

## MINUTES OF A MEETING

### URBANA DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD

**DATE:** August 5, 2003

**APPROVED**

**TIME:** 7:30 p.m.

**PLACE:** Urbana City Building – Executive Conference Rooms A & B  
400 S. Vine Street  
Urbana, IL 61801

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mike Brunk, Bill Gray, Rob Kowalski, Gordon Skinner,  
Elizabeth Tyler

**MEMBERS ABSENT** None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Teri Andel, Planning Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Rich Cahill, Liz Cardman, Scott Cochran, Betsey Cronan,  
Malcom Davis, Andrew Fell, Jeff Johnson, Steve Ross,  
Barry Weiner, Joan Zagorski

---

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

Chairperson Tyler called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. The roll call was taken, and a quorum was declared present with all members present.

#### 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Gray moved to approve the minutes from the June 16, 2003 meeting as presented, and Mr. Brunk seconded the motion. The minutes were then approved as presented by unanimous vote.

#### 3. COMMUNICATIONS/PUBLIC COMMENTS

##### Communications:

Email received from Matthew Taylor  
Email received from Ruth Wyman

**Public Comments:**

Chairperson Tyler reserved public comments regarding each case to be heard during the individual cases. If there were any other comments or suggestions, then the public may speak now. No one spoke.

Chairperson Tyler announced that this meeting was likely to be the last meeting of the Development Review Board, as it currently exists. Because of a request from a number of citizens, action was taken by the City Council to impose a temporary moratorium on development in the M.O.R., Mixed-Office Residential Zoning District until the district could be reevaluated for issues including the Development Review Board having the ability to review design concerns and the composition and process of the Development Review Board itself. She noted the exceptions to the moratorium were the developments for 611 West Green Street, 605 West Green Street, 701 West Green Street, and 410-1/2 West Elm Street.

**4. OLD BUSINESS**

**DRB-02-03: Development Review Board consideration of a proposed 6-unit multi-family development at 605 West Green Street in the M.O.R., Mixed-Office Residential Zoning District.**

Chairperson Tyler gave a brief review of the events of the previous meeting regarding this case. She, then, asked the applicant to come forward to explain the changes that were made to the site plan.

Jeff Johnson, architect for the proposed development, noted that their intent was to try and develop an apartment building that would tie in between the mixed uses of the church across the street, an apartment building next door, and a single-family home on the other side.

He mentioned that at the last meeting the discussion was not so much about what the building is, but about what the building could be in terms of issues with parking. Therefore, he addressed those concerns by planning to have a solid wall between the study and the bathroom and by changing the bathroom configurations on the mezzanine level, so that there would not be a shower.

They have also discussed with Mr. Brunk to extents the type of landscape that they plan to use in the development to mitigate the impact of headlights shining in Mr. Cahill's back yard. They still need to discuss the screening between the proposed development and Mr. Ross's home next door with Mr. Ross to get his opinion. Also, they still need to decide what the actual landscaping would consist of, and they will finalize that decision with Mr. Brunk's approval.

Mr. Kowalski inquired if Mr. Johnson was aware whether or not the owner was planning to lease the parking separate from the lease of the units? Mr. Johnson replied no. The parking spaces will be included in the cost of the lease for the apartments themselves.

Mr. Kowalski questioned if the owner had made any attempts to try and provide additional parking? Mr. Johnson answered that they had tried to work something out with the church across the street a while back; however, they were trying to stay away from that, because they felt that there would be adequate parking provided with this development.

Ms. Tyler asked if it turned out that the future tenants had more cars than there were spaces provided, then would the owner be amendable to providing or helping the tenants find off-site parking? Mr. Johnson replied that he felt that the owner, Mohammad J. Feiz, would be open to that even though they had not discussed it before this meeting. He also felt it would be up to the owner to enforce how many vehicles the tenants were actually using.

Ms. Tyler inquired if the actual parking spaces would be assigned to the tenants? Mr. Johnson answered that the parking spaces would be numbered and assigned. Ms. Tyler mentioned that the tenants could then have another person's car towed from their spot.

