



DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Planning Division

m e m o r a n d u m

TO: Mayor Diane Wolfe Marlin and City Council Members

FROM: Lorrie Pearson, AICP, Community Development Services Director
Kevin Garcia, Principal Planner

DATE: January 21, 2021

SUBJECT: **An Ordinance Approving a Preliminary Development Plan for a Planned Unit Development** (602 South Lincoln Avenue / CCH Development, LLC & CMH Development, LLC – Plan Case 2411-PUD-20) (Ord. No. 2020-12-070)

An Ordinance Approving a Final Development Plan for a Planned Unit Development (602 South Lincoln Avenue / CCH Development, LLC & CMH Development, LLC – Plan Case 2412-PUD-20) (Ord. No. 2020-12-071)

Supplemental Memorandum

On December 7, 2020, the Committee of the Whole discussed two ordinances for a proposed Planned Unit Development at 602 South Lincoln Avenue. After discussion, the Committee voted to forward the case to a future City Council meeting, after a related design review case had been considered by the Design Review Board (DRB). On January 14, 2021, the DRB voted unanimously (5-0) to approve the project, with seven conditions.

Staff recommends that the City Council send these ordinances back to the Committee of the Whole for consideration at their February 1, 2021 meeting. This will give the design team time to address the conditions approved by the DRB, and will give the Committee more time to discuss the revised plans prior to voting on the ordinances at City Council.

Attachments: Exhibit A: Conditions approved by the Design Review Board
Exhibit B: Design Review Board Minutes (Draft) (January 14, 2021)

cc: CCH Development, LLC; Mode 3 Architecture

Exhibit A: Conditions for 602 S. Lincoln Ave. Approved by Design Review Board

- 1: That the proposed building and parking area are in general compliance with the site plans, elevations and architectural renderings.
- 2: Accept another masonry material that is on the Urbana design guidelines approved materials list as an alternate to the stone masonry.
- 3: Accept natural wood lap siding, or wood shake or shingles as an alternate material to the engineered wood siding.
- 4: Allow for the reduction of the area of the parking lot in any way to preserve trees, taking into consideration a reduction in parking spaces.
- 5: That the proposed permeable pavement be permeable pavers, and may be extended to other areas of the parking lot, to increase stormwater management and tree preservation.
- 6: Allow solar panels to be installed on the rooftop.
- 7: Canopy trees shall be added to the landscape plan of a diversity of tree species, looking at the replacement value for trees being removed from the site, in coordination with the City Arborist.

EXHIBIT B: DRAFT MINUTES of the DESIGN REVIEW BOARD, January 14, 2021

Meeting Called to Order 7:04 p.m.

All members in attendance

...

2020-LBDRB-01 – Design Review for 602 S. Lincoln Ave.

Chair Scott Kunkel stated he has a business relationship with the applicant in the case and would abstain from participating. As Vice Chair, Adam Rusch assumed the role of Chair for the public hearing.

Kevin Garcia stated that prior to opening the public hearing, some items needed to be addressed. He stated that Mr. Rusch and Ms. McGuire had weighed in as citizens on the related Planned Unit Development public hearing at the Plan Commission meeting, and that Mr. Allred had to vote on the case as a member of the Plan Commission. He said that they had all stated to him that their previous comments on the PUD case would not interfere with their ability to objectively review the design criteria for the design review case. The applicant, Chris Hartman, was made aware of the situation, and did not have a problem with their participation in the design review case.

Mr. Rusch then opened the public hearing for case 2020-LBDRB-01.

[Note: Mr. Garcia was unable to share his screen due to technical difficulties.]

Mr. Garcia said that this is a request by CCH Development, LLC for a 70-unit Planned Unit Development on a site of 10 parcels in the Lincoln-Busey Corridor. The Planned Unit Development case went to Committee of the Whole and consideration at City Council had been deferred until after the Design Review Board meeting. The Lincoln-Busey Corridor design guidelines are in place to ensure a new development's compatibility with the surrounding area. He said the development will include a number of design elements to help it blend in with the character of the neighborhood: multiple buildings with varying depths and heights, pitched roofs, varying materials, etc.

Mary Pat McGuire asked if the online packet is consistent with the staff report. She asked if there was some way to address the lack of screen sharing. Jason Liggett was able to show his screen, showing the proposed building elevations. [Mr. Garcia then directed Mr. Liggett to show specific pages from the staff report as necessary for the remainder of the meeting.]

Mr. Garcia continued with the staff report. The DRB needs to determine if the proposal meets the intent of the Lincoln-Busey Corridor and is compatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood. The staff analysis outlines how the proposed developments meet the guidelines. Zone 1, which includes the proposed project, is the higher-intensity section of the corridor; Zone 2 is the lower-intensity section of the corridor.

