

## MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING

### URBANA PLAN COMMISSION

### APPROVED

**DATE:** June 8, 2017

**TIME:** 7:30 P.M.

**PLACE:** Urbana City Building  
Council Chambers  
400 South Vine Street  
Urbana, IL 61801

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Barry Ackerson, Jane Billman, Andrew Fell, Tyler Fitch, Chris Stohr, David Trail, Daniel Turner

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Lew Hopkins

**STAFF PRESENT:** Lorrie Pearson, Planning Manager; Liila Bagby, CD Associate; Kevin Garcia, Planner II, Marcus Ricci, Planner II; Teri Andel, Administrative Assistant II

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Etenesh Callaway, Melvin Cheek, Jeff Headtke, Molly Headtke, Barbara Kessel, Chad Knutson, Jill Knutson, Theresa Michelson, Vera Waisvisz, Kathy Wallig

---

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL AND DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Chair Fitch called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. Roll call was taken and a quorum was declared present.

#### 2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

There were none.

#### 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the March 9, 2017 regular meeting were presented for approval. Mr. Trail moved to approve the minutes as presented. Mr. Turner seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote as written.

#### 4. COMMUNICATIONS

- 2017 Multi-Family Campus-Area Residential Parking Survey

## 5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

## 6. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

## 7. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

**Plan Case No. 2302-T-17 – A request by the Urbana Zoning Administrator to amend Article XIII of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance to establish the Southeast Urbana Overlay District and special procedures for multiple-family dwellings to promote neighborhood safety and quality of life in the area generally bounded by Colorado Avenue to the north; Philo Road to the east; East Harding Drive and East Mumford Drive to the south AND Fletcher Street, Bruce Drive and Anderson Street to the west.**

Chair Fitch opened this item on the agenda. Lorrie Pearson, Planning Manager, introduced Liila Bagby, Community Development Associate, and stated that Ms. Bagby would be presenting the staff report for this case. Ms. Bagby began her report by stating the purpose of the proposed text amendment and noting the location of the proposed Southeast Urbana Overlay District. She talked about the Silver/Vawter Area Safety: Planning Solutions study by Maximillian Mahalek that was previously performed on the subject area. She discussed the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles which are Natural Surveillance, Maintenance, Territoriality and Accessibility. She mentioned what other cities such as Sarasota, Florida have done. She talked about the outreach the City performed to gather public input about ways to make improvements in the area. She reviewed the proposed regulations, location, procedures, exemptions, criteria, and guidelines for construction for the proposed overlay district. She talked about how the goals and objectives of the 2005 Comprehensive Plan support the proposed Southeast Urbana Overlay District. She read the options of the Plan Commission and presented City staff's recommendation for approval.

Mr. Fell questioned if the proposed overlay district had been stretched to meet the zoning district and if some properties had been left out because they were not zoned the same. Ms. Pearson replied that the study showed that crime generally occurred in or around multi-family buildings. Multi-family buildings would only be allowed in higher residential zoning districts of R-4 and up or in the B-3, General Business Zoning District. So, it made sense to limit the overlay district to where the multi-family structures could be constructed.

Mr. Fell commented that he saw potential for some of the R-3 properties to be rezoned to R-4. He asked what the implications would be for this. Ms. Pearson said that if any R-3 properties are likely to be rezoned, then City staff would look at whether they should be included in the overlay district. Mr. Fell wondered if it would be appropriate to add language to say that any contiguous properties that are rezoned to R-4 or higher would automatically be added to the overlay district. Ms. Pearson said that she would caution against adding that language only because the legal notice for this public hearing did not list any additional areas. So, the Plan Commission was bound to the proposed area or smaller. If the Plan Commission felt this should be added, the City staff could propose additional language in a future text amendment.

Ms. Billman inquired if crime would move somewhere else in the City. Has the concept of reducing crimes of opportunity been proven to be accurate? Chair Fitch noted that the staff report states crime calls in Wichita Falls, Texas dropped 85% and in Riverside, California and Sarasota, Florida there were significant less calls. Ms. Bagby added that there was no statistics on whether crime moved to another area of the cities in those locations.

Ms. Billman questioned if there were any plans for new construction in the proposed overlay area. Ms. Pearson responded that City staff had reached out to property owners and managers and was not aware of any plans for redevelopment at this time. However, if a neighborhood is stable and has a high quality of life, there might be an interest in reinvestment in the properties that there might not be otherwise.