Mr. Brunk questioned where the underground utilities would come into the building? Mr. Johnson responded by saying that there were overhead electric utilities that would come in from the backside of the property. The storm utilities would come off of Green Street. They were planning to tap into the existing sanitation line into the northwest corner. Mr. Brunk asked where the sanitation line would run? Mr. Johnson replied to the north side. It would be tied somewhere off of the property itself. Mr. Brunk asked if it would run along the west side of the building or just to the northwest corner of the building? Mr. Johnson stated that was the question they had and decided to leave it up to the contractor. Mr. Brunk preferred if it did not run along the west side of the building along the tree root area.

Ms. Tyler questioned if it was still necessary to have an easement for access during the construction period for the adjoining property owner? Mr. Johnson responded by saying that they have not gotten into any detailed discussions regarding staging. From what they can see, they would not be encroaching onto that drive itself. Since they have a nineteen-foot setback on the east side, they would be able to do all of their staging outside of the existing driveway. Mr. Johnson commented that by staging it on the east side, they would stay away from all the root systems of existing trees.

Mr. Kowalski inquired as to when construction would start? Mr. Johnson stated that even though they had not discussed all the details, they would probably get some foundation work done before winter.

Ms. Tyler pointed out that due to the property line dispute, the City Attorney had recommended that there be a waiting period before construction began to allow them time to settle the dispute. Mr. Johnson commented that as far as the plat of record shows, there is not a dispute. Their surveyor had researched back and found no dispute.

Steve Ross, of 609 West Green Street, referred to his property as the "Ground Zero of the MOR Zoning District" because of the proposed developments immediately to the east, immediately to the west, and across Coler Street to the west. He gave a brief history of his home and of the original owners. He noted that he and his wife were only the third owners of the house, and it

was still a significant house. He stated that each house in the MOR Zoning District had its own story to tell. He felt that the MOR Zoning District was created to allow those stories to build and grow.

Mr. Ross noted that the Development Review Board in the past had focused on thirteen specific design criteria. However, there was an additional criteria that was in the Zoning Ordinance, which stated as follows: *No Site Plan shall be approved by the Development Review Board unless the plan was consistent with the intent and purpose of the MOR Zoning District.* He mentioned that the purpose was detailed in the Zoning Ordinance. Four parts of the purpose included the following: *1) Encourage compatible new construction or rehabilitation in alteration of existing structures, 2) Encourage compatibility and minimize impacts between the proposed land use and the surrounding area, 3) Encourage the maintenance, preservation and the enhancement of both individual structures and the neighborhood's visual and aesthetic character, and 4) Encourage the economic use of older structures in a manner compatible with the neighborhood.*

Mr. Ross mentioned that there was a disagreement as to where the property line is exactly. His platted survey, performed by Berns, Clancy and Associates, shows a discrepancy on the eastern edge of his property of about 1.7 feet with that of Mr. Johnson's plans.

Mr. Ross believed that the existing structure at 605 West Green Street could be rehabilitated and reused. He questioned who allowed the building to dilapidate as it has? Why was it allowed to be rented to people in that condition? Every building needs routine maintenance, whether the building is new or old.

The plans for 605 West Green Street call for the demolition of the existing structure and the construction of an apartment building with six units holding up to twenty-four people. Going from four people that previously lived there to twenty-four people did not "*minimize impacts between the proposed land use and the surrounding area*". Going from no more than 2,000 square feet of living area with the existing structure to an apartment building with 5,700 square feet of living area did not "*limit the scale of intensity of the use*" nor did it "*best protect the value of surrounding properties*".

Another concern of his was that the proposed apartment building did not allow for a main entrance to the building facing Green Street. The proposed design forced all foot traffic along the west side of the planned apartment building, which would be closest to his house. He was concerned for the safety of his four children, who often play on that side of his house. This design did not "*encourage the maintenance, preservation and enhancement of the neighborhood's visual and aesthetic character*".

Lastly, Mr. Ross talked about the tree located about 23 feet from the current house. The tree has a 48-inch diameter. He recalled at the June 16, 2003 meeting, Mr. Brunk had stated that a rule of thumb for root protection was 1.5 feet per diameter inch. Thus, given a 48-inch diameter, that would require 72 feet to allow for root protection for this particular tree. He believed that either digging for sanitary concerns or excavation would certainly disturb this area.

