

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING

URBANA PLAN COMMISSION

APPROVED

DATE: October 9, 2008
TIME: 7:30 P.M.
PLACE: Urbana City Building
400 South Vine Street
Urbana, IL 61801

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jane Burris, Tyler Fitch, Lew Hopkins, Michael Pollock, Bernadine Stake, Marilyn Upah-Bant, Don White

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Ben Grosser

STAFF PRESENT: Robert Myers, Planning Manager; Jeff Engstrom, Planner I; Rebecca Bird, Associate Planner/Historic Preservation Planner; Connie Eldridge, Grants Management Division Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT: Brian Adams, Dick Brazee, Cathy Eastman, Tony and Mary Graham, Medford Johnson, Georgia Morgan, Kent Ono, Beverly Rauchfuss, Marc Rogers, John and Candice Sloan, Shirley Stillinger, Susan Taylor

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

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

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

There was none.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Stake moved to approve the minutes of the September 4, 2008 meeting as presented. Mr. Hopkins seconded the motion. Mr. Hopkins recommended changing the word “imaging” to “imagining” in the second to last line of the first paragraph on Page 7. The Plan Commission approved the minutes as amended by unanimous voice vote.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

- ✚ Revision of Section XI-15. Design Review Board of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance

5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

6. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

7. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

Plan Case No. 2088-CP-08: A request by the Zoning Administrator to adopt the Crystal Lake Neighborhood Plan as an element of the 2005 Urbana Comprehensive Plan.

Jeff Engstrom, Planner I, presented this case to the Plan Commission. He gave a brief introduction and showed the west study area boundary as Lincoln Avenue and the east boundary as one block east of Broadway Avenue. The northern boundary is Country Club Road, and the southern boundary extends along the rail right-of-way south of University Avenue. He explained that the Plan contains goals and strategies similar to the King Park Plan and the Downtown Strategic Plan. The proposed plan, if approved, will become a guiding document for the planning area.

He reviewed the steps in the planning process that have been completed and what phases are left. The phases involved include:

- 1) **The Background Research Phase** – Research on the neighborhood’s history and existing conditions.
- 2) **The Visioning Phase** - Visioning workshops, resident and business surveys, and open house events to gather public input.
- 3) **The Plan Concepts Phase** - Staff synthesized information from the surveys and stakeholder interviews. They used this information to try to identify with some trends and issues and to try to create some preliminary goals.
- 4) **The Draft Plan Preparation Phase** – Preparation of a draft plan with goals and a map. Staff presented these drafts documents to the public to get more input.
- 5) **Final Plan Preparation Phase** – The draft plan is currently going through the City review process. The proposed plan has been presented to the Community Development Commission and is now before the Plan Commission, which will make a recommendation to the City Council.
- 6) **Implementation Phase** – This will consist of carrying out strategies identified in the plan, and will guide the City’s activities in coming years, help in allocating City funds and prioritize Capital Improvement Plan projects, and provide a basis for review of rezoning requests and building permits.

The plan overview consists of six major components, which are the Background, the Process, Trends and Issues, the Plan Concepts map, Goals and Objectives and the Implementation Strategies, as well as the Appendix.

Mr. Engstrom gave a brief description of the Background and the Process. With Trends and Issues, there are four key topic areas – Land Use and Development, Housing, Mobility and Community Enhancements. He discussed the Plan Concepts Map and the Goals and Objectives. He explained how each of these were created, the comments and ideas of the residents, the stakeholders and City staff that were involved as well as the existing City documents, such as the 2005 Comprehensive Plan and the Development Agreement between the City of Urbana and Carle Foundation Hospital, that support them. The Implementation Strategies are aimed at achieving the Goals and Objectives of the Plan.

Mr. Engstrom discussed the comments and concerns of the Community Development Commission (CDC). During their meeting, a CDC member recommended having homes either facing Crystal Lake Park or on new public open space. The CDC also discussed the potential for a community center. The CDC suggested prioritizing the implementation strategies. Their final comment was that the strategy to promote apartments should be clarified as promoting the maintenance and upgrade of existing apartments.

As for public comments, City staff has received only one comment during the 30 day review period. The comment states that business uses should not expand into the residential areas or into the park, which is something that City staff concurs with.

He read the options of the Plan Commission and gave staff's recommendation, which is as follows:

Staff recommends that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 2088-CP-08 to the Urbana City Council with a recommendation for approval.

