

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING

URBANA PLAN COMMISSION

APPROVED

DATE: October 16, 2025

TIME: 7:00 P.M.

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

MEMBERS ATTENDING: Dustin Allred, Andrew Fell, Bill Rose, Chenxi Yu

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Will Andresen, Karen Simms

STAFF PRESENT: Kevin Garcia, Principal Planner; Olivia Jovine, Director of Community Development Services; Teri Andel, Planning Administrative Assistant II

OTHERS PRESENT: Matthew Bustiunen, Tom Hagensick, Wes Taylor

A. CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL

Chair Allred called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. Roll call was taken, and there was a quorum of the members present.

B. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

Kevin Garcia, Principal Planner, proposed that Plan Case No. 2511-M-25 be heard before Plan Case No. 2510-PUD-25. He felt the rezoning case should be considered after the text amendment regarding the CMU, Campus Mixed Use, Zoning District, which is what the rezoning is also about. Chair Allred agreed.

Mr. Fell moved that the Plan Commission make the change to the agenda as recommended by City staff. Mr. Rose seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The amended minutes of the December 7, 2023 regular meeting were presented to the Plan Commission. Chair Allred explained that the amended language is meant to remedy a violation of the Open Meetings Act that occurred during that meeting. He read the following amendment into record:

Staff recommend that the minutes be amended by adding the following: “During the recess, the group discussed the nature and efficacy of the proposed motion. No notes were taken by the Commission or staff during the recess, and the recessed gathering was not recorded. At no time during the recess was any vote or final action taken by the Commission on any matter.”

Mr. Rose moved that the Plan Commission adopt the minutes as amended. Mr. Fell seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

The minutes of the March 13, 2025 special meeting were presented to the Plan Commission. Ms. Yu moved that the Plan Commission approve the minutes as written. Mr. Rose seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

The minutes of the April 17, 2025 regular meeting were presented to the Plan Commission. Mr. Fell moved that the Plan Commission approve the minutes as written. Mr. Rose seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

D. COMMUNICATIONS

- Email from a concerned citizen regarding the Preservation and Restoration of Woodlawn Cemetery
- Email and attached letter from Laura Mattos, of JSM Living, in support of Plan Case No. 2509-T-25
- Email from Rosalyn LaPier in opposition to Plan Case 2510-PUD-25

E. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

F. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

G. NEW PUBLIC HEARING

Plan Case No. 2509-T-25 – A request by the Zoning Administrator to amend Table VI-3 of the Zoning Ordinance to establish lower maximum building heights in the CMU, Campus Mixed Use, Zoning District when located south of Green Street and west of Lincoln Avenue.

Chair Allred opened Plan Case No. 2509-T-25. He reviewed the procedure for a public hearing. Kevin Garcia, Principal Planner, presented the case to the Plan Commission. He began by stating that the reason for the amendment is to match the intent of the Imagine Urbana Comprehensive Plan to have two different “University Neighborhoods”. Using a map, he showed where each area was located, one being north of Green Street and west of Lincoln Avenue AND the other area will be south of Green Street and west of Lincoln Avenue. The area north of Green Street would be appropriate for buildings taller than five stories, whereas, the area south of Green Street would be allowed to have buildings up to five stories. He stated that the amendment would also set a lower maximum building height to 40 feet/three stories for the CMU district in any other area of Urbana.

Mr. Garcia reviewed the development regulations for the CMU district and talked about how the proposed text amendment relates to Big Move 2 and Little Move 2.2 in the Imagine Urbana Comprehensive Plan. He presented staff’s recommendation for approval of the proposed text amendment.

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

Mr. Fell said that anecdotally it is hard to project ahead on how tall a building is going to be with how many stories and what is going to go in it. He asked how open City staff might be in the future when someone wants a variance on a height limit for a building that wants to be 68 feet tall. Mr.

