

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING**

**URBANA PLAN COMMISSION**

**APPROVED**

**DATE:** January 24, 2019

**TIME:** 7:00 P.M.

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

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Barry Ackerson, Jane Billman, Tyler Fitch, Lew Hopkins, Daniel Turner, Chenxi Yu

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Andrew Fell, Nancy Ouedraogo, Jonah Weisskopf

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Nancy Ouedraogo

**STAFF PRESENT:** Lorrie Pearson, Planning Manager; Kevin Garcia, Planner II; Teri Andel, Administrative Assistant II

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Suzanne Bissonnette, Jarrett Cooper, Dan Folk, Karen Fresca, Randall Kangas, Pierre Moulin, Diane Plewa, Graeme Rael, Joe Williams, Phyllis Winter-Williams

---

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

Chair Fitch called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. Roll call was taken and a quorum of the members was declared present.

**2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA**

There were none.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the January 10, 2019 regular Plan Commission meeting were presented for approval. Mr. Turner moved that the Plan Commission approve the minutes as written. Mr. Hopkins seconded the motion. The minutes were approved as written by unanimous voice vote.

**4. COMMUNICATIONS**

- Revised Recommended Conditions for Plan Case No. 2362-SU-18

## 5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

**Plan Case No. 2359-T-18 – An application by the Urbana Zoning Administrator to amend the Urbana Zoning Ordinance with changes to Article II (Definitions), Article V (Use Regulations), and Article VI (Development Regulations), and other relevant sections, to facilitate solar energy system installation.**

Chair Fitch continued this case to the February 21, 2019 regular meeting of the Urbana Plan Commission at the request of the applicant.

## 6. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

## 7. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

**Plan Case Nos. 2361-M-18 & 2362-SU-18 – A request by Rael Development Corporation to rezone approximately 1.5 acres from B-2 (Neighborhood Business – Arterial) and R-4 (Medium-Density Multiple-Family Residential) to B-3 (General Business) AND for a Special Use Permit to allow multi-family residential use in the B-3 (General Business) District at 802, 804, 806, 808, 810, 812, 814, and 816 Clark Street AND 406, 406 ½, and 408 North Lincoln Avenue.**

Chair Fitch opened the public hearings for these two cases.

Kevin Garcia, Planner II, presented one staff report for both the proposed rezoning and the special use permit requests. He began by stating the purpose for the two requests to allow a mixed-use development on several properties. He mentioned that the developer, Rael Development Corporation, held a neighborhood open house about the project and more than 50 people attended. Two of the main concerns expressed at the open house were regarding parking and traffic. He talked about the subject properties noting their location, zoning, and existing land uses as well as for the surrounding neighboring properties. He discussed the proposed use and reviewed the LaSalle National Bank criteria and the Sinclair Pipeline Company factors and how they relate to the proposed rezoning. He reviewed the requirements according to Section VII-4.A of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance for a special use permit. He read the options of the Plan Commission and presented City staff's recommendation for approval of the proposed rezoning including the revised recommended conditions listed below that were handed out prior to the start of the meeting and for approval of the proposed special use permit:

- 1. The development shall be constructed in general conformance with the Site Plans and renderings submitted with the application.*
- 2. The developer shall submit a Traffic Impact Analysis prior to the City issuing any building permits.*
- 3. The developer shall adequately mitigate negative impacts the Traffic Impact Analysis anticipates prior to the City issuing a Certificate of Occupancy.*

Chair Fitch asked if any members of the Plan Commission had questions for City staff.

Mr. Ackerson asked if the Traffic Impact Analysis would be done by the developer or if it would be done jointly with the City. Mr. Garcia explained how the Traffic Impact Analysis works. The developer will work with a consultant, which has certain steps that will need to be followed to develop the Traffic Impact Analysis. City staff will then review to ensure that the consultant followed the necessary steps.

Mr. Hopkins wondered if the property to the northeast of the railroad right-of-way was exempt and if it was owned by Carle or the City of Urbana. Mr. Garcia believed it is owned by the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT). Lorrie Pearson, Planning Manager, added that IDOT had been acquiring right-of-way throughout University Avenue in order to support their safety improvements.

Mr. Hopkins inquired about the status of the railroad right-of-way. Mr. Garcia replied that the railroad is active.

