



**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING
URBANA PLAN COMMISSION**

APPROVED

DATE: May 7, 2026

TIME: 7:00 P.M.

PLACE: Council Chambers, City Hall, 400 South Vine Street, Urbana, Illinois

MEMBERS ATTENDING: Dustin Allred, Will Andresen, Andrew Fell, Klayton Matlock, Bill Rose, Chenxi Yu

MEMBERS EXCUSED: There were none.

STAFF PRESENT: Olivia Jovine, Director of Community Development Services; Evan Alvarez, Principal Planner; Aimirou Sy, Planner II; Teri Andel, Administrative Assistant II

OTHERS PRESENT: Carolyn Baxley, Chris Berti, Melissa Brashear, Richard Cahill, Philip Grier, Adrienne Kim, Mark Nilges, Dannie Otto, Dennis Roberts, Martin Sachs, Jiadong Shen, Phyllis Williams

A. CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL

Chair Allred called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m. Roll call was taken, and there was a quorum with all members present.

B. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

There were none.

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

There were none.

D. COMMUNICATIONS

- Email Invitation from Paula Freeze for the American Planning Association – Illinois Chapter Spring Planning Q & A for Commissioners, Boards, and Staff
- Champaign County Regional Planning Commission Citizen Planner Training Guide from the April 29, 2026 training session
- Letter from Andrew Fell regarding Plan Case No. 2519-PUD-25
- Email from Pierre Albin regarding Plan Case No. 2519-PUD-25
- Email from Sarah McEvoy and Huseyin Schitoglu regarding Plan Case No. 2519-PUD-25
- Email from Jan Kalmar regarding Plan Case No. 2519-PUD-25
- Email from Kay Kirkpatrick regarding Plan Case No. 2519-PUD-25

- Email from Donald Shen regarding Plan Case No. 2519-PUD-25
- Memo from Daniel Folk regarding Plan Case No. 2519-PUD-25

E. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

F. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

G. NEW PUBLIC HEARING

Plan Case No. 2519-PUD-25 – An application by Andrew Fell, on behalf of DMCB Properties, LLC, for preliminary and final approval of a multi-family residential Planned Unit Development at 413-419 West Main Street in the R-2, Single-Family Residential, Zoning District

Chair Allred opened the public hearing for Plan Case No. 2519-PUD-25. Mr. Fell recused himself from the case because he is the applicant. Chair Allred reviewed the procedures for a public hearing.

Olivia Jovine, Director of Community Development Services and Zoning Administrator, and Evan Alvarez, Principal Planner, presented the case to Plan Commission. Mr. Alvarez began staff presentation by stating that this is a request by Andrew Fell on behalf of DMCB Properties to permit a Planned Unit Development (PUD) at 413 through 419 West Main Street, which Mr. Fell is requesting in alignment with the R-5, Medium High Density Multiple Family Residential, Zoning District with a waiver to increase the permissible Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 0.9 to 1.0. He said that this request began with a Creekway permit that was granted last month due to the proximity of the site to the Boneyard Creek. He reviewed the process for a PUD application.

Ms. Jovine stated that she, as the Zoning Administrator, issued the Creekway permit on April 17, 2026 along with the conditions placed on approval of the Creekway permit by City Council. She noted the location, current use, and zoning of the proposed sites and the adjacent properties. According to *Imagine Urbana* Comprehensive Plan, this is a Neighborhood 1 place type.

Mr. Alvarez stated that the proposed project is the construction of a multi-family apartment building along West Main Street in the Boneyard Creek District. The developer intends to build a three-story building with a mezzanine, bringing the structure to four stories at the western end of the building with a total of 32 units. Immediately south of the building is the parking lot and the land dedication required for the Creekway permit. He showed a rendering of the site from the northwest. The proposed development would include 19 one-bedroom units and 13 two-bedroom units. He talked about the parking requirements in the Zoning Ordinance, and he stated that the proposed development would require 27 parking spaces, which is what the plan includes. In addition, the plan also includes eight bicycle parking loops for a total of 16 spaces for bicycles, which also meets the requirements in the Zoning Ordinance. He reviewed how the proposed request relates to each of the nine criteria for approval of a PUD according to Section XIII-3.C of the Zoning Ordinance. He reviewed the options of the Plan Commission and presented staff's recommendation for approval with the following conditions:

1. That the final development plans be in general conformance with the submitted Site Plan; and

2. That the final development plans be built in general conformance with an R-5 Zoning District, with an allowance for a FAR of 1.0, instead of 0.90.

