

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING

URBANA PLAN COMMISSION

APPROVED

DATE: October 9, 2014

TIME: 7:30 P.M.

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

MEMBER PRESENT: Corey Buttry, Maria Byndom, Andrew Fell, Tyler Fitch, Lew Hopkins, Dannie Otto, David Trail

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Bernadine Stake

STAFF PRESENT: Elizabeth Tyler, Director of Community Development Services; Jeff Engstrom, Interim Planning Manager; Teri Andel, Planning Administrative Assistant; Brad Bennett, Assistant City Engineer

OTHERS PRESENT: Mohammad and Road Al-Heeti, Mir Ali, Waqar Ehsan, Waleed Jassim, Mikal Karim, Charles Lozar, John C. Marlin, Brant Muncaster, Waleed Muhammed, Faruq Nelson, Zeenet Rashid, Chuck Reifsteck, Stanley Summers, Steve Summers, Bridgett Wakefield, Aaron Wozencraft

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

Chair Fitch called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. The roll was called, and he declared that there was a quorum of the members present.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

There were none.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the September 18, 2014 meeting was presented to the Plan Commission for approval. Mr. Fell moved to approve the minutes. Ms. Byndom seconded the motion.

Mr. Trail requested that the minutes reflect how much water Mr. Kirk stated the grinder in their facility in Bloomington uses. Mr. Engstrom responded that this information will be added to the minutes.

The minutes were then approved by unanimous voice vote as amended.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

Regarding Case No. CW-2014-01:

- Letter from Patricia A. Fitzpatrick in opposition
- Email from Kevin Hunsinger in opposition
- Letter from Gwain Zarbuck II DC of Zarbuck Chiropractic Clinic in opposition
- Map Indicating the Number of Floors that Surrounding Buildings have

Regarding the future Digital OASS Text Amendment:

- Driver Visual Behavior in the Presence of Commercial Electronic Variable Message Signs (CEVMs) dated September 2012 submitted by Cain Kiser of Adams Outdoor Advertising

5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

6. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

7. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case No. CW-2014-01 – A request by the Central Illinois Mosque and Islamic Center for a Creekway Permit to construct a dormitory/gymnasium at 711 West Western Avenue in the R-5, Medium High Density Multi-Family Residential Zoning District and the Boneyard Creek District.

Chair Fitch opened this case and then reviewed the procedures for a public hearing.

Jeff Engstrom, Interim Planning Manager, presented the staff report for this case to the Plan Commission. He began by talking about the proposed development. He described the subject property and the surrounding adjacent properties noting their zoning, existing land uses and future land use designations. He reviewed the exhibits attached to the written staff memo and referred to the handout on Surrounding Building Heights.

He talked about Western Avenue, which functions more like an alley than a street due to the width of the pavement. Referring to Exhibit E, the Proposed CIMIC Campus Site plan, he talked about the two subject properties. He also discussed the previous approval granting a Boneyard Creekway Permit for the proposed development and explained that CIMIC was not ready to start

construction on the project and the approval lapsed in the last three years. They have gotten all of their needed financing and are ready to move forward with the project. They are asking for re-approval of the project with a few minor changes to the Site Plan. Those changes are 1) handicap parking be located across Western Avenue with the other parking spaces, 2) additional reduction in the setbacks along Busey Avenue.

He stated that thirteen additional parking spaces are required for the dormitory use. The ancillary uses are covered in the existing mosque parking lot. CIMIC plan to build to LEED standards and to pursue the University of Illinois certification for the housing. They plan to provide a multi-use path easement along the Boneyard Creek to the City of Urbana. Referring to the other exhibits, he talked about the Open Space area.

He also talked about how most of the proposed parcel is in the floodplain. In order to remediate this, the applicant is proposing to elevate the building and provide compensatory drainage storage under the building. He showed where the entrances into the proposed building will be located and explained that people who drive to the building will park across Busey Avenue in designated parking spaces in the CIMIC parking lot, then walk up Busey Avenue to Western Avenue, cross the street and enter through the main entrance along Western Avenue. He mentioned where the waste receptacle would be located and that it would be screened.

