

---

**DATE:** Monday, November 10, 2025  
**TIME:** 6:30 p.m.  
**PLACE:** 400 S. Vine Street, Urbana, IL 61801

---

The City Council of the City of Urbana, Illinois, met in regular session Monday, November 10, 2025, at 6:41 p.m.

**ELECTED OFFICIALS PHYSICALLY PRESENT:** DeShawn Williams, Mayor; Darcy Sandefur, City Clerk; CM Maryalice Wu, CM Shirese Hursey, CM Jaya Kolisetty, CM Grace Wilken, CM James Quisenberry\*

**\*CM PRESENT AFTER ROLL**

**ELECTED OFFICIALS ABSENT:** CM Christopher Evans, CM Chaundra Bishop

**STAFF PRESENT:** Bourema Ouedraogo, Darius White, Olivia Jovine, Elizabeth Hannan, Matt Roeschley

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call**

With a quorum present, Mayor Williams called the meeting of the Urbana City Council to order at 6:41p.m.

**2. Approval of the Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

**a. 10-20-2025 Committee of the Whole Meeting Minutes**

Motion to approve by CM Kolisetty, seconded by CM Wu

Voice Vote:

**AYE:** Wu, Hursey, Kolisetty, Wilken

**NAY:** None.

**3. Additions to the Agenda**

None.

**4. Presentations and Public Input**

**a. Public Input**

*Written Public Input regarding the use of a drone at the No Kings rally was received from the following individual and read by CM Wilken: Sarah Roper. Written Public Input regarding the Housing Needs Study was received from the following individual but was not asked to be read: Esther Patt. Written Public Input opposing the implementation of Automatic License Plate Readers was received from the following individual but was not asked to be read: Rohn Koester.*

**5. Council Input and Communications**

None.

**6. Reports of Standing Committees**

None.

**7. Committee of the Whole (Council Member Jaya Kolisetty, Ward 4)**

**1. Consent Agenda**

None.

**2. Regular Agenda**

- a. Ordinance No. 2025-11-028:** An Ordinance Amending the Urbana Zoning Ordinance (Amend Table VI-3 to Establish Lower Maximum Building Heights in the CMU, Campus Mixed Use, Zoning District in Specific Areas / Plan Case No. 2509-T-25) – CD

The Ordinance approves an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance to the Campus Mixed Use (CMU), Zoning District to maintain the 120-foot maximum building height for properties north of Green Street and west of Lincoln Avenue and south of University Avenue; and lower maximum building height to 65 feet/five stories for properties west of Lincoln Avenue and south of Green Street.

Motion to approve by CM Kolisetty, seconded by CM Wu. Discussion followed.

Roll Call Vote:

**AYE:** Wu, Hursey, Kolisetty, Wilken

**NAY:** None.

- b. Ordinance No. 2025-11-029:** An Ordinance to Approve the Preliminary Planned Unit Development at 704 East Windsor Road (Plan Case No. 2510-PUD-25) – CD

The Ordinance provides a preliminary approval of a residential Planned Unit Development (PUD) at 704 East Windsor Road that includes zoning waivers to reduce minimum lot sizes and street widths.

Motion to approve by CM Kolisetty, seconded by CM Wu.

Roll Call Vote:

**AYE:** Wu, Hursey, Kolisetty, Wilken

**NAY:** None.

- c. **Ordinance No. 2025-11-030:** An Ordinance Amending the Urbana Zoning Map (Rezone 905 West Oregon Street from R-6 to CMU, and 907 and 909 West Oregon Street from R-5 to CMU / Plan Case No. 2511-M-25) – CD

The Ordinance approves a zoning map amendment at the 900-block of West Oregon Street to rezone 905 West Oregon Street from R-6; and 907 and 909 West Oregon Street from R-5 to CMU.

- i. Motion to amend to align the table figures to be consistent with the figures in Ordinance No. 2025-11-028 by CM Wu, seconded by CM Wilken.

Roll Call Vote:

**AYE:** Wu, Hursey, Kolisetty, Wilken

**NAY:** None.

Motion to approve, as amended, by CM Kolisetty, seconded by CM Hursey. Discussion followed.