He said that staff analyzed the design criteria for the Lincoln-Busey Corridor, and provided details for how the application meets them. He said staff recommends that the DRB find that the proposal meets guidelines for:

- Façade Zone
- Building Orientation
- Patterns & Rhythms
- Roof Lines
- Window & Door Openings
- Outdoor Living Space
- Materials
- Landscaping
- Parking Areas
- Sustainability (“best practices”)

He concluded his report by stating that staff recommends that the Design Review Board approve the case, with the condition **(condition #1)** that the proposed building and parking area are in general compliance with the site plans, elevations and architectural renderings.

Questions for staff:

Ms. McGuire asked if there was any documentation coming from the recent meeting between the project architects and the City Arborist. She also asked about scale compatibility and if there has been an analysis presented by the applicant or done by City staff.

Mr. Garcia said that the applicant met in person with the City Arborist, and that they can provide details of the meeting. He said a condition of the related Planned Unit Development case being considered is to create a tree preservation plan in consultation with the City Arborist.

He also stated that the only technical analysis that he did was to analyze the height-to-width ratios. He described how he performed the analysis, and stated that the proposal was either within the range of height-to-width ratios on each block, or very close to it.

Statement from the applicants, Josh Daly and Jacob Unzicker (Mode 3 Architecture):

Josh Daly made a statement describing the care that was taken to design the proposed development to be compatible with the Lincoln-Busey Corridor. He emphasized the uniqueness of the project, and the goal to preserve the mature trees on site. He also stated the features of existing buildings along Lincoln Avenue that they aimed to avoid.

Jacob Unzicker made a statement about the tree preservation meeting with City Arborist Kevin Sanderson. He presented a survey of the existing trees on the site, and the trees that would be preserved in the development. He also spoke about the sustainability features of the development – open space, bicycle parking, covered parking, preserving mature trees, etc. He explained the materials on the proposed buildings: engineered wood siding, asphalt shingles, pitched roofs, etc. and the mechanisms for preserving the trees on the site.

Questions for the applicant:

Ms. McGuire asked how the tree selection process worked and what criteria was used to determine which trees would be saved.

Mr. Daly explained how trees were chosen to be preserved. The largest tree on the southern half of the site will be preserved, with buildings on either side. The cluster of trees in the middle of the site will be built around, and the goal is to orient pedestrian traffic around trees, rather than have parking on top of the existing root systems. The trees along Lincoln Avenue create a difficulty because the sidewalk will be widened and moved further east, so they would need to be removed. He said they deliberately eliminated a driveway from their earlier plans on the south side of the site to preserve the trees. He said no street trees will be affected by the proposed development.

No other questions for the applicant.

Public Participation:

Jane Billman spoke in favor of the proposal. She said she had planned to ask the applicant why they chose the color of siding on the original plans [white]. She said that she likes the grey siding choice and feels that it matches the neighborhood better than their original choice. She also asked why they chose vertical siding.

Paul Debevec spoke neither in favor of or in opposition to the proposal. He requested that the considerations of the DRB be broadened. He mentioned the Comprehensive Plan and comments Mayor Marlin made about prioritizing combatting climate change. He stated that density does not always mean "more sustainable." He does not agree that the site is not ideal for solar panels, and said the roof area leaves a significant amount of area for panels. He also mentioned ground-source geothermal energy, which would be most feasible to install when the existing buildings are demolished. He stated that the proposal could be net-zero if the applicant wanted to do that. He mentioned Energy Star construction.

Christopher Hansen spoke in favor of the proposal. He stated that he has followed the project from the beginning. He mentioned sustainability efforts in Urbana, and the tradeoffs of different energy sources. He said that he was happy with the decision to widen the sidewalk and move it further east. He said that the design aesthetics are somewhat stale, but did not offer significant changes to the design. He spoke in favor of brick sidewalks. He stated that he appreciated that trees are being preserved, but during construction, the developers need to be aware of soil compaction and root damage.

Nathan Sonnenschein spoke in opposition to the proposal. He stated that the Lincoln-Busey Corridor encourages entrances as centralized focal points, which are not present here. He emphasized the importance of the globe style light posts along the north and south sides of the site. He also wants to see brick on the exterior rather than stone, to tie the new buildings in to the existing neighborhood.

There were no further comments from the public.

Mr. Rusch asked if a swap from stone to brick would fall under general conformance of the site plan. Mr. Garcia stated that materials are a design criteria of the corridor, and if something needs to be changed, it should be approved by the Design Review Board. If either material would be acceptable, then the motion could be “future-proofed” to allow for either material.

Mr. Garcia stated that he does not know a lot about geothermal technology, but if the applicant were interested in geothermal or solar energy, Scott Tess could be contacted (Sustainability - Public Works). He directed anyone watching the meeting to <https://www.growsolar.org/geothermal-urbana-champaign/> for more information.

He confirmed that the original proposed light fixtures had been removed from the plans, to follow up on Mr. Hansen’s earlier comment that it appeared that the lights had been removed.

Mr. Rusch asked if solar panels and/or geothermal energy sources could be added to the project/development without Design Review Board approval. Mr. Garcia stated that geothermal would likely not be a DRB issue, but solar panels may require DRB approval.