He briefly reviewed the landscape plan and the floor plan layouts. He, then, reviewed the bonus provisions that the applicant is requesting, which are as follows: 1) Increase in the maximum height allowed from 35 feet to 47 feet; 2) requested building setbacks along Western Avenue and along Busey Avenue; 3) handicap parking be located in the parking lot across Busey Avenue rather than at 711 West Western Avenue; 4) allow the Mosque and the proposed Annex parcels to be treated as one zoning lot so that they can share the Floor Area Ratio and Open Space Ratio to meet the required standards; and 5) allow for the transfer of development rights to move 13 parking spaces and 11,979 square feet of FAR from 106 South Lincoln Avenue to 711 West Western Avenue.

He talked about the review process noting the criteria that the Plan Commission should use to determine whether they just grant the proposed Creekway Permit. He talked about the meeting that was held between the Boneyard Creek Commissioner, the Zoning Administrator and the City Engineer. He stated that after reviewing the Site Plan, they decided to forward this case to the Plan Commission and to recommend approval of the proposed development including the requested bonus provisions and subject to the conditions as recommended by City staff.

Chair Fitch asked if the Plan Commission members had any questions for City staff.

Mr. Fell asked if the applicant sold the properties, how would the proposed Annex remain in conformance with the development and zoning requirements with regards to FAR and parking. Mr. Engstrom replied that the transfer of the development rights for parking and FAR will be part of the deed for the Annex property. The 11,979 square feet of FAR that is being transferred is not specific to a certain area of the Mosque property. They will be allowed to expand but will have to subtract the 11,979 square feet of FAR.

Mr. Trail asked if the transfer of development rights would represent an obstacle for the applicant to sell the Annex site as a standalone property. Mr. Engstrom replied that it would not present an obstacle, but it could complicate the matter a little. Upon approval and construction of the proposed Annex, the City would require CIMIC to record the transfer rights before we would issue a Certificate of Occupancy. So, if a future sale happens, then the rights would be sold along with the physical ground of 711 West Western Avenue. Libby Tyler, Director of Community Development Services, added that the transfer of development rights (TDR) is a benefit that is available under the zoning regulations, but it is also with the approval of the proposed permit would be an encumbrance on both lots, which is part of the recording. To sale the two lots individually would create some difficulties. If Busey Avenue was not there, then the two lots would be one zoning lot, and the FAR would be calculated on that entire lot. Also, In terms of parking, she clarified that the proposal does meet the minimal required number of parking spaces. The Zoning Ordinance does allow off-street parking in any zoning district within 600 feet of a property. The City allows agreements between property owners because parking is a premium and we want to encourage that it be used optimally. So, there are some uses in the City that do provide some or all of their parking off-site within 600 feet.

Mr. Otto clarified that if the Mosque had 30,000 square feet FAR on the west side and are currently using 13,722 square feet for the mosque building and transfer 11,000 square feet FAR to the proposed Annex across the street, then that leaves CIMIC around 6,000 square feet FAR to build on anywhere on the west property.

He went on to say that even though they will have an easement for the parking rights, if the lot was sold there would not be a transfer of title to the land for the parking spaces. The deed for the west property would simply show that the owners of the east side have an easement that would allow them to park vehicles on the west side. Mr. Engstrom replied that is correct. The Mosque property would still be one lot but with an easement for parking spaces for the east property.

Mr. Trail asked if CIMIC sold the two properties to separate owners, the new owner of the west property would not get the transferred FAR back. Mr. Engstrom said that is correct.

Mr. Fell stated that the handout showing the number of stories or floors is a bit of a misrepresentation because even though it says the proposed building will be three stories, it will actually be four stories tall because of the ground floor being left open. He asked if City staff knew the height and the bulk of the adjacent properties. Mr. Engstrom replied that they did not measure the adjacent properties because it would be too hard to do. Instead, they provided the handout stating the number of stories of each adjacent building. He added that many of the two story buildings are higher than two stories. The height of the building is measured to the middle of the pitched roof line or half way to the top, so the tip of the roof could easily be higher. The proposed building will have a flat roof so there will be no pitched area and the roof will all be at 47 feet. Ms. Tyler clarified that 47 feet is the same height that was presented and approved in 2011. She pointed out that the additional 12 feet is the maximum bonus height allowed in the Boneyard Creekway.

