

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING

URBANA PLAN COMMISSION

APPROVED

DATE: September 20, 2001

TIME: 7:30 P.M.

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Christopher Alix, Alan Douglas, Randy Kangas, Gerrit Knaap, Michael Pollock, Joseph Rank, Bernadine Stake, Marilyn Upah-Bant

MEMBERS EXCUSED: None

STAFF PRESENT: Elizabeth Tyler, Planning Manager; Tim Ross, Planner; Rob Kowalski, Senior Planner

OTHERS PRESENT: Kellee Caton, Mike Doyle, Loretha Harmon, Ray Kan, Bob Leach, Bryan Long, Mike O'Leary, Tim Ols, Esther Patt, Ann Talbott, Mark Welp, Ruth Wyman

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

Chair Pollock called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. Roll Call was taken, and a quorum was declared present.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

There were none.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Knaap motioned to approve the minutes from the September 6, 2001 meeting. Ms. Stake seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by unanimous vote.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

Summary of Changes Proposed to the Development Agreement prepared by Carle Hospital.

5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

Plan Case #1792-T-01; Request by the Zoning Administrator to amend portions of the Zoning Ordinance related to the expansion of the Medical Institutional Campus (MIC) Special District to include a proposed guest house.

Plan Case #1793-DA-01; Proposed Amendments to the Development Agreement between the City and Carle Foundation related to expansion of the MIC Special District and permitted demolitions outside the MIC.

Tim Ross, Planner, began the staff report update by addressing some language changes to the proposed amendments of the Development Agreement. Those language changes are as follows:

- He stated that the most significant language change was the removal of the amendment to Article III, which would have allowed Carle to demolish structures that were in Carle's possession at the time of the signing of the original Development Agreement.
- Language has been added to restrict all four of the proposed properties to be added to the Medical Institutional Campus (MIC) to guest house use only.
- Additional language in relation to the guest house states as follows: The properties at 701 and 703 North Orchard Street will be developed for a guest house for patient families/support members and the properties at 702 and 704 North Coler Street will either continue as presently utilized or be used for future guest house purposes. A guest house is an overnight residence to provide respite for family and support members to patients in serious condition at Carle Hospital.
- In regards to the property at 809 North Orchard, some language had been added so the amendment now reads as follows:replace said structure with a 2 or 3 bedroom "visitable" home between 1,000-1,200 sq/ft in keeping with the character and size of the local neighborhood. Further the rent for the home will be maintained within the average for 2 or 3 bedroom homes currently rented by Carle.

Those changes have also been reflected in the proposed text amendment.

Mr. Ross continued to report that given some of the changes made and items brought up by both the Community Development Commission and the Plan Commission, the City of Urbana staff was withdrawing a recommendation to require an additional tax payment be made by Carle for the rezoning purposes of the guest house. He mentioned that included in his report were copies of the Fraenhoffer report on the structural investigation of the 809 North Orchard property, the minutes from the previous Community Development Commission meeting that was held on August 28, 2001, and a letter from Ruth Newman supporting the proposed guest house. Mr. Ross stated that based on the evidence presented in the staff report, staff recommended that the Plan Commission recommend approval of both the proposed amendment to the Zoning Ordinance and the Development Agreement, as presented in the staff report, to the City Council.

Chair Pollock asked in light of the changes made to the amendment, would it be staff's recommendation to approve the rezoning of all four of the properties in question or only the two properties that were recommended to be approved? Mr. Ross answered that staff

recommendation was for the Plan Commission to recommend approval to the City Council regarding the guest house properties with the restrictive language for all four properties.

Petitioner Testimony

Tim Ols, petitioner for Carle Foundation Hospital, approached the Plan Commission. He noted the communication handouts (the Carle Guest House Proposal Changes and the Guest House Site Considerations). He addressed the prevailing issue of why Carle Hospital wanted to build the guest house at the proposed site by giving the key goals, which are as follows:

1. Close to core buildings.
2. Front door would be visible.
3. Respite/pastoral surroundings.

He mentioned that the areas for major future expansion would likely be to the west; however, there are not any current plans to expand. He discussed the alternative locations to build the proposed guest house and the reasons for deciding not to build on those locations.