Mr. Schiess stated that round river stone isn’t as common in this area, where limestone or brick may be more appropriate as exterior materials. He also stated that there have been supply chain challenges during the pandemic, so it can be difficult to get materials that were originally planned once construction starts.

Ms. McGuire asked about energy conservation within the project, and the requests by City Council for the DRB to consider that specifically. Mr. Garcia stated that the general guidance he recalled was to “do more” regarding energy efficiency; however, he said the Design Review Board needs to consider all of the Lincoln-Busey Corridor design criteria during their decision. Ms. McGuire emphasized the importance of building performance with respect to design and the criteria. Mr. Garcia emphasized that the board consider the criteria that are laid out for the Lincoln-Busey Corridor.

Mr. Schiess asked about the existing structures on the site, and for confirmation that they are not on any local or national historic list. Mr. Garcia confirmed that none are historic properties.

Final statement from the applicants:

Jacob Unzicker stated that the colors were chosen based on what looked nice and followed similar color strategies in the neighborhood. He said the choice for vertical siding was to add interest to the facades and avoid monotony. He also stated that brick did not lend itself as well to the desired aesthetic, and that there is stone on other buildings in the neighborhood.

Mr. Rusch asked if solar panels could be ready to go whenever they are ready and acceptable for the building, and if electric vehicle charging stations could be ready for installation. Mr. Unzicker

said yes, there will be power connections available on the roof and in the parking lots. He also stated that they are still in the preliminary stages of planning for electrical and plumbing.

Mr. Schiess asked if the parking for the site has been maxed out, per requirements. Mr. Unzicker referred to sustainability and sustainable modes of transportation, i.e. walking, biking, transit. He stated that parking is also a concern of residents in the West Urbana Neighborhood, so the developers are providing the minimum amount of parking, per requirement. Vehicle parking is supplemented with bicycle parking, electric vehicle charging stations, permeable paving, covered/hidden parking spaces, etc.

Ms. McGuire asked about the permeable pavement for the parking lot. Mr. Unzicker said that a final decision hasn't been made, but it would be a porous concrete with underground drainage. Ms. McGuire asked about the stormwater detention, relative to the permeable pavement, and design performance. Mr. Daly said that a civil engineer will be designing the capacities specifically, but it will be calculated to balance pervious systems and retaining water.

Mr. Rusch closed the public hearing. Mr. Schiess moved for approval. Mr. Allred seconded.

Board Discussion:

Ms. McGuire stated that she appreciates the efforts by the architects to meet the design review board criteria. However, she said, there is still work to be done. She emphasized the importance of public input at this point. She said that the Lincoln-Busey guidelines are difficult to apply to a project of this size, and they were not written for Planned Unit Developments (multiple building projects). This site occupies 2/3 of the block (10 parcels), and a waiver has already been granted for the floor area ratio. She emphasized the importance of the Comprehensive Plan, sustainability, and solids and voids with respect to the area. She asked how the Lincoln-Busey Corridor guidelines could be adapted to Planned Unit Developments, developments with multiple buildings, etc. She mentioned issues with the Lincoln-Nevada development, and components of that project that should be avoided in other sites in the corridor. She also stated that engineered wood siding is not a high-quality material visually, and she would encourage a masonry approach or a wood product.

She also talked about the tree preservation on the site, and said that site analysis can be done to inventory the health and location of the trees where buildings can be developed around existing trees. She expressed concerns about the scale of the site and potential damage to the root systems. She said she does not think that deep analysis of the existing trees has been done to really prioritize tree preservation. She referenced existing street trees and the importance of preserving these, even if the sidewalk is widened/moved further east.

Ms. McGuire then talked about pavement and impervious surface area. She stated that the proposed project would increase impervious area by 24%. She stated that all of the pavement on the site could be permeable, and it could be coordinated with the tree roots. She stated that the stormwater collection/detention requires a significant amount of analysis and should be taken into account with design.

She discouraged the proposed stone, and stated that she wanted to see a smaller brick. She emphasized the importance of tree preservation, especially trees of high value. Finally, she wanted to see a permeable paver proposal that takes stormwater detention into account. She requested better documentation on all of the features mentioned.

Mr. Schiess agreed that tree preservation should be a priority, and the two trees in the parking lot island may be in danger of dying because of the pavement directly on top of them. He requested that the applicants have a plan for tree replacement for any trees that do not survive during/after construction. He also mentioned the entrances on Lincoln Avenue and the proposed outdoor seating area – he stated this was a weaker part of the proposal. He stated that he appreciates the design efforts of the architects, and this proposal largely meets the design criteria. He also addressed a comment from the public about density not changing on the site; however, in terms of energy efficiency, the new construction would be more energy efficient than the existing buildings. He encouraged the applicants to look for more sustainable features, with an emphasis on permeable pavement.

Mr. Rusch asked Mr. Schiess what he thought about the increase in impervious area, and what areas would be suitable for more permeable pavement. He stated that increasing the area of pervious pavement would help to reduce that percentage.

