

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING

URBANA PLAN COMMISSION

APPROVED

DATE: March 24, 2011

TIME: 7:30 P.M.

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jane Burris, Tyler Fitch, Lew Hopkins, Dannie Otto, Michael Pollock, Bernadine Stake, Marilyn Upah-Bant

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Andrew Fell, Ben Grosser

STAFF PRESENT: Robert Myers, Planning Manager; Rebecca Bird, Planner I; Teri Anandel, Planning Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT: Jacob Barton, Ricardo Diaz, Joe Futrelle, Mayi Gere, David Gehrig, Bob Illyes, Mike Lehman, Don McClure, Jr., Raymond Morales, Migiko Nishikawa, Judith Pond, Alison Ruyle, Russell Rybicki, Tatyana Saprionova, Dan Sedgwick, Susan Taylor, Don Thorsen, James Webster

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

Chair Pollock called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m. The roll was called and a quorum was declared present.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

Chair Pollock requested a change to the agenda. Plan Case No. 2137-SU-11 was officially opened at the March 10, 2011 meeting and continued to this meeting due to lack of a quorum. He asked that this item be moved on the agenda to “Continued Public Hearings.” With no objections from the Plan Commission the agenda was revised.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the February 10, 2011 Plan Commission meeting were presented for approval. Ms. Stake moved that the Plan Commission approve the minutes as presented. Mr. Fitch seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote as presented.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

- An Updated List of Conditions for Plan Case No. 2137-SU-11 was distributed by City staff to Plan Commission members.

5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

Plan Case No. 2137-SU-11: A request by Urbana-Champaign Independent Media Center for a Special Use Permit to construct a 100-foot radio transmission tower at 202 South Broadway Avenue in the B-4, Central Business Zoning District

Rebecca Bird, Planner I, presented this case to the Plan Commission. She began by explaining the purpose for the proposed Special Use Permit request to allow the construction of a 100-foot radio transmission tower. She gave a brief history of the building and described the zoning and current land uses of the proposed site and of the surrounding properties. She reviewed the comments from the Historic Preservation Commission. She discussed staff's findings and 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 as listed in the handout distributed prior to the start of the hearing.

Mr. Otto wondered if the Historic Preservation Commission only provided comments or were they suppose to vote on this case. Ms. Bird said that they were asked to simply provide comments. Three of the five Historic Preservation Commission members present thought the proposed tower would have a detrimental impact in the downtown area. But two members thought it would not have much of an impact.

Chair Pollock asked City staff to clarify what was meant when Ms. Bird said that the City Council supports the radio station. Ms. Bird said that Resolution No. 2009-03-014R, which was passed by the Urbana City Council on March 16, 2009, supports the expansion of low-power FM radio service. At the time, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) was considering increasing the number of low-frequency FM community radio stations that they would allow to exist in any particular area. The FCC came before the Urbana City Council and sought support, which they received.

Chair Pollock noticed that there were not going to be any lights on the proposed 100-foot tower. He questioned whether this might be a safety issue with helicopters coming to and from Carle Foundation Hospital. Ms. Bird explained that any tower shorter than 200 feet is not required to have lights on it.

Ms. Burris wondered if City staff had asked the East Elm Street residents how they felt about the proposed tower. Ms. Bird replied that City staff sent out notices to properties within 300 feet of the proposed site so the East Elm neighborhood was not directly notified. When she went into the neighborhood to see how visual the existing tower, she found that because of the tree canopy one can only see the tower when standing in the middle of the street.

Mr. Otto asked Chairman Pollock whether he should abstain since he was a participant in a show during the first year of the radio station's operation. Chair Pollock replied that if Mr. Otto felt he had a conflict of interest, then he should abstain from voting on this case, but the decision is his.

With no further questions for City staff, Chair Pollock opened the hearing up for public comments and/or questions.

Ricardo Diaz, of 1002 East Main Street in Urbana, mentioned that he produces two Spanish speaking shows at the Urbana-Champaign Independent Media Center (UCIMC). It is a community station meaning that anyone with about an hour of training can go on the air. Training involves learning the FCC rules and the basic operation of the board.

One of his shows is an extension for the University of Illinois, and they try to reach people at the University of Illinois, and the second show tries to reach others who are non-university groups in the area. He supports the proposed special use permit to allow construction of a 100-foot tower.