He commented that it was getting to the point where if the Development Review Board approves anymore of these types of development, then his home and the Ricker House would be the exception rather than the rule. Any new construction would have to look more like the current proposals than his homes in order to fit into the neighborhood.

Unfortunately, he did not see any difference brought about by the MOR Zoning District compared to the previous zoning of the area, which was either R-5, Medium High Density Multiple Family Residential or R-6, High Density Multiple Family Residential. The MOR Zoning District should be different, and he asked the Development Review Board to show that it was different and to show that the words of the MOR Zoning Ordinance have real meaning.

Mr. Kowalski inquired as to what was happening with the property line dispute? Mr. Ross was trying to work with Dave Barr to come to an agreement. However, the outcome of this dispute affects the property line on the east, because on a plat of survey in the City of Urbana, a property owner gets an X number of feet along Green Street. Therefore, it is all piped together.

Rich Cahill, of 307 South Orchard Street, noted that he tried to visualize what this proposed development would look like from his back porch. He envisioned seeing balconies being used as storage spaces and/or as party areas.

He mentioned that the scale of the proposed building sort of fits, and it also does not fit. He did not like the idea of the entrance into the building not being along Green Street. He was concerned about the traffic. There would be more cars pulling out of this driveway and not watching out for pedestrians. Overflow parking will go on Green Street and High Street. He believed that there should not be any parking on Green Street in front of the Presbyterian Church, except on Sundays. The traffic visibility is very poor with people parking along Green Street. Green Street is a major bus route. He was also concerned about crime. There was a lot of petty crime in the 800 and 900 Blocks of Illinois Street.

The existing structure at 605 West Green Street posed as a perpetual problem for the Housing Inspector. There were always building violations occurring there. It was also the largest party house in the neighborhood for years.

Ms. Tyler questioned if there were currently parking restrictions on High Street? Mr. Cahill replied yes. Parking was restricted to no parking from 3:00 am to 3:00 pm without a parking permit. He mentioned that there were not any restrictions on Elm Street. During a further discussion about parking, it was mentioned that future tenants of the proposed apartment building would not be allowed to purchase parking permits and be allowed to park on Green Street.

Joan Zagorski, of 1605 South Race Street, understood that Mr. Ross had offered to remodel and restore the existing house at 605 West Green Street? She asked what the response was to this? She also wanted to know if it was the Preservation and Conservation Association that had offered to buy this same house? What happened to that offer?

The proposed apartment building would have the entrances to the bathrooms going through the bedrooms. She thought that was not allowed. Mr. Skinner stated that the revised layout meets code requirements. The code has nothing to do with visitors being able to get to the bathroom.

Mr. Johnson re-approached the Development Review Board. He mentioned that there were enterprise zones in Downtown Champaign that offer Redevelopment Increment Financing (RIF) Grants for the preservation and renovation of the existing buildings there. Ms. Tyler stated that the City of Urbana does have a similar program that was funded by Tax Increment Financing (TIF), and it covers the downtown area, which is east of the MOR Zoning District. There are other areas that have been aided in redevelopment by the City's TIF funding. However, TIF has mostly been used for commercial redevelopment. Mr. Johnson mentioned that he was not sure if that would have helped in this case, because there was too much water damage to renovate.

Ms. Tyler inquired as to how long Mr. Feiz had owned this property? Mr. Johnson did not know that answer.

Mr. Kowalski asked for clarification regarding if there had been a program that assisted in renovating old buildings, then the owner may have been interested in renovating? Mr. Johnson replied that in that case it might have offset some of the preservation costs and might have been an option that the owner would have thought about. Ms. Tyler noted that there would have been some tax credits available if the existing structure would have been designated a historic structure.

Mr. Johnson noted that he did not know of any offer being made to purchase the property. Mr. Cahill clarified that PACA did not make an offer to buy the house. Mr. Ross stated that he had talked to Mr. Feiz about selling the property, and Mr. Feiz said it depended on the outcome of the Development Review Board's decision.