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

Ms. Yu asked why we are using the R-5 Zoning District as the baseline FAR requirement. Mr. Alvarez replied that through the Planned Unit Development, if another zoning district has appropriate guidance for the development of a site, then that type of change can be built into the Planned Unit Development process. Since there is a mix of R-4 (Medium Density Multiple-Family Residential) and R-5 (Medium High Density Multiple-Family Residential) zoning across the street, the applicant requested the City to consider the development as the higher-level zoning of R-5.

Ms. Yu asked what the difference is between Planned Unit Development versus rezoning the proposed parcels to R-5. Ms. Jovine responded that a PUD process ties approval of the future development to the proposed development as shown on the submitted site plan. Rezoning the proposed parcels would simply allow for an increase in density on that site and would not be tied to a specific development. So, anyone by right could build at that density of an R-5 Zoning District if the properties are rezoned to R-5. With approval of the proposed PUD, the City is only allowing the applicant and the application as presented to be built at this density.

Mr. Rose asked for clarification on an FAR of 0.90 versus 1.0. Mr. Alvarez explained that the FAR is a ratio of the amount of developed building space over the space of the whole site. It is used as guidance for density. He stated that the total combined footage of the four lots is 32,200 square feet, and the design plans for the proposed building is 32,273 square feet. The area of the building divided by the area of the site would be 1.0. Since the requirements for R5 is 0.9, that would equal a gap of 3,293 feet, so the building would have to be smaller. There would be fewer units and just the implications for the economic viability of the site.

Ms. Jovine noted an error in the written staff report regarding the square footage of the subject parcels. On the first page under Background, it incorrectly states the square footage of the site as 25, 590, but in fact it is 32, 200 square feet.

Ms. Yu ask for clarification of what is meant by “coordinate with the architectural style within the development and the surrounding neighborhood”. Ms. Jovine explained that the proposed structure will be three stories and then rise to four stories on the west end, but that is only a result of a mezzanine. Directly across the street there is a three-story brick apartment building called “Element on Main.” It has a flat roof instead of a slightly pitched roof as is presented in the proposed design. However, there are residential properties directly adjacent to the subject site at medium density which is one of the main reasons why staff felt that it would be consistent with the architectural style of the surrounding area. It is also a fringe neighborhood being on the outskirts of downtown, which means that it is directly adjacent to the B-4 (Central Business) Zoning District, which allows for a very high density and allows for buildings as tall as you can go in Urbana. So, there is consistency with the surrounding built environment. She added that the main reason staff feels that the proposed development meets criterion #7 is the three-story residential structure located across the street.

Mr. Matlock asked what the difference is in height restrictions between an R-2 Zoning District and an R-5 Zoning District. What is the height of the proposed structure? Is the height of the proposed structure relevant? Ms. Jovine replied that the maximum height allowed in both the R-2 and in the

R-5 Zoning Districts is 35 feet. She pointed out that the Creekway permit was approved with a bonus provision for an additional 12 feet of height. The height of the proposed development would be 47 feet.

Chair Allred asked if all of the criteria need to be met to approve the request for a PUD. Ms. Jovine stated that it is staff's interpretation of the Zoning Ordinance that the criteria are general considerations and is meant to be flexible to provide a balanced development, especially since each PUD is unique and will differ greatly from one case to the next. She noted that City staff feels a general consistency with the criteria will be met as 6 of the 9 criteria are deemed in conformance.

Ms. Yu asked for clarification on "environmentally sensitive areas ..." in criterion #9. Mr. Alvarez said that the way that the plans elevate the site to where it stands an inch over the 100-year flood plain would allow water to flow unimpeded rather than resorting to another method like a detention pond. This is why staff feel that the proposed development would meet the criteria for being harmonious with an environmentally sensitive area.

Chair Allred stated that the Plan Commission has never dealt with waivers for PUDS. The Zoning Ordinance talks about waivers in the context of subdivisions with regards to standards for public improvements. He asked staff to expound on this. Mr. Alvarez said that it would not be considered a traditional waiver as the term is used in the Zoning Ordinance. It is mostly meant to acknowledge that the FAR maximum for the R-5 Zoning District is 0.9, and this is an exception being requested as part of the PUD process for this case. Ms. Jovine added that if we choose to request that the proposed PUD be developed in general conformance with an R-5 zone, then we would be adding a layer of control on the project that the applicant did not necessarily request. So, we would be ensuring that the setbacks and other development regulations that would apply in an R-5 zone would apply in this case with the slightest modification of FAR to allow for that additional 3,000 square feet.

