

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING

URBANA ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

DATE: August 21, 2002

APPROVED

TIME: 7:30 p.m.

PLACE: Urbana City Building
400 S. Vine Street
Urbana, IL 61801

MEMBERS PRESENT: Herb Corten, Darwin Fields, Anna Merritt, Joe Schoonover, Charles Warmbrunn, Harvey Welch

MEMBERS ABSENT Paul Armstrong

STAFF PRESENT: Tim Ross, Senior Planner; Rob Kowalski, Planning Manager; Michaela Bell, Planner; Elizabeth Tyler, Director of Community Development Services; Teri Anel, Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT: Randy Baker, William DeJarnette, Dave Nall, Mack Weckel

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

The meeting was called to order at 7:33 p.m. The roll call was taken, and a quorum was declared present.

***Note:** Ms. Merritt, Chairperson, announced that Tim Ross, Senior Planner, has an American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP) Certification.

****Note:** Rob Kowalski, Planning Manager, introduced Michaela Bell as the newest Planner to the City of Urbana.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

There were none.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Warmbrunn moved to approve the minutes from the May 15, 2002 meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals. Mr. Schoonover seconded the motion. Those minutes were passed by unanimous vote.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

- ✓ Letter from Donald & Cheryl McClain
- ✓ Correction Memorandum from staff
- ✓ Zoning Board of Appeals Annual Report
- ✓ Family Video Sign Profile Brochure
- ✓ Family Video Corporate Profile Folder

5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

6. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

ZBA-02-C-2: A request by Randy Baker of Morton Buildings, Inc. for a Conditional Use Permit to allow the establishment of a cemetery use for the East Lawn Burial Park Association on the property directly east of 714 North Cunningham Avenue.

Tim Ross, Senior Planner, presented the staff report regarding this case. He gave a brief introduction and talked about the background of the subject property and East Lawn Burial Park Association. He discussed the adjacent land uses and zoning descriptions of the surrounding properties. He reviewed the criteria for a conditional use permit according to Section VII-2 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance. He summarized staff findings and read the options of the Zoning Board of Appeals. Mr. Ross presented staff recommendation, which was as follows:

Based on the findings outlined in the written staff report, and without the benefit of considering additional evidence that may be presented at this public hearing, staff recommended that the Urbana Zoning Board of Appeals approve ZBA-02-C-2.

Mr. Schoonover inquired if the previous request for East Lawn Burial Park Association was turned down or did they just purchase the property? Mr. Ross replied that the previous request was for the parcel immediately to the west of the subject property. East Lawn Burial Park Association had been trying to purchase the proposed property from the National Guard Armory. With that purchase complete, the cemetery wishes to use the subject property to make better use of their land and use the parcel that was previously rezoned for access to the cemetery. They would like to construct the building on this newly acquired piece of ground.

Mr. Warmbrunn asked if the Zoning Board of Appeals should be concerned about the building at this time? Mr. Ross answered that at this time, there was no need to request any variances for setbacks. The cemetery is in the process of subdividing this portion and combining it with their other holdings. That will most likely eliminate a lot line immediately near that future building.

All the other development regulations are in compliance. Ms. Tyler added that this conditional use permit would allow them to construct the proposed building.

Mr. Warmbrunn questioned whether the trees had been cleared prior to the purchase of this parcel? Mr. Ross responded that he was not aware of the history as to when the trees had been cleared. He mentioned that the cemetery had been using this parcel with permission from the National Guard Armory.

Ms. Merritt asked approximately where the building would be constructed on the proposed property? Mr. Ross replied that Randy Baker, petitioner, indicated that the building would be constructed in the northwest portion of the proposed property.

Ms. Merritt swore in members of the audience who wished to speak during public testimony.

Randy Baker, of 809 Wesley Avenue in Savoy, stated that he was responsible for design coordination, sales, and project management of Morton Buildings, Inc. in this area. He had been working with the East Lawn Burial Park Association for quite some time on this project. They had been trying to purchase the proposed property from the National Guard for quite some time. It finally came through after the East Lawn Burial Park Association had been through the rezoning and the conditional use permit process for the previous parcel of land that they own.

Mr. Baker commented that as they were laying out the building, they realized that the building would work a lot better if it was sitting about ten feet east of the present building. They would like to construct the building before snow flies this year. The Urbana Fire Department wants the East Lawn Burial Park Association out of the existing building. The existing building is in an extreme state of disrepair.

