



City of Aurora

44 East Downer Place
Aurora, Illinois 60505
www.aurora-il.org

Legistar History Report

File Number: 21-0507

File ID: 21-0507

Type: Resolution

Status: Agenda Ready

Version: 3

**General
Ledger #:**

In Control: Building, Zoning,
and Economic
Development
Committee

File Created: 06/30/2021

File Name: M/I Hmes of Chicago, LLC / Chelsea Manor / 1079 S.
State Route 59 / Preliminary Plat and Plan Revision

Final Action:

Title: A Resolution Approving a Revision to the Preliminary Plat and Plan for the
Property Located Near the Southeast Corner of South Commons Drive and
Irving Road (M/I Homes of Chicago, LLC - 21-0506 /
NA33/2-21.195-CUPD/Psd/Ppn/R - SB - WARD 8)

Notes:

Agenda Date: 08/25/2021

Agenda Number:

Sponsors:

Enactment Date:

Attachments: Exhibit "A-1" Preliminary Plat - 2021-08-11 -
2021.195, Exhibit "A-2" Preliminary Plan - 2021-08-11
- 2021.195, Chelsea Manor Presentation - 2021-08-18
- 2021.195, Land Use Petition and Supporting
Documents - 2021-06-29 - 2021.195, Qualifying
Statement - 2021-06-29 - 2021.195, Letter of Support
from Cavalry Temple Church - 2021-08-17 - 2021.195,
Letter of Support from Indian Prairie School District
204 - 2021-08-09 - 2021.195, Building and Signage
Elevations - 2021-06-29 - 2021.195, Landscape Plan -
2021-06-29 - 2021.195, Fire Access Plan - 2021-08-11
- 2021.195, Traffic Impact Study - 2021-08-04 -
2021.195, Fire Access Plan Review Comments -
2021-08-16 - 2021.195, Property Research Sheet -
2021-08-16 - 2021.195

Enactment Number:

Planning Case #: NA33/2-21.195-CUPD/Psd/Ppn/R

Hearing Date:

Drafter: broadwells@aurora.il.us

Effective Date:

Related Files:

History of Legislative File

Ver- sion:	Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:
---------------	--------------	-------	---------	----------	-----------	-----------------	---------

2	Planning and Zoning Commission	08/18/2021	Forwarded	Building, Zoning, and Economic Development Committee	08/25/2021	Pass
---	-----------------------------------	------------	-----------	---	------------	------

Action Text: A motion was made by Mrs. Anderson, seconded by Mr. Elsbree, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Building, Zoning, and Economic Development Committee, on the agenda for 8/25/2021. The motion carried.

Notes: See Attachment for Items 21-0506 and 21-0507.

Aye: 5 Chairperson Pilmer, At Large Anderson, At Large Elsbree, At Large Gonzales and At Large Owusu-Safo

Attachment for Items 21-0506 and 21-0507:

21-0506 An Ordinance establishing a Conditional Use Planned Development, approving the Chelsea Manor Plan Description and amending Chapter 49 of the Code of Ordinances, City of Aurora, by modifying the Zoning Map attached thereto to an underlying zoning of R-4A© Two Family Dwelling District with a Conditional Use Planned Development, and OS-1(C) Conservation, Open Space and Drainage District with a Conditional Use Planned Development for the property located near the southeast corner of S. Commons Drive and Irving Road (M/I Homes of Chicago, LLC – 21-0506 / NA33/2-21.195-CUPD/Psd/Ppn/P – SB – Ward 8) (PUBLIC HEARING)

Mr. Broadwell said as we heard, this is the Plan Description and the Conditional Use Planned Development and the Preliminary Plat and Plan for the Chelsea Manor development. So a little bit of background here, again, the property is approximately 36.3 acres of vacant land. It is located near the southeast corner of S. Commons Drive and Irving Road, just south of the Gramercy Subdivision that was in front of the Planning Commission a few years ago. The property itself, is owned by the Calvary Temple Church, which is located directly to the east. The property was previously, I believe in 2002, is when the previous approvals came through for townhomes on the northern portion of the property and then a separate area on the south for athletic activities and other uses associated with the church. But getting back to the proposal at hand, the Petitioner is requesting approval of the Conditional Use Planned Development with the underlying R-4A Conditional Use Planned Development for the Two Family Dwelling District and the OS-1, which is the Conservation/Open Space and Drainage district also with a Conditional Use Planned Development. It looks like we have the Preliminary Plan up on the screen there. Parcel A, which is the northern part where the townhomes are located, is approximately 3.14 acres. That's Parcel A. That's where the townhomes will be. Parcel B is the southern portion where you will see the detention pond. That's approximately 4.9 acres. Parcel A will, again, correspond to the R-4A Conditional Use planning. Parcel B will correspond to the open space zoning. Some details of the request include the modifications to the bulk restriction standards for the R-4A zoning district. Those standards you can see in the Plan Description are standards between buildings and along the perimeter line of the proposed subdivision, permitted obstructions in the required setback areas and minimum dwelling standards per individual dwelling unit. There are also parking and loading standards that include the minimum requirement of two enclosed spaces and two driveway parking spaces. The detention pond will be developed per the standard OS-1 zoning district standards. Concurrently with the proposal, you'll see the Petitioner's Preliminary Plat and Plan. The plat includes 59 lots, 48 acres of which will be developed for residential townhomes, and the remaining utilized for open space and recreation and stormwater management access to Calvary Church. The preliminary plan indicates that the townhomes will be situated on both sides of the drive that circles the proposed subdivision. Townhomes on the outside of the circle are shown as frontloading units, while the townhomes on the inside of the circle drive are shown as rear loaded units. The preliminary plan is showing an approximately 2.4 acres lot within the center of the subdivision for open space and recreation. The Petitioner, you'll see on the preliminary plan, is proposing two access drives on N. Commons Drive. The first one is located in the middle of the frontage on Commons and the second is near the southern portion of the property. You will also see there is an access drive being proposed on the eastern frontage that allows access to Calvary Church and then the detention pond is along the southern portion

of the property. Then you'll see also on the preliminary plan there is 66 foot wide right-of-way with 31 foot wide streets, both of which are dimensioned standard for a residential subdivision allowing for better parking availability on the street. The preliminary plan is also showing that there is adequate residential parking available to meet the minimum parking requirement of two enclosed spaces like I mentioned earlier. Then you can also see there around 95 parking spaces shown on the preliminary plan. I think that outlines the preliminary plan and plat section. I also wanted to point out that the Indian Prairie School District 204 provided a letter on August 9th indicating their support for the proposal. We also received a letter from the Calvary Temple Church on August 17th also indicating their support for the proposal. Are there any questions for staff at this point?

The Petitioners were sworn in.

Good evening. My name is Russ Whitaker. I'm an attorney with the law firm of Rosanova and Whitaker in Naperville. I'm here this evening on behalf of M/I Homes as contract purchaser of the approximately 36 acre site to be known as Chelsea Manor. Steve kind of mentioned the property is located on the east side of Commons Drive, south of 75th Street and north of Montgomery Road and is part of the Calvary Temple Church property today. I have a team of consultants with me this evening, so if there are more specific questions, I can defer to some experts, Grey Collins with M/I Homes, Javier Milan is our Traffic Engineer with KLOA, I have Mike May, who is our Civil Engineer with Cemcon, and Carl Peterson with Gary R. Weber, which is our Planning, Ecology and Landscape Architecture firm. A little bit of background on M/I Homes while we are waiting for some stuff to come up here. Nationally, M/I Homes is the 13th largest home builder in the country. They operate across 9 states. Locally, they are the 3rd largest home building in the Chicagoland region, 28 active communities, 9 communities in planning and we anticipate over 500 closings on a year over year basis. The map that I think you can see now, gives you an idea of where we are currently located. I think that these points are relevant because they speak to a couple of things that should be important to the city. Its knowledge of industry, its capacity to perform and its credibility. You don't become the 3rd largest home builder in the region if you aren't building quality product and fulfilling promises to both communities and customers. In Aurora, M/I is currently at Gramercy Square. We are under construction. As Steve mentioned, approvals were granted in 2018. Gramercy consists of 171 units on approximately 25 acres. It is located immediately adjacent and north of the Chelsea Manor subdivision we are proposing here this evening. Just of couple of images from that Gramercy Square subdivision. A 3 story townhome product in the top left. A 2 story townhome product on the bottom left and then a couple of shots from the interior of the model home. It gives you some perspective of the type of fit and finish in home that M/I is constructing in the area. We move onto the next slide, which is a site plan for Gramercy. This plan is color coded off of their website today. Where you see all of the darker red, those are homes that have already closed. We've closed 114 homes over a year and a half, two years since we got into the land development. Green homes are currently homes that are currently available. It looks yellow on my screen here. The grey blocks are buildings that are yet to be constructed, so that's future homes coming to market. I think what you can see that in a manner of two years we've been extraordinarily successful. With Chelsea Manor, we're looking to build off of that success. To that end, I think it's important to note that what we are doing here at Chelsea Manor is very much a mirror image of what happened at Gramercy. I think that's made working through some of the issues with staff pretty simple because we're utilizing all of the same metrics for development that have proven successful there. We have the same setbacks,