Chair Allred commented that several of the communications received mentions that the proposed parcels are located in a historic district. He asked staff to clarify this. Ms. Jovine said that she would need to research this before giving an answer.

With there being no further questions for City staff, Chair Allred opened the hearing for public input. He invited the applicant's representative to approach the Plan Commission.

Adrienne Kim approached the Plan Commission on behalf of the applicant. She complimented staff on the good presentation for their request. She would be happy to answer any questions that the Plan Commission members may have.

Chair Allred asked for a summary of the type of questions they were asked at the open house and if there was anything that was done to address those questions? Ms. Kim recalled the following questions:

- *Would the proposed development block sunlight on the neighbor's house to the east?* They researched this and found that the neighbor's house is a little south of the proposed development, so the only time that sunlight would be blocked is probably going to be the peak of summer at sunset. Everyone agreed that this would be a non-issue.
- *Would the applicant consider an amenity to the location of bicycle parking on the subject site?* The applicant and others discussed options and talked about putting the bicycle parking on the

southwest corner of the building. This is where covered bicycle parking would best be located without blocking any windows.

- *Plans for the floodplain?* The applicant plans to construct the building one inch above the floodplain. The civil engineering firm they hired found that with the foundation and with the amount of land that the development would take up, they would be raising the flood elevation by an inch. She noted that the applicant is planning on raising the building four feet higher to be above the floodplain and flood elevation point.

Chair Allred invited other audience to speak.

Dennis Roberts approached the Plan Commission to speak. He stated that he has had a long interest in development along and adjacent to the Boneyard Creek. One of the things that he finds favorable about this presentation is that the developers are willing to dedicate 20 feet along the Boneyard Creek. This is important to him because he hopes to retain the image or the vision of completing the Boneyard Creek pathway and beautification multi-use path along Urbana's section of the creek, as has been done in the City of Champaign, campus town, and all points west. The fact that the City of Urbana has not been able to develop beautification, except for one section of the creek, for 12 to 14 years ago is a sad aspect of community life, but these projects require funding and grants.

He stated that there are aspects in the proposed PUD that he has great concern about. He mentioned that he is also interested in historic preservation in the sense that the older buildings in our community define the character of Urbana when it was originally developed significantly after the fire that occurred around 1872 or 1873. At that time, the city became a brick and stone facade on Main Street. It no longer had very many wooden structures. Development that occurred in the early part of the 1900s creates a significant image of what the downtown represents to not only the community but to visitors to the community. So, recently the Historic Preservation Commission proposed, and City Council agreed that Downtown Urbana is a historic district. Previously, the entire length of Main Street was proposed to be a historic district street, but unfortunately for the lack of a single vote or a single participant among the property owners at the time only the farthest west section of Main Street became a historic designated area. Since that time, Canaan Baptist Church, which is in the middle of West Main Street, has become a local historic landmark approved by the Historic Preservation Commission and the City Council. He stated that when he looks at what makes Urbana unique, it is visually the older style buildings along Main Street and the handsome homes that go up West Main Street.

He said that while he would really like to see development on Springfield Avenue and on Main Street along the Boneyard Creek, he thinks it is very appropriate to build a multi-story building next to the Boneyard Creek. However, he does not find that the design of the proposed development resonates in any way to being considerate of the proportions, the architectural feeling, the rhythm of buildings, peers, detailing, window treatment, and color relates to any building in the Downtown Urbana Historic District. He asked if the Plan Commission ever looked at visual harmony in the community. Does the Plan Commission think about what aspects of the proposed development contain some of the material constructional aspects of some of the historic facades in the buildings in the downtown area and along Main Street.

Chris Bertie approached the Plan Commission to speak. He stated that he is a retired professor of art at Parkland College. He has lived in Urbana since the mid-1980s. He mentioned that the Main Street residents worked hard to get their street downzoned from R-5 to R-2 to respect the historic

properties on the street and to prevent further encroachment from large apartments. The proposed new development is too large and too dramatic for the area. The historic Plan Commission worked hard for many years to get that R-2 zoning. They felt it was important.