Mr. Corten moved that the Zoning Board of Appeals approve this case as proposed. Mr. Schoonover seconded the motion. The roll call was as follows:

Mr. Fields	-	Yes	Ms. Merritt	-	Yes
Mr. Schoonover	-	Yes	Mr. Warmbrunn	-	Yes
Mr. Welch	-	Yes	Mr. Corten	-	Yes

The motion was passed by unanimous vote.

ZBA-02-MAJ-5: A request for a major variance filed by David Nall of Family Video Movie Club, Inc. for a reduction of the required front yard from 15 feet to 8 feet along Hill Street in the B-1, Neighborhood Business Zoning District.

ZBA-02-MIN-2: A request for a minor variance filed by David Nall of Family Video Movie Club, Inc. for a reduction in the required front yard setback from 15 feet to 12 feet along Lincoln Avenue in the B-1, Neighborhood Business Zoning District.

ZBA-02-MAJ-6: A request for a major variance filed by David Nall of Family Video Movie Club, Inc. to increase the size of a freestanding sign from the maximum of 32 square feet per sign to 80 square feet in the B-1, Neighborhood Business Zoning District.

Mr. Ross gave a staff report on these three cases together as requested by Chairperson Merritt. He introduced and presented general background information regarding these requests by describing the adjacent land uses and zoning designations of the surrounding properties and by giving a brief history of the subject property. He discussed the variance criteria from Section XI-3 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance that pertained to each individual case. He reviewed the options of the Zoning Board of Appeals regarding each case. He presented the staff recommendation for each case, which was as follows:

Based on the findings outlined in the written staff report, and without the benefit of considering additional evidence that may be presented at this public hearing, staff recommended that the Urbana Zoning Board of Appeals recommend APPROVAL of case #ZBA-02-MAJ-5 as requested to the Urbana City Council.

Based on the findings outlined in the written staff report, and without the benefit of considering additional evidence that may be presented at this public hearing, staff recommended that the Urbana Zoning Board of Appeals APPROVE case #ZBA-02-MIN-2 and;

Based on the findings outlined in the written staff report, and without the benefit of considering additional evidence that may be presented at this public hearing, staff recommended that the Urbana Zoning Board of Appeals not approve case #ZBA-02-MAJ-6 as requested for the reason that a larger sign would be inconsistent with the essential character of the B-1, Neighborhood Business Zoning District. However, staff recommended that a request for an increase in maximum area of one freestanding sign from 32 square feet to 60 square feet be APPROVED, with the CONDITION that no other freestanding signs be placed on the site.

Chairperson Merritt suggested that the Zoning Board of Appeals talk about cases #ZBA-02-MAJ-5 and #ZBA-02-MIN-2 first and vote on each separately. After that, the Zoning Board of Appeals would discuss case #ZBA-02-MAJ-6 and vote on it.

Mr. Fields asked what the City of Urbana's requirements were for screening and what different options would Family Video have? Mr. Ross answered that the City of Urbana requires screening of off-street parking that is directly along a setback line from adjacent residential. In this case, it would generally consist of a fence along those properties to the west.

Mr. Warmbrunn questioned how many parking spaces would Family Video need? Mr. Ross responded that the requirement would be for twenty-eight spaces. However, the petitioner indicated on the application that they have an increased need for parking at certain hours of the day. Therefore, Family Video had designed the site to accommodate approximately forty-nine spaces. Mr. Warmbrunn inquired if the parking spaces closest to the door would be used as

handicap parking spaces? Mr. Ross replied that two handicap parking spaces would be required closest to the door.

Mr. Warmbrunn questioned if the front entrance to the video store would be on the north of the proposed building? Mr. Ross replied that was correct. Mr. Warmbrunn asked if the measurement from the parking lot to the street would be six feet? Mr. Ross replied that it would measure twelve feet from the property line to the edge of the parking area. Mr. Kowalski added that access drives are allowed to encroach into the setback itself; however, parking itself is generally not. Therefore, Family Video does not need a variance down to six feet. They need a variance to the point where the parking spaces actually start. Mr. Warmbrunn asked if the sidewalk would be eliminated? Mr. Ross answered that this would all be on private property, which would begin behind the sidewalk. Mr. Warmbrunn asked if there would be six feet from the sidewalk to the access drive? Mr. Ross replied that it might actually be closer to seven feet to the sidewalk, because the property line usually begins approximately one foot behind the sidewalk. Mr. Warmbrunn inquired if Family Video would landscape in that six-foot area along Lincoln Avenue? Mr. Ross responded that it was not required; however, it could be a condition that the Zoning Board of Appeals places on the variance. The petitioner had already indicated that landscaping in this six-foot area would be done.

