

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING**

**URBANA PLAN COMMISSION**

**APPROVED**

**DATE:** September 9, 2004  
**TIME:** 7:30 P.M.  
**PLACE:** Urbana City Building  
400 South Vine Street  
Urbana, IL 61801

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Christopher Alix, Lew Hopkins, Michael Pollock, Bernadine Stake, Don White  
**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Laurie Goscha, Randy Kangas, Marilyn Upah-Bant  
**STAFF PRESENT:** Libby Tyler, Director of Community Development Services; Rob Kowalski, Planning Manager; Paul Lindahl, Planner; Teri Andel, Planning Secretary  
**OTHERS PRESENT:** Bob Dean, JaeHong Kim, DongJun Lim, Barbara Morgan, Paul Tatman, Elizabeth Wirt, Charles Zukoski

---

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

The meeting was called to order at 7:32 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. Alix moved to approve the minutes from the August 5, 2004 meeting of the Plan Commission as presented. Ms. Stake seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.

**4. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS**

- Champaign County Comprehensive Zoning Review
- Champaign County, Illinois Land Use Regulatory Policies – Rural Districts

**5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS**

There were none.

**6. OLD BUSINESS**

There was none.

**7. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**Plan Case # 1871-A-04: Request to revise the approved Planned Unit Development (PUD) plan for the Prairie Winds development (south side of Colorado Avenue, 394 feet east of Philo Road).**

Rob Kowalski, Planning Manager, presented this case to the Plan Commission. He recapped the previous cases regarding the annexation agreement and the Planned Unit Development, which were approved in November 2003. He noted the changes that were made to the preliminary and final plats when they were submitted and approved in August 2003. When the petitioner, Paul Tatman, and his engineers were working on the details for the Prairie Winds development, they found that the size and the shape of the detention area needed to be changed slightly to better serve the entire development. As a result, the change caused a little less room between Prairie Winds Circle and the detention area, which made it difficult to plan the four-plex buildings that were originally proposed. Therefore, the proposed change was to keep the road as a loop-road, change the four-plex buildings to duplexes, and add four new duplex units to the south side of Prairie Winds Circle. Staff felt this was a substantial enough change to warrant a new public hearing and consideration by the Plan Commission and City Council. He summarized staff findings and noted that staff recommended approval of the proposed changes.

Mr. Alix asked what the existing setback was between the house at 2002 Morrow Court and the back property line? Charles Zukoski, of 2002 Morrow Court, stated that the setback was about 30 feet. Mr. Alix asked what the setback from the property line to the proposed four new duplexes would be? Mr. Kowalski replied that there would be about 23 feet from the back of the closest duplex to the property line. Therefore, there would be about 53 feet from the edge of the duplex to the edge of the existing house at 2002 Morrow Court.

Mr. Alix inquired if the adjacent property lines met or was there any buffering or easements between the two? Mr. Kowalski said no. However, there was some vegetation that straddled the property line. Mr. Alix questioned if there was a requirement as to where the wrought iron fence would need to be built? Mr. Kowalski mentioned that the fence could be built on the property line.

Ms. Stake wondered why the developer did not include the four new duplex units on the inside of Prairie Winds Circle rather than have them on the south side of the road. Mr. Kowalski was not sure if the developer could fit the four units inside the looped street.

Ms. Stake inquired if the four new duplex units would be the same size as the units inside the looped road. Mr. Kowalski stated that some of the units would be smaller than other units.

Ms. Stake asked why the detention area was smaller than originally planned? Mr. Kowalski explained that the detention area would be bigger than originally planned, which squeezed the space between the detention area and Prairie Winds Circle. It made it difficult to plan the four-plex units.

He noted that the two detention basins on the west side of Prairie Winds Circle would be temporary detention areas to collect the water that flows over the land until the senior retirement center was built. The temporary detention basins would then be filled, and stormwater would be piped over to the new detention area.

Ms. Stake inquired if the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) would be the same for the residential. Mr. Kowalski answered by saying that overall the lot size would not change. He mentioned that all of the condominiums would be on one lot rather than being on individual lots. So, reducing the four-plex units down to duplexes would keep the FAR consistent, even though there would be an additional two duplex units being added. He stated the FAR was lower than the maximum allowed in the original proposal. It did not come anywhere close to exceeding the FAR requirement.

