

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING

URBANA PLAN COMMISSION

APPROVED

DATE: February 7, 2008

TIME: 7:30 P.M.

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jane Burris, Tyler Fitch, Ben Grosser, Michael Pollock, Bernadine Stake, Marilyn Upah-Bant, James Ward, Don White

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Lew Hopkins

STAFF PRESENT: Robert Myers, Planning Manager; Lisa Karcher, Planner II; Jeff Engstrom, Planner I; Teri Anel, Planning Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT: Megan Barcus, Marianne Downey, Mitsu Fujik, David Fullerton, Mike Howley, Eunkoo Noh, Michael Parkinson, Michelle Thornley

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 present.

NOTE: Robert Myers, Planning Manager, introduced Lisa Karcher, Planner II, to the Plan Commission. He stated that she previously worked as a planner in Findlay, Ohio, and he briefly talked about her previous work experience.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

There were none.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Upah-Bant moved to approve the minutes from the January 10, 2008 meeting. Ms. Stake seconded the motion. Chair Pollock called for a voice vote on the motion to approve the minutes as presented. The minutes were approved by unanimous vote.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

- ◆ Champaign County staff report on Case No. CCZBA 596-AT-07
- ◆ Updated Champaign County staff report on Case No. CCZBA 596-AT-07
- ◆ Kerr Avenue Project Phase I Final Report

5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

6. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

7. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

Plan Case No. 2058-SU-08: A request by Insite Incorporated (as an agent for T-Mobile Communications) for a Special Use Permit to locate nine panel antennas on an existing telecommunications tower at 1106 West Main Street in the R-5, Medium High Density Multiple Family Residential Zoning District.

Ms. Karcher presented this case to the Plan Commission. She began her presentation by giving a brief history of the subject site. The Plan Commission had previously approved a Special Use Permit request by Insite Incorporated to locate nine panel antennas on an existing telecommunications tower. Construction of the Burnham Building in Champaign will block signal transmissions of WILL from their studio on West Main Street to their transmitter located near Monticello. To resolve this issue, the University of Illinois built a second, taller telecommunications tower located on the lot immediately east of 1110 West Main Street. The University of Illinois asked T-Mobile to locate their antennas on the new tower, which requires T-Mobile to seek approval of a second Special Use Permit.

Ms. Karcher described the proposed site noting the land uses and zoning designations of the subject site as well as for the surrounding properties. She reviewed the requirements for a Special Use Permit according to Section VII-4 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance. She 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 recommends that the Plan Commission recommend approval of the proposed special use permit in Plan Case No. 2058-SU-08 to the City Council, with the condition that the installation of the antennas conform to the submitted site plan.

Mr. Ward wondered if the apartment building where the second tower is located was demolished when the University of Illinois built the second tower. Ms. Karcher replied yes, which explains why the tower site is zoned R-5, Medium High Density Multiple Family Residential Zoning District.

Ms. Stake asked if WILL is located next door to the proposed site. Ms. Karcher said yes. WILL is located immediately to the west of the proposed site of the antennae. The tower was constructed for the transmission of WILL's signal.

Ms. Stake questioned if there would be any problems with more antennas attached. Mike Howley, representative of T-Mobile, approached the Plan Commission to answer Ms. Stake's question. This proposal is no different than their previous request for a Special Use Permit, which was approved by the City Council about a year ago. The only difference is that it would be located next door on the second tower instead of the original tower.

Mr. Grosser inquired as to whether the University of Illinois is planning to tear down the original tower. Mr. Howley stated that he did not know for sure.

Mr. Fitch asked if the nine antennas would be the same size as the existing ones on the original tower. Mr. Howley explained that T-Mobile does not have any antennas on the old tower. The antennas that are on the old tower are for other carriers. T-Mobile's antennas would be about the same size though.

Ms. Stake wondered what would be in the University of Illinois's district. Mr. Myers stated that around the fringes of the University of Illinois, the City and the University encounter questions about what the protocol is development by the University. Over the years, the University of Illinois and the City of Urbana have come to agree on which development standards and permits the University will comply with, but when University staff changes, people seem to forget what the agreement was. So, the City of Urbana is looking at creating a University Zoning District that would be similar to an intergovernmental agreement for what City development standards the University has agreed to follow. The City of Urbana is not trying to dictate what types of uses can be in the middle of the campus, but development occurs along the edges of campus, the City and the University should agree on what City development standards University projects will follow.