Mr. Warmbrunn questioned if there were any future plans for commercial or business use along Lincoln Avenue in the immediate area? Mr. Ross replied that the land use in this general area is designated low-density and high-density residential.

Mr. Warmbrunn asked if this was to be considered a small neighborhood business with a 7,000 square foot building? Mr. Ross answered that this would be an allowed use in the neighborhood business zone.

Mr. Corten inquired as to whether the easement was the reason for the access onto Lincoln Avenue? Mr. Ross answered that the access needs to be maintained.

Mr. Warmbrunn questioned how many parking spaces would be for employee parking? Chairperson Merritt answered that there would be four parking spaces for employees.

Mr. Fields inquired as to whether every existing building would be demolished? Mr. Ross replied that was correct.

Mr. Warmbrunn asked if staff looked into the possibility of Family Video putting the building on the north side of the property with parking on the south side? Mr. Ross answered that the proposed is what was requested by the petitioner. Family Video wants the building to be on the south side of the property, so that the entrance could be visible from Lincoln Avenue. Mr. Kowalski added that Family Video originally wanted the building to be on the north side; however, when Family Video was unable to purchase the access easement rights from the property to the west, the two access easements along with the requirement for a fifteen-foot setback along Fairview and Lincoln Avenue made it impossible for Family Video to get this size of a building on the north side of the property.

David Nall, of 4407 Pickfair Road in Springfield, Illinois, mentioned that he is the regional manager for Family Video. He oversees the operations of thirty stores between Interstate 72 and Interstate 80 along with his primary responsibility of acquiring real estate and developing for the company. Family Video would prefer to put the building on the north side of the property facing Lincoln Avenue. However, with the easements, the setbacks, size of the building itself, and the parking spaces, it would be impossible to put the building on the north side.

Mr. Nall noted that by siting the building on the south side, Family Video was asking for two setback easements to allow a parking space to be acceptable in the front yard. To answer the question regarding employee parking spaces, Mr. Nall replied that there would not be enough parking spaces for the employees during peak hours of operation. Typically, there are six or seven employees working during the evening shifts. Some employees will have to utilize the general parking area.

Mr. Nall explained that the existing properties are in disrepair. It would be unfeasible to reutilize them as residential, and it is unfeasible to utilize the commercial building as well. This is why the properties have not sold or are being leased.

Mr. Nall mentioned that Family Video's primary consideration for the parking lot was how to get people out of the parking area safely. The logical plan was to provide the site plan as submitted.

Mr. Corten asked what the easements would be used for? Mr. Nall replied that the property owner is an engineer who has an office/pole barn/shop immediately to the west. That structure has an overhead garage door that the property owner utilizes for a fairly sizable truck. He needs those easements to be able to park next to his building and to be able to get his truck in and out of his garage area. By Family Video putting asphalt up to their property line, this will allow the property owner to utilize his easements all the way to Lincoln Avenue and to Fairview.

Mr. Warmbrunn asked if there would be windows on the west side of the building? Mr. Nall replied that it would be a solid, windowless wall consisting of a masonry split-face block.

Mr. Fields inquired as to what Family Video would use for screening between the Family Video store and the residential neighborhood to the west? Mr. Nall replied that the screening would be a six-foot wood fence, which is what the Zoning Ordinance requires. In addition, he stated that there would probably be a small fence between the building and the fence to block that area off so no one would be able to walk between the fence and the building.

Mr. Corten inquired as to what the hours of operation would be? Mr. Nall replied that Family Video would be open from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 midnight.

Mr. Nall addressed an earlier question regarding the number of parking spaces. Generally speaking, Family Video has two primary prime-time shifts, which are from 4:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Fridays and Saturdays. During two hours of one of those time frames, sixty parking spaces would be easily utilized.

Mr. Warmbrunn asked if there would be an employee entrance on the south side of the proposed building? Mr. Nall answered that the entrance to and from the building would be on the north side facing Fairview. An emergency exit would be located on the east corner facing Lincoln Avenue. The emergency exit is required by the City of Urbana's Fire Codes.