There were no further questions for City staff, so Chair Fitch opened the hearing up for public input. He explained the procedures for a public hearing.

Brant Muncaster, of Gorski Reifsteck Architects, stated that he represented the petitioner. He thanked Mr. Engstrom and Ms. Tyler for their help on the proposed project. CIMIC has worked with City staff quite a bit and felt that they had created a project that deals with all of the issues and conforms to the Zoning Ordinance and building codes. Mr. Engstrom's presentation covered all of the major notes of the proposed project. He would answer any questions.

Mr. Trail asked about the south side of the proposed building. Will it be open or closed in as crawl space? Mr. Muncaster replied that the entire building will be elevated because they are changing the contour of the floodplain. They need to allow water to come in and occupy a similar volume; otherwise, the flood water would spread to the adjacent properties. With the building being open on the ground level it makes the property comparable to being undeveloped as it is now.

Mr. Trail asked if someone would be able to walk under the building. Mr. Muncaster answered by saying that there would be three to four feet in height of open space under the building. They plan to cover it with prairie grass.

Charles Lozar, owner of 714 West Elm Street, started out by thanking CIMIC for a public offer they made to him when there was a fire in one of his buildings. He went on to say that many of his objections to the 2011 proposal have been corrected in the newly proposed plans. However, density and traffic in and out of the area will increase if the proposed Annex is approved, and Busey Avenue is already busy. The property to the immediate north of the subject property will never see sunlight once the proposed Annex is built. No one will be willing to purchase the subject property in the future due to the parking arrangement. Although the architect who designed the proposed Annex did a very good job, he expressed concern about the open space becoming a shelter for animals. He asked if the proposed site would be tax exempt because of its religious affiliation. Ms. Tyler replied that she believed it would be tax exempt.

John C. Marlin, owner of 712 West Western Avenue, stated that it is an awkward block with the Inter-Urban railway having gone through there in the past and with the fill issue of the old Boneyard Floodplain, which makes some of the ground unstable. So, trying to design a building of this height and scale for the size of the subject property has posed problems. He believes that the problem lies in trying to put a gymnasium in a dormitory.

He stated his concerns with the proposed Annex, which were as follows: 1) Proposed balconies will be too big and awkward and will create more of a shadow problem. In addition, the architect stated at the Boneyard Creekway Conference meeting that they might install the air compressors for the air conditioners on the balconies. Two problems with this would be the odor and the noise. He suggested that the air compressors and other noise making devices be located on the roof of the building or on the side of the building with shielding; 2) Location and accessibility of the garbage dumpsters. He recommended that it be put in at an angle so that garbage trucks can back in easier without getting in the sidewalk or adjacent parking lots and front yards; and 3) Plowing of snow along Western Avenue. Many homes front right along Western Avenue.

Mr. Marlin talked about parking and how there used to be enough room for people to park next to their buildings along Western Avenue. Now the City allows people to park in the right-of-way.

In terms of a path along the Boneyard Creek, the City may an opportunity to go from Lincoln Avenue to Busey Avenue. It would give good access to the Mosque and to the proposed Annex.

Mr. Muncaster re-approached the Plan Commission. Mir Ali, petitioner, joined him. Mr. Muncaster responded to some of the concerns of the public. He addressed the concern that the building at 712 West Western would never see the light of day. He noted that the building would be 43 feet away from the proposed Annex. While 712 West Western would be shadowed by the proposed Annex during most of the day in the winter, there would still be times when sunlight would hit the property. With regards to the opening underneath the building, he stated that they planned to put gated screenings around it to keep animals out but would still allow maintenance workers to get in. He understood that the balconies would create a little more shadow on the neighboring property; however, the balconies would not be that big and would be beneficial to the residents that live in the building.

Mr. Ali stated that some of the issues were the same as the issues in 2011. He appreciates Mr. Lozar and Mr. Marlin's comments and will take them seriously.