Ms. McGuire stated that promoting root growth requires a permeable paver system. Consider both qualitative and quantitative factors for tree preservation, root systems and permeable/impervious surfaces. She also mentioned tree replacement based on caliber/size, and that trees should be prioritized over bushes, shrubs, and small plantings.

Mr. Schiess proposed a condition to require the applicants to provide a tree replacement plan for any trees that die or are removed during or after construction. Mr. Rusch proposed a “condition that the applicant work with the City Arborist coordinate a plan for tree replacement, and to orient the parking lot in a way to preserve the existing mature trees...”

Ms. McGuire stated that this motion does not encompass all of her concerns, and that it would be more beneficial to have the applicants address the recommendations with revised site plans and design revisions.

Mr. Rusch stated that receiving approval for their preliminary design is integral in the sale of the properties, and requiring revised designs would set the sale of the properties back.

Mr. Garcia mentioned that the Planned Unit Development has not been approved or denied by the City Council. He emphasized that the Design Review Board needs to consider the design guidelines and criteria as a whole.

Mr. Allred asked if a tree preservation plan was included as a condition to the Planned Unit Development. Mr. Garcia said that a tree preservation plan was a recommendation from the Plan Commission to City Council in the related Planned Unit Development case.

Mr. Rusch asked if the motion prevents them from increasing the permeable pavement on site. Mr. Garcia stated no, it would not preclude the applicants from increasing permeable pavement.

Ms. McGuire stated that the current motion would not require them to install more permeable pavement. Mr. Rusch said he would like to see a condition that requires solar panels at a later point, and allowing for more flexibility in the future is beneficial to the board and the applicant. Ms. McGuire asked about an incentive to bring the proposal into more compliance with the criteria, and the importance of public input at this point in time. She would like the applicants to make revisions to the design, considering recommendations from the board and the public, rather than approving the existing proposal with conditions of approval. She also emphasized the importance of a response from DRB to the City Council. Mr. Rusch stated that the applicants have shown him what he needs to see, and applying conditions to the existing proposal could better meet the criteria in some areas. Ms. McGuire emphasized the importance of specific technical detail and design components of the parking lot, the tree preservation, etc.

Mr. Cho stated that the applicants have made a strong effort to adhere to the design guidelines, and the staff analysis states that it conforms to the criteria. He recommended that a motion is made to encourage more permeable pavement, brick exterior, etc. and the details can be hashed out at City Council.

Mr. Schiess agreed with Mr. Cho: the applicants have taken the staff recommendations and design guidelines into consideration, and a motion can be made to allow for slight changes to certain things. He also stated that the designs and plans at this time are par for the course, for this point in the design.

Ms. McGuire respectfully disagreed. She stated that the landscape and parking area need more design consideration. She wants to see the applicants devote a couple of weeks to looking at the components that have been brought up tonight.

Mr. Rusch brought up the proposed stone, and replacing with brick or another material. Mr. Schiess stated that brick or masonry would be more appropriate for the area.

Mr. Scheiss proposed motion for a new condition, seconded by Mr. Allred (**condition #2**): move to accept substitution of the stone masonry portion with another masonry material that is on the Urbana design guidelines approved materials list.

Ms. McGuire asked if engineered wood siding had been taken into consideration. Mr. Rusch said no, that could be considered separately.

That motion passed 5-0.

Mr. Rusch asked about other materials in place of the engineered wood siding. Mr. Schiess listed other types of siding on the approved materials list. Motion for a new condition (**condition #3**): accept as an alternate material to the engineered wood siding, natural wood lap siding or wood shake or shingles.

That motion passed 5-0.

Mr. Rusch proposed a condition (**condition #4**) to allow for the reduction of the area of the parking lot in any way to preserve trees, taking into consideration a reduction in parking spaces. Mr. Schiess said he is in support of that recommendation, as a means to protect the trees on site and reduce the amount of required vehicle parking.

Mr. Garcia stated that he liked the idea, and said the Design Review Board does not have authority over the parking requirement as a zoning issue. He stated that for the sake of tree preservation, it would allow for flexibility to allow for a parking reduction.

That motion was moved by Mr. Schiess, seconded by Mr. Allred.

That motion passed 5-0.

Ms. McGuire emphasized the concern over the amount of paving, and the type of paving. She encouraged an interlocking permeable pavement. She also suggested a parking swap, having residents park across the street at the alumni center. She recommended the permeable paver system as a condition.

She suggested a motion to require an interlocking permeable paver system, or a similar system over the entire parking lot, for the benefit of stormwater management and tree preservation, to maximize performance of those areas of the site. Ms. McGuire mentioned that this system would need to be designed for the site.

Mr. Schiess asked if this system is used anywhere in town, or in the City of Urbana. Mr. Garcia stated that he is unaware; however, he has heard the U of I Facilities and Services uses this technology extensively.