He talked about the regulations. IMC Staff is interested in safeguarding the downtown area, especially the IMC Building, which is one of the reasons why the antenna needs to shift from the top of the roof to a freestanding tower. It will be safer and more secure and for them a better way of managing an antenna on top of the roof. The proposed tower will increase the visibility; however, it will be in an alley and most of it will be covered.

The proposed tower will benefit the community, because the existing signal does not reach much of their intended audience. He asked the University of Illinois to help him sponsor both a physical survey of where the signal reaches and an actual person survey to see how many people are listening. They also helped him fill out a pre-tower and a post-tower application.

Although there is a regional Spanish language paper that publishes every fifteen days, but it does not cover very much local news. They do not have a television station, and there is only one radio station in Spanish that reaches in the area, which is transmitted out of the Village of Rantoul.

In order to determine whether the IMC antenna could be placed on an existing structure, Mr. Diaz surveyed every antenna within the line of sight of the IMC Building with a global positioning system (GPS) device. The best signal and the best line of sight is to the downtown Champaign area, where there happens to be lots of radio antennas. The existing tower does not reach most of the signals due to the size of the tower. Increasing the height of the tower by 35 feet will help more people to access direct information from the only station in which there is regular Spanish programming.

Mike Lehman, of 608 East Green Street in Urbana, is the President of the IMC. He stated that the IMC Staff has looked at other alternatives. They are all more costly and more difficult. They are planning to upgrade the alert systems and want to increase the tower to be able to make more people aware when there are tornados in the area, etc.

The Historic Preservation Commission would prefer not to have a tower in the area near the historic landmark, Urbana Landmark Hotel. However, you can look at postcards from all around the country and see big courthouses or post offices with radio towers next to them. Someone looking out of the hotel will see a tower which will be a little taller than the existing ones. However, people on the street will probably not even notice it. Most people do not typically look up. The bottom 35 feet of the proposed tower will be screened by the surrounding buildings so he believes it will not be obtrusive to the character of the neighborhood.

IMC definitely needs the proposed tower to extend their signal. With the proposed tower, the signal will reach a lot more people. As far as this case setting a precedent, there could conceivably be two to four new radio towers constructed in Champaign County over the next ten years, and none of them will be constructed in Downtown Urbana. It is just not how the low-power FM radio works.

Tatyana Saprionova, of 510 South Elm Street in Champaign, is a volunteer with the IMC. She stated that she has a weekly radio show where she interviews people from around town about their lives and what they are doing. She produced as evidence simulated images of how visible the proposed tower would be from the top of the parking garage diagonally across the street.

In terms of precedent, Ms. Saprionova spoke on the Federal laws mandating regulations on radio towers. In December of 2010, Congress passed a Local Community Radio Act allowing even more low power FM stations. So, the act basically freed up the public airways to allow more low-power FM stations. If other local non-profit agencies, like churches or schools, want to have low-power radio stations, then they now have a greater opportunity to do so. Low-power FM allows organizations like the IMC to reach the community relatively cheaply and on their own terms without relying on advertisers or on media corporations.

WRFU is a progressive community radio station run by local volunteers and committed to social justice. She presented letters from current and past volunteers in support of the proposed tower. WRFU focuses on public affairs issues and the arts. They air opinions and debates in an open and diverse forum that focuses on educating and empowering the public. People only need an idea to start up their own show. IMC Staff train new people on how to operate the sound boards and teach them about FCC regulations. With a new tower, they will reach more listeners and potential volunteers.

Mr. Fitch questioned whether another business/service could co-locate on the proposed tower. Mr. Lehman believes that the IMC would be open to this idea. If they don't have a radio engineer then they will have to pay someone to get connected to the proposed tower. Otherwise, there would be no reason to have another tower. It would be very difficult to add another antenna to the City's tower, because there are already several antennas on it. Having a separate tower for non-commercial use in the downtown area is actually an amenity in terms of the business community.

As far as the building, when they first bought the Post Office building, they wondered if the IMC would be a suitable reuse of the building. The key to historic preservation is to have users in the building that want to invest in the building and take care of it. If you don't have users wanting to

take care of it then it will fall apart. IMC takes great interest in the historic nature of their building.

Ms. Bird pointed out that any additional users would have to come back to the Plan Commission and City Council for review and approval.