Mr. Warmbrunn questioned if Mr. Nall was planning to use a lighted tower like the one in the picture in the Sign Profile Brochure? Mr. Nall replied that was correct. Family Video will work with the City of Urbana to follow City code regarding lighting. There will be no directional lighting towards the residential neighborhood. Neighbors will be able to see the lighting from the front windows of their homes; however, the lighting should not keep them up at night.

Mr. Corten asked if there was already a traffic light at the corner of Fairview and Lincoln Avenue? Mr. Nall replied that was correct. He mentioned that Family Video would be landscaping in the setback area off Lincoln Avenue and Fairview between the sidewalk and the parking area.

Mr. Warmbrunn asked if this proposal would affect the water drainage for this area? Mr. Ross answered that Family Video would be required to submit a drainage management plan, which would be reviewed by the City's engineering staff.

Mr. Corten moved to forward case #ZBA-02-MAJ-5 to the City Council with the recommendation for approval. Mr. Welch seconded the motion.

Mr. Schoonover inquired as to whether anyone was in opposition to this case being approved. Mr. Ross replied that staff had not received any phone calls or written opposition.

The roll call was as follows:

Ms. Merritt	-	Yes	Mr. Schoonover	-	Yes
Mr. Warmbrunn	-	Yes	Mr. Welch	-	Yes
Mr. Corten	-	Yes	Mr. Fields	-	Yes

The motion was passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. Corten moved to approve case #ZBA-02-MIN-2 as recommended. Mr. Schoonover seconded the motion. The roll call was as follows:

Mr. Schoonover	-	Yes	Mr. Warmbrunn	-	Yes
Mr. Welch	-	Yes	Mr. Corten	-	Yes
Mr. Fields	-	Yes	Ms. Merritt	-	Yes

The motion was passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. Ross noted that the pictures in Exhibit G were of the Family Video signs located in Champaign. There are two freestanding signs at this property, and the signs are both

approximately fifty square feet each. Staff felt that a sign of approximately this size would meet the criteria for the variance.

Mr. Fields inquired as to where the sign would be located? Mr. Nall stated that Family Video would really like a sign of 100 square feet; however, they would settle on an 80 square foot sign to satisfy the criterion that the petitioner only request the amount of variance necessary. Family Video needs an 80 square foot sign for their logo identification as well as an advertising space necessary to convey a message that they need to convey. If Family Video would place a single pylon sign of 80 square feet, then it would be placed on the corner of Lincoln Avenue and Fairview. The pole would be around 17 feet from Lincoln Avenue and about 16½ feet from Fairview. Mr. Nall stated that upon talking with Mr. Kowalski, he found that the City of Urbana has a sign requirement that does not allow a sign to overhang into the setback area. Mr. Nall noted that the reason Family Video is requesting an 80 square foot sign was because Family Video offers a lot of programs to the residents in the community, such as free rental for each report card "A", and needs to promote those programs.

Mr. Fields asked if Family Video was granted permission for a 60 square foot sign, then would they locate it in the same place as the 80 square foot sign? Mr. Nall replied that he might use three 32 square foot signs instead. He preferred to have two 50 square foot signs. However, since it is in a residential area, they want to minimize the amount of square footage on a sign. Mr. Fields asked where those three signs would need to be located? Mr. Ross replied that each of the three signs would need to be located on its business frontage.

Mr. Corten referred to the Sign Profile brochure and asked if it made any difference as to what sign Family Video would use? Mr. Nall responded that since this store would be located in a residential neighborhood, then the typical square footage needed would 100 square feet with a minimum of 80 square feet. Mr. Corten inquired as to if Family Video only targets the residential neighborhoods within a mile and a half from the store, then why do they need strong signage? Mr. Nall replied that they need the message boards to attract the younger clientele. Mr. Corten asked if there was a minimum height of letters that Family Video uses? Mr. Nall answered that Family Video uses 4" x 8" lettering so that traffic can easily see what is on the message board.

Mr. Welch inquired as to whether there were any other 80 square foot signs located in Urbana that could be used as a reference? Mr. Ross replied that there are two signs that the Zoning Board of Appeals has granted variances for. They are the Bigfoot sign on North Cunningham Avenue, which is approximately 75 square feet and the sign for the gas station at Washington and Lierman, which was approximately 75 square feet.