we've got the same building separation, we've got the same parking metrics. In fact, we've actually reduced the net density slightly at Chelsea Manor and we've also been able to increase the open space and landscape area in Chelsea Manor, where we were at 52% open space landscape area at Gramercy we're at 62% at Chelsea Manor, so similar development standards, but we've been able to even build upon them as we move forward. The next slide is going to be a site plan comparison, so we kind of did a little work on the computer and tried to take the original plan from Gramercy to the north and we put it onto the same slide with Chelsea Manor to the south. I think you'll see that there's a lot of commonalities, even as you look at the site plans on a high level here. I would note that Gramercy Square has two entrances off of Commons Drive. I would note that Commons is a major collector south of 75th Street, so we have two driveway accesses, or public roadway accesses to Commons, but we have no homes fronting on Commons. In Chelsea Manor you'll see a similar site. Internal roadway, a little bit difficult to see and unfortunately I can't really point it out to you, but when you look internal to Gramercy Square, what you see is a public road that is effectively a loop that comes back upon itself and provides access out to Commons. When you look at Chelsea Manor, you'll see the exact same thing, a single public road that moves around on itself with access out to Commons. You'll see a similar layout in the site plan where you've got a large central open space with some open space extensions to the north and south in both Gramercy Square and Chelsea Manor. The one difference I would point out, and important to call out where we're not doing the exact same things, is park space. In Gramercy, we actually had an acre park space. We talked to the Park District, the Fox Valley Park District, on this site and they did not want a public park. So what we've done is instead of having dedicated park land, we've got some private open space that will be owned and maintained by the HOA and we'll look at that as we focus a little bit more on the site plan. I talked a little bit about access, there being two access points off of Commons Drive for Chelsea Manor, but we actually have three total access points. The first and primary access point is Schmidgall Boulevard, which is sort of centrally located on the site. It is a boulevard type entrance with a planted median that terminates into a central open space courtyard. From a purely planning standpoint, from a landscape standpoint, we are checking a lot of boxes with this type of layout and you can see the type of landscape improvements on both sides of that boulevard. The secondary access, and I'm going to zoom in as I go through this and hopefully that will help you identify where I'm talking about, the secondary access is actually a private road connection to the east of Calvary Church. This access is intended to be gated and restricted, used solely for two purposes. One is emergency access to our subdivision and two, as an overflow outlet for Calvary Church. This is a condition of our purchase and sale agreement, as it allows Calvary to maintain existing traffic patterns and to provide the church an outlet to Commons Drive. So I started by saying three access points. Here is the third one. That third access point is to the south of the Chelsea Manor Subdivision and is sort of located on the start of a bend in Commons Drive. Over the last 24 to 48 hours there's been a bit of discussion about this access point. Given the timing of the discussions, we haven't had an opportunity to update the site plan, but needless to say, we've heard loud and clear from staff that this was a concern. Following this meeting, we do intend to eliminate that access point. We had some additional study information that we'd like to dive into, specifically with respect to the amount of traffic that would be coming from Calvary Church. We don't know if by eliminating the access point altogether and going to a single access point at Schmidgall Boulevard, or alternatively if we would flip the access point to the north portion of the site and you can see how we could almost extend Chelsea Manor out to the north in the same manner we extended Chelsea Manor Circle out to the south. That's a follow up item. We are working with staff on it. The fact that we're committing here and now 24 to 48 hours after hearing

about these concerns to addressing that concern speaks volumes about M/I is prepared to respond to neighbors, respond to the city and work with everybody involved. From a roadway layout standpoint, when we were looking at the two site plans, there is a single city road that is Chelsea Manor Drive, which circles around the development. Homes located both interior and exterior to that single public road. I would note that it is a 66 foot right-of-way, 31 foot back to back, so we are building to typical city standards in this instance. We will be selling three different product lines at Chelsea Manor. Again, it's going to be a little difficult to identify them here without being able to point for you, but if you look around the perimeter of Chelsea Manor Circle, you will see what is the Charlestown series. These are two story frontload townhomes. We are proposing 106 units across 24 buildings. There are four different floor plans that will be offered in the Charlestown series, with square footages ranging from approximately 1,500 to 2,100 square feet. I would note that the Danbury is an end unit. Within the Danbury we do have a first floor master suite option or master suite as a standard, so given the kind of change in demographics in the market, we think that will be a very attractive option in the townhome community. This is an image of the Charleston series. New exterior elevations for the Charlestown series, so this is very similar to the floor plans, some of the floor plans that are offered at Gramercy, but we've rolled out entirely new elevations. You can see that sort of stylistically it is taken off the cues of that modern farmhouse, which if you turn on HGTV you can't miss. A lot of different materials being incorporated. You can see your traditional lap siding. You can see the board and baton elements in the gables and you can also see a wainscot of stone across the base of the structure, so a very nice upgraded elevation. We think this is a nice improvement to what we did at Gramercy. The second series of homes is identified as the Town Square series. These are three story rear load units. They are interior to Chelsea Manor Circle and they are west of the north/south common area. When I talk about the common area, there's an east/west common area that bisects the middle of the development. There is almost another open space that's a smaller open space tree lined area that runs north and south. The Town Square series units are all located to the west, so on this plan, we'd be looking at units 25-30 on the south and 43-48 on the north, 72 units across 12 buildings. There are two different floor plans in this Town Square series. It is a base three bedroom configuration with square footage ranging from 1,900 to 2,100 square feet. What you'll see is that across each series there's very different lifestyle, there's a very different square footage trying to attract a different buyer profile and consistent with the city's Comprehensive Plan providing diversity of housing options to meet needs for a variety of residents. When we look at elevations for the Town Square series, I think you'll see that the elevations pull similar cues as the Charlestown series. You're going to see the same sort of primary building blocks with the brick wainscot. You're going to see the lap siding. You're going to see the board and baton. You see the detail in the peaks. A very Americana type design here. We're including even some dormers to help break up the roofline and you can see in some of the lap siding sections, you can see where dormers are used in order to really build out the architecture on these units. Note also that there are covered porches, covered front porches with each unit. The final series is the Lincoln series. These are 2 story rear load units. These units are located on the opposite side of that north/south divide, so we're talking about here, units 37-42, here units 32-36. This is an entirely new product line to the market. It is a 2 bedroom base configuration with square footages ranging from 1,500 to 1,600 square feet. The unique element here is that all of the primary living space is actually on the second story. So it lives almost like a ranch. You're certainly going to have to be able to manage stairs because you're going to park below. There is some small living space in the first floor, that's almost if you can imagine you've got an older child living at home, they might be downstairs. You would then have 2 bedrooms on

the second floor, your kitchen, bathrooms and all of your primary use spaces would be on that second floor. The object here is you're not eliminating stairs entirely, but you're significantly reducing the amount of trips you take up and down the stairs going from bedrooms and bathrooms to kitchens and those types of facilities. So we think it is a great addition to the lineup of townhomes that we are proposing out here. Again, I think that you can see that the architecture is building off of what came previously, the same building blocks. You can see we are maintaining the quality building materials throughout. Here, again, the wainscot of brick across the base. You see more of the lap siding with the gables, including some of that board and baton siding. We're dividing things up a little bit differently here, so we've got the balconies off of the front of these units and you can see we are using some color change in these units to help create some interest across that front façade as well. A couple of final remarks with respect to open space, as I referenced earlier, there is no public park space, but there is substantial private space that will be owned and maintained by the HOA. As Steve mentioned earlier, that central open space is almost 2.5 acres. It is like 125 feet wide, but it's almost 900 feet long, so we're talking about circa 3 football fields long, so that is a large space. You kind of lose it in the scale on an image like this, but it is a substantial space. The idea here is that there are large turf areas flanking both sides of a central courtyard. That central courtyard, as you can see, is a paver area. The idea is that there is a central garden, some surrounding gardens. The black spots that you can't make out very well is actually a trellis structure. There are some benches and other built in facilities. The intent is that this is a central gathering place for residents here. You'll note as we look at another slide here, that everything is built around and leads to that central gathering space, so what we're showing here in orange or red is a pedestrian plan. We have a very, very strong network of pedestrian walking trails. You can see that it is doubled up on both sides of the park. You can see north/south in that central open space that we've got two sets of walking paths. We're not looking to forgo costs. We're trying to create a certain type of environment in improvement with this plan. In addition to the onsite walking paths, you can see that we are actually extending those lines off-site. We will be doing improvements on the main Calvary Church parcel. There's an existing detention basin that serves Calvary. It is too good of an improvement to just let it sit fallow next to us, so in coordination with Calvary, we're working on an easement agreement. That easement agreement will allow us to enter on that property to build these walking paths, and some structures at the end of them so that it is an amenity not only for our residents, but also for Calvary. Calvary will continue to own them. They're not incorporated or made part of the area that we're developing, but really it is an off-site improvement that we're doing in order to make a better subdivision overall. I think the last thing I want to touch on here is the detention basin to the south. This is really a critical component to the plan. The basin is nearly 5 acres in size and it will be improved as a naturalized wetland and will be protected in perpetuity with stormwater easements. It provides a really nice separation between the existing single family residents to the south and our proposed townhomes. Not only is there approximately 250 feet of separation from those single family residential properties to the rear of our townhomes, but we strategically planned layers of landscaping to enhance the character of that environment. As we zoom in to the south, you can see there is a layer of deciduous and ornamental trees along the south property line, not blocking views of the wetland, but providing a layer of screening that will provide a filtered view of the wetland. The wetland itself is a couple of hundred feet wide and will be improved with native grasses and flowers. This type of wetland typically becomes a sanctuary for birds and other wildlife. On the opposite side of the wetland, we have a second layer of screening that will provide another filter to the rear of the townhome units. So we're not trying to build a wall. We're not trying to say we're not here and we have inconsistent uses. We

thoughtfully planned open space and planned landscaping around the open space to provide an appropriate transition between the adjacent residential land uses. In conclusion, we're excited about the opportunity here. We see Chelsea Manor as a natural extension of the successes that have been realized at Gramercy. We've worked closely with city staff, the Fox Valley Park District and District 204 to put together the plan that is before you this evening. We look forward to your feedback and are happy to answer any questions you might have.

