

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING**

**URBANA PLAN COMMISSION**

**APPROVED**

**DATE:** November 21, 2019

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

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

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Dustin Allred, Jane Billman, Tyler Fitch, Lew Hopkins, Jonah Weisskopf, Chenxi Yu

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Barry Ackerson, Andrew Fell

**STAFF PRESENT:** Kevin Garcia, Planner II; Lily Wilcock, Planner I

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Bridget Broihahn, Matt Deering, W. Scott Stough

---

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

Chair Fitch called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Roll call was taken, and there was a quorum of the members present. (Note: Mr. Hopkins arrived after roll call was taken.)

**2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA**

There was none.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the October 24, 2019 regular Plan Commission meeting were presented for approval. Ms. Billman moved that the Plan Commission approve the minutes. Mr. Weisskopf seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by unanimous vote as written.

**4. COMMUNICATIONS**

There were none.

## 5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

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

Chair Fitch continued this case to the January 16, 2020 regular meeting of the Plan Commission.

**Annexation Case No. 2018-A-03 and Plan Case No. 2360-M-18 – A proposed annexation agreement between the City of Urbana and Henri Merkelo, including rezoning from County R-5, Manufactured Home Park, to City R-1, Single Family Residential, for a 1.01-acre parcel located at 2218 East University Avenue, Urbana, Illinois 61802.**

Chair Fitch continued these two cases to the December 5, 2019 regular meeting.

**Plan Case No. 2383-T-19 – An application by the Urbana Zoning Administrator to amend the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance and create the Manual of Practice.**

Chair Fitch continued this case to the January 16, 2020 regular meeting.

## 6. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

## 7. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

**Plan Case No. 2392-SU-19 – A request by Stough Real Estate Holdings, LLC for a Special Use Permit to allow a Medical Clinic (Plasma Collection Facility) at 907 North Lincoln Avenue.**

Chair Fitch opened the public hearing for this case. Lily Wilcock, Planner I, presented the staff report to the Plan Commission. She began by stating the purpose for the proposed request for a special use permit and presenting a brief history of the subject property. She noted the existing zoning, location and future land use designation of the subject property and of the surrounding, adjacent properties. She talked about the plasma collection facility, stating the number of beds, the number of staff, the hours of operation and the expected number of donors per hour. Referring to the Conceptual Site Plan, Exhibit E, she discussed parking for the proposed use. She mentioned that there was a meeting with some residents in the neighborhood. She reviewed the requirements for a special use permit according to Section VII-4.A of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance. She read the options for the Plan Commission and presented City staff's recommendation for *approval* with the following conditions:

1. *That the applicant submits a landscape plan prior to issuance of any building permit to ensure that proposed landscaping and screening conforms to the City of Urbana Zoning Ordinance standards for screening and required landscape buffers.*
2. *The use generally conforms to the site plan submitted in the application, except that no more than 60 parking spaces be installed. If, after one year of operation, Stough Real Estate Holdings, LLC, believes that additional parking is needed, they may provide staff with appropriate documentation and request to install additional parking.*
3. *That the development shall be constructed in general conformance with the attached Preliminary Site Plan and an approved landscape plan.*

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

Ms. Yu asked for more insight into the discussion at the neighborhood meeting regarding the impact on employment. Ms. Wilcock responded that four people attended the meeting. They asked questions about how many staff would be employed by the proposed use, traffic, transportation, and questions about Stough Real Estate LLC and KED Plasma.

Ms. Yu inquired why they chose this location for a plasma collection facility rather than another location in the City. Chair Fitch deferred this question for the applicants to answer when they approached to speak.

Mr. Allred asked if there was a precedence as to why the proposed use was classified as a medical clinic. The proposed use appeared to be more of a business. Ms. Wilcock explained that staff tries to find the use in Table V-1, Table of Uses, that mostly relates to the proposed development. The Zoning Ordinance does not specify if a Medical Clinic would be a business or would be non-profit.

Ms. Billman asked how many other plasma collection facilities are located in Champaign and Urbana. Ms. Wilcock pointed out that there are two. One is located on Kirby in Champaign, and the second is located on Wright Street, near OSF Hospital.