Roll Call Vote:

**AYE:** Wu, Hursey, Kolisetty, Wilken

**NAY:** None.

- d. **Resolution No. 2025-11-088R:** A Resolution Approving an Intergovernmental Agreement for a Housing Needs Study by the Champaign County Regional Plan Commission – CD

Olivia Jovine, Director of Community Development was present for questions. The Resolution approves an agreement between the City of Urbana and the Champaign County Regional Planning Commission (RPC) for professional services for the development of the Urbana Housing Needs Study.

Motion to defer to the November 24 City Council meeting by CM Wu failed without a second.

Motion to approve by CM Kolisetty, seconded by CM Wilken. Questions and discussion followed.

Roll Call Vote:

**AYE:** Hursey, Kolisetty, Wilken, Quisenberry

**NAY:** Wu

- e. **Resolution No. 2025-11-089R:** A Resolution Approving an Increase in the Number of Liquor Licenses in the Class A Designation for 25 O’Clock Brewing Company, LLC, 208 West Griggs Street, Suite 101, Urbana, Ill. – Exec

The Resolution approves an increase to the number of Class A (Retailer’s On-Premises) liquor licenses in the City of Urbana for 25 O’Clock Brewing Company LLC for their establishment at 208 West Griggs Street, Suite 101.

Motion to approve by CM Kolisetty, seconded by CM Wu.

Roll Call Vote:

**AYE:** Wu, Hursey, Kolisetty, Wilken, Quisenberry

**NAY:** None.

## 8. Reports of Special Committees

None.

## 9. Reports of Officers

None.

## 10. Discussion

### a. Police Surveillance Technology (Ordinance No. 2024-12-042)

CM Wilken shared updates comparing the definitions included in the proposed Ordinance to definitions included in similar Ordinances of other municipalities. Requested Matt Roeschley, City Attorney to speak on the definition of exigent circumstances.

Matt Roeschley shared an analysis of what exigent circumstances are defined as in the Ordinance using Chapter 6, Civil Emergencies of the Urbana City Code which was adopted in 1977 after the Illinois Emergency Services and Disaster Act of 1975 (ESDA Act). Stated the definitions and processes within Chapter 6 as well as the ESDA Act are outdated. Stated updating the City Code in parallel to approving Ordinance 2024-12-042 would be a significant distraction and needs to be done separately. Suggested Council consider using the original proposed language similar to the language for exigent circumstances used by other municipalities that relies on the discretion of the Chief of Police rather than a disaster declaration. Alternatively suggested Council consider replacing the language to define an exigent circumstance using the definition for “disaster” under the Illinois Emergency Management Agency Act and require a disaster declaration from the mayor or governor instead of utilizing the discretion of the Chief of Police. Recommended Council to focus on agreeing on a definition for exigent circumstances to be aligned with current emergency management practices and then update Chapter 6 separately.

Council discussed the potential for using the language from the Emergency Management Agency Act to define an exigent circumstance without requiring an official declaration of disaster from the mayor or governor.

Council discussed specifying who, in the moment of disaster, is determining an exigent circumstance and what the procedure is or could be. Further discussed the importance of the long-term applicability of the Ordinance.

CM Wilken shared comparisons between the definitions of the proposed Ordinance and the Village of Oak Park’s Surveillance Ordinance. Further shared a comparison between covered surveillance technologies between the proposed Ordinance and the ordinances of the Village of Oak Park; the City of Boston in the State of Massachusetts; the City of Oakland in the State of California; and the City of Dayton in the State of Ohio.

CM Wu requested further updates containing comparisons and tables to be provided to Council in physical copies. Council discussed the format in which updates to the Ordinance and discussion are to be presented.

Council discussed the process of implementing the agreed upon changes to the Ordinance and finding compromise to move toward approving the Ordinance.

Council discussed whether the Ordinance can be seen as a source of liability or a protection from liability with surveillance technologies.

City Clerk Sandefur notified Council that if they would like for the documents tracking updates to be made available to the public through the published meeting packet, the documents are required to be submitted by Thursday at noon.

## 11. Mayoral Appointments

### a. Board and Commission Appointments

#### *Chair of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission*

– Annie Adams (term ending June 30, 2026)

#### *Civilian Police Review Board*

– Melissa Baber (term ending June ~~20~~ 30, 2028)

Presented by Mayor Williams. Mayor Williams corrected the typo in the term ending date for Melissa Baber to read as “June 30, 2028”.