Mr. Cho asked if the motion would be “future-proofing”. Mr. Rusch stated that this would be a requirement, not an optional component. Ms. McGuire stated that this is a standard practice and good design product/system. Ms. McGuire clarified her motion, to move that the permeable pavement area is expanded to the non-covered parking area with interlocking permeable paver system for the benefit of stormwater and tree preservation. Mr. Schiess stated that it would be okay to call for this, and if it doesn’t make sense for cost reasons, then the applicants can re-approach the DRB for future consideration/approval.

Mr. Daly stated that he agrees that the interlocking pavers are better, but they need to consider challenges with the building foundations, so they are not in favor of that option. Ms. McGuire emphasized this as a reason for the applicants to revise their designs, permeable pavement, etc. Mr. Rusch reiterated that this is not precedent or a requirement by the Lincoln-Busey Corridor design guidelines. She stated that there is a lack of an interim stage to discuss design alternatives. She moved instead for a condition (**condition #5**): the proposed areas of permeable paving be permeable pavers instead.

Mr. Cho stated that the applicant should be able to increase permeability through whatever means are available. Mr. Garcia said he liked Mr. Cho's idea to word it in a way that the proposed permeable pavement become permeable pavers, and may be extended to other areas of the parking lot, to increase stormwater management and tree preservation.

Motion by Ms. McGuire, seconded by Mr. Cho.

That motion passed 5-0.

Mr. Rusch moved for a condition to allow solar panels to be installed on the rooftop. (**Condition #6**) (No phasing or time requirement on this condition.)

Mr. Allred asked if solar panels would be allowed by-right at this location. Mr. Garcia stated that they should be allowed in this district and on a residential building.

Motion by Mr. Schiess, seconded by Mr. Allred.

That motion passed 5-0.

Ms. McGuire raised a question about site safety at the consolidated entryway on the north side of the site. She emphasized the importance of safety features at the entry/exit. Mr. Garcia stated that he could consult with the engineers in Public Works before the case goes to City Council to see what options are available.

Ms. McGuire also suggested a condition that the applicants share what trees will be removed and why, and have a plan in place for tree replacement. She said that other recommended tree species would be white oaks, hornbeams, ginkgoes, etc. and that one-for-one replacement would not be sufficient in many cases. [i.e. if a mature tree is to be replaced, multiple young trees should be planted.]

Mr. Schiess asked if the planning for the PUD could incorporate tree requirements/replacement more easily than the Design Review Board conditions. Mr. Garcia stated that it would fit within the PUD criteria, but it could be included as a condition here as well. A final landscape plan has not been submitted to this point. Ms. McGuire would like to be involved in the tree planting/replacement process, and help in determining which trees will be removed and what they will be replaced with.

Ms. McGuire made a motion, seconded by Mr. Allred: Canopy trees shall be added to the landscape plan of a diversity of tree species, looking at the replacement value for trees being removed from the site, in coordination with the City Arborist. **(Condition #7)**

That motion passed 5-0.

Mr. Rusch called the question: approval with seven conditions: one condition proposed by staff in the original packet, and six conditions proposed by the Design Review Board members.

The motion for approval passed 5-0.

Annual Review of Bylaws

Mr. Kunkel resumed his role as Chair. He summarized the proposed changes to the bylaws: replace gender-specific pronouns with gender-neutral pronouns, and allow for remote attendance when a physical quorum is already present, under three circumstances.

Ms. McGuire asked if a Board member would be able to participate in remote attendance if they were on vacation or out of town. Mr. Kunkel stated that being on vacation is not one of the exceptions for remote attendance. Mr. Garcia stated that these were written to reflect the Illinois State Statute, and it makes sense to follow them at the local level.

Mr. Rusch moved to approve the bylaws as presented. Mr. Allred seconded.

The motion passed 6-0.

Staff Report:

Mr. Garcia welcomed Mr. Scheiss and Mr. Allred to the Design Review Board.

Meeting adjourned at 11:12 p.m.

ORDINANCE NO. 2020-12-070

**AN ORDINANCE APPROVING A PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR A
PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT**

**(602-602 South Lincoln Avenue, 805-809 West California Avenue, and 806-810 West Oregon
Avenue / Plan Case No. 2411-PUD-20)**

WHEREAS, the City of Urbana (“City”) is a home rule unit of local government pursuant to Article VII, Section 6, of the Illinois Constitution, 1970, and may exercise any power and perform any function pertaining to its government and affairs, and the passage of this Ordinance constitutes an exercise of the City’s home rule powers and functions as granted in the Illinois Constitution, 1970; and

WHEREAS, Mode 3 Architecture, on behalf of CCH Development, LLC and CMH Properties, LLC, has applied for a residential planned unit development (PUD) for property known as 602 and 604 South Lincoln Avenue, 805, 807 and 809 West California Avenue, and 804, 806, 808, 808 ½ and 810 West Oregon Avenue in the R-4, Medium Density Multiple-Family Residential and R-7, University Residential Zoning Districts; and

WHEREAS, Section XIII-3 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance requires the submission and approval of a preliminary and a final development plan for planned unit developments, and that all requested waivers from development standards be expressly written; and

WHEREAS, the applicant has submitted a preliminary and a final development plan with requested waivers to increase the floor area ratio from 0.50 to 0.76 for the PUD; and

WHEREAS, after due publication, the Urbana Plan Commission held a public hearing on such petition at 7:00 p.m. on November 24, 2020, in Plan Case No. 2411-PUD-20; and

WHEREAS, the Plan Commission voted seven (7) ayes and zero (0) nays to forward the cases to the Urbana City Council with a recommendation to approve the requested preliminary and final Planned Unit Developments; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that the requested preliminary and final development plans are consistent with Section XIII-3 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance, Planned Unit Developments, and with the definitions and goals of this Section of the Ordinance.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Urbana, Illinois, as follows:

Section 1.