Chair Fitch explained the procedure for a public hearing. He then opened the hearing for public input. He invited the applicants to speak.

Matt Deering, Attorney with Meyer Capel, and Scott Stough, of Stough Development Corporation, approached the Plan Commission to speak.

Mr. Deering talked about Stough Development Corporation. He said they agreed with most of City staff's recommendation with exception to traffic and parking. The proposed building would be pushed up close to the sidewalk that connects to King Park and the pathways there. Therefore, pedestrians would not have to walk through dirt and a parking lot to get to the proposed facility. Regarding parking, he did not believe 81 parking spaces would be detrimental to the neighborhood. There would still be plenty of open, unpaved area. He said the applicant intends to try to save as many of the large, mature trees on the subject property to help retain some of the essential character of the neighborhood.

He said the applicant believed that fewer parking spaces would result in parking overflowing onto the neighborhood streets, particularly along Wascher Drive. He said from their understanding, there are people who already park along this street to use King Park. In addition, waiting to add more parking, if needed, would only increase the cost to construct the parking spaces. It would make more sense to provide all of the parking now that the applicant knows the use will need. Therefore, he asked the Plan Commission to strike Condition #2.

Mr. Deering stated that they would answer any questions that the Plan Commission members may have.

Ms. Yu asked what the basis for asking for 81 parking spaces is. Mr. Stough replied that during shift change there would be about 40 staff at the facility. Another fact is that the number of donors would not spread out evenly throughout the day. Many people donate plasma either before or after work, so there would typically be one or two rushes per day. While there will be 42 beds, there will be people waiting for a bed to free up. He said he would not want the proposed business to add to the amount of parking on the street. He also mentioned that if they were capped at 60 parking spaces or less, then they would not be required to provide detention on the site. If they waited until next year to add the additional parking spaces needed, then they would have to tear up a lot of the parking lot to install drainage from the parking lot to a detention pond. That would be very costly.

Mr. Allred expressed his concern about how the proposed use would work within the context of the uses around it, which is a park to the north and residential on the other sides. The proposed development would be a small building on a relatively large parcel. Parking makes it a bigger footprint. However, landscaping and screening will affect the impact on the surrounding neighborhood. He wondered where the landscaping and screening would be located. Mr. Stough explained that they discussed the layout with City staff extensively. At the request of staff, they intend to construct the building along Lincoln Avenue and put the parking behind the building. They pushed both as far south as possible to allow more green space between the proposed building and parking to King Park. Regarding landscaping, he said they want the proposed development to be beautiful for the City of Urbana and they have a reputation of providing a high level of landscaping. They plan to retain many of the existing trees and planting additional trees to blend in with the park and with the neighborhood overall.

Ms. Billman asked if they would consider increasing the setback along Lincoln Avenue a little. Mr. Stough replied that they are willing to work with the City of Urbana and push the building back if that is what the Plan Commission and City Council want to see.

Mr. Allred inquired if they would be willing to provide either a rain garden or bio detention to manage stormwater runoff. Mr. Stough stated that he was familiar with bio detention and stormwater purification boxes. He said they would be happy to look into providing this if it is required.

Mr. Hopkins asked if the applicant would be required to provide stormwater management if they are approved for 81 parking spaces. Ms. Wilcock stated that the City's Public Works Department is in the process of making that determination. Mr. Stough said he understood that

just over an acre of impervious area (such as the paved parking area) would require on-site detention. Under an acre, they would not be required to provide on-site stormwater detention. Kevin Garcia, Planner II, noted that the Zoning Ordinance requires a development with more than 10,000 square feet of impervious area to provide a sub-surface drainage connection and a stormwater management plan. If someone is redeveloping a site that had already been developed, then Public Works looks at the increment over what [impervious area] already exists on the site. Since most of the site is already impervious, then the City would be looking at what the increment would be. He said because he is not an engineer, he cannot give the Plan Commission exact numbers; however, the Public Works Department is looking into it. Mr. Stough added that he did not believe detention ponds to be the prettiest things in the world, but will comply with what the City requires. Mr. Hopkins stated that there are alternative solutions for providing stormwater management.