Mr. Pollock questioned if staff had received any comments from any residents or developers of the Eagle Ridge Subdivision about a preference in terms of what type of screening would be used. Mr. Kowalski responded by saying that he had not heard any specific preferences on the screening. However, he mentioned that he received one phone call from a resident in the condominium part of Eagle Ridge Subdivision who disapproved of the plan. She felt that the original plan was better, and she did not see the need for change.

Mr. Alix inquired as to how far to the east was the east property line of 2002 Morrow Court extended relative to the proposed duplexes? Mr. Kowalski pointed out on a map where the property line was.

Ms. Stake asked what had been decided about the screening? Mr. Kowalski noted that there would be a fence either of wrought iron or opaque. Staff did not offer an official recommendation of what type of screening or fencing should be used. Staff felt that the proposed setbacks would exceed the City's requirements.

Paul Tatman, developer of the proposed development, and Bob Dean, engineer approached the Plan Commission. Mr. Tatman mentioned that the development was going to cost more than anticipated due to some changes that they had to do because of the existing conditions on the site. They had also anticipated a little more financial participation from the City on constructing Colorado Avenue. Therefore, they were trying to maximize their investment to hopefully be able to make some profit off of the proposed development. For this reason and because of the necessary changes to the detention area, they decided to develop duplexes in place of the four-plex units. He commented that he had received some calls from a number of single women in their fifties or above requesting units in the 1200 to 1400-foot range.

Mr. Alix believed that having three units on the south side of Prairie Winds Circle instead of four units would be keeping more in the spirit of the original plan and would potentially make those three units more marketable because they would have bigger yards. He wondered if the petitioner had considered this possibility. Mr. Tatman remarked that they had considered several different options.

Mr. Pollock asked if Mr. Tatman had talked to the neighbors in Eagle Ridge Subdivision in terms of screening? Mr. Tatman mentioned that he had talked with Barbara Morgan and Charles Zukoski. He agreed that they preferred a wrought iron fence. Mr. Pollock felt that if Mr. Tatman and the neighbors agreed upon what type of screening they wanted, then there was not much of an issue.

Mr. Alix questioned if the wrought iron fence would be constructed on the property line? Mr. Tatman replied yes.

Charles Zukoski, of 2002 Morrow Court, thanked Mr. Tatman and Mr. Kowalski for working with him to address his concerns. When an intermediate plan came forward, the setback from the property line to the proposed duplex units was around 5 feet. After working with Mr. Tatman and Mr. Kowalski, it was a changed to 23 feet. Regarding the issue of screening, he agreed that the general consensus was that a wrought iron fence would be much nicer than an opaque privacy fence. Therefore, they were satisfied with the current proposal.

Fred Wirt, of 2007B Eagle Ridge, questioned if there was any more information on the retirement center in terms of whether the job had been put up for bid, etc.? Mr. Tatman responded by saying that the proposed development was about a 22 million dollar project, and they could not do it all at once. They were trying to get the site developed so that they could sell some home lots and start building the condominiums. The retirement center would probably not begin being constructed until spring of 2005.

Mr. Kowalski noted that there had been a lot of discussion about the parking lot for the retirement center. There was a requirement put into the annexation agreement that landscaping had to be put in around the parking lot. The landscaping would need to be reviewed by the City Arborist.

He noted that there had been a lot of work done to the site, as well. Staff had approved the construction plans for Colorado Avenue, which would include an 8-foot bicycle path on the north side of the street. He mentioned that they had received some federal funding for 2006 to improve Colorado Avenue from Philo Road to the site, which would complete the improvement of Colorado Avenue, provide for a signalized intersection at Colorado Avenue and Philo Road, and improve Philo Road from Colorado Avenue south to Mumford Drive.

Mr. Alix asked Mr. Kowalski to speak to the issue of the City's contribution to Colorado Avenue. What was the disconnect between the original plan and what the City paid? Mr. Kowalski did not believe that there was a disconnect. The City agreed to contribute \$60,000 to the overall cost of Colorado Avenue. It was about a \$460,000 investment. The City had a requirement on new development to pay for half the construction of a road when one was being built. This case was unique in that most of the land to the north of Colorado Avenue extended

was not in a position to pay for the other half of the improvement for the road. Most of the frontage on the north side of Colorado Avenue was Lohmann Park and pre-existing apartment buildings.

