

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING

URBANA PLAN COMMISSION

APPROVED

DATE: June 19, 2003

TIME: 7:30 P.M.

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Christopher Alix, Alan Douglas, Laurie Goscha, Lew Hopkins, Michael Pollock, Don White

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Randy Kangas, Bernadine Stake, Marilyn Upah-Bant

STAFF PRESENT: Rob Kowalski, Planning Manager; Tim Ross, Senior Planner; Teri Andel, Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT: Wesley Meyers, Dave Monk

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

The meeting was called to order at 7:34 p.m., the roll call was taken, and a quorum was declared.

***Note:** Rob Kowalski, Planning Manager, mentioned that Tim Ross, Senior Planner, was leaving the City of Urbana to move to New York. He was accepted to the Department of Arts and Humanities at Columbia University Teachers College for the Summer 2003 Term. He will be pursuing a Masters of Arts degree with the specialization of teaching English to speakers of other languages. As part of the Peace Corps Fellows program at Teachers College, he will also be teaching full time in the New York Public Schools starting in the fall. The Plan Commission expressed their “Congratulations” and wished Mr. Ross “Good Luck”.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

There were none.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Alix moved to approve the minutes from the April 10, 2003 meeting. Mr. Hopkins seconded the motion. The minutes were then approved as presented by unanimous voice vote.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

- Letter from the Illinois Chapter of the American Planning Association stating that the City of Urbana had received a Chapter Honorable Mention Award in the Plan of the Year category for the “City of Urbana Comprehensive Plan Update – Public Participation Process”.

5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

6. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

7. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

8. NEW BUSINESS

Plan Case # 1858-S-03: Revised Preliminary Plat for Lots 300 and 302 of East Urbana Industrial Park and Final Replat of Lots 300 and 302 of East Urbana Industrial Park

Mr. Kowalski presented the staff report. He gave a brief history of the original preliminary plat for the East Urbana Industrial Park. He discussed the access, drainage, utilities, and the requested waivers for the proposed development. He summarized staff findings and read the options of the Urbana Plan Commission. He presented the staff recommendation, which was as follows:

Staff recommended that the Plan Commission forward this case to the City Council with a recommendation to approve the Preliminary and Final Plats of the East Urbana Industrial Park Subdivision along with the two requested waivers.

Wes Meyers, of VSA Engineering, stated that this essentially amounts to a second-generation replat of the remaining unplatted 17.6-acre lot. There would be nine new lots, with the inclusion of one lot for minor reconfiguration. He believed that Tatman Construction, Inc. had one pending potential sale for one of the lots at the northwest corner of what would become Industrial Circle and Tatman Court. The remaining lots are undetermined of what the actual use would be. Tatman Construction, Inc. are wanting to create a varying size of lots that could be used for different purposes and/or replatted if a user came in needing a larger lot than what would be created by this particular plat.

He went on to say that the one lot would not have frontage on a public street, but would have access via ingress and egress easement. The intent there was to be a mirror image of the somewhat large warehouse that was constructed on the lot adjoining it to the north.

Mr. White inquired as to whom would have the decision to determine when the requested deferred sidewalk would be built? Mr. Kowalski answered by saying that there were a number of different ways the City could handle this issue. First, the City could require Tatman Construction, Inc. to build the sidewalk immediately. Second, the City could defer it by either allowing it to be built incrementally as each lot is developed or allow them to defer it to some point in the future when the City would feel that it was necessary for the developer to build it. If the City defers the sidewalk to be built incrementally as each lot was developed, then the City would also require the developer to bond it up front; in case, the developer leaves, then the City could finish the construction of the sidewalk. The City typically only defers sidewalk construction to some point in the future when a lot is subdivided in the ETJ Area, and where there are not any sidewalks and the City does not anticipate needing any. The City would prefer to either require the developer to build the sidewalk immediately or allow them to build it incrementally. Either way, the decision is made by the Administrative Review Committee, which are essentially Community Development and Public Works representatives.

Mr. White assumed that the only advantage to not building the sidewalk now, other than cost, would be so that the developer would not risk having to damage the sidewalk with heavy trucks when they build on that lot. Mr. Meyers agreed that was one advantage. He noted that the developer had been waffling back and forth as to which side of the cul-de-sac would make the most sense to build the sidewalk on. Mr. White felt that it would be good to make a decision on the sidewalk before approving the proposed preliminary and final plats.

Chair Pollock asked what the parking requirement in the Industrial Zone for the lots themselves? Would it depend on the size of the development? Mr. Kowalski replied that it would depend on the use of the lots. Different industrial uses would have different requirements. The requirement was usually 1 per 1,000 square feet.