Mr. Kowalski expressed that his biggest concerns with the previous floor plan were with the bathroom in the mezzanine area and the downstair's study. It made it less reasonable to believe that those spaces would be used as bedrooms. The owner and architect have eliminated his concerns by taking the shower in the bathroom in the loft out, by removing the wall between the study and the living room area and by taking out the access to the bathroom from the study. His understanding was that now by building code definitions, the study and the loft could not be used as bedroom spaces, because a tenant would have to access a bathroom through someone else's bedroom.

He did not know what kind of parking problems would result, if any. Any multi-family project that would be proposed would most likely pose a problem with parking. However, given the City's current regulations and codes, the current floor plan was providing the number of spaces that was required for what was being proposed.

Mr. Brunk commented that he was satisfied that the petitioner was willing to work with him regarding the landscaping. Regarding the mature tree, the City does not currently have any codes or ordinances that protect private trees. Mr. Feiz could come in and trim that tree straight up to perpetuity to where the property line is. After looking at the plans, he felt that the

proposed building would be far enough away from the branch reach on the mature Maple tree. In fact, the slope was going away from the tree. The design of the proposed building was set in such a way that the roofline was going to be more compatible with the tree. He did not see a conflict with it. As far as root damage, this particular development did not pose any more root damage than with a development of a single-family house, because it was not so much as the footings that they would be digging as much as the trench going straight down the west part of the property. Mr. Johnson commented that instead of trying to tie into the existing Y, which they are not exactly sure where it is, they are looking at keeping the excavation completely under the driveway. Mr. Brunk stated that would certainly satisfy all concerns regarding excavation.

Mr. Gray inquired if there would be a basement? Mr. Johnson answered by saying no. Mr. Gray asked if there was any further thought of having an open paver in the driveway using a permeable soil? Mr. Johnson replied that they were willing to look at that option. Mr. Brunk suggested using a material called "rotten granite", which was used in the north quite a bit for driveways. It is pervious and packs exceptionally well because it is an angular rock. It is also easy to dig through if needed.

Ms. Tyler read through her list of issues and items of concern from the previous meeting. The list included the following:

1. Maintaining the access driveway during construction and afterwards for the adjacent apartment building.
2. Waiting period for resolution of property line dispute to issue building permit, and afterward the waiting period, if they had not reached a resolution, then the developer could begin construction at his/her own risk.
3. Limit number of bedrooms allowed.
4. Work with City Arborist and get his approval on the type of landscaping and work with adjacent property owner and provide landscaping and screening, possibly a privacy fence between properties. Ensure protection of privacy of entryway into the proposed building on the west side.
5. Recommendation for the surface of the driveway

Mr. Gray moved that after a second review of the Design Review Criteria in the Urbana Zoning Ordinance that the new information provided by the petitioner meets those requirements particularly the number of bedrooms in each unit, the Development Review Board approve this case with the five additional conditions stated above. Mr. Skinner seconded the motion.

Ms. Tyler commented that the Development Review Board had done the best they could with the current limitations of the Zoning Ordinance. Staff was looking for improvements and reduction of impacts of future proposed developments.

The roll call was as follows:

Mr. Kowalski	-	Yes	Mr. Skinner	-	Yes
Mr. Gray	-	Yes	Mr. Brunk	-	Yes
Ms. Tyler	-	Yes			

The motion was approved by unanimous vote.

Mr. Kowalski reminded Mr. Johnson that a building permit must be obtained within a period of one year.

## 5. NEW BUSINESS

### **DRB-03-03: Development Review Board consideration of a proposed 8-unit multi-family development at 701 West Green Street in the M.O.R., Mixed-Office Residential Zoning District.**

Ms. Tyler noted the informational material that was included in the packet regarding this case. This material included an overview of the proposed development from Andrew Fell, Architect, a copy of the submitted application for site plan approval in the MOR Zoning District, a copy of the legal description, and a copy of the site plan for the proposed development. Mr. Kowalski mentioned that the Zoning Board of Appeals would be meeting on August 20, 2003 to consider the front-yard setback areas. Ms. Tyler added that approval of this case would be conditional upon the decision made by the Zoning Board of Appeals regarding the variance request. She pointed out that there were two letters, one from Ruth Wyman and the other from Matt Taylor, voicing their comments about the proposed development.

