

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING

URBANA PLAN COMMISSION

APPROVED

DATE: November 6, 2014

TIME: 7:30 P.M.

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

MEMBER PRESENT: Corey Buttry, Maria Byndom, Andrew Fell, Tyler Fitch, Lew Hopkins, Bernadine Stake, David Trail

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Dannie Otto

STAFF PRESENT: Jeff Engstrom, Interim Planning Manager; Matt Rejc, Planning Intern; Teri Andel, Planning Administrative Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT: Caitlin Lill, Carol McKusick

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

Chair Fitch called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m. The roll was called, and he declared that there was a quorum of the members present.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

There were none.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the October 9, 2014 meeting was presented to the Plan Commission for approval. Mr. Trail moved to approve the minutes as presented. Mr. Hopkins seconded the motion. The minutes were then approved by unanimous voice vote as amended.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

- Plan Commission Official Bylaws

5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

Plan Case No. 2223-CP-14 – A request to adopt the Active Choices: Champaign County Greenways & Trails Plan as an amendment to the 2005 Urbana Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Fitch re-opened this case. Jeff Engstrom, Interim Planning Manager, presented a brief update of the proposed plan. He reviewed the concerns previously expressed by the Plan Commission at the October 9, 2014 meeting, which were as follows: 1) Inconsistencies between the maps in the proposed Greenways and Trail Plan and the map in the upcoming Bicycle Master Plan and 2) inconsistency with the Comprehensive Plan Mobility Map. City staff produced a list of these inconsistencies, which are shown in Exhibit D of the written staff report dated October 31, 2014. The only inconsistency they found with the Mobility Map is regarding the expansion of Olympian Drive east of US-45.

Staff has also considered the language that would be most appropriate in adopting the proposed Active Choices Plan. He read the options of the Plan Commission and presented staff's recommendation for Option B.

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

Mr. Trail asked what it would mean to adopt as an agency plan. Mr. Engstrom replied that the language would be to accept it rather than adopt it into the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Trail wondered where a concern member of the public would go to find to get a concise description of what the relationship of all the plans are and how the concerned citizen would interpret if they were interested in finding out what each plans says about their neighborhood. Mr. Engstrom stated that there is not a concise list of all of the plans. The City has accepted some as agency plans and adopted some into the City's 2005 Comprehensive Plan. This is something that City staff could work on. Mr. Trail responded that he believed much of the Plan Commission's concern would be alleviated if there was a quick and easy way to see what the relevant plans are and what the City of Urbana thinks of them. Mr. Engstrom pointed out that there is a list of City plans that are available on the City's website; however, the external plans are not available in final format.

There were no further questions. Chair Fitch opened the hearing up for public input from the audience. There was none, so he closed the public input portion of the hearing. He, then, opened the case up for Plan Commission discussion and/or motion(s).

Mr. Hopkins moved that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 2223-CP-14 to the City Council with a recommendation using Option B – to adopt the Active Choices Plan as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, with the general stipulation that any inconsistencies between the Active Choices and other city plans shall not be adopted and the City's existing and future plans shall prevail. Mr. Buttry seconded the motion.

Mr. Hopkins commented that we know we need to create a way of accessing this information on the City's website. This would be a priority when we get fully staffed. Under the current

circumstances, he believed that Option B would be the right choice; however, he felt that the City should change the circumstances so we have a better way of doing this.

Roll call was as taken and was as follows:

Ms. Byndom	-	Yes	Mr. Fell	-	Yes
Mr. Fitch	-	Yes	Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes
Ms. Stake	-	Yes	Mr. Trail	-	Yes
Mr. Buttry	-	Yes			

The motion was passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. Engstrom stated that this case would be forwarded to the City Council on November 17, 2014.

6. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

7. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

Plan Case No. 2244-T-14: An amendment to Article IX of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance to allow electronic message board displays on signs in the CRE, Conservation-Recreation-Education Zoning District.

Chair Fitch opened this case and then reviewed the procedures for a public hearing. Matt Rejc, Planning Intern, presented this case to the Plan Commission. He began by giving a brief explanation for the proposed text amendment. He reviewed the restrictions according to Section IX-4 of the Zoning Ordinance on all electronic display signs.

