

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING

URBANA PLAN COMMISSION

APPROVED

DATE: June 9, 2011

TIME: 7:30 P.M.

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jane Burris, Andrew Fell, Tyler Fitch, Lew Hopkins, Dannie Otto, Michael Pollock

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Ben Grosser, Bernadine Stake, Marilyn Upah-Bant

STAFF PRESENT: Robert Myers, Planning Manager; Rebecca Bird, Planner I; Teri Andel, Planning Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT: Walter Alspaugh, Linda Bauer, Clark Bullard, Michael Doran, Darwin Fields, Ruth Ann Fisher, Mark Foley, Andrew Graumlich, John Jakobsze, Ralph Langenheim, Imran Malik, Donald and Sandee Moore, Gary and Michele Olsen, Peggy Patten, William and Grace Schoedel, Susan Taylor, Lisa Travis, Gale Walden

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

Chair Pollock called the meeting to order at 7:37 p.m. The roll was called and a quorum was declared present.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

Due to a large number of people in the audience present to hear other cases on the agenda, Chair Pollock said that he wished to move Plan Case No. 2142-T-11 to the end of the agenda. The Plan Commission agreed.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the May 5, 2011 Plan Commission meeting were presented for approval. Mr. Fitch moved that the Plan Commission approve the minutes as presented. Mr. Hopkins seconded the motion but on page 10, line 6 from the top, replacing the word “quarter” with the word “corridor.” The minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote as amended.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

- ✚ Email from Fran Ansel regarding Plan Case No. 2145-SU-11
- ✚ Email from Jeff Unger regarding Plan Case No. 2145-SU-11
- ✚ Section 2-4 of the Urbana City Code. Public Meetings
- ✚ Planning Commissioner's Journal – Number 82, Spring 2011

5. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

Plan Case No. 2145-SU-11 – A request by US Cellular on behalf of the Urbana School District for a Special Use Permit to construct a 150-foot monopole telecommunications tower with antennas, and a telecommunications equipment enclosure at 1201 South Vine Street in the City's CRE, Conservation-Recreation-Education Zoning District.

Chair Pollock announced that as an employee of the Urbana School District that he would abstain from this case. He then asked for a nomination for another member of the Plan Commission to serve as Acting Chairperson. Ms. Burris nominated Tyler Fitch, and Mr. Hopkins seconded the nomination. The Plan Commission voted approval of the motion. Chair Pollock then left the meeting and Mr. Fitch assumed the position of Acting Chairperson.

Robert Myers, Planning Manager, presented this case to the Plan Commission. He stated the purpose of the special use permit request. He spoke about the different types of towers and showed photos of towers in other areas, some of which are similar to the proposed tower in this case. He noted the location, existing land use and zoning of the proposed site as well as that of the surrounding properties. He reviewed the site plan noting the distance that the proposed tower would be located from homes along Race Street. He explained why the petitioner feels that the proposed tower should be located at this location rather than elsewhere on the School District's property. He summarized the requirements of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 for local governments reviewing cell tower applications. He also reviewed the requirements for a Special Use Permit according to Section VII-4 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance. He read the options of the Plan Commission and presented staff's recommendation.

Mr. Fell asked if the height of the tower is part of the Special Use Permit or will the petitioner need a separate zoning variance for it. Mr. Myers replied that the height of the tower is a waiver which could be approved as part of the special use approval. Mr. Fell wondered if it is held to the standards that are required to get a zoning variance. Mr. Myers said no. The criterion provided in the Zoning Ordinance is that if the Plan Commission and the City Council feel that the goals of the ordinance are better served with tower being at this particular location then they can approve it.

Mr. Hopkins inquired as to why the proposed tower has to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Is it because the Urbana High School is listed? Mr. Myers replied that it is because they need a federal license, and anytime you use federal money or request a federal license, the project has to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and Section 707 of the State Historic Act.

Mr. Otto asked that Mr. Myers elaborate more about what the results could be if the Plan Commission allowed discussion concerning environmental effects of radiofrequency electromagnetic (RF) emissions. He knows that in the discussions at the neighborhood meetings with US Cellular, some residents voiced concern with this. Mr. Myers explained that although this sort of discussion could take place at a neighborhood or School Board meeting, local governments must comply with the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 in reviewing tower applications. The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is responsible for regulating telecommunication towers in terms of health and safety concerning RF emissions. Based on the law, a court overturned a Peoria County, Illinois denial of a tower based in part possible health effects and so it's clear that this aspect should not be part of our consideration. Mr. Otto stated that he felt this is important to clarify for the people in the audience who would like to comment later during the public hearing.