Mr. Alix questioned as to who paid to build the current half of Colorado Avenue? Mr. Kowalski did not know. The north half was improved when Osco Drugs was built.

Mr. Hopkins moved to recommend approval of the proposed changes to the Prairie Winds Planned Unit Development to the Urbana City Council. Mr. White seconded the motion.

Mr. Pollock commented that it was a pleasure to see a case in which there were possible conflicts between neighbors that had been worked out before the public hearing.

The roll call was as follows:

Ms. Stake	-	Yes	Mr. Pollock	-	Yes
Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes	Mr. Alix	-	Yes
Mr. White	-	Yes			

The motion was passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. Kowalski noted that the Urbana City Council would hear the case on Monday, September 20, 2004.

**Plan Case # 1907-T-04: Request by the Zoning Administrator to amend Article IX of the Zoning Ordinance to add Section IX-10, Interim Development Ordinance – 12-month Moratorium on issuance of permits for Outdoor Advertising Sign Structures (billboards).**

Libby Tyler, Director of Community Development Services, gave the staff report for this case. She explained that this was the second phase of a four-part process that started with a resolution from the City Council directing the preparation of the proposed Interim Development Ordinance (IDO). The third step would be the actual text amendment, and the final step would be implementation.

Ms. Tyler explained how the proposed case came about. She talked about the proposal and noted that staff was asking for a period of 365 days or one year in which to complete the review. They wanted to have enough time to properly study and bring it back to the Plan Commission and the City Council in the form of a text amendment. Staff felt that they needed more time than they were allowed in 2002 with a similar case.

She discussed the previous text amendment and noted that it had pertained to the structural and aesthetic appearance of Outdoor Advertising Sign Structure(s) (OASS). As a result, the City now has landscape provisions and color-matching provisions along with some other structural parameters that were not previously in the Zoning Ordinance. She pointed out that the larger issues of the number of billboards, the spacing that was permitted, and locations of billboards were constrained by a then existing settlement agreement from several years ago. The settlement agreement recently expired in January 2004.

Ms. Tyler noted that staff had seen a significant increase in the number of applications for OASS. Another concern that City staff had experienced was with the difficulty in the actual placement of the billboards, so they would not interfere with other operations such as parking, access, and visibility. The third concern that City staff had was how some of the billboards could interfere with some of the goals of the City, particularly along the North Cunningham Avenue Corridor Plan, which was a Tax Increment Finance (TIF) Plan that was adopted in 2001. The plan addressed how to get the older commercial area to redevelop and look at lot consolidation, driveway closures, and improved levels of development and activity. The City was also looking at University Avenue as an important corridor that linked the downtowns of the City of Urbana and the City of Champaign, two important medical campuses of Carle and Provena, and the University of Illinois.

She talked about some of the billboards that had been placed within the jurisdiction that the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) holds within 660 feet of the interstate. IDOT reviews many of the billboard applications. In some cases, depending on the land use history, IDOT will prohibit any visibility of a billboard from the highway. One example was at 1710 North Cunningham Avenue, where the AAA Storage business is located. There was a proposal for a billboard at the normal height of 22 feet or so above the ground, which is what is usually seen along Cunningham Avenue or University Avenue. However, IDOT would not allow the billboard to be placed at that height because it might be visible from the highway. Because the billboard company was not able to prove that the site had been in continuous commercial existence since 1959, IDOT would not allow a billboard to be built over about 8 or 9 feet above grade. Therefore, the appearance engendered a number of complaints from neighboring properties. The complaints related to the view blockage of businesses, access points and signage, inequitable sizing of a billboard relative to a freestanding sign, the competition within the visual plane, and the competitive situation of all the locations being approached for leasing for billboards sites. These issues created an unhealthy environment for businesses, especially when the City was trying to look at doing redevelopment in the area.