Ms. Upah-Bant quoted Implementation Strategy M12, which states, “*Create safe bicycle path along Lincoln Avenue towards campus.*” She recalled discussing this issue extensively when they reviewed the Urbana Bicycle Plan. It was determined then that Lincoln Avenue was not wide enough, and Goodwin Avenue was should have the bike path instead. Mr. Pollock added that south of University Avenue is not included in the boundary of the proposed Crystal Lake Neighborhood Plan, so why is there a strategy listed for outside the Plan area? If the idea is to hook this path up to a broader vision for a bike path that goes through the Plan area, then he would agree that we need to talk about how to accomplish this on the busiest street in Urbana. Mr. Engstrom replied that the issue for a bike path along Lincoln Avenue to campus came up early in the process, and City staff will take a closer look at why it is still mentioned. Robert Myers, Planning Manager, noted that City staff will ensure that this implementation strategy matches the Bicycle Master Plan.

Mr. Pollock feels it is crucial to discuss the replacement of housing that is removed. The Plan states that removed housing will be replaced one-for-one in a “larger neighborhood.” What defines a “larger neighborhood”? Mr. Engstrom explained that City staff had in mind a neighborhood where one could easily walk or bike to Crystal Lake Park or to Carle.

Mr. Pollock referred to H1 in the Implementation Strategies. He did not feel that “encouraging” Carle would be enough to make sure the one to one replacement happens in neighborhoods where homes are removed due to the Carle expansion. The City would need something that would do more than just encourage Carle to do this. Mr. Engstrom responded that Carle will be asking for an amendment to the Development Agreement with the City of Urbana. When this happens, the City would be more specific than just encouraging Carle to be put into the amendment. Mr. Pollock stated that he realizes the proposed plan is kind of a small Comprehensive Plan, and it does not call for this type of specificity. However, he would like to bring this up and make sure it stays at the top of the list.

Mr. Pollock went on to discuss the Community Center. Is any of the planning area inside Tax Increment Financing (TIF) District #3? The purpose for him asking this question is because part of the reason people agreed to take those revenues and use them for business promotion and development was the agreement that some of those funds would get put back into the neighborhood in the form of a community center. He understands that there has been a lot of discussion about this, but this is something that the City committed to years ago already. Mr. Engstrom explained that City staff proposes a community center to go into a larger neighborhood, such as the King Park neighborhood.

Mr. Myers said that he had the answer to Ms. Upah-Bant’s earlier question regarding a bike path on Lincoln Avenue. The Urbana Bicycle Master Plan shows that Lincoln Avenue is not slated for either a bicycle lane or route. Instead it shows Goodwin and Coler Avenues as being routes. So Implementation Strategy M12 will be modified to reflect the Bicycle Master Plan.

Ms. Stake felt it would be a good idea to change “encourage” to “require” in Implementation Strategy H1. She did not think that the Plan Commission should let the proposed plan be approved with “encourage” as part of the language in this case. Mr. Pollock pointed out that this is an amendment to the 2005 Comprehensive Plan, and it is not actually a development agreement with Carle. So, he is not sure if they should change the wording or just keep it on the radar, because the Plan Commission will be reviewing a future amendment to the Development Agreement between the City of Urbana and Carle in the next few months. Mr. Myers added that City staff has spoken with representatives from Carle. Carle recognizes that it is important to the Mayor, the City, and to the residents that houses be replaced one-for-one, so they are willing to see that it happens. However, Carle is not sure what role they would play because they are not developers, but they are in agreement with the concept. City staff feels that this should be pinned down in the Development Agreement Amendment with Carle.

Mr. Engstrom reviewed a map with the Commission showing the boundaries of TIF # 3. It only goes to the east side of the Lincoln Avenue right-of-way. If a community center would be partially funded by the TIF District #3 funds, he understood it would need to be located within the District’s boundaries.

Chair Pollock opened the hearing up for public input.

Cathy Eastman, of 1311 North Berkley Avenue, requested that the Plan Commission table this item to a future meeting to allow City staff to get some additional feedback from the neighbors east of Broadway Avenue. There are a number of issues and changes to North Broadway mentioned in the proposed plan that would affect the neighborhood to the east, such as additional

sidewalks on the north end, additional street lighting, and a multi-use path. She is concerned that there is a need for additional feedback.

Mr. Myers asked if Ms. Eastman was asking that the boundary of the proposed plan be expanded, or does she just want the residents along the east side of Broadway Avenue to have a second opportunity to look at what is being proposed in the Broadway Avenue Corridor? Ms. Eastman replied that she does not know what the neighborhood's options are. Many of these issues will have an impact on the adjacent neighbors. They are not sure if they will have other opportunities to voice their concerns or if this meeting is their only chance.