Mr. Otto continued by saying that there are other health and safety issues that are not related to RF emissions that they can discuss, such as electrical storms hitting the utility structure located under the bleachers. Mr. Myers said that is correct. They can also discuss the possibility of a tower collapsing, security, etc.

Mr. Otto wondered if the Quincy photo that was shown during the City staff presentation was real or touched up using Photo Shop software. Mr. Myers said that it is a photo of an existing tower in Quincy, Illinois provided by the applicants. It's not a simulated photo.

There were no further questions for City staff, so Acting Chair Fitch opened the hearing for public input.

John Jakobsze, of US Cellular, approached the Plan Commission and introduced the other members of his team, Michael Doran (Site Acquisition Consultant) and Imran Malik (Senior RF Engineer). He thanked Mr. Myers for his thoroughness and his outstanding preparation. He then gave a presentation on the following:

- Background of US Cellular
- US Cellular's On-Going Commitment to Customers and Communities It Serves

Mr. Malik continued their presentation by talking about the following:

- Pre-Coverage Map – *Pink area shows problematic area where customers are experiencing the most connection issues.*
- Area Map used to choose possible tower sites
- Existing Sites within Urbana or within 1.5 miles
- Adjacent US Cellular Sites
- Site Selection Process
- Typical Cell Sites
- Search Area
- Existing Structures that were 1st and 2nd Preferred
 - United Methodist Church

- City Hall Tower
- Hendrick's House
- WILL Tower
- T-Mobile/Sprint Tower
- Met Cad Towers
- Champaign County Courthouse
- Other Preferred Locations
- Urbana High School Location
- Post-Coverage Map

Mr. Jakobsze discussed the following:

- Proposed Cell Site Characteristics of the Urbana High School Location
- Overall Site Plan
- Enlarged Site Plan showing the tower surrounded by a 6' high fence and underground ducts
- Elevation
- Photo Simulations
- Benefits to the Community
- Addresses Goals of Zoning Ordinance

He thanked the Plan Commission for their consideration and mentioned that they are available to answer any questions that they may have.

Mr. Fell questioned what the estimated life span of a tower. Mr. Jakobsze answered that although towers have a "book value" of 40 years, with proper maintenance they can last a lot longer than that.

Mr. Fell wondered when the tower is no longer used, who will have to tear the tower down? Mr. Jakobsze responded that US Cellular would be required by the lease agreement they will have with the Urbana School District to remove the tower if no longer used.

Mr. Fell noticed that on the site plan, there appears to be an access easement for the tower, but there is no easement for the equipment building. What is the possibility when there are more users located on the tower that they would need to access the equipment building? Would this mean that they could tear down the bleachers? Mr. Jakobsze replied that under the bleachers there will be a series of storage rooms, and US Cellular will lease one of the storage rooms for their equipment. The lease agreement with the School District for the storage room will also address easements and leasing the location of the tower. Mr. Hopkins wondered how big the storage rooms would be. Mr. Jakobsze said their unit would be about 12 feet by 15 feet.

Mr. Hopkins wondered what would happen when lightning strikes. Mr. Jakobsze explained that the structures are grounded per specific standards.

Mr. Hopkins asked Mr. Jakobsze to elaborate on why none of the University of Illinois sites were acceptable. Mr. Jakobsze explained that US Cellular approached the University, but they had difficulty in reaching an agreement with them.

Acting Chair Fitch noted that they received two written communications from individuals via email. One email is from Fran Ansel and the other is from Jeff Unger.

William Schoedel, 1207 South Race Street, mentioned that he lives across the street from the site of the proposed tower. His main concern is that the tower will not be aesthetically pleasing and will not fit because it is too big. People in the community have spent a lot of money on the Urbana High School because it is a building of architectural distinction, and the school is in the middle of a redevelopment of the grounds. It seems odd to place something there that will not fit and will look tacky. He urged the Plan Commission to try to avoid this.

