

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING

URBANA PLAN COMMISSION

APPROVED

DATE: March 20, 2008

TIME: 7:30 P.M.

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tyler Fitch, Ben Grosser, Lew Hopkins, Bernadine Stake, James Ward

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Jane Burris, Michael Pollock, Marilyn Upah-Bant, Don White

STAFF PRESENT: Robert Myers, Planning Manager; Teri Andel, Planning Secretary; Jennifer Selby, Civil Engineer

OTHERS PRESENT: Rita Black, Bjorg Holte, Susan Taylor, Ruth Wyman

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.

In the absence of Michael Pollock, Chairperson for the Plan Commission, Mr. Grosser moved that Mr. Ward serve as Acting Chairperson. Ms. Stake seconded the motion. The Plan Commission agreed by unanimous voice vote.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

There were none.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Stake moved to approve the minutes from the March 6, 2008 meeting as presented. Mr. Grosser seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

- ◆ Urbana Bicycle Plan Implementation Matrix
- ◆ Updated Staff Report for Plan Case No. 2059-CP-08 dated February 21, 2008

5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

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.

Robert Myers, Planning Manager, presented an update to the City staff report to the Plan Commission. He said that the written staff report, which he handed out prior to the start of the meeting, reiterated what was provided verbally at the previous Plan Commission meeting and highlighted some of the important aspects of the proposed plan.

Public input has been an integral part of the process in creating the proposed plan including creating a Steering Committee, holding a public workshop in May 2007, and holding a follow-up public workshop in December 2007. It also included having a League of Illinois Bicyclist representative on the consultant's team, reviewing the proposed plan with the City of Urbana's Bicyclist and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, conducting an online bike route survey, coordinating with the City of Champaign and the University of Illinois concerning connecting to bicycle routes in their respective jurisdictions, and consulting with other parties such as the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) and members of the League of Illinois Bicyclists.

He noted some of the most salient parts of the plan to review are Figure 8.1: Recommended Bicycle Network and Figures 9.1, 9.2, and 9.3, which show the Bicycle Network Improvements over time.

He stated that the Comprehensive Plan clearly expresses an overall desire that bicycling be a viable form of transportation in the City of Urbana; however, it does not really offer any details on how it can or should be achieved. The proposed Urbana Bicycle Master Plan provides clear and specific means to achieve a future bikeway system.

The Bicycle Network Recommendations were based on the following:

- ◆ Inventory of existing bicycle facilities and roadway characteristics;
- ◆ Existing policies and plans for proposed bikeways;
- ◆ Public input from bicyclists and others on the most desirable routes;
- ◆ Input from public agencies, boards and commissions, including the Urbana Bicyclist and Pedestrian Advisory Committee;
- ◆ Connecting activity centers, major destinations, and neighborhoods;
- ◆ Bicycle Level of Service ratings of A, B, or C for "casual adult cyclists";
- ◆ Spacing of bikeways from 0.5 to 1.0 miles apart;
- ◆ Transportation standards and guidelines which incorporates safety standards.

He referred to Table 9.3: Implementation Matrix by Timeframe on Page 9-16 of the proposed plan. The table divides development of the bicycle network into 0-5 years, 6-10 years and 10+ years. He stated that a lot of the proposed improvements are just repainting of the existing streets. He handed out copies of the "Urbana Bicycle Plan Implementation Matrix", which Jennifer Selby, Civil Engineer for the City of Urbana's Public Works Department created.

In terms of costs, he noted that the two most expensive improvements shown in Table 9.3 are building a sidepath along Route 45/Cunningham Avenue from the Village of Rantoul to the future Olympian Drive (\$4.2 million) and the adding of a sidepath along High Cross Road from Curtis Road to the Village of Philo (\$1.7 million). These are not only in the 10+ year time frame but also outside the City and its future planning area.

In terms of funding, the City of Urbana has been quite successful in the last two years for acquiring grants for bikeways. The City received a \$900,000 grant for Goodwin Avenue and a \$500,000 grant for High Cross Road.

Mr. Myers, then, asked Ms. Selby to talk more about the funding for the proposed improvements.

