

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING

URBANA PLAN COMMISSION

APPROVED

DATE: June 6, 2002

TIME: 7:30 P.M.

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Christopher Alix, Lew Hopkins, Randy Kangas, Michael Pollock, Marilyn Upah-Bant

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Alan Douglas, Joseph Rank, Bernadine Stake

STAFF PRESENT: Rob Kowalski, Planning Manager; Libby Tyler, CD Director; Tim Ross, Senior Planner; Teri Hayn, Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT: Carl Hill, Michael Lopez, Bob McCartney, Karl Radnitzer, Susan Taylor

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

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m., the roll call was taken, and a quorum was declared.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

There were none.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Hopkins moved to approve the minutes from the meeting held on May 23, 2002. Ms. Upah-Bant seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by unanimous vote.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

Plan Case #1824-T-02: Request by the Urbana Zoning Administrator to Amend Section II-3, Definitions and Table V-1, Table of Uses of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance to add “Methadone Treatment Facility” was continued to a future meeting to be determined.

6. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

7. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

8. NEW BUSINESS

Plan Case # 1823-S-02: Request for Waivers of Subdivision Regulations for South Ridge V, VI, and VII Subdivisions.

Tim Ross, Senior Planner, introduced the case by giving a brief background. He discussed the waivers, which were as follows:

1. *Waiver of the requirement for barrier curb, Section 21-54D.*
2. *Waiver of requirement to allow Baronry Drive north of the site to be terminated in a hammerhead cul-de-sac rather than be continued through the subdivision. This requirement was created through Ordinance # 2001-05-048, which approved the Preliminary Plat for South Ridge V, VI, and VII.*

Mr. Ross explained that these waivers must meet certain criteria, and he reviewed that criterion. He summarized staff findings and read the options of the Plan Commission. He noted that staff recommended that the Plan Commission forward this case to the City Council with a recommendation to deny the requested waivers.

Bill Gray, Director of Public Works, reiterated that Baronry Drive is classified as a collector street. In our Subdivision Land Development Code, arterial and collector streets require barrier curbs. One possible reason why the other portion of Myra Ridge Subdivision was allowed to use mountable curbs was because the original portion of Myra Ridge is about twenty-five or thirty years old and may perhaps have predated the ordinance that requires barrier curbs. From Public Works perspective, South Ridge III Subdivision should have used barrier curbs as well and do not condone that the curbs are mountable in that area. Another reason might be that when Myra Ridge Subdivision was originally built, it may not have been envisioned through the lack of a general area plan that Baronry Drive would have been a collector-designated street.

Mr. Alix mentioned that regarding the Savannah Green Subdivision, he remembered a discussion about half-mountable curbs. The developers had a curb profile that they considered mountable, which fell within the City’s classification of a barrier curb. He asked how that related to this?

Mr. Gray answered by saying that it was a little different profile. On the local streets in Myra Ridge Subdivision, that type of curb would not be a curb that would be desired. It would be a significant bump to go in and out of a driveway. He stated that part of the beauty for that curb for a local street is that if there was an overlay, then there would still be a little bit of a curb face left. The downside of a collector street by definition is that it has more traffic with heavier vehicles on it. It is more of a candidate for future road resurfacing than a local street would be. Thus, the curb face is important.

Mr. Alix asked if Mr. Gray felt that the curb type used in Savannah Green would be okay for Myra Ridge? Mr. Gray replied no, because it would be a detractor in the sell of homes. No one would want to drive his or her vehicle over a bump everyday. In Savannah Green, there are no driveways. There is alley access to get to the garages.

Mr. Alix inquired as to how much it would cost to construct the hammerhead versus the construction of only the curb? He also wanted to know who would bear those costs. Mr. Gray responded that the developer bears the cost. In regards to cost, Mr. Gray believed it would be less than \$10,000.

Mr. Alix asked if it would all be in existing City right-of-way? Mr. Gray stated that was correct. He added that a detail that needed to be worked out with the developer was that there are parkway trees, which might possibly conflict with the location of the hammerhead. The City would work with the developer to make sure the trees were saved. Mr. Alix inquired how the City would save those trees? Mr. Gray replied that the trees could be saved by pushing the hammerhead a little to the south.

Mr. Alix inquired about the basketball goal at the south end of Baronry Drive. Mr. Gray replied that there are a lot of the basketball goals showing up in a lot of locations. Mr. Alix asked if the City had an opinion about these basketball goals? Mr. Gray commented that as long as the goals are retracted or removed at the end of the day, then they are fine. The City has encountered some basketball goals with street sweepers and dump trucks in the past. They should be removed back on private property.

Carl Hill, of 1913 Trails Drive, talked about curbing and the requested hammerhead. He stated that he was looking for something that is user friendly yet looks good.

Mr. Hill referred to the map included in the staff report and stated that in the whole general area, he would like to have one length of street as a barrier curb. There are several reasons why he would like to stay with a user friendly, residential friendly, bike-friendly, and slit-form paver friendly curb that could be used in the subdivision to continue the type of curb that is mountable and does not have to be cut out for driveways.