Ms. Stake asked if the agreement would include things such as lighting and parking. Mr. Myers stated that the agreement could very well include those issues.

With no further questions from the Plan Commission for staff or the petitioner, Chair Pollock opened the hearing up to take testimony from members of the audience. With no comments or questions from members of the audience, Chair Pollock closed the public input portion of the hearing and opened the case up for Plan Commission discussion.

Mr. White moved that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 2058-SU-08 to the City Council with the recommendation for approval including the condition that the installation of the antennas conforms to the submitted Site Plan. Ms. Upah-Bant seconded the motion. Roll call was as follows:

Ms. Burris	-	Yes	Mr. Fitch	-	Yes
Mr. Grosser	-	Yes	Mr. Pollock	-	Yes
Ms. Stake	-	Yes	Ms. Upah-Bant	-	Yes
Mr. Ward	-	Yes	Mr. White	-	Yes

The motion was passed by unanimous vote. Mr. Myers noted that this case would go before the City Council on February 18, 2008.

Plan Case No. 2059-CP-08: A request by the Urbana Zoning Administrator to adopt the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan as an amendment to the 2005 Urbana Comprehensive Plan (as amended) including a Proposed Bicycle Network Map indicating future bicycle routes.

Chair Pollock opened this case and recommended that the Plan Commission forward the case to their next meeting scheduled for February 21, 2008. The Plan Commission members agreed.

Mr. Myers stated that the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan has been in the works for some months with a lot of public input and with the help of the Urbana Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission. The Plan looks great but needs a little more work before presentation to the Plan Commission.

8. NEW BUSINESS

CCZBA 596-AT-07: Request by the Champaign County Zoning Administrator to amend the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance to add a standard Special Use Permit condition regarding lighting near residential uses and districts and to add “Township Highway Maintenance Garage” to the table of uses.

Jeff Engstrom, Planner I, presented the case to the Plan Commission. A corrected copy of the County’s report was distributed as the version provided in the packet lacked several pages. The second handout is a new memo from Champaign County explaining some changes to the proposed amendment.

Mr. Engstrom talked about the first proposed change to the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance, which is as follows:

Amend Section 6.1.2.B, Standard Conditions for Special Use Permits to include the following provisions:

- a) All exterior light fixtures shall be “full-cutoff” type fixtures and shall be located to minimize glare. Full-cutoff means that the light fixture emits no light above the horizontal plane.*
- b) No lamp shall be greater than 250 watts and the County Board may require lower wattage.*
- c) Locations and numbers of fixtures shall be indicated on site plans.*
- d) The County Board may require conditions regarding the hours of operation for outdoor recreational uses and other large lighting installations.*
- e) The County Zoning Administrator shall not approve a Zoning Use Permit without the manufacturer’s documentation of full-cutoff for all outdoor lighting fixtures.*

Chair Pollock inquired as to whether the City’s ordinance has similar regulations. Mr. Engstrom explained that he would discuss this shortly.

Mr. Engstrom explained the second proposed change to the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance, which is as follows:

Amend Section 5.2, Table of Authorized Uses to include "Township Highway Maintenance Garage" as follows:

- a) *Allowed by right in County B-1, B-4, B-5, I-1 and I-2 Zoning Districts.*
- b) *Allowed by right in County AG-1, AG-2, B-2, and B-3 Zoning Districts if the use is not located within 150 feet of an existing dwelling, and is not located within the 1.5 mile ETJ of any city with a comprehensive plan, and complies with other standard conditions that may apply to all Special Use Permits. Otherwise it shall be allowed only with a Special Use Permit in County AG-1, AG-2, B-2 and B-3 districts.*
- c) *Allowed with a Special Use Permit in the County CR and all Residential zoning districts.*

Mr. Grosser asked if the Extra-Territorial Jurisdictional (ETJ) condition still be in affect. Mr. Engstrom said yes. The ETJ condition would still apply.

Mr. Engstrom discussed the schedule for the text amendment to be presented to the different bodies. He reviewed how the proposed changes would relate to the 2005 City of Urbana Comprehensive Plan goals. He explained that the City's Zoning Ordinance currently does not regulate lighting to the same level as the proposed amendment would. The City has more discretion and less standardized language. The Zoning Ordinance does specify some minimum lighting levels for certain districts. City staff realizes that this is a shortfall in the City's Zoning Ordinance, and City staff is currently working on a text amendment to address this and to make uniform lighting standards for all developments. The text amendment should be presented to the Plan Commission sometime in the spring.