Mr. Knaap questioned whether the guest house would be the extent of the expansion for the MIC District or does Carle have any future plans to expand further? Mr. Ols answered that the land to the west of the hospital could be for future building. Carle does not have any particular plans on the drawing board at that moment. There are some facilities' renovation plans in the works. Those plans are within the core buildings with nothing stretching into the MIC area.

Mr. Knaap asked if Carle was buying the surrounding property to protect their options? Mr. Ols replied that was correct.

Mr. Knaap inquired as to whether Carle had considered facing the guest house towards the park? Mr. Ols responded that Carle had considered it; however, with the guest house facing Carle Hospital, it would be easier for people to find the guest house. Also, the house on Coler Street and the guest house would face the same direction. Mr. Knaap commented that there were two reasons for his preference to have the guest house face the park, and they are as follows:

- 1) There currently is a block facing the park, which creates architectural integrity. If the guest house faces the hospital, then a side of the guest house will face the park. This will break up the rest of the block facing.
- 2) Carle precludes some development options by having the backdoor of the guest house face the neighborhood.

Mr. Ols responded that if the guest house faced the park, then Carle would have to redo the layout for the guest house, because the guest house would be too wide for the lot. The guest house would be property line to property line. Mr. Knaap argued that another negative aspect would be that the parking lot would be next to the neighborhood.

Mr. Knaap commented that Carle could not articulate plans for moving north, because the development agreement makes it difficult for Carle to expand. Mr. Ols replied that this

was a sensitive issue. Carle had talked about what the guest house would do in terms of Carle expanding further to the north. The guest house may not stop Carle from expanding to the north. Nevertheless, it does make much more logical for Carle to expand westward.

Ms. Stake questioned whether Carle had considered expanding upwards above the parking garage with a walkway to the hospital instead of demolishing affordable homes for the guest house to be at ground level? Mr. Ols responded that building upwards above the parking garage would make the guest house more expensive and more institutional. Carle would like to avoid that. Carle wants to create a different environment with a home-like atmosphere. Ms. Stake commented that by building the guest house above the parking garage, it would solve the problem of guests having to walk a long distance to the parking garage to retrieve their vehicles and/or having a parking lot next to the neighborhood. She stated that she was concerned with Carle expanding out of MIC District. The proposed site would take away from low cost housing in that area. If Carle is allowed to build the guest house on the proposed site and to expand the MIC District, then Carle should be required to sell back some of the residential properties that they own. Mr. Ols mentioned that Carle wants to protect their options to expand in the future. Carle provides homes for people to live in, and Carle has spent over \$350,000 on those homes for upkeep.

Ms. Stake stated that another concern was preserving access to the park for the neighborhood. She asked if the wording in the agreement stated that the guest house property could only be used as a guest house? Mr. Ross answered that was correct.

Ms. Upah-Bant mentioned that it would be a long walk from the hospital to the guest house. She inquired as to whether there would be security guards who would walk the guests to and from the hospital? Mr. Ols responded that there is security available 24 hours a day/7 days a week. They will be able to escort any guests to and from the hospital.

Public Testimony in Opposition

Bob Leach, representative from United Citizens and Neighbors (UCAN), read the letter that was written stating UCAN's issues of support and disapproval of the text amendment to the Development Agreement. This letter had been sent to the Plan Commission prior to the meeting.