The issue of traffic they have dealt with intensively. It should not be an issue now. They take parking seriously and have a Parcel Manager who looks around and keeps an eye on the parking. Regarding sunlight access to 712 West Western Avenue, there will not be a shadow all of the time. As for being tax exempt, CIMIC owns a couple of apartment buildings that they pay taxes on, so he assumes that they will pay taxes on the proposed dormitory.

With regards to the proposed Annex being too big, Mr. Ali replied that there are many large buildings in the City. CIMIC is located next to the University of Illinois campus where there are many other large buildings. Mr. Lozar's apartment building is many stories. He believes that the proposed Annex will help beautify the area.

They came up with the concept of a gymnasium and student housing as one idea. The dormitory is for students who are young people, and they want to encourage the students to be physically active. They also plan to use the gymnasium for multi-purpose activities.

As for the mechanical units being located on the balconies, he stated that they are still in the process of studying this. They have not made any final decisions. They will take Mr. Marlin's concerns seriously and if they think it will create any noise issues, then they will consider placing the units on the roof. Mr. Muncaster added that part of the project is to meet some of the LEEDS standards to be LEED Certified. There are many ways to achieve certain points to get to a certain level of LEED Certification. One of the ways is the efficiency of the mechanical systems. So, they were considering mechanical units for each individual apartment, which might require them to have the condensers on the balconies. If they did this, then they would screen the condensers to dissipate the noise and hide them visually.

Mr. Ali stated that he believes that the neighbors will be happy once the building is constructed because it will improve the area. They are aware of not creating problems for their neighbors. Therefore, he requested that the Plan Commission consider approving the proposed development.

Ms. Byndom asked if the gymnasium would be for the occupants in the student housing or would it be open for the public. Mr. Ali replied that it would be only for the occupants.

Bridgett Wakefield, of Gorski Reifsteck Architects, talked about the shadowing. She stated that they did not have time to do a solar study; however, if you look at the handout of Mr. Engstrom's showing the number of floors that each adjacent building has. The adjacent building at 714 West Elm Street has 3.5 floors and shows how big the shadow is. This building is similar to the proposed development in height. So, the handout proves that the building at 712 West Western Avenue will see the light of day.

With no further comments from the audience, Chair Fitch closed the public input portion of the hearing. He asked the Plan Commission if they had any additional questions for City staff.

Mr. Fitch asked if 702, 704 and 712 West Western were non-conforming properties with regards to the front-yard setbacks. Mr. Engstrom said that they are non-conforming because they were built within the required front-yard setback.

Mr. Fell wondered how far the balconies on the proposed development could extend into the setbacks. Mr. Engstrom answered saying that balconies could extend five feet into the required setbacks.

Mr. Trail asked if there was any concern about pedestrian traffic between the proposed Annex and the parking lot across Busey Avenue during the original public hearing. Also, has the City discussed putting in a pedestrian crossing in the middle of the block on Busey Avenue to make it safer? Does the City have any intention of making Western Avenue a one-way street? He noticed a "Do Not Enter" sign posted off the Lincoln Avenue entrance onto Western Avenue. Mr. Engstrom replied that with regards to the crosswalk, City staff discussed this and the City Engineer did not want a mid-block crossing exclusively for the proposed Annex. City staff felt that crossing at Western Avenue and Busey Avenue would work best. In the future, when the City makes improvements to the Boneyard Creek, the City will install a crosswalk then for the purpose of the pathway. There are currently no plans to change Western Avenue to a one-way street.

Mr. Trail wondered if it was usual to allow handicap parking to be located across the street from the use. Wouldn't it be better to put the crosswalk for the Boneyard Creek pathway closer to CIMIC and the Annex so that CIMIC would ensure that the sidewalks are handicap accessible in the future? Mr. Engstrom said that it is unusual to have handicap accessible parking located across the street from the use, but CIMIC contacted the State of Illinois architect's office that oversees parking and got a letter to support it. When the Boneyard Creek pathway and crossing is installed, he believes it will become the de facto crossing for handicap people.