Ms. Upah-Bant inquired as to why the IMC doesn't make use of someone else's tower. Mr. Lehman answered by saying that it has to be line of sight, so they can point their antenna at another antenna. They might have to keep a tower around anyway depending on where you point the antenna. The other thing is that they cannot be any higher than 100 feet Height Above Average Terrain (HAAT). The proposed antenna will actually be just a little above and a little below because it will be a two-bay antenna. Basically, this means that they cannot be any higher than this, but if they go on top of another building, then they must be at least fifteen feet above the top of the building for the RF protection factor. So, alternative towers are not available.

Mr. Diaz added that because they only produce a 100-watt signal, the tower needs to be located in the center of the listening area. The other issue is the cost. In order to co-exist on another tower they would have to pay rent, and they would also have to raise the equipment on top of their roof to be able to send the signal to the tower. He referred to the map showing the coverage pattern for WRFU-FM. The red line shows the area that they presently cover with the existing tower. The purple line shows the area they estimate to reach with the proposed 100-foot tower.

The simple solution seems to be to construct a 100-foot ground based-tower rather than co-exist on someone else's tower. The FCC does not require a modification of the present license if they keep the tower on their property.

Mr. Hopkins inquired as to how tall the City's tower is. Mr. Myers guessed 60 to 70 feet but he will research this question. Mr. Lehman feels it is even taller.

Chair Pollock wondered why the City of Urbana was reviewing this case before the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA) made a decision. Ms. Bird said that it really doesn't matter what order the steps are taken in. The City of Urbana has the final say because we are the ones that will be issuing the building permit.

With no further questions for the applicants or City staff, Chairman Pollock opened the meeting to comments from the public.

James Webster, owner of Lincoln Square in Urbana, said he wants to be a good neighbor. He has heard a lot of good things during this hearing, and he certainly does not want to step in the way of the admission that the IMC group is trying to accomplish. However, as the property owner he has interest of what happens to the Lincoln Square Mall.

He expressed his concern about the effect the proposed 100-foot radio tower would have on his property. He suggested that the IMC construct the proposed tower on the east side of their property, but Ms. Bird explained that the purpose for locating the tower on the south side was to make the bottom of the tower less visible. Everyone acknowledges that a tower is not very

slightly and not aesthetically pleasing, and he feels that as people enter the north entrance of the mall, they will be able to see the tower. He also believes it is not appropriate for the downtown area. He serves on the Downtown Plan Update Steering Committee and does not agree that this would be the kind of improvement desired for downtown. Another small concern of his is if the tower would fall, which he doubts would happen, but it could fall on his building.

He remarked that his main concern is the visual appearance of the proposed tower. He was surprised to hear that the State of Illinois is not concerned with the sight lines. When Lincoln Square went through the process of being nominated as a historic landmark, he had to revise his redevelopment plans to construct a second and third floor. The Illinois Historic Preservation Agency was concerned that the rooftop addition would change the existing sight lines. He is concerned that if they do construct a second and third floor for apartments, then the proposed tower might impact his ability to market them.

Mr. Hopkins asked for clarification on what Mr. Webster's main concern is. Mr. Webster replied that his main concern is the ground level view from the north entrance and sight line appearance from future floors.

Mr. Fitch inquired as to whether there are any kinds of screening that would make Mr. Webster feel better about that aspect of the proposed tower. Mr. Webster said that he does not know. City staff made a good point in that it is not very feasible or practical to provide vegetation given the paved area around the proposed tower.

Bob Illyes, of 810 South Elm Street in Champaign, mentioned that the City of Champaign has a radio station which carries locally produced shows called WEFT. One of the reasons that WRFU was proposed was because WEFT does not have the capacity to support the number of local shows that people would like to air. He is a little surprised by the discussion of the appearance of the proposed tower. The tower will be in an alley. The alley features a couple of boxes with heavy equipment in them and a dumpster. He believes that no one looks down the alley, and they would not see the proposed tower in the alley. The part of the tower that would appear above the roofline would be very narrow, and most people would not even notice it.

David Gehrig, of 304 West Elm Street in Urbana, mentioned that he served on the Urbana City Council. He reiterated what Ms. Bird had said regarding Resolution No. 2009-03-014R. It is a sign of broad support on the City Council for the concept of low-power FM radio and celebrating the fact that we have this community provided resource which is available for all members of the community. He suspects that the City Council would lean towards approval of the proposed Special Use Permit request.