Mr. Bertie stated that the proposed development has nothing in common with the neighborhood other than the fact it has got windows and a roof. When you walk through older neighborhoods in Urbana, it enriches your life. He stated that he considers the subject parcels to be part of the historic district. He believes this type of building would be perfect one block north along Griggs Street. It would enrich that neighborhood and the downtown area. Another location that would be perfect to locate the proposed development is on Race Street where the City just invested money. He implored the Plan Commission to not change the zoning for these reasons. He asked the members of the Commission, if you live on a street and are a homeowner, how would you like to have the proposed development on your street?

Phyllis Williams approached the Plan Commission to speak. She said that the Zoning Map would seem to justify rezoning the subject parcels from R-2 to R-5 because properties directly north, northwest, and southwest are zoned R-4 and R-5. The zoning does not reflect the reality of the neighborhood as older apartment buildings in this area are not built to the maximum allowed by zoning, which have increased in density and decreased in parking open space and setback allowances over time. The existing apartment buildings observe the average setback on the block preserving the vistas of the neighborhood. The description of the existing site indicates apartment buildings to the west and to the east of this site. These are actually older homes that had been converted into apartments in response to the World War II housing crunch around the University of Illinois. As such, they blend with the surrounding neighborhood seamlessly.

She noted that 413 West Main Street retains high integrity to its original design, and 419 West Main Street lost its front porch several years ago. Yet, it retains its basic footprint minus porches which were drawn in the 1909 Sanborn fire map. The apartments, which do exist in this neighborhood, are true two- and three-story older apartments with no balconies or are converted older homes cut into apartments. The landmark apartments, now called Element, located at 502 West Main Street are set back on the south and east sides as well as set back from 506 West Main Street by the underground parking garage and landscaping. It sits in the footprint of the old Busey mansion which burned. The only similarity between Element and the proposal apartment development is four walls and a roof.

Ms. Williams stated that granting R-5 zoning would create an R-2 island from 411 West Main Street to Patterson Parklet. Instead of Main Street being the treelined corridor when leaving downtown, the proposed development would cause old trees to be removed and would irreparably damage the trees which remain due to construction compaction and root pruning with building within three feet of the sidewalk to produce a welcoming grass shoulder.

She said that a gift of 20 yards [20 feet instead of yards] of Boneyard Creek access path is no real gift. The applicant could not build on that strip anyway. Those who have tried have experienced cracked and heaved concrete. All pedestrian amenities in this proposal are focused on North McCullough Street and the west entry to the complex with 10-foot front yards. All other buildings along this corridor face Main Street and pedestrian access is best served for Main Street.

Ms. Williams stated that the R-4 zoning is a step down between R-5 Zoning District. The R-4 Zoning District has worked for the 800 block of West Main Street with the Gather development

with the apartments being set back from the abutting R-2 Zoning District along Main Street and by having fencing and parking with lighting sensitive to dark skies. There are no balconies. The noise from the open-air hot tub in the R-5 portion is the only complaint. To protect the historic homes in the West Main Street corridor from the proposed development, the R-3 (Single- and Two-Family Residential) Zoning District would provide more sensible development regulations. City staff use of the phrase “generally consistent in conforming to PUD goals” is not a ringing endorsement. She asked what is the hurry? Why two approvals (preliminary and final) in one meeting? She urged the Plan Commission to send this project back to the drawing board. She said that the hardworking stewards of Main Street deserve better.

Carolyn Baxley approached the Plan Commission to speak. She stated that she has been a resident of West Main Street since 1981. She is also an 8-year veteran of the Plan Commission, so she knows how difficult it is to have differing opinions about a project. She asked in what planning universe is it okay to jump from R-2 to R-5 zoning? It never would have happened during the eight years that she was on Plan Commission. It is a huge increase skipping over R-3 and R-4 zoning and jumping right to a high-density project in the middle of what is essentially a single-family neighborhood except for the Element apartments. The Element took out the most significant house (the Busey Mansion) in Urbana, which is why the rest of the neighborhood was so adamant to get the neighborhood downzoned from R-5 to R-2. Now, the proposed development is talking about reversing everything that we tried to do, and you're plopping an R-5 development right in the middle of our neighborhood. It is not right. It is not good planning. While she agrees that it would be wonderful to have more density near Downtown Urbana, there are other locations in the City that would be far more appropriate for this type of development as previously noted by Mr. Berti. She urged the Plan Commission to urge the architects and the owners of the subject properties to consider other locations and not threaten what the West Main Street residents have worked so hard to protect on Main Street.