Garcia replied that a property owner/developer is always welcome to apply for a variance; however, they will have to have a special circumstance. He added that if Mr. Fell felt there needed to be a little more room for design professionals to exercise their craft, then he suggests the Plan Commission propose a higher height limit now rather than relying on a future variance case.

Chair Allred asked how tall the tallest building to the west is. Mr. Garcia said that he believes the tallest building at Gregory Place is about 70 feet tall.

Chair Allred asked for verification that the intent is to match what already exists. Mr. Garcia said yes.

Mr. Rose asked about the definition of "height". Is it to the ridge of a gabled building and to the parapet height of a low slope? Mr. Garcia explained that it is to the midpoint on a sloped roof. If it is a flat roof or if there is a parapet, then it measures to the height of the wall.

Chair Allred stated that the University Neighborhood currently crosses University Avenue and goes as far as the railroad line. He expressed concern about these causing problems because it does not make sense to allow 120-foot-tall buildings north of University Avenue. Mr. Garcia said that in practice, it would be limited to the area identified as "University Neighborhood". He said that he was trying to be as simple as possible with the wording of the text amendment so that it would not open up to things that we do not want to see.

Chair Allred asked what the current height limit is on the north side of University Avenue. Mr. Garcia said that the height limit is theoretically infinite because it is zoned B-3, General Business. However, it is limited by floor area ratio, so we probably would not see any building much taller than four stories.

With there being no further questions for City staff, Chair Allred opened the hearing for public input. There was none. So, Chair Allred closed the public input portion of the hearing. He opened the hearing for Plan Commission discussion and/or motion(s).

Mr. Fell stated that he shares a little of Chair Allred's concern about the area to the north of University Avenue, but it is not enough to change the language of the proposed amendment. Chair Allred stated that the CMU district does not currently apply to any properties north of University Avenue. So, if there was a future proposal to rezone to CMU, then the Plan Commission could deal with it at that point.

Mr. Rose moved that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 2509-T-25 to the City Council with a recommendation for approval. Mr. Fell seconded the motion. Roll call on the motion was as follows:

Mr. Fell	-	Yes	Mr. Rose	-	Yes
Ms. Yu	-	Yes	Mr. Allred	-	Yes

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. Garcia noted that Plan Case No. 2509-T-25 would be forwarded to Committee of the Whole on Monday, November 3, 2025.

Plan Case No. 2511-M-25 – A request by Jon Cairns, on behalf of Fairlawn Capital, to rezone 905 West Oregon Street from R-6, High Density Multiple-Family Residential, and 907 and 909 West Oregon Street from R-5, Medium High Density Multiple-Family Residential, to CMU, Campus Mixed Use, Zoning District.

Chair Allred opened Plan Case No. 2511-M-25.

Kevin Garcia, Principal Planner, presented this case to the Plan Commission. He began by stating the reason the applicant applied for the proposed map amendment, which is to construct a mixed-use building on three adjacent parcels. Using a map, he showed the location of the three parcels. Exhibit A shows the existing land use designations. He noted the current zoning of the proposed lots and of the surrounding properties. He talked about the development regulations in the CMU, Campus Mixed Use, Zoning District. He stated that staff finds that the proposed rezoning request meets all eight of the LaSalle criteria used for rezoning. He showed photos of the existing parcels and reviewed the options of the Plan Commission. He presented staff's recommendation for approval.

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

Chair Allred suggested that if the Plan Commission recommends approval of the proposed rezoning to City Council, then they should recommend approval pending City Council's approval of Plan Case No. 2509-T-25. Mr. Garcia agreed and added that they should word the language of the motion to resemble the language for the City's staff recommendation in the written staff report.

With there being no further questions for City staff, Chair Allred opened the hearing for public input. He invited the applicant to speak.

Tom Hagensick, Senior Construction Project Manager for Fairlawn Capital, approached the Plan Commission. He stated the idea of the proposed development is a continuation of the type of mixed-use buildings to the west. Their intention is to have commercial space on the ground floor with parking. The second floor would be dedicated to the University of Illinois for their School of Social Work. The three floors above that would be apartments.