Ms. Selby approached the Plan Commission to talk more about the handout. She pointed out that \$2,355,904 of the proposed improvements have already been identified in the Capital Improvement Fund (CIP) as part of funded projected.

She noted that the table in the handout is different than the tables in the proposed plan. The handout rearranges the table to show only the City of Urbana and the University of Illinois' projects. Page 2 shows that only \$265,001 of bikeway projects in the next five years haven't been earmarked for funding as part of the Capital Improvements Plan.

She said that City staff is going to apply for a grant for the Main Street project, which will run from Cedar to Scottswood. The grant would be for approximately \$1.5 million. Main Street already has funding set aside, so if the City receives the \$1.5 million grant, then it will be used towards the \$265,001. She pointed out that the majority of the \$265,001 improvements are for bike routes (share the road).

The total funding needed to implement the 6-10 year plan is \$228,560, of which \$2,812 has already been funded. This brings the total cost of the improvements that still need to be funded for the 0-10 year plan to \$493,560. City staff will be applying for grants to cover this amount.

Ms. Selby mentioned that the improvements listed in the 10+ year plan include roads that are not currently in the City of Urbana limits or roads that do not currently even exist yet. Therefore, she does not want the Plan Commission to focus on the 10+ year plan, because it appears to be rather costly and gives the impression that we still need to come up with \$6,036,249. When, in fact, no one knows when the roads will be built or brought into the City, and these improvements are things that would normally be associated with development projects anyway. For example, when building Olympian Drive, the sidewalks or shared use paths would be incorporated, just as drainage, etc. would be.

Mr. Fitch said that he is the Plan Commissioner who raised the question about funding at their previous meeting. He stated that the handout was very helpful. He is glad to see that a lot of the funding has already been identified.

He clarified that at the previous meeting, he meant to say that in general, it is clear that someone is going to have to raise their taxes. He did not mean to imply that it would be the City of

Urbana. Clearly, the Urbana Park District's portions of the proposed plan are contingent on them having the necessary resources.

Mr. Myers noted that these numbers will change as the years go by. The matrix is intended to give an order of relative costs. It is not intended to state specifically to the dollar how much the projects would cost. Ms. Selby added that the treatments listed as lanes, the amount shows the cost of the paint. So while they resurface say Philo Road from Pennsylvania to Colorado Avenue, the \$4,500 listed is just the cost of the paint. When we resurface a project, we have to paint it anyway. Therefore, the amount of cost would be less, because there would be some element of stripping anyway.

Mr. Grosser felt that the handout is very helpful and should be helpful to the City Council as well. He noticed an error on the final table. It shows it as being for the 6-10 year plan, but Ms. Selby had referred to it as being the 10+ year plan. Ms. Selby clarified that it should say 10+ year plan.

Mr. Grosser wondered if the City was planning to redo Race Street between Meadowbrook and Curtis Road. Rita Black, of Champaign County Regional Planning, answered that it is just a collection street. It is part of the Greenways and Trails Plan.

Mr. Grosser asked if all of the sidepaths in the 10+ year plan, which are the bulk of the costs, are on streets that are already built and not going to be changed in anyway. Ms. Selby reviewed each improvement listed under the 10+ year plan noting whether or not each would require road improvements and the reason why each is on the 10+ year plan. Mr. Grosser stated that he just wanted to get a sense of how much money the City is hoping would come along for roads that are not going to get improved to build sidepaths next to them. It appears there are only two. Ms. Selby pointed out that the more bike paths the City gets in place, the better our chance is of getting grants to make the connections.

Mr. Fitch wondered if there would be a sidepath along University Avenue. Ms. Selby replied that it would be the rail trail.

Mr. Grosser expressed a concern about the issue with the trail going or not going through the Urbana High School and Middle School campuses. In looking at the plan, it appears that there will be a big hole in the middle of the bike network without this connection. How do we fix this issue?

Mr. Myers responded that they had looked at extending it through the High School and Middle School campuses, but after further inquiry with the school district, it is not workable. It is not just a policy question, but also a physical barrier, because the Urbana School District has plans to build across where the bike path would go. So instead of a through path, bikeways will be leading to and from a major traffic generator – the school.