Mr. Hopkins noticed that the proposed development plans ignore the existence of the railroad and show improvements on IDOT owned property. Mr. Garcia felt the plans were conceptual.

Mr. Turner questioned if there is a different zoning district that would encompass the proposed development rather than the developer having to request the proposed special use permit to allow the development in the B-3 Zoning District. Mr. Garcia said that the B-3U (General Business – University) would allow a mixed-use development and maybe B-4 (Central Business) which would not fit in the proposed area. City staff thought that since half of the properties are already zoned B-3, then they could request B-3 for all of the subject properties and ask for a special use permit. Mr. Hopkins asked if that is the only reason. Mr. Garcia said yes.

Chair Fitch noticed the plans show parking on the north side of Clark Street; however, he did not believe that parking was allowed on that side of the street. Mr. Garcia said that is correct. He reassured him that the City engineers would work with the developer to keep parking only on one side of the street. The plans are conceptual at this phase.

Mr. Fitch wondered if there was any anticipated street parking or sidewalk improvements along Busey Avenue. Mr. Garcia replied not that he was aware of with the proposed project. Ms. Pearson added that she would check this.

Chair Fitch reviewed the procedure for a public hearing. He opened the hearings for public input.

Graeme Rael, of Rael Development Corporation, and Jarrett Cooper, of Rosemann and Associates Architects, approached the Plan Commission to speak on behalf of their proposed requests.

Mr. Rael talked about the proposed mixed-use development project. They see the corner of Lincoln and University Avenues as the gateway to the University of Illinois. They believe that the historic district along West Main Street is another important component of the area. They scaled down the size of the buildings from University Avenue to the south side of Clark Street. They want to maintain the cobblestone street on Clark Street to make it feel pedestrian.

He explained that the intent of having parking on the south side of Clark Street would be to slow traffic down and give it even more of a pedestrian feel. They plan to work with City staff to address this.

He commented that including the triangular piece owned by IDOT in the project plans was illustrative. It is not part of the proposed project.

The subject properties are near Carle and the University. They met with Carle Hospital, and the Carle staff expressed excitement over the proposed development. He hoped the development would be an asset to the community.

Mr. Cooper offered to answer any specific questions about the project.

Mr. Hopkins stated that the closest thing to a Site Plan is Exhibit E, which is a rendering. The Site Plan does not indicate there would be a sidewalk along Busey Avenue. He asked if the applicant had done measured Site Plan drawings to know if they are meeting the parking requirements with the proposed configuration. Mr. Cooper said yes. He explained that they started with a hardline Site Plan, which then led to the proposed renderings. Exhibit E: Site Plan does not show it, but there will be parking within the first level of the building marked as residential.

Mr. Hopkins questioned where the access to the parking was located. Mr. Cooper showed where the access drives were located on the Site Plan. They talked about the layout of the parking and main entrance for the residential units.

Ms. Billman wondered what an amenity area would offer. Mr. Cooper stated that the amenity area would offer a business center or a fitness center. Mr. Rael added a hotel lobby, café/coffee shop, lounge, meeting/study rooms, etc.

Ms. Billman wondered where the retail space would be located. Mr. Cooper explained that the primary retail space would be located in the area facing University Avenue on the west corner of the building and continue down through the storefront space.

Mr. Ackerson asked if they had talked with OSF Healthcare. Mr. Cooper said no.

Mr. Ackerson wondered what part of the proposed development that Carle was enthusiastic about. Was it the extended stay use? Mr. Rael said that Carle expressed enthusiasm about each component of the development.

Ms. Yu asked how the extended stay hotel would operate in comparison to a regular hotel. Mr. Rael responded that there is not much difference other than people would be able to stay for longer periods because each unit would have a kitchen and is larger than a typical hotel room.

Mr. Turner questioned what other concerns were expressed at the neighborhood open house. Mr. Cooper replied that another main concern, other than parking and traffic, was the proximity of the proposed development to the homes along Main Street. They talked with the residents about different opportunities to provide screening (including landscaping) to their backyards; however, many of the neighboring property owners prefer a privacy wall.

Suzanne Bissonnette approached the Plan Commission to speak in opposition. She stated that she lives at 804 West Main Street. She and her husband have lived in the Busey Home since 1992. The neighborhood is diverse in terms of income, employment and demographics. There are many rental properties including the other two properties that they own at 802 West Main Street and 305 North Coler Avenue. The neighbors are close. Overcrowding parking issues and congestion are part of their daily lives. The neighborhood is located close to the University of Illinois, to Carle and to St. Patrick's Catholic Church.