He talked about how the proposed text amendment, if approved, would bring the existing electronic display signs at the Urbana High School and the Urbana Middle School into conformance with the Zoning Ordinance. He pointed out that no complaints or ill effects have been noted about the two signs. The Urbana Park District is proposing to have an electronic display sign at the Phillips Recreation Center. He also talked about electronic displays in the CRE (Conservation-Recreation-Education) Zoning District for land uses requiring either a special use permit or a conditional use permit and about the size, setback, brightness and change time restrictions outlined in Section IX-4 of the Zoning Ordinance that would apply as well.

He reviewed the proposed changes to Section IX-4, General Sign Allowances, of the Zoning Ordinance. He summarized staff findings, read the options of the Plan Commission and presented City staff’s recommendation for approval of the proposed text amendment.

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

Mr. Fell asked if there was a specific request that instigated the proposed text amendment. Mr. Engstrom said yes. The proposed text amendment came about because the Urbana Park District requested to install an electronic sign at the Phillips Recreation Center.

Mr. Fell wondered what would be the biggest size allowed for an electronic sign. Mr. Engstrom replied that signs in the B-3, General Business, Zoning District could be up to a maximum of 500 square feet; however, they would have to be setback pretty far from the property line.

Ms. Byndom inquired about the maximum size for a wall sign. Mr. Rejc responded that the wall sign itself could have a maximum area of 300 square feet; however, the electronic display board could only be up to 50 square feet. He went on to say that it would not only be park districts or municipal buildings that could use electronic display signs. It could also be uses like a bait shop, a miniature golf course within the CRE Zoning District. Mr. Engstrom added that when looking at the City's Zoning Map, the property owners in the CRE Zoning District are mostly the University of Illinois, the Urbana School District, the Urbana Park District, and the Champaign-Urbana Sanitary District. There is only one small strip just north of I-74 that is privately owned land in the CRE Zoning District. So, it is not a common district outside of the institutional uses.

Ms. Stake asked if a sign owner could display ads. Mr. Engstrom replied that electronic message boards would only be allowed on the on-premise signs and would only be intended to message things for the property that they are located on. Therefore, it is not intended for off-premise advertisements anyway. Mr. Fell asked if the text amendment stated this. Mr. Engstrom said no.

Mr. Buttry noticed that the electronic display sign at the Urbana High School changes every five to ten seconds and the sign at the Urbana Middle School changes every three seconds including animated borders and pictures of their mascots. While it was mentioned that electronic display signs can decrease visual clutter, he did not feel that animation fit in with the compatibility of the surroundings. Mr. Engstrom pointed out that the two signs on the school properties have been non-conforming since they were installed. City staff does not have a mechanism to enforce against non-conformities unless they ask the Urbana School District to remove the signs entirely. City staff has been working with the Urbana School District, and if the proposed text amendment is approved, then it will allow City staff to enforce regulations on the Urbana School District to bring the two signs into compliance with the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Fitch noted that the City just passed the digital sign ordinance about three or four years ago. Before that digital signs were not allowed at all.

Mr. Trail questioned if there are any other ways that the Urbana School District electronic display signs are non-conforming. Has City staff measured the current brightness of the two signs? Mr. Engstrom answered that City staff has not measured the two signs yet because they do not have a mechanism to bring them into conformance. However, we do have light meters, so we will be working with the Urbana School District to bring them into conformance.

Mr. Trail asked for an example of an existing sign in the B-3 Zoning District that would be on the edge of the brightest sign allowed. Mr. Engstrom replied that the Wendy's sign is bright; however, City staff has not measured the sign yet.

There were no further questions for City staff. Chair Fitch opened the hearing for public input. There was none, so he closed the public input portion of the hearing and opened it for Plan Commission discussion and/or motion(s).

Ms. Stake expressed concern about what signs would be allowed. It doesn't seem like there are any restrictions on what sign owners could do. It gets really bad when there are too many signs. Ms. Byndom commented that the majority of the CRE property owners are the University of Illinois, the Urbana Park District and the Urbana School District. So there are not a lot of private buildings that would be advertising.