The public input portion of the public hearing was opened. The witnesses were sworn in.

My name is Ram Chandramouli. I live at 1012 Sundew Court, Aurora, Illinois. I live actually west off Commons Drive exactly facing the property that's going to come up here. I have a few concerns. He already said Gramercy has 117 units and this is going to have 72 units, so they are going to use Commons Drive. Commons Drive is less than 100 feet from my property. One of my worries is there is going to be more traffic, which means there is going to be air pollution and noise pollution that's going to happen. I bought this house at a premium price because it was already a cul-de-sac with absolutely nothing behind my home, but now I have to live with all that. That's one concern. The other concern I have is I work in downtown Chicago. I have to and catch my train and already there is a lot of traffic. Of course, because of COVID, not much, but otherwise I have only two access point. One is through Meadowridge and the other is through Commons Drive and both are going to kind of get blocked with more traffic flowing in. Of course, I have the other concern of property value reducing. That's pretty much it.

My name is Karmen Tai. I live at 4180 Castle Rock Circle. I'm actually in the homes that are south of proposed rezoning development. So my homes are going to be backed to the new development. I have very similar concerns of the gentleman that was just here. My primary concerns are around 1) the current density of the neighborhood and crowding. So as the Petitioner mentioned, this is just one townhouse development that's already, this is one of multiple developments that are happening in our subdivision within a 2 or 3 mile radius. There's a lot of crowding. There are multiple units that are going up there. They are multi-resident townhomes. I'm very surprised to hear the Indian Prairie School District has approved their proposal. When we moved to the subdivision 10 years ago, Stonehaven, Metea Valley School wasn't even built. My daughter starts there tomorrow as a Freshman. There are 800 students in her Freshman class. The information that we are getting from the Superintendent is that the District 204 schools are overcrowded. So I would like to understand how these development plans integrate with the school plans to build and expand so that we can have the school system that we moved out here for. A lot of the characteristics of the neighborhood that we moved out here for are being chipped away by these development plans for multi-resident housing. The areas up and down Commons Drive, there's already a lot of traffic from Gramercy Square. I can't even walk up and down the pathway that's on Commons Drive from the one development that's already there that's just south of 75th Street. So to build another 100 plus homes there, I don't understand how it's going to work. It's a 6 foot walking path. You can't even walk down the path. It's crowded with families, with strollers, with bikers. It's already overcrowded. That street never went through. Commons Drive stopped right there and never went all the way through to 75th Street. When they started the townhouse development Gramercy Square, they took the road and opened it all the way up to 75th Street and now there's traffic that zooms up and down Commons Drive. There's loud music. There's litter. There's

trash. It's completely changed the landscape of our neighborhood. The homes that are backed up in Stonehaven Subdivision are over a half a million dollar homes, so to put this amount of traffic into a community that's intended to be a suburban residential community, we're not supportive of it. We're not supportive of the development. I understand urban planning. We understand urban development, but this is not what we want to do with our neighborhood. That's not what we want. That's not what we moved here for and that's not why we purchased our homes. We have had no communication from M/I Homes with the homeowner subdivision. Not one. The letter I received was from the attorney in Naperville and that was 2 or 3 weeks ago. They have not engaged in any discussions with us. If they've had conversations with Calvary, if they've had conversations with Indian Prairie School District, they have not had it with the residents that are affected by the developments in the community. Then some of the aspects around privacy, I understand. I think some of those things could be addressed through proper landscaping. We have some beautiful detention ponds. There are beautiful willow trees and I do think that we can achieve the privacy. That is not the primary concern here. It's the density of the community. It is the overcrowding of the neighborhoods. It's the street. It's the traffic patterns going through Commons Drive and that's just not what we are interested in, in our neighborhood. Again, the bigger concern is I would like to understand Indian Prairie School District and where they are on this matter. It is not consistent with what we are hearing from the Superintendent. That is not consistent. What we're hearing is that the schools are overcrowded and they need to rebalance between Waubesa, Metea and Neuqua and potentially build additional schools. So before we throw up more townhouses and bring thousands of more residents into the neighborhood, I want to understand how this is integrated with the school's plan and does that timing match up or not. It should match up. We moved to Naperville. That's what they have signs up for. Their development says M/I Homes, Indian Prairie District 204. That's what they advertise. The reason why we moved here is to be in Indian Prairie District 204, so we have smaller class sizes and we have a lot of the other amenities that come along with properly educating our children. So to continue to chip away at that, it doesn't make any sense. You're going to run all your residents out and then what ends up happening is you have these young families, it is their first home purchase in townhomes, all of them are young families, most of them. They grow out of the homes and they rent them out. That's what they do. In 2 or 3 years they are going to need more space, more than 1,500 to 1,600 square feet, more than 2 or 3 bedrooms. They are going to rent them out if they can't sell and get their money's worth and then we're going to have a whole other group of people that are in those townhouses. Thank you.

My name is Susan Chan. My address is 4190 Castle Rock Circle. I too, my back yard will be the new development that's going to go up. I'm one of the original homeowners in the Stonehaven Subdivision and one of the reasons we bought our house is because of the open back yard. It was told to us at that time that it was going to be an open soccer field and at that time, there was a premium that was attached to the open soccer, which we paid in order to get that amenity. I'm kind of in shock when we got the letter from the lawyer saying that they are going to build these townhomes because I thought that lot was going to be open and is an open field. That's pretty much it.

Good evening everyone. My name is Tahir Yahya. I live at 4123 Winslow Court in the Gramercy Square development. I think the individual who was up here moments ago, she brought up a really important point. I'm a health care professional. I work here in Chicago and this pandemic has changed quite a bit in our lives and the most important thing to me is I've got 3 kids. I purposely moved to the

Naperville/Aurora area because of the 204 district. It just bothers me that the School District, Indian Prairie, went ahead and had discussions with M/I Homes without counseling the folks that are currently living here at Gramercy Square and even at Stonehaven. They're planning on putting more kids in the school district and that really bothers me because right now we're back to putting masks on. I'm scared. My kids are starting school tomorrow and I'm concerned if they're going to bring COVID back home. We're living through some really difficult times right now, so that's something we need to be mindful of how having more kids in the school district with the limited schools we have, how we are taking that decision right with what's going on. The other thing I'm concerned about that I want to bring up, I think, is in regard to privacy. A lot of us here from the Gramercy Square district, subdivision, we paid a premium for the lots. I live in a corner lot. I live just north of this new proposed area. I'm just steps away from it. I paid a premium for my corner lot so that my kids can go use the field. I was told that property, they told me specifically that oh yeh, it's an open field, there's soccer games. I signed my kid up to the Galaxy Soccer team and we take part in that. If you're planning on having another development there, where are my kids going to go play? The only field that they gave us at Gramercy, which you might have seen moments ago, was a small piece of land that doesn't have any monkey bars, that doesn't have any swings, nothing. It is just an open, you know, like a small patch of land. We can't rely on that. If there's additional homes being built, additional families, where are those kids going to go and play? This is something that's a major concern to me that I need to drive out, take my kids to a park in White Eagle or somewhere. That shouldn't be the case. They should think about that. The other thing is my house actually backs to the service road and from what I heard right now, if they're using that right now, right now forget the property right now. This church is using that service road for the Sunday, you know, the services. They use that road, so the road is open. There's traffic all the time and I'm always concerned about my kids crossing the road. If that road is going to be used for additional use, there's going to be more traffic. There's no fencing. There's nothing separating my property to that field right now, so that's another major concern I have. So how M/I Homes is going to tackle that is going to be an important one. The other thing they talked about was about parking metrics. Horrible parking metrics that have been used right now at Gramercy. The road is curved. Nobody knows how to park properly. There's not enough parking given at the corner lots. I have a fire hydrant right in front of my house. I can't even have guests come over. I need to ask them to park all the way outside. That's another concern. I'm not sure exactly how you measure your success of the current Gramercy Square that you mentioned, but that is incorrect information. I've got some other things here. The other thing, it seems to me that the Gramercy Square property was a guinea pig. They used the demographics in that area, the people that were moving in there, as a test to see how are they going to model this new proposed land because this addition of having a master suite on the main floor, it's clear that they were watching what type of people are moving into Gramercy. I can tell you from fact that the majority of the people that are moving there are first time homeowners. They like to call their parents over from overseas. They like them to come stay with them. They're not used to going up and down stairs. They are elderly people and they would prefer to stay on the ground floor. That's going to devalue our properties because now you have better properties right next door that are providing you with this master on-suite on the main floor. So that is another concern of mine. I'd like to leave on this note as #1) the School Districts, right now they are going to be jammed packed; #2) the privacy and #3) is the value, the devaluing of the property that we had paid such a premium for. I don't know if anyone else has anything else to say from Gramercy, but thank you.