She reviewed the following LaSalle National Bank and the Sinclair Pipeline factors and gave her interpretation of how they relate to the proposed rezoning and special use permit requests:

- 1) *Existing Land Uses and Zoning of Nearby Property.* Carle is two blocks away and not in her backyard as the proposed development would be. All of the B-3U (General Business – University) zoned properties are located on the west side of Lincoln Avenue. South of Clark Street is all residential properties. The developer would not need to worry about slowing down traffic since they planned to keep the cobblestone street. Because it is so bumpy, drivers are not able to drive fast going down the street.
- 2) *The extent to which property values are diminished by the restrictions of the ordinance.* They have turned their neighborhood into a historic district and maintained their properties to the best of their abilities. She felt that the proposed development would impact the value of her home in a negative way because it will add more congestion to the neighborhood and will affect their view from their backyards.
- 3) *The extent to which the ordinance promotes the health, safety, morals or general welfare of the public.* The developer stated that the proposed project would be aimed at students renting the residential units. Having students as neighbors, there things that property owners deal with such as parties, trash, damage to rental properties the students live in. She expressed concern for the students exiting the proposed development either by vehicle or by walking.
- 4) *The relative gain to the public as compared to the hardship imposed on the individual property owner.* She felt it would not be a benefit to the public as it would be difficult to access the development at the proposed location. It is a highly dangerous intersection at University Avenue and Lincoln Avenue.
- 5) *The suitability of the subject property for the zoned purposes.* She expressed concern about the egress of vehicles. To exit the proposed development and head towards the university, a driver would not easily be able to turn left onto Lincoln Avenue. If they take Busey Avenue, there is parking on both sides of the street, so there is only room for one car to travel down the street. Pedestrians walk down the middle of the street because there are no sidewalks on either side of Busey Avenue.
- 6) *The community's need for more of the proposed use.* She wondered if the City of Urbana needed more vacant apartments in the subject area. There are already many available to rent.
- 7) *The care with which the community has planned its land use development.* With regards to the subject area being a “gateway” to the University of Illinois, it would not match the west side of University Avenue with having taller buildings. There is already a “gateway” at Green Street and Lincoln Avenue and another one at Lincoln Avenue and Illinois Street.

She concluded saying that she does not want a view of a five-story apartment building from her kitchen or bedroom windows. The proposed development will negatively affect the historic district as well as the value of her properties.

Ms. Billman asked if there would be 412 additional residents. Ms. Bissonnette replied yes. That is the number that the developers told her when she asked them. This number includes the 16 townhouses and the 5-story apartment and extended stay buildings.

Mr. Fitch asked if Ms. Bissonnette was opposed to the rezoning request or the proposed special use permit request or both. Ms. Bissonnette said both.

Randy Kangas approached the Plan Commission to speak in opposition. He began by stating that it is a very hard corner to redevelop, especially because of the railroad going through it and because of University and Lincoln Avenues. Just because there is a lot of traffic does not make it a good location to develop a commercial use. For example, the old Huey's building sat vacant for a long time and had never been redeveloped for a higher use.

He expressed concern about the capacity of the City sewers in the proposed area. There is a new high-density residential project being developed on the northwest portion of the University Avenue/Lincoln Avenue intersection. He asked how old the sewer system is for this area. Would the existing sewer system in the area be able to handle another high-density residential development or were the sewer system built for single-family residential use? Mr. Garcia replied that it depends. Some of the system is old and some are new. Mr. Kangas continued saying that there is currently about 12 homes in the area and now there would be hundreds of people including residents and staff and employees of the commercial uses for the proposed development, not including the residential development on the northwest portion of the intersection. This also does not include the stormwater runoff created from covering the now permeable grassy areas with the proposed development. He asked who would pay for the improvements to the sanitary sewer system.

Parking is an issue. The developer is planning to provide 250 parking spaces for 420 beds. Traffic increase is also an issue. He handed out a photo of the parking along North Busey Avenue. He asked the Plan Commission to imagine more cars adding 1000 trips down this one lane street. In addition, Busey Avenue and Clark Street are in bad condition and in much need of repair. Parking and access to the site are reasons why projects for redevelopment have failed in the past.