A final development plan for the PUD, as attached hereto in Ordinance Attachment A, is hereby approved for property known as 602 and 604 South Lincoln Avenue, 805, 807 and 809 West California Avenue, and 804, 806, 808, 808 ½ and 810 West Oregon Avenue with the following conditions:

1. That construction be in general conformance with the attached Site Plan and elevations, subject to minor modifications that may be required by the Design Review Board; and
2. That the sidewalk along Lincoln Avenue be reconstructed further to the east on the applicant's property and at their expense, and that the applicant provides an access easement to allow the sidewalks use by the public.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

The West 55 feet and 7 inches of Lot 31 of Campbell and Kelley's Addition to Urbana, as per Plat recorded October 6, 1858 in Deed Record "O", at Page 392, situated in Champaign County, Illinois.

P.I.N. 92-21-17-152-004, Address: 805 West California

The East 50 feet 7 inches of Lot 34, and the East 50 feet 7 inches of the North 29 feet 8 inches of Lot 35 all in Campbell and Kelley's Addition to Urbana, Illinois, as per Plat recorded in Deed Book "O" at Page 392, in Champaign County, Illinois.

P.I.N. 92-21-17-152-003, Address: 807 West California

The East 45 feet of the West 135 feet of the North 23 feet 8 inches of Lot 35 in Campbell and Kelly's Addition to Urbana, Illinois, as per Plat recorded in Deed Book "O" at Page 392, situated in Champaign County, Illinois.

P.I.N. 92-21-17-152-002, Address: 809 W California

The North 53 feet of the West 90 feet of Lot 34 in Campbell and Kelly's Addition to Urbana, Illinois, as per Plat recorded in Deed Book "O" at Page 392, situated in Champaign County, Illinois.

P.I.N. 92-21-17-152-001, Address: 602 South Lincoln

The West 90 feet of the South 26 feet 4 inches of Lot 34; the West 90 feet of the North 23 feet 8 inches of Lot 35; The East 45 feet of the West 135 feet of Lot 34; in Campbell and Kelly's Addition to Urbana, Illinois ad per Plat recorded in Deed Bok "O" at page 392, situated in Champaign County, Illinois.
P.I.N. 92-21-17-152-006, Address: 604 South Lincoln

The West 53 feet and 6 inches of Lot 33 and the West 53 feet and 6 inches of the South ½ of Lot 32, and also the East 1 foot and 6 inches of Lot 36 and the East 1 foot and 6 inches of South ½ of Lot 35 in Campbell and Kelly's Addition to Urbana, as per plat recorded in Deed Record "O" at page 392, in Champaign County, Illinois.
P.I.N. 92-21-17-152-011, Address: 804 West Oregon.

All of the East 50 feet 7 inches of Lots 35 and 36 of Campbell and Kelly's Addition to Urbana, as per Deed Record "O" at page 392, except the North 29 feet 8 inches thereof, and also excepting the East 1 foot 6 inches of the South 119 feet thereof, situated in Champaign County, Illinois. And also excepting the East 1 foot, 6 inches of the South 119 feet thereof, including easement for driveway, situated in Champaign County, Illinois.
P.I.N. 92-21-17-152-010, Address: 806 West Oregon

The East 60 feet of the West 135 feet of Lot 36 in Campbell and Kelley's Addition to Urbana, as per Plat recorded in Deed Book "O" at Page 392, in Champaign County, Illinois, EXCEPT as to the rights of the adjoining property owners in the East 4 feet of said described property for driveway purposes as described in Agreement dated June 27, 1921 and recorded in Book 186 at Page 456 as Document Number 168993.
P.I.N. 92-21-17-152-009, Address: 808 West Oregon

The East 60 feet of the West 135 feet of the South 55 feet, 7 inches of Lot 35 in Campbell and Kelley's Addition to Urbana, as per Plat recorded in Deed Book "O" at Page 392, in Champaign County, Illinois, EXCEPT as to the rights of the adjoining property owners in the East 4 feet of said described property for driveway purposes as described in Agreement dated June 27, 1921 and recorded in Book 186 at Page 456 as Document Number 168993.
P.I.N. 92-21-17-152-008, Address: 808 ½ West Oregon

The south 135 feet of the West 75 feet of Lots 35 and 36 of Campbell and Kelly's Addition to Urbana, situated in the city of Urbana, County of Champaign, Illinois.
P.I.N. 92-21-17-152-007, Address: 810 West Oregon

Section 2.