Ms. Tyler asked Mr. Muncaster to talk about the condition of the sidewalks. Mr. Muncaster stated that they have not looked at the sidewalks on the west side of Busey Avenue, so he is not sure what condition they are in currently. Part of the project will include constructing new sidewalks along the east side of Busey Avenue.

Ms. Byndom expressed concern about how difficult it would be for a person in a wheelchair to cross when there is snow or bad weather. Mr. Fitch stated that it was originally located on the east side next to the Annex. The Plan Commission could make a motion to move the handicap parking space back to the east side of Busey Avenue. Mr. Engstrom explained the reason for moving the handicap parking space to the west side is because they could not fit the parking space in without it extending into the City right-of-way. Ms. Wakefield added that there were a few factors that played into wanting to move the handicap parking space. A single handicap parking space located next to the proposed Annex building would not be maintained as quickly in a snow as it would be located in the parking lot. They had heard from many neighbors that Western Avenue is not one of the first streets to be plowed; whereas Busey Avenue is. They are just trying to maintain the best place for people to park whether they are in wheelchairs or not. One of the requirements by the State in approving the location of the handicap parking space is that CIMIC must designate the closest available parking space to the proposed Annex building as the handicap parking space.

Mr. Otto clarified that there will be 38 beds in a 24,600 square foot building. If instead of having a gymnasium, they provided more housing units, how many additional beds would that accommodate? Mr. Engstrom replied there could be about twice as many.

Mr. Otto asked Mr. Lozar how many units are in his building at 712 West Elm Street. Mr. Lozar replied 33 beds.

Mr. Otto explained that he was only trying to point out that there could be more density in terms of beds if CIMIC did not construct the gymnasium. Mr. Lozar pointed out that in design criteria for a normal development in the R-5, Medium High Density Multiple Family Residential Zoning District, every bed generates a half a parking space requirement.

Mr. Trail questioned the setback along Western Avenue. Mr. Engstrom had previously mentioned that the average setback is 25 feet. Is that for the south side only of Western Avenue? Mr. Engstrom said yes.

Ms. Byndom wondered if the garbage truck would have any problems with accessibility to the trash receptacles. Mr. Muncaster responded saying that Western Avenue is 17 feet wide and the actual garbage enclosure is another 15 feet, so it gives a good area for a garbage truck to turn around. Mr. Fell added that the garbage truck will drive down the street, wheel the dumpster out to the truck and dump it, so they will not need to turn around.

Mr. Fell commented on the bulk of the building. He believes that the increase in the height of the building will be less of an impact than it could be if they had a three story building with a pitched roof and tried to stick the top floor into the pitched roof. They could have created a

much greater impact on the neighbors, especially to the north with no increase in height. So, he believed it was better to allow the 12-foot increase in height.

Mr. Otto moved that the Plan Commission approve Case No. CW-2014-01 subject to the conditions recommended by City staff in the written staff report. Ms. Byndom seconded the motion. Roll call was as follows:

Ms. Byndom	-	Yes	Mr. Fell	-	Yes
Mr. Fitch	-	Yes	Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes
Mr. Otto	-	Yes	Mr. Trail	-	Yes
Mr. Buttry	-	Yes			

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Plan Case No. 2223-CP-14 – A request to adopt the Active Choices: Champaign County Greenways & Trails Plan as an amendment to the 2005 Urbana Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Fitch opened this case. Jeff Engstrom, Interim Planning Manager, presented this case to the Plan Commission. He talked about the proposed plan and what it contains and that it will replace Appendix C, Greenways and Trails Classification Map in the 2005 Comprehensive Plan. He briefly talked about the process that was followed to create the proposed Active Choices plan. He pointed out that the 2014 Urbana Bicycle Master Plan will supersede the Greenways and Trails Plan upon its completion later this year.

He mentioned that the Plan Commission had already reviewed and made a recommendation for approval to the City Council for this case; however, the City Council recognized that City staff had missed a step by not having the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) review the plan, so City staff started the process over again. BPAC reviewed the proposed plan last month and while recognizing that the 2014 Urbana Bicycle Master Plan should be the controlling document for the City’s bicycle and trail planning, they recommend that the City adopt the proposed plan without any changes. He presented City staff’s recommendation for approval.