Marty Sachs approached the Plan Commission to speak. He stated that he also lives on West Main Street. Many of his neighbors have already said most of what he wanted to say. One issue that jumps out at him is parking. He wondered if there would be an extra charge for a parking space. Chair Allred explained that the petitioner would have a chance to respond at the end. Mr. Sachs stated that there would be fewer parking spaces than the number of people that will live in the proposed apartment development. Parking will be a major issue, especially if the owner charges for parking.

Richard Cahill approached the Plan Commission to speak. He mentioned that he was on the Historic Preservation Commission with Mr. Rose when West Main Street became a historic district. It was a contentious meeting over a math rounding error. At that time Canaan Baptist Church and St. Patrick Catholic Church opposed the district. He and others on the Historic Preservation Commission would walk down West Main Street, and there was character in the neighborhood.

He said that the proposed development is a nice-looking building, but it does not belong on West Main Street. It is going to totally take the character away from West Main Street. He urged the Plan Commission to say no to this plan and ask the applicant to go back to drawing boards and put this development in another location, such as on Griggs and Race Streets.

With there being no additional input from the audience, Chair Allred asked City staff to reapproach and address concerns expressed by the public.

Ms. Jovine and Mr. Alvarez reapproached. Ms. Jovine stated that the West Main Street historic district boundary runs along Springfield and concludes just behind Firestone Tires. So, 413-419 West Main Street is not inclusive in the historic district.

She stated there are additional limitations to construction due to the 100-year and 500-year floodplain, which predominately covers the majority of the proposed site. Any future development would be significantly hindered by the realities of constructing in the floodplain. This particular project would be elevated a foot or more above the base floodplain elevation, which means that there will be a concrete slab, pillars, and then a foundation wall running along the exterior. It will be somewhat impervious to flooding. While the final design is not completely confirmed yet, the understanding is that water could flow into the space under the building and then out and be unimpeded to the Boneyard Creek or to whatever other drainage storm water management system that is presented on the site. This introduces quite a bit of additional cost. So, in order to make the development feasible from an underwriting perspective, the added density has been requested that was specifically outlined in the applicant's proposal and is a reality for these particular parcels whether the City moves forward approving the proposed PUD or with any future development in this area. The floodway will remain a design constraint for those parcels.

Ms. Yu asked what extent the Plan Commission has to ask for a better design that would be compatible with the neighborhood? So many people spoke in opposition to the design of the proposed development. She believed that applies to Criterion #7. Ms. Jovine replied that the Plan Commissioners are welcome to make motions for additional conditions on approval. Mr. Alvarez added that the Commission has the ability to suggest changes or conditions as they forward this case to City Council. The changes could be things like numbers or more concrete requirements. In terms of more qualitative parts of the building, theoretically, there is nothing in the Zoning Ordinance that does not allow the proposed development as designed. He pointed out that the ability to design a building by committee is not the purpose of the PUD process. Ms. Yu stated that she is talking about how the design fits into the character of the neighborhood. The public speakers asked for a continuation to request that the applicant redesign the project. Is this something that the Plan Commission can recommend? Chair Allred stated that this is getting more into discussion amongst the Commission. City staff presented the options of the Plan Commission. Ms. Jovine stated that the case does not have to be voted on at this meeting. It could be held in discussion.

Chair Allred asked for clarification with regards to setbacks if the proposed PUD is approved with the condition that it adheres to the R-5 development regulations with the exception of Floor Area Ratio (FAR). The setback requirements in the R-5 Zoning District would apply, correct? Mr. Alvarez said that is correct.

With there being no further questions for City staff, Chair Allred invited the applicant to reapproach and respond to some questions and concerns expressed by the public.

Adrienne Kim, of Fell Architecture & Design, and Melissa Brashear, real estate broker, approached the Plan Commission. Ms. Brashear explained that as a real estate broker, she sees a housing deficit that they would like to address with the proposed development. She feels that the proposed building is a master class of Mr. Fell, and it marries nicely Downtown Urbana to the campus area. She said that she would be open to using different colors, if that would help the proposed building fit into the character of the neighborhood more. She thanked the audience for their comments.