Mr. Grosser wondered if City staff had considered removing parking on Race Street in this stretch. Ms. Selby explained that even with the removal of parking, the street would not be wide enough for bike lanes. They also use Race Street to stack buses. She did not know what the Urbana School District had planned.

Mr. Grosser recalled talking about developers being held responsible to provide bike path connections and facilities in future developments at the previous Plan Commission meeting. Elizabeth Tyler wrote in a memo responding to the concerns and questions of the Plan Commission that a simple amendment to the Urbana Subdivision and Land Development Code could enforce this idea. He asked if the simple amendment would ensure connectivity. Mr. Myers answered that the first step is to adopt the proposed plan as an element of the 2005 Comprehensive Plan. In the Subdivision and Land Development Code there currently are various places where it requires developments to comply with the Urbana Comprehensive Plan, including any successive amendments. The other thing is that the proposed plan has some segments that new development would have to contribute towards. Finally, most development along the fringes of the City of Urbana is done through annexation agreements. Annexation agreements spell out which parties are responsible for certain improvements. This would include bikeways.

Mr. Grosser inquired as to whether there is language in the Subdivision and Land Development Code that states that future developed streets should connect to existing streets. Mr. Myers said yes. He mentioned that City staff could also add an additional section or line in the Subdivision Regulations to strengthen the language further, and that could take place following approval of the Bike Plan. We also have Appendix D, the Mobility Map, in the Comprehensive Plan that is a skeletal framework for how the City of Urbana will grow. It is a blueprint for the major arterial and collector streets.

Mr. Grosser questioned whether the Traffic Commission has reviewed the proposed bike plan at all? Ms. Selby answered by saying that Joe Smith, Senior Civil Engineer, serves on the Traffic Commission, and has not looked at it. Council member, Dennis Roberts, serves on the Traffic Commission, and she assumes he has reviewed it as the rest of the Council members have. They sent a copy to Mike Bily, Chief of Police, who is the other member of the Traffic Commission. In addition, they sent a copy to the Fire Department, who responded and said that they do not have any problems with the proposed plan.

Mr. Grosser asked who in the City staff deals with traffic flow. Ms. Selby replied that would be Mr. Smith. She does not believe that he has read the entire plan. She stated that the Traffic Commission is scheduled to meet on Tuesday, March 25, 2008, and City staff plans to discuss the removal of parking on Main Street, so they can begin applying for the grant to cover those improvements.

She mentioned that when there is a road diet, the Public Works Department has software that they can use to tell them whether the street will fail or not. She noted that they plan to do this with each of these projects listed in the matrix tables.

Ms. Stake commented that one thing that was discussed is requiring complete streets for all new developments. Mr. Myers responded that we need to approach complete streets smartly in terms of what is realistic about what roadways could accommodate complete streets. We are looking at a network where the facilities are spaced a half mile to a mile apart. So, if we have a blanket requirement that every new street become a complete street, bikeway segments might be provided outside the proposed network. The other thing is that we need to have complete streets installed where it is realistic to do so, where there is enough width for the bikeways and for pedestrian paths or whatever those additional facilities may be. Acting Chairperson Ward added

that complete streets goes far beyond simply bicycles. Therefore, it would not be appropriate for a bicycle ordinance to go beyond the scope of the plan. It needs to be a more comprehensive approach to planning.

Ms. Stake commented that maybe it should not be part of the proposed plan. Maybe it should be in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Fitch said that he bikes through the Urbana High School and Middle School campuses all of the time. He understands that Vine Street is too busy, especially in the morning and when school lets out in the afternoon. The Washington Street/Vine Street four-way stop is very busy as well, and it is a problematic intersection. Although it is beyond the scope of the proposed plan to talk about whether the stop signs will be sufficient, he feels it should be on someone's radar screen to at least monitor the intersection. Acting Chairperson Ward commented that he feels that the Plan Commission has identified this particular area of the City as one that needs some consideration in terms of connectivity of bike paths. He understood the school also being concerned about school safety with a thoroughfare running through their campus, especially if they change it to a closed-campus. He is willing to defer to the Urbana School District's interest at this particular point.