City staff would like the IDO to establish a mechanism where staff could look over the OASS regulations without the constraint of the previous settlement agreement. Ms. Tyler reviewed the goals and specific amendments to the Zoning Ordinance that would be addressed during the term of the IDO. She pointed out the exceptions to the moratorium on permits to accommodate special circumstances that may occur during the duration of the IDO.

She read the options of the Plan Commission and noted that staff recommended the Plan Commission recommend approval of the text amendment to the Urbana City Council.

Mr. Alix wondered who owned the land in the example that Ms. Tyler had given. He commented that it seemed like a matter between the landowner and the lessee rather than something that the City would be expected to intervene in. Ms. Tyler remarked that it was an observation that the billboard did not function well on that site. It was an illustration of poor placement. The leases were relatively lucrative and added income to the property.

Mr. Alix stated that the Plan Commission recently reviewed a text amendment regarding OASS regulations in 2002. He asked if there was any significant reason to believe that the regulatory or

legal climate in the State of Illinois had changed significantly since the original settlement agreement was reached. The City of Urbana had a history of trying to restrict billboards and a history of the courts saying, "No". If they approve the moratorium and craft a new ordinance, would they have any more flexibility in terms of the wording of the ordinance? Ms. Tyler replied by saying that the settlement agreement was a long time ago, and there had been many changes. It was probably more difficult to restrict billboards overall; however, there were ways to do it that would be defensible. There was pending legislation that could affect how the City of Urbana approached the changes to the Zoning Ordinance. Communities all over the country successfully restrict billboards. However, the outdoor advertising lobby industry is very strong, vigilant and aggressive in promoting legislation and litigation to protect their interests. Where the City of Urbana fits in this, remained to be seen.

Mr. Alix pointed out that every time a text amendment regarding OASS comes up, there was considerable citizen interest raised; because it appeared that the vast majority of citizens would rather that the City of Urbana have no billboards. He believed that every time the City raised the issue of billboards, those citizens would get hopeful that the City would do something about billboards, and each time the City did not do anything. It was difficult for him to accept that things had changed much since the last time they approved a text amendment regarding OASS. He was curious as to what the justification was by the City Council or City staff to say why we need to go through this process again. Ms. Tyler stated that the significant change was that the settlement agreement had expired. While some people may want to go the route of eliminating all billboards, staff is trying to find good "middle of the road" approaches, where the City would determine how many billboards would be enough. The City was currently not hampered with the settlement agreement as they were in 2002 and were working with different people, who have different goals and needs.

Mr. Alix was concerned that more restrictive regulations might open the City up for being sued again. Ms. Tyler pointed out that the players have changed, the settlement agreement had changed, case law had changed, and the community had changed. It was a whole different landscape. The City Attorney felt that it was a good time to reevaluate the issue. It was a big commitment of time, and City staff would work on this at the expense of other things. But, City Council felt it was important and directed staff to do this.

Mr. White moved that the Plan Commission forward the case to the City Council with a recommendation for approval. Ms. Stake seconded the motion.

Mr. Pollock asked if it was a local rule or state regulation that there was a maximum 300 square feet allowed for the size of billboards? Ms. Tyler responded by saying that the rule was in the Urbana Zoning Ordinance. There were communities that have much wider spacing differences. Mr. Pollock wondered if there had been any consideration at reducing the maximum size allowed for a billboard. Ms. Tyler mentioned that staff had talked previously to Kip Pope about this issue, and he told staff that they were no longer manufacturing some of these sizes. She stated that this was something that this review could certainly cover. Staff would be looking at any and all regulations that pertain to OASS. She recommended an amendment to the motion that would explicitly include reviewing the maximum size allowed for an OASS or billboard.

Mr. Alix remarked that he would be extremely disappointed if the City imposed a year-long moratorium, which would be a significant hardship, and after a year of significant effort by staff and by the Plan Commission and the City Council, the City ends up with an ordinance that was substantially similar to the existing ordinance with some minor changes. He hoped that those who were entering into this and requesting this at the Council level and the staff level had reason to believe that there was some additional regulatory leeway in terms of modifying the ordinance. Mr. Pollock offered a counter-view to Mr. Alix’s statement by saying that when this issue came up last time about two or three years ago, it was because members of the City Council wanted to address this problem based on public complaints. The suggestion at that time was that the City should wait until they were out from under the settlement agreement, because it had been a very long time since that court decree was made. In his opinion, the expiration of the settlement agreement significantly changed the possibilities and the atmosphere in which the City could take a look at the regulations.