Mr. Turner asked if any properties north of Colorado Avenue were considered to be included in the district, such as Sunnycrest Manor. Ms. Pearson said no and explained that this area was not part of the original study. She mentioned that there were neighbors in the audience. The Plan Commission could take comments from the neighbors and possibly expand the district in the future if need be.

Mr. Trail asked if the study was documented and available. Ms. Pearson replied that the Executive Summary is available on the City's website.

Mr. Trail inquired as to how many of the multi-family buildings on the subject properties violate the proposed guidelines. Ms. Pearson explained that the proposed guidelines were not a checklist. They were to be used when reviewing a special use permit application in the proposed overlay district to determine if the overall project meets the intent of those guidelines. A redevelopment project would not necessarily be required to meet all of the guidelines. City staff did not perform an analysis on if buildings meet all of the proposed criteria. The idea was to catch buildings at the point of major reinvestment. Mr. Trail commented that City staff then has no idea of whether other multi-family buildings violate the guidelines outside of the proposed district. Ms. Pearson said no.

Mr. Trail asked if any of the proposed guidelines were ones that City staff would not apply elsewhere. Ms. Pearson replied that City staff was not suggesting that the proposed guidelines be applied City wide in the proposed text amendment. Mr. Trail questioned if the proposed guidelines would not be good for other multi-family buildings elsewhere in the City. Ms. Pearson answered that she would not say that. The proposed text amendment was only for the proposed area as a result of the study and the concerns expressed by the neighbors.

Mr. Trail questioned why City staff was explicitly excluding commercial areas. He commented that some of the proposed guidelines could apply to commercial areas as well that are contained within the overlay district. Ms. Pearson stated that they were not excluding the commercial areas. Mr. Trail commented that commercial areas were explicitly excluded from the application of the guidelines by the overlay district. Ms. Pearson explained that buildings which are primarily commercial were being suggested to be exempted from the guidelines. However, if a property owner wanted to build multi-family housing on a commercial lot, then the text amendment suggests that they would be required to get approval of a special use permit. The reason for this was because the study showed that most of the crime issues occurred in or around multi-family

residential buildings. The text amendment focuses on where the study documented crime instances.

Mr. Trail inquired as to how many of the crimes could be tied to the physical characteristics of the multi-family building as opposed to the management style of the landlords. Ms. Pearson replied that any crime needs to be looked at from multiple facets, and the facet that the Zoning Ordinance could control is the design of buildings and site. As a result, Planning staff was recommending approval of the proposed text amendment. Our Building Safety Division would tackle the maintenance of a building, and Public Works staff would tackle the site maintenance.

Mr. Trail asked if the study documented anything about the particular crimes in the proposed area and whether any of the crimes were related to the issues being addressed by the proposed guidelines. There may be a higher crime rate in the area but did it have anything to do with the building designs or layouts. Ms. Pearson responded that the study did not detail the crimes in each building in the area. However, the study did mention buildings where the crimes occurred do have recessed entrances hidden by vegetation. Mr. Trail asked if there were buildings elsewhere in the City with recessed entrances hidden by vegetation. Ms. Pearson said yes, there are other buildings with recessed entrances. Mr. Trail commented that he was trying to understand how the overlay district proposals would address the crime issues in the subject area. Ms. Pearson explained that the proposed guidelines and overlay district would help prevent crimes of opportunity. Mr. Trail asked if that was what most of the crimes that had occurred were. Ms. Pearson responded that she was not an expert in crime.

Mr. Fell asked for clarification in that no existing building would be required to make changes unless the owner would apply for a building permit, correct? Ms. Pearson said that was correct if they apply for a building permit for a major addition or renovation.

Mr. Fell noticed that one of the guidelines contradicts the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance with regards to parking lot screening. Ms. Pearson believed that there was some flexibility in the Zoning Ordinance but that Planning staff would double check because they do not want to have conflicts.

Mr. Fell questioned if the design guidelines were simply suggestions or if there were any rules that must be met. Ms. Pearson answered that the Plan Commission and the City Council would determine if a project as a whole met the intent of the proposed guidelines.

Mr. Turner wondered if there would be potential to look at having guidelines for other areas as well. Ms. Pearson replied that there was always that potential. There has been interest in doing assessments in other neighborhoods. It was good to start in one area and figure out the right approach. If it is successful, then perhaps the City can suggest it for other areas as well.