Mike Doyle, of 411 West Park, stated that he was in support of the idea of the guest house being near the hospital. He reviewed background information regarding the neighborhood perspective on the Development Agreement. The process to develop the original agreement took two years of meeting with Carle, the City of Urbana staff, and the neighborhood. The main concerns for Carle Foundation during the process were the following: 1) room for growth, 2) easier process for future growth, and 3) safety for their patients in terms of traffic flow and access to their facilities. The main concerns for the neighborhood were the following: 1) protecting the housing stock in the neighborhood,

2) the residential character of the neighborhood, 3) preventing traffic congestion that would lead to safety issues and problems, and 4) pollution in the area. After the long process, a Development Agreement was proposed, revised, negotiations were held, and in the end all three parties endorsed the final proposal, which makes up the Development Agreement, that is now being proposed to be changed. The Development Agreement provided room for Carle to grow; however, it provided limits on Carle's expansion to the north. Church Street represented the line, which Carle could not cross to expand. Another issue addressed and resolved in the Development Agreement was residential access to Crystal Lake Park. He continued his debate by saying that the Plan Commission was being asked to reverse the Development Agreement.

Mr. Doyle supported the idea of a guest house by saying that it was a wonderful idea, and the community and guests of Carle would all benefit. He stated that Carle Foundation approached UCAN in May of this year regarding the idea of a guest house being built north of Church Street. Although the residents were surprised, they commented that it would be a wonderful idea if it would be located some place other than north of Church Street. People who would be using the guest house would not be interested in the fact that it would be across from a park. The guests just need some place to get some sleep. Most of their time will be spent in the hospital next to their loved ones.

Two months later, during another neighborhood meeting, Carle presented their proposal to the neighborhood. The residents were concerned that there had not been any changes to it regarding the location of the proposed guest house. Again, a month later, when Carle first presented their proposal to the Plan Commission, there were no changes or alternatives, and no other options available. Now, on the night that the Plan Commission was to vote on the proposal, Carle shows alternative locations for the guest house to be built.

Mr. Doyle went on to discuss the issue that during the process of developing the Master Site Plan or Development Agreement, Carle stated that within five to fifteen years they would expand north of Church Street. UCAN argued for Carle not to expand in five years, since that would not be far away. Carle stated that they did not want to be land-locked with no place to expand. The only reason UCAN agreed with the Development Agreement was because they had the understanding that Carle would not expand north until after Carle had already expanded east, west and south as far as they possibly could.

Mr. Doyle mentioned that he felt the best location for the proposed guest house would be in location #1 on the Guest House Site Consideration handout. The reason is because there would not be any neighborhoods opposing the tearing down and expansion of Carle Hospital to the west.

He stated that the planning process is about gathering information from all interested parties. Carle did not do that with this proposal. An example of a good planning process is the University of Illinois's expansion.

Mr. Alix asked Mr. Doyle to speak on how UCAN felt about the compatibility of the guest house with the residential neighborhood. Mr. Doyle stated that the guest house would be more compatible than a ten-story hospital building. The issue is that the guest house would be an expansion of a medical building. It would only make sense to expand in the medical facility campus.

Mr. Alix commented that Mr. Doyle had mentioned western access to the park as a concern, and questioned what specific concerns regarding how this project was proposed or other projects might restrict that access. Mr. Doyle responded that it has to do with all the development along Orchard Street. Residents want to be part of the park. The neighborhood is the jewel area of the city. The guest house would be the foothold of expansion to the north.

Mr. Alix mentioned the issue of future home replacements not in the new amendment. He asked if UCAN would have any objections to the language as originally proposed that said that Carle could tear down houses in this neighborhood as long as Carle replaced them with houses of equivalent value, size, or rent? Mr. Doyle answered that the Development Agreement was to protect the characteristic of the neighborhood's appearance. Carle can build whatever they want to the west without approval. Carle wants the power to build to the north. The neighborhood wants to be protected from Carle's expansion. Therefore, the original Development Agreement accomplishes that.

Mr. Alix finds the reasoning, that the guest house would be the foothold to Carle expanding to the north and that this would be a major change to what happened in the past, a little hard to accept, because it seemed that the particular project proposed is a relatively minor project. He asked Mr. Doyle to give a good reason for the Plan Commission to deny the proposal. Mr. Doyle gave the following reasons: 1) destroying affordable housing for no reason when there are other locations to build the guest house, 2) zoning and planning directs growth in certain ways to make areas compatible, 3) why expand north into residential area when Carle owns property in the west and east, and 4) the Development Agreement was approved because it would be incompatible to build MIC District in residential neighborhoods.

