

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING

URBANA PLAN COMMISSION

APPROVED

DATE: January 22, 2009

TIME: 7:30 P.M.

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

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

MEMBERS EXCUSED: There were none.

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Tom Falender, Laura Huth, Ken and Rita Mathis, Michael Mervis, James Picillo, Neil Richardson, Susan Taylor, Ted Vacketta

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

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:29 p.m., the roll call was taken, and a quorum was declared present with all members present.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

City staff requested that Plan Case No. 2081-T-08 regarding lighting standards be forwarded to the February 5, 2009 Plan Commission meeting. With no objections from the Plan Commission members, the request was approved.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. White moved to approve the minutes of the January 8, 2009 meeting as presented. Ms. Stake seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

- ✚ Zoning Ordinance – 2008 Republication
- ✚ Boneyard Creek Master Plan
- ✚ Packet of Information submitted by Mervis Industries for Plan Case No. 2093-SU-08
- ✚ Revised Site Plan for Plan Case No. 2093-SU-08

5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

6. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

7. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

Plan Case No. 2081-T-08: Amend the Urbana Zoning Ordinance by adding Section VI-8, Outdoor Lighting Standards.

This case was forwarded to the February 5, 2009 Plan Commission meeting.

Plan Case No. 2093-SU-08: A request by Mervis Industries for a Special Use Permit to establish a Recycling Center at 3008 North Cunningham Avenue in the City's IN, Industrial Zoning District.

Jeff Engstrom, Planner I, presented this case to the Plan Commission. He gave a brief introduction and presented background information on the proposed site. He described the site and the surrounding properties noting their current land uses and existing zoning. He discussed how the proposed use relates to the Future Land Use Map designation of "Regional Business" and how it relates to the 2005 Comprehensive Plan. He further discussed the proposed recycling center noting the hours of operation, the layout of the proposed site, landscaping and storm water runoff plans. He reviewed the requirements of a Special Use Permit according to Section VII-4 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance. He read the options of the Plan Commission and presented City staff's recommendation, which was as follows:

Staff recommended that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case 2093-SU-08 to the Urbana City Council with a recommendation for approval subject to the following conditions:

1. *The layout and operation shall conform to the Site Plan, as shown in Exhibit D.*
2. *An engineered Stormwater Management Plan and an Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan shall be prepared and implemented consistent with the requirements of the Urbana Subdivision and Land Development Code.*
3. *The site shall conform to the requirements for screening and landscaping in Article VI of the Zoning Ordinance.*

Mr. Engstrom noted a revised landscape plan which he distributed to Plan Commission members. He then continued with the final two recommended conditions.

4. *Final traffic layouts shall be subject to the approval of the Illinois Department of Transportation.*
5. *All runoff, noise levels, odors, dust or other emissions shall meet standards set forth by the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency.*

With no questions for City staff, Chair Pollock opened the hearing up for public input and testimony.

Laura Huth, Do Good Consulting, handed out a packet of information regarding Mervis Industries. She stated that she is the consultant for Mervis Industries. They will present a project called Advantage Recycling. She introduced Mervis Industries representatives: Michael Mervis, a fourth-generation operator; Tom Falender, Director of Marketing and Customer Relations; Jim Picillo, Director of Operations; and Ted Vacketta, Engineering and Operations. She gave a brief introduction about Advantage Recycling, a division of Mervis Industries, which is proposing a regional recycling facility. She believes this is a perfect project for the City of Urbana and the “green image” that Urbana has and wants to continue to project. She mentioned that the following presentation was shown to the City of Urbana’s Sustainability Advisory Committee about two weeks ago. Mervis also held a neighborhood meeting with nearby residents and met with Rudy and Tom Frasca, the owner and operator of Frasca Airfield.

Mr. Mervis discussed the following topics in a PowerPoint presentation:

- ◆ History of Business
- ◆ Business’ Reputation
- ◆ Recycling: Then & Now
- ◆ Impact

Mr. Falender discussed the following topics:

- ◆ Urbana Project
- ◆ Advantage Recycling
- ◆ Advantage Customers
- ◆ Materials Collected

Mr. Picillo continued the presentation by discussing the following topics:

- ◆ Inside an Advantage Facility
- ◆ Operations: How it Works
- ◆ Employment at Advantage
- ◆ ISO 9001:2000 Quality Management

Ms. Huth talked about the following topics:

- ◆ Advantages of the proposed Advantage Recycling Center
- ◆ Relationship to Urbana's Curbside Program

Mr. Vacketta discussed the following topics:

- ◆ Details of the proposed site and of the project
- ◆ Hours of Operation
- ◆ Estimated Traffic Counts
- ◆ Odor, Noise & Dust (*He handed out some steel slag to the Plan Commission members.*)
- ◆ Signage
- ◆ Exterior Lighting
- ◆ Security

Ms. Huth discussed the landscape plan. She felt that this project could be described as "exceptional." This project will far exceed minimum standards. It is a ten acre site with about five of the acres being developed. They plan to leave the remaining five acres as natural open area. They plan to partner with local conservation organizations as well as with other businesses to put in landscaped wide buffers on all four sides of the property. They would like to have some educational signage and some walking paths. She showed a rendering of what they intend the facility and grounds to appear following development. She commented that they plan to salvage as many of the perimeter trees as possible in addition to supplement it with some other plantings.