Mr. Fell questioned that if the proposed design guidelines were good or the proposed neighborhood, then why not blanketly apply it everywhere. Ms. Pearson said that sometimes it was good to start in a small area and test it out to see what was good and what could be improved upon before applying it City-wide. The City did not want to hold up development in areas where they certainly needed development. She was not sure if there was a desire to make the proposed guidelines a requirement throughout the City.

Mr. Stohr inquired about the feedback they received from the property managers of the multi-family buildings in the proposed area. Ms. Pearson explained that at the first meeting, the topic was generally mentioned. She did not recall there being any feedback at that point. At the meeting in May, City staff presented more details about the proposed text amendment. They did not get a lot of feedback; mostly the property managers wanted to know how the text amendment would impact them.

Mr. Ackerson understood the approach fairly well. It has been done in a number of places. It did not displace crime. This was a fairly common approach to reduce opportunities for crime. The proposed text amendment only focuses on a small area and it would only affect property owners who might reinvest in their property. He wondered what the response was from the people who would be impacted by the proposed text amendment. Ms. Bagby commented that overall, the response from the property managers had been positive. Ms. Pearson added that they mostly were asked questions, and not so much given opinions.

Chair Fitch asked if the commercial properties were included in the proposed district because multi-family residential buildings might be constructed there someday. Ms. Pearson said yes. They would be required to get approval of a special use permit though. Mr. Fitch added that if they were not included, then the proposed properties in the district would not be contiguous.

Chair Fitch wondered why the R-3 zoned properties on the south end of the proposed district along Mumford Drive were not included in the proposal. Ms. Pearson explained that multi-family buildings were not allowed in the R-3 Zoning District; therefore, it did not make sense to include them.

Chair Fitch questioned why require a special use permit instead of having the Design Review Board review future redevelopment plans for the proposed district. There are two other review districts in Urbana that go through the Design Review Board. Ms. Pearson stated that the Design Review Board was designed to look at the mass, scale and architectural features of a building. City staff would not want the Board to focus on these things as much as the CPTED principles and the guidelines for construction. The Plan Commission is a higher bar and requires approval by the City Council. She felt there was interest from the neighbors to really have the higher bar.

Mr. Fitch asked what the definition was for “*multi-family*”. Ms. Pearson noted that it was in the Zoning Ordinance under “*Dwelling, Multiple-Family Residential*”. The Zoning Ordinance goes on to define the use; however, it doesn’t define what zoning classifications it is associated with. The Zoning Map puts “*multiple-family*” in the title of those districts where multiple family residential would be allowed.

Mr. Fitch questioned what criteria would be mandatory. It appeared to him that the only one to be mandatory was the Landscape Plan. Ms. Pearson said that was correct, and it was typical to require a Landscape Plan for a building permit. She noted that if the Plan Commission felt that any of the others should be stated differently, then they could change it. The intent is to make sure a redevelopment project would be evaluated and not just have a checklist of things.

Mr. Turner asked if there was any research on if a special overlay district discouraged improvements in structures that currently exist. Ms. Pearson answered no. This was why they

selected the trigger points of new construction or significant renovation or addition. The cost of these would be significant and would involve a major gut, not just paint or minor improvement.

Mr. Fell commented that in the process of applying for a special use permit generally speaking, the development plans are not as detailed as an application before the Design Review Board. As the Plan Commission, they would not be privy to as much detail. Ms. Pearson responded saying that there are some special use permit projects that require some level of architectural detail so Planning staff could get a level of detail that would allow the Plan Commission and the City Council to evaluate whether or not a project would meet the criteria at the special use permit stage. A special use permit by definition is site specific. It is also use specific, and if a vacant property was proposed to be developed for a specific use, the Plan Commission and City Council will want to know what the building would look like, so the applicant would be required to provide more detail than if an existing building was already on the property.

With no further questions for City staff, Chair Fitch opened the hearing for public input. He reviewed the procedures for a public hearing.

Kathy Wallig approached the Plan Commission to speak in favor of the proposed text amendment. She noted that she is a member of the Southeast Urbana Neighborhood Association (SUNA) steering committee. She gave a brief history of Urbana and the University of Illinois. The first chancellor of the U of I was Jack Peltason, who was hired in 1967. He and his family lived on Bruce Drive.