My name is Bob Eggert. I live at 1022 Sundew Court. I'm in the court that butts up right against Commons. So like the lady in the red from Castle Rock with the traffic, we're really concerned with that because the traffic has really increased with the current build project from M/I. It's really going to be bad if they ever put that road, Commons, through across that triangle vacant lot that's connected to the mall because then we are going to have a throughway from New York Street or from the industrial park all the way though to White Eagle. That calls for that triangle lot to have Commons go through. So we are really concerned about traffic. Then you've got the density issue with the extra people in that area. My concerns that haven't been addressed is the wetland area. Is that going to be a pond that's deeper and it's going to hold things like maybe some fish and stuff, or is it going to be the wetland area that gets wet every once in a while and has tall weeds? I.e. you've got rodent problems, you have mosquito problems. How is that going to be abated when those issues happen? We have retention ponds right now. The waters kind of flow through those to get back to the Waubensee Creek watershed. They have a little bit of flowage, but those grassy wetland areas that only have water or real shallow water and the water don't move, we're going to get mosquitos. You've got West Nile disease that still floats around and how are you going to handle the mosquito population potentially? So I have concerns about the wetland. About the traffic pattern, you've got the exits going out on Commons. Your headlights are coming into the back windows and back doors of people's houses that are on that road. So what are you going to do when the church lets out and you've got 200 to 300 people floating through there and their headlights are beaming in these people's houses? I used to have a 7 foot high fence. Aurora changed that requirement and would not allow me to put a 7 foot fence up. So now I have a shorter fence. I'm not quite sure where that exit, who's house that's pointing to, but I'm hoping that it doesn't point to mine because that's going to be a hinderance for when we want to sell our house because, again, who wants to have headlights going into their house all the time. I will say one other thing about traffic. We sometimes have people racing down that road. They also have the younger generation who really likes loud noisy cars. At 12:00 o'clock, 2:00 o'clock in the morning that's happening not only on Route 59, but on Commons. Is there a way for speed bumps or something to keep people from going 45 miles an hours down through a residential area that should be like 25? Again, I'm concerned. Now with traffic going from 75th to Montgomery Road as an offshoot from Route 59, it will really be a concern if that other lot gets developed and that road comes all the way from New York Street because now you are going to have commuter traffic coming down Commons all the way to Montgomery Road or into White Eagle. You know what? Speed limits are there, but not a lot of people pay attention to them, at least not through a residential road that's wide open. Thank you for your time.

My name is Murali Emani. I'm from 4135 Winslow Court in the Gramercy Square community. I echo the points touched earlier that people have, so traffic is one. But I would like to (inaudible) on one specification. Most of us in the Gramercy Square neighbor are kind of first time home buyers, so we want to settle down in this beautiful place and we want to raise our kids in this community, but with the overcrowding of the schools, we're going to impact education and also by (inaudible) they are trying to build over the soccer fields. In the summer, it is very lively and active. You see lots of kids having their coaching. They have tournaments, so you are going to snatch away their prime motive to play around in that area. So it is going to impact all their education and also all their other activities. It's going to have a longer impact on the next generation of our children. That's my primary concern. We want to come done here and settle down and do what's best for our kids, but that's not going to happen if they approve this. Thank you very much.

My name is Rupak Singore. I'm also from Gramercy Square community. I live right behind here, so I also have a corner house facing toward the field where this new community is coming. I do want to reiterate a few points, some of which have already been brought up. The first one is the road from 75th to Commons Drive, the intersections of 75th and Commons Drive, it is a very narrow road. The road widens right when the Gramercy Square community starts, so there is a patch of about maybe .2, .3 miles, which is a very narrow road, so there are sometimes drugs and stuff going around. It is kind of a single lane road serving two way traffic. So that's one of the things, which is increasing traffic. I also go downtown for work and so like the other gentleman said, I have to catch a train in the morning and that's my only way to get to the train station and which is getting really crowded right now. The second thing is I also have a corner house right now. When we were buying the house 2½ years ago, they sold it to us as a premium plot. The plot premium that we paid for it was much higher than the other plots in the Gramercy Square community and the reason they said is because you have an open field, an athletic open field, which is used by kids and for other athletic activities like soccer and stuff. The field where they are building this community right now has about 10 different soccer fields and all of them are occupied pretty much 3 to 4 days a week with kids training there. We have over 100 kids pretty much every other day training all summer. Parking, the point that they brought up about parking, parking is very bad in our new community, Gramercy Square community, right now. Like the gentleman Tahir was saying, I also have a corner plot, but we don't have any open parking because we have a fire hydrant right where the street ends, so we can't even use that parking spot for anything. There are a couple of safety concerns. The road that goes, the service road that has access to the Calvary Church, sometimes people do races and stuff there during the nights with loud music and stuff going on. The same thing goes on the Commons Drive as well. This point was also brought up before, we are all new house, first time house owners. We bought in the community because of School District 204. The school district is already backed up and we are adding more house there, but because of the same reason people in Gramercy Square, right in Gramercy Square, have already started selling their houses and moving out of Aurora. It is happening right now. A house in my building, which has a 4 building house, people only live there for a year and they already sold it and moved out. The same thing happened in the opposite building. People are already selling it and moving out, so we are already getting a new crowd, so the neighborhood is going to get ruined because people are going to keep moving constantly selling houses and getting out. We are here to settle in, but the reason they sold us the premium plot is they said you have an athletic field and stuff like that, but now they are using that field, right? Two years down the line they are planning to build a community there. I think that kind of covers what I have to say. Thank you.

Hi Commissioners. My name is Revanth Mothekani. I'm from the Gramercy Square community. My address is 4111 Winslow Court. I agree with all of the people who have said all the important stuff here. I would like to highlight only one specific point and that is we all paid a premium price to buy that particular property which we are living in and right now, the same as my builder, he's trying to build a better home than what I have right next to me, even within like 2½ years of what I have purchased. Just in case if I want to sell it, I won't be able to sell it for the same price which I have bought it. I might be stuck there for like at least 3 years. Let's say even if I want to sell it out, I have to sell it out at a lower price because there is a better home which is being built right now and it is a new home and a customer would be interested in buying a property with a master suite on the ground floor because he doesn't

have to climb one more additional steps, so it is definitely going to impact me and the community who is right, like they are still building the properties in the Gramercy Square. They are still selling the homes in there, so it is eventually going to impact every single one of them who have been their customer in the last 2 to 2½ years. That is the core reason why I would be objecting this new Chelsea community which is coming right next door. Thank you.

My name is Norma Lazatin. I live at 4210 Castle Rock Circle in Stonehaven. So my house was the last house that was built in Stonehaven. So the lot that I bought has the most highest premium that was charged by the builder. So my house is located like adjacent to that detention. The ladies who spoke there are my neighbors. So what King's Court Builder did is that because this is an open area, they charged us the highest premium. If I can remember correctly, the builder charged \$15,000 to \$20,000 because of the premium location, so now building these houses are going to block our open view and then for the amount that we paid that means we are losing it. So there's even my neighbor who is next to me who approached me yesterday and asked me are you going to attend this meeting and I said if I can and if I have time I will. This is also his main concern. I want to echo for those who spoke here the traffic concern and also it will be overcrowded in the School District 204. My son just graduated in Metea high school and he is even telling me how crowded the school is. Then the houses they are going to build is around \$200,000 and our houses are about \$500,000 compared to these houses, so how is this going to impact the buyer of our houses? That's all my concern is.

