

## MINUTES OF A SPECIAL MEETING

### URBANA PLAN COMMISSION

### APPROVED

**DATE:** August 22, 2024

**TIME:** 7:00 P.M.

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

---

**MEMBERS ATTENDING:** Dustin Allred, Will Andresen, Andrew Fell, Lew Hopkins, Bill Rose, Chenxi Yu

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Debarah McFarland

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Karen Simms

**STAFF PRESENT:** Teri Andel, Planning Administrative Assistant II; Breaden Belcher, Grants Division Manager; Tim Cowan, Public Works Director; Kevin Garcia, Principal Planner; Will Kolschowsky, Senior Management Analyst; Mayor Diane Marlin, Carol Mitten, City Administrator; Andrea Ruedi, Senior Advisor for Integrated Development

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Anne Feldmeier Adams

---

#### **A. CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL**

Chair Allred called the meeting to order at 7:08 p.m. Roll call was taken, and there was a quorum of the members present.

#### **B. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA**

There were none.

#### **C. COMMUNICATIONS**

There were none.

#### **D. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

There was none.

#### **E. STUDY SESSION**

*Imagine Urbana* Comprehensive Plan Process to Date  
How the *Imagine Urbana* Comprehensive Plan Will Be Used  
Discussion of Early Draft and Structure  
Public Input on *Imagine Urbana* Comprehensive Plan Early Draft

Chair Allred opened this item on the agenda. He thanked City staff for all the work they had done putting together the draft plan. He also thanked the Plan Commission members for setting aside time to attend this special meeting.

He said that we have an early draft that he feels needs some work on the key content and on some issues with how it is organized, particularly when we think about how the Plan Commission uses the plan in the work that they do. He stated that he wanted to structure the discussion of the draft Comprehensive Plan by first focusing on the uses of the Comprehensive Plan and who it is used by. Secondly, thinking about what content is missing that needs to be in the plan so that it can be useful for the different users and stakeholders. Thirdly, he suggested talking about how the structure or the organization of the plan may also need to change as a result of their discussions. After this, he would like to spend time getting general reactions of the Plan Commission members' first look at the draft. Lastly, he wants to allow the public time to comment and provide input on the draft or the discussions that they have heard.

He mentioned that he had asked staff to brainstorm who the users might be. This would include City staff from various departments, elected officials, development community, residents and the business community. He invited City staff to make their presentation.

Carol Mitten, City Administrator, and Andrea Ruedi, Senior Advisor for Integrated Development, approached the Plan Commission.

Ms. Mitten stated that she has been involved since the beginning of the process when they first were coming up with ideas of what City staff wanted the new Comprehensive Plan to address. When meeting with Mr. Hopkins and Mr. Allred prior to this meeting, she recalled Mr. Hopkins saying, "Don't just make plans, use plans." She pointed out that one of the hallmarks of Mayor Marlin's two terms in office has been using plans to lay a foundation for action. These plans included What's in Your Square and the Facilities' Master Plan. The whole idea is to do a plan that leads to implementation. They understand that the most important asset we have besides the people that work here and live here is our streets, so they undertook a comprehensive pavement condition index analysis, which then fed into a newly revitalized and much more transparent Capital Improvement Plan, which they are very diligently implementing at a rate and in a way that we have not been able to in the past. So, it is their intention to make the new Comprehensive Plan realistic and to be a plan that can be implemented.

She went on to say that the Comprehensive Plan is supposed to be an overarching policy document that guides all place-based activity on the part of the City. They want one place where all activities of the different departments happen. They also want to include Mayor-Council goals and how to spend our American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funding.

Ms. Mitten stated that it is important that the new Comprehensive Plan is authentic to the City of Urbana, and it will not be like anything else. This is why there has been a lot of public outreach and a lot of toggling between the input they have received from the public and the City staff. They also want the plan to reflect the broadest set of values for the community, to have a realistic sense of where we are starting, to tell a story of who we are today, and to have a realistic sense of what can be accomplished during the projection period.