Jacob Barton, of 906 South Maple Street in Urbana, stated that he has a musical radio show on WRFU. It is run by local, experimental composers of experimental music. They invite composers on to talk about their music and try to stimulate conversations as an educational component to it. He talked about the training process. He has friends in Downtown Champaign that cannot listen to his show because they do not receive a signal for the station. He supports the proposed tower.

Raymond Morales, of 903 North Lincoln Avenue in Urbana, spoke in favor of the proposal. He agreed in that the tower would be placed in an alley and very few people look down an alley. He has been with IMC for five years and never even knew where the existing tower was located. People coming from the Vine and Elm Streets intersection is where the best view of the tower would be and yet that is where the least amount of traffic is in the community. IMC is the most accessible radio station he has ever experienced. He hopes that with the proposed tower, IMC will be able to reach out to a larger listening area and bring more vitality to the Downtown Urbana community in doing so.

With no further input from the audience, Chair Pollock closed the public input portion of the hearing and asked for any Plan Commission discussion and/or motion(s).

Mr. Myers interjected that he wanted to suggest a possible small change which could deal with the visual impacts. The City of Urbana requires a screen fence to be placed around the bottom of most towers. He asked if instead of screening the tower base, a screen fence were to be constructed closer to the north entrance of Lincoln Square Mall. This would block the field of vision of people exiting the north entrance of the mall. However, both the IMC and the Mall owner would need to be in agreement as this screen would not be built on IMC property.

Mr. Otto said he noticed that there is already a small unpaved area between the alley and the north entrance to Lincoln Square. Possibly an evergreen hedge could be planted there.

Mr. Hopkins questioned if the alley is really an alley in the sense of a City right-of-way. Ms. Bird answered that part of the alley has been vacated and part of it is still City right-of-way. Mr. Hopkins responded that by blocking off the alley completely, it will create a significant security issue because the alley would become invisible from anywhere. Ms. Bird also noted that there is an entrance on the south side of the IMC for the Urbana Bike Project.

Mr. Fitch said he walked around the IMC Building and did not even notice the existing tower on top of the roof. He does not feel the proposed tower would be as obtrusive as some people fear.

Ms. Burris stated that she does not feel the proposed tower will help to revitalize the area. She has noticed the existing tower on the roof because she is the type that looks up in the sky. She supports the radio station and sees where it is a value to the community, but at the same time she does not want a tower of any type in the Downtown Urbana area.

Mr. Hopkins moved that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 2137-SU-11 to the City Council with a recommendation for approval including the seven conditions and one waiver as provided in tonight's handout.

Mr. Hopkins commented that understands the concern about towers. In certain circumstances, he feels that towers can be overpowering such as having high tension wires on the huge stands going through residential neighborhoods, but he does not feel that is what the proposed case is. He looked for the existing tower and noticed it for the first time today. One of the ways to think about this is as historical depth, but it is also a kind of downtown development depth. If we want to keep the old Post Office Building and we want to turn downtown Urbana into a place where

people are going to be (which is crucial to Lincoln Square as well), then he sees this as another element of what does a downtown of a place like Urbana look like and what is included in it now. He believes the proposed tower would be okay in this context.

Ms. Stake seconded the motion.

Ms. Upah-Bant agreed with Ms. Burris’s comments in that she does not like the proliferation of towers, but she is convinced in this case that the IMC needs their own tower. Also, she does not hear a lot of objection to the proposed tower from the public so she feels she can support it.

Chair Pollock stated that he as Ms. Upah-Bant is torn about this case. In reviewing the Historic Preservation Commission comments, he noticed that if they would have taken a vote it would have been a very narrow “no”. He also serves on the Downtown Plan Update Steering Committee that is revising the Downtown Strategic Plan. A historic feeling and nature of the downtown is the focus of virtually everything the Committee has discussed. Although he is not strongly supportive of the proposed tower, he also sees it as not being very obtrusive. He does not feel the reasons for denying it outweigh the reasons for approval so he will vote to support it.

Roll call on the motion was as follows:

Mr. Fitch	-	Yes	Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes
Mr. Otto	-	Yes	Mr. Pollock	-	Yes
Ms. Stake	-	Yes	Ms. Upah-Bant	-	Yes
Ms. Burris	-	No			

The motion was approved by a vote of 6 ayes to 1 nay.