Upon approval of this Ordinance, the City Clerk is directed to record a certified copy of this Ordinance with the Champaign County Office of Recorder of Deeds. The City Clerk is directed to publish this Ordinance in pamphlet form by authority of the corporate authorities, and this Ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage and publication in accordance with Section 1-2-4 of the

Illinois Municipal Code.

This Ordinance is hereby passed by the affirmative vote, the “ayes” and “nays” being called, of a majority of the members of the Council of the City of Urbana, Illinois, at a meeting of said Council.

PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL this ____ day of _____, 2020.

AYES:

NAYS:

ABSTENTIONS:

Phyllis D. Clark, City Clerk

APPROVED BY THE MAYOR this ____ day of _____, 2020.

Diane Wolfe Marlin, Mayor

CERTIFICATE OF PUBLICATION IN PAMPHLET FORM

I, Phyllis D. Clark, certify that I am the duly appointed and acting Municipal Clerk of the City of Urbana, Champaign County, Illinois. I certify that on the _____ day of _____, 2020, the corporate authorities of the City of Urbana passed and approved Ordinance No. _____, entitled “An Ordinance Approving a Preliminary Development Plan for a Planned Unit Development (602-602 South Lincoln Avenue, 805-809 West California Avenue, and 806-810 West Oregon Avenue / Plan Case No. 2411-PUD-20)” which provided by its terms that it should be published in pamphlet form. The pamphlet form of Ordinance No. _____ was prepared, and a copy of such Ordinance was posted in the Urbana City Building commencing on the _____ day of _____, 2020, and continuing for at least ten (10) days thereafter. Copies of such Ordinance were also available for public inspection upon request at the Office of the City Clerk.

DATED at Urbana, Illinois, this _____ day of _____, 2020.

ORDINANCE NO. 2020-12-071

AN ORDINANCE APPROVING A FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT

(602-602 South Lincoln Avenue, 805-809 West California Avenue, and 806-810 West Oregon Avenue / Plan Case No. 2412-PUD-20)

WHEREAS, the City of Urbana (“City”) is a home rule unit of local government pursuant to Article VII, Section 6, of the Illinois Constitution, 1970, and may exercise any power and perform any function pertaining to its government and affairs, and the passage of this Ordinance constitutes an exercise of the City’s home rule powers and functions as granted in the Illinois Constitution, 1970; and

WHEREAS, Mode 3 Architecture, on behalf of CCH Development, LLC and CMH Properties, LLC, has applied for a residential planned unit development (PUD) for property known as 602 and 604 South Lincoln Avenue, 805, 807 and 809 West California Avenue, and 804, 806, 808, 808 ½ and 810 West Oregon Avenue in the R-4, Medium Density Multiple-Family Residential and R-7, University Residential Zoning Districts; and

WHEREAS, Section XIII-3 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance requires the submission and approval of a preliminary and a final development plan for planned unit developments, and that all requested waivers from development standards be expressly written; and

WHEREAS, the applicant has submitted a preliminary and a final development plan with requested waivers to increase the floor area ratio from 0.50 to 0.76 for the PUD; and

WHEREAS, after due publication, the Urbana Plan Commission held a public hearing on such petition at 7:00 p.m. on November 24, 2020, in Plan Case No. 2411-PUD-20; and

WHEREAS, the Plan Commission voted seven (7) ayes and zero (0) nays to forward the cases to the Urbana City Council with a recommendation to approve the requested preliminary and final Planned Unit Developments; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that the requested preliminary and final development plans are consistent with Section XIII-3 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance, Planned Unit Developments, and with the definitions and goals of this Section of the Ordinance.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Urbana, Illinois, as follows:

Section 1.

A final development plan for the PUD, as attached hereto in Ordinance Attachment A, is hereby approved for property known as 602 and 604 South Lincoln Avenue, 805, 807 and 809 West California Avenue, and 804, 806, 808, 808 ½ and 810 West Oregon Avenue with the following conditions:

1. That construction be in general conformance with the attached Site Plan and elevations, subject to minor modifications that may be required by the Design Review Board; and
2. That the sidewalk along Lincoln Avenue be reconstructed further to the east on the applicant's property and at their expense, and that the applicant provides an access easement to allow the sidewalks use by the public.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

The West 55 feet and 7 inches of Lot 31 of Campbell and Kelley's Addition to Urbana, as per Plat recorded October 6, 1858 in Deed Record "O", at Page 392, situated in Champaign County, Illinois.

P.I.N. 92-21-17-152-004, Address: 805 West California

The East 50 feet 7 inches of Lot 34, and the East 50 feet 7 inches of the North 29 feet 8 inches of Lot 35 all in Campbell and Kelley's Addition to Urbana, Illinois, as per Plat recorded in Deed Book "O" at Page 392, in Champaign County, Illinois.