She talked about the constraints of creating a new Comprehensive Plan. This includes the fact that the plan is intended to be a 10-20 year plan, so there are only certain things that we can accomplish

over this time period. Another constraint is resources. There are priorities over things that are not included because we do not have resources to accomplish them. She stated that this will be a very important guide for City staff as we go forward. It will help the Plan Commission to decide whether we should make an investment or approve a rezoning.

Ms. Ruedi talked about how *Imagine Urbana* will be used. She referred to a table stating how City Planners; Other City Staff, Elected Officials & Commissions; Developers, Architects & Contractors; and New & Existing Residents & Businesses would use the draft plan. She believes that the table will help people understand that the Comprehensive Plan is a broad-based document because it does affect a lot of users.

She reviewed the *Imagine Urbana* process with going out into the different wards and hosting meetings. She mentioned several reports that were created from the various outreach events that were held. She also noted when City staff gave an update to the Plan Commission on where they were in the process and the outcome of each event.

Ms. Ruedi then talked about calling overarching goals the “Big Ideas”, calling strategic action items “Big Moves” and “Little Moves”, and providing metrics to measure where we are at now, where we are going to go, and what we will accomplish.

She reviewed the reports that Ms. Mitten had briefly talked about. She explained the announcement and promotion of the draft plan review. She presented a list of future meetings that they plan to hold informal community discussions on the draft plan. She presented a list of meeting dates for public meetings before various boards and commissions, including the Plan Commission. She noted the tentative dates for the Plan Commission, Committee of the Whole and City Council once the public meetings have been held and a Final Draft of the plan is ready to be approved.

Chair Allred asked Kevin Garcia, Principal Planner, to go through how Planning staff uses the Comprehensive Plan for certain cases and where in the draft of the new Comprehensive Plan one could find the information that staff uses. Mr. Garcia stated that when a planner gets a call inquiring about rezoning a property, the planner will look at the Future Land Use Map to see whether the proposal to rezone a property is going to relate to what the map says. City staff is currently putting together the new Future Land Use Map with annotations and more detail than just listing a future land use designation. He stated that Planning staff also looks at the goals and objectives in the Comprehensive Plan to see how they relate to a proposal.

Chair Allred asked how the draft plan with the way it is organized with Big Ideas, Big Moves and Little Moves map onto goals and objectives and action items. Mr. Garcia replied that Big Ideas are the overarching goals of the plan. Big Moves are the objectives, and Little Moves are the action steps to meet those objectives.

Mr. Garcia went on to explain that Planning staff uses the Comprehensive Plan for other things like when someone says that they want to do a particular thing in a particular place. Planning staff will look in the Comprehensive Plan to see what it says about that. They are not just using the Comprehensive Plan for cases.

Mr. Rose stated that Big Move #2 was to revise the Zoning Ordinance so that it aligns with *Imagine Urbana*. The Plan Commission’s work hinges greatly on the Zoning Ordinance. He asked Mr. Garcia to elaborate on this. Mr. Garcia stated that the existing Future Land Use Map designates a

particular area west of Lincoln Avenue. The Zoning Ordinance did not align with the Comprehensive Plan Map designation, so City staff changed the zoning district to match up with the Comprehensive Plan. Another big issue that City staff has had with the Zoning Ordinance to date is that it was not updated to align with our current Comprehensive Plan, so City staff wants to address this quickly after the adoption of the new Comprehensive Plan.

The draft plan focuses on creating complete neighborhoods, which has more of a mix of housing types and maybe even some small-scale businesses. The current Zoning Ordinance does not allow this at all, so City staff would need to rewrite the Zoning Ordinance and create new zoning districts that aligns with the future land uses in the new Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Ruedi noted that Breaden Belcher, Grants Division Manager, and Tim Cowan, Director of Public Works, were present at the meeting and could speak about how they use the Comprehensive Plan in their day-to-day tasks as well.