Mr. Fields inquired as to what the height requirements for a sign were in the B-1, Neighborhood Business Zoning District? Mr. Ross responded that the maximum height could be fifteen feet at the minimum setback line and one foot per two feet additional setback, up to a maximum of twenty-five feet high. Mr. Kowalski added that there is not really a lot of B-1 zoned properties in the City of Urbana.

Mr. Corten inquired why Family Video does not like to put signage on their windows? Mr. Nall replied that the Urbana Zoning Ordinance in regard to building signage is fairly restrictive. Family Video would have a total of 104 square feet of signage, which is barely under the maximum allowed.

Mr. Corten asked if the tower was an icon for Family Video? Mr. Nall answered that was correct.

Mr. Warmbrunn questioned if they could put "Family Video" on three sides of the proposed building? Mr. Ross replied yes, because the Zoning Ordinance allows, in terms of maximum area per frontage, ten percent of the wall area for signage, but not to exceed 150 square feet in total for the B-1 zone. Mr. Nall stated that their competitors have signage in their windows. Family Video does not want to put signage in their windows, because from a security standpoint, they do not want to hide their employees.

Mr. Warmbrunn asked if the east side would be windowless? Mr. Nall noted that the west side of the building would be windowless facing Hill Street. However, the walls facing Fairview and Lincoln Avenue would have windows.

Mr. Warmbrunn inquired about how much parking lot lights would be added? Mr. Kowalski responded that the Zoning Ordinance requires lighting to be generally directed down towards the parking lot. Staff had not seen any details about how many parking lot lights there would be. Part of staff's reasoning for a smaller sign was that this was a unique location. It would be in a residential area and yet it would be on an arterial street, which makes it hard to balance those. This would not be located in an area that has a long strip of other commercial uses that this could easily blend into; therefore, staff felt that a smaller sign might be appropriate and a larger sign would be unnecessary.

Mr. Warmbrunn questioned if the Zoning Board of Appeals did not approve a 60 square foot sign, then would Family Video still be allowed to put up three 32 square foot signs? Mr. Kowalski replied that was correct. Mr. Corten asked where Family Video would be able to place those signs? Mr. Ross replied that Family Video would be required to place each sign along its respective business frontage; however, they could face the signs in any direction that they wanted to.

Mr. Schoonover moved to forward case #ZBA-02-MAJ-6 to City Council with the recommendation for approval of the 80 square foot sign with the condition that no other freestanding signs be placed on the site. He reasoned that it would be better to have one sign than three signs. More signs would add more lighting to the neighborhood. Mr. Welch seconded the motion.

Mr. Warmbrunn asked if Family Video would be restricted to the sign that was shown to the Zoning Board of Appeals or would they be able to put some other sign up? Mr. Nall stated that the sign would be of the same quality, design and type as the sign shown in the Sign Profile brochure. It would be a foot shorter in height than the picture in the brochure, because the picture in the brochure is of a sign that is 150 square feet. However, Family Video does not

want to lower the height of the sign any more than the one-foot, because it would impair traffic visibility. Mr. Kowalski added that the Zoning Board of Appeals could add this as another condition to the recommendation for City Council.

Mr. Schoonover amended the motion to include that the sign conform to the same quality, general shape, and design as pictured in the brochure. Mr. Welch agreed to the amendment. The roll call was as follows:

Mr. Warmbrunn	-	Yes	Mr. Welch	-	Yes
Mr. Corten	-	Yes	Mr. Fields	-	No
Ms. Merritt	-	Yes	Mr. Schoonover	-	Yes

The motion was passed by a 5-1 vote.

ZBA-02-MAJ-7: Request by William DeJarnette for a major variance to increase the allowed area for an accessory garage from 750 square feet to 960 square feet and to decrease the required five-foot side yard setback to two-feet and the required ten-foot rear setback to five feet.

Michaela Bell, Planner, gave the staff report regarding this case. She gave a brief introduction and a description of the site including the zoning and land uses of the surrounding properties. She discussed the square footage, setbacks, and floor area/open space ratio. She reviewed the variance criteria according to Section XI-3 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance. She read the options of the Zoning Board of Appeals and noted staff's recommendation, which was as follows:

Based on the findings outlined in the written staff report, staff recommended that the Zoning Board of Appeals recommend approval of the major variance to allow the 960-square foot accessory garage with a five-foot rear yard setback and a two-foot side yard setback on the east to the Urbana City Council.