Good evening Commissioners. This is Praveen Nimmala, 4147 Winslow Court in Gramercy Square. First let me start, I know it is 5 past 9. I will not take much time. I moved from India like 16 years back to the United States to have a better family life, to give a better life to my family and kids. The last 15 years I was in an apartment in Madison, Wisconsin, so I moved to Aurora because of the nice school districts, so that is one of the major points to moving to the Aurora area. Those are the main points. Like the other gentleman just said, like very valid points. Traffic conditions and the overcrowding in the schools is part of all those things. I just would like to say just one point. Commissioners, if you haven't visited this place, this Commons Drive, please just visit one of the fine evenings or on Saturday morning. It is athletic zoned, so kids come there and play soccer here. When you see that, you feel the sense of happiness when you see kids playing in that area. I know like M/I Homes, at least I heard, they are the 13th largest in the country. That's good, 13th largest in the country. Why in this athletic zone? Why not build in some other area? We are losing the soccer areas for kids, so just please come and visit us one of the fine evenings and Saturday morning and you'll see kids playing in that soccer zone. You feel that sense of happiness when you see kids playing. I have a 4 year old son who would like to play in the soccer area and papa just come and watch me. I would like to play soccer. After this, where do my kids go and play? Please just think about this and just come one fine evening and just check out the neighborhoods and just before you decide, I would like to make a kind request just to think about this and just do some kind of value judgement for all the neighborhood people. Thank you so much.

Good evening. I'm Debbie Cardinal. I'm at 1225 Chicory Lane in Chicory Place Subdivision. I'm the subdivision next to with the (inaudible) people. I actually am on the main drag for Chicory Place, but I've been a resident for 25 years and when they originally, when I originally bought my house, they were like Commons Drive is going to go through from 75th to Montgomery, but when they started building Stonehaven and that's how they were putting Commons, I was very surprised that they would put

something that was supposed to be thoroughfare through a subdivision, which is obviously a poor way to put traffic and now with these additional townhomes, I was just actually here because I was concerned with that tiny stretch of road that that man talked about that's actually at the other side going to 75th Street. I use that road and, yes, it is very hard to, when you get to the subdivision, Stonehaven, the speed limit says 25, but when you get on the other side of it, there's no speed limit signs and people are definitely not driving slowly. Then when you get to the end of Gramercy, it shoots back down to a single lane handling two way traffic. I know that eventually, per plan, that's supposed to be all apartments in that farm field, but with these additional houses, the traffic is just going to be even worse and for myself, I'm by Montgomery. I just probably won't use that because I always thought one day somebody is going to get in an accident on that short road because sometimes there are some big trucks and cars and you're like trying to move over and almost in the farm field just to get by. My concern is really not with all the other stuff, but just basically that flow of traffic to get to 75th Street. That tiny piece of road is not going to handle any more traffic than it already has. In fact, it's like I said, a poor place for them not to have gone all the way to 75th Street to begin with. Thank you.

My name is Sami Daraiseh. I live at 4285 Castle Rock Circle. The concerns I have, have been stated already, but I just want to reiterate the traffic on Commons Drive there. My son and I like to ride our bikes and when Commons Road was opened up, there was much more traffic, cars just speeding by cutting through the subdivisions. I foresee now they are going to have more traffic. Our kids that go to middle school, they either bike or walk or get dropped off because they go to Still Middle School and some concern for them as well in terms of the increase of traffic. Even when leaving our subdivision to get out to Montgomery if you are taking a left, sometimes it takes 4 to 5 minutes just to be able to take that left given the traffic on Montgomery. So if there is going to be more cars coming, more cars using that road, there's going to be a bottleneck I foresee happening there. So my question really is are there any plans for stop signs, traffic lights or speed bumps or anything like that that can potentially help those concerns and that flow of traffic if the development proceeds? As been mentioned before, the road from Commons to Boulder Court is very narrow. There really needs to be something done with that. It is, as been mentioned, a one lane road for two cars trying to pass. Then lastly, right now on Commons for the athletic events, there is an area where cars can park and still allow for the traffic to go. If the development proceeds, are they going to allow traffic from the townhomes to park on the side of Commons? When it happens for the athletic events, it is once a week, but it does cause some issues. You have to be really leery as you try to pass by. There's cars coming in and out, so you have to really pay attention. If they are going to allow cars to be parking there on a constant basis, I think that's going to also be an issue and concern that I have. That's all. Thank you.

Chairman Pilmer said so heard a number of questions. One that was, I think, heard the most was traffic. Why don't we start with traffic? If the Petitioner would like to, or staff...

Mr. Sieben said I would let the Petitioner start with that, but we also have Bob Greene, our city Traffic Engineer, in the audience. Bob is here that can relay to that also on the city side.

Mr. Whitaker said I guess a couple of things with respect to traffic. We've designed the subdivision in a specific manner so that there's two access points out to Commons. We recognize that Commons is a major collector. That means it is designed to carry a high level of traffic between a road like 75th and

Montgomery Road. That's the function of Commons. Our traffic study projects out to 2027. It is background growth plus our subdivision plus the Gramercy Square subdivision. At that point in time, we are projecting about 2,000 cars a day on Commons. A collector is typically designed at 3,000 to 4,000 cars a day, so even at that rate, we're functioning at 50% the capacity of a major collector. I would note that I think it has been in the city's plan for a long time that Commons was extended not just to 75th, but ultimately through to the train station. That's something that's going to actually facilitate better flow of traffic than a negative flow of traffic, so I think the development that's occurring north of 75th Street, the triangle parcel, will help facilitate a better flow of traffic and these people won't be forced out to 59 all the time in order to get around that section of Commons. It is unfortunate that Commons isn't or can't be improved presently all the way to 75th Street. Unfortunately, there's an old farm parcel that is there. My understanding is that there's not right-of-way sufficient in order to make additional improvements to Commons. That's something that I think I'd let Ed comment on, but it is my understanding that that is why Commons narrows down as it does in that location. We certainly understand it and appreciate the concerns of residents every time we're adding traffic to a roadway that residents use on a regular basis and they perceive as being busy. There's always a concern of more traffic. I'm sure there was a concern of more traffic before Gramercy was built and there was a concern of more traffic when the subdivision before that was built, but we are within the design parameters of how Commons should be functioning even as we project out to 2027. So I think that's the most critical component of the discussion here.

Chairman Pilmer said can you explain the service road, how that's going to work and access, or limited access?

Mr. Whitaker said absolutely. The service road extends about 25 feet south of our north property line, so you'd effectively be in that north row of buildings, or kind in the back yard through a portion of that north row of buildings, so that service road is going away. We would have open space transitional yard areas between Chelsea Manor and the adjacent Gramercy Square subdivision. You can see a pretty significant landscape buffer that's proposed between the two subdivisions. Gramercy was not planned with a cross connection, so there is no traffic flow between the two subdivisions, so again, it is that continual landscape buffer in lieu of that access road that we heard some residents expressing concern about. There will be an access road, that's the access road to the east there on our plan, connecting into Calvary Church. The Calvary Church residents, or the Calvary Church occupants will have use of the private access road and they will circulate through our subdivision out to Commons. That is not a primary access for the church. Obviously, the church utilizes Route 59. They pay for police protection in order to funnel people out onto Route 59 and onto Montgomery Road. This is a secondary access point. It is an obligation in our contract to maintain a secondary access point and this has been something that has been negotiated between Calvary Church and the developer, M/I.

Chairman Pilmer said how about if you could just explain the new wetland area to the south. That detention outlot, will that hold water or is it a flow just during peak times?

Mr. Whitaker said good question. Let me back up to that last one real quickly because I did leave off a critical component. That private access road will be gated and locked. It will only be open on weekends. The church services on Saturday evenings and on Sunday mornings. The intent is only that that access is open for those limited hours, so there's not going to be that cross access or concerns about people

racing cars down that access road. That kind of condition would be entirely eliminated because there is not a through route to the church in the evening or during the weekday. The stormwater detention pond, it is a naturalized pond. It will maintain some water over time, so it is designed, if you look at the engineering plan, there are contours where there are deeper pools of water that will retain some water and remain wet. There are some other higher sections that are contoured that will have your traditional native plantings that are not always inundated with water. It is sort of a combination, but it is a wetland detention basin. It is what is encouraged from the past management practice. It's the type of thing that we know now provides ecological improvement. There's not an ecological benefit to having a big open blue water with a fountain in it. It looks pretty and it is attractive to humans, but it doesn't provide habitat, it doesn't filter water, it doesn't do a lot of the things that we now know these native basins do. It is a native basin designed consistent with county ordinances.

Chairman Pilmer said one of the questions that we heard, or some of the testimony, was regarding potential turnover in the subdivision. I think the concern was it could lead to lack of owner-occupied units converting to potential investor units. I don't know if you have a stance or if there is a comment on that or if there is anything in the HOA that would prevent that or limit it.

Mr. Whitaker said there is a condition contained in the staff report that is a 30% limit on rental units. That's something that we've done on other developments, specifically that are attached product, so townhomes. That is something that we'd be fine carrying through with this project.

Chairman Pilmer said I don't know if you can comment or give an opinion on property values and the impact.