With no further questions for City staff, Acting Chairperson Ward opened the public hearing up to gather input from the audience.

Bjorg Holte, of 1001 North High Cross Road, asked who the Zoning Administrator is. Mr. Myers replied that the City of Urbana's Zoning Administrator is Elizabeth Tyler. Ms. Tyler is also the Director of Community Development Services Department.

Ms. Holte read the paragraph from the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan Comments on Page 3, which states as follows:

Comment: Regarding High Cross Road north of I-74, [we] agree that it is important to preserve the natural setting of the roadway, which was expressed in the Urbana Comprehensive Plan 2005 and the High Cross Road Corridor Study after significant public input. In the Urbana Bike Plan there is a statement about adding bike lanes on the bridge if it is rebuilt. That statement could cause confusion that we recommend rebuilding the bridge or even widening the roadway or opening up High Cross Road to more cars north of I-74. I suggest to avoid this confusion we add a statement such as "Please refer to the Urbana Comprehensive Plan 2005 or the High Cross Road Corridor Study for information about retaining the rural, natural setting of High Cross Road north of I-74". [The Plan Commissioner] also had the suggestion of considering a side-path on that stretch in the future.

She also read the following paragraph from the same page:

The following text will be added to Section 8.1.26 (page 8-21) of the Bicycle Master Plan:

At the first public workshop for the Bike Master Plan process, attendees were broken up into groups geographically. There were two groups that represented Northeast Urbana – an area defined as North of I-74 east of Cunningham, PLUS Beringer Commons & Edgewood (east of University Ave. spur to I-74 and north of University Ave.). Both groups identified the I-74 overpass as an obstacle to safe bicycling on High Cross Road (See A1-2). Group 2b marked “Safe passage over interstate” on their group map (See A1-4). Group 2b also prioritized the overpass of High Cross Road over I-74 as their second prioritized issue (See A1-5). The recommendation to provide a safe crossing of High Cross Road over I-74 upon any future bridge reconstruction project is consistent with the public comment received. It is also consistent with the IL 130/High Cross Road Corridor Plan.

She commented that she participated in the IL 130/High Cross Road Corridor Plan Study. She understood that north of Route 150, High Cross Road is to stay as is and not to be developed or widened. So, she did not feel that the last paragraph that she read is what the public attending the study workshops had in mind. She feels that the first paragraph more expresses their goal. Therefore, she suggested that the Plan Commission delete the last paragraph and to add the first paragraph read.

Acting Chairperson Ward remarked that the proposed comments are a proposal for an addition to the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan. The Master Plan already is fairly clear on what happens north of Interstate 74 on High Cross Road. The proposed comments do not change anything. They are merely an addendum.

Ms. Holte referred to Page 8-21 of the proposed Urbana Bicycle Master Plan. Under 8.1.26 High Cross Road (IL 130), the third bullet point states, “*Over Interstate 74: Provide a safe crossing of I-74 upon any future bridge reconstruction project. Coordinate with IDOT.*” She did not know whether this appeared in either the 2005 Comprehensive Plan or the IL 130/High Cross Road Corridor Plan. So, does this mean that the City is planning to change these two documents regarding this issue? Acting Chairperson Ward said no. There are no plans to change the bridge at this point. If at some point in the future, there is a plan to change the bridge, then it should be made safe for bicyclists.

Ms. Holte wondered if the change would be made part of the Comprehensive Plan. Acting Chairperson Ward said no. No one is suggesting that change now. At this point, there are no plans to change the bridge. If some future group a year from now, 10 years from now, or 20 years from now decides to change the bridge, the City is only recommending that the new bridge be made bicycle safe.

With no further comments, Acting Chairperson Ward closed the public input portion of the hearing. He, then, opened the hearing up for any questions, discussions, and/or motions by the Plan Commission on this particular case.

Ms. Stake agreed with Ms. Holte in that the High Cross problem has been with us for a long time. People worked very hard when the City developed the 2005 Comprehensive Plan to make sure that the area on north High Cross Road would be protected.

She referred to Section 21-3 Scope on Page 2 of the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan Comments handout. It states as follows:

Section 21-3 Scope.