Walter Alspaugh, 206 West Indiana Avenue, stated that he can see the proposed site from where he lives. When the story was first published in the *News-Gazette* it referenced microwaves. He asked the applicants if they leave their microwave door open in their homes. Chairman Fitch asked the speaker to address their comments to the Commission and not the applicants. Mr. Alspaugh continued that many young people in the community are going to school in this area, and we are not sure if cell towers are safe. Mr. Fitch said he felt uncomfortable with the direction of these comments because it's a topic which can't be a factor in making a decision. Mr. Alspaugh pointed out that there is a discrepancy in the reason for the tower being located on the proposed site. City staff mentioned that it is to allow for school building expansion, but the petitioner said it was due to the current plans to redevelop the grounds. He asked if they turn the power off when a maintenance person works on the tower. Acting Chair Fitch replied that he feels confident that OSHA (Occupational Safety and Health Administration) and FCC regulations would apply. Mr. Alspaugh is unhappy with the proposed Special Use Permit request. He suggested that the petitioner research locating the proposed tower on University property again.

Ralph Langenheim, 401 West Vermont Avenue, supports the preservation of the historic and cultural values inherent not just in the high school itself, but how the high school, fountain in Carle Park, and Abraham Lincoln statue form an outdoor area which should be protected. One of the top 20 statues of Abraham Lincoln in the nation is located across the street from the high school. In front of the statue, Congressman Tim Johnson declared his candidacy and people get married there. The façade of the high school is one of the better public buildings from the point of architecture. When looking at the proposed plans he does not feel that they are as bad as they could be. However, it will still be obtrusive. It will not add any value to the cultural monument of the Lincoln statue. He has been monitoring his email and listening to the West Urbana Neighborhood Association (WUNA) and has found that a large number of his constituents are unhappy with the proposed tower as well.

Clark Bullard, 509 West Washington Street, feels that the proposed tower will be a terribly ugly intrusion next to a historic building that the taxpayers are still paying for from the referendum when they rehabbed it in order to preserve it to the community. The written documents in the

packet of information only talk about the view from a few residences. However, every citizen of the community and every visitor will be exposed to the view.

Mr. Bullard went on to say that the Findings of Fact in the packet are only blanket assertions that say the proposed tower would be good for the public convenience. One of the proposed findings actually uses the name of a different city instead of Urbana. At one of the previous meetings between the School Board and the neighborhood, some residents asked US Cellular what the problem is that they are trying to solve. How many people are affected? Is it just affecting US Cellular customers? US Cellular refused to answer these questions, and he hasn't heard any answers during this meeting. He spoke with an engineer who told him that 9-1-1 works with any carrier as long as they have coverage in an area. So, are the dropped calls because US Cellular is unwilling to pay roaming charges to a competitor who has better coverage in the area? As a result, he feels there are technical questions that have not been asked or answered effectively.

He mentioned that he is an engineer. If this proposal is a result of a standard engineering analysis, then you are looking at the solution that is the least costly and most profitable for US Cellular. There has not been much evidence that alternatives will not work. He suggested increasing power at the existing transmitters so they reach farther or the alternative of having multiple smaller towers. He wondered why the other eight alternative locations were located north of High Street when the underserved area is more than a half of a mile south of the Urbana High School. There were not any preferred sites located in the southern area. Why not replace one of the existing ugly towers with one of these beautiful poles. Have people really tried to be imaginative about solving the problem? Is this a public problem or is it something that only affects a hand-full of people?

Mark Foley, 411 West Illinois, stated that he has two young children who will be going through the Urbana School District. He also is a teacher at the Urbana High School. His classroom will be the closest room to the proposed tower. He mentioned that the last thing the high school needs is better reception because the students do enjoy texting during class. The high school is probably the one place in the City where the most human beings are for most of the time during the week. He feels installing a telecommunications tower that has a lot of power and electricity going through it in the midst of all these people could be potentially dangerous. He is very anxious and excited about getting new athletic grounds and stadium coming in. Everyone he has spoken with agree that the proposed tower would be an eyesore and would diminish the beauty of the new stadium. He stated that he was speaking as a citizen and not as a teacher. He only represented himself and not the School District or anyone else.

Gale Walden, 306 West Washington Street, mentioned that she has a daughter who is 13 years old and attends the Urbana Middle School. No one is listening to the children's concerns. Her daughter told her that the proposed tower would make her feel bad about her school if the School District was so financially desperate to allow something like this. Ms. Walden has a problem with corporations inside publicly funded entities, specifically educational entities. What does this teach the children?

Mr. Otto asked if the Findings of Fact were drafted by City staff or by US Cellular. Mr. Myers pointed out that the Findings of Fact that Mr. Bullard had referred to are part of the petitioner's

application and was drafted by the applicant. City staff's proposed Findings of Fact are included in the City staff memo.