Mr. Hopkins commented that there is a fundamental problem with what a Comprehensive Plan actually is. He explained that a Comprehensive Plan is focused, like the other plans that Ms. Mitten mentioned, on a particular component of City actions. The time frame and the image of long-term, unpredictable criteria and principles of physical development that may occur within 20 years or may not occur for 50 years or may never occur that we still have to be prepared for to avoid it happening too quickly without sufficient rehearsal to be prepared for how it is done. So, the notion that there is a projection period and actions to be ticked off is appropriate at one extreme for the Mayor-Council Annual Strategy Plan or for an organizational plan that is intended to prioritize budgets over four years or a Capital Improvement Plan, which is resource constrained. A Comprehensive Plan is about land development and infrastructure in the very long range, and it is not resource constrained because it is trying to be ahead of the possibility that resources become available, that the economy changes dramatically, and that we have principles, location ideas, and legal backing for zoning to be prepared for it. He felt that they needed to decouple part of what *Imagine Urbana* is trying to be in order to enable the City to have a Comprehensive Plan, which despite the name is not the City's overall organizational strategic plan. It is comprehensive in the sense that it includes all of the City and all of the things, not just the things we want to prioritize now or that we have the resources to act on, that we have to be prepared to deal with in the very, long run. He went on to say that the things that are missing are the land development infrastructure, Plan Commission, and Long-Range Transportation Plan activities. These will not fit in the current structure of the draft Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Mitten pointed out that Mr. Garcia had land use maps to still show the Plan Commission. She continued by noting that the previous Comprehensive Plan emphasized growth through annexation. While it makes sense to figure out what the City wants to do with the fringe areas, it is not what City staff expects to do in the next 20 years because the City cannot afford it and it has not been effective. This is important guidance for how we view what is inside Urbana. It is important guidance for Public Works. It is important guidance for people who acquire farmland thinking that the City is going to bring them sewer and streets. Mr. Hopkins replied that the reason the existing Comprehensive Plan looks this way is because annexation is what was happening. He mentioned several examples of developments that happened at the time. The fact that annexation is not happening now does not mean that we do not have to have policies and expectations about how development will occur at our edges. At some point, in some way, it is likely to occur. If we do not want it to occur or if we want it to occur in a particular way, we have to say so. The 2005

Comprehensive Plan still says if people want to develop in certain places, then the City wants a certain kind of connectivity.

He stated that it is okay to say in a future plan that we are focused on infill, but the existing Comprehensive Plan confounds infill in incremental and does not explain them. It is no where near specific enough about this kind of choices that we need to be prepared for. It can be this sort of short run, resource constrained, action-oriented organizational focus for the next five to ten years, but that is not what a comprehensive plan needs to be able to provide. Ms. Mitten responded that unlike the existing Comprehensive Plan that we basically let be what it was. Aside from one neighborhood plan that came out, the plan was not revisited. There was not any reporting out on the progress towards the ideas that were reflected in it. The idea for the new Comprehensive Plan is that it will be revised every five years.

She mentioned that economic trends in places that are highly desirable might occur very quickly in major cities with rapid growth. She said that she did not see that happening in Urbana. So, it is the responsibility of City staff as they see trends happening to catch up. Mr. Hopkins stated that the whole point of a comprehensive plan is to not to have to catch up. It is to prepare ahead of time so that we have the frame to use to make the decisions because we do not know when they are going to come up. The draft of the new Comprehensive Plan focuses heavily on downtown Urbana and on a particular notion of walkability. He said that if we cannot think beyond a short term this is what is happening now and this is what we are dealing with, then we are not thinking the way a comprehensive plan needs to think. He said that we need to think centennially and act daily.

Tim Cowen, Director of Public Works, stated that he likes “think centennially” and felt that is what they need to do. He agreed that they need to think about growth outward; however, they need to be realistic about it. If the City’s Comprehensive Plan states that we are ready to grow in a way that the City cannot sustain, then that is an issue. He mentioned that there are people who approach the City staff about developments that are not even located within the Urbana Champaign Sanitary District’s planning area. We are talking about tens of millions of dollars that if we build the infrastructure and the development does not happen, then the City is sitting on it and the infrastructure is deteriorating underneath us, and we do not get any use out of it. Conversely, we are also dealing with development up now, which is a limitation and a big focus in Urbana of infill and growth. He said that the last 100 years, the City has not been diligent enough about analyzing the infill developments based on the systems that we put in place to be able to handle those things. There are some points in *Imagine Urbana* that talks about pursuing our infrastructure so that it is financially and environmentally compliant and also about building things and being cognizant of what we have got. The City has developments that over the years were potentially bad buys for the City in terms of not having money in the bank to maintain. He mentioned that they recently overhauled the Land Development Code and it has been useful to stop letting people do things that the City cannot sustain. City staff is trying to look holistically about the whole thing and not repeat mistakes that have happened in the past. He said that he understands that we need to be prepared for these things, have enough education to talk about those things so that when they come up, the City can be real with developers about what is and is not realistic for the City.