Mr. Kangas wanted to correct a few things that Mr. Doyle had stated. He believed that the Plan Commission never gave an official opinion on the original Carle case (Development Agreement). The City Council, UCAN, and Carle had come to an agreement before the Plan Commission ever closed the case. Secondly, this was not the first time that the Plan Commission had see alternative locations. Several members of the Plan Commission asked questions and talked about alternative locations at the Plan Commission meeting a month prior to this meeting. Mr. Doyle responded that he meant to say that the neighborhood residents have not had time to see the alternative locations for the proposed guest house. Mr. Kangas stated that the Plan Commission meeting a month ago was a public hearing. Mr. Doyle asked if the Guest House Site Considerations handout was available then? Mr. Kangas replied no; however, members of the Plan Commission pointed out specific locations on the display map and talked about alternative locations. Mr. Doyle commented that UCAN had also discussed several alternative locations for the guest house during neighborhood meetings with Carle.

Loretha Harmon, of 1105 Busey, commented that she has lived in her neighborhood since 1972. She likes the neighborhood where she lives. She stated that she was glad that some of the events from the past had been mentioned at this meeting. One issue that upset her most was that the City always seems to put the neighborhood residents in opposition to Carle. She would like to feel that the City represents the residents as well. The Development Agreement was agreed upon by the City, the neighborhood (UCAN), and Carle Hospital.

Mr. Alix questioned whether the residents were having problems with the guest house on the proposed site or with the process with what might happen in the future beyond this proposal? Ms. Harmon replied that there was no objection to the guest house in general; however, she had objections to the location of the proposed guest house.

Petitioner Testimony

Mr. Ols re-approached the Plan Commission. He commented that since he has only been with Carle for three years, he did not carry the history of what happened previously between Carle Hospital, UCAN, and the neighborhood. Therefore, he felt challenged. He understands that Carle Hospital is asking to change things. However, Carle is placing specific perimeters on what they can do with that space. There is a huge difference between the guest house and what Carle can build west of the hospital. By building the guest house to the north, it will be out of the fray. Carle does a good job with maintaining their other residential properties.

Mr. Ols wanted to clarify that Carle Hospital has spent close to \$20,000,000 to expand the campus since the Master Facility Agreement was signed. Not all of the expansion has been to the west. Carle has built the Forum, the Lab Building, changed the Park Street turnaround, changed the entire front entrance, and done a tremendous amount of renovations inside the hospital.

Mr. Ols stated that he dropped off a packet for Bob Leach in August that stated Carle would be happy to sit down and talk about the project. Mr. Ols added that he had not received one call to setup a meeting or one question asked regarding the project.

Ms. Stake mentioned that Mr. Ols had made a comment stating that he did not think the zoning was a big issue, but it is. The integrity of the residential neighborhood is jeopardized by Carle expanding across the street. If the guest house was built above the parking garage with a walkway to the hospital, then the guests would not have to go down to ground level. Mr. Ols commented that Carle wanted to build a respite place for guests to get away from the hospital and be able to relax in a home environment.

Ms. Stake asked if the guest house would pay taxes? Mr. Ols answered that taxes will continue to be paid as if the two houses were still there. Taxes fall under the EAV. Ms. Stake asked what the EAV means? Mr. Alix replied that EAV stands for Equalized Assessed Value. Mr. Ross explained that the EAV provision in the agreement means that a house being torn down will continue to be assessed at the rate that it was still standing. There will be no change to the tax revenue.

Ms. Stake questioned who would pay for the building and operation of the guest house. Mr. Ols responded that the Carle Auxiliary and the Carle Foundation would cover those costs.

