text amendment point-by-point, because he is not sure how he would give a preference on some of them at this time. There are two major stakeholders in this (WUNA and HEUNA), and both have put a great deal of time, effort and thought into the proposed text amendment. Therefore, he would like to be able to craft an ordinance that would meet everyone's needs. It was suggested that WUNA might be willing to meet with HEUNA.

Mr. Hopkins talked about the options of the Plan Commission. He wanted to send the message that there are some things that they want to do, and the intent of the proposed text amendment is that they want to accomplish these things. However, he did not feel that the proposed text amendment as it is currently written works toward that. Chair Pollock commented that if the Plan Commission agreed to forward a recommendation to the City Council to deny the proposed text amendment, then the Plan Commission should identify the weaknesses or the corrections that they would like to see made. City Council can then figure out what they would like to do with it. City Council may like the form that it is in now, but the Plan Commission evidently is not.

Ms. Burris stated that the Plan Commission has continuously heard from the residents that they want something to deal with the demolition of single-family homes and the building of multi-family units. Is it possible to take portions out of the proposed text amendment that deal with these needs? Chair Pollock mentioned that if she is talking about strictly preventing the consolidation of lots, the deterioration and demolition of buildings, and the building of multi-family units, this is already in the Zoning Ordinance already. Property owners need to down zone those lots to low-density residential zoning districts. The proposed text amendment is not the way to go to do such a thing.

Mr. Dossett pointed out that HEUNA does not want to take away the right of property owners to build a multi-unit apartment building, because rental units and people who rent those units are an integral and valued part of their neighborhood. HEUNA would only like to change some of the requirements for building multi-unit buildings, such as for parking and green space. The objective is to not get the least cost structures built on lots, so they do not look like warehouses, because they are in residential communities.

Chair Pollock pointed out that this is where the proposed text amendment would change drastically between neighborhoods. There are neighborhoods that are extremely interested in preventing the disappearance of single-family houses and the construction of multi-family apartment buildings.

Mr. Fitch noted that he is hearing five points of consensus, which are as follows: 1) citizens initiative, 2) a neighborhood plan, 3) design review, 4) design guidelines, and 5) Historic Preservation Commission process with Plan Commission and City Council action. The other Plan Commission members agreed with this.

Chair Pollock asked the Plan Commission what they would like to do with this. The options are to send these five items back to City staff and have them rework the proposed text amendment or forward a recommendation to City Council with a recommendation for denial and request that they direct staff to work on these changes. Chair Pollock asked Mr. Myers if he felt the proposed text amendment is repairable or would they need to start from scratch.

Mr. Myers stated that he felt that it is repairable but that based on what he is hearing it would take so much time to build consensus that the current process would likely grow cold and its momentum would be lost. Concerning the Plan Commission's options, the Commission is clearly not ready to recommend approval or approval with specific changes. That leaves either

recommending for denial or postponing the case. Postponing would not be helpful unless there's a clear direction for changes. He is not hearing consensus on direction. The cleanest thing may be to forward the case to the City Council with a recommendation for denial based on specific reasons.

Chair Pollock inquired if this case came from City Council's direction. Mr. Myers said yes, that City staff had recommended six initiatives to the City Council, this being one of them. City The Council directed City staff to move forward with those six initiatives and NCDs are one of them. Also the Comprehensive Plan calls for NCDs and some neighborhood plans call for them. Chair Pollock commented that maybe the Plan Commission should send this back to City staff to rework the proposed text amendment since the direction from the City Council was so general.

Mr. Ward did not feel that it should be forwarded to the City Council even with a list of reasons for denial or a list of things that should be changed. In the beginning, there was a catalog of problems that needed to be addressed in chart form. One of the things on the chart was what policy mechanisms might exist that could deal with those problems, including a NCD. He recalled that most of those issues could be addressed without a NCD. At this point, he does not have a strong feeling whether the City should have a NCD or not. He just wants to see the problems dealt with. He wants to see the neighborhoods protected. He is less concerned with the mechanism. He is becoming more and more convinced that with some proper changes in ordinances or looking at other mechanisms, these problems could accomplished much more expeditiously and much more efficiently without a NCD. He does not want the proposed text amendment just sitting out there trying to fit the NCD into some sort of a mold to make it do all these things when we could be doing these things already. At this point, he would rather forward this to City Council rather than sending it back to City staff.

Mr. Hopkins inquired as to how the Plan Commission gets this item off their agenda. The most direct way to do this might be to forward this case to the City Council so that City staff is not being drawn into different directions. He felt that a motion should include a little bit of what Mr. Ward just said and list the five points of consensus that Mr. Fitch came up with. The reasons for both of them is because just correcting the proposed text amendment in the five ways that Mr. Fitch mentioned may not be the best way to do this. There may be better ways to solve those problems, including direct action. HEUNA might be quite happy if the City just created NCDs rather than creating an ordinance in which they could force us to do this.

Mr. Fitch said that this is a good point. One of the reasons why he could not support the proposed text amendment as it is currently written is because it ties HEUNA's hands.

Mr. Hopkins moved that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 2023-T-06 to the City Council with a recommendation for denial with the following explanation:

- 1) The Plan Commission believes that the concerns and intent of neighborhood conservation that led to the creation of the proposed text amendment are important and need to be achieved.
- 2) It is not clear to the Plan Commission that the proposed text amendment as it is currently written is the best way to achieve those concerns and intent.

- 3) If a NCD ordinance in some other form comes back to the Plan Commission, they suggest that it consider the following five points:
 - A) Citizen’s Initiative
 - B) City Assisted Plan
 - C) Design Review with Design Guidelines
 - D) Initiative and Protest, and
 - E) Process with Plan Commission recommendation and City Council action

Mr. Ward seconded the motion. Roll call on the motion was as follows:

Ms. Burris	-	Yes	Mr. Fitch	-	Yes
Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes	Mr. Pollock	-	Yes
Mr. Ward	-	Yes	Mr. White	-	Yes

The motion was passed by unanimous vote. Mr. Myers noted that this case is scheduled to go before the City Council on May 21, 2007.