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

Chair Fitch asked for justification for City staff's recommendation to cap the number of parking spaces. Ms. Wilcock explained that when reviewing the proposed application, City staff took into consideration how the area is developing and how it currently exists. The neighborhood is very walkable and bikeable. It is close to parks, on a transit line, and there are many student apartments nearby. City staff asked the applicant to move the building closer to the street to match other developments such as Einstein Bagels. They tried to match the proposed development up with the goals and objectives in the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Yu stated that the written staff report talks about other uses for the property that would benefit the community; however, the proposed use would not hurt the community. She asked the other Plan Commission members how they felt about this. Ms. Billman pointed out that while some other uses may be more beneficial to the community, no one else had expressed interest in redeveloping the subject property. Mr. Weisskopf agreed. He said it has been on the market for a long time. The location has not been able to support a more productive use.

Ms. Yu wondered if 2.7 acres was enough for the applicant to divide and sell part off to someone else. Chair Fitch stated that this is not for the Plan Commission to decide in this case.

Mr. Hopkins stated that it is zoned for multi-family housing, not for business. However, the demand for multi-family housing is less than what is under construction. The Plan Commission needs to take this into account and be adaptable.

Mr. Hopkins commented that he did not like walking on five-foot wide sidewalks right next to the street or buildings constructed close to the street. The Plan Commission needs to consider this. With the subject property being located near a park, the sidewalk could be moved back.

He said he believed that the nature of the proposed use would have peak busy times. He felt the City should let them have the number of parking spaces they feel they will need and work hard to have a Landscape Plan to add character to the place and take advantage of its site location.

Ms. Billman agreed that she did not have any issues with the number of parking spaces being requested. Her only real concern is landscaping. There is a lot of space on the subject property. She preferred if they would set the building back ten more feet from the front property line along Lincoln Avenue. They could put a couple of trees in the parking lot. She asked how many of the existing trees would remain. Mr. Stough replied that they planned to keep the trees that lined the property and the two Walnut trees in the green space. There is also a Sycamore tree that he would like to keep as long as it does not interfere with grading or stormwater management.

Ms. Wilcock noted that the City has requirements for providing shade trees. A building permit will not be issued without having plans to provide shade trees in the parking lot. Ms. Billman felt that the amount of landscaping the City requires is minimal, but she believed the applicant cares about landscaping.

Ms. Yu said she felt comfortable walking by the Retreat development. They have the parking behind the apartment housing. The buildings are not pushed up close to the sidewalk. Mr. Garcia said that the setback for the Retreat development is at least 15 feet. He pointed out that the building for proposed development would have a 20 to 30 foot setback from the sidewalk. The original Site Plan had the building set further towards the back of the property. The applicant listened to City staff's concerns and brought the building closer to the sidewalk.

Chair Fitch asked if there are screening requirements for the west side of the property from the neighboring residential homes. Mr. Garcia said yes.

Ms. Billman moved that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 2392-SU-19 to the City Council with a recommendation for approval with the following conditions:

1. *That the applicant submits a landscape plan prior to issuance of any building permit to ensure that proposed landscaping and screening conforms to the City of Urbana Zoning Ordinance standards for screening and required landscape buffers.*
2. *That the development shall be constructed in general conformance with the attached Preliminary Site Plan and an approved landscape plan.*

Mr. Hopkins seconded the motion. Roll call on the motion was as follows:

Mr. Weisskopf	-	Yes	Ms. Yu	-	Yes
Mr. Allred	-	Yes	Ms. Billman	-	Yes
Mr. Fitch	-	Yes	Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. Garcia noted that this case would be forwarded to a Special Meeting of the Committee of the Whole on December 2, 2019. At City Council's direction, City staff is trying a new approach and presenting certain types of cases to the Committee of the Whole prior to being presented at City Council.

**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 8:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Kevin Garcia, Secretary  
Urbana Plan Commission