He talked about the increase in density that the proposed development would create. Density would be increased 200 times what currently resides in the proposed location. This impacts parking, traffic, and the sanitary sewer system.

His interpretation is that the City wants to redevelop Main Street because the proposed rezoning would increase the property value of his home. If it is not the intent of the City to redevelop Main Street, then why would his home on Main Street become more valuable?

He talked about the aesthetics of the view from his back porch. He showed a picture of what the view is currently. He showed a rendering of what five stories would look like from his back

porch. Although the proposed development would be around 200 feet away from his house, he did not like the idea of residents in the new development being able to look into his property.

He mentioned that the proposed development would not look like the first rendering in Exhibit E as there are gates for the railroad that are not illustrated in the rendering. He believed that the developer should address the infrastructure before starting a major project like the one being proposed. He encouraged the Plan Commission to continue the case to allow the members the opportunity to drive around the neighborhood and imagine the magnitude of increased density and traffic that the proposed development would add.

Mr. Fitch asked if he was opposed to the proposed rezoning or to the proposed special use permit or both. Mr. Kangas said both. He added that he does not think that the proposed development would make West Main Street viable as a historic district any more. How important is historic preservation to the City of Urbana?

Ms. Pearson asked if City staff could keep the pictures that Mr. Kangas had passed around for the record. Mr. Kangas said that City staff could have the photos but not the rendering as he did not have a copy of it. He asked why City staff never asked for a rendering of the view of the proposed development from the backyards of the homes on Main Street. Mr. Fitch stated that it must have been an oversight.

Daniel Folk approached the Plan Commission to speak in opposition. He mentioned that he lives at 807 West Main Street. He pointed out that if the City approves the proposed rezoning, then we would end up with a historic R-2 zoned area within about 100 feet from a B-3 zoned area. The proposed development would be a very large increase in density for traffic and people. The City and the developer need to consider traffic flow exiting the subject properties. It would be quite difficult for someone leaving the proposed development turning south onto Lincoln Avenue. They need to create a plan for traffic to go down what is virtually a one-way street on Busey Avenue to Main Street. It is more than just the streets though. It is also about the sewer and sub-surface and surface drainage that would be impacted by the proposed development. The sewer system is old and when overloaded below the surface can cause them to crack and suck dirt. Who will pay to repair or improve the sanitary sewer once it fails? If the developer intends to charge for parking on-site, then people will park on Main Street where parking is free, so he believed that parking should be studied further.

Phyllis Williams approached the Plan Commission to speak in opposition. She mentioned that she lives at 810 West Main Street. She appreciated that the developer did not plan to construct balconies and felt that they could work with the developer about providing a buffer to the townhouses. However, she expressed concern about drainage onto her property. Busey Avenue is in need of repair. Pedestrians already find it difficult to cross Lincoln Avenue at Main Street. She encouraged the Plan Commission to step back and get input from the City Engineering Department. She mentioned that the neighborhood felt like they were blindsided by the proposed project. She is opposed to the density and height of the proposed development and she is opposed to the special use permit.

Diane Plewa approached the Plan Commission to speak in opposition. She expressed concern about access to proposed development. Drivers cannot turn south onto Lincoln Avenue from Clark Street, and drivers cannot turn west onto University Avenue from Busey Avenue. More

people bring extra noise, congestion and traffic to a neighborhood. She realized that the renderings may be too preliminary, but she did not notice any dumpsters or a loading dock/delivery area for the proposed development. She encouraged the Plan Commission to consider the sewer, stormwater runoff, and increase in parking.

She stated that she is tired of developers trying to spin additional space as being a community benefit. It will benefit the hotel or other businesses that locate there and it will benefit the residents, but it will not benefit the community. No one from the community will use the additional space to hold parties for children's birthdays or graduations.

The proposed development would set a precedent of encroachment into the historic district along West Main Street. The City always uses the justification that something similar is located across the street or on the same block or around the corner. Every development changes the character of the neighborhood and sets a precedent to allow the next development to change it more. She thanked the Plan Commission for listening to their concerns. She stated that she lives in Urbana because she loves it here, and she is not opposed to change. She loves her neighborhood because of the neighborhood feel it has. She just wants to preserve the neighborhood feel for herself, for her family and for future generations. She found difficulty in seeing how the proposed five-story apartment building and extended stay hotel would fit in with a quiet neighborhood of families and students. She encouraged the Plan Commission to delay in making a decision until there is a safety plan in place regarding traffic and the sewer system.