Andrew Fell, Architect, and Scott Cochran, owner of the property, approached the Development Review Board to present their case. Mr. Fell commented that the proposed development was probably the least dense of all their options. They elected to do this option for a couple of reasons: 1) to keep the density down and 2) so they could develop units that were a little more upscale to hopefully attract some tenants that would like to live in a nicer place.

As proposed, the building has one parking space per each bedroom. Therefore, the overflow parking issue would be a great concern for this project. In laying out the site plan, they attempted to keep the bulk of the building away from the adjacent residential uses. Also in developing the building, they would try to use materials that would be a little more compatible with that used in the neighborhood.

Mr. Cochran noted that he had been in the rental business for about 15 years. He pointed out that he had done some restoration of houses before, but in the current situation with the existing house, it did not make economical sense to restore it.

The proposed apartment building would have 4 two-bedroom units and 4 one-bedroom units, and they would be very upscale. They would be expensive to rent. He was looking for associate professors or young professionals in this location to be tenants. He commented that he was also in the restaurant/bar business and understood the "party environment". He mentioned that rental houses tended to be the "party places". He did not intend for this development to become like that nor would he allow it to happen. He intended to screen the tenants and make the proposed units for living and not partying.

He stated that he was invested in the City of Urbana heavily. He wants to be involved in trying to make a solid and positive impact on the community. He hoped to build an aesthetically pleasing apartment building. He plans to maintain the building and make landscaping fit in.

Mr. Gray inquired what the height of the proposed building would be? Would it be 35 feet? Mr. Fell answered by saying that it would be close to that, but within the limits of the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Gray asked if the first floor would be built below grade? Mr. Fell replied that the first floor might end up being slightly below grade. They have not developed the structural designs as of yet.

Mr. Fell commented that they went through a couple of schemes of doing this building without a requesting a variance. They found that they could do this; however, one of the reasons why they decided to ask for a two-foot variance was to be able to provide some green space between the parking area and the building to help the development blend into the character of the residential neighborhood. Therefore, the purpose of the variance was to help out the neighborhood and not the building.

Mr. Cochran mentioned that the other reason for the variance request was to allow the eave overhang to go from 2 feet 6 inches to 3 feet 6 inches, so they could cover the entire depth of the patio that would extend out from the building.

Mr. Kowalski questioned if they had thought about what kind of interior finishes and what kind of rents there would be? Mr. Cochran surveyed other people in the business, and his intentions were to have ceramic floors, hardwood floors in the living rooms, carpeted bedrooms, granite islands in the kitchen. The rents for the one-bedroom units would be between \$650 and \$750 per month, and the two-bedroom units would rent for between \$900 and \$1000 per month. He believed that there was a market for this type of upscale apartment building.

Mr. Brunk asked if there were any existing trees on the property? Mr. Kowalski mentioned that there were not any trees on the property; however there were two trees in the parkway. Mr. Brunk noted that one of the trees looks like it would be clear of any type of development. However, the other tree was close in proximity to the egress area along Green Street. It would be close enough the driveway that it would be questionable whether they would be able to save the tree. He would like to know the exact measurements.

Mr. Brunk inquired if the one-way exit onto Green Street a necessity? Mr. Fell replied by saying that they could fit the parking in without the exit, but it would require another variance because they would not have the proper turnaround space in the lot. They decided that this would be a more feasible solution. Mr. Gray commented that another option they had would be to provide ten parking spaces rather than twelve.

Mr. Gray mentioned that they would need space for two dumpsters, one of which should be used for recycling. He then went on to talk about the entry way into the apartment building. He noted that the main entrance would be off of Coler Avenue, and the entryway off of Green Street would be the single-bedroom unit on the first floor. Was that correct? Mr. Cochran replied that

was correct. The separate entryway to the first floor single-bedroom unit was to give the building the look of a house.

Mr. Gray asked about plans for lighting. Mr. Fell responded that they planned to use standard lighting for the parking area. There would not be any lighting affixed to the building other than at the entryways, because it would shine towards the neighbors.