Ms. Stake asked why it is so important to have all of the security that Mervis Industries is planning for the proposed development. Mr. Mervis replied that when they talk about taking photo IDs and snapshots of everything that comes across their scales, rather than protecting something or someone they are just trying to meet or exceed the local laws. This type of security is deterrence to theft and to help catch thieves who might steal, for instance, a coil from people's air conditioners or the copper downspouts from churches. In terms of security in the evenings, with any site you would want to have a little lighting on the site to make sure that the site remains safe and secure.

Ms. Stake inquired about separation of materials at the source versus separating the materials at the recycling facility. Mr. Mervis stated that it is much more efficient to separate materials at the source. If they allow materials to be brought to the site co-mingled, then they would have to expend energy and resources to separate the materials out again.

Ms. Stake asked if Urbana wanted to insist that all of their materials were separated at the source, then could they be taken to the proposed site and paid for. Mr. Mervis commented that Mervis Industries would like to work with the local community recycling agencies. Whether or not anyone gets paid for their recyclable materials, the most important thing is to keep recyclables from going to the landfill; saving the energy by recycling materials and saving the natural resources by reusing that material and avoiding the need for new raw materials.

Mr. Hopkins asked what the implication would be for the Marco site. Mr. Mervis responded that their goal is to grow both the Marco and the proposed sites and to continue to operate both. Operationally, it would mean that potentially they could move some of their business to the new site, which would free up the space in the phenomenally cramped Marco site, so they could offer more recycling opportunities there. It would also offer some of the efficiency that they can offer at their Goodman and Will site in Terre Haute, IN and at their Advantage site in Danville, IL. Marco has been in business and been located on the same site for 100 years. As the business grew and they developed new customers, the site has become rather cramped. Therefore, it does not operate as efficiently as they would like. It also does not allow them to expand into new opportunities for the community. Mervis Industries has a strong local following in the Marco site. So, there is no intention to close that site.

Mr. Grosser thanked the petitioners for the level of detail that they have presented. He expressed his appreciation for holding a neighborhood meeting. He wondered if there were any concerns expressed by nearby residents at the neighborhood meeting. Mr. Mervis responded that there were no negative comments that came out of the meeting.

Mr. Grosser inquired as to how much someone could receive by bringing in a stove or similar appliance for recycling. Mr. Mervis stated that it depends on the material brought in. An older stove might be made of cast iron, which would bring in one price. A newer stove would bring in a different price. The price varies. There have been phenomenal swings in the value of recyclables over the last five years. The price goes up and down depending on the market fluctuations.

Mr. Grosser wondered if the Marco site currently accepts appliances. Mr. Mervis said yes. They accept appliances such as a water heater or a stove. However, they do not accept appliances with refrigerants still in them. These types of appliances must be drained prior to bringing them in to be recycled. At other locations, they will accept these types of appliances, but not at the Marco site.

Mr. Grosser asked if the proposed site would accept appliances with refrigerants still in them. Mr. Mervis said yes.

Mr. Grosser inquired if the petitioner offers and recycled materials for purchase back to the community. Mr. Mervis said no, because there are problems associated with offering scrap metal for purchase. Most of these problems are related to possible litigation. They will make sure that the materials are recycled and come back to the community in a different form.

Mr. Picillo commented that they have on occasion donated scrap materials to local artists – sculptors and to art departments at some local schools. Mr. Mervis added that they have also donated some of the end-of-life vehicles to local fire departments for training purposes. Mr. Falender noted that it is really important for them to recycle the materials brought into them. Their customers want them to destroy and recycle all the products coming out of industrial locations for obvious reasons.

Ms. Upah-Bant inquired as to whether there is any competition already located in the City of Urbana or in the City of Champaign. Mr. Mervis replied yes. Ms. Upah-Bant asked if the petitioners would be offering anything different than what the competitors are doing. Mr. Mervis said that the proposed new facility would be much more customer friendly than any other similar business in the area.

Ms. Upah-Bant questioned where end-of-life vehicles currently go to now. Mr. Mervis explained that for a while end-of-life vehicles were sitting in backyards. Now, when an end-of-life vehicle comes into one of their facilities, the fluids are drained, any mercury switches are removed, refrigerant is removed, and the vehicle is densified and then sent off-site to an auto shredder. At the auto shredder, the pieces are separated into different materials. An air system will separate the fluff from the seat, the leather from the seats, the dashboard, the remaining glass, etc. Magnets are used to separate aluminum from stainless as well as any copper that may have been used. The clean steel will go back to the steel mill to be remelted and turned into something else. The aluminum, the stainless and the copper will be sent to be remelted as well. The only operation they would be doing with end-of-life vehicles at the proposed site would be to drain them of fluids and stored until they have enough for a load to be sent elsewhere for further processing.