With no further comments or questions from the public, Chair Pollock closed the public input portion of the hearing. He then opened the hearing up for Plan Commission discussion and/or motion(s).

Chair Pollock asked if this area was originally part of the proposed plan. Mr. Engstrom answered that originally the east boundary for the plan was Broadway Avenue. As part of the feedback from the first visioning session, some neighbors on the east side of Broadway Avenue wanted to be included in the proposed plan, so City staff expanded the boundary to include the block just east of Broadway Avenue. Chair Pollock inquired as to whether the residents in the block where the expansion occurred had been notified about the Plan Commission meeting. Mr. Engstrom said yes. The residents in this area have been notified of every meeting, except for the Visioning session.

Mr. Myers added that if people feel like they need more time for comment, then the Plan Commission could table the item until the next meeting. City staff initially discussed the eastern boundary of the proposed plan quite a bit. They decided that extending the boundary to Cunningham Avenue might dilute the original impetus for the plan, which was a concern for neighbors about the proposed expansion of Carle Hospital.

Chair Pollock realizes that there are other plans in the works at the same time. When we look at what is being planned that would affect the residents along the east side of Broadway Avenue in terms of a multi-use path, sidewalks or other amenities, would that be done in conjunction with the Urbana Park District (UPD) as a reflection of their plan? Is the UPD far enough along that they are aware of what the City is proposing? Or do the changes along Broadway Avenue have anything to do with what the UPD is doing? Mr. Myers responded that the UPD has adopted a long term plan over the next 50 years. The proposed Crystal Lake Neighborhood Plan reflects what the UPD's adopted long-range plan. Subsequent to finishing their plan, some residents have expressed a concern about UPD's plans to purchase properties on Franklin Street, as they become available. But the Crystal Lake Plan reflects the UPD's adopted plan.

Ms. Stake requested that the Plan Commission postpone making a decision regarding this case until the next regularly scheduled meeting. Mr. Fitch agreed. With no objection from the other members of the Plan Commission, Chair Pollock continued this case until October 23, 2008.

Plan Case No. 2074-T-08: A request by the Zoning Administrator to adopt design guidelines for the Lincoln-Busey Corridor, amend the Urbana Zoning Ordinance to enable design review in certain areas, and establish the Lincoln-Busey Corridor design overlay district.

Rebecca Bird, Associate Planner, presented this case to the Plan Commission. She began by explaining that there are three reasons for the text amendment, which are as follows: 1) Adopt design guidelines for the Lincoln-Busey Corridor, 2) Amend the Zoning Ordinance to enable design review to take place in specified areas by creating a Design Review Board, and 3) Establish the Lincoln-Busey Design Overlay District.

Ms. Bird described the boundary lines of the proposed Lincoln-Busey Corridor. She reviewed the proposed Design Guidelines pointing out that there are five chapters – 1) Introduction, 2) Existing Conditions, 3) The Design Review Process, 4) Design Guidelines and 5) Photo Inventory.

She stated that the text amendment will add Section XI-15, Design Review Board, to the Urbana Zoning Ordinance. This will create a Design Review Board to enable and administer design review for projects in multiple areas and will establish the Lincoln-Busey Corridor Design Review Overlay District. She referred to the revised Section XI-15 handout, which she passed out prior to the start of the meeting.

She read the options of the Plan Commission and noted that although the three components of the proposed text amendment can be discussed together, they should be voted on separately. She presented staff's recommendation, which is as follows:

Staff recommends that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 2074-T-08 to the Urbana City Council with a recommendation to approve the Lincoln-Busey Corridor Design Guidelines, approve the Zoning Ordinance text amendment creating the Design Review Board, and approve the Lincoln-Busey Corridor Design Review Overlay District.

Chair Pollock commented that this is all within one plan case number. Will the City Council vote on the elements separately in different votes? Ms. Bird said yes.

Mr. Fitch wondered about the process for where the guidelines come from. Were the Lincoln-Busey Design Guidelines basically staff-driven with public input? Ms. Bird replied that is correct. Mr. Fitch asked if this is the process that she would anticipate for future guidelines for other areas. Ms. Bird explained that design guidelines could be appropriate for fragile areas. City staff would work with the residents in the neighborhood or business owners on the design guidelines.