Mr. Whitaker said it's, again, always a concern anytime you build something that doesn't look exactly like the other. We heard concerns from residents that it's going to diminish property values. Change is difficult. We recognize that people have made significant investment in their homes, whether it's on Castle Rock Circle or whether it's in Gramercy. Those are significant investments for folks. We don't think that we're doing anything that is going to negatively impact those investments. As with any business, we're continually improving and developing new product and making change based on feedback we see from customers. We're using some of the exact same floor plans we used in Gramercy in Chelsea. We're using floor plans that we've developed and used in Rolling Meadows in Chelsea Manor, so it is a constant process of getting feedback from buyers, getting feedback from people who visit us, but didn't buy to understand what people are looking for, so we are constantly providing new product that is attractive to the community. That's our business model. It's the city's business model to continually get better and continually improve. I don't think simply adding more townhome units next to Gramercy is a negative impact with respect to that community. It's a natural extension and I think it will fit seamlessly. With respect to the adjacent single family subdivision to the north, I drove it today. It's a beautiful community. They've got very nice homes. We've got a substantial separation between those communities, between the single family community and what we are proposing and we think it is an appropriate treatment. I could understand the concern if we were backing townhomes up to their larger single family homes, but we're not doing that. We took great care to plan an extensive buffer. Today there are kids playing in what is effectively their back yard, the property we are developing. There's about 5 acres that we're setting aside and it's going to have a permanent protective covenant

and they're going to know in perpetuity that nobody can change that. I think there's actually some benefit there. Some people like having a park in their back yard, some people like having a permanent pond in their back yard and now they've got a permanent pond in their back yard. We think that's a nice transition spot for us.

Chairman Pilmer said another item we heard a lot of testimony on is the impact on the school system and Indian Prairie. If the residents in the audience didn't hear earlier, in the staff's report, Indian Prairie School District 204 did provide a letter indicating their support the proposal. I don't know if the Petitioner wants to add anything additional on that.

Mr. Whitaker said I do a lot of land development in Naperville, in Aurora, and a lot of surrounding communities. It is a standard practice with most of my clients that we go and we reach out to government bodies. We're working with city staff. Part of that process is we're going to talk to the Fox Valley Park District. We coordinated with them and we didn't force a park on them. We heard what they needed. We heard what their long-term vision was and we worked with them. We talked to Indian Prairie School District 204. We sat down with Jay Strange. Jay is, I guess, now retired, but his predecessor, or his replacement, is Matt Shipley, but we had a great conversation with Matt. We went through the project, talked about the various dynamics of the project. We understand fully that they are going through a process because they've gotten more student generation happening on the north and they've got some schools that need students on the south. There is a process ongoing in District 204 where they are shuffling some boundaries, not because the schools are overcrowded on a district-wide basis, but because there's pressure points. I've been doing this type of work for coming up on 20 years and when I started, the pressure point in District 204 was south. There was no capacity in the south end of town, but if you wanted to build something in the north end of town, it wasn't a problem because there was plenty of capacity. It's funny how things change in 20 years, but this is part of a school district needing to manage its resources. They are doing that right now and there is plenty of capacity for students as reflected in the letter.

Chairman Pilmer said Ed, I've heard several questions around traffic and maybe geared toward the city or Mr. Greene.

Mr. Sieben said maybe Bob could come up and help answer those.

Chairman Pilmer said I know one of things we heard, and I think the Petitioner just touched on it, but Commons Drive from, I think it is, Thatcher north to 75th, I think the land to the east of that is not yet developed. Will that stay a narrow road at this time or can you explain the process there that Commons would be widened?

Mr. Greene said that's kind of getting a little bit out of my realm of Traffic Engineer, but as that develops up there, the road would be improved. It does drop to a two lane section, as you said from Thatcher up toward 75th. Hopefully that can be improved. What is that piece of land there?

Mr. Sieben said it is Brock-Bordie.

Chairman Pilmer said and with that development would come a widening at that time?

Mr. Sieben said right. Essentially, it's built as a half of a road, although it is wide enough for two lanes. There is also only half right-of-way because the other half hasn't come in for development yet.

Chairman Pilmer said how about as far as the volume of traffic, is there potential for traffic calming devices or stop signs?

Mr. Greene said usually the higher functioning road, such as arterials and the major collectors, what we've seen that may be effective is the radar speed signs. You may see those out. We put some on Indian Trail recently. Getting good feedback from the public with those. Also, we like to collect the speed data from time to time and share that with the Aurora Police Department so they can more effectively target their enforcement, speed enforcement.

Chairman Pilmer said then on Commons, there's some off-street parking there that will continue to be in place?

Mr. Greene said right. What I've seen with the plan, that on-street parking disappears and that's due to the implementation of left turn lanes for the access to the development. It would function as a three lane cross section, but without on-street parking in that section of Commons.

Chairman Pilmer said thank you. Anything else that you want to add?

Mr. Greens said I'd just echo the previous speaker. Commons Drive is functionally classed as a major collector. Major collectors typically will carry in the range of 4,000 or 5,000 at the low end and 10,000 at the upper end. The projections from the traffic impact study show a lot lighter than that, I think a couple thousand vehicles in the year 2027. But as things pick up with a new road, it is certainly noticeable to the public, so I understand their concerns.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said can I ask one question? What is the anticipated speed limit? It is going to be consistent throughout Commons? Some of them are pretty residential with driveways literally feeding into a major collector. What is the proposed speed limit and what does your traffic study show?

Mr. Greene said the last traffic study that wasn't influenced by COVID we took in January of 2020, so right before we got into lockdowns. The occupancy of M/I Homes development, the existing one, it was pretty light traffic. We measured some speed there thinking let the roadway further develop, let the occupancy happen and take a new sample. We are committed to get back there. Right now, in the absence of speed limit signs, it would revert to a statutory 30 miles per hour by the State of Illinois.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said so is that what would be the ideal for a residential area that goes to a major collector to maintain 25, 30, 35 speed limit and not your major collectors like Indian Trail that might have a higher speed limit?

Mr. Greene said for major collectors that we see in residential areas, usually you are typically in the 30 to 35 mile hour posting on those in the city.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said just another question, but it might be more related to noise. Have there been any noise analysis at all with the increase because folks when they purchased their homes, obviously, it was a lot less developed than it is now and has there been any other analysis at all of impact?

Mr. Greene said I'm not aware of a noise study.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said because that's one of the other concerns somebody had as to with all of the increased traffic, what is the noise impact to the neighborhood? Some of them have their back yard, little league, abutting against Commons, right? If you are going to have a 30 mile per hour 2,000 vehicles per day, it would add up. I live off of Liberty and there are berms and other mitigation factors to buffer out some of that noise, and these areas don't have that. Just wondering if there's been any consideration for noise impact to the neighborhoods.

Mr. Greene said I'm not aware of a noise study. I do know that there is a landscaping plan. Does someone want to speak to the landscaping plan for that?

Chairman Pilmer said we are going to work through the rest of our questions, but I'd ask the Petitioner if he or someone on his team would want to address the landscape plan.

Mr. Sieben said this actually is a preliminary. This will come back for final, so we don't have, right now, a detailed landscape plan, but that will come through with the final. I believe there might be one in the packet that you guys are proposing.

Mr. Whitaker said there is a preliminary landscape plan that's contained in the packet. Also on the Preliminary Engineering plan you would be able to identify that there is a small berm that we have planned along Commons and then we would have pretty significant plantings kind of on both sides of the top of the berm in order to address the kind of view our residents would have of Commons.

Chairman Pilmer said we've got a couple of follow up questions in the audience if you want to come forward. Were you sworn in earlier?

I was not because I wasn't going to talk.

Chairman Pilmer said if you'll raise your right hand. Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

I do.

My name is Nancy Luna and I'm on the board from Stonehaven. One of my questions is everyone is talking about the traffic from Gramercy north. Nobody is talking about the 2,000 cars that are going to come through our neighborhood. We are a little tiny neighborhood of 93 houses. That's all we have

and Commons Drive comes right through our neighborhood all the way to Montgomery Road. So I don't understand, I don't remember the word that was used as far as what type of road Commons Drive is, but I don't know if that is always through a neighborhood when you take those considerations in. I mean, that's a lot of cars. We are, like I said, a little neighborhood with 93 houses. We have kids. We have old people. To have that many more cars that are going to come through our neighborhood, I'm not even concerned about the north part. All the people need to get to the train. I don't even care, but I'm concerned about my neighborhood with all of these cars that are going to have to drive through to get to Montgomery Road because it is going to be congested going that way when they are trying to get to the train, so okay let's go out and let's just drive through Stonehaven. I mean it is crazy enough now when the soccer kids are there playing, people are making U-turns, they're driving crazy through our neighborhood and now we are going to have 100 more houses that are going to be here on a regular basis. That's my concern.

I'm Karman Tai. Just to be completely honest with you, I cannot say that any of my questions or concerns were addressed through the responses that the Petitioner gave, even from the Engineer from the city, specifically, is the road from Gramercy to 75th Street where it is single lane going to be expanded? Yes or no? If the answer is yes, when is that going to happen? Because I heard the Petitioner mention that this was a part of the farmland. That's the reason why it hasn't already been expanded and then I heard the other gentleman saying we hope that it will be in the future. What are the plans for that road? I don't believe that we should continue to build townhome developments if we have not addressed the traffic concerns both north and south. I agree with you too. We have not talked a lot about the traffic going south to Montgomery. That is a concern as well. This is a residential community. What are those plans? What specifically are the plans around the traffic there? Commons, whatever you want to classify it as, a collector of thousands of cars, the lane narrows down to a single lane of traffic once you get past Gramercy Square. That is the fact of the matter. We can all drive there when we leave here and you can see exactly how it is.