Mr. Jakobsze re-approached the Plan Commission. He commented that in doing research on existing structures in the area, one of the towers that they identified was a Verizon tower which was approved under a Special Use Permit by the City Council in 1993. He noticed that the 200% fall zone requirement was not conformed to in that permit, so it appears to be a precedent already established for one carrier. He is not sure when the 200% fall zone requirement came into effect.

He asked the Plan Commission what they would like to see in a subsequent presentation if this case is continued to the next meeting. Mr. Otto replied that he would like to see someone come to the meeting that can represent and speak on behalf of the School Board. He would also like to hear more about the basis for an agreement with the University of Illinois being unacceptable. Mr. Jakobsze said that he would present responses to these concerns.

There was no further public input. Acting Chair Fitch closed the public input portion of the hearing, and he opened it up for Plan Commission discussion.

Mr. Hopkins asked for clarification regarding the 200% fall zone. Does the Zoning Ordinance set the 200% limit relative to the parcel boundary? Mr. Myers stated that the Zoning Ordinance requires a setback of 200% of the tower height from the front-yard setback line of the nearest residential zoning district. So basically the proposed tower should be setback 300 feet from the front-yard setback line of the houses located on the west side of Race Street. It will be about 75 feet short of complying with this requirement. This setback requirement is more stringent in residential zoning districts than it is in a business or industrial zoning district. Urbana's telecommunications ordinance specifically defines the CRE (Conservation-Recreation-Education) zone as a type of residential zone, and so a 200% setback is required unless waived as part of the Special Use Permit approval. There needs to be a reason for waiving the requirement. In this case there are barriers for locating the tower elsewhere on the High School/Junior High property, but on the other hand it's really a large area (five square blocks). Therefore, he recommends that the City staff meet with the petitioner and discuss other possible locations on the property which would meet the 300 foot setback requirement. This way City staff could advise the Plan Commission at the next meeting on whether a waiver would be justified if the tower remains there.

Mr. Hopkins said that there seems to be two levels of questions that would be of interest. What are the explicit trade-offs of the locations on the high school/middle school site itself? His initial reaction is to locate the proposed tower in the middle of the site. However, the middle of the site may be over the sanitary sewer easement. Is there really no place to locate the tower elsewhere? What do we know about the foundation requirements for a telecommunications tower? Knowing a little more about why it doesn't make sense to construct the proposed tower in the middle of the school site would be important, especially when considering the waiver.

Mr. Fell agrees with Mr. Hopkins. He feels uncomfortable lumping in a zoning variance with a Special Use Permit because he does not believe that they meet the criteria for a zoning variance. He asked for clarification on why the City can lump the zoning variance in with the Special Use

Permit and not require a separate review for it. Mr. Myers explained that the Zoning Ordinance authorizes a few waivers to be approved with the Special Use Permit process. For instance landscaping is normally required around the base of cell towers, but the Zoning Ordinance allows waivers for landscaping in the Special Use Permit process if the City Council feels that the area would be better served without the landscaping. The radio tower for the Independent Media Center was just approved without landscaping, at the request of the Plan Commission and approval of the City Council.

Mr. Hopkins stated that the second level of questions is more explicit explanation of the trade-offs with alternative sites. Because of the tower requirements, there are not many potentially legal locations for such a tower within the area of interest other than University properties or the Urbana High School property. There are not that many large sites where they could place a tower that far away from residential. This means that alternative sites would need to include something other than 150' towers. Maybe they could replace the City's tower or they could use multiple smaller towers. In any case, this is the kind of information that the Plan Commission needs.

Mr. Fitch also feels that some continued discussion and further research into the two levels of questions would potentially be helpful.

The Plan Commission continued the hearing until the next Plan Commission meeting, scheduled for June 23, 2011.

Plan Case No. 2146-M-11 – A request by Gary Olsen on behalf of Verdant Prairies, LLC to rezone a 4.01 acre parcel at 704 East Windsor Road from CRE, Conservation-Recreation-Education District, to R-3, Single and Two-Family Residential Zoning District.

Plan Case No. 2146-PUD-11 – A request by Gary Olsen on behalf of Verdant Prairies, LLC for preliminary approval for a Residential Planned Unit Development at 704 East Windsor Road under Section XIII-3 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance.

Rebecca Bird, Planner I, presented these two cases together to the Plan Commission. She explained the purpose for the proposed rezoning and residential planned unit development (PUD). She noted the location of the site and described the proposed PUD project. She discussed the existing zoning and land use of the site as well as that of the surrounding properties. She discussed how the proposed project relates to the goals and objectives of the Urbana Comprehensive Plan. She reviewed the LaSalle criteria for rezoning of the property. She then discussed the PUD preliminary approval process. She reviewed the PUD criteria noting the requirements and the recommended design features according to Section XIII-3 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance. She read the options of the Plan Commission and presented City staff's recommendation for approval for both applications.