Mr. Alix inquired into the process of the neighborhood meetings. Mr. Ols had stated that Carle solicited input from the neighborhood, and no one would talk to Carle or offer suggestions. At every Plan Commission meeting, people have stated that they gave Carle input, but that Carle would not listen. Mr. Ols claimed that neither Carle nor UCAN called any meetings together to throw issues on the table. Carle's meetings were more informational.

Mr. Alix questioned whether there was a general consensus in the administration at Carle that UCAN is a positive force to work with or an obstruction to what Carle wants to do. Mr. Ols stated that there has been a lot of change in the administration of Carle over the last three years. There have been meetings between Carle and the neighborhood twice a year for the last three years, and there was never any contentious issues mentioned.

Mr. Alix asked if Mr. Ols could explain how Carle has stayed in and continues to stay in the spirit of the original Development Agreement. Mr. Ols stated that there are blocks of land with timetables on them. As Mr. Doyle mentioned, UCAN was thinking fifteen years (in the five to fifteen years area), whereas, Carle (the landowner) was thinking five years. There is a difference. Mr. Ols felt that the Development Agreement was well crafted, and that the change for the future was spelled out. Carle would not be here if Carle did not believe that the proposed guest house on the proposed site would be a positive thing for everyone.

Mr. Alix asked if Mr. Ols could give any guidance as to Carle's intention north of the proposed site for the guest house? Mr. Ols responded that Carle has no specific plans to expand north. The guest house would be more of a residential structure than Carle could ever build. It will act as a buffer between the MIC District and the rest of the neighborhood. There is plenty of land to the west to build MIC.

Mr. Alix commented that the impression from the neighborhood is that before Carle expands to the north, Carle will use all available land in the current MIC Zone. This seems to be the deal worked out in the Development Agreement according to the neighborhood. Mr. Ols responded that in terms of institutional buildings, it would only make sense to expand west. He cannot speak to the spirit of the Development Agreement on Carle's behalf because he was not involved with it. The neighborhood is important to Carle as well.

Ms. Upah-Bant mentioned that a question had been brought up at the Community Development Commission meeting of whether Carle would proceed with the construction of the guest house if the zoning were changed on the parcels and not on the MIC District. She asked if this idea had been pursued since that meeting? Mr. Ross replied that with the types of rezoning that would need to occur, the idea would be unlikely. The biggest stretch would be to rezone to R-4. In terms of the LaSalle criteria, there are no adjacent properties in the surrounding area other than R-2; therefore, the guest house would not be compatible. The guest house is not mentioned in zoning limitations.

Plan Commission Discussion on Plan Case 1792-T-01

Ms. Stake stated that she preferred to vote on the amendments separately. There was a large amount of discussion amongst the Plan Commission members as to how the motions should be made and what each vote would pertain to. Ms. Tyler suggested having Plan Case 1792-T-01 be split into two parts (Part A and Part B) of which the following would apply:

Part A would consist of: **Amend Article II, Section 11-3 “Definitions” to include “guest house for patient families/support members” and Amend Section V-10.A to include “guest house for patient families/support members”.**

Part B would consist of: **Amend Section IV-2.I to include the following properties in the MIC Special District (generally described as those within the boundaries of Lincoln Avenue, Church Street, the Conrail Railway Company right-of-way, and McCullough Street extended north to Church Street) as follows:**

Four properties north of Church Street between Coler Street and Orchard Street, commonly known as 701 and 703 North Orchard and 702 and 704 North Coler, legally described as follows: Lots 1, 2, 19, and 20 in M.W. & G. W. Busey’s Subdivision of Lot B, City of Urbana, Champaign County, Illinois.

The properties at 701 and 703 North Orchard Street will be developed for a guest house for patient families/support members and the properties at 702 and 704 North Coler Street will either continue as presently utilized or be used for future guest house purposes. A guest house is an overnight residence to provide respite for family and support members to patients in serious condition at Carle Hospital.