Ms. Kim reiterated that the cost to build on these lots would be very high. The developers have put forth a lot of money into the flood study. If somebody were to develop these parcels individually, they would also have to do the same thing. They would have to put money into performing a flood study. Three out of the four parcels are fully in the floodplain, and they would have a difficult time with that. They would not be able to have a basement. They would have to build their first floor about 4 feet above grade.

She explained that one way they are mitigating being in the floodplain is by designing the foundation to allow water to flow in and back out the other side. This is not a very affordable option for a building that is on a much smaller scale. So, these parcels would not be able to be developed unless they were developed more economically, which means a larger building. If the building were to be redesigned, they would need to give the civil engineer a new foundation design for the engineer to base their entire study around. Engineers use the design of the building to calculate what the impact would be on flooding.

Ms. Kim said that she is used to creating a lot of variety of different developments. Many that they do in Champaign and Urbana are student housing. This generally means squeezing in as many units as possible, and they are one-unit apartments that are about 550 feet, which is a puzzle. With the proposed development, we were able to design units that would be larger to attract graduate students and young professionals and would be a lot nicer than their standard ones. The building would be Y-shaped, which is a way to create a more interesting building. Generally, we get to do a double loaded corridor and stack as many units in as we can; as many bedrooms as we can. To make this economically viable, we would need more units. So, jumping from 0.9 FAR to 1.0 would provide about five more units. She pointed out that the slope of the roof is a design option that they wanted to do to make the building more visually interesting. So, the roof will slope up and that will allow them to put in lofted units which are another unit type that they thought would be a nice addition. These are designs that they are not usually able to do these days because of economics. As designers, this was a fun building to design, which they do not usually get to do anymore because buildings are so expensive.

She talked about the lot on Griggs Street. She mentioned that someone came to them wanting to develop the lot. They have not even put boxes on yet because it has not been economically viable for the owner. So, she anticipates most people will have the same issue.

She pointed out that they would be meeting the requirements for parking according to the Zoning Ordinance. The neighbors obviously think that there would not be enough, which is something that they can consider; however, the dedication of 20 feet to the City along the Boneyard Creek limits their ability to provide additional parking.

Ms. Kim pointed out that they did the building at 408 West Green Street. They would be using the same materials on the proposed development. She encouraged the Plan Commission to think about people who cannot afford places to live because there is not enough housing stock. While she would not say that they are providing affordable housing, she would say that providing more housing allows housing to become more affordable over time. If it continues that there is less development over the years, it will continue to get worse for everybody. She stated that the City of Champaign recently conducted a housing study and concluded that there is a housing shortage in Champaign. They have been working to find ways to increase the housing supply there. She said that she believes there is a similar situation for Urbana and the amount of development that we have not done in Urbana is a good indicator of that as well.

She stated that she understands that she is not going to appeal to everybody, but I did want to give a little more perspective as an architect, as a younger person in the community about not having enough housing in the area.

Ms. Brashear stated that she is excited to get this project off the ground, and they appreciate the Plan Commission's support and ideas on it.

With no further comments, Chair Allred closed the public input portion of the hearing, and he opened it for Plan Commission discussion and/or motion(s).

Mr. Rose stated that his opinion is that the intent for Criteria #4 and #8 are to ensure that the PUD addresses public and private open space. The idea is to make sure that this is not a closed community, but instead it is one that is welcoming and open. These are redlined because these two criteria probably do not envision that a project, such as the proposed development, would be in a location where it is called upon to actually do what the criteria is intended to do. In other words, the fact that #4 and #8 get redlined does not reflect on the proposed project being unwelcome to the public. Instead, it reflects on the fact that an ordinance has been put in place where the more ordinance itself rather than the PUD opens the project to the public.

He thanked the public for their input. He believes it goes towards Criterion #7 to coordinate architectural styles, building forms and building relationships within the development and the surrounding neighborhood. If we look at this in pieces, then styles, forms, and relationships all deserve serious consideration.

Styles may have to do with facade treatment which is probably quite variable. Forms have to do with density and are obviously a lot less malleable on the site. Building relationships is the critical one that the public has brought up here, and this is a site that is pulled in several directions.

He recalled during his tenure on the Historic Preservation Commission that within a historic district, a proposed project should be shown in streetscape. That is, it should be able to be viewed when decisions are being made by the public and by commissioners. The context should be provided in a historic district. He believes that there is a concern for the historic nature of the neighborhood such that it would be a valuable gesture on the part of the architect and applicant to address the public by showing the streetscape in which this building would exist.