Mr. Rael and Mr. Cooper re-approached the Plan Commission to address some of the concerns that were mentioned by previous speakers.

Mr. Rael stated that many of the neighbor concerns related to traffic and infrastructure, which they cannot do anything about. He noted that Rael Development Corporation cares about pedestrian and vehicular safety as much as the neighbors, and he looks forward to the process to address it. He mentioned that they would be investing quite financially into the project and have a pride of ownership in all of their buildings. They do not have balconies on their buildings because they do not want bicycles and other items stored on them. Dumpsters would be located on-site and would provide valet trash so trash will not build up outside or in the hallways. He respects that the neighborhood is close and has gatherings. He hoped that they could become a part of the neighborhood. He noted that there is a reason why they are not proposing a street full of retail, because quite often they end up vacant. They have designed a project that is economically feasible and are looking forward to building it. They believe it can be part of the community, which is why they planned smaller scaled buildings next to the single-family residential neighborhood.

Mr. Cooper reiterated that they were intentional in the way they laid out the buildings on the properties so that they went from a higher density, taller building along University Avenue across Clark Street to a lower density building buffering up to a residential neighborhood. The maximum height of the townhomes would be 35 feet. Some of the historic residential homes with the extreme roof pitches do reach a similar height.

With regards to street improvements, once the Traffic Impact Analysis is complete and accepted, they plan to work with City staff to mitigate any traffic issues that this project might have on the surrounding area. Along with that is the improvements to streets along the property lines. The



attached renderings and Site Plan are early concepts. If the City requires a sidewalk, then they will provide one.

He explained that the process for developing. Seeking approval for zoning and the use is the first step in the process. After getting approval of these, they must then work closely with the City Engineering staff to make sure that all concerns are addressed. The last thing they want to do is have a negative impact on the neighborhood adjacent to them. During the course of the review with City staff, the sanitary sewer system and stormwater runoff will be reviewed entirely and any issues would be addressed.

He talked about maintenance of the property. Rael Development Corporation are very strict in making sure that their buildings are well cared for. He recommended going to their website and visit Rael's other properties.

By siting the property as they have proposed, they have tried to be very respectful of the Main Street corridor. They tried to maintain the walkability and the visual appeal of Clark Street. Part of the reason for configuring Clark Street as shown in the renderings is to slow down traffic and to provide safe parking zones along the street. They will work with City staff on the final configuration of the street.

Mr. Rael stated that there would be a charge for the covered parking areas, which is common in the City of Urbana. The rest is preliminary, and they have not determined the final resolution of all the parking spaces.

Mr. Cooper stated that community spaces provided in the development are truly meant to invite the community into the space.

Mr. Turner asked about the timing of the process. Mr. Cooper explained that it is normal to acquire the zoning and approval for the use prior to working out the details of the development and getting studies done because there is a cost associated with getting the studies done and doing all of the investigation that has to happen.

Mr. Turner asked if they have other developments in Champaign/Urbana. Mr. Rael said that this would be the first for this area; however, they have other developments nationwide from North Carolina to Washington. Their business is to locate attractive sites to redevelop. The proposed site is perfect for them because it is a key location, has a growing university, the hospital is just down the street, and it has visibility.

There was no additional input, so Chair Fitch closed the public input portion and opened the hearing for Plan Commission discussion and/or motion(s).

Mr. Hopkins felt that a project like this is appropriate for this location. His problem is with the mechanism for permitting and approving it. Currently, the property along University Avenue is already zoned B-3, which has no height restrictions. They are talking about a proposal to redevelop and are being asked to vote on a rezoning of the property. In effect, this proposal is only an instance of something that could be created that might be useful information to consider when making a rezoning decision. However, the zoning decision is really about what the zone would be. His impression is that they are trying to do this to create a single zoning parcel so they

can get a project that is reasonably coherent. There have been many times when they have rezoned a property for a project, and then the project does not happen, so he is reluctant to make a rezoning of the entire block to B-3 based on this project. He expressed concern about what could be built by right if this project is not done. B-3, by right, does not allow residential. For the neighbors who do not want this project in their backyard, this project would be rather nice to have compared to what could be built by right in the B-3 Zoning District. If this were built, then it would protect you from something else being built.