Ms. Stake made a motion to forward 1792-T-01 (Part A) to City Council with a recommendation for approval of the proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Rank seconded the motion. The roll call was as follows:

Mr. Alix	-	Yes	Mr. Douglas	-	Yes
Mr. Kangas	-	Yes	Mr. Knaap	-	Yes
Mr. Pollock	-	Yes	Ms. Stake	-	Yes
Ms. Upah-Bant	-	Yes			

The motion was passed by unanimous vote.

Ms. Stake commented that she does not see a compelling reason for rezoning the area north of Church Street. She cannot make sense of demolishing affordable housing to build a guest house.

She felt this would be a good basis for denial of the plan case. There are plenty of alternative locations for the guest house.

Mr. Knaap stated that the guest house is a good idea. However, he felt that there would be a tremendous, excess demand for the guest house service. There would only be twelve spaces available. He found some of the arguments regarding the MIC District agreement and its significance to be compelling. The Development Agreement should be given appropriate recognition. It was developed to provide compromise between different groups. He was not convinced that the proposed location for the proposed guest house would be good for the neighborhood, the City of Urbana, or for Carle Hospital. Carle wants to place the guest house at the proposed site to maximize the access to Carle Park. It would also be detrimental to Carle's future expansion to the north. He felt that Carle needed to go back to the drawing board to find a happy medium on the location of the guest house. Finally, he stated that he liked alternative location #3. The reason was that the guest house would be a nice building along University Avenue. In terms of what would be best for the City of Urbana as opposed to what would be best for the twelve people using the guest house, he felt that site 3 would be a much better option.

Mr. Alix agreed with most of what Mr. Knaap stated except for his conclusion. He felt that the project as a whole was okay. There are some things that he disliked, such as a significant portion of the lot taken up with parking. Carle made a reasonable argument as to why they wanted to have parking adjacent to the guest house. He felt that in trying to keep with the residential character of this neighborhood, having a guest house with a twelve-space parking lot tends to detract from the illusion of a house that Carle would be trying to create. However, he believed that the guest house would be compatible with the residential neighborhood.

Mr. Alix commented that he did not feel that the guest house would be a foothold for Carle to expand further north of Church Street. Carle wants to rezone the four properties for a specific use. It is a use that is reasonably compatible. When the original MIC boundaries were defined, the concerns that the neighborhood had about the MIC expansion and what type of buildings would be built, everyone had in mind the type of buildings that Carle already had such as hospital, labs, warehouses, parking lots, and support buildings. At that time, no one had a guest house in mind. It is a hospital building and a house.

Mr. Alix mentioned that he supports the idea that landholders have the right to develop their land how they want as long as the landholders have good intentions. However, it would be in Carle's best interest if Carle worked more closely with the neighborhood residents on the next expansion project to prevent major issues from being raised. Mr. Alix stated that he would support this proposal.

Ms. Upah-Bant commented that she disagreed with Mr. Alix in regards to if Carle was not thinking about building a guest house, then they should have been. Guest houses are not a novel creation. There are guest houses situated with hospitals all over the country. Therefore, she could not support this without seeing a larger site plan to show further plans and rationale for extending the MIC District.

Mr. Rank stated that Mr. Alix covered several of the points he was going to make. Like Mr. Knaap, he was moved by the sincerity and logic of the positions presented during the public testimony. He agrees with Mr. Alix that Carle has a public relations problem that Carle needs to address. However, the neighbors need to consider Carle's position. Carle's core mission does not extend to providing affordable rental housing in the community. If Carle's long-range plans are continuously subjected to this kind of scrutiny and opposition, and they choose to divest themselves of the 47 homes that they currently own, then it would create havoc in the real estate market and forever change the nature of the neighborhood. He doubted that any other real estate investor would maintain a rental community, which that neighborhood essentially is, at the level that Carle has done it. The process was flawed, the project has merit, and he would support it.