Mr. Trail asked if there was any reason to believe that there might be a great proliferation of additional electronic signs. When he was younger, there was a church that had a difference of opinion with the municipality and as a result ended up erecting about 40 signs, all individually conforming. He believed that most of the electronic display signs would replace non-electronic signs. Mr. Engstrom responded saying that there has not been a lot of interest expressed in erecting electronic display signs. The proposed text amendment came about from a request by the Urbana Park District to erect one electronic display sign at the Phillips Recreation Center.

Mr. Fell stated that at some point the City felt strong enough about our land to call it conservation land. Now, to say that we allow electronic signs there seems counter-productive to him even if it is a small percentage of the land. What prevents the one private land owner in the CRE Zoning District to put signs up if there are no regulations saying that the signs have to be about the business? If that land owner came in and wanted a sign to advertise for other businesses, how could the City deny him a sign because there are no grounds to do so? Mr. Engstrom replied that with respect to the on-premise versus the off-premise, it is difficult with content neutrality. These are allowed only for on-premise signs, so they are not supposed to have advertisements for off-premise businesses. If someone were to try this, it would be something that the City would challenge legally.

Mr. Fell asked if the proposed Phillips Recreation Center sign would be allowed to advertise pool passes. Mr. Engstrom said yes. Mr. Fell said that it would be an off-premise use. Mr. Engstrom stated that it would be related to the Park District though. Mr. Fell stated that he believed we would be implying regulations that would be impossible to uphold.

Mr. Trail wondered if they could currently put up non-electronic signs that would create the same problems. Mr. Trail stated that the only change would be the electronic part. He did not read anything saying that they would be allowing signs where they currently are not allowed. The proposed text is only saying that under certain circumstances, a portion of the sign could be electronic. Mr. Engstrom said that this is correct.

Ms. Byndom questioned if it would be possible to limit the number of signs on a property. Mr. Engstrom answered that there are currently limits on the number of signs allowed. For freestanding signs, properties are only allowed one freestanding sign per business frontage. A property on a corner lot would be allowed two freestanding signs. The other type of signs is wall signs, and these are limited to 10% of the area of the wall.

Mr. Buttry asked if the City already requires a conditional use permit for an electronic display sign, then is this an extra step to change the zoning of the district they are on? Mr. Engstrom replied that no, the conditional use permit requirement is only for certain uses that were listed in the written staff memo. Electronic display signs are allowed by right with a building permit approval in most B-3 Zoning District uses. They would be allowed by right in the CRE Zoning District uses listed in the written staff memo.

Mr. Hopkins commented that most issues of the concern are going to occur in the B-3 Zoning District, but they are not discussing the B-3 Zoning District. The B-3 Zoning District has less restrictive sizes than the proposed text amendment for the CRE Zoning District. He sees a benefit in the Phillips Recreation Center being able to provide more information than they currently can. If we are letting businesses do this but not the public entities, then it seems inappropriate to him.

Mr. Fell reiterated that he did not think it was a bad thing to have electronic signs in the recreation or education districts, but he has a problem with them being allowed in conservation areas. The City designated the land as conservation for a reason.

Mr. Trail asked if they could currently put a non-electronic sign on the conservation areas. Mr. Engstrom said yes. Mr. Trail wondered under what circumstances you would find a sign in these areas. Mr. Fitch replied at the Phillips Recreation Center or the pool. Mr. Engstrom stated that the University of Illinois has a forest where they could put up a sign announcing what the forest is.

Mr. Hopkins stated that there is one zoning category for conservation, recreation and education uses. So the City does not have a way to distinguish between them. The University of Illinois does not subject itself to City Ordinance. He does not believe that there are any other areas in the City of Urbana zoned CRE other than the Urbana Park District and the Urbana School District at this time. So, the proposed text amendment is okay with him.

Ms. Byndom moved that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 2244-T-14 to the Urbana City Council with a recommendation for approval. Mr. Hopkins seconded the motion. Roll call on the motion was as follows:

Mr. Fell	-	No	Mr. Fitch	-	Yes
Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes	Ms. Stake	-	No
Mr. Trail	-	Yes	Mr. Buttry	-	Yes
Ms. Byndom	-	Yes			

The motion passed by a vote of 5-2. Mr. Engstrom noted that this case would be forwarded to the Urbana City Council on November 17, 2014.