Mr. Fitch pointed out that there are two separate cases. One is for rezoning and the other is for a special use permit.

Mr. Turner recalled a rezoning request for the proposed properties coming before them in the past. He remembered one of the Plan Commission's issues was that they did not have a plan for redeveloping the site. Mr. Fitch stated that it ended up being that they had to look at all the uses in the B-3 Zoning District that would be allowed and not just one use.

Mr. Hopkins talked about the special use permit request. One of the recommended conditions is that *the development shall be constructed in general conformance with the attached site plans and renderings*. He does not feel they have a Site Plan, which makes him reluctant to approve the special use permit. He has been trying to find a solution to this, because this corner should be redeveloped and something similar to the proposed development is potentially appropriate. He cannot find a zoning category that would allow the extended stay hotel but would have a height limit. Unlimited height is not okay to him.

There may be a couple of ways to achieve this but it would involve creating an aggregated parcel. He asked if they could create an aggregated parcel under the Planned Unit Development (PUD) Ordinance. Ms. Pearson thanked him for articulating some of the things City staff had discussed at length. There is not a perfect zoning district. While there is no height limit in the B-3 Zoning District, the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) maximum is four, and there is a parking requirement. So, there are practical limitations to the height. They could treat the subject properties as one lot with separate zoning and have a PUD over it. It had been proposed at Lincoln Avenue and Nevada Street site, which had two zoning districts. City staff had asked the architect on that project to calculate a weighted ratio of all of the requirements. So, it has been done and it is not easy.

Mr. Hopkins stated that he would like to continue the two cases so they can do more work on it. Chair Fitch echoed that there is a need to redevelop the proposed lots, and there is a need to protect the West Main Street historic district. He also understands the neighbors' concern for access to and from the proposed site. Mr. Turner stated that he would like to see a Traffic Study performed for the area. Mr. Fitch asked if they could require a stormwater management plan. Ms. Pearson explained that if the property were over a certain size, then the developer would need to provide stormwater management plan above and beyond for what is currently pervious. City engineers would look at the plans and determine how much of the stormwater would need to be dealt with.

Mr. Ackerson commented that one should not assume that everyone has a car. A traffic study as well as a study of the use of mass transit needs to be done. There are students who live much further north on Lincoln Avenue who largely take the bus to campus. They can identify where the

mass transit stops are located in the area and where there would be a safe place for people to cross Lincoln Avenue.

Ms. Pearson asked the Plan Commission to list their main issues. To do a PUD is a separate process and would need to re-advertise the public hearing. If the Plan Commission wanted, City staff could ask the developer to address any issues that the Plan Commission may have.

Mr. Ackerson asked for more clarification on how the FAR affects the height of a building. Mr. Garcia replied that the B-3 Zoning District has a 4.0 FAR. One could build a four-story building that covers the entire site or they could build a taller building with a smaller footprint. However, the height of the tallest building possible would not be much taller than what the developer is proposing. Ms. Pearson added that it is more expensive to build additional stories after five. Additional stories require more parking spaces.

Mr. Hopkins stated that he was interested in finding procedural options of how to get a project we want without opening up possibilities through zoning that we do not want. He asked staff for help.

Chair Fitch listed the following issues that Plan Commission would like to see addressed:

- 1) Height of the building – density that five stories would create
- 2) Traffic Patterns and Parking
- 3) City Improvement Plans for Busey Avenue, Clark Street, University Avenue and Coler Avenue
- 4) Traffic Study
- 5) Use of Mass Transit and pedestrian crossing on Lincoln Avenue
- 6) Information about stormwater and the existing sewer system capacity

Ms. Pearson stated that she had some ideas to discuss with the developer and potentially provide a quick turnaround. If they are not acceptable, then the Plan Commission could continue the case again during the next meeting of the Plan Commission.

Mr. Hopkins moved that the Plan Commission continue Case Nos. 2361-M-18 and 2362-SU-18 to the next regular meeting of the Plan Commission. Ms. Billman seconded the motion. Roll call on the motion was as follows:

Ms. Billman	-	Yes	Mr. Fitch	-	Yes
Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes	Mr. Turner	-	Yes
Ms. Yu	-	Yes	Mr. Ackerson	-	Yes

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

**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 9:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Lorrie Pearson, Secretary  
Urbana Plan Commission