Mr. Corten inquired about the roofline of the garage. William DeJarnette, of 710 East Pennsylvania, stated that the slope of the roof on the garage would match the slope and shingles of the roof on the house so that it would appear to be an extension of the house. They would blend in nicely.

Mr. Schoonover questioned what the height of the roof would be? Mr. DeJarnette replied that it would be 19 feet. Mr. Schoonover asked if the garage would have a wood structure frame? Mr. DeJarnette stated that the footings would be constructed out of block with reinforced block footings inside for the storm/tornado shelter area. The advantage of using block material is that it can be made to look different.

Mr. Corten wondered why Mr. DeJarnette needed a three-car garage? Mr. DeJarnette explained that he and his son would be converting a car to electric and needed the extra space, because the electric car could not be left outside due to rain and snow. He noted that the wallboard in his house was made out of a material like chip board and would not be safe during a storm;

therefore, he was also requesting extra room to have a storm shelter inside the garage. He believed that even if his family decided to move in the future, the proposed garage with the storm shelter would enhance the property and make it easier to sell to a young family with children. He noted that he looked at several designs to add on to the house and found one out of ten designs that appealed to him. The cost of building the garage would be cheaper than building an addition on to the house.

Mr. Warmbrunn asked for staff comments regarding the letter from Donald and Cheryl McClain. Ms. Tyler responded that, regarding point number two about a second house being built on the property not being allowed, the property was zoned R-3, Single and Two-Family Residential. Duplexes are a permitted use in the R-3 zoning district, and two principal uses on one lot would require a conditional use permit.

Mr. Warmbrunn referred to a garage on Anderson and California. He recalled a variance being granted for it and felt that it seemed rather large. Mr. Kowalski stated that the variance in that case was for floor area ratio and not for the size of the garage.

Mr. Warmbrunn asked if staff was concerned about point number one from the letter regarding rainwater drainage? Mr. Kowalski replied that the garage would be five feet from the north property line. Five feet should be adequate for any runoff of rainwater. Mr. DeJarnette commented that there would not be any water runoff on the north side. Ms. Tyler added that he would be required to have any runoff drain towards his property.

Mr. Warmbrunn expressed concern about the garage being bigger than the house. However, in order to build onto the house, the petitioner would have to tear the house apart and building the garage would cost less.

Mr. Fields moved to forward case #ZBA-02-MAJ-7 to City Council with the recommendation for approval. Mr. Welch seconded the motion. The roll call was as follows:

Mr. Welch	-	Yes	Mr. Corten	-	Yes
Mr. Fields	-	Yes	Ms. Merritt	-	Yes
Mr. Schoonover	-	No	Mr. Warmbrunn	-	No

The motion was passed by a 4-2 vote.

7. OLD BUSINESS

Annual Review of By-Laws.

Due to the large number of cases, the Annual Review of the By-Laws will be postponed until the next meeting.

8. NEW BUSINESS

Presentation of Annual Report

Mr. Ross presented the annual report by briefly explaining each section of the report. He noted that the first part of the report was an overview of the previous cases that were presented to the Zoning Board of Appeals in 2001. The second part of the report contains all of the decision sheets and ordinances that applied to each case. Lastly, the third section includes all of the minutes from every meeting.

9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There was none.

10. STAFF REPORT

Mr. Kowalski gave the staff report on the following:

- ✓ **Next scheduled meeting** will be held on September 18th. Case #ZBA-02-MAJ-8, regarding the garage at 705 West Michigan Avenue is scheduled for that meeting. Ms. Merritt noted that she would not be able to attend.

Mr. Ross reported on the following:

- ✓ **Televised Meeting** – The Zoning Board of Appeals meetings will be televised in the future at the request of the City of Urbana.
- ✓ **Jan Kalmar Case** was approved by the City Council. She has been working to try and accomplish the house move. Ms. Tyler added that the house might even be moved to a different location than planned.
- ✓ **Cunningham Motors Update:** The owner completed the paving plan. There is some work that still needs to be done on the landscape screening. Since that time, the City of Urbana has approved the Redevelopment Plan – TIF #4. When funds become available, the City will try to assist any of those properties along Cunningham Avenue that are wanting to or need to do landscaping.
- ✓ **Andrae Harley Davidson Shop** finally broke ground.

11. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

August 21, 2002

Respectfully submitted,

**Tim Ross, Senior Planner
Urbana Zoning Board of Appeals**