Ms. Tyler noted that Plan Commission would see all the changes, and what would get forwarded to the City Council would rest with the Plan Commission. She felt that given the pattern of applications for billboards and OASS, it did indicate somewhat of an emergency situation. If City staff, the Plan Commission and the City Council could address the issue in less than a year, they certainly would. There is a current staffing shortage, and she believed the term for the moratorium recognized that.

Mr. White accepted Ms. Tyler’s suggested amendment to the motion to explicitly add a review of size limits. Ms. Stake agreed as the seconder. The roll call was as follows:

Mr. Pollock	-	Yes	Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes
Mr. Alix	-	Yes	Mr. White	-	Yes
Ms. Stake	-	Yes			

The motion was passed by unanimous vote. The case would be brought to the City Council on September 20, 2004.

**8. NEW BUSINESS**

There was none.

**9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

There was none.

**10. STAFF REPORT**

Mr. Kowalski gave a staff report on the following:

- **Prairie Winds Subdivision Preliminary and Final Plats** were approved at City Council.
- **MOR, Mixed-Office Residential Zoning District Text Amendment and Design Guidelines** were adopted by the City Council with a few changes.



- **The Development Review Board** was fully appointed. Staff was in the process of putting together some orientation information and having the Board meet, so they can elect their Chair and Vice-Chair.

## 11. STUDY SESSION

### **Update on Champaign County Comprehensive Zoning Revisions**

Mr. Kowalski mentioned that at some point in the future this would be brought to the Plan Commission in the form of a protest or no protest. In 2001, the Champaign County Board adopted a set of land use regulatory policies as direction for the Department of Planning and Zoning at the County to start studying their Zoning Ordinance and consider a major overhaul of how it should be amended based on these policies. These policies were based on concerns of the various types of development happening in the rural areas, specifically the small-scale residential subdivisions that did not have urban services. There was also interest in creating more astringent environmental standards on developments in the county and also protection of prime farmland.

In 2002, the Department of Planning and Zoning started making some changes to their Zoning Ordinance. The Plan Commission had actually reviewed a couple of those changes as formal protest-no protest cases. Mr. Kowalski mentioned that the County had put out some maps with some changes on them. Whenever there was a map, then there was a lot of interest sparked.

Currently, the County was considering Phase 1 of seven phases. Phase 1 includes seven different plan cases that were a combination of zoning map changes and Zoning Ordinance text changes. He reviewed the proposed changes in Phase 1. One of the major changes would be turning the two existing AG, Agriculture Zoning Districts into one Agriculture Zoning District and rezoning some of the existing agriculture zoned areas to either a Conservation Zoning District or to a TR, Transitional Zoning District. Another major change would be to create a RPO, Resource Protection Overlay Zoning District.

Mr. Pollock inquired as to how many zoning cases the Plan Commission would be reviewing. Would these cases come in as a series of cases in which the Plan Commission would have a protest or no protest vote? Or would these cases come in one huge package of regulations? Mr. Kowalski replied that the County was attempting to package them all together. There were still questions of how the City of Urbana could protest a rezoning on one parcel as opposed to protesting the whole concept. The County had not given staff a clear answer on how that would work yet.

Mr. Pollock remarked that there were eleven municipalities within Champaign County. He asked if each municipality would have the right to protest the Master Plan? Or would a different master plan go to each municipality? Mr. Kowalski answered by saying that each municipality would have an opportunity to protest.

Mr. Pollock questioned if protest by any one of the eleven municipalities could force a super-majority vote on the whole package of regulations at the County level? Mr. Kowalski had asked that same question at a meeting with the County, and the answer was if Urbana protested, we would be protesting the changes that were proposed in the Urbana Extra-Territorial Jurisdiction

(ETJ). Mr. Pollock commented that it would be an interesting thing to try to present on the County's behalf, because it would take the County's legal staff a long time to word it correctly.