8. NEW BUSINESS

Update to the Plan Commission's Official Bylaws

Chair Fitch opened this item under New Business. Jeff Engstrom, Interim Planning Manager, presented this item to the Plan Commission. He began by explaining that the people on the packet mailing list who receive paper copies received a copy of the bylaws with only the odd numbered pages due to a printing error. Prior to the start of this meeting, City staff handed out a full version of the bylaws. He noted the changes being recommended by the City's Legal Division, which include the following: 1) limiting the time for public input by shortening it to three minutes if the Plan Commission so chooses, 2) limiting public input to topics germane to those on the agenda if the Plan Commission so chooses and 3) no member of the Plan Commission is obligated to respond to any public input provided.

Mr. Hopkins asked if limiting the public input to three minutes or shorter is a meeting time decision or a permanent decision. Mr. Engstrom answered saying it is a meeting time decision. It is intended to allow for cases when there is a lot of public input.

Mr. Trail inquired as to who makes the determination about whether public input is being germane to the topics on the agenda. Mr. Engstrom responded saying that the Plan Commission could write it in to the proposed amendment and say it is up to the Chair or give members of the board the ability to vote on it or to object to the Chair limiting input. Mr. Trail assumed this would only be invoked in some contentious setting, so he would want some language that describes the mechanics of this. Mr. Fitch agreed that they should tighten up the language to make it clear that it will be the Chair's decision and as with other rulings of the Chair, it could be overridden by a majority vote following a motion by the Plan Commission members. So, if the Chair were to do anything unilateral or outrageous, the Plan Commission as a whole would have the final say. Ms. Byndom agreed as well.

Mr. Fitch recommended the language to read as such, "*The Chair may limit ~~All~~ public input ~~may be limited~~ to topics germane to those described on the agenda for that particular meeting....*" Mr. Hopkins suggested using the same language as recommended for reducing the time limit. It would read as such, "*The Chairperson shall also have the authority to limit public input ~~may be limited~~ to topics germane to those described on the agenda for that particular meeting without debate by motion.*" Mr. Trail recommended combining both the time limit reduction and the topics limit in one sentence, so it would read as follows, "*The Chairperson shall also have the authority to reduce the time limit to a shorter time or to limit public input to topics germane to those described on the agenda for that particular meeting.*"

Ms. Stake wondered how this change came about. It seems that three minutes would not be enough time. They should be interested in hearing people's concerns and opinions. Mr. Fitch pointed out that this is only pertaining to Audience Participation and not testimony heard during a public hearing. They currently practice that the topics do not have to be germane to the topics described on the agenda. It is pretty open ended. However, in the past when a person gets up to speak during Audience Participation on a topic that is out of the jurisdiction of the Plan Commission, he has stated as such and directed the speaker(s) to the appropriate bodies. Mr. Trail suggested that they say, "*In the interest of ensuring limited time, the maximum number of people can give input...*" Mr. Fitch liked this suggestion because it puts it in context.

Ms. Byndom wondered if someone goes over the five (5) minute timeline, then does the board vote to extend the time. Chair Fitch replied that the Chair would stop the person and if the Plan Commission wanted to extend the time, then one of the members would make a motion to allow the speaker to continue. Another member would second the motion, and the Plan Commission would vote on the motion.

Mr. Trail talked about how valuable it is to have the rules in writing. The only thing we do not have is rules to deal with when the Plan Commission cuts off the meeting. Some people are concerned about whether they will get a chance to speak during Audience Participation. Mr. Fitch agreed that it is helpful for the audience to know what to expect which is why he has been reading the rules for a public hearing to the audience before opening the public hearings during meetings. It might be better to have the rules for Audience Participation written down for the audience to have.

Chair Fitch brought up the issue of public testimony and cross examining the petitioner. He interprets Article VI.6 to mean that public speakers ask the Chair questions for the petitioner and when the petitioner re-approaches the Plan Commission, the Chairperson can ask those questions of the petitioner. However, he would like language in the bylaws to clarify this procedure better. Ms. Byndom and Mr. Trail agreed with this.