Mr. Gray inquired about how tall the screening fence would be? Mr. Fell stated that it was undetermined at this time. Ms. Tyler noted that for screening purposes it must be at least six feet tall. Mr. Kowalski added that the code would allow them to use landscaping as a screen, but they would need more space to do that. That was why they were proposing a fence. Mr. Cochran noted that their intentions were to use landscaping on the east side by using planter boxes.

Mr. Gray suggested that the Development Review Board add a condition to any approval of this case that a drainage plan must be submitted and approved. Mr. Brunk also suggested that a condition be placed requiring a dedicated landscape plan for the property including the accurate location of the existing parkway trees.

Betsey Cronan, of 305 West High Street, asked Mr. Cochran how long he had owned the property? Mr. Cochran answered that he used to own it in partnership with his sister. They separated as business partners. He recently repurchased the property from her a few months ago. She owned it for about five to seven years. The condition of the existing house was a result of his sister's management.

Joan Zagorski, of 1605 South Race Street, agreed with the comments in the letters from Ms. Wyman and Mr. Taylor. She stated that here we are again to face the demolition of another old house to build another undesirable, very tall apartment building, which would have an unappealing design not in anyway having a visual or aesthetic character. Nor would it be designed in a manner compatible with the neighborhood. The design incorporates balconies, which would end up being storage for all sorts of unsightly things. The proposed development would not be harmonious with adjacent land uses nor the character of the surrounding neighborhood as required in the MOR Zoning District rules. At 611 West Green Street, there will be eight apartments with two bedrooms each, which would equal about 16 people. At 605 West Green Street, there could be approximately 17 more people. With these two and the proposed development, there could be a total of 45 people living in spaces that were once three single-family houses. Was this the low-density residential buildings that the City of Urbana requires?

Ms. Zagorski went on to say that it seemed that everything was going in favor of the landlords and what they choose to do to destroy Green Street and nothing in favor of saving Green Street. We are not protecting the aesthetic and residential character of the area.

Steve Ross, of 609 West Green Street, noted his appreciation for the efforts on behalf of Mr. Fell and Mr. Cochran to create a building that would fit into the neighborhood. However, he was

fundamentally at odds with their approach. He believed that the house needed a lot of work, and the fact that it was allowed to decay did not speak highly of the owner.

In their application, on page three, he disagreed with their answers for Question #18 about the proposed development being “smaller than allowed in an attempt to minimize the impact on neighboring properties. The footprint and scale of the proposed building would not be dramatically different than the current use.” Mr. Ross argued that the scale would actually be almost three times the scale of the current house. He believed that this directly bears on the Design Review Criteria #3. On page four of the application, he disagrees with the answer to Question #19 as well. Going from two to four stories does not qualify has having a “low profile compatible with its surroundings.”

Mr. Ross believed that the MOR Zoning District rules sounds good on paper. As a homeowner and reading the words for the first time, he was happy with them and thought they were pretty good. He has come to see that the MOR Zoning District really depends on a Development Review Board that was willing to act in accordance with the spirit of the words.

Malcolm Davis, of 710 West Green Street, noted that he also owns 708 West Green Street. His family has a history of owning many properties on West Green Street. He gave a brief history of some of the properties along Green Street. Apartment buildings have been built on Green Street since then. His family would be the only one on the block that lives in a single-family home if this is approved. He asked if the two-foot variance would obstruct the visibility of drivers coming off of Coler Avenue onto Green Street? Mr. Brunk replied no. It would be well outside of the visibility triangle.

Mr. Kowalski asked Mr. Davis if he had any problems living next door to the apartment building at 712 West Green Street? Mr. Davis stated that the residents had not bothered him at all. He has not had any problems with loud music. They must be good landlords who get good tenants living there.

Mr. Fell responded that they would provide one parking space for every bedroom. He appreciated the neighborhood’s concerns about Mr. Cochran trying to minimize the impact on the neighborhood; however, he felt that they were being as sympathetic as they possibly could be. In response to Mr. Ross’s concern regarding the scale of the proposed building, he stated that the scale involved more than the size of the building. It also involves things like the types of materials used and the relationship of the building to the site. Although Mr. Ross may not agree, he believed that the proposed building would have a smaller scale than the existing structure.