Mr. Myers reported that this case would go before the Urbana City Council on April 4, 2011.

6. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

7. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

8. NEW BUSINESS

Plan Case No. 2138-M-11: Annual Update of the Official Zoning Map

Rebecca Bird, Planner I, presented this case to the Plan Commission. She reviewed the changes to the official 2010 Zoning Map as a result of rezoning and annexation cases and any minor map editor changes. She read the options of the Plan Commission and presented staff’s recommendation.

Ms. Stake inquired about the two shades of yellow used in the West Urbana Neighborhood and asked if there had been any changes in this regard. Ms. Bird explained that R-1, Single Family Residential Zoning District, is represented by the lighter shade of yellow, and the R-2, Single-Family Residential Zoning District, is represented by the darker shade of yellow. No changes have taken place in the past year.

Mr. Hopkins pointed out that along East University Avenue just south of the University Avenue/I-74 Interchange, some of the City of Urbana appears to be disconnected. Three of the parcels are pink in color and one parcel is shaded light yellow. All other properties in the City are connected via right-of-ways, but it does not appear to be so in this specific case. Ms. Bird responded by saying that City staff would check the map and make sure this is represented correctly.

Mr. Hopkins stated that a major portion of Meadowbrook Park is shown as being zoned R-1. He suggested that City staff initiate a map amendment to change the zoning for this portion of land to CRE (Conservation-Recreation-Education). With looking at development of the adjacent Pell Farm tract, having this portion zoned as R-1 seems less than ideal.

Mr. Hopkins also proposed that City staff consider rezoning the two parcels on the northeast corner of Colorado Avenue and Cottage Grove Avenue from B-3, General Business Zoning District, to reflect that these two parcels are currently developed as apartment buildings.

Mr. Fitch moved that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 2138-M-11 to the Urbana City Council with a recommendation for approval. Ms. Upah-Bant seconded the motion. Roll call on the motion was as follows:

Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes	Mr. Otto	-	Yes
Mr. Pollock	-	Yes	Ms. Stake	-	Yes
Ms. Upah-Bant	-	Yes	Ms. Burris	-	Yes
Mr. Fitch	-	Yes			

Mr. Myers noted that this case would be forwarded to the Urbana City Council on Monday, March 28, 2011.

Case No. CCZBA-675-AT-10: A request by the Champaign County Zoning Administrator to amend the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance concerning Expansion of Non-Conforming Uses.

Robert Myers, Planning Manager, presented this case to the Plan Commission. He explained that the impetus for the proposed County text amendment was the land use and zoning conflicts caused by the mixed residential and industrial properties in the unincorporated Wilber Heights Subdivision in Champaign County. To resolve some of the issues and problems, Champaign County had attempted to rezone parts of the subdivision to Residential, but the City of Champaign protested the County's zoning map amendments because they were concerned that the County would be encouraging a residential subdivision right next door to an industrial park in the City of Champaign. Champaign County staff feels that the proposed text amendment

would provide some relief to County regulations which now prevent residential homeowners there from repairing and renovating their homes.

He reviewed how the proposed County text amendment would affect the City of Urbana. Most of the area within the extra territorial jurisdiction (ETJ) is zoned AG-2, Agriculture. Although Carroll Subdivision is likewise a mixed residential/commercial/industrial area, it has few if any residential use nonconformities. To County staff's knowledge all the residences in Carroll Subdivision are zoned Residential. Therefore, City staff believes that the proposed text amendment would not affect properties within Urbana's ETJ. City staff recommended that the Plan Commission recommend to the City Council that they defeat a resolution of protest in this case.

Mr. Fitch moved that the Plan Commission forward Case No. CCZBA-675-AT-10 to the Urbana City Council with a recommendation to defeat a resolution of protest. Ms. Burris seconded the motion. Roll call on the motion was as follows:

Mr. Otto	-	Yes	Mr. Pollock	-	Yes
Ms. Stake	-	Yes	Ms. Upah-Bant	-	Yes
Ms. Burris	-	Yes	Mr. Fitch	-	Yes
Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes			

Mr. Myers noted that this case would go before the City Council on Monday, April 4, 2011.

9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There was none.

10. STAFF REPORT

Update on Planned Extensions of Olympian Drive and Lincoln Avenue

Mr. Myers gave an update on the planned extensions of Olympian Drive and Lincoln Avenue.