Motion to approve by CM Wu, seconded by CM Hursey. Questions and discussion followed.

Roll Call Vote:

**AYE:** Wu, Evans, Hursey, Kolisetty, Wilken, Quisenberry

**NAY:** None.

## 12. Adjournment

With no further business before the Urbana City Council, Mayor Williams adjourned the meeting at 8:11p.m.

Seok Hyun Cho

Deputy City Clerk

This meeting was video recorded and is viewable [on-demand HERE](#).

**Minutes approved: 12/8/25**

---

**PUBLIC INPUT - November 10, 2025**

---

From Esther Patt <[REDACTED]>  
Date Fri 11/7/2025 10:01 AM  
To City Council <CityCouncil@Urbanall.gov>

**\*\*\* Email From An External Source \*\*\***

Use caution when clicking on links or opening attachments.

Dear Mayor Williams and Urbana City Council Members:

Regarding the \$125,000.00 **Housing Needs Study** you will be requesting from the Regional Plan Commission, I have listed here 7 data questions that thus far, city officials have been unable to answer. These data are central to evaluating assumptions about housing in the Imagine Urbana document. Please ask the RPC to include the following in the Housing Study.

1. Provide Census data for housing vacancy rates by *Census Tract* as well as the vacancy rates for Urbana as a whole for each of the 5 years and **distinguish homeowner vacancy rate from rental housing vacancy rate in each Tract.**
2. Count the total number of properties in each Census Tract (or each neighborhood) that are zoned for multi-family housing.
3. List the locations of all undeveloped properties where multi-family housing is currently a permitted use.
4. Count the number of properties in Urbana that are duplexes and the number of those where **one or more of the units is owner-occupied.**
5. Count the number of properties in Urbana that currently have an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) and the number of those where **one or more of the units is owner-occupied.**
6. Count the number of condominium units in Urbana and **how many of those are owner-occupied.**
7. Count the number of townhouse units in Urbana and **how many of those are owner-occupied.**

Thank you for your consideration of my concerns and for your service in city government.

Esther Patt  
[REDACTED]

---

**PUBLIC INPUT 11/10/25**

---

From s roper [REDACTED]  
Date Mon 11/10/2025 12:13 AM  
To City Council <CityCouncil@Urbanall.gov>

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

**\*\*\* Email From An External Source \*\*\***

Use caution when clicking on links or opening attachments.

Please read my comments into the record at the November 10th Regular City Council meeting.

Dear City Council and Mayor Williams,

I am writing with deep concern over the recent UPD use of a drone at the No Kings rally, in apparent violation of state law.

Cervantes' presentation at last week's Committee of the Whole meeting stated that a drone was deployed using exception 15(3) of the Freedom from Drone Surveillance Act. This specific exception allows for the use of a drone "If a law enforcement agency possesses reasonable suspicion that, under particular circumstances, swift action is needed to prevent imminent harm to life."

Although this act does not specifically define "imminent harm," The Illinois Safe-T act defines it by stating, "An imminent harm is not merely a fear of future harm, no matter how great the fear and no matter how great the likelihood of the harm, but is one that, from appearances, must be instantly confronted and addressed."

During his presentation, Cervantes describes the deployment of the drone by stating, "When we deployed the drone, which was about at Race St., because we knew they were continuing west, um we gave the order for the crowd to get off of the roadway, to get out of the roadway. That was not a permitted route, it was unlawful at that point, we told them to get on the sidewalk." He also states that the drone was "deployed after the route deviation and traffic obstruction at a main intersection."

In explaining the rationale of believing there was an imminent threat to life, Cervantes states, "And I say imminent harm because it was directly in route of the hospital corridor and that was one of the things that we discussed. Luckily, we had touched base with people about a week before so Carle security and ER director were made aware of the march happening... So when the route did go that way, what our main concern was that main entrance off Coler and University is how ambulances get people into the ER. We wanted to make sure that wasn't going to be blocked or that if it did, we could re-route traffic if we needed to. So having that drone in the air gave us the ability to see what was going on and monitor traffic and then see anywhere else that we had to block off traffic to make sure cars weren't going around and we wanted to make sure that everybody was safe."