Mr. Gray asked for more clarification on why it was not economically feasible to rehab the existing structure. Mr. Skinner replied that he did not have the specifics in front of him, but the City Housing Inspector inspected the existing structure. Ms. Tyler added that there were three pages of site violations. Mr. Skinner stated that he could not speak to economics of the issue, other than it was a fairly extensive list of repairs that needed to be done on the house in order.

Mr. Gray asked Mr. Cochran to explain how he determined the existing structure as being not economically feasible to rehab. Mr. Cochran responded by saying that in looking at the rehab

and what it would take to bring the existing structure up to code and at what value the house would bring once it was brought up to code, the economics of it do not work. Inevitably when doing a project like this, you start fixing one thing and find more wrong with it than what appeared to be. A person can go in debt over fixing a house up in this situation. He mentioned that if the Development Review Board did not approve this case, then he was not sure what he would do. He would probably put the property back up on the market and try to sell it.

Mr. Kowalski suggested that they use double hung windows to give it a more residential look. Mr. Cochran mentioned that he was building these units not just for today, but for the next thirty years. He wants to build something that will rent easily in his old age. He agreed that people want a lot of window space, and therefore, he hoped to build so that there would be a lot of light. He added that he would provide washer and dryers in each unit as well.

Ms. Tyler made a few suggestions as well to help create a more residential and less institutional look and feel. There are prairie style elements that could be brought out more. She agreed with Mr. Kowalski about the double hung windows. Dormers might help make the east side look less institutional. Mr. Brunk stated that stone would be nice. Mr. Cochran replied that if this case were approved, he would be willing to accept comments from the neighbors as well.

**DESIGN REVIEW CRITERIA #1:** *Will the proposed land use conform with the purpose of the MOR District as stated in Section IV-2-H, and with the table of permitted uses listed in Table V-1? Will the project design be harmonious with adjacent land uses and the character of the surrounding neighborhood?*

Ms. Tyler pointed out that the purpose of the MOR Zoning District did recognize compatible new development.

Mr. Gray stated that single-family dwelling could be 35 feet in height as well. The footprint of the proposed development was not out of the ordinary. The massing seemed to be consistent with the other buildings in the neighborhood.

Mr. Kowalski agreed. The scale of the proposed structure would be consistent with the other structures on the north side of Green Street. Overall, it would fit and be compatible.

**DESIGN REVIEW CRITERIA #2:** *Will the proposed site plan and structure(s) conform to the development regulations in Article VI? Will the proposed site plan be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood? Will the proposed use overburden the capacities of existing streets, utilities, sewers and other public facilities?*

Ms. Tyler commented that from the zoning review standpoint, the proposal seemed to meet the requirements.

Mr. Gray stated that the key word was “overburden”. He commented that accidents do occur. He did not feel that this proposal would “overburden” traffic on Green Street. He did not see where it would “overburden” the sanitary sewer or other utilities as well.

**DESIGN REVIEW CRITERIA #3:** *Will the location, orientation, setbacks, spacing and placement of the structure(s) harmonize with the surrounding neighborhood and minimizes the impact of their use and bulk on adjacent properties?*

Ms. Tyler mentioned that the variance request for the setback, if approved by the Zoning Board of Appeals, would allow the overhang to the east, which she believed would help with the architectural character. She believed that the plans met the requirements.

Mr. Brunk asked if shrubs would be planted in the two-foot area? Mr. Cochran replied yes.

**DESIGN REVIEW CRITERIA #4:** *Will drives and parking areas be located, designed and controlled to move traffic conveniently and safely in a manner which minimizes traffic friction, noise and visual impacts?*

Mr. Gray commented that the two access points would be far enough away from the intersection that they would not pose a problem.

**DESIGN REVIEW CRITERIA #5:** *Will adequately sized and designed parking areas be located to meet the requirements of Article VIII except as modified by the Development Review Board?*

Ms. Tyler mentioned that there were not any modifications requested by the architect or the owner.

Mr. Kowalski found it interesting that they would be providing one parking space per bedroom, and 611 West Green Street will have 16 bedrooms with 8 parking spaces. Therefore, he felt it would accommodate the true demands of parking better than the previous two proposals.