Mr. Engstrom read the options of the Plan Commission and presented staff's recommendation, which is as follows:

Staff recommends that the Plan Commission forward this case to the City Council with a recommendation to defeat a resolution of protest for the proposed text amendment based upon the findings presented in the written staff report.

Ms. Stake referred to No. 2 of the Summary of Staff Findings, which reads as such, "*The proposed zoning ordinance text amendment is generally consistent with the City of Urbana's 2005 Comprehensive Plan's goals and objections.*" She inquired how the proposed text amendment is inconsistent with the City's comprehensive plan. Mr. Engstrom stated that this is standard language. The proposed text amendment is consistent with the 2005 Comprehensive Plan's goals and objections.

Mr. White remarked that he is pleased to see the City reviewing the lighting standards. It has been an issue for a long time.

Chair Pollock agreed. He commented that whenever a development is proposed near residential areas, then lighting is generally an issue.

Mr. Ward stated that he just came back from Tucson, Arizona. Tucson has been very diligent in controlling light pollution. It is so noticeable. You can actually see stars while standing in the middle of the city. Therefore, he also encourages City staff to review and propose changes to the existing lighting standards in the City’s Zoning Ordinance.

With no further questions, Chair Pollock opened the hearing up to take input from the audience. No one from the audience spoke, so Chair Pollock closed the public input portion of the hearing and opened the hearing up for Plan Commission discussion.

Mr. Ward moved that the Plan Commission forward Case No. CCZBA 596-AT-07 to the City Council with a recommendation to defeat a resolution of protest. Ms. Stake seconded the motion. Roll call was as follows:

Ms. Burris	-	Yes	Mr. Fitch	-	Yes
Mr. Grosser	-	Yes	Mr. Pollock	-	Yes
Ms. Stake	-	Yes	Ms. Upah-Bant	-	Yes
Mr. Ward	-	Yes	Mr. White	-	Yes

The motion was passed by unanimous vote. Mr. Myers stated that this case would be forwarded to City Council on February 18, 2008.

9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There was none.

10. STAFF REPORT

Mr. Engstrom gave an update on the Kerr Avenue Project Phase I Final Report. This is the Kerr Avenue model sustainable community project. With the completion of this report, it brings Phase I of the project to an end. This project stemmed from a City Council goal to create a national model neighborhood that is affordable and consumes 10% of standard energy consumption.

The first phase began in 2006, and the goal was to issue a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the design concepts to see what kind of development would be possible for the Kerr Avenue site. After reviewing the designs, the City selected FARR Associates to complete the design. They came down along with some experts for a two-day charette in May of 2007. During the design charette, FARR Associates came up with a couple of designs, which the City really liked.

Both designs feature a single road through the site. Both include a variety of housing types. They both a narrow right-of-way and minimized storm water runoff with permeable paving,

bioswells and natural detention areas. Both designs have about 46 to 48 dwelling units, which are considered high density for 3.2 acres. And both feature shared recreation space and community gardens.

The differences between the two plans are that Plan B has a slightly longer road because it runs down the east side and connects through to Crystal View Townhome site. Although Plan B appears to be a little more costly, it would require less grading work. Overall, both developments would cost about the same. Plan B is the site plan that has been endorsed by the City Council when City staff gave a presentation to them early this week.

Chapter IV of the report provides architectural studies. This reviews the types of housing that might be suitable for the project's development. The designs are preliminary.

Chapter V provides energy analysis using a computer model of how energy could be saved using different housing types and other factors. The computer model concluded that homes can conserve up to 27% of standard energy consumption using these designs. Using the Eco-Passivhaus, the straw-bale house, depending on how efficient the appliances are, which direction the house faces and whether it is a duplex or not, FARR Associates believes that 35% to 50% energy savings are possible. They even say that they can get up to 75% if they use more energy efficient techniques such as solar hot water heaters and district geo-thermal heating.

The end of the report is final recommendations. Many of these are going directly into the RFP for Phase II. Phase II will be the actual final design, construction of the homes and selling them. One of the things that they need to look at is the financial involvement. The City will probably need to invest a little more to ensure that the homes are affordable and have a high level of energy efficiency. Another recommendation was to require the LEED-ND certification standard, and FARR Associates feels that this project might possibly qualify for Gold certification which is the highest level.

One of the most important recommendations is to embrace diverse construction methods. The idea is to make the whole neighborhood a showcase to show how the different technologies look and perform.