Mr. Rose asked if all parking would be at grade. Mr. Hagensick said that he is not sure. He added that they are challenged with the current below grade parking in the two existing buildings with pipes freezing constantly.

Matthew Bustiunen approached the Plan Commission to speak in favor of the proposed rezoning. He feels that it is unfortunate to have an empty lot in this area, and he agrees with the applicant's representative in that a proposed development could greatly improve the area. He also feels that it would fit the surrounding area much better if the subject parcels are rezoned to CMU.

He asked if the first floor would be guaranteed for University of Illinois use or would it be open to other businesses. Mr. Garcia explained that when a parcel is rezoned, it becomes open to any of the possible uses allowed in that zoning district. So, when we review rezoning cases, we try to think of what types of uses might be allowed in that zone that would potentially be a nuisance to the surrounding area. We do not tie rezonings to specific projects, because there could be a nefarious developer say that they are going to do a certain project and show us some beautiful, fancy drawings, and then as soon as the property gets rezoned, they could build something totally different.

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

Mr. Fell stated that he was employed to work on one of the existing buildings about ten years ago, and it was in really bad shape then. He moved that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 2511-M-25 to the City Council with the following recommendations:

- Denial of Plan Case No. 2511-M-25 if the City Council denies Plan Case No. 2509-T-25; and
- Approval of Plan Case No. 2511-M-25 if the City Council approves Plan Case No. 2509-T-25

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

Mr. Rose	-	Yes	Ms. Yu	-	Yes
Mr. Allred	-	Yes	Mr. Fell	-	Yes

The motion was passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. Garcia noted that this case would be forwarded to Committee of the Whole on November 3, 2025.

Plan Case No. 2510-PUD-25 – An application by Wes Taylor, on behalf of PK Elledge, LLC, for preliminary approval of a residential Planned Unit Development at 704 East Windsor Road in the R-3, Single- and Two-Family Residential, Zoning District.

Chair Allred opened Plan Case No. 2510-PUD-25.

Kevin Garcia, Principal Planner, presented the case to the Plan Commission. He began by noting the location and giving a brief history of the proposed site. He stated the zoning and future place types of the subject property and of the surrounding properties. Using the Site Plan, he reviewed the layout of the proposed development and how the development would compare to the *Imagine Urbana* Comprehensive Plan and to the Planned Unit Development (PUD) goals in Section XIII-3.C of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance. He talked about the requested waivers for a reduction in street width and to allow a reduction in the requirement for lot width. Since 2023, the City requires applicants for PUDS to hold an open house, which was held on October 9, 2025, and three residents from the neighborhood attended. They expressed concern about parking on the streets, ownership of each type of housing, whether existing trees would be retained, and about egress/ingress off Windsor Road. He showed photos of the site from all directions. He presented staff's recommendation for approval with the following conditions:

1. That the final development plans be in general conformance with the Site Plan, except that the Site Plan may be amended to reduce the number of automobile access points from two to one along Windsor Road; and
2. That the final development plans include a pedestrian connection to the existing sidewalk in the northwest corner of the site, and that the connection ties into sidewalks within the PUD.

Chair Allred asked if the Plan Commission members had questions for the Planning staff.

Mr. Fell recalled that the Fire Department required a secondary access onto the site when a PUD was requested last time. He asked if the Fire Department was consulted on the proposed PUD. Mr. Garcia replied that they were consulted during a preliminary stage of the application process, but he would reach out to them again.

Mr. Fell stated that each housing unit would need to have a garage or else the parking would not fit. It appears that they can have garages. Townhomes are required to have two parking spaces per unit. The parking spaces on the Site Plan do not look like they are wide enough to put two cars. He would like justification if the Fire Department staff is okay with the amount of parking spaces that would preliminarily be provided for. He also asked if the applicant would be required to put sidewalks in. Mr. Garcia said yes. Mr. Fell stated that a car will not fit between the sidewalk and the building. Residents would have to park their cars in the garage. He stated that he needed more information on the Site Plan regarding parking.