Now look at Bruce Drive today. The Silver/Vawter area was a textbook example of City planning gone wrong. The multiple decisions creating what the area is like now have occurred over the last forty years. Due to less than desirable landlords and little attention paid to multiple family housing by various controlling boards, we now have high crime rates, multiple victims, property neglect, unsanitary living conditions, little accountability until a few years ago, a prevailing attitude of fear, and plummeting property values. The conditions having been improving somewhat lately, but it has taken the raised voices of many residents adjacent to or in the immediate area to get the attention of the City. While we cannot go back and undue the many decisions for high density housing that have occurred since 1967, but we can start to make things right with the proposed overlay district. The residents understand that change will not happen overnight, but the proposed text amendment could make it more difficult for multi-family property owners. She implored the Plan Commission to approve the proposed text amendment.

Mr. Stohr asked how Ms. Wallig thought the proposed guidelines would improve the area. Ms. Wallig stated that she was perplexed by Mr. Trail's questions for City staff. Many crimes were crimes of opportunity by people who think they are not being seen. When you decrease vegetation, increase lighting and remove other barriers and obstructions to view, then you decrease the crimes of opportunity.

It makes sense to start making improvements with a small area, tweak the system as it moves along and continue to spread through the City. We need to start making improvements though.

Molly Headtke approached the Plan Commission to speak. While no crime has occurred at her home, she and her family live very close to the subject area where crime does occur. She felt that the proposed text amendment was a great opportunity for the City to start to do something rather

than do nothing. All kinds of crime were happening in the subject area. She encouraged the Plan Commission to approve the proposed text amendment.

Mr. Ackerson asked if she knew how any of her neighbors felt about the proposed text amendment. Ms. Headtke said that she hadn't talked with any of her neighbors.

Mr. Stohr asked if she had attended the previous SUNA meeting. Ms. Headtke replied no. Theresa Michelson approached the Plan Commission to speak in favor of the proposed text amendment. She mentioned that she was one of the coordinators for SUNA. She stated that Max Mahalek had done an incredible job by doing a lot of research, meeting with SUNA, performing surveys in the neighborhood, and had a meeting with the neighborhood to show the results and present his survey.

She stated that the Silver/Colorado/Vawter/Harding area had experienced problems with public safety particularly with disinterested apartment landlords for a number of years. 82% of the 272 study's survey respondents stated that they were in favor of the types of changes in the proposed text amendment and felt it would improve public safety. The proposed text amendment may not make one bit of difference if no construction or renovations occur in the subject area. However, there are three vacant multi-family buildings and if by chance they should be put up for sale, then a new owner would have to make renovations and would be an opportunity for the proposed overlay district regulations to make improvements and increase the quality of life in the neighborhood.

Mr. Ackerson asked how many people in SUNA believe this would be a good thing to do. Ms. Michelson commented that a large number of people who would be affected are apartment dwellers. She hadn't really talked with many of them. Property values have diminished due to the high crime rate. What would be their objection to the proposed text amendment? When Mr. Mahalek surveyed the neighborhood and presented his survey results to SUNA, 82% of the respondents agreed that the proposed overlay district would improve safety in the area.

Melvin Cheek approached the Plan Commission to speak. He mentioned that he owns one unit in a multi-family dwelling. He did not believe that the proposed text amendment would make too much difference for his property because there was no room to grow and there were no plans to renovate. He expressed concern about hearing that the area had the second highest crime rate in the City of Urbana. As for the proposed overlay district, he had no objection. It makes sense to him.

With no additional input from members of the audience, Chair Fitch closed the public input portion of the hearing. He opened the hearing for Plan Commission discussion and/or motion(s).

Mr. Ackerson mentioned that he has worked to help decrease crime on the U of I campus. The principles and guidelines mentioned in the proposed overlay district were accepted as common things that can be done to decrease crimes of opportunity. There is a balloon effect in that if the City puts pressure on one area to clean up crime, then crime can move elsewhere, which was why most cities like to address crime City-wide. Therefore, he was concerned about the proposed text amendment only affecting a small area of town. The proposed text amendment in and by itself won't do much; however it is a push into the future. It is a beginning to doing something.

Mr. Fell questioned whether they should put some kind of periodic enforcement review in the proposed text amendment. For example with landscaping, when bushes are planted they are small, but in 15 years they can grow to be tall if uncontrolled. Ms. Pearson replied that this would also be a good reason to make it a special use permit because they would need to continue to comply with the conditions of the special use permit. Mr. Fell asked what the penalty would be if they did not comply. Ms. Pearson answered that the Zoning Ordinance has provisions for enforcement and the City could fine the property owner per shrub per day, for example.

Mr. Fell wondered if the Planning staff had a tool for remembering there is an overlay district next to a contiguous property should the property owner want to rezone it. Ms. Pearson responded that overlay districts are shown clearly on the Zoning Map.