Mr. Hill noted that he tried to come up with a curb that was in between the mountable curb and the barrier curb. However, it ended up being too much of a bump for residents with a RV or a jeep. Joe Smith and others came up with a curb to use in Fairway Estates Subdivision that worked as a mountable-type curb. If water builds up on the grass from rain, then it is only a matter of few minutes before the water is gone. Therefore, the fact that the curb is higher really

does not have much of an impact. Mr. Hill went on to say what does have an impact is when the developers have to cut this type of curb out for driveways. Whenever there is a slit-form paver producing a curb and street, the result is a profile that is fairly tall at the edge. Although stiff concrete is used with a slit-form paver, there are some imperfections. When dirt is piled back against the curb, and all you can see is the top of the curb. When you cut into the curb, there are areas that are not exactly perfect. Trying to pour driveway up against it creates a problem of trying to make it look good and straight.

Mr. Hill explained that with a mountable curb, snowplows might just go over and back. The worse thing that could happen is that the snowplow might scratch up a little bit of sod. On a barrier curb, the blades of snowplows keep hitting the curb time after time. Eventually, it will cause deterioration of the curb, which is not appealing and is not easy to fix. There are a lot of things that go into the aesthetics of a curb. It is not just in the short term, but it is also in the long term of a curb.

Mr. Hill had discussed with Mr. Gonameyer about the possibility of generating a local business for someone if there were enough lots developed that needed driveways to be cut out. He stated that he usually pays between \$220 and \$260 for each driveway to be cut out. Mr. Hill remarked that he was not very optimistic about this happening.

Mr. Hill went on to say that barrier curbs are not user friendly. In a residential area, such as this subdivision, will probably be a dead end for a long time. There will be a great advantage using mountable curbs to not just the builder, not just the developer, but to the residents who will live there and utilize the facilities that will be in this subdivision.

Mr. Hill talked about asphalt in regards to the barrier curbs. Although it might be easier to asphalt barrier curbs because there would still be some curb remaining, he has found two situations that might pose as problems. The first is that the asphalt is dropped off so that it comes down to the flow line, rather than extending it out to the curb. The other situation is that once the asphalt is laid over into a driveway, then it has to go back into that driveway behind the old curb up to and in the driveway in order to meet the grade that is going into the sidewalk.

Mr. Hill remarked that curbing is an important thing. He would like to see his subdivision continue on as a well-designed, usable, and user-friendly residential area. He believes that a barrier curb is a barrier.

Mr. Alix inquired as to how many lots on Myra Ridge Drive will actually have driveways entering onto Myra Ridge Drive? Mr. Hill replied that there would be at least nine. Mr. Alix asked what the plan was for the lots between Myra Ridge Drive and Memory Lane? Mr. Hill replied that the planning for those lots were to build duplexes, so that each owner would have their own driveway and front yard.

Mr. Hill spoke about the hammerhead turnaround. He mentioned that there would only be the one hammerhead in this area. In place of the hammerhead turnaround, the owners of the properties on Baronry Drive at the stub end have offered their driveways as a place for vehicles to turn around. There is a good possibility of losing one or two trees in the construction of the

turnaround. The sidewalk and the approach are basically the same thickness as the street. Emergency vehicles that can turnaround in a sixty-foot hammerhead can also turnaround in a driveway. Other emergency vehicles, even with an eighty-foot cul-de-sac pavement, back up down the street. Therefore, would emergency vehicles even use a hammerhead turnaround? By not building the hammerhead turnaround, he would save around \$5,000 to \$6,000.

Mr. Alix questioned what the relative cost was (including loss in sales of lots and cost to build additional pavement versus savings from not having to build the extension of Baronry Drive) of the burden that was imposed by requiring that Baronry Drive not continue through? Did it cost more money or save money? Mr. Hill replied that by extending Marc Trail through to Philo Road and not extending Baronry Drive, it is kind of a tradeoff. This has provided South Ridge its own access to Philo Road or Windsor Road. Mr. Alix asked what the cost of building the hammerhead would be as opposed to the cost of extending Baronry Drive? Mr. Hill answered that he would be saving between \$15,000 and \$18,000 by building the hammerhead turnaround.

Karl Radnitzer, of 3210 Baronry Drive, presented some pictures, which showed how the hammerhead turnaround would affect his neighbors and himself. It was the understanding of the neighborhood that the hammerhead turnaround would be going south of the end of the street. He supports the road ending there. Neighbors are willing to allow vehicles to use their driveway to turn around.

Bob McCartney, of 3209 Baronry Drive, was concerned about how the hammerhead would look in front of his home. He will lose one of his big trees, as will Mr. Radnitzer. It will make a difference on how his property will look. He noted that the basketballs in the photos represent the width of the hammerhead and how much Mr. Radnitzer and himself will lose in front yard space.

Mr. Pollock inquired as to whether it was City property? Mr. McCartney replied that was correct.