Mr. Fell questioned if the setback requirements for this zoning district would be met for the proposed development. Two duplexes with a five-foot setback and ten feet between the buildings seems pretty close. If this conforms to the Zoning Ordinance, then he is fine with it. However, if it does not, then the applicant would need another waiver. Mr. Garcia said he would look into this further.

Mr. Rose noted that the subject parcel is zoned R-3, Single and Two-Family Residential. Townhomes are not permitted uses in the R-3 Zoning District. He asked if we consider townhomes to conform to the R-3 District. Mr. Garcia said no. Typically, townhomes would not be allowed in the R-3 District because they would be more than two common lot line units. However, when an applicant asks for a planned unit development, they can ask for things that are not typically allowed. Chair Allred asked why this was not mentioned that the applicant would be getting relief from the requirements or the use restrictions. Mr. Garcia replied that waivers are only granted for things required in the Land Development Code. So, with a PUD, if an applicant provides a Site Plan showing setbacks that are less than would be allowed, he was not sure if they would need a waiver for it. Chair Allred stated that it is not so much about whether an applicant would need a waiver but more about the Plan Commission knowing what the relief and trade off would be so they can weigh the benefit to the community versus what they would be giving away in terms of what the rules are calling for. Mr. Garcia referred to Section XIII.3.E of the Zoning Ordinance, which talks about minimum development standards. He pointed out that #1 in this section talks about flexible zoning standards. He read this to the Plan Commission.

Chair Allred asked if the applicant would need to apply for a subdivision as well. Mr. Garcia said yes. Chair Allred stated that the waivers would formally apply in the subdivision approval process as well. Mr. Garcia confirmed this.

Chair Allred asked about the next steps. Mr. Garcia said that if the proposed preliminary PUD is approved by City Council, then the applicant could apply for a final PUD and could also concurrently apply for subdivision approval. Both of these would require the Plan Commission to review and make a recommendation to the City Council. He pointed out that the Final PUD would provide a more detailed site plan, landscaping plans, and elevation plans.

Chair Allred asked if the Plan Commission would need to request a condition asking for more details in the final PUD, because the only thing listed in the purpose statement is that the proposed development would be infill, but any by right development for this site would also be infill. So, this

does not seem particularly unique. It would provide a mix of housing types, but only two are allowed by right and one would be an exception to the rules. So, he is left wondering about what details of the proposed preliminary PUD justify relief from the rules. Mr. Garcia replied that this is not something that the Plan Commission would have to specify in detail. He stated that an applicant can apply for waivers during the preliminary PUD or wait until the final PUD to ask for them. An applicant is not required to submit very detailed plans during the preliminary PUD. It is more of a sketch or concept of what the applicant would like to do.

Chair Allred read the purpose statement for this development. He said that it is not clear what the applicant would be providing in exchange for getting relief from the requirements. The only thing that staff has asked for at this time is the extension or preservation of the trail, which he believes would be a minimum expectation when we are thinking of this as something that should go beyond conventional approaches to development. The application has no description of any kind of intent to do anything with landscape buffering. He said that he is trying to get a sense of how the Plan Commission could proceed if there are these kinds of concerns.

Mr. Rose asked if the applicant was required to provide a retention pond or would it be considered an amenity. Mr. Garcia said yes, and the size of the pond is what they think would be required for this development.

Chair Allred asked if the Land Development Code or Manual of Practice discouraged private streets. Mr. Garcia said that the City discourages them by only allowing private streets in mobile home parks or in planned unit developments. The City does not allow them anywhere else.

Chair Allred asked if there would be turnarounds at the dead ends of the north-south streets. Mr. Garcia said that he was not sure. These may need to be reconfigured.