Mr. Hopkins stated that this tells him that we need the level of detail in principles and policies that would relate to infill, sewer capacity, and development, which is about location, gravity and density or demand. This matters in redevelopment or intensified development. The problems we have had with reconstruction and expansion ought to be identified because that is what the Plan Commission needs to be aware of. Before we needed to have the Urbana-Champaign Sanitary boundary

agreement outlined in the Comprehensive Plan. It is part of the annotation of the Future Land Use Map. This is what the developers, the Plan Commission, and people who come to talk with the Planning staff need to have evident and visible. The level of detail needed is not that we need infill, but tell us what the infrastructure capacity is, where it is, and whether or not it is a problem. Mr. Cowan mentioned that when working on the maps for the future Comprehensive Plan, they are making the Sanitary District's boundary visible so a developer knows where there are limitations for expansion with water service.

Mr. Garcia pointed out that the Public Works staff are working on creating these [data and tools] over time, but we do not want to hold up adopting the proposed draft plan until we have that level of detail.

Mr. Garcia noted that one reason City staff went to using online software hosting platform is so that when changes are made to the plan over time, the current plan will be available online. Our current Comprehensive Plan has many amendments and you cannot find one place to see a revised current plan, so City staff wants to have the new plan all in one place online.

He stated that he wants to share the draft of the online Master map. Mr. Hopkins shared his concern that the map is being talked about as an afterthought of the draft Comprehensive Plan, but the policies, moves, actions and statements in *Imagine Urbana* he does not agree with. If they cannot talk about them through the representation of the map the content, then City staff and the Plan Commission are not on the same page.

Chair Allred stated that he has a problem with this as well. The draft plan talks about encouraging incremental development. He asked what is the capacity for incremental development and where is it going to happen. If we are going to say that we are going to prioritize incremental development, then we should know that we have the ability to absorb some incremental development in particular locations and that absorbing incremental development in those locations makes sense in terms of other priorities, such as walkability and providing housing. The draft plan does not have a lot of specificity. The vagueness in the draft plan comes back to spatial analysis, the maps that do not exist, to support the ideas in the draft plan.

Mr. Hopkins stated that it does not make sense to jump to the map, because there is a whole set of policy questions and focus questions that need answers; otherwise, it would be a wide-open discussion. Mr. Garcia stated that his intention was to share the map at this meeting to give the Plan Commission members a chance to form ideas and discussion topics for a future meeting.

Ms. Yu stated that not every city has a comprehensive plan. She added that there is a history for why cities create comprehensive plans. She asked City staff if there was a shift in how cities approach comprehensive plans. Her understanding is that City staff wants to make a living document to best serve the City of Urbana that will always be up-to-date as new pieces become available. However, Mr. Hopkins has a very different idea of what a comprehensive plan is and should be. Mr. Hopkins, with his 50 years of planning background, may have a different idea than our City staff. She believes that we need to get a mutual understanding before we get into more detail of the content in the draft plan. Chair Allred stated that it is not a question of whether the plan is a living document. Ideally, people would love if the plan was updated every 5 years; however, this is a question of resources and not being able to update it.

Chair Allred stated his understanding of Mr. Hopkins' comments to be whether the draft plan has the content to be able to provide guidance for the work that the Plan Commission does, for the work that City staff does, and to send the appropriate signals that allow developers and land owners to make the kind of decisions about investments that they want to make. Ms. Yu replied that she understands this; however, City staff is trying to make an authentic plan for the City residents driven by the approach to have more inspiration. This type of authentic plan would not do things that Mr. Hopkins mentioned until more of a core part of a comprehensive plan is slowly added to the proposed visionary plan. Chair Allred explained that the Plan Commission needs the Comprehensive Plan to function for them immediately. If the draft plan is adopted in December, and in January, someone proposes a Planned Unit Development in a particular neighborhood, the Plan Commission needs things in the new Comprehensive Plan to be able to make a recommendation to City Council.