- (C) *The requirements, standards and specifications of this chapter do not relieve the developer of compliance with any other applicable requirements which regulate land development, including but not limited to:*
- (1) *The Urbana Official Comprehensive Plan, 1982, as may be amended;*

She suggested changing “1982” to “2005”, since we recently updated the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Myers explained that this is the actual wording in the Subdivision and Land Development Code. City staff is currently working on updating the Subdivision and Land Development Code to incorporate changes and updated references such as this.

Acting Chairperson Ward inquired if according to the statute, the 2005 Comprehensive Plan is an amendment to the 1982 Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Stake expressed that she did not understand how the Official Comprehensive Plan could be 1982. Mr. Myers explained that this was the date of the Comprehensive Plan in place at the time when the Subdivision and Land Development Code Ordinance was last adopted. Ms. Stake wondered about the 2005 Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Myers pointed out that Section 21-3 Scope does say “*as may be amended*”. This refers to later changes in the Comprehensive Plan, so it would take into consideration the 2005 Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Stake expressed her concern about the wording in the last paragraph that Ms. Holte had read earlier. The bridge reconstruction should not be the project. It should talk about putting in a sidepath. The wording makes it look like they are planning to expand the bridge to more lanes. More lanes mean more traffic, and then, with more traffic come more problems with trying to preserve the natural setting of High Cross Road. Ms. Black clarified that they are not proposing bike lanes at all on this particular segment of the roadway. They are proposing that bicyclists and motor vehicles share the road. They are also not proposing any additional bicycle facility in the area. The idea of improving the bridge, if ever, is to widen it to meet the current standards. Right now, each lane measures 10 to 11 feet in width. The regular width of a lane should be 11 feet to be safe for any traffic to cross over the bridge.

Ms. Black noted that they do not want to add a sidepath, because it would only be problematic for the bicycle traffic to merge back onto the shared roadway. If they provide a sidepath over the bridge, then they would need to provide a sidepath the entire length of IL Route 130/High Cross Road segment to the north. They do not want this. Ms. Stake asked why not. Ms. Black explained the reason is because there is no right-of-way available to provide for a sidepath. There are houses located near the roadway that would not allow them to use the right-of-way for sidepaths.

Ms. Stake commented that if they wanted to widen the road, then they would find a way to do it. Why should it be different for sidepaths? Bicycles are just as important as cars. So, a sidepath in this nice historic area would be a good idea. Acting Chairperson Ward clarified that Ms.

Black was trying to say that there is not sufficient right-of-way. Ms. Black added that it might be a good idea, but it would be really expensive to get the right-of-way to provide for a sidepath. In order to keep the area low volume of traffic, they do not want to widen the road. Low volume of traffic hopefully means it will be easier and safer for bicycles and vehicles to share the road. Acting Chairperson Ward remarked that obtaining the right-of-ways would also involve infringe upon property owners' property.

Ms. Black said that this is why it is not viable to have sidepaths over the bridge. It would be really difficult for bicyclists to reconnect to the shared roadway, and it would be confusing to drivers as well. So, they are proposing that, if ever the bridge is reconstructed, that they consider widening the lanes a little and leave it as a shared path. Mr. Myers stated that a shared road means putting up signs saying that bicycles and motor vehicles share the same lanes.

Mr. Fitch said that they could strike the language. Or is the purpose to indicate that they only plan to share the road until or unless some unforeseen reconstruction of the bridge happens? Acting Chairperson Ward mentioned that if you read this carefully, the Comments handout is a reporting of what took place at one of the study workshops. It is not a policy statement. Ms. Stake argued that it will be if it is approved. Mr. Ward does not feel that there is a policy statement in the paragraph. The purpose of the paragraph being included in the proposed Bicycle Master Plan he assumed would be to show the people that attended the study workshop that their comments were heard. He has no problem with taking the paragraph out, because he feels it does nothing either positively or negatively. Mr. Fitch agreed.