Chair Fitch recommended the following changes to Article VI.6, *“Opponents of the request shall present evidence. Opponents may include persons not in favor of the petition as proposed, as determined by the Chairperson. Opponents may ask shall be allowed a reasonable opportunity for relevant questioning (i.e., “cross-examination”) of questions of the petitioner by submitting questions to the Plan Commission either in writing or during oral testimony. The Chairperson will direct the petitioner to answer such questions during rebuttal. The chairperson shall direct the Recording Secretary to take note of such in the minutes of the Plan Commission.”*

Mr. Trail asked if a petitioner was under and legal compulsion to answer any question asked by the Plan Commission. Mr. Fitch felt it would come down to the Plan Commission having a full record and making sure that the basis for their decision making is fully specified in case of a lawsuit. He did not believe that the petitioner would be legally required to answer any questions.

Mr. Fell wondered if there were any risks with the Plan Commission Chair being the one to decide if a question was relevant or not. Opponents make think their questions are relevant but the Chair may not think so and may not ask the petitioner to answer it. Mr. Trail agreed. Chair Fitch stated that they could change the word *“shall”* to *“may”*, so that it reads as such, *“The Chairperson may direct the petitioner to answer such questions during rebuttal.”* Mr. Hopkins stated that Article VI.16 refers to the admissibility of evidence, but that could be different than the relevance.

Mr. Hopkins went on to say that Article VI does not sound like the procedure they follow. *“The petitioner shall present evidence.”* The Plan Commission does not focus on the idea of evidence. He does not know how much of this article is based on the legal requirements for public hearings. He could imagine a slightly looser way of framing this that would be much

more informative to people of what actually occurs. Mr. Fitch agreed that “evidence” is a strong word and that maybe “testimony” would be a better fit.

Mr. Trail wondered if the proposed bylaws are similar to what other boards and commissions use. He would consider this administrative law. Are there model rules for administrative procedures that the State of Illinois has? It doesn't seem that any issue has arisen from the current bylaws and how the Plan Commission processes a public hearing. He asked when the current bylaws were adopted. Mr. Fitch replied that the current bylaws were adopted on July 21, 2005.

Mr. Trail assumed that there must be somewhere in the State that if a municipality holds an administrative hearing, there are certain procedures that must be followed. Mr. Engstrom stated that City staff could check with the City's Legal Division if the Plan Commission wanted more direction on the rules that they are required to follow.

Mr. Trail questioned why the Legal Division is recommending the proposed changes. Was there a specific issue? Mr. Engstrom believed that there was a recent administrative ruling.

Mr. Trail felt that the City would have an interest in having one process for all similar boards and commissions that conduct hearings. This way any citizen or petitioners that come before it would know that there is one set of rules and know how it works.

Chair Fitch opened the item up for public input.

Carol McKusick approached the Plan Commission to speak. She commented that this appeared to be riddled with all kinds of complexity. She suggested that they follow the procedure for amending the bylaws under Article IX. Amendment of Rules. She expressed concern about the Plan Commission taking a vote during this meeting with regards to the bylaws. She realized that this is the first meeting on the bylaws so that the Plan Commission would not be able to vote on them now. Mr. Trail assured her that they would not be able to vote on the bylaws during this meeting.

Ms. McKusick asked if the Plan Commission would review the bylaws one article at a time or list different areas for City staff to make changes to. Chair Fitch stated that he preferred to let City staff add all the changes in total and bring it back to let the Plan Commission review it. If there are no further changes, then the Plan Commission could vote on it at a subsequent meeting.

Ms. McKusick expressed concern about the bylaws being entirely up to the Plan Commission and about the other Plan Commission members being able to overrule the Chair's action or decision. She also believed that a petitioner should be responsible for their answers. She would want to be able to ask a petitioner the question directly rather than the Chair of the Plan Commission asking her question to the petitioner if he felt it was relevant. Public questions may get fumbled by the Plan Commission.

Mr. Trail stated that he understood her concern, but he did not feel that the Plan Commission could legally compel an answer from a petitioner. Mr. Fitch added that he had never seen a

petitioner not want to answer a question that someone had asked. They usually jump up and want to answer questions immediately. Mr. Trail stated that the public is afforded the opportunity to convince the Plan Commission to reiterate their questions in essence. There is nothing that prevents the petitioner from answering the public's questions. There is not much difference between the public asking a question and the Chair reiterating the question to the petitioner. Ms. McKusick responded saying that there is a big difference. The petitioner will either answer the question or be on the record of not answering. She doesn't feel it has to be hostile. Mr. Fitch agreed that it does not have to be hostile, but he is concerned that it could get that way.