Mr. Cochran stated that people double up in bedrooms in rental houses, because those are the people who are trying to find as cheap as possible of rent as they can. They are also the ones who party the most and take the least good care of the properties. This was why he was shifting to more upscale and better quality developments. He stated that the University of Illinois changed the parking problem issue when they changed and began allowing students to bring vehicles on campus.

**DESIGN REVIEW CRITERIA #6:** *Will safe and convenient provisions for the movement of handicapped persons and parking for the vehicles of the handicapped be accommodated in the project design in conformance with the requirements of the State of Illinois?*

Mr. Skinner believed that this would meet requirements.

**DESIGN REVIEW CRITERIA #7:** *Will the project design encourage the preservation of natural features such as mature trees and other healthy vegetation?*

Mr. Brunk stated that this would be contingent on what they decide to do with the entrance along Green Street. It may not be a problem with where the trees in the parkway are located. It may be that they need to tweak the driveway to the east more.

Mr. Gray mentioned that the one-way drive could be narrower.

**DESIGN REVIEW CRITERIA #8:** *Will the project design conform to the sign regulations in Article XI?*

Mr. Cochran stated that there would only be the sign for notification stating the owner and a phone number.

**DESIGN REVIEW CRITERIA #9:** *Will the location and construction of fencing and screening conform to the requirements of the Urbana City Code?*

Mr. Kowalski stated that they were planning to construct a six-foot privacy fence, and all other screening would be detailed on the construction plan.

**DESIGN REVIEW CRITERIA #10:** *Will the project design conform to customary engineering, site development and site landscaping standards?*

Mr. Brunk noted that he would need the landscaping plan.

Mr. Kowalski encouraged the landscape plan to provide a couple of mature growth trees to be planted in the front yard. Mr. Cochran commented that he would like more input from the City's Arbor Department. Mr. Brunk stated that he could send Mr. Cochran a tree list. He also suggested that Mr. Cochran get a good lawn specialist.

Mr. Gray mentioned that as far as engineering, he recommended placing a condition on the owner to provide a storm water management plan for the City's review and approval.

**DESIGN REVIEW CRITERIA #11:** *Will landscaping berms, fences and/or walls be provided to screen adjacent properties from possible negative influences that may be created by the proposed use?*

Ms. Tyler encouraged Mr. Cochran to work with his neighbors regarding the type of screening used. Mr. Cochran responded by saying that ownership of the property just recently changed hands, and that he would contact all adjacent property owners.

**DESIGN REVIEW CRITERIA #12:** *Will the design of drives and parking areas result in a minimum area of asphalt or concrete? Will drainage be provided in conformance with the requirements of the Urbana City Code?*

Ms. Tyler again noted that the owner needed to provide a drainage plan.

August 5, 2003

**DESIGN REVIEW CRITERIA #13: Will the location of exterior trash dumpsters, storage areas and loading areas be screened from adjacent properties and streets? Will exterior lighting be directed away from adjacent structures?**

Ms. Tyler asked if the dumpster area would be screened well and ambient lighting be provided? Mr. Fell replied that they intended to use standard yard lighting rather than a spot light on the building. Mr. Cochran added that he would make sure that there was enough light over the street, so that his tenants would feel safe, but not so much that it would impact his neighbors. Mr. Fell mentioned that one of the reasons the dumpster area is located in the one-way exit driveway was so that the tenants and the adjacent neighbors would not have to hear the garbage trucks backing up to exit the parking area at 4:00 a.m.

Ms. Tyler reviewed the conditions and concerns that the Development Review Board had discussed. They were as follows:

1. To obtain approval of the variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals.
2. Need to submit a landscape plan showing the exact location of parkway trees.
3. Need to submit a storm water management drainage plan.

Mr. Kowalski moved that the Development Review Board approve this case based on the finding that it met the 13 Design Review Criteria with the additional three conditions mentioned above. Mr. Gray seconded the motion. Roll call was as follows:

Mr. Skinner	-	Yes	Mr. Gray	-	Yes
Mr. Brunk	-	Yes	Ms. Tyler	-	Yes
Mr. Kowalski	-	Yes			

The motion was passed by unanimous vote.

**6. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

**Respectfully submitted,**

---

Elizabeth Tyler, Secretary