Mr. Kangas commented that strictly from a land use perspective, he felt that it was in the bounds of what was discussed six years ago in regards to expansion to the north. The guest house would look more like a house and less institutional. It would offer that kind of buffering down to a residential neighborhood. He understands that Carle wants to keep the west area for expansion for more institutional types of buildings.

Mr. Douglas commented that with living in the neighborhood, it seems like a balancing act between the past and the future. Carle is a great institution that is attempting to grow and provide a service against a stable neighborhood with character. He felt there was no compelling reason to extend the MIC District zoning. The guest house may be a minor structure to Carle Hospital; however, it is a major structure to the neighborhood. There was no reason to move away from the Development Agreement. He would not support the proposal.

Mr. Pollock commented that it would take an exceptional situation for him to agree to move the MIC District boundary north of Church Street. The guest house would be an exceptional project. The guest house would be something that the community could use.

Mr. Pollock added that whether it would be six month planning horizon or fifty years, any changes outside the MIC District would have to come before the Plan Commission and the City Council. By placing the guest house on the corner of Church Street and Orchard, it would protect the neighborhood to the north. He mentioned that he did not blame the neighborhood to the north for being wary based on the history of what has happened. If the Plan Commission had decided to approve this motion, he would have suggested to only approving two of the four lots.

Mr. Rank made a motion to approve the staff recommendation with regards to Plan Case 1792-T-01 (Part B) to be forwarded to City Council with a recommendation for approval. Mr. Alix seconded the motion.

Mr. Knaap added that the reason why he did not support this motion was not to protect the neighborhood nearly as much as to protect the broader interest of the City of Urbana. This neighborhood will eventually be consumed by Carle. The question is whether the City is going to do it in an orderly process and a planned process through an agreement. Those are his issues.

The roll call was as follows:

Mr. Alix	-	Yes	Mr. Douglas	-	No
Mr. Kangas	-	Yes	Mr. Knaap	-	No
Mr. Pollock	-	Yes	Mr. Rank	-	Yes
Ms. Stake	-	No	Ms. Upah-Bant	-	No

The motion was tied 4-4; therefore, there was no recommendation to forward to City Council.

Plan Commission Discussion on Plan Case 1793-DA-01

Ms. Tyler suggested that Plan Case 1793-DA-01 be split into two parts, which would be as follows:

Part A would consist of **ARTICLE I – Demolition and Replacement of Residential Structure at 809 North Orchard.**

Part B would consist of **ARTICLE II – Addition of Properties to Medical Institutional Campus Zoning District.**

Chair Pollock agreed.

Mr. Knaap moved to approve Plan Case 1793-DA-01 (Part A) to be forwarded to City Council with the recommendation for approval. Ms. Stake seconded the motion. Roll call was as follows:

Mr. Douglas	-	Yes	Mr. Kangas	-	Yes
Mr. Knaap	-	Yes	Mr. Pollock	-	Yes
Mr. Rank	-	Yes	Ms. Stake	-	Yes
Ms. Upah-Bant	-	Yes	Mr. Alix	-	Yes

The motion was passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. Alix moved to approve Plan Case 1793-DA-01 (Part B) to be forwarded to City Council with the recommendation for approval. Mr. Kangas seconded the motion. Roll call was as follows:

Mr. Kangas	-	Yes	Mr. Knaap	-	No
Mr. Pollock	-	No	Mr. Rank	-	Yes
Ms. Stake	-	No	Ms. Upah-Bant	-	No
Mr. Alix	-	Yes	Mr. Douglas	-	No

The motion failed with a vote of 5-3.

6. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

7. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

8. NEW BUSINESS

Review of Existing Conditions Report for 2002 Comprehensive Plan Update.

Rob Kowalski gave a Power Point slide presentation regarding the Existing Conditions Report for the 2002 Comprehensive Plan Update. He mentioned that the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee and City Staff worked to put the Existing Conditions Report together and the Committee has approved it for public review. They are asking for general comments from the Plan Commission.

During his presentation, Mr. Kowalski reviewed the following:

- Who is on the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee?
- The phases of the Comprehensive Plan.
- Participants of the plan update.
- The schedule of the phases.