It is very hard to believe that this vague possibility that this small group of protesters who were engaging in a 1st Amendment protected activity, and who might continue in a particular direction for multiple blocks towards the vicinity of a hospital, would meet the definition of “imminent threat to life” requiring “swift action.”

The Freedom from Drone Surveillance Act is incredibly clear in its language that protests and marches cannot be surveilled by drones. This is clarified explicitly at several points within the act. The Illinois OAG further defines some examples of 1st Amendment assemblies at which law enforcement may not use drones to gather information on individuals:

- A permitted rally at a public forum, such as a city plaza
- An unpermitted sidewalk protest targeting a government facility
- A protest march along public streets (whether permitted or unpermitted)
- An unpermitted demonstration by protestors at a routed or special event.

Without a doubt, the No Kings rally and subsequent march on Vine and University were protected 1st Amendment activities that are explicitly protected from drone surveillance in the act.

If UPD had been discussing for “about a week” the possibility that protesters might march in the direction of the hospital, there is absolutely no reason that available officers shouldn’t have been prepared to head that direction, if needed, to direct the flow of traffic and ensure safety. In fact, photographs of the protesters near the main hospital entrance show three UPD squad cars blocking both westbound lanes and the center lane of University Avenue with protesters standing on the adjacent sidewalk. UPD’s physical presence at this location undermines the claim that aerial surveillance was necessary to have the “ability to see what was going on and monitor traffic and then see anywhere else that we had to block off traffic to make sure cars weren’t going around,” as Cervantes stated, even if this did meet the definition of a situation requiring “swift action” to prevent “imminent harm.”

At a later slide in the presentation titled Policy Compliance, one of the bullet points listed, Freedom from Drone Surveillance Act 15(3), 20(2). It is important to note that section 20(2) of the act discusses video retention requirements when a drone has been used at a “routed event” or “special event.” As stated before, the act is very clear in its language that these events are absolutely different from 1st Amendment protected activities and have separate requirements for drone usage.

If the city believed that the No Kings rally was not a 1st Amendment protected activity and was instead a special event, one of the requirements for operating a drone at a “special event” or “routed event” is that notice of the drone usage must be posted at the event location including at major entry points for at least 24 hours before the event. Additionally, the notice must clearly communicate that drones may be used at the upcoming event for the purpose of real-time monitoring of participant safety. If the city operated the drone under this exception, I am unaware of any public posting of the intent to operate the drone and Cervantes made no mention of this during his presentation.

In closing, the city has deployed drone surveillance to a 1st Amendment protected activity in what I believe to be a violation of the Illinois Freedom from Drone Surveillance Act. There was no situation in which “swift action” was needed to prevent imminent harm to life. There was no violence, there was no property destruction. There were peaceful protesters marching along a city street.

Sarah Roper  
Urbana

---

**PUBLIC INPUT: November 10, 2025 City Council regular meeting**

---

From Rohn Koester [REDACTED]  
Date Mon 11/10/2025 1:19 PM  
To City Council <CityCouncil@Urbanall.gov>

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

\*\*\* Email From An External Source \*\*\*

Use caution when clicking on links or opening attachments.

Dear Mayor and City Council:

This message is about the Flock interstate surveillance system + automatic license plate-reader surveillance technology. I'm against the use of ALPRs by the City of Urbana and encourage you to support the police surveillance technology resolution. Oak Park and Evanston dumped their ALPRs a few months ago – Urbana shouldn't start using them.

I've written before against ALPRs on the premises that they aren't very helpful to legal cases, they are prone to corruption and we should keep local authority local, especially at this point in history.

To this list we need to add another reason: a judge in the state of Washington just issued a ruling that defines ALPR data within the scope of public records and therefore available for FOIA requests. Let that sink in.

One person can use a FOIA request to geolocate a particular license plate across a number of days in a certain specified area – are we witnessing the legal scaffolding to support this? Anyone could track an automobile's movements by means of FOIA request? Holy crap.

The only solution is to not collect the data. The City of Urbana and the Urbana Police do not have the wherewithal to ensure the citizenry they can protect their data. It's in the interest of public safety that we all should reject ALPRs and the Flock network that powers them. Please support the resolution about regulating police surveillance technology.

Thank you for your representation and service – be well!

Respectfully,  
Rohn Koester



Urbana