

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING

URBANA PLAN COMMISSION

APPROVED

DATE: September 22, 2005

TIME: 7:30 P.M.

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Lew Hopkins, Ben Grosser, Randy Kangas, Michael Pollock,
James Ward

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Laurie Goscha, Bernadine Stake, Marilyn Upah-Bant, Don White

STAFF PRESENT: Elizabeth Tyler, Director of Community Development Services;
Matt Wempe, Planner I; Teri Andel, Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT: Tim and Irene Edwards, Bishop Lloyd Gwin, David Spence

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. Ward moved to approve the minutes from the September 8, 2005 Plan Commission meeting as presented. Mr. Grosser seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.

4. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

- big.small.all.champaign county. information
- Scottswood Area Stormwater Improvement Project Open House/ Presentation information

5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

6. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

7. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

Plan Case No. 1956-SU-05 – Request by the Church of the Living God for a Special Use Permit to establish a “church or temple” within the R-3 Zoning District.

Matt Wempe, Planner I, presented the case to the Plan Commission. He began by explaining that the petitioner, the Church of the Living God, had previously been approved for a special use permit for the construction of the proposed church. However, the special use permit had expired, and as a result, the petitioner is seeking approval of the proposed special use permit. He mentioned that the Church of the Living God held a neighborhood meeting on September 20, 2005 to discuss their plans for the proposed site.

The largest change to the proposed special use permit from the original 2002 application is that the petitioner has acquired approximately 20 acres immediately west of the site, and they intend to develop this area for residential uses. The residential development to the west would be located in the City of Champaign. The petitioner has indicated that there would be a connection between the residential development and the site for the church development.

Mr. Wempe discussed the development regulations including parking, landscaping, drainage, setback and other requirements. He gave a brief description of the proposed site and of its surrounding properties, noting their current zoning and land uses. He discussed the requirements for a special use permit according to Section VII-6 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance. He summarized staff findings and read the options of the Plan Commission. He presented staff's recommendation, which was as follows:

Based on the evidence presented in the written staff report, and without the benefit of considering additional evidence that may be presented during the public hearing, staff recommended that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 1956-SU-05 to the Urbana City Council with a recommendation for approval with the following conditions:

- 1. That the layout of the facility shall closely resemble the submitted Site Development Plan attached as Exhibit G. Any significant deviation from this Site Development Plan will require an amendment to the Special Use Permit, including further review by the Urbana Plan Commission and approval by the Urbana City Council. This includes any access connection to the church's proposed residential development immediately west of the subject property.*
- 2. That an engineered drainage plan, including proper conveyance and detention of Stormwater from the site shall be prepared and constructed consistent with the requirements of the Urbana Subdivision and Land Development Code and shall be subject to the review and approval of the Urbana Zoning Administrator and Urbana City Engineer.*

3. *That Federal Drive shall serve as the exclusive vehicular access to/from the site to minimize impacts upon the adjacent residential neighborhood.*
4. *That there shall be no lighting provided for the softball field except for security purposes. Any lighting that is installed must be approved by the Zoning Administrator.*
5. *That a pedestrian connectivity plan shall be prepared and constructed, subject to the review and approval of the Urbana Zoning Administrator and Urbana City Engineer.*

Mr. Wempe noted that there was a staff recommended change to Condition 3. Staff added language on the end of Condition 3, so that it would read as follows: *“That Federal Drive shall serve as the exclusive vehicular access to /from the site to minimize impacts upon the adjacent residential neighborhood until such time as the church develops its 20-acre holdings to the west.”* Mr. Ward pointed out that this was already recommended in the last sentence of Condition 1, which states, *“This includes any access connection to the church’s proposed residential development immediately west of the subject property.”* Mr. Wempe suggested that they delete the last sentence in Condition 1.

Mr. Hopkins understood that there would not be any access to the proposed property through Carver Drive or Dorie Miller Drive. He suggested that they clarify this by adding it to Condition 3. Mr. Pollock stated that Condition 3 would now read as follows: *“That Federal Drive shall serve as the exclusive vehicular access to/from the site to minimize impacts upon the adjacent residential neighborhood until such time as the church develops the residential area to the west. No access will be permitted from Dorie Miller or Carver Drives to the church site.”*

Mr. Pollock asked staff to explain what changes were made to the proposed Site Plan from the original Site Plan. Mr. Wempe stated that the petitioner has gone from four buildings to three buildings, and the function of some of the buildings has slightly changed. The petitioner also relocated the parking lot to the north.