Ms. Yu said that she was not clear about the initial approval. She asked if the initial approval was for the developer to know if they should invest and put more resources on developing a more detailed plan. Would the final approval come back to the Plan Commission? Mr. Garcia said that the final PUD would come to the Plan Commission, who would make a recommendation to City Council.

Mr. Garcia stated that the preliminary PUD application just has to have the following basic information:

- Owners of the site;
- Developers;
- General location map; and
- Site inventory that shows flood plains, and wetlands

He said that this is all that is required for the preliminary PUD application. The final PUD application requires the following:

- General location map;
- Specific site plan with locations of proposed structures;
- Circulation system for pedestrian, bike and motor vehicles;
- Location of existing and proposed curb cuts;
- Off- street parking and loading spaces;
- Landscape plan;

- Location of any proposed open space;
- Preliminary storm water plan;
- Preliminary utilities plan;
- Location of street and pedestrian lighting;
- Conceptual elevations of all proposed commercial buildings and conceptual typical elevations of residential buildings;
- Design, location, display area, and height of any proposed signage; and
- Development program that provides general information about the development, including desired residential and commercial tenants, housing price targets, estimated construction costs, and any other information that conveys that purpose and intent of the development and a development schedule and any other information deemed necessary by the Secretary of the Plan Commission

He said that the final PUD application has a lot of detail; whereas, the preliminary PUD application does not have much detail required.

Chair Allred said that the Plan Commission should take it as this is our opportunity to provide feedback and recommendations about what we would like to see in the final submission if they are to recommend approval for this. Mr. Garcia said yes.

With there being no further questions for City staff, Chair Allred opened the hearing for public input. He invited the applicant to approach and speak on behalf of his request.

Wes Taylor, applicant, approached the Plan Commission. He mentioned that he worked with his Engineering group to create the proposed concept. He also attended a Development Review Team (DRT) meeting with City staff to get feedback and learn what the best process would be. It was with City staff's recommendation to apply for a planned unit development. He mentioned that this is his first PUD, so he is not sure what is or is not required. One thing about the PUD that attracted him to try it is to keep the homes at a more affordable price point. The main waiver that they are requesting is a reduction in the street width because the more space they have allows them to build more units, which in turn brings the cost per unit down and aids them in being able to provide the price point for the housing that they want to be able to provide.

Mr. Taylor stated that he is open to whatever the City's input is to an extent to make the development work for what works for the City as well as for his company. His understanding was that this is a preliminary phase to get approval for their concept, so they can move to the next step and get a final design that meets all the criteria.

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

Mr. Fell stated that the proposed details are appropriate for this level of review. He is not concerned with density or street width. He expressed his concern about how the developer is going to incorporate all the infrastructure of the subdivision that is required. He needs to see how the sidewalks are going to be integrated and how the driveways are going to fit. The proposed Site Plan looks like there will be duplexes with two car garages, which will take up a considerable amount of real estate to do and to get a driveway there. They will not be able to fit a car between the street and the garage. Extra cars will be parking on the street. He does not see a way they will be able to get

cars into the townhouses. He said that he is not saying that they cannot do it. He is only saying that he does not have enough information to know that it is possible. He also wants some kind of confirmation that the Fire Department has been consulted about having one access on/off Windsor Road. He would like to see a more elaborate, detailed site plan when the applicant applies for the final PUD.

Mr. Rose expressed concern about the connection at the northwest corner. He believes that pedestrian access for the whole site needs to be accommodated at the corner. He expressed concern about residents on Scovill because if parking is pinched in the proposed development, then people might want to park on Scovill and walk the rest of the way to their units. He would hate to see this become a sore point for the neighborhood.

He expressed concern about whether the applicant would provide a retention or detention pond. He needs more information for the final PUD application on this.

Chair Allred stated that he agrees with what Mr. Fell and Mr. Rose both said. He reiterated that he needs to see more details about what the applicant proposes to provide in exchange for relief from the required zoning and subdivision regulations. He mentioned different options the applicant could provide. He feels the proposed development is exciting and does not want to discourage development on the site, especially since it has been vacant so long.