Mr. Rose continued to say that the Plan Commission is called on to make a decision regarding the criteria for approval of the PUD. The Plan Commission can bring their own judgment to staff's recommended position on this. He stated that two criteria in red have a peculiar instance in this case that he does not think reflects poorly on the project. He feels that what has been brought up has to do with Criterion #7.

Chair Allred added that when he asked the question about the waivers earlier, so the history of PUDS in general is that they come out of the need to build better subdivisions. So, some of the criteria that are an odd fit are things that make more sense when you are developing a residential neighborhood. The inclusion of a variety of public open space, recreational facilities, greenways, trails, these kinds of things is not something that is so applicable to an infill development in a dense urban part of the city or adjacent to the densest urban part of the city. This is something important

to keep in mind when looking at the criteria and wondering why they do not make sense, or they seem hard to apply to the particular development type that we are looking at.

Mr. Matlock expressed his appreciation that the design team and the developer are local. He feels they have extra equity in our neighborhood and in our community to build more houses for our housing shortage. He also appreciates learning that the size of the apartments was considered and that they are not packing in as many units as possible in order to try to make as much profit as possible. He feels there is a quality concern to addressing housing. He stated that any property can become unsightly as well. So, although most of the discussion has been about the overall appearance of the property, he feels there is just as much of a chance for one of these existing properties to become unsightly or a neighborhood eyesore that we would also be talking about.

He thanked City staff for their research and for their presentation. It was a very comprehensive presentation.

Ms. Yu said that Mr. Rose had already talked about Criterion #7. She stated that she and the public are concerned about it. She would like to continue this public hearing to see something presented to us that is more in the nature of the surrounding neighborhood. She said that at this time, she cannot agree that the proposed PUD requests meet Criterion #7, so this is a hard no for her at the moment.

Chair Allred stated that the challenge for me with that idea is that there is not a consistent architectural style that applies to the neighborhood. As Mr. Rose said, building form gets to the question of density, which is a factor in building height, massing, and setbacks. If you look west, the parcels that have older homes look different. However, we can also go in other directions and find very similar buildings that have very similar development types that have similar form and even similar architectural style or architectural features. Then, there are relationships, which vary where you look. He feels this neighborhood is a zone of transition from taller buildings with B-4 zoning in Downtown Urbana to an area that has more historic, detached single family homes with R-2 zoning. This area also generally contains a mix of other development types. So, the proposed PUD makes sense as a transition.

He said that he did not know if he could support the idea of continuing the case for another two weeks without really clear guidelines about what kind of architectural style and what kind of form and what kind of relationship. Leaving it up to someone to look at the existing neighborhood, we could easily end up with the same development proposal that is before them now. He does not feel comfortable trying to design a building or answer those questions, because they are not a design review commission or a design review board.

Mr. Rose stated that this site is pulled in many directions; and as Plan Commissioners, training has told him that the Commission's primary job is to have the proposed project be as cognizant as possible of its neighbors. Public comments that were heard earlier are from neighbors to the west. As Chair Allred pointed out, it is pulled in several directions with part of the city from the south and part of multifamily from the north. We can look at it economically as well, but it also addresses the fact that it is in the floodplain. As a preservationist, he is challenged to try to address the question that the architect/petitioner addressed, which is "what kind of building could be a new building". Some people said another location would be better for the proposed development. His question is what would provide a bridge from a historic district to the downtown area. He said that he has difficulty imagining just what that might be. Therefore, he does not have a hard no on this project.

Chair Allred asked how long the two vacant lots have been vacant. Mr. Cahill responded that they have been vacant for 15 years; however, they have not been on the market for sale.

Ms. Yu pointed out that the façade of 408 West Main Street does not fit into the character of the neighborhood. The building was built very nicely, but the exterior did not age very well. There are some deteriorations already, and it was built less than 10 years ago. This is one reason that when she sees a design like the proposed development, it makes her feel cautious.

Chair Allred reviewed the options of the Plan Commission. He asked if they continue the case so that they provide some clear direction to the petitioner about what they can do over two or three weeks until the Commission’s next regular meeting.

Ms. Yu moved that the Plan Commission continue Plan Case No. 2519-PUD-25 to the next regular meeting with the recommendation that the applicant provide a streetscape of this plan fitting into the neighborhood and do any design modification that will make the overall design flow better in the neighborhood. There was no second to the motion, so the motion failed.