Mr. Pollock inquired as to what type of screening would be used on the entire south side of the proposed property. Mr. Wempe replied that they had not specifically discussed screening. Mr. Pollock questioned if anyone in the neighborhood had any comments on what type of screening they preferred. Mr. Wempe pointed out that the residents of the adjacent residential property to the south had expressed interest about the church being located as far away as possible from the southern property line, because they do not want to feel boxed in by the proposed development. Staff had not really talked about whether a fence or vegetation screening should be used. Although they do not want any vehicular access to the southern subdivision, they do not want to create a physical barrier that would prevent parishioners living in the southern subdivision from walking to church. Elizabeth Tyler, Director of Community Development Services, added that the Site Plan shows tree plantings. Therefore, they might want to ask for additional landscaping materials to be used. Mr. Pollock mentioned that this could be added as a condition if the Plan Commission deemed necessary.

David Spence, Architect for this project, and Bishop Lloyd Gwin, minister for the Church of the Living God, approached the Plan Commission to make comments and answer any questions. Mr. Spence acknowledged that Mr. Wempe and other staff had been very helpful in working with the petitioner on this project. The Church of the Living God had been involved in community activities for many years in this neighborhood. He believed that this would be a good project and good for the City of Urbana.

Mr. Grosser inquired as to where the Church of the Living God was currently located. Mr. Spence replied that it was located on the corner of Fourth Street and Bradley Avenue.

Mr. Hopkins questioned what the youth development building would be used for. Bishop Gwin responded by saying that they envisioned this building serving as a place where they could help young people develop academically and socially and prepare them for a future in society where they are involved.

Mr. Hopkins recalled that in the original Site Plan, the youth development building was located in this spot because of the shape of the parking lot, which has now been changed. So, now he was wondering why the youth development building would still be located in this spot, which now would be about 400 feet from the parking lot and 25 feet from the southern property line. Mr. Spence commented that in the evolution of events and in the community building, it had been brought up that the youth development building would be moved closer to the fellowship hall. He believed this would be a better location for the youth development building. However, since it would not be constructed immediately, the Site Plan did not get revised in time for the Plan Commission meeting.

Mr. Hopkins asked about the time of use for the youth development building. Bishop Gwin responded by saying that it would probably be used more in the evening. The church uses Sunday mornings for service and then the rest of the day is for family time, which they really encourage. During the weekdays, they would probably use the youth development building up till 8:00 in the evenings. They generally cut off their activities at 8:00 p.m., because they want the children to get a good night's rest, so they can learn in school the next day.

Mr. Pollock stated that the special use permit would require the Church of the Living God to build what is resembled on the Site Plan. He suggested that if the church was planning on moving the youth development building to be closer to the parking lot and the fellowship hall, then they should have the Site Plan changed to reflect this before going to the City Council. He believed that more people would be comfortable with this if the youth development building was moved further away from the residential subdivision to the south. Would it be possible for the petitioner to revise the Site Plan or make a commitment before the City Council approves the special use permit request? Mr. Spence replied yes, the church could do that. The church was planning on moving the youth development building west and north of where it is shown on the Site Plan, approximately 20 feet away from the fellowship hall.

Mr. Kangas remarked that the area in Phase III was a pretty big area. Would it just be left as green space? Mr. Spence commented that they were leaving a small area just south of the parking area to be used for future parking expansion if needed.

Mr. Wempe stated that staff would like to add Condition 6 to read as such, "*That a landscape plan shall be prepared and constructed subject to the review and approval by the Urbana Zoning Administrator in consultation with the Urbana City Arborist.*"

Mr. Kangas asked if the petitioner ties into the City's regional detention basin north of Kenyon Road, then would they still need to build the stormwater retention pond. Mr. Wempe explained that the petitioner would be using the material that they dig out for the pond to help grade their parking lot. The petitioner is not required to build a retention, and they will be required to pay a fee, as everyone else is that connects to the Regional Basin.

Mr. Grosser inquired about the pedestrian connectivity plan to the south subdivision. He asked if the City staff would review that before it was built, since it would not be brought back to the Plan Commission for review. Mr. Wempe commented that it was the idea that the City staff review the sidewalk plan, when and if they decided to construct a sidewalk connecting to the subdivision to the south, rather than having to amend the special use permit. Mr. Grosser inquired if the petitioner intended to build a sidewalk from Dorie Miller or Carver Drive to the church. Mr. Wempe said no, not from his understanding. Ms. Tyler noted that Condition 5 referred to a pedestrian connectivity plan to the residential development that the petitioner intended to build to the west. Bishop Gwin added that they currently did not have any plans of constructing a sidewalk to the south, because residents in the subdivision to the south previously during the public hearing for the original special use permit that was approved had stated that they did not want any access to the church's property. However, there has since been a great softening of that position. The petitioner was very open to having a pedestrian access or not having an access. They would just like to please the residential neighbors to the south.