Mr. Fitch noted that some of the proposed structures are not permitted in the R-3 Zoning District by right. Would this require additional review and action by another board or commission? Ms. Bird said no. The purpose of a planned unit development is to allow greater flexibility in the regular development regulations for a zoning district. While the PUD Ordinance requires a

higher quality of design and features, the developer is allowed greater flexibility in uses and development regulations. The only waiver the developer requests for the proposed project is for the building height.

With no questions for City staff, Acting Chair Fitch asked if the petitioner had any additional information for the Plan Commission's consideration.

Gary Olsen and Andrew Graumlich, Olsen & Associates Architects, approached the Plan Commission. Mr. Olsen mentioned that he had been working with City staff for over a year on the proposed project. He believes together they have come up with a development that will be successful in revitalizing the property.

He gave a presentation on the following:

- Aerial Plan of Site
- Proposed Site Plan
- Time Expected to Complete
- Layout of One Story Duplex Dwelling Unit
- Fourplex Building Plan – First Floor
- Fourplex Building Plan – Second Floor
- Fourplex Building – Front Elevation
- Fourplex Building – Side Elevation
- Parking Level Floor Plan – Twelveplex Building
- First Floor Plan – Twelveplex Building
- Second Floor Plan – Twelveplex Building
- Third Floor Plan – Twelveplex Building
- 3 Story 12 DU – Front Elevation
- 3 Story 12 DU – Side Elevation
- Club House
- Variance for height of 3 story 12 DU buildings
- Modular Building Construction

Mr. Fell asked if the interior street would be dedicated to the City of Urbana. Mr. Olsen replied that the entryway would belong to the City and the rest of the interior street would remain privately owned and maintained.

Mr. Fell wondered who owns the strip of land where the sidewalk is on the northwest side. Mr. Olsen believes that this strip was deeded over as open space by the previous owner. Ms. Bird stated that this strip is owned by an owner of property on Scovill that is adjacent to it. The sidewalk across this property has a public access easement.

Mr. Fell stated that he has no objection to granting a variance for the height of a building; however, he objects to granting it as a blanket variance across the entire property because although he feels it is appropriate for the buildings that will face Windsor Road, it is not appropriate for the area on the north part of the property. If Mr. Olsen sells the property to someone else they could then construct all the buildings higher than in this proposal. Ms. Bird

noted that the waiver is cited in the City staff recommendation on Page 13 of the written staff report and states, "Maximum height for the two twelve-unit buildings as shown in the attached elevation drawing marked '3 Story 12 DU – Front (South) Elevation' (Exhibit G)".

Mr. Otto asked for clarification regarding stormwater detention. Mr. Olsen pointed out that on the east and west sides, and in front along Windsor Road, there will be dry basins that will fill up as rain gardens where water will slowly soak into the ground. Ms. Bird added that it will be necessary for the petitioner to submit a detailed stormwater management plan when they ask for approval of the final PUD. This plan will need to be approved by the City Engineer, Bill Gray.

Mr. Otto questioned whether the petitioner was asking for any waivers from the standard stormwater requirements for a development like this. Ms. Bird said no.

Mr. Olsen explained that they are requesting approval of the proposed preliminary residential PUD so they can start working on the final documents. Final documents will show how the stormwater plan will work and all the details of it. They do intend to build the development as shown in the preliminary plans. There might be some variation in how things look in Phase 3 depending on how the construction of the other buildings goes.

Mr. Otto explained that he is concerned about detention because from the proposed plans it appears that most of the proposed site will be roofed over and paved over. The surrounding property owners will be concerned about stormwater drainage as well. Mr. Olsen responded that all the hard surfaces will be permeable concrete except for the sidewalks.

Mr. Myers noted that the PUD offers flexibility when it comes to zoning, but it doesn't offer waivers from the Subdivision and Land Development Code. Before the petitioner will be able to get building permits, they will need to submit a stormwater plan that meets the stormwater requirements in terms of retention. The permeable surfaces and rain gardens are good features but can't take the place of flood control measures.

Mr. Fell inquired as to whether the petitioner will be going for LEED Certification. Mr. Olsen said no.

Mr. Fell asked if City staff was planning to install a stop sign. There are not very many arterial streets that come out on Windsor Road. Mr. Olsen answered that they do want to control the traffic in this area. City staff is considering what would be the best way to do this.