Mr. Sieben said it is actually two lanes.

Ms. Tai said okay two lanes of traffic. You still have to stop to allow cars to pass. It is a very narrow single lane of traffic. It is not the same width as what you have once you are at Gramercy.

Mr. Sieben said I believe it is a two lane wide street, correct Bob?

Ms. Tai said it narrows and there is a traffic concern. These aren't perceived. I think the terminology he used were perceived concerns. These are real legitimate concerns. This isn't a matter of us not being able to handle change. That is not the case. These are legitimate concerns that we're bringing forward so that they can be addressed. We want to understand what the plan is to address them in advance of more development. Not we hope, not eventually. What is the current plan? We also heard about the School District. There was a meeting with whoever you mentioned, Jay, who is now retired. Has there been conversation with the incumbent IPSD leadership? When are we going to rebalance and rezone the school boundaries? When is that going to happen and what is that timeline up against the development timeline? It needs to match up and it needs to be integrated. If the school is doing rezoning but it's not going to happen for 5 or 6 years and you're putting up more townhouses that are

going to go up in 6 months, the concern is still there. It is not addressed. Our concerns are not addressed. The other thing that I thought was compelling about tonight, the residents that live in Gramercy aren't even happy. I thought I was going to come here tonight, and it's my neighbors in Stonehaven. The residents in Gramercy Square, the development that they're not even finished with, they're not happy. So before you continue to expand more development, why don't you figure out the one that you're already currently building? Meet with the neighbors and understand what their concerns are. You're saying that the residents, you think it is an upgrade, it's attractive. That is not what the residents are saying. That is not what we heard from the residents. Our voices matter. The people that live in Gramercy Square, it's more of them here than from Stonehaven. Like they said, that development hasn't been up for more than 2 years and people are already moving out of it and they're not happy. So what I would suggest we do is work with those residents in Gramercy Square and address their concerns and then address the other concerns that are coming out of the other communities across on the west side of Gramercy and this proposed development and in Stonehaven. When is that stuff going to be addressed? What are the specific plans? What are the detailed plans and what are the detailed timelines? That's what we would like to know. Not throw up more townhouses and then we'll get to that later and the can gets kicked down the road and it never gets addressed and then we're stuck with dealing with it. It is not fair to us and I agree, if you are the 13th largest developer in the U.S., why are you developing on the only piece of land that we have, the only piece of green land that we have? Why, why are we doing that? It doesn't make any sense to me. Where do children play? Where do you go outside? This is not city living that we were interested in. This is a suburban community that we were interested in living in where there is green land, there's open space and not all of these housing developments piled up on top of each other. Go and find somewhere else to build. There's other places where you can build and develop. It doesn't need to be all crowded in one mile subdivisions. It doesn't make any sense.

Chairman Pilmer said before we go to our next speaker here, I just want to clarify for those in the audience, our Plan Commission is a group of residents of Aurora. We volunteer. We are residents just like the people in the audience tonight. We're just a recommending body, so it does not end here this evening. We are here to provide residents to allow them to provide testimony. We will do the best we can to have the Petitioner provide a response. We have very good ears. We listen. Everything that is spoken tonight will be recorded and it will be provided to our Aldermen that will, as this progresses to City Council, will make the final vote on this. We value the passion that everyone has. We value the time commitment that you have as residents, but we're also here to be good listeners and stewards of the City of Aurora as part of the overall development process. So sir, if you want to come forward.

My name is Tahir Yahya from 4123 Winslow Court at Gramercy Square. I just want to reiterate some of the points that were brought up and some of the concerns that weren't discussed by the Petitioner. When we're talking about the middle school that's in that area, there's only one middle school, it is Still Middle. That caters to three elementary schools, so the kids that are graduating from elementary, that would be Owens, Peter Gombert and White Eagle. So just imagine how many kids are going to that middle school. So I think we should think once again. I know that the person who was in charge of the Indian Prairie school, he retired now, who made that decision, but I don't know if that decision was made prior to the pandemic, but we need to speak to the current person and see if they are okay with it because I don't think that's fair to the people that are living there who have kids who are getting to go

to that middle school with so many students coming from three different elementary schools. Number two, the north side of Commons Drive, I know a lot of people spoke about how narrow that road is. I personally have seen people clip their side mirrors driving on that road and nobody spoke about how much more narrow that road gets during the wintertime when you have a snowbank on the side. So that's another concern. I've seen people go into the cornfield. I've seen people go into the snowbank, so that's a very narrow road and right now there is still construction going on at Gramercy Square. There is going to be more construction when the new development comes, so there are going to be more trucks going on that road. That means there is more potential for some sort of accident and it is just an accident waiting to happen and I don't know what program you guys use to, you know, that the engineers are using to project to the traffic, 2,000 cars going through that intersection on Commons Drive and Irving Road, or whichever, whatever intersection at those speeds, nobody follows the speed limit there. There is a speed detector. Nobody follows it. I've seen people race down that road. I've seen people leave from their soccer, pick up their kids from soccer and almost get in a car accident. That is a major concern. I have my kid who is going to be biking to middle school through that development. It is a straight, maybe 5 minute bike ride to Still Middle. I don't know if we are just waiting for some sort of accident to happen for some kid, God forbid, to get hurt, so then you guys can go to your projection and figure out that 2,000 cars is too much. So think about those things. I don't agree with some of the answers we've got from the Traffic Engineer and how that's been projected until 2027. I don't know how you guys figured that one out. Okay, another thing we haven't spoken about and I know we are pressed for time, everyone wants to go home, there is another development by Still Middle it is called Meadowridge. It is by Lenner Properties. That hasn't even been finished being constructed, so there is a lot of traffic coming in. There are a lot of people moving in, in this area. There is a lot more families that are going to be moving in sending their kids to school. I think we need to do more homework. Clearly what's been presented here today with the lack of people who showed up, there's not enough people. We had a significant amount of people who spoke on behalf of Gramercy. There's been a few people who spoke about Stonehaven, but that community, a lot of people wanted to move there and bring their kids there so that they could have a better life, they can give their kids some free room to play and go to some good schools, so please don't take that away from us.

Chairman Pilmer said any additional testimony? So at this point, I'm going to close the public hearing. I am just going to ask for a little clarification. We appreciate your comments regarding Indian Prairie School District. I know there is some additional testimony just given and I will reiterate that, as the developer said and as I stated earlier that it's in the staff report, the City of Aurora did receive a letter from the School District dated August of 2021 that does show their support of the development. I hope that clarifies that point. I believe I'd ask Mr. Greene again to come forward and just clarify the traffic to the south. So on Commons to Montgomery Road, I think you talked about that a little bit earlier, but if you just reiterate a collector and the amount of traffic that is it set to absorb.

Mr. Greene said Commons, 75th down to Montgomery, is a major collector as classified by the city. Again, major collectors will carry between typically in the city and in the nation several thousand vehicles, up to about 10,000 and then they'll go into a classification of a minor arterial. The traffic impact study that I've seen and the numbers that were supplied by the developer, and I just want to clarify, show that projection of 2027 being 2,000 cars for Commons at that time with the developments and the background traffic.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said I have a question for the Petitioner about the detention pond. I think someone raised a concern about how is that going to be maintained to insure there's not much rodents and mosquitoes. I've lived behind a detention pond in the past and they require significant maintenance if it is not maintained properly, especially a dry bottom detention pond. Can you please clarify that or is there a plan by the HOA to make sure that's being maintained?

Mr. Whitaker said great question. As part of our landscape plan, it's preliminary now, but if we were to get approvals, we would develop a final landscape plan and the final landscape plan would detail all of the plantings and where all of the plantings go. It is developed by a landscape architect, an ecologist and they are skilled in understanding inundation of water flows and what should be planted where. So I think that's item number one. That landscape plan becomes a record with the city. It is an obligation of the development and the Homeowner's Association, who will maintain the detention pond, and has an obligation to comply with the landscape plan. So there's an affirmative obligation of the Homeowner's Association to comply with it. As part of the documents that we write for the Homeowner's Association, there is also a management maintenance plan. That management and maintenance plan explains how they are supposed to, through their professional management company that would be hired and they would be paying to maintain this, how they maintain the ponds so that it doesn't become a nuisance. There are absolutely situations where they have become a nuisance, but I think in the last 10 to 15 years we've gotten much better at figuring out exactly how to maintain them and what best practices are and I think ponds that have been built in more recent vintage have done a very good job of sort of balancing that.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said and will such a plan be shared? I'm just speaking for, I think that's, Stonehaven residents because their back yard literally backs against this detention pond and how will would they have access to those documents and being able to monitor if something happens?