Mr. Pollock understood that any connectivity from the proposed site to any future development to the west would be reviewed and would require approval of the Zoning Administrator as stated in Condition 5. However, any type of connectivity to and/or from the subdivision to the south would require an amendment to the Special Use Permit, because the language currently recommended in Condition 3 generally states that no access to Dorie Miller or Carver Drives would be permitted. It does not specify sidewalk or vehicular access. Ms. Tyler said that was correct.

Mr. Grosser commented that he could understand why residents of the subdivision to the south did not want vehicular traffic moving through their subdivision to get to the proposed site or to Federal Drive. However, he would be open to having a pedestrian path leading from Dorie Miller or Carver Drive to the proposed site, because it would be nice for the residents who belong to the church to be able to use rather than trudging through grass and mud when it rains. Mr. Pollock stated that the easiest way to leave it open for a pedestrian path to happen would be to specify *no vehicular traffic* in Condition 3.

Mr. Ward stated that if people want to walk then they will walk regardless of whether there are sidewalks or not. If the residents from the neighborhood decide that they want to walk to the church, then he would prefer to see some sort of walkway built. However, he did not feel that it would be something that needed to come before the Plan Commission. He believed that the Zoning Administrator could make that judgment.

Mr. Kangas moved that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case Number 1956-SU-05 to the City Council with a recommendation for approval along with the conditions recommended by staff including the three adjustments that the Plan Commission and staff had made during the meeting, which were to: 1) Delete the last sentence of Condition 1; 2) Add Condition 6; and 3) Add two sentences onto Condition 3. As a result the conditions for the special use permit would read as follows:

1. *That the layout of the facility shall closely resemble the submitted Site Development Plan attached as Exhibit G. Any significant deviation from this Site Development Plan will require an amendment to the Special Use Permit, including further review by the Urbana Plan Commission and approval by the Urbana City Council. ~~This includes any access connection to the church's proposed residential development immediately west of the subject property.~~*
2. *That an engineered drainage plan, including proper conveyance and detention of Stormwater from the site shall be prepared and constructed consistent with the requirements of the Urbana Subdivision and Land Development Code and shall be subject to the review and approval of the Urbana Zoning Administrator and Urbana City Engineer.*
3. *That Federal Drive shall serve as the exclusive vehicular access to/from the site to minimize impacts upon the adjacent residential neighborhood until such time as the church develops the residential area to the west. No vehicular access will be permitted from Dorie Miller or Carver Drives to the church site.*
4. *That there shall be no lighting provided for the softball field except for security purposes. Any lighting that is installed must be approved by the Zoning Administrator.*
5. *That a pedestrian connectivity plan shall be prepared and constructed, subject to the review and approval of the Urbana Zoning Administrator and Urbana City Engineer.*
6. *That a landscape plan shall be prepared and constructed subject to the review and approval by the Urbana Zoning Administrator in consultation with the Urbana City Arborist.*

Mr. Ward seconded the motion.

Mr. Hopkins asked where the 20-acres were located that the church planned to develop as residential. Bishop Gwin stated that the Church of the Living God owns almost everything west of the subject property on Exhibit E: Aerial Map.

Mr. Hopkins inquired as to the size of the subject property was. Mr. Wempe answered by saying the subject property was approximately 11.33 acres.

Mr. Hopkins expressed that he has concerns regarding the feasibility and logic of the future development of the tract to the west. The current site layout essentially precludes connection of vehicular access of right-of-way to a very large parcel. What is the future residential parcel zoned as? Mr. Wempe believed that it was zoned as low-density residential in the City of Champaign. Mr. Spence added that the City of Champaign was planning to extend both Fourth and Fifth Street north into the 20± acres and connect to the proposed subject property.

Bishop Gwin stated it was the church's intent to connect to the worship area from the future residential area in the west. They do not plan to have any vehicular access through Dorie Miller or Carver Drives. They were in the process of working with the City of Champaign to work out how to connect Fifth Street and possibly Fourth Street to the church area. Mr. Hopkins commented that there was a right-of-way problem, and the proposed Site Plan did not solve the problem. Mr. Spence remarked that it was a right-of-way issue in the City of Champaign. He went on to say that in the same way that Federal Drive would connect to the north side of the church parcel, the connection from the west would be used as a feed to the church property. It would not be used as a through way.