Mr. Fell asked if a contiguous property was rezoned to multi-family residential, would staff insist on the property becoming part of the proposed overlay district. Ms. Pearson said that there would be discussion amongst City staff and the property owner about this.

Mr. Fell stated that as an architect he submits applications for special use permits and creates detailed plans for property owners. To him, there was nothing in the proposed text amendment that was not part of a good design. It was not in the best interest of anyone to not adopt it. In addition, it would not cost his client any extra money to do the things that are being asked in the proposed text amendment.

Mr. Trail expressed concern that we always over regulates pockets of poverty. Why do we need a special overlay district? Why not apply the proposed guidelines throughout the City? The proposed overlay district would do nothing to regulate right now today. He did not see how the proposed text amendment would be a way to help crime. In fact, he believed it might discourage marginal investment. People who may buy the multi-family buildings in the future won't want to make improvements for fear of triggering the proposed text amendment in the Zoning Ordinance. The special overlay in a special area and the exclusion of commercial properties near it – how much of the issue here is the condition, structure and zoning of the commercial area that discourages pedestrians to any of the businesses. All the commercial areas along Philo Road discourage pedestrians. While the proposed text amendment may sound great, if you sell it as an anti-crime thing and apply it only to a specific area, then it is kind of selective. Why not make a blanket change to all multi-family zoned areas? Why only limit it to the proposed area where it won't have an immediate impact?

Mr. Fell stated that he understood Mr. Trail's point; however, he disagreed with it. Part of the Plan Commission's job is to react to situations that happen in the community. Why do we have a Zoning Ordinance? It is because we want to regulate what happens in certain places and we don't want certain things next to other certain things. It is a small part of the Zoning Ordinance, but it is important. Why do we have any overlay districts or a Design Review Board for certain places and no other places? We have them because citizens in those particular neighborhoods are concerned about something, and it is the Plan Commission's job to help mitigate those concerns. That is exactly what the proposed text amendment would do. Although it may not make a giant impact right now, in the future, it will help. It is the Plan Commission's job to help regulate the growth of the community.



Chair Fitch commented that he was on the Plan Commission when both the Lincoln-Busey Corridor district and the East Urbana Design Review District were created. There is still tension between the developers and the residents in the Lincoln-Busey area. To make the proposed text amendment be city-wide would be more difficult than one would think. Mr. Trail replied that the creation of the Lincoln-Busey Design Review District has unintended consequences. His concern is whether the proposed text amendment would actually do anything about the crime in the subject area. Why create an overlay district if it doesn't help the reason why you want to put it in? He has not been shown that the nature of the crimes committed were crimes of opportunity.

Mr. Stohr inquired if the proposed guidelines were adopted for this particular area, would it have an effect on other architectural types of work in the City. Would architects take note and incorporate some of the better practices in designs and modifications elsewhere? Mr. Fell said yes and no. A reasonably good architect considers all of these factors anyway. Except for installing security cameras, there is no economic impact on clients if it is designed well.

Mr. Stohr moved that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 2302-T-17 to City Council with a recommendation for approval. Ms. Billman seconded the motion. Roll call on the motion was as follows:

Ms. Billman	-	Yes	Mr. Fell	-	Yes
Mr. Fitch	-	Yes	Mr. Stohr	-	Yes
Mr. Trail	-	No	Mr. Turner	-	Yes
Mr. Ackerson	-	Yes			

The motion passed by a vote of 6 to 1. Ms. Bagby noted that this case would be forwarded to City Council on June 19, 2017.

## 8. NEW BUSINESS

There was none.

## 9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There was none.

## 10. STAFF REPORT

### Campus Area Parking Study

Kevin Garcia, Planner II, and Marcus Ricci, Planner II, presented the parking study conducted in the area bounded by Goodwin Avenue to the west, Vine Street to the east, University Avenue to the north and Pennsylvania Avenue to the south. Mr. Garcia stated the purpose of the study was to determine supply and demand of parking near campus to potentially modernize the Zoning Ordinance and to better process variance requests that are submitted for reduced parking. Planning Division staff conducted the study with the help of 70% of the multi-family property owners (187 responses out of the 272 properties that were contacted). The results were that there are 386 surplus parking spaces. Mr. Ricci talked about the questions that were asked on the survey.