Ms. Yu recalled that for every case, City staff always refers to the 2005 Comprehensive Plan to help the Plan Commission make a decision. She asked if the content in the draft Comprehensive Plan have the information they would need for future cases. Chair Allred stated that it is not just about guiding the Plan Commission for making decisions. He pointed out that the Comprehensive Plan is the legal basis for zoning and changes to zoning. The courts will defer to cities exercising their police power and zoning and making zoning changes if the cities are basing their decisions on something, historically this has been the City's Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan keeps the City out of trouble.

Mr. Garcia stated that City staff had discussed and what he is hearing at this meeting is that they need to kick the tires on this plan from the perspective of different end users for the plan. If it does not serve the needs of the different user groups, then what good is the plan. City staff will figure out how to structure this and go forward with it.

Mr. Fell stated that as an architect, what gets him in trouble with the Comprehensive Plan is there are quality items in the Plan, and the way he has to use it are not quality items. They are definable, measurable things in the Comprehensive Plan. He noted that a developer's perception of a goal in the Plan may not be the same the City's intention for the goal. A developer may believe that he is presenting the City with the goal they want, and he is not.

Mr. Fell stated that the problem with the existing Comprehensive Plan is that it is outdated enough that the developers cannot use it to back a decision. So, it is very important that the Comprehensive Plan stays up-to-date and that the Zoning Ordinance matches the Plan.

Chair Allred stated that the Plan Commission also needs the Future Land Use descriptions that go with the uses so when a developer comes to the City to do a Planned Unit Development (PUD), they can not only see the goals or requirements for a PUD in the Zoning Ordinance, but they can look at the future land use descriptions and what incorporates the community's desires/aspirations for particular parts of the City by seeing how it is reflected in characteristics that would describe development in those neighborhoods. He stated that there is not enough nuance in the description use categories in the draft plan. Mr. Garcia stated that City staff is trying to pair it down; however, it seems that they might have been getting a little too less fine grained with the future land uses. Chair Allred replied that we have different neighborhoods and different developments in those neighborhoods. We have heard different willingness to accept changes to those development types.

He went on to say that this ties in with being more walkable. Walkability looks different with different development types in different locations around the City. We need more nuance to be able to say where these things apply and what they look like when they apply to those places. When we start sharing this with the public, this is the kind of information we need so that the public has something to comment on. If we suggest changes to a person's neighborhood that they live in or to a commercial corridor that they frequent, then they have more of an interest to comment on those areas as opposed to generally saying that we want to make the City more walkable. What does that mean? Does that mean we are going to build an apartment building on my block? Does it mean that the City is going to install sidewalks? He believes that these kinds of ideas need to be more fleshed out.

Mr. Rose stated his understanding of what had been discussed. He recalled that Ms. Mitten said the Comprehensive Plan tells a story of who we are today. He commented that the Zoning Ordinance is not telling a story; instead, it is a legal document with a formal structure that serves a distinct purpose, and it is the first document that a developer looks at. The Comprehensive Plan would be the second document they refer to.

He stated that he gets the feel that there are promotional elements in the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed draft plan states that the City will be walkable; whereas, in the 2005 Comprehensive Plan, walkability arises from the formal specific task of the Plan.

He stated that his take on the conversation so far is that there is a formal, legal structure that is anything but telling a story. The Comprehensive Plan is providing a structure for decision making.

