

## **City of Aurora**

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

## **Legistar History Report**

File Number: 17-00863

File ID:17-00863Type:PetitionStatus:Draft

Version: 2 General In Control: Planning &

Ledger #: Development
Committee

File Created: 09/12/2017

File Name: ATMI Precast / Setback Variance / 1023 Ridgeway Final Action:

Avenue Variance

Title: An Ordinance Approving a Setback Requirement Variance pursuant to

Section 10.5 for property located at 1023 Ridgeway Avenue being north of Ridgeway Avenue and west of Elmwood Drive to allow for a 18 foot reduction of the front yard setback from 30 feet to 12 feet and a 21 foot reduction of the

rear yard setback from 30 feet to 9 feet (ATMI Precast - 17-00863 / AU29/2-17.152-A/Su/DED/V - JM - Ward 4) (PUBLIC HEARING)

Notes:

Agenda Date: 10/12/2017

Agenda Number:

Sponsors: Enactment Date:

Attachments: Exhibit A - Legal Description.pdf, Final Plan - Enactment Number:

2017-08-23 - 2017.152.pdf, Landscape Plan -

2017-09-09 - 2017.152.pdf, Property Research Sheet - ID 46446 - 2017-07-20 - 2017.152.pdf, Property Research Sheet - ID 64481 - 2017-07-20 - 2017.152.pdf, Land Use Petition and Supporting Documents - 2017-08-23 - 2017.152.pdf, Plat of Survey - 2017-08-23 - 2017.152.pdf, Landscape Materials Worksheet - 2017-08-23 - 2017.152.pdf, Legistar History Report (Variance) - 2017-10-02 -

2017.152.pdf, Findings of Facts - 2017-09-28 -

2017.152.pdf

Drafter: jmorgan@aurora-il.org

Planning Case #: AU29/2-17.152-A/Su/DED/V

Hearing Date:

Effective Date:

## **History of Legislative File**

Ver- sion:	Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:
1	Committee of the Whole	09/19/2017	Forward to Planning Council	DST Staff Council (Planning Council)			

Action Text: This Petition was Forward to Planning Council to the DST Staff Council (Planning Council)

DST Staff Council 09/26/2017 Forwarded Zoning Board of

(Planning Council) Appeals

Action Text: A motion was made by Mrs. Morgan, seconded by Mr. Broadwell, that this agenda item be Forwarded

to the Zoning Board of Appeals, on the agenda for 10/4/2017. The motion carried by voice vote.

Notes: Mrs. Morgan said staff made some small comments on landscaping. They met all of our comments.

Mr. Feltman said we sent out comments. I don't remember if they resubmitted back in, but our comments were pretty minor. You've got more issues than we do with all your setbacks and everything.

Mr. Sieben said you just had a couple of comments with the landscaping.

Mrs. Morgan said just a few additional landscaping comments.

Mr. Sieben said I believe they were burning the house soon and working with the Fire Department.

Mrs. Morgan said this is going October 4th to the Zoning Board of Appeals for the setback variance. I do make a motion to move this forward to the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting on October 4th. Mr. Broadwell seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

2 Zoning Board of Appeals

10/04/2017 Forwarded

this is for the Variance only.

Planning &

10/12/2017

10/04/2017

Pass

Pass

Development Committee

Action Text:

A motion was made by Mr. Pilmer, seconded by Mrs. Truax, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Planning & Development Committee, on the agenda for 10/12/2017. The motion carried.

Notes:

Mrs. Morgan said the Petitioner is requesting, as you mentioned, a Variance to the setbacks, including the front yard setback and the rear yard setback to develop a 52 stall parking lot. Just to note for everyone, this is for the Variance only. The Special Use allowing the parking lot will be covered at the Planning Commission meeting along with the Annexation and Dedication. The subject property is currently a residential single family and vacant land. The portion that's at 1023 Ridgeway that's in the city is zoned R-1. The small lot that is vacant to the east of 1023 Ridgeway will be annexed into the city as R-1. The details of the project do include development of a 52 stall parking lot to accommodate more off-street parking for ATMI Precast. The parking lot will be on both 1023 Ridgeway that's currently in the city and the vacant lot that is currently unincorporated Kane Country. Just to note for this Variance, they did submit a landscape plan. The existing 6 foot fences that run along the north, east and west property lines will remain. The landscape plan also includes additional canopy trees, evergreen trees and understory trees on the yards to the north and east to provide buffering for the residential properties. Hedgerows will be added to the ends of the parking isles on the east and west to provide some buffer for headlights. Also concurrently with this proposal the Petitioner is requesting the Annexation of .18 acres to the east of 1023 Ridgeway and it will be annexed as R-1 and it will remain R-1. The Petitioner is also requesting a Plat of Dedication for a right-of-way for the property of Ridgeway Avenue that abuts 1023 Ridgeway. Lastly, the Petitioner is requesting approval of a Special Use for a parking facilities, non-residential use on the lot. It will stay R-1, both properties with a Special Use allowing the parking lot. The current house on the site, I don't know if anyone's noticed, is in the process of being demolished. The development will continue to have the one entrance that it currently does, but that will move slightly to the west. There will still be one entrance. The parking lot will have about 3 isles in kind of a "U" shape. Just to note, some of the staff's points worthy to mention is that the property is located across the street from an existing parking lot for the ATMI Precast business and adjacent to an existing commercial property to the west that has a 24 space parking lot and that parking lot abuts right up to the actual property line. This has more of a setback than the property to the west. This is to accommodate additional parking. Again,