Mr. Trail asked if the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan would supersede the proposed plan in whole or in part. Mr. Engstrom explained that what the City staff is proposing to adopt is the Future Conditions Map, which will be superseded when the City adopt the Bicycle Master Plan.

Mr. Trail questioned if it wouldn’t be easier to adopt the relevant parts of the proposed plan into the Bicycle Master Plan and call it one document. Mr. Engstrom stated that it was just bad timing. When the Greenways and Trail Plan was originally created, it was the County’s and many municipalities within the County main bike and trail planning document. Since then, the City of Urbana has started doing our own Bicycle Master Plan. The Greenways and Trails Plan is still needed for the overall county more so than for the City of Urbana. Even so, the City still adopts it because of our system of plans. Libby Tyler, Director of Community Development Services, added that the 2005 Comprehensive Plan is mother plan. There are other plans that have been adopted as elements of the Comprehensive Plan because they add to the impact and the importance of the plan for obtaining grants and showing compliance.

The City wanted the Appendix C, Greenways and Trails Plan to be an element of the 2005 Comprehensive Plan so that we could require some greenways and trails as part of future developments and to show granting agencies it was part of an adopted plan. Since 2005, the City has created a Bicycle Master Plan and periodically updates it, which the City also wants to adopt as elements of the Comprehensive Plan again to be able to integrate them into development and obtain grants also.

She believes that the Greenways and Trails Plan is a different type of document than the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan. The Greenways and Trails Plan is more of a recreational document, and the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan is more about bicycles as urban transport in the City. If the proposed plan is adopted as an element of the 2005 Comprehensive Plan, then it will replace the old Greenways and Trails Map that currently exists. If the City then adopts the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan update, then it will supersede the proposed Greenways and Trails Plan.

Mr. Trail asked for clarification in that the proposed plan will not overlap with the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan. Even though the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan will supersede the proposed plan, they do not cover exactly the same things and that when they come into conflict, we will consider the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan to be the guiding document. Mr. Engstrom said that is correct.

Mr. Hopkins argued that the City should not adopt the proposed plan. There needs to be more distinct ways of distinguishing between things that the City adopts as City policy and plans that we acknowledge we know about and are taking into account. For example, the proposed plan shows Olympian Drive being extended to High Cross Road. By adopting it, it means that not only is the City planning to build a bikeway there but it also means that the City plans to change the Comprehensive Plan and made the decision to extend Olympian Drive to High Cross Road, which the City has not done. So if the City adopts the proposed plan, then we will have adopted a plan that is in direct conflict with other City policies. He feels that the City could acknowledge the proposed plan that the City has read it, but he opposed adopting it.

Ms. Tyler replied that Olympian Drive has been phased. The choice was to fund just the western portion. When looking at the Comprehensive Plan and the Long Range Transportation Plan, which guide the City's future arterial development, it shows Olympian Drive extending eastward. Mr. Hopkins stated that it shows it as an option. It was a very explicit decision in the record of adopting the Comprehensive Plan that this decision had not been made. Ms. Tyler responded that the plan that guides roadways, which is the Comprehensive Plan, would rule as well as the Long Range Transportation Plan; not the proposed Greenways and Trails Plan. The danger of not adopting these alignments is that we tie the Comprehensive Plan and its elements into our development regulations explicitly in the Subdivision Ordinance. If we do not adopt Appendix C, then we will lose the ability to require those alignments as part of development review. So, we are using a provision in the State Statute that allows a community to use the official plan or map to mandate these alignments. She did not believe that there were any intentions to override the City's Mobility Map. Mr. Hopkins argued that if we are going to back our development regulations as an official map argument and we have adopted plans that are in direct conflict, then we are not creating good backing. If we need to adopt elements of the

proposed plan, then they should be adopted as part of the Bicycle Master Plan or as amendments to the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Tyler commented that if the Plan Commission noticed an annotation in the proposed plan that they feel would be in direct conflict with the City's Mobility Map, then she would offer an amendment. Mr. Fitch stated that he did not want to get in the business of amending the plan because there are so many places that they would suggest changes. Mr. Hopkins pointed out that is what the Plan Commission is being asked to do. They are being asked to adopt an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Tyler stated that the proposed plan is an element to the Comprehensive Plan, not an amendment.