Ms. Yu said that it is really good to see someone develop this big piece of land across from one of the City's most beloved parks. She hopes that the developer comes back with a high-quality development and more details.

Mr. Taylor reapproached to confirm what the Plan Commission input is asking for. He asked if the discussion that the Plan Commission just had about what they need to see is input for the final PUD application or is the intention for his company to go back and revise the preliminary PUD application. Chair Allred replied that it is to provide guidance to Mr. Taylor for the final PUD application.

Mr. Rose asked if the Plan Commission should make a list of information that they want to see for the final PUD application. Chair Allred and Mr. Fell listed some of the Plan Commission's concerns:

- General conformance with the purpose of the Planned Unit Development
- Conceptual and subdivision plans preliminarily approved by staff including infrastructure and site design requirements such as parking, sidewalks, and lighting

Mr. Garcia pulled up the staff's recommendation for the Plan Commission members to see. The Plan Commission discussed how to best modify the recommendation. They talked about parking requirements, which is two parking spaces per single family house, two parking spaces for each unit in a duplex, and two parking spaces for each unit in a townhome; however, the applicant can ask for a waiver of the parking requirements.

Mr. Fell moved that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 2510-PUD-25 to the City Council with a recommendation for approval including waivers for street width and for lot width; with an additional recommendation that the petitioner get verification from the Fire Department regarding there only being one access along Windsor Road; a more detailed site plan is presented with the

Final PUD submission including all subdivision requirements and any additional areas intended to be paved on the property; and to include the following condition:

- That the final development plans include a pedestrian connection to the existing sidewalk in the northwest corner of the site, and that the connection ties into the PUD sidewalks

Ms. Yu asked if the Plan Commission could require the applicant to incorporate some useful green space in the retention pond design. Mr. Fell said it is possible; however, the drawback is that the infrastructure for this type of basin is very expensive to install. He does not know if they are planning to provide a detention or retention area. Mr. Taylor said that it would be a dry basin. Mr. Fell explained that a dry basin fills up when it rains, but it will not have water in it all of the time or the Plan Commission could ask the petitioner to provide other options. Ms. Yu said that it would be worth asking the petitioner. Chair Allred agreed.

Mr. Fell added a friendly amendment to the motion to recommend that the petitioner investigate alternative options to the dry basin. Mr. Rose stated that he likes the wording. Is it possible for the petitioner to tie into existing sanitary sewers. Mr. Garcia pointed out that the storm sewer is located along Windsor Road.

The motion and friendly amendment now reads as such:

The Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 2510-PUD-25 to the City Council with a recommendation for approval including waivers for street width and for lot width; with an additional recommendation that the petitioner get verification from the Fire Department regarding there only being one access along Windsor Road; a more detailed site plan is presented with the Final PUD submission including all subdivision requirements and any additional areas intended to be paved on the property; and to include the following condition:

- That the final development plans include a pedestrian connection to the existing sidewalk in the northwest corner of the site, and that the connection ties into the PUD sidewalks; and
- Request that the petitioner consider alternative options to the dry-basin storm water retention pond.

Mr. Rose seconded the motion. Roll call on the motion with amendments was as follows:

Ms. Yu	-	Yes	Mr. Allred	-	Yes
Mr. Fell	-	Yes	Mr. Rose	-	Yes

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. Garcia noted that this case would be forwarded to Committee of the Whole on November 3, 2025.

H. NEW BUSINESS

There was none.

I. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There was none.

J. STAFF REPORT

Mr. Garcia reported on the following:

- Staffing – There are two candidates that the City is considering hiring to fill open Planner positions.
- Resignation from the City – He stated that this is his last Plan Commission meeting as he is resigning after 11 years of service with the City of Urbana. His last day will be Wednesday, October 22, 2025. The Plan Commission members thanked him for his service and said that they have enjoyed working with him.

K. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

L. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:04 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



Olivia Jovine, Interim Secretary
Urbana Plan Commission