Appendix D Mobility Map from the 2005 Comprehensive Plan essentially shows the proposed skeletal framework for transportation in both the City of Urbana and just beyond the City's limits. Olympian Drive is a segment of a much larger web for future mobility in Champaign-Urbana. He described the proposed alignment for Olympian Drive. The City of Urbana long ago decided not to build Olympian Drive in the exiting Olympian Drive right-of-way because there are too many homes along there that would be impacted. So the location was shifted north.

The only east-west routes north of University Avenue that continues across the entire metro area are University Avenue, Interstate 57 and Ford Harris Road. A major reason is that there are two major barriers: the railroad tracks and the Saline Branch. The cost of constructing bridges is extremely expensive. Since the 1960s, planners have been anticipating and preparing for a route that ties together the north ends of both the City of Champaign and the City of Urbana to provide better mobility for the two cities and the region.

The Future Land Use Map in the 2005 Comprehensive Plan is in synch with Olympian Drive plans. From today's perspective the "Light Industrial/Office" designation is misleading because most of the area is Frasca Airfield and now zoned City I, Industrial. Frasca has a development agreement with the City of Urbana to develop around the airfield for businesses that would be complimentary to the airfield. In the next update or republishing of the Comprehensive Plan, City staff is interested in updating the future land use in this area to better reflect development trends. He pointed out that the City has designated the railroad area for heavy industrial uses.

Mr. Myers provided a map showing potential routes for extending Lincoln Avenue included in recent Champaign County Board deliberations. The County Board voted in favor of the so-called "purple" alignment which is a compromise between the "orange" and "green" alignments shown on this map.

Funding is available so it looks like Olympian Drive can and will be extended from the City of Champaign across the railroad tracks to North Lincoln Avenue. The City of Urbana anticipates delaying extending Olympian Drive from North Lincoln Avenue to North Cunningham Avenue at this time. But we still need to plan for the eventual extension of this segment of Olympian Drive.

Mr. Pollock inquired about the time frame for the construction of Olympian Drive and the extension of North Lincoln Avenue. Mr. Myers stated that he understood that plans are to start construction in 2013.

Ms. Stake requested copies of the material that has been approved by the Champaign County Board. Mr. Myers agreed to provide Plan Commissioners with a map showing the Lincoln Ave. route approved by the County Board.

Ms. Stake questioned whether City staff considered using the railroad for freight. Mr. Myers replied that one of the reasons the 2005 Comprehensive Plan shows a heavy industrial designation along the railroad is to provide access to the rail for many properties.

Ms. Stake commented that the City of Urbana should be thinking about light rail and fast trains. However people are still driving cars. Mr. Myers responded that there is a lot of interest in high speed rail. There are discussions going on with elected officials, transportation officials and with the Federal Department of Transportation regarding high speed rail. The logical right-of-way for a high speed rail for the potential route between Chicago and St. Louis would be through Champaign-Urbana. Ms. Stake added that light rail is much cheaper and does not pollute as much as cars do.

Mr. Otto wondered if the revision to not connect Olympian Drive to North Cunningham Avenue at this time comes about from the opposition that the Champaign County Board received last year regarding Olympian Drive. Mr. Myer explained that the County Board did not agree to extend Olympian Drive further east at this time. City staff wants to plan for the segment from North Lincoln Avenue to North Cunningham Avenue as this would happen eventually. The

Champaign County Board is involved because of the right-of-way. Should imminent domain be necessary for any particular parcel, the Champaign County would have to condemn the property.

Mr. Otto asked how the newly approved plans have been received by the opponents to the Olympian Drive extension. Mr. Myers replied that the recently approved plans addressed enough of the concerns of neighboring property owners that the County Board was willing to compromise and move forward with extending N. Lincoln Ave. and extending Olympian Drive to N. Lincoln.

2010 Plan Commission Annual Report

Mr. Myers presented the 2010 Annual Report to the Plan Commission. He mentioned that if anyone needs a paper copy, please contact our office.

11. STUDY SESSION

White Street and Springfield Avenue Corridors Analysis

Mr. Myers asked the Plan Commission members to review the report, copies of which were provided to them. He will make a presentation at the next scheduled meeting of the Plan Commission so the members can make a recommendation to forward to the City Council for acceptance.

12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Myers, AICP, Secretary
Urbana Plan Commission