Mr. Fitch asked how they have handled similar cases in the past. Do they deny the case and go on record that they acknowledge they read the plan? Mr. Trail stated that he felt that the system of plans is basically great. Someone is going to look at adopted plans for guidance. If a proposed plan is not in conformance with other City plans and is not increasing the clarity in the mind of someone who would be looking at the plan for guidance, then he doesn't think we would want to adopt it. If the proposed plan is going to be immediately superseded, then maybe they should just acknowledge the proposed plan rather than adopting it.

Mr. Hopkins stated that the legal backing to make development deals is important but it is not clear to him that adopting the proposed plan is the right thing, if it is not actually the City's bicycle road plan and the County's road plan for the City of Urbana. Ms. Tyler stated that it is a county-wide process and the City of Urbana has participated in that process. The problem is that we have a really old Appendix C, and we have an opportunity to update it even though it is not a perfect map. However, adopting these sets of maps for replacement of the old map, then the City has a better chance to get funding for some of the greenways. Mr. Hopkins stated that if there are things in the proposed plan that will not be in the update to the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan that we will want to use to get funding, then we should put them in.

Mr. Hopkins mentioned again that the decision to extend Olympian Drive to High Cross Road has not been made and if they adopt the proposed plan, then it would hold up even though it conflicts with the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Tyler stated that Map 29 shows Olympian Drive going from the color green to the color black and annotates "Future Olympian Drive". She said that they could add a question mark; however, she feels that the City's Mobility Map rules. She does not think that they are necessarily inconsistent unless someone wanted to distort the meaning of the one map.

Mr. Fitch recommended that the Plan Commission recommend that when the proposed plan conflicts with any of the City's plans, then the City's plans carry. Ms. Tyler stated that would help. Mr. Fell argued that we cannot say that because we do not know what future plans are going to say.

Ms. Tyler commented that City staff for reasons that were discussed during this hearing would like to get the proposed plan adopted as an element of the 2005 Comprehensive Plan by the City. City Council can spell out in the adopting ordinance that they approve the proposed Greenways & Trails Plan except where it may conflict with the 2014 Update of the Bicycle Master Plan.

Then that way they can adopt the parts of the proposed plan that they agree with and can benefit from.

Mr. Trail asked about the level of plans. Mr. Engstrom explained that there are some regional plans that the City “Accepts” and some that the City “Adopts”. Because the Greenways & Trails was already a map in the Comprehensive Plan, City staff decided it would be best to adopt the proposed plan to replace the old map. Ms. Tyler added that there are two reasons for “Adopting” the proposed plan, which is as follows: 1) Update the map in the 2005 Comprehensive Plan and 2) It includes some alignments, which are important in order to get them built as part of the official plan.

Ms. Tyler stated that the City Council really wants a recommendation from the Plan Commission with regards to planning documents such as the proposed plan. They will not feel comfortable adopting a plan with a recommendation. City Council may notice other alignments that they will take exception to. There are two that were mentioned tonight. One is on Broadway and the other is Olympian Drive. Mr. Engstrom added that there were a few other minor alignments that conflicted but he did not have the full list with him.

Mr. Hopkins wondered if the projects listed as “High” time frame were related to the City’s Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Mr. Engstrom said yes. All of the projects on the list come from the CIP, the Bicycle Master Plan and from other plans such as the Urbana Park District’s Plan. Not all of the projects are budgeted and/or scheduled, but they are all plans that are on the horizon.

Mr. Trail asked if the list of projects was for the County. Mr. Engstrom explained that Rebecca Bird, a former planner, and Craig Shonkwiler, Assistant City Engineer, participated in compiling the proposed plan. They had input in assigning the priorities. Although it is a County plan, but it is the priorities that City staff has recommended they put into it.