Chair Pollock remarked that this is really a difficult issue and process. Mr. Hopkins acknowledged the hard work of City staff that has gone into the proposed text amendment in addition to the work of the Plan Commission.

6. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

7. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

Plan Case No. 2002-T-06: A request by the Zoning Administrator to amend VIII of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance regarding allowed surfaces and location of parking.

Jeff Engstrom, Planner I, presented this case to the Plan Commission. He said that the written staff report is in three parts which are: 1) enforcement strategies, 2) proposed text amendments to the Urbana Zoning Ordinance, and 3) evaluation of our open space ratio requirements. He discussed the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance regarding required parking space and gravel parking lots. He referred to and talked about Exhibits A (Gravel Parking Spaces by Zoning in West Urbana) and B (Enforcement Strategies) and the communication (Proposed Enforcement Strategies). He explained the difference as defined in the Zoning Ordinance between a “parking lot” and a “driveway”. He explained about Categories 1, 2, 3 and 4 in terms of proposed enforcement. He stated the proposed changes to the Zoning Ordinance and how they would relate to the 2005 Comprehensive Plan. He also talked about Open Space requirements. He read the options of the Plan Commission and presented staff’s recommendation, which is 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 text amendment, with the following exception:

Page 81 – Section H.3: City staff recommends not removing the word “passenger” from the text.

Mr. Hopkins asked if this would preclude the construction of driveways that have grass in the middle and two treads. Mr. Engstrom believes that it would be the Zoning Administrator’s interpretation, because the surface of driveways could be approved by the Zoning Administrator.

Mr. Hopkins understood the text to read that a person would have to pave the center of a parking space for a recreational vehicle. Mr. Myers replied that there would need to be a hard surface where the grass could not grow up beneath or between it. If it is not a hard surface, then when a vehicle rocks back and forth it creates ruts.

Mr. Hopkins inquired if a driveway, where presumably things would be moved, could be approved in a relatively more permanent parking space. It would not be allowed under the proposed ordinance be allowed. Mr. Myers mentioned a parking surface called “grasscreeet” which is basically interlocking rings. It is a hard surface, but would allow grass to grow through it. This is a parking surface the Zoning Administrator review and possibly approve.

Mr. Hopkins noted that the proposed ordinance explicitly acknowledges permeable hard surfaces. Mr. Myers clarified that City staff wanted to make it explicit that permeable asphalt is allowed. There is some different maintenance required though. Water needs to go somewhere after it soaks through this asphalt so the sub-surface may need to be drainable. Another thing is that permeable asphalt needs to be vacuumed once a year to prevent the pores from clogging. The third thing is during the winter time and the ground is frozen, water will run off because it cannot be absorbed by the ground.

Mr. Fitch inquired as to how City staff decided whether to require paving or not for Categories 2 and 3. Mr. Engstrom replied that City staff will look at the use of the property. If the property is being used for multi-family residential then they are generally required to provide parking lots, and City staff will ask for the parking lot to be paved.

Mr. Myers pointed out that the enforcement material in the written staff report is only to provide context on how the ordinance changes fit into it. The proposed changes to the ordinance although pretty small are meaningful. In terms of enforcement he feels that Categories 2 and 3 properties would have to be taken on a case-by-case basis. The first category where there is multi-family parking lots that are gravel and are zoned multi-family, it only seems right to require the owner to pave them, especially due to all of the traffic and because it is a income generating property. In Categories 2 and 3, under the current Zoning Ordinance, a single-family home is allowed to park in the driveway, in the garage, or in two additional off-street parking spaces. Over the years, we have had many backyards mushroom into parking. Therefore, staff would need to take these on a case-by-case basis because some of the parking may have existed for several years before the regulations changed. If some of the parking areas came after a certain period of time, it is likely illegal; and then the City may ask the property owners to remove the additional parking spaces.

There are many gravel driveways in the City. Most of them are grandfathered, and the only thing the City should do is to require the property owners to refresh the gravel every so often and to provide a border to keep the gravel in place rather than allowing them to widen and enlarge.

Mr. Ward moved that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 2002-T-06 to the City Council with a recommendation for approval as presented. Mr. Fitch seconded the motion.

Mr. Hopkins pointed out that this is an instance of actually what the Plan Commission was talking about in the previous discussion regarding Plan Case No. 2023-T-06 in two important ways. First, the proposed text amendment in Plan Case No. 2002-T-06 is actually figuring out how to solve a problem. The problem is gravel parking lots, and City staff has figured out an enforcement strategy using both an existing ordinance and proposing to tweak the ordinance to make the enforcement strategy fit. Second, because of the way it is presented and the nature of how it arose, it is one more case where it appears that this is the City of West Urbana. We are addressing West Urbana’s issues, and we are presenting material as if it only applies to West Urbana. It needs to be clear that this does not only apply to West Urbana. In fact, he can recall at least one place in East Urbana that could benefit from the proposed text amendment.

Roll call was taken and was as follows:

Mr. White	-	Yes	Mr. Ward	-	Yes
Mr. Pollock	-	Yes	Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes
Mr. Fitch	-	Yes	Ms. Burris	-	Yes

The motion was passed by unanimous vote. Mr. Myers noted that this case would go before the City Council on May 21, 2007.

8. NEW BUSINESS

There was none.

9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There was none.

10. STAFF REPORT

There was none.

11. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 9:19 p.m.

May 10, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Myers, AICP, Planning Division Manager
Urbana Plan Commission