Mr. Fitch stated that he was talking more about procedural protections, such as notice provisions, required public meetings and time tables, etc. He asked how the proposed design guidelines differ from neighborhood conservation districts (NCD). Ms. Bird replied that neighborhood conservation districts are where the property owners come together and decide to apply for a NCD. The proposed design guidelines are really driven by the Urbana City Council.

Mr. Fitch wondered if the proposed Design Review Board would be the arbitrator of any future NCD with design review or would there be a separate review board for NCDs. Ms. Bird said that this is a good question and not something that City staff has discussed.

Chair Pollock asked if a NCD could employ the same type of design guidelines as being proposed in the text amendment. Mr. Myers said yes. The City wrote the NCD Ordinance flexible enough to customize the requirements for the particular needs of an area. Some areas feel that design guidelines are useful while other areas do not. Each area has different needs. Which body would carry out design guidelines would need to be specified for each district.

Chair Pollock questioned if there would be a new design review board for each district. Ms. Bird said no. As proposed, this text amendment would create one Design Review Board that would review design in all areas that have adopted design guidelines. All of the members of the Mixed Office Residential (MOR) Development Review Board except for two (who are specifically appointed to the MOR Development Review Board because they live in or near the MOR Zoning District) would also serve as members of the Design Review Board. There is no requirement that any of the members of the Design Review Board be associated with the neighborhood in which design guidelines have been created for.

Mr. Fitch inquired if one could arrive at the same result using the NCD process or the design review process. Mr. Myers answered yes. However, the Design Review Board deals with one sliver of the planning spectrum. It deals with design for new developments. The NCD is a broader planning tool that could be used potentially for a variety of things.

Ms. Stake wondered if one would change the zoning by adding an overlay district to a property or area. Ms. Bird responded by saying no. This is purely design review to help buildings be compatible with what is located on either side of it. It does not change the underlying zoning. Any project proposals in an overlay district still have to meet the zoning for that particular parcel.

Ms. Stake asked if any of this will come before the Plan Commission or City Council after it has been decided. Ms. Bird stated no.

Ms. Stake commented that it does not help much that the design guidelines “encourage” certain types of development. It should say it either is required or say it is not allowed. Ms. Bird explained that the idea with design guidelines is that each project is going to be unique. If the City writes a set of requirements, then there could be a project that meets all those requirements, but is still a bad project and won’t look good in the corridor. If there are guidelines that give the Design Review Board the ability to interpret them and decide whether a project meets the intent, then there will be better chance for projects be appropriate. The intent is for new construction to be compatible with the existing environment.

Ms. Upah-Bant inquired as to how anyone would go about changing the design criteria once it has been approved. Ms. Bird answered that they would need to file a Zoning Ordinance text amendment and staff would bring it before the Plan Commission and the City Council for approval.

Mr. Hopkins talked about the membership of the Design Review Board. He recalled that an owner of a local small business with fewer than 40 employees made sense for the MOR Zoning District for a particular reason. The reason is to get mixed use small businesses by implication to use existing buildings with small footprints. So the City wanted input and understanding from the type of people we wanted to get involved in using those buildings. It's unclear to him why it would make sense to include this requirement on the Design Review Board.

His second question is "*what is the definition of a "community or residential representative"*". Ms. Bird said that staff may need to include that in the section of the Zoning Ordinance that gives definitions of various words used throughout. Mr. Myers added that a community representative could be from community group. A residential representative may be a resident who lives in a particular block of the City or someone who knows what it is like to live in a specific area. Mr. Hopkins pointed out that the Design Review Board is to serve as a city-wide board, so that could mean anyone then. Thus he does not know what they are trying to accomplish with a "community or residential representative.

Ms. Stake stated that it seems in trying to make the Design Review Board serve the entire City, it has become difficult. The Lincoln-Busey Corridor is very different from much of the other areas in the City. It is very important that we keep the existing residential and most of the buildings. It is important to have design guidelines for developers who demolish some of the buildings and construct new buildings. However, this is not what the rest of the City is like, so she feels that the proposed text amendment is trying to do too many things at once. Ms. Bird asked if she was suggesting that there be a separate Design Review Board for the Lincoln-Busey Corridor. Ms. Stake replied yes.

Mr. Myers commented that there are a couple of different elements in trying to specify the composition of the Board. The first is values and the second is technical expertise. If there is someone representing the neighborhood, then they would know what it is like to live in that area, about quality of life issues, etc. The technical side could be covered by members such as an architect or a realtor. A developer/business owner has both technical expertise and knows what values are important to the development community. City staff can better define the difference between a local developer and a developer representative.