Mr. Hopkins questioned if the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan would include the same list. Mr. Engstrom said yes with better wording. Mr. Hopkins recommended City staff use a better color scheme as well because it is hard to read the map.

Chair Fitch stated the options of the Plan Commission, which are as follows:

1. Recommend approval with a formal condition
2. Deny the proposed plan
3. Recommend approval and let the record speak for itself

Mr. Hopkins added another option would be for the Plan Commission to recommend that the proposed plan be adopted as an element of the 2005 Comprehensive Plan to be completely superseded by the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan and acknowledging that some things in the proposed plan may be inconsistent with other elements of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Trail wondered what the consequences would be if they decide not to adopt it. Ms. Tyler responded that the proposed plan is a type of plan that ideally the Plan Commission would have

been involved in and felt ownership of. Obviously, this has not happened. It has been some time in the making. As she understands it, it is a grant from the State of Illinois. The regional Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) took on the proposed plan for the City of Urbana, and the State of Illinois has funded this plan for the City of Urbana. A planner and engineer participated in the process of updating the document, which took some time, so now the document is out of date. It would send an anti-planning message for the Plan Commission to recommend denial. It would make it hard for the City Council to adopt it, which would be awkward.

In addition, they discussed ways to cobble together an approval that accounts for the fact that the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan is more up-to-date and more detailed. There are elements of the proposed Greenways & Trails that would be left out if the City allows the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan to entirely supersede it because there will be territory that will be left out. Also, the Greenways & Trails Plan is not a bicycle plan. She hoped that the Plan Commission did not move to deny it, because it would create awkwardness not only for this particular project but in the future.

Mr. Trail commented that Ms. Tyler was alluding to the idea that if the City does not adopt the proposed plan that it will create an obstacle to get funding or to get state approval. What is the practicality of this happening? Ms. Tyler replied that specific grants require cities to have an official map in the Comprehensive Plan. If the City does not adopt the proposed plan, then the maps in the plan will not become part of the Official Map for the City of Urbana, which we use to enforce development regulations. There may be a residential development in an area adjacent to one of the greenways in the proposed plan. By adopting the proposed map, the City can use the City's Subdivision Ordinance to get that greenway as part of the development lawfully. She felt this would be a good thing to do. Every plan gets a little out-of-date and has errors in it. She trusts the City Council and the Plan Commission to know what is the most recent document and if there are questions, then to come back to seek further clarification or to ask for an amendment.

Mr. Otto asked for clarification regarding the sequencing of documents. Ms. Tyler explained that the Urbana Bicycle Plan, once it is updated and adopted, will be the last word because it would be more recent and it would be more specific.

Mr. Trail asked if it was possible for City staff to create an enumeration of conflict. Mr. Engstrom said that City staff could do that. It might delay the process but not beyond the adoption of the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan.

Mr. Trail wondered if it would be possible for the Plan Commission to continue the case. Ms. Tyler responded that it is possible to hold the case open. It will allow time to see if anything else comes up and to work on some motion language that the Plan Commission might feel comfortable with. If there is confusion and concerns, she would almost always try to recommend continuation.

Mr. Trail moved that the Plan Commission continue the case to a future meeting of the Plan Commission. Ms. Byndom seconded the motion. Roll call was as follows:

Mr. Fell	-	Yes	Mr. Fitch	-	Yes
Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes	Mr. Otto	-	Yes
Mr. Trail	-	Yes	Mr. Buttry	-	Yes
Ms. Byndom	-	Yes			

The motion was passed by unanimous vote.

8. NEW BUSINESS

There was none.

9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There was none.

10. STAFF REPORT

Jeff Engstrom reported on the following:

- Corey Buttry – New member on the Plan Commission
- Henson Disposal and Southwind RAS Special Use Permit requests were both approved by City Council.
- Joint Meeting with the Plan Commission, the Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission and the Sustainability Advisory Commission will be held on Thursday, October 30, 2014 at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers regarding the Long Range Transportation Plan 2040.

11. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

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

Respectfully submitted,

Jeff Engstrom, Secretary
Urbana Plan Commission