Ms. Upah-Bant wondered if the petitioner would take computer components at the proposed new site. Mr. Mervis said it is their intent to help keep computer components out of the waste stream and specifically out of area landfills.

Ms. Upah-Bant asked if Mervis Industries was currently working with the University of Illinois. Mr. Mervis answered by saying no, not at this time. However, he looks forward to working with them in the future.

Chair Pollock asked how soon a load is moved out. Mr. Mervis replied that as quickly as they can get a load together and send it out. They have no intention of holding scrap at the proposed facility. He mentioned that while they are waiting for enough materials to make a load, materials will be stored in the concrete bins. End-of-life vehicles that have been drained of fluids, mercury switches removed, and batteries removed will be stored on some of the aggregate until they can be shipped out.

Chair Pollock noticed in the packet of information that the petitioner anticipated a steady stream of rolloffs coming in. Are these industrial customers or co-mingled materials from somewhere else? Mr. Mervis explained that if it is one of their own rolloff trucks, then it is probably carrying material and the content is well known to them coming from one of their industrial customers. Other trucks coming in might be farmers cleaning their fields, etc.

With no further public input, Chair Pollock closed the public input portion of the hearing. He then opened the hearing up for Plan Commission discussion and motion(s).

Mr. Myers pointed out that the Plan Commission now had two site plans before them. The revised site plan handed out during the meeting differs slightly from the plan attached as Exhibit E. He recalled a previous case where the Zoning Board of Appeals approved a site plan as part of

a Conditional Use Permit. A nearby neighbor became very upset after the landscaping was installed because the landscaping differed somewhat from the approved plan in terms of the number and location of trees and shrubs. On the new Mervis site plan, maybe half of the trees shown would be on the neighboring properties across property lines. He recommended that the Plan Commission do one of two things. First, they could specify in their motion that the site plan in terms of landscaping is an illustrative drawing and that the petitioner must meet the landscape buffering requirements in the Zoning Ordinance. Second, the Plan Commission could ask that the petitioner submit a new site plan for City Council approval showing exactly the number and location of landscaping.

Chair Pollock commented that since the plan shows plantings in excess of what is required by the Zoning Ordinance that the Plan Commission simply comment that it is an illustration of possibilities or that the petitioner submit a plan that does not show plantings across the property boundary lines. Mr. Myers commented that he didn't want the petitioners to obligate themselves to something that could be onerous or impossible to do.

Mr. Hopkins feels that Condition #3 should be explicit that any landscape plan provided is for illustrative purposes only. In this context, he did not see any reason to be using a particular landscape plan as a requirement of the Special Use Permit. The aspirations of this project are such that the kind of landscape plan being presented now we would not want to hold them to because they will get additional advice as this project goes forward. He believes the landscape plans will be better than what is being proposed.

Mr. Hopkins moved that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 2093-SU-08 to the Urbana City Council with a recommendation for approval along with the five conditions as recommended by City staff and with the amendment to Condition #3 that "*any landscape plans presented are for illustrative purposes only*". Ms. Stake seconded the motion.

Mr. Grosser stated that he was really happy to see this and feels it will be a great addition to the City of Urbana. Many of these types of materials end up in landfills. Again, he appreciates the level of detail in the petitioners' presentation. He feels it would be in a great location that is appropriately zoned. It is also located near Interstate 74, which makes it easier for people in the City of Champaign to access as well.

Roll call on the motion was as follows:

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

The motion was approved by unanimous vote.

Mr. Myers noted that this case will go to the City Council on February 2, 2009.

8. NEW BUSINESS

CCZBA-635-AM-08: Request by Country Arbors Nursery, Inc. to amend the Champaign County Zoning Map from AG-1, Agriculture District, to AG-2, Agriculture District, for a 41.5 acre tract of land located at 1742 County Road, 1400 North.

Lisa Karcher, Planner II, presented the staff report for this case to the Plan Commission. She described the subject property noting the existing zoning of the proposed site and of the surrounding area. She discussed the designation of the subject property on the Future Land Use Map. She reviewed the La Salle National Bank criteria that pertain to the proposed rezoning case. She read the options of the Plan Commission and presented City staff's recommendation.

With no questions from the Plan Commission for City staff, Chair Pollock opened the case up to hear input from the public audience. With none, he opened the agenda item up for Plan Commission discussion and/or motion(s).

Mr. White moved that the Plan Commission forward Case No. CCZBA-635-AM-08 to the Urbana City Council with a recommendation to defeat a resolution of protest. Mr. Grosser seconded the motion. Roll call on the motion was as follows:

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

The motion to defeat a resolution of protest was approved by unanimous vote.

9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There was none.

10. STAFF REPORT

Mr. Myers reported on the following:

- ✚ The Lincoln-Busey Design Overlay District and Design Review Guidelines were approved by the City Council on Tuesday, January 20, 2009.
- ✚ The Zoning Ordinance was republished and distributed. The Plan Commission members should all have received a copy.

11. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 8:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Myers, AICP
Secretary, Urbana Plan Commission