So, these are the recommendations that are going into the RFP for Phase II, which City staff is currently working on. It should be ready by the end of February. Hopefully, by this summer, they will have a developer on board.

Chair Pollock inquired as to where along the way will the City decide whether they want to go with Plan A or Plan B. Mr. Engstrom replied that the City Council has endorsed Plan B. City staff looks at it like a menu, where we can take some things from Plan A and add it to Plan B or vice-versa.

Ms. Upah-Bant asked if the plans will ever come before the Plan Commission. Mr. Engstrom said yes. It's anticipated the project will come through the Plan Commission for review as a Planned Unit Development.

Chair Pollock asked if there were multiple property owners. Mr. Engstrom replied that the property is all owned by the City of Urbana.

Chair Pollock inquired as to whether there are any local subsidies that would help pay for the project. Mr. Engstrom explained that it is a Grants Management project. Grants Management funded the first study using Federal funds, and they are looking to allocate some funds in their next Annual Action Plan to possibly help with infrastructure.

Mr. Grosser asked for clarification in that the developer would invest their funds to construct the homes and would get the land for free. Mr. Engstrom responded yes. The City would give the developer the land if they can build energy efficient homes that meet the affordability requirements, and depending on how efficient the units are, the City may give an additional subsidy.

Chair Pollock questioned if City staff is looking for a developer to do the entire project or are they planning to parcel it out. Mr. Engstrom stated that this is something that they are still working on. The model with having a showcase would require several different builders, but City staff was thinking that they could have a master developer to develop the site and contract out.

Ms. Stake wondered how much the land is worth. Mr. Engstrom responded by saying that the City acquired the land for at least \$100,000.

Ms. Stake asked if it is possible to do anything with older homes to have solar hot water. Mr. Engstrom said yes. It's possible for homeowners to do so, but there are not any incentives offered at this moment.

Mr. Grosser inquired as to the definition of "affordable". Mr. Engstrom replied that for this project, since the land was acquired with HOME funds, the affordability would have to be 80% of the area median family income, which equals about \$50,000 for a family of four.

Chair Pollock asked if Mr. Engstrom had any idea of when the Planned Unit Development would come back before the Plan Commission. Mr. Engstrom said that they will hopefully select a developer this summer. He is not sure how long it will take after that.

Mr. Fitch pointed out that on Page 15, there is some sample pricing information ranging from \$115,000 up to \$157,000. Mr. Engstrom noted that these are the ranges that would be considered affordable and considered to have descent demand in the area. So, \$157,000 would be the upper range of affordable.

Next, Mr. Myers reported on the following topics:

Upcoming Cases:

- ◆ Hazard Mitigation Plan Amendment will be coming before the Committee of the Whole at their February 11th meeting. The City currently has a Hazard Mitigation Plan that was adopted in 2005, and it is an element of the Comprehensive Plan. Although it is up-to-date and is an excellent resource, Champaign County has

received a grant from the State of Illinois to write a Hazard Mitigation Plan, and other jurisdictions in Champaign County will be participating as well. So, this is an opportunity for the City of Urbana to be part of that, and there are several benefits for doing so, not only in terms of coordination and making sure that Urbana's interests are taken into account, but it would also help qualify local jurisdictions for Federal disaster monies. Since we will need to update Urbana's Hazard Mitigation Plan in 2010 anyway, it seems like a good opportunity to participate.

- ◆ Chatham Annexation Agreement Resolution would support changing the Illinois Municipal Code concerning annexation agreements. In 2005, the Illinois Supreme Court decided upon a case regarding an annexation agreement having to do with the Village of Chatham. Prior to this case, if a City had an annexation agreement and the property was not annexed, the property fell under the County's jurisdiction. Once annexed, the property would then fall under the City's jurisdiction. This is no longer the case. Due to this Illinois Supreme Court case, once a municipality signs an annexation agreement, then the development jurisdiction for that property falls under the City. As far as the City of Urbana, we may have annexation agreements with about 20 properties outside of the City that are contiguous or almost contiguous. There are some cities that have annexation agreements with properties that may be one to three miles away. He gave some examples of why the resolution would be beneficial. One of these benefits is that it would limit how far out a city can enter an annexation agreement with a property owner. This would help limit the exposure the City of Urbana has to other municipalities, including ones miles away, approving development on the City's borders using an annexation agreement. The proposed resolution will be reviewed by the Committee of the Whole at their meeting on February 11.

11. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 8:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Myers, AICP
Secretary, Urbana Plan Commission