Mr. Fitch opened the meeting to public comment.

Linda Bauer, 709 Scovill Street, said that the proposed development will abut their rear property line. She and her husband are concerned about noise, lack of privacy, lights and stormwater drainage. They feel that 48 units seem like a lot for the proposed site. However, she would rather have the proposed development be constructed than a liquor store or flimsy apartments which could be denser. She recommends that the petitioner provide some screening along the common property line. The proposed development appears to be well planned, but ask her again

in a year. She believes overall that it could improve property values and she is hoping for the best.

Mr. Fitch questioned whether the final PUD plans would address screening. Mr. Myers said yes.

Don Moore, 901 Scovill Street, stated that he agrees with his neighbor's comments in that the proposed project is better than the dirt they currently have to look at and better than some of the options that could be developed on the site. He is also concerned about traffic in this area already and feels that the traffic going in and out of Meadowbrook Park needs better protection. He mentioned that he is the only one on Scovill Street that already has a privacy fence in his back yard. He would prefer that the north sidewalk be eliminated. He is also concerned about drainage. They want to make sure there is a good demarcation where the drainage would not come into his back yard. The proposed PUD has some good potential, and he does not stand in opposition.

With no further comments or questions from the public audience, Acting Chair Fitch closed the public input portion of the hearing. He then opened it up for Plan Commission discussion and/or motions.

Mr. Fitch stated that his major concern is traffic on Windsor Road. There needs to be something at Vine Street and Windsor Road to create a safer environment for pedestrians crossing the road.

Mr. Fell wondered if the PUD has to conform to the screening requirements in a multi-family residential zoning district. Mr. Myers said that appropriate screening should be provided. The City can deal with screening when the petitioner submits the final PUD plans for approval. The idea behind having a two-step approval process is to provide a general plan during the preliminary process and receive public comments, and in the final process the developer would submit a more refined plan that deals with specific issues identified at the preliminary public hearing. Mr. Fitch agreed and thanked the residents in the nearby neighborhood for attending the public hearing and voicing their concerns.

Mr. Fell expressed his concerns about the height waiver. It seems too specific. A number of variables can cause the height of a building to change. For instance soil conditions might require a slightly lower or higher foundation and building height. How much leeway should the City give the petitioner? He is inclined to provide some leeway because the height variance is for the buildings facing Windsor Road where he feels taller buildings are more appropriate; however, there should be a limit. Mr. Olsen commented that he is only asking for a height waiver up to 6 feet 8 inches and not any more. Mr. Fell suggested wording the language to say that the height variance would be up to 10 feet without reconsideration.

Mr. Hopkins pointed out that when the Plan Commission reviews the final PUD plans this issue will come up again. He asked if they need to approve it twice or just wait until the final PUD plans are submitted. Ms. Bird replied that it is good that they discuss this issue and have something as part of the preliminary approval so that the petitioner knows in his refining of the plans whether or not he can continue to include the extra height. Mr. Fell said that they could

leave it at 6 feet 8 inches for now and raise it later if necessary when the petitioner submits the final PUD plans.

Mr. Hopkins moved that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 2146-M-11 to the City Council with a recommendation for approval. Mr. Otto seconded the motion. Roll call was taken and was as follows:

Mr. Fell	-	Yes	Mr. Fitch	-	Yes
Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes	Mr. Otto	-	Yes
Ms. Burris	-	Yes			

The motion was approved by unanimous vote.

Mr. Hopkins moved that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 2146-PUD-11 to the City Council with a recommendation for approval. Mr. Otto seconded the motion. Roll call was taken and was as follows:

Mr. Fitch	-	Yes	Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes
Mr. Otto	-	Yes	Ms. Burris	-	Yes
Mr. Fell	-	Yes			

The motion was approved by unanimous vote.

Acting Chair Fitch announced that these two cases will then be forwarded to the June 20, 2011 City Council meeting.

6. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

Plan Case No. 2142-T-11: Request by the Zoning Administrator to amend Section VI-9 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance regarding portable storage containers.

Robert Myers, Planning Manager, recommended continuing this case to the next scheduled meeting of the Plan Commission due to the late hour of the evening. The Plan Commission agreed, and Mr. Fitch announced that this case would be forwarded to the June 23, 2011 meeting.

7. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

8. NEW BUSINESS

There was none.

9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There was none.

10. STAFF REPORT

There was none.

11. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Myers, AICP, Secretary
Urbana Plan Commission