Ms. Mitten stated that *Examine Urbana* tells a story of who we are today. To her, the Comprehensive Plan is an expression of we aspire to be over a time frame. It is grounded in reality, and that is what they want to bring to the plan about implement ability. So, while it may not be a traditional narrative story, she said that she feels it is still telling a story. The Comprehensive Plan is a policy underpinning to the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Hopkins stated that he feels the Comprehensive Plan should start with a story. The first part of the Plan should be that story aspiration "This is what will be". From this story, we need to rehearse to the public the details of what that story means. We need to spell out, as Mr. Allred, stated the details of what the changes or ideas mean to specific neighborhoods or areas of the City. Chair Allred added that we need this kind of information for people to be able to provide input on it. It does not do any good to say that the City will be walkable, because no one knows what that means. He felt that there was too much jargony language in the draft plan that the average person is not going to really know how to interpret. Another issue is that people do not know what this means in their specific neighborhood on their block on in a place they frequent. As it is currently written, the draft plan does not provide the Plan Commission and City Council anything to be able to assess or push back on a development proposal. So, he expressed that he is skeptical on how useful the proposed new Comprehensive Plan will be.

Chair Allred suggested that the Plan Commission give City staff some tasks or some direction for staff to try and address some of their issues.

Ms. Mitten stated that her understanding is that some of the Plan Commission is not happy with the lack of nuance in the draft plan regarding future land use descriptions/designations. Chair Allred added that another part for staff to work on is explaining how some of the ideas in the draft plan



translate into development types. What does increment development mean for various neighborhoods? Same for walkability...what does walkability mean in general? And what does it mean in specific places? There are overarching goals or more like themes that should show up or suggest ways that particular places in the City could change, should change, might change, or should not change so that we can achieve these things that we have heard from the community are important.

Ms. Mitten stated that she was trying to chunk it out. She suggested starting with the basics and let staff make changes, and then they go from there. Chair Allred stated that he agreed. Since, staff is planning to take the draft plan to the public in two weeks, then they have to chunk it over a timeframe to allow this to proceed in a meaningful way. Ms. Mitten commented that if it is the sentiment of the Plan Commission that taking what we have now to the public is a useless exercise, then we will regroup. Chair Allred said that he would not say that the draft plan is useless; however, there is work to be done, and the Plan Commission is willing to help. Ms. Mitten stated that she acknowledged that there is work to be done and feels that there is useful information to share. If the Plan Commission is willing to help, then City staff will work on making changes in the next two weeks to make their interaction with the public more meaningful.

Mr. Hopkins shared his vision of how the public meetings should be held. He envisioned a table and four panels on easels that contain the following information:

- 1) Future Urbana Map – Since Mr. Garcia and he have already been talking, they could work out the details of the map. He mentioned that he already has ideas of how to create it. He said that there should be two copies of the map: one on a panel and one on the table so it can be discussed easier.
- 2) Big Ideas and Big Moves – He stated that they should go with what is in the draft plan even though he has concerns about both the structure of them and the content of some of them. He felt that putting the information out there is a way to have a discussion in the neighborhoods. They do not have time to create something else.
- 3) Examples of Development Types that we are imagining and do not currently exist in Urbana – He said that if we are going to talk about mixed-use neighborhoods in multiple kinds of neighborhoods in Urbana, which we basically do not have, with a couple of exceptions, we need to think about how to describe them to the public. He can imagine how different neighborhoods are going to react because he has been through this before. He noted that these should be on the easel as well as printouts on the table. Each development type should be on separate paper so they can be easily seen by several people.
- 4) Different Layers of Future Land Use Map – He said that there should be two or three printed maps showing the information of the different layers.

Mr. Hopkins stated that this does not actually involve creating new ideas between now and then or even discussing or deliberating about those ideas between now and then. However, it comes up with representations with which to deliberate, which will be helpful to the Plan Commission as well as the neighborhood groups.

Ms. Ruedi stated that she agrees with Mr. Hopkins vision. She mentioned that City staff is getting feedback from the public already on the plan, so they could provide answers to the public's questions too at the public sessions.

Mr. Rose stated that he shares in the notion that the key for public involvement hinges on having a map. He wondered if City staff has in mind the level of change from the 2005 Comprehensive Plan might be presented in map form to the public. Mr. Garcia stated that he has two printed maps that they can share with the public. They also have the online map that includes a layer showing where changes are being suggested.

Mr. Garcia talked about the reason for paring down the Future Land Use designations. He said it was by design to simplify things. He said that with regards to neighborhoods, every neighborhood can have a certain intensity of development. He noted that some businesses are allowed everywhere in Urbana, even in residential homes. So, when City staff paired down the list of Future Land Use designations, it was with the idea that there is a continuum of intensity but that some level of residential and business would be allowable in most areas of the City.