Ms. Upah-Bant asked for clarification in that for every neighborhood there would be a set of design guidelines. Ms. Bird replied no. City staff tried to create a Design Review Board that would be able to accommodate reviewing projects in other areas of the City that required, developed and adopted design guidelines. City staff is not suggesting that we develop design guidelines for every neighborhood. The Lincoln-Busey Corridor is unique in that it is under certain pressures because of its location between the University of Illinois and the single-family neighborhood. So, it is a fragile area that design guidelines would help.

Chair Pollock asked about remodeling and alterations to existing structures. So if someone wanted to add a sunroom onto their existing house, they would come in and fill out an application for a building permit. City staff would decide whether or not the sunroom might infringe upon the appearance of the neighborhood or the integrity of the corridor. If they decided that the proposed sunroom affects the neighborhood, then the Design Review Board would meet to discuss that individual request or application. Ms. Bird said that this is correct. However, it would not be City staff that made the preliminary determination of whether a project would

affect the neighborhood or not. It would be the Zoning Administrator and the Chair of the Design Review Board. If they jointly decided that the project did not require the review of the full Design Review Board, then it would be reviewed administratively. If one or both of them decided that it should go to the Design Review Board for review, then it would go before the entire Board.

Chair Pollock asked if the Chair of the Design Review Board would be appointed by the Mayor or designated as such by the Design Review Board. Mr. Hopkins said that the text amendment states that the position of Chair would be elected by the Design Review Board.

With no further questions for City staff from the Plan Commission, Chair Pollock opened the hearing up for public input.

Georgia Morgan, of 804 West Nevada Street, stated that she also questioned the make-up of the Design Review Board. What is the importance of having a small business owner on the board? What is a community representative? What is a residential representative? She gathered from listening to comments that part of the impetus behind the design is the anticipation that there will be more overlay districts with their own design guidelines in the future. However, there will only be one board reviewing the cases. Is it possible for the membership of the Design Review Board to have an ad hoc member who would be from whatever district that was being considered in place of the small business owner? This would ensure local representation on the board. She inquired about false divided light windows. What are they and why are they so terrible? Ms. Bird responded by saying that false divided light windows have the snap in muntins or muntins between a single pane of glass. In the design community, they are thought to give a false sense. They also do not provide the same depth that the individual divided light windows do. Ms. Bird explained that this is an example of why they would be design guidelines and not requirements.

Ms. Stake inquired as to whether Ms. Morgan had been notified of the public hearing. Ms. Morgan said yes. Ms. Bird remarked that City staff sent notices to all property owners and tenants in the actual Lincoln-Busey corridor as well as to all property owners within 250 feet.

Kent Oto, of 803 West Michigan Avenue, suggested that the Historic Preservation Commission be the review board for this particular design area (Lincoln-Busey Corridor), because in part of the fragile nature of the area and because of the many historic buildings in the neighborhood. He agreed with Ms. Morgan in that it would be easy enough to bring in two people living in a district to review cases for that overlay district as well as a resident of the adjacent living area. He feels that a resident living outside of a district would also have some interest in protecting their homes from encroachment or from the design possibilities that might occur. Having people with design abilities and aesthetic skills and interest on the Design Review Board could be a very positive thing. He did not think that developers, small business owners or architects would be the best type of people to provide that kind of input. Mr. Oto believes from what he has seen that the proposed text amendment would be a very positive thing. The intent is to protect the residents who live in the area from having an institutional design elements introduced into the work done on homes in the corridor.

Ms. Stake agreed. The historic part of the City of Urbana is right along Lincoln Avenue, so it would be good to have the Historic Preservation Commission review any future cases for this district.

Shirley Stillinger, of 1003 South Busey Avenue, mentioned that as a resident in the corridor, she feels very reassured of the direction that the text amendment is going. There are differences on the details, but the overall intent is very reassuring. It is important to keep the street and the area a good place to live. She expressed her appreciation for the work that City staff has done on the proposed text amendment.

Brian Adams, of 412 West Elm Street, stated that he lives in the MOR Zoning District and they have design guidelines in place for his neighborhood. There is the Development Review Board to monitor and comment on new developments. He feels it is a good thing. He wishes the City would have had the design guidelines in places years ago, because there have been some pretty unsightly buildings constructed in the area that have destroyed the historical and aesthetic character of the neighborhood. Given the design guidelines currently in place for the MOR Zoning District, it would not be possible to build anymore undesirable buildings in the neighborhood.