Mr. Matlock moved that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 2519-PUD-25 to the City Council with a recommendation for approval with the conditions outlined by City staff. Mr. Andresen seconded the motion. Roll call on the motion was as follows:

Mr. Andresen	-	Yes	Mr. Fell	-	Recused/Abstain
Mr. Matlock	-	Yes	Mr. Rose	-	Yes
Ms. Yu	-	No	Mr. Allred	-	Yes

The motion was passed by a vote of 4-1-1.

Mr. Alvarez stated that Plan Case No. 2519-SU-25 would be forwarded to Committee of the Whole on May 18, 2026.

H. NEW BUSINESS

There was none.

I. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Dennis Roberts approached the Plan Commission to speak. He stated that he appreciated the thorough discussion of the Plan Commission, especially Ms. Yu's comments, which she actually heard the input of the community and the people who live around the building. While he does not personally live in the neighborhood, he certainly is concerned about the neighborhood and its homogeneous vitality.

Mr. Roberts said that he was really sorry that the Plan Commissioners did not extend the discussion and ask for the streetscape view. He is sorry that the Commissioners have such a small catalog of reference to architectural style and to not be able to imagine something that is a little bit more appropriate in sizing, in rhythm, in massing, and that would more adequately express some of the structures within the neighborhood community, which could still be built on a raised platform or stilts. Because the Plan Commission could not imagine something else that looked a little bit different on the stilts, they could not come up with a decision that there could be a discussion further about the style itself.

He stated that any downtown plan that is a design guidance plan used by many communities, which unfortunately Urbana does not have, talks about the rhythm of the buildings, the size and kinds of shapes that it creates, and the pattern of the windows and how they're arranged. We are not seeing in Downtown Urbana buildings that have different angled roofs. Instead, the Plan Commission is imagining that the proposed style of the PUD will be harmonious with what we have in Downtown Urbana. He talked about the original design of 400 South Vine Street that did not fit into the character of the neighborhood. As a result, Green Street Realty changed the design to fit in with the neighborhood better.

He asked if the developer of the proposed PUD could make the design look less objective and less like it came from some space station or something dropped in the middle of the historic West Main Street. He cannot imagine that the Plan Commission thinks the facade design matches anything in our downtown. It does not. It matches stuff that you see in campus town. All of this developer's work is in the downtown campus town area. Historic West Main Street is a different part of the community, and we have different values. He expressed his disappointment with the Plan Commission's discussion on Plan Case No. 2519-PUD-25 and with their decision not to have a discussion that goes further to ask the applicant to provide a streetscape. When you see it from some angle, from the top, from the bottom, it does not give you a sense of what it will look like when you are walking down the street.

Mr. Roberts stated that this shows that Urbana needs a design overlay district for the downtown area and for the adjacent area. An overlay district is not law, but they are suggestions. They suggest how a developer can see how they can harmonize with the existing buildings. The Plan Commission should support a design overlay district for the downtown area.

J. STAFF REPORT

Ms. Jovine reported:

- Evan Alvarez – New Principal Planner. Mr. Alvarez gave a brief background on his work experience. Ms. Jovine explained that Mr. Alvarez would serve as the Secretary for the Plan Commission.
- City Email Address – Ms. Jovine encouraged the Plan Commission members to use their assigned City email address rather than personal email addresses to avoid using their personal cell phones and to protect from being subjected to FOIA requests.
- Previous Case Status – Ms. Jovine stated that in the future, Planning staff will make this part of regular staff reporting.
- People Over Parking – Mr. Alvarez announced that the Illinois General Assembly passed the People Over Parking Act. It will go into effect on June 1, 2026. The Act states that municipal authorities cannot impose parking minimums on any property within 1/8 of a mile of a transit corridor or half of a mile of a transit hub. Planning staff will talk about next steps at the next Plan Commission meeting.
- Zoning Ordinance Overhaul – Ms. Jovine explained that there are budgeted funds for procuring professional services to rewrite the Zoning Ordinance. Those funds will roll over into the next fiscal year to enable the City to put out a bid for those professional services.
- Comprehensive Plan Implementation Report – Ms. Jovine stated that we are overdue for the report; however, we have been implementing some rigorous structure in the Planning Division, and we will certainly be working on this soon.

K. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

L. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:54 pm.