Mr. Fell stated that many times they hear from the West Urbana Neighborhood Association (WUNA) area about how there is never any parking. Do we know how many of the on-street parking spaces are leased by non-residents? Mr. Ricci replied that a person can only get an on-street parking permit in the West Urbana special parking area if you are a resident of the district. Therefore, a non-resident could not purchase an on-street parking permit. However, a multi-family property owner could rent out a space in their parking lot to a non-resident. The Commission members talked about the possibility of a resident purchasing a permit and then selling it to a non-resident. Mr. Fell inquired how teachers at Leal School obtain parking permits. Mr. Ricci did not know.

Mr. Ackerson asked for clarification about on-street parking versus off-street parking. It appeared to him that all of the on-street parking was being used and the surplus of parking came from off-street parking. Mr. Garcia responded saying rather than going out and counting every on-street parking space, they used the number of permits that were purchased, which was why the number was the same for supply and demand. Mr. Ackerson said that he walks a lot and noticed that while there are some empty on-street parking spaces, there are not many. He sees many people walking and riding bicycles.

Many of the complaints they hear are about there not being enough on-street parking; however, there appeared to be several off-street parking spaces available from the parking study. Mr. Ricci commented that one multi-family property may have rented out all of their spaces while another property may have extra parking spaces available. He talked about variance in the rates for rented parking.

Mr. Ackerson stated that between a fourth and a fifth of the students at the U of I are international students and many of them do not have cars on campus. Also many students use public transportation or walk? Does staff know how the parking demand had changed over time? Mr. Garcia said that the only real point of reference was the 2001 parking study. The questions were not the same so he did not know if the comparisons would be entirely accurate. Ms. Pearson added that another trend was self-driving cars and there may be more of a need for drop off areas.

Mr. Fitch commented that the purchase of parking permits on campus has decreased. Mr. Ricci noted that the 386 surplus parking spaces equaled about 2 acres of extra space.

Mr. Fell asked if City staff was considering reducing the number of parking spaces required for one-bedroom apartments to ½ a space. Several years ago, the market was for three or four bedroom apartments, but today people want one to two bedroom apartments. In Urbana, these are hard to build because of the current parking requirements. If the City reduces the parking per bedroom, then there would be more development.

Ms. Billman asked about the purpose of the parking study. Mr. Garcia reiterated that it was to see if the Zoning Ordinance was accurately regulating the supply of parking and also to be able to provide better evidence in variance cases requesting a reduction in parking.

Mr. Trail asked if the 4,363 bedrooms were of the responding surveys. Mr. Ricci said yes. Mr. Trail asked what the percentage was of total parking that responded as opposed to properties that

responded. Mr. Ricci replied that was unknown because City staff did not know how many parking spaces were non-respondent. Mr. Garcia added that they tried to get all the big apartment properties to respond, but if they did not respond, then it creates a caveat of data.

Mr. Trail noticed that there was a huge disparity in what people are charging for parking. Was this accounted for by the different type of parking – off-street parking and on-street parking, underneath the building parking, etc.? Mr. Garcia explained that those were questions City staff decided not to include in the survey in an effort to keep the survey short and easier to get a better response percentage. City staff could always go back to the sites and determine this. They really only wanted to look at what the supply and demand of parking is. Mr. Trail felt this information was important to the survey. Mr. Fell commented that there is a vast discrepancy on how an apartment owner allows the tenants to park. Some developments are high end and provide a secured parking area that may even be heated, which will definitely cost a lot more than a surface parking space.

Mr. Trail inquired if the high end parking spaces were the ones that weren't being used as opposed to surface parking. Mr. Ricci reiterated that the purpose of the study was to figure out gross supply and demand of parking, not to find out how much parking was covered, not covered, heated, or secured. It was more about whether the Zoning Ordinance was reflecting what the supply and demand actually is. Mr. Trail wondered if the survey responses gave City staff what they really want. Isn't the reason for undertaking the study was to find if the Zoning Ordinance was requiring the right amount of parking? Mr. Ricci said yes, and cost does not factor into that.

Chair Fitch stated it was a short survey and a useful instrument.

Mr. Stohr asked if the MCORE project would create a loss of parking along Green Street. Would that be taken into consideration in this study? Mr. Garcia said no it was not taken into consideration because it was mostly an off-street parking study.

Mr. Stohr questioned if City staff checked to see if there was any double counting of spaces. Mr. Garcia explained that they flagged things that needed follow up. Mr. Ricci did a great job of following up and getting clarification where needed.

## **11. STUDY SESSION**

There was none.

## **12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Lorrie Pearson, Secretary  
Urbana Plan Commission