Ms. Upah-Bant remembered that the neighborhood of Deerfield Trails was originally happy with the idea of a hammerhead turnaround to stub the street. Mr. Radnitzer replied that it was their understanding that if the hammerhead turnaround had to be put in, then it would be going south from the street. Now, the Deerfield Trails neighbors have the understanding that the hammerhead would be going north from the street.

Ms. Upah-Bant questioned if they were unhappy with the location of the hammerhead rather than being unhappy with the hammerhead itself? Mr. Radnitzer replied that they were concerned about the location of the hammerhead. Mr. Pollock commented that they have the luxury of a little additional land that is actually City right-of-way, which would be taken away for the construction of part of the hammerhead turnaround. Mr. McCartney responded that they would lose the distance between the actual sidewalk in front of the house to the street.

Mr. Gray commented that Engineering never set the physical location of the hammerhead turnaround. The City does not want to remove parkway trees. We want to preserve trees if possible. Therefore, it would make a lot of sense to push the hammerhead south. As far as the

bike trail through there, the two can work together well. He has not seen any plans for paving or the bike path come across his desk. With a detailed survey, he would like to think that the hammerhead could be made to fit, so that the trees would be saved.

Mr. Pollock asked Mr. Radnitzer and Mr. McCartney if the hammerhead would be pushed south, then would that remove their objections to having a hammerhead turnaround built? Mr. McCartney noted that if the driveway idea would not work, then by moving the hammerhead turnaround to the south of the street, then the neighborhood would be okay with it.

Michael Lopez, 3208 Baronry Drive, agreed with Mr. Gray. The twenty-feet to the south could be used for the hammerhead turnaround, and the bike path would have a nice drop down into the street and come back up on the other side, as well as the sidewalk extending to the south. This would connect the two divisions together.

Mr. Gray stated that although the Fire Department was not present to speak at this meeting, Mr. Ross and himself have heard their concerns. They do not want to set a precedent of using driveways to turn their fire trucks around in. Therefore, they would prefer to see a hammerhead.

Mr. Pollock inquired if the hammerhead turnaround could be moved far enough south? Mr. Gray replied yes.

Mr. Alix had mixed feelings on the hammerhead turnaround. He does not want to see the street end. He felt that the Fire Department's argument was compelling. Given the fact that continuing the street was not approved, then moving the hammerhead south far enough to spare the trees would be a reasonable solution. However, he does not want to see the hammerhead moved too far south that it would affect the bike path.

Mr. Kangas clarified that the Plan Commission would not be approving or denying the individual plat or how far south the hammerhead would be moved. The Commission would only be deciding whether or not they should allow the waiver for the hammerhead. Mr. Alix commented that based on that, then he needed to support the hammerhead.

Mr. Kangas moved to forward this case to the City Council with the recommendation for denial for waivers proposed for South Ridge V, VI, and VII Subdivisions. Mr. Hopkins seconded the motion. Ms. Upah-Bant requested a friendly amendment to recommend that the City Council consider locating the hammerhead to go south from Baronry Drive. The amendment to the motion was acceptable to both Mr. Kangas, the mover, and to Mr. Hopkins, the seconder. The roll call was as follows:

Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes	Mr. Kangas	-	Yes
Mr. Pollock	-	Yes	Ms. Upah-Bant	-	Yes
Mr. Alix	-	Yes			

The motion was passed by unanimous vote.

Plan Case #CCZBA-331-AT-02: Request by the Champaign County Zoning Administrator for a text amendment for both the Zoning Ordinance and the Interim Stormwater Management Policy (ISMP).

Mr. Ross gave the staff presentation regarding this case. He presented a brief background and reviewed the proposed changes to the Zoning Ordinance and to the policy. He summarized staff findings and read the options of the Plan Commission. He noted that staff recommended that the Plan Commission forward this case to the City Council with a recommendation to defeat a resolution of protest for the proposed text amendment based upon the findings summarized in the staff report.

Ms. Upah-Bant moved to forward this case to the City Council with the recommendation to defeat a resolution of protest. Mr. Alix seconded the motion. The roll call was as follows:

Mr. Kangas	-	Yes	Mr. Pollock	-	Yes
Ms. Upah-Bant	-	Yes	Mr. Alix	-	Yes
Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes			

The motion was passed by unanimous vote.

Annual Review of By-Laws.

Rob Kowalski, Planning Manager presented the by-laws and noted that nothing had been changed. He mentioned that the last review was last year in February.

Mr. Kangas moved to approve the adoption of this version of the by-laws. Mr. Alix seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There was none.

10. STAFF REPORT

2001 Annual Report.

Mr. Kowalski presented the 2001 Annual Report of the Plan Commission cases. He mentioned that the Commission met twenty-one times last year and heard thirty cases.

Mr. Alix inquired if the Comprehensive Plan Amendments were included in this report? Mr. Kowalski answered that none of those amendments were acted upon in the year 2001. There was one proposed in the first part of 2002. The Downtown Plan, which was also an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, fell right in 2002.

11. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

Chair Pollock adjourned the meeting at 8:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rob Kowalski, Secretary
Urbana Plan Commission