Mr. Alix inquired what the County Transitional Zoning District would translate into the terms of the City's zones upon annexation? Mr. Kowalski replied by saying that had not been determined. The City of Urbana has a transition chart in the Zoning Ordinance, which showed what the County's zoning would translate to in the City upon annexation. The City would have to create a translation for the County's Transitional Zoning District. The problem would be if the County mixed Commercial, Industrial and Office in their Transitional Zoning District, then which City Zoning District would best apply in the translation. Mr. Alix asked if the City could do that based on the Comprehensive Plan? Mr. Kowalski remarked that it would be awkward based on the system that the City currently had set up in zoning. Ms. Tyler added that the City could just not offer a translation zoning for the County's TR Zoning District.

Mr. Kowalski pointed out that City staff had significant concerns about the TR Zoning District and its concept. The biggest concern was that the County's TR Zoning District would become a "catch-all" for potentially incompatible commercial, industrial or office uses in very close proximity to the City, where the City would like to be able to have at least a say of what was proposed or how it would be developed. The City's protest abilities only extend to rezonings and text amendments to the Zoning Ordinance. It does not extend to Special Use Permits or Conditional Use Permits. The other problem was that by mixing the different uses, it would not meet the City's Comprehensive Plan. After meeting with some other municipalities in Champaign County, staff found that those municipalities shared the same concern as the City of Urbana did. Those concerns were expressed to Champaign County, and they took the TR Zoning District off of the table for now. There were also concerns from landowners who did not like the category as well. Champaign County planned to re-examine the TR Zoning District.

Mr. Alix commented that he favored the idea of using something other than AG as the "catch-all" for all non-conforming, non-agricultural random uses. At the same time, he believed that the TR Zoning District would be attempt to co-opt the City's ETJ rights by permitting essentially unfettered development around the periphery of the City. He thought that there would be ample grounds for the City to protest or in fact, challenge that if it passed. Ms. Tyler noted that it became apparent that there was an element of the TR Zoning District that was sort of a sacrificial area, because the County was proposing to restrict the AG Zoning District so much more, that they felt that they needed to have something to offer to landowners. The municipal concern was really that the TR Zoning District would be a "catch-all", rather than a proper holding zone. Compared with the current AG designation, the TR Zoning District would allow many additional uses to be permitted. It would allow many of those uses to be administratively approved, so there would be situations where the City did not only have no protest rights, but we would not even know about a proposed use. Mr. Pollock commented that in any informal discussions with County staff, the City staff should feel free to pass along the Plan Commission's belief that to take away any ability of theirs to review what goes on in the mile and a half ETJ area would not be acceptable.

Mr. Kowalski stated that the other major change that was generating a lot of media was the RPO Zoning District. He did not feel that this would concern the City of Urbana as much though. It might encourage those who own property right next to the City limits to annex in order to

develop. Because of the numerous requests by rural residents to the County to hold public hearings in the different townships, the schedule for completing these changes has been delayed. City staff was waiting for the right time to present the proposed changes in Phase 1 to the Plan Commission formally. Staff did not want to present the proposed changes when those changes were still being altered.

Mr. Pollock commented that it was helpful to know what was in the pipeline when it was something this significant. It was amazing to think that someone may annex his/her property into the City to develop because the County was too restrictive. Mr. Kowalski noted that when the County map with the proposed changes on it first came out, there were a handful of calls with people saying that they wanted to annex because they did not like the proposed changes. It was just the power of a map.

One of the difficulties for the County was that they were producing the map, and County staff was not able to be exact about where the zoning lines were. So, landowners were being told that they were zoned in the RPO.

Ms. Stake felt that the RPO Zoning District was a good idea. It would preserve the creeks and some of the natural area in the County.

Mr. Alix liked the idea of the fact that there was a significant amount of AG-2 that was proposed to revert to AG. It clarified what was going on in the County and hopefully would provide an incentive for those who would develop higher intensity uses than what would be permitted in the AG zone. Mr. Kowalski stated that it would be much more restrictive for residential development.

Ms. Tyler commented that this was a huge undertaking that the County was taking on. It would be easier to do this if they had established a set of policies and a Comprehensive Plan. The zoning text and map amendment process was not set up to do what they were trying to achieve.

## **12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING**

Chair Pollock adjourned the meeting at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Rob Kowalski, Secretary  
Urbana Plan Commission