Mr. Hopkins stated that it seemed to him that if they were planning to develop to the west, then they should be seeing on the Site Plan how that connection would occur and make it occur well, because at the moment it was not clear that the retention pond was not in the way and that the design of the parking lot would be consistent with creating what amounts to a through street that was not intended to be a through street. He would like to see an indication on the Site Plan about how the connection would be feasible and what the intent is. Ms. Tyler mentioned that this might be a phasing problem. She was not sure how far along the church was with planning the residential portion. They only recently purchased the property and may not have had sufficient time to do the site planning for the western portion. It would certainly be a more ambitious project than the church development. Bishop Gwin stated that Ms. Tyler's speculation was correct. The church only recently started investigating what it would take for them to develop the land to the west. They were in the very early stages of doing this. They would like to have vehicular and pedestrian access to the west without having a thorough way.

Mr. Hopkins questioned if it would be conceivably acceptable if the access to Federal Drive would be closed after the residential development to the west occurred and there was a vehicular access from/to the west. This would prevent traffic from going through to Federal Drive. Bishop Gwin felt this would be a good idea.

Mr. Spence mentioned that they had two civil engineers helping them with their final Site Plan. They were beginning the topographical study and could show how the street plan would work in the final Site Plan.

Mr. Pollock stated that the Site Plan had to be substantially in conformance with what is built. He really did not see too much of a problem. If they had to move the stormwater retention pond to the south to make room for a right-of-way to construct a vehicular path the church's parking lot, then it would not be considered a major change. Mr. Kangas pointed out that the retention pond was not mandatory. He also stated that truck drivers want to take the most direct route. They also use roads that are more conducive to big trucks. Going through the church parking lot

and through some street maze in the future residential neighborhood to the west would not suit their needs. It probably also depends on what kind of roads are built.

Mr. Hopkins suggested making a change to Condition 3, so that it would read as such: *That Federal Drive shall serve as the exclusive vehicular access to/from the site to minimize impacts upon the adjacent residential neighborhood until such time as a vehicular access from the west is developed. ~~the church develops the residential area to the west.~~ No vehicular access will be permitted from Dorie Miller or Carver Drives to the church site.* He also suggested excluding Phase III from the special use permit. His logic is that by approving it as is, the church would not have to resolve the location of the youth development building. He believed it would be difficult to resolve because it would be a trade off between parking and the location of the building. By moving the building further north, it might force parking to the southern portion of the property, which may be worse. Mr. Pollock stated that if the petitioner changes the Site Plan by deciding that they did not want the youth development building closer to the parking area, then they would have to come back before the Plan Commission and the City Council for an adjustment to the special use permit. Therefore, the City is protected on making sure that the youth development building did not get built in a place that the City finds unacceptable. Any additional parking that might be constructed in the future would require a review of the special use permit. Mr. Hopkins remarked that if the church builds the youth development building in the wrong location, then the City would not have much choice in the matter.

Mr. Spence commented that the petitioner’s vision in Phase III was to build the youth development building to the south and somewhat to the east of the Phase II building, the fellowship hall. Because of the easement to Illinois-American Water Company, the church cannot place the building on the easement. So, it protects the expansion of a future parking lot in the area immediately east of the fellowship hall and north of the proposed parking lot. Mr. Pollock pointed out that staff will work with the petitioner before this goes to the City Council to make sure that there is an updated Site Plan.

Mr. Kangas inquired as to how many members belonged to the church. Bishop Gwin replied that there were about 1500 members.

The roll call was as follows:

Mr. Ward	-	Yes	Mr. Pollock	-	Yes
Mr. Kangas	-	Yes	Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes
Mr. Grosser	-	Yes			

The motion was passed by unanimous vote. Mr. Wempe noted that this case would go before the City Council on October 3, 2005.

8. NEW BUSINESS

There was none.

9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There was none.

10. STAFF REPORT

Ms. Tyler reported on the following:

- Emulsicoat Cases were working their way through to the City Council. City staff had a noticing glitch, so all five cases were carried forward to a Special Council meeting to be held on September 26, 2005.
- Planning Manager – The City was getting closer to hiring someone to fill the position. A reception was held for a candidate on Monday, September 19, 2005. He seems to be a very good fit. We are hoping that City Council will appoint him on September 26, 2005.
- Scottswood Area Stormwater Improvement Project Open House/ Presentation will be held on Wednesday, September 28th from 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm at the Prairie School Gymnasium. She gave a brief update on the plans for the stormwater improvement project.

Mr. Wempe reported on the following:

- big.small.all.champaign county. is the tagline for the new visioning efforts of the Champaign County to bring all the people of Champaign County together to gather ideas and goals for just about every aspect of our county's life – including the natural and built environment, economic and community development, transportation, education, culture, recreation, sports diversity, and social issues, among others. He mentioned that the City of Urbana would host the first public dialogue meeting on November 1, 2005 at Urbana Middle School in the evening. The exact time is to be determined.

11. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

Chair Pollock adjourned the meeting at 8:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Tyler, City Planner
Urbana Plan Commission