Mr. Whitaker said again, it is preliminary engineering now, so it is sort of beyond concept, but it is just a preliminary layout plan. When we do the final engineering, we would have a final stormwater report. A final stormwater report is probably going to be a couple of hundred pages. It is going to be all of the essential details for the engineering of that basin and have a final landscape plan associated with it. There will be a management and maintenance plan associated with it. All of that stuff will be on file with the city. I would also note that the city, I assume, will have a backup SSA on this property, so if, in fact, there were a failure to maintain, so if the Castle Rock residents identified that the Chelsea Manor residents were not maintaining the pond, they could pick up the phone and call Ed and Ed could go out there and verify if we've complied with the plan and they could actually impose a special tax on our residents in order to insure that it was maintained. There's sort of three different layers of control in order to make sure these things function long-term.

Mr. Broadwell said I'll read the Findings of Fact for the Conditional Use Planned Development.

1. Will the establishment, maintenance or operation of the conditional use be unreasonably detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort, or general welfare?

Mr. Broadwell said as far as the land use is concerned, staff believes that the proposed land use is consistent with the surrounding area. We did hear some significant concerns from the community about the traffic and the school. As far as traffic is concerned, as we heard from the Petitioner and from the city's Traffic Engineer and also from the Zoning Director, Commons is a major collector that has capacity for the traffic based on what we've reviewed. We've heard that there will be continual analysis and mitigation in regard to the north and south parts of Commons Drive.

2. Will the conditional use be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted or substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood, factors including but not limited to lighting, signage and outdoor amplification, hours of operation, refuse disposal areas and architectural compatibility and building orientation?

Mr. Broadwell said again we would say that what we've discussed with land use and traffic, staff believes that the Conditional Use Planned Development has been prepared as a means for these residential townhomes to develop consistently with the residential townhomes to the north, and for the southern detention pond to provide a buffer to the single family subdivision to the south and that N. Commons drive will also allow for further separation from the single family development to the west. As we also heard, there is landscaping and berming that will be included with the final plan.

- 3, Will the establishment of the conditional use impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding property for uses permitted in the district?

Mr. Broadwell said staff believes that the Petitioner has gone to great lengths to provide a proposal that is consistent with the surrounding neighborhood.

4. Will the proposal provide for adequate utilities, access roads, drainage, and/or other necessary facilities as part of the conditional use?

Mr. Broadwell said staff believes that the proposal will allow for the Planned Development to also comply with the applicable city review standards and processes.

5. Does the proposal take adequate measures, or will they be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets?

Mr. Broadwell said we believe that this is evident in the city's review and also the Petitioner's willingness to review and mitigate traffic in the area and that this will be in compliance with the demands.

6. Does the conditional use in all other respects conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located, except as such regulations may in each instance be modified by the City Council pursuant to the recommendations of the Commission?

Mr. Broadwell said staff believes that the Conditional Use Planned Development does in all other respects conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located, except as such regulations may in each instance be modified by the City Council pursuant to the recommendations of the Commission.

Mr. Broadwell said so that's the Conditional Use Findings of Fact. Moving onto the Rezoning.

1. Is the proposal in accordance with all applicable official physical development policies and other related official plans and policies of the City of Aurora?

Mr. Broadwell said staff has reviewed the petition and believes that the proposal is in accordance with the applicable official physical development policies and plans of the City of Aurora, which you can see in the staff report.

2. Does the proposal represent the logical establishment and/or consistent extension of the requested classification in consideration of the existing land uses, existing zoning classifications, and essential character of the general area of the property in question?

Mr. Broadwell said staff believes that it does.

3. Is the proposal consistent with a desirable trend of development in the general area of the property in question, occurring since the property in question was placed in its present zoning classification, desirability being defined as the trend's consistency with applicable official physical development policies and other related official plans and policies of the City of Aurora?

Mr. Broadwell said staff does believe that this is consistent.

4. Will the rezoning permit uses which are more suitable than uses permitted under the existing zoning classification?

Mr. Broadwell said staff believes that the residential townhomes and detention pond uses are suitable for the zoning classifications.

5. Is the rezoning a consistent extension of the existing land uses, existing zoning classification and essential character of the general area?

Mr. Broadwell said staff does believe that this is true.

Mr. Broadwell said staff would recommend conditional approval of an Ordinance establishing a Conditional Use Planned Development, approving the Chelsea Manor Plan Description and amending Chapter 49 of the Code of Ordinances, City of Aurora, by modifying the Zoning Map attached thereto to an underlying zoning for R-4A Two Family Dwelling District and Conservation, Open Space and Drainage District with a Conditional Use Planned Development for the property located near the southeast corner of S. Commons Drive and Irving road with the following condition:

1. That the CC&R's include a provision that no more than 30% of dwelling units be licensed rental units.

I believe that came up and they were agreeable to that.

Chairman Pilmer said Steve, can you also give some clarification, I think there's an additional potential condition regarding access.

Mr. Sieben said that's actually going to be on the second one with the preliminary.

MOTION OF CONDITIONAL APPROVAL WAS MADE BY: Mr. Elsbree

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mr. Gonzales

AYES: Chairman Pilmer, Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Elsbree, Mr. Gonzales

NAYS: Mrs. Owusu-Safo

FINDINGS OF FACT – CONDITIONAL USE

1. Will the establishment, maintenance or operation of the conditional use be unreasonably detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort, or general welfare?

Mrs. Anderson said no, this is consistent with the surrounding area and is also stated in the staff report.

2. Will the conditional use be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted or substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood, factors including but not limited to lighting, signage and outdoor amplification, hours of operation, refuse disposal areas and architectural compatibility and building orientation?

Mr. Elsbree said as stated in the staff report, it will not be injurious.

3. Will the establishment of the conditional use impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding property for uses permitted in the district?

Chairman Pilmer said staff does not believe the proposed Conditional Use Planned Development will impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding property for uses permitted in the district. Staff also believes the Petitioner has gone to great lengths to provide a proposal that is consistent with the surrounding neighborhood.

4. Will the proposal provide for adequate utilities, access roads, drainage, and/or other necessary facilities as part of the conditional use?

Chairman Pilmer said as listed in the staff report, those items are all provided or listed as being provided for.

5. Does the proposal take adequate measures, or will they be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets?

Mrs. Anderson said yes, it has been provided and is also listed in the staff report.

6. Does the conditional use in all other respects conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located, except as such regulations may in each instance be modified by the City Council pursuant to the recommendations of the Commission?

Mr. Elsbree said as stated in the staff report, it does conform to the applicable regulations.

FINDINGS OF FACT – REZONING

1. Is the proposal in accordance with all applicable official physical development policies and other related official plans and policies of the City of Aurora?

Mrs. Anderson said it is and it is also listed in the staff report.

2. Does the proposal represent the logical establishment and/or consistent extension of the requested classification in consideration of the existing land uses, existing zoning classifications, and essential character of the general area of the property in question?

Mr. Elsbree said yes it does and is stated in the staff report.

3. Is the proposal consistent with a desirable trend of development in the general area of the property in question, occurring since the property in question was placed in its present zoning classification, desirability being defined as the trend's consistency with applicable official physical development policies and other related official plans and policies of the City of Aurora?

Mr. Elsbree said yes, the trends are consistent.

4. Will the rezoning permit uses which are more suitable than uses permitted under the existing zoning classification?

Chairman Pilmer said we believe that rezoning will allow for uses that are more suitable than uses permitted under the existing zoning classifications and that residential townhomes and detention pond uses are permitted within their respected zoning districts.

5. Is the rezoning a consistent extension of the existing land uses, existing zoning classification and essential character of the general area?

Mr. Elsbree said yes, it is consistent.

Mr. Broadwell said this will next be heard at the Building, Zoning and Economic Development Committee meeting on Wednesday, August 25th at 4:00 on the 5th floor of City Hall, Conference Room B.

21-0507 A Resolution approving a Revision to the Preliminary Plat and Plan for the property located near the southeast corner of S. Commons Drive and Irving Road (M/I Homes of Chicago, LLC – 21-0506 / NA33/2-21.195-CUPD/Psd/Ppn/P – SB – Ward 8)

Mr. Broadwell said staff would recommend conditional approval of the Resolution approving a Revision to the Preliminary Plat and Plan for the property located near the southeast corner of S. Commons Drive and Irving Road with the following conditions:

1. That the developer will eliminate the southerly access to S. Commons.
2. Per the Engineering Department, the submitted Traffic Study should be revised to include the peak weekend traffic volume during the time period when Calvary Church traffic would be allowed to utilize the proposed private access road. The proposed S. Commons Drive left turn striping lane should be revised based on the findings of the Traffic Impact Study as necessary.
3. Final approval from the Engineering Division should be obtained.
4. That the Fire Access Plan be re revised per review comments which are dated August 16, 2021.

MOTION OF CONDITIONAL APPROVAL WAS MADE BY: Mrs. Anderson

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mr. Elsbree

AYES: Chairman Pilmer, Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Elsbree, Mr. Gonzales, Mrs. Owusu-Safo

NAYS: None

Mr. Broadwell said this will next be heard at the Building, Zoning and Economic Development Committee meeting on Wednesday, July 28th at 4:00 on the 5th floor of City Hall.