Mr. Hopkins stated that we need to acknowledge that the neighborhoods are different types, and some of those differences are deeply embedded after long, long deliberations and mean a lot to people in those neighborhoods. So, lumping them together in the Future Land Use designations is not going to tell us what we need to know. Mr. Garcia commented that when we rewrite the Zoning Ordinance, that is when we are able to get into those nuances of the particular form of a neighborhood. Mr. Hopkins noted that we are trying to say in the Comprehensive Plan that we recognize this neighborhood in Urbana. We have been developing this neighborhood and nurturing it in a particular way and are not going to be treated like every other neighborhood in the City. This goes for every neighborhood in Urbana. The way this discussion needs to happen, if they are going to be able to do anything as a Plan Commission without having a lot of people in the audience at each meeting screaming at us, is to acknowledge and do some of that rehearsal now as part of the draft Comprehensive Plan. The City wants more mixed use, but we have to work on that hard now, not pretend to save it for later.

Ms. Mitten stated that as they work through what is an appropriate distinction among neighborhoods that is relevant to the level of the Comprehensive Plan, that we are mindful of the values that are reflected for the whole City of Urbana and that no neighborhood gets to adopt its own set of values. Some neighborhoods in other cities are seated in things that are not appropriate and would violate the City's values. Chair Allred said this is true, but we can have a value for the City of Urbana as a whole that we want development that is financially resilient.

Ms. Yu said that going through the 2005 Comprehensive Plan, she found that Chapters 5 & 6 are what the Plan Commission wants to make us feel more comfortable.

Chair Allred asked about what is next for the Plan Commission. Mr. Garcia stated that now that they have good tasks to work on in the next two weeks, City staff can bring to the next Plan Commission meeting what they intend to take to the public during the public sessions.

Mr. Garcia shared the online version of the Future Land Use Map with the Plan Commission. He noted that Nicole Darby, with the Champaign County GIS (CCGIS) Consortium was helpful in creating the map. He noted that it includes layers, which includes the Community Development Target Areas ("Special Development Areas"); high priority items from the Urbana Pedestrian Master Plan; short-term, mid-term and long-term projects from the Bicycle Plan; Future Land Use categories; and a commenting section. He welcomed suggestions to make changes to the map to make it better.

Mr. Hopkins said that we need to give people versions of the information at the public sessions. He did not know if the online map should be shared with the public because someone who does not have knowledge of GIS layers might not know how to work the map. However, it could be useful to have it available at the public sessions. Mr. Garcia stated that they have provided options for people to submit their comments either in person marking on stuff or providing online components to capture different audiences.

Chair Allred asked if the only audience member wished to speak about the draft Plan.

Annie Feldmeier Adams approached the Plan Commission. She stated that she is for dense, walkable, bikeable neighborhoods where there are businesses. She has heard from other people that it is hard to develop in Urbana. She stated that she thinks the draft Comprehensive Plan is a great plan and that it is really exciting. She is grateful for all the work the City staff has put into the plan. She noted that one thing she asks is where she wants to live as she ages if she stays in Urbana. She suggested having a poster/panel asking this to get more public input.

Mr. Rose inquired about the structuring of future Plan Commission regarding the draft Comprehensive Plan. Chair Allred stated that he would work with City staff to create the structure for discussion at future meetings. He pointed out that at some point the study sessions would end and a public hearing would be brought before the Plan Commission for a recommendation to City Council.

Ms. Yu commented that it seems we are trying to do things using newer technology. She has not been trained and is trying to learn the newer technology. Mr. Hopkins stated that this is a major issue for some people. He noted that for the last 5 to 10 years, he has been involved in trying to create online ways to handle access and manage plans. There is a system in Illinois, Maryland and Texas, and none of them get used. He said that when he and Mr. Allred met with Mr. Garcia, they are worked from hard copies. Mr. Garcia responded that some people may prefer to view it online. With it being hosted online, whenever the plan gets updated, staff can easily turn it into a pdf form for people to be able to print it off.

## **F. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:11 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin Garcia, Secretary  
Urbana Plan Commission