Mr. Hopkins pointed out that on Page 8-21 of the proposed Urbana Bicycle Master Plan, where the paragraph would be inserted, there is a policy statement. It states as such, "*Provide a safe crossing of I-74 upon any future bridge reconstruction project. Coordinate with IDOT*". He understands Ms. Stake's and Ms. Holte's concern, but bridges do not last forever. Bridges get reconstructed even to be exactly what they were before. Therefore, it does seem to him to be appropriate to have it included in the proposed plan to have it as a reminder that this area is a high demand bicycle point and a bottleneck. When we rebuild the bridge, we should redesign it to be consistent with the type of bicycle path being used, which at the moment is a shared path.

He feels that the Plan Commission is arguing more about what the policy statement is rather than the last paragraph being added. He feels that the policy statement should be kept in, and he would be happy putting the additional paragraph in as well, because it is explanatory and does give feedback to the public participants that they are being listened to. It also might help explain why the policy statement is included in the plan, since we do not have similar statements for every single road and bridge reconstruction in the City. Mr. Fitch agreed and feels that the statement should be left alone.

Mr. Ward pointed out that at the moment, there has been no motion made to approve the proposed plan. Therefore, there is nothing to amend. If there was a motion and someone wanted to propose an amendment, then this might be the way to expedite this particular issue. Mr. Hopkins asked if the current status of what they would vote on if someone made a motion to recommend this case to the City Council would include the underline paragraphs in the Comments handout. Acting Chairperson Ward said yes.

Mr. Grosser moved that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 2059-CP-08 to the City Council with a recommendation of approval with the specific changes underlined in the addendum titled "Urbana Bicycle Master Plan Comments" and dated March 14, 2008. Mr. Fitch seconded the motion.

Mr. Grosser spoke about his motion. He strongly agrees with Mr. Hopkins. He feels that the statement listed on Page 8-21 in the proposed plan about the bridge is simply saying that when the bridge is reconstructed, we should make sure that it is safe and consistent with the shared path that leads to and away from the bridge.

Ms. Stake moved to amend the motion to add the March 1, 2008 comment to the proposed plan and remove the suggested underlined text in the last paragraph on Page 3 of the handout. With no second, the motion to amend died.

Ms. Stake moved to amend the motion to add the March 1, 2008 comment to the proposed plan. With no second, the motion to amend died.

Mr. Grosser feels that the City Traffic Engineer should be asked to review the proposed plan and give approval. Mr. Ward asked if it was on the agenda to discuss the proposed plan at the next Traffic Commission meeting. Ms. Selby said no. They were planning on discussing the removal of parking on Main Street to allow room for bike paths.

Roll call on the motion was as follows:

Mr. Fitch	-	Yes	Mr. Grosser	-	Yes
Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes	Ms. Stake	-	No
Mr. Ward	-	Yes			

The motion was approved by a vote of 4 ayes to 1 nay.

Mr. Myers noted that this case will go before the City Council on April 7, 2008. City Council has already had a detailed briefing on the proposed plan already at a previous Committee of the Whole meeting.

6. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

7. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

8. NEW BUSINESS

There was none.

9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There was none.

10. STAFF REPORT

Mr. Myers, Planning Manager, reported on the following topics:

- ◆ Major Variance request by the Vermilion Development, Inc. to allow a setback encroachment will go before the City Council on March 24, 2008. They are proposing a three-story commercial building with retail on the first and offices on the second and third floors at the southwest corner of Lincoln and University Avenues.
- ◆ Major Variance request by the Atkins Group to allow an LED sign at The Pines will go before the City Council on March 24, 2008. They are proposing one shopping center sign with a message board that changes every ten seconds in lieu of having other signs for each store/tenant.
- ◆ 2008 Official Zoning Map Annual Review will go before the City Council on March 24, 2008.
- ◆ A budget amendment for the University Avenue Corridor Study will go before the City Council on March 24, 2008. This is a corridor project between Cunningham Avenue and Downtown Champaign along University Avenue. It concerns both what should happen within the right-of-way and also development potential/opportunities for selected areas within the corridor.
- ◆ A Historic Preservation Landmark Application for the Historic Lincoln Hotel has been submitted and will be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission on April 2, 2008.
- ◆ Menards will be submitting a formal submission of plans and an annexation agreement for review and approval.

11. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 8:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Myers, AICP
Secretary, Urbana Plan Commission