Ms. McKusick wondered if it would be possible to have a visual display of the text so the public could see what text is being crossed out and added. She asked if the Plan Commission could define a bylaw review period annually.

Another issue is that the proposed amendment to the bylaws is being treated like a case even though Mr. Engstrom told her in an email that this was not a case. She has a communication of an entire system that she wants to promote for an annual bylaw review period that would be put on the regular schedule of meetings.

The rules for communications to the Plan Commission under the bylaws are weak. She sent emails to City staff to forward to the Plan Commission and because her emails did not refer to specific cases, they were handled differently. Mr. Fitch stated that he asked City staff to gather her emails and forward them to the Plan Commission. Her emails were entered as formal communications during an earlier meeting. Ms. McKusick did not like how they were submitted to the Plan Commission. Mr. Fitch stated that if something was left out, then she could resubmit them to City staff and they will forward the email communications to the Plan Commission and enter them into the record. Ms. McKusick pointed out that communications are not available online. Mr. Engstrom explained that communications are kept in the related paper case files. However, if a communication is not related to a case, then they would be kept in the internal files for that particular meeting. Ms. McKusick felt that communications are not being handled fairly and uniformly and feels that this needs to happen.

With no further public comments or questions, Chair Fitch closed the public input portion of this item. He, then, asked if there were any other changes to recommend to City staff tonight.

Mr. Hopkins stated that there were changes recommended to Article V.5. The Plan Commission will review new language at the next meeting and possibly vote on the change at the following meeting. However, there were some concerns and questions that will take longer than one more meeting to resolve. Mr. Trail agreed that they are more than two meetings away from voting on all of the amendments they want to make. Mr. Fitch commented that it will take as long as it takes, and the key is to get them right.

Mr. Fell wondered if it would be possible to add language to allow the Chair to ask a petitioner to answer a question immediately after an opponent requested an answer. The Plan Commission sometimes will do this anyway. Mr. Hopkins responded that the bylaws say that we should be doing this, but it is something that is not normally practiced. Mr. Trail believed it would be

better to only allow one person to speak at a time. They also have an option to provide one microphone for the petitioner and another microphone for opponents. He reminded the Plan Commission that they have the ability to suspend the rules if the rules become an obstacle during a public hearing.

Chair Fitch asked if there were any other specific changes the Plan Commission wanted City staff to work on. There were none, so Chair Fitch continued this item to the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Plan Commission.

9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Carol McKusick gave the contact information for the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (IL-EPA). The phone number for the Champaign Regional Office of the IL-EPA is 217-278-5800. The reason she felt it is important for people to have this phone number is for when Henson Disposal, Inc. starts up their asphalt shingle recycling plant. If they allow mixed construction and demolition waste, then it should not be accepted there.

If they do not build the facility according to the Site Plan, she is not sure if the City will be aware of it. Mr. Fitch clarified that when Henson Disposal submits final plans to get a building permit, City staff will review the final plans to make sure they are in conformance with the approved Site Plan.

Ms. McKusick stated that when there are two different applicants for two different applications answering questions together at a public hearing, then no one is held responsible and it is completely worthless. She gave an example from the minutes of the Plan Commission meeting on September 18, 2014. Mr. Fitch explained that in the minutes Mr. Engstrom only meant that the changes that Southwind RAS was proposing was not significant enough to impact their permits they received from the IL-EPA; however, the changes were significant enough for the City to reconsider the special use permit. It had to do with the traffic coming in and out of the property and the location of the entrance/exit.

Ms. McKusick asked if the underground water goes to a detention pond, then would the pond be lined. Mr. Fitch stated that this would be a question for the City Engineer. He assumed since the City Engineer approved the Site Plan, then the drainage pond must meet the City's requirements.

10. STAFF REPORT

Jeff Engstrom reported on the following:

- DRAFT 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) was forwarded to a special meeting of the Committee of the Whole on Monday, November 3, 2014. From there it was forwarded to the City Council to be heard on Monday, November 17, 2014.

11. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 9:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeff Engstrom, Secretary
Urbana Plan Commission