Mr. Hopkins inquired as to why it was so important to plat the one lot to be landlocked and require an easement for access rather than platting it as a deep lot with road frontage? He stated that it was pretty unusual to create a landlocked parcel. Mr. Meyers commented that it was not that unusual. In this particular situation, it would allow for the creation of one additional lot. Otherwise they would have to reduce the size of the lots in order to get the additional frontage around the L-shape of what would become "Industrial Circle" street and the extension of the new "Tatman Court" cul-de-sac to the west. The situation was one where they could create another lot internally or reduce the frontage on all the other lots along the public street to gain another lot by having public frontage on it. Being a warehouse-type lot, frontage on a public street might not be a significant issue for exposure.

Mr. Hopkins questioned if the Lot 311 had been sold? Mr. Meyers answered by saying that Lot 311 had not been sold. The developer currently owned it. Mr. Hopkins asked if it would be possible for a street to be dedicated or way to specify between the two lots? Mr. Meyers replied that it would not meet the width requirement for a dedicated street per se. Mr. Kowalski noted that it would be problematic with its intersection of the bulb with the cul-de-sac, and it would also affect the existing parking lot that was built there. It would have to be rebuilt to the standard

of a street. The requested easement would make it a little easier for the developer to get access back to Lot 310 without having to meet those requirements.

Mr. Hopkins commented that if the parcel had already been sold, then it would have been more complicated. He felt that in effect, they were creating a lot and providing access to that lot in a way that did not meet the City's requirements. He questioned why the City has requirements? Mr. Kowalski responded by saying that the access to the lot was satisfactory to City staff. He noted that the City did not have specific requirements for providing access easements. Staff looked to make sure that the easement was a sufficient width and that the agreement was one that was perpetual. Mr. Meyers added that in the future, either lot could be sold and the easement would run with the land.

Mr. Hopkins noted that the access to the water storage tower, south of the proposed property, was off Pfeffer Road. Mr. Meyers commented that the tower was not part of the replat. The tower and access to the tower was actually part of the Urbana School District #116 Subdivision. He added that there was a restricted access from Pfeffer Road to the proposed replat. There was a berm built along there that was like a landscaping berm. Therefore, there was no access to Pfeffer Road from the proposed replat.

Mr. Hopkins inquired as to whether it made sense to have the access to the water tower come in from Pfeffer Road rather than High Cross Road? He was concerned about how the street layout that the City was creating would relate to the parcel on the south, which had not yet been platted. There was no notion of how the streets were going to work. Mr. Kowalski responded by saying that the lot that the water tower sits on did not extend to High Cross Road. Mr. Meyers added that the property to the east of the water tower was under a different ownership. Mr. Hopkins commented that from the City's point of view, they were platting land. Some of the issues to consider in doing so were parcels, access, street connectivity, etc. This parcel with the water tower would be creating no street connectivity and would be giving up access. Mr. Kowalski commented that the City did not know how the parcels to the south would be developed. The parcel owned by the Urbana School District was zoned low-density residential. The parcel to the east of the water tower was currently not in the City limits. If these two parcels were to develop as industrial, then it would make sense to have a stub of a street from the proposed new development to the two parcels. If not, then the City would not be looking to connect the industrial park to a residential subdivision.

Mr. Hopkins pointed out that on the draft Future Land Use Map, the two parcels were shown to be industrial. Mr. Kowalski stated that staff and the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee are still working on updating the Future Land Use Map.

Mr. Hopkins inquired if the School District owned the parcel with the premise of a possible school site? Mr. White mentioned that the parcel was bought for that reason some years ago with money from the federal government as a potential new site, because it was thought that Urbana would expand to that direction. Mr. Hopkins stated that presumably the School District does not buy land that was speculative. Mr. White stated that by law, the Urbana School District was not able to do so. Mr. Hopkins inquired if the Urbana School District could sell land? Mr. White replied that they could sell land in certain ways.

Mr. White moved to forward this case to the City Council with a recommendation for approval along with the waiver requests and with a general recommendation that the deferral of sidewalk construction be permitted but be constructed on an intermittent basis. Mr. Douglas seconded the motion. The roll call was as follows:

Mr. Douglas	-	Yes	Ms. Goscha	-	Yes
Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes	Mr. Pollock	-	Yes
Mr. White	-	Yes	Mr. Alix	-	Yes

The motion was passed by unanimous vote.

9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There was none.

10. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

11. STAFF REPORT

Mr. Kowalski reported on the following:

- **Next Upcoming Meeting** was scheduled for July 10th. There will be a public hearing for a text amendment for an Interim Development Ordinance in the M.O.R., Mixed-Office Residential Zoning District.
- **Future Cases:** Staff was expecting a review of a CCZBA for a rezoning of the Apple Dumpling restaurant site on High Cross Road. There was a fire a few weeks back, and in order for them to rebuild, the owner will need a commercial zoning district instead of an agricultural zoning. In addition, staff was still expecting subdivision plats to come in for Sunny Estates.

12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

Chair Pollock adjourned the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rob Kowalski, Secretary
Urbana Plan Commission