Ms. Stake wondered how much area the MOR Design Guidelines cover. Mr. Adams replied by saying that it covers Elm Street, part of Green Street and part of Springfield Avenue. He does not know the exact boundaries of the top of his head.

Ms. Stake asked who is on the Development Review Board for the MOR Zoning District. Mr. Adams answered that he is on the board because he lives in the neighborhood. There is a developer, an architect, nearby neighbor, small business owner, member of the Plan Commission and a member of the Historic Preservation Commission.

With no further questions or comments from members of the audience, Chair Pollock closed the public input portion of the hearing. He, then, opened the hearing up for Plan Commission discussion and/or motion(s).

Mr. Myers noted that there is another element to this proposal. The design guidelines are not only a helpful tool, but having a review process where neighbors can give input can be beneficial as well.

Chair Pollock wondered if the proposed text amendment is flexible enough to allow someone from the neighborhood to serve on the Board. Mr. Myers replied that the text amendment as written calls for a residential representative to serve on the Board, but it does not specify that the representative be from this specific area. However, there will be an opportunity for residents to attend the Board meetings and voice their concerns and opinions.

Ms. Stake asked what the process is for an application. Ms. Bird reviewed the process. When an application comes in, the Zoning Administrator looks at the application and decides whether the application is for a major redevelopment/development, which she would then forward on to the Design Review Board. If the Zoning Administrator has a question of whether or not the application should go before the Board, then she consults with the Chair of the Design Review Board. If they both decided that the proposed project does not require review of the Board, then they would review it and make an administrative decision.

If the application goes to the Board, then City staff would schedule a public hearing, which would involve noticing neighbors and putting up a sign on the property. So, the neighborhood would have a chance to give their input on a project. One example of what could be reviewed administratively would be the addition of a small sunroom on the back of a house. This would be something that would not be viewed from the public street if it was built in scale with the existing house.

Mr. Myers pointed out that the City has a similar process with the Historic Preservation Commission. Minor projects are reviewed administratively, and major projects are reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission. The Zoning Ordinance specifies what is considered a major project and minor project. The intent of this is to keep very minor changes from going to the Board or Commission. We do not stop the process to discourage maintenance, changes or modifications. Minor changes such as constructing a fence in the backyard shouldn't be a long and difficult process. This also helps City staff manage its workload and devote its manpower to highest priority projects.

Ms. Upah-Bant feels uncomfortable with the appeal process. If an application is denied, it sounds like the only applicant's only choice is to resubmit an application. Ms. Bird stated that there is an appeal process.

Ms. Stake questioned if a person would have to submit an application for work needing to be done if the property is within an overlay district. Ms. Bird said yes. Exterior building projects would need to be reviewed and approved either by the Zoning Administrator or by the Design Review Board depending on the level of the project.

Ms. Stake inquired if there could be someone from the district serve on the Board. Ms. Bird answered that in speaking with the City's Legal Department, the City Attorney did not feel it would be possible to write in the Zoning Ordinance that there would be members switching out. However, it might be possible to write in the text amendment that one of the members is defined in the design guidelines for a district. So, the design guidelines for the Lincoln-Busey Corridor would specify who the person is.

Mr. Hopkins commented that the architect, the developer, the Historic Preservation Commission member and the Plan Commission member makes sense to include on the Design Review Board. This means we would have three empty slots. He doubted that the City would have three districts within five years. So, the additional three slots could be filled by a member from each district. If there are more than three districts, then the City would need to work it out at that point. The text amendment could read, "Citizen representatives must be one from each designated overlay district.

Mr. Fitch expressed concern about the lack of specified process. In other City ordinances, it lists the types of projects that trigger different levels of review. We could borrow some of their ideas. He feels that some sort of procedural depth needs to be added in the formation of the guidelines.

Mr. Hopkins commented that the design guidelines are good. He does not believe that they need to be changed.

With no further comments from the Plan Commission members, Chair Pollock recommended continuing this case to a future Plan Commission meeting. He mentioned that there will not be a public notice for when it comes back to the Plan Commission. Mr. Myers stated that this item will remain on the agenda for the October 23, 2008 Plan Commission meeting.

8. NEW BUSINESS


There was none.

9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There was none.

10. STAFF REPORT

Mr. Myers reported on the following:

 **University Avenue Corridor Study** will be held on November 5, 2008 from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at the Illinois Terminal, 4th Floor. MTD is looking at development that enhances mobility. There are two corridors that MTD is reviewing potential development in. They lead from each of the two major downtown areas to University of Illinois' campus.

11. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 9:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Myers, AICP
Secretary, Urbana Plan Commission