P.I.N. 92-21-17-152-003, Address: 807 West California

The East 45 feet of the West 135 feet of the North 23 feet 8 inches of Lot 35 in Campbell and Kelly's Addition to Urbana, Illinois, as per Plat recorded in Deed Book "O" at Page 392, situated in Champaign County, Illinois.

P.I.N. 92-21-17-152-002, Address: 809 W California

The North 53 feet of the West 90 feet of Lot 34 in Campbell and Kelly's Addition to Urbana, Illinois, as per Plat recorded in Deed Book "O" at Page 392, situated in Champaign County, Illinois.

P.I.N. 92-21-17-152-001, Address: 602 South Lincoln

The West 90 feet of the South 26 feet 4 inches of Lot 34; the West 90 feet of the North 23 feet 8 inches of Lot 35; The East 45 feet of the West 135 feet of Lot 34; in Campbell and Kelly's Addition to Urbana, Illinois ad per Plat recorded in Deed Bok "O" at page 392, situated in Champaign County, Illinois.

P.I.N. 92-21-17-152-006, Address: 604 South Lincoln

The West 53 feet and 6 inches of Lot 33 and the West 53 feet and 6 inches of the South ½ of Lot 32, and also the East 1 foot and 6 inches of Lot 36 and the East 1 foot and 6 inches of South ½ of Lot 35 in Campbell and Kelly's Addition to Urbana, as per plat recorded in Deed Record "O" at page 392, in Champaign County, Illinois.

P.I.N. 92-21-17-152-011, Address: 804 West Oregon.

All of the East 50 feet 7 inches of Lots 35 and 36 of Campbell and Kelly's Addition to Urbana, as per Deed Record "O" at page 392, except the North 29 feet 8 inches thereof, and also excepting the East 1 foot 6 inches of the South 119 feet thereof, situated in Champaign County, Illinois. And also excepting the East 1 foot, 6 inches of the South 119 feet thereof, including easement for driveway, situated in Champaign County, Illinois.

P.I.N. 92-21-17-152-010, Address: 806 West Oregon

The East 60 feet of the West 135 feet of Lot 36 in Campbell and Kelley's Addition to Urbana, as per Plat recorded in Deed Book "O" at Page 392, in Champaign County, Illinois, EXCEPT as to the rights of the adjoining property owners in the East 4 feet of said described property for driveway purposes as described in Agreement dated June 27, 1921 and recorded in Book 186 at Page 456 as Document Number 168993.

P.I.N. 92-21-17-152-009, Address: 808 West Oregon

The East 60 feet of the West 135 feet of the South 55 feet, 7 inches of Lot 35 in Campbell and Kelley's Addition to Urbana, as per Plat recorded in Deed Book "O" at Page 392, in Champaign County, Illinois, EXCEPT as to the rights of the adjoining property owners in the East 4 feet of said described property for driveway purposes as described in Agreement dated June 27, 1921 and recorded in Book 186 at Page 456 as Document Number 168993.

P.I.N. 92-21-17-152-008, Address: 808 ½ West Oregon

The south 135 feet of the West 75 feet of Lots 35 and 36 of Campbell and Kelly's Addition to Urbana, situated in the city of Urbana, County of Champaign, Illinois.

P.I.N. 92-21-17-152-007, Address: 810 West Oregon

Section 2.

Upon approval of this Ordinance, the City Clerk is directed to record a certified copy of this Ordinance with the Champaign County Office of Recorder of Deeds. The City Clerk is directed to publish this Ordinance in pamphlet form by authority of the corporate authorities, and this Ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage and publication in accordance with Section 1-2-4 of the

Illinois Municipal Code.

This Ordinance is hereby passed by the affirmative vote, the “ayes” and “nays” being called, of a majority of the members of the Council of the City of Urbana, Illinois, at a meeting of said Council.

PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL this ____ day of _____, 2020.

AYES:

NAYS:

ABSTENTIONS:

Phyllis D. Clark, City Clerk

APPROVED BY THE MAYOR this ____ day of _____, 2020.

Diane Wolfe Marlin, Mayor

CERTIFICATE OF PUBLICATION IN PAMPHLET FORM

I, Phyllis D. Clark, certify that I am the duly appointed and acting Municipal Clerk of the City of Urbana, Champaign County, Illinois. I certify that on the _____ day of _____, 2020, the corporate authorities of the City of Urbana passed and approved Ordinance No. _____, entitled “An Ordinance Approving a Final Development Plan for a Planned Unit Development (602-602 South Lincoln Avenue, 805-809 West California Avenue, and 806-810 West Oregon Avenue / Plan Case No. 2412-PUD-20)” which provided by its terms that it should be published in pamphlet form. The pamphlet form of Ordinance No. _____ was prepared, and a copy of such Ordinance was posted in the Urbana City Building commencing on the _____ day of _____, 2020, and continuing for at least ten (10) days thereafter. Copies of such Ordinance were also available for public inspection upon request at the Office of the City Clerk.

DATED at Urbana, Illinois, this _____ day of _____, 2020.