Mr. Kowalski, then, gave a brief review of the chapters in the Existing Conditions Report. He commented on the following:

- Chapter 1 is an introduction.
- Chapter 2 talks about the existing plans.
- Chapter 3 gives a history of Urbana.
- Chapter 4 shows the demographics regarding population, housing and employment in Urbana.
- Chapter 5 defines Urbana's land use, zoning, and annexation.
- Chapter 6 explains Urbana's economic development.
- Chapter 7 discusses the environment regarding soils, hydrology, urban forest, and project impact in Urbana.
- Chapter 8 describes transportation.
- Chapter 9 defines the utilities.
- Chapter 10 identifies the community services in Urbana.

Mr. Kowalski stated that the next steps would be to incorporate comments, update census data, and re-publish for final Steering Committee approval. He asked for comments regarding missing data, topics not discussed, or some analysis that would be beneficial.

Mr. Douglas mentioned that he skimmed it and felt that it was an excellent source of information

Mr. Alix agreed with Mr. Douglas. He felt it was great to define the neighborhoods. It gives the neighborhood organizations some encouragement to have City recognition of that entity as being a neighborhood.

Mr. Alix asked if in the chapter regarding employment, were the numbers for full-time equivalence or were those total number of employees? Mr. Kowalski replied that those numbers refer to full-time employees. Mr. Alix commented that Mr. Kowalski should indicate whether the numbers refer to full-time employees. It would be great to see total employees and potentially even total payroll.

Mr. Alix stated that in regards to the real estate tax differential, more details should be given as to why it is that Urbana's tax rate is higher and include taxing bodies and their rates. He inquired as to whether Urbana would own the new fire station being built on the University of Illinois Campus or will it be U of I owned and leased to Urbana? Mr. Kangas answered that the City of Urbana owns that fire station. Mr. Alix commented that should be mentioned in the summary for the Fire Department.

Lastly, Mr. Alix commented on the University of Illinois' zoning. It would be nice to address and include in the Comprehensive Plan Update, a cleaning up of the outdated "U of I" zoning.

Mr. Knaap had one big issue with everything in the Existing Conditions Report being confined to the City of Urbana. He felt that information was needed on other cities to get an idea of what is going on in surrounding areas and how the City of Urbana relates.

Another issue that Mr. Knaap had was with the land use map. Meadowbrook Park was still listed as "Agriculture". Mr. Kowalski replied that it was part of the park that had not been developed. Mr. Alix commented that the park had been fully developed. Ms. Tyler remarked that the map was out-of-date. Farmland was bought and developed into a park in pieces. Farmers continued to farm the land until it had been developed. Mr. Alix asked if it had been turned into prairie land? Mr. Knaap replied that was correct. Mr. Kowalski stated that he would change the agriculture listing to conservation-recreation-education.

Mr. Knaap commented that in regards to economic development, he would like occupational composition, income levels, poverty rates, etc. included in the report. In viewing the land use change, it might be misleading to show commercial as a low percentage without showing vacant commercial percentages. Lastly, Mr. Knaap mentioned that it would be informative to see more quantitative data on affordable housing.

Overall, Mr. Knaap agreed that the Existing Conditions Report was a nice piece of work; however, there are some other pieces of data that could be put into it.

Mr. Kangas mentioned that there had been revisions to the University of Illinois South Farmland. April Getchius would probably have updated maps.

9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There was none.

10. STAFF REPORT

Ms. Tyler gave a staff report as follows:

- She reviewed the schedule for the Neighborhood Workshops on the Comprehensive Plan Update.
- She mentioned that the Staff recommendation regarding the UCSD Long-Range Plan was approved by the City Council.
- The projecting signs case was moved to be continued by City Council to coincide with review of the Downtown Plan.
- She reported on the North Cunningham Avenue Corridor Redevelopment Plan.

11. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth H. Tyler, Secretary
Urbana Plan Commission