Mr. Pilmer said I just have a quick clarification. You just talked about the property to the west of their parking lot that runs right to the property line, but the Variance we are looking at today is not the east or the west property lines, those are conforming, it is just the north and south?

Mrs. Morgan said yes. It is just the north and south, but the property to the west, the southern parking

abuts

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said may I ask real quickly, what's the intent of the parking lot?

Mrs. Morgan said to accommodate more off-street parking for the employees of ATMI. Currently they are doing a lot of on-street parking, which is causing some congestion in the area. If you remember, there was another parking lot that came through like a month or so ago.

The Petitioners were sworn in.

My name is Martin Jacyno. I'm with ATMI Precast. Like Jill said, primarily we're just trying to provide some additional parking. The lot we looked at previously, we are putting that in so that we can get some of our office employees a place to park off the street. The intention of this lot is to provide a little bit more space for our plant employees. When we did the building itself, we did a building addition, we added 86 parking spaces for that, but this will hopefully get the rest of our guys off of the street. The Fire Department has been practicing now for the last 3 days. Today is the last day that that house will be there. The house that the Fire Department has been training in, that is the house that we are taking down obviously and that is where the parking lot is going to be.

Chairman Cameron said that and the adjacent lot.

Mr. Jacyno said yes. What was going on there was the lot that the house was on, that was already in the City of Aurora and the adjacent lot where Jill is pointing right now, that was unincorporated Township. When we bought the property both of those parcels came together so we asked if we could incorporate that into the city.

The public input portion of the public hearing was opened. No witnesses came forward. The public input portion of the public hearing was closed.

Mrs. Morgan said staff does not provide recommendations for Zoning Board of Appeals. I did note some of our discussion items earlier about what staff noted about the adjacent properties, how they are developed and their setbacks. Staff doesn't have any oppositions.

MOTION OF APPROVAL WAS MADE BY: Mr. Pilmer

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mrs. Truax

AYES: Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Bergeron, Mrs. Cole, Mrs. Owusu-Safo, Mr. Pilmer, Mrs. Truax

NAYS: None

## FINDINGS OF FACT

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. Cole said these are 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. Pilmer said this is a Variance request for the subject property and I believe I would state that it is consistent and actually less obtrusive to neighboring properties, primarily those to the west.

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?

Chairman Cameron said it is consistent with the idea of providing off-street parking and removing the

congestion on the streets. Hopefully this will solve that concern.

- 4. Will the proposal maintain a compatible relationship with the traffic pattern and traffic volume of adjacent streets and not have an adverse effect upon traffic or pedestrian movement and safety in the general area of the property in question?
- Mr. Bergeron said again, moving the traffic off the street into the parking lot would relieve some of the traffic.
- 5. Will the proposal allow for the provision of adequate public services and facilities to the property in question and have no adverse effect upon existing public services and facilities?
- Mr. Pilmer said there should be no change.
- 6. Does the proposal take adequate measures or will they be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to maximize pedestrian and vehicular circulation ease and safety, minimize traffic congestion, and not substantially increase the congestion in the public streets?
- Mrs. Owusu-Safo said the proposal is a better alternative to on-street parking since it is removing all of these vehicles into one location.
- 8a. Is the variance based on the particular physical surroundings, shape or topographical conditions of the specific property involved so that a particular hardship to the owner would result, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if a strict letter of regulations were carried out?
- Mr. Pilmer said I would say it is unique to the property and would impact the owner from a hardship that they would not be able to take advantage of the amount of parking they are trying to provide.
- 8b. Is the variance based on unique conditions to the property for which the variance is sought and are not applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification?
- Mrs. Owusu-Safo said it is based on unique conditions to that particular property based on the anticipated use.
- 8c. Is the variance based on an alleged difficulty or hardship that is caused by the ordinance and has not been created by any person presently having an interest in the property?

Mrs. Truax said I don't believe it has been created by any person presently having an interest in the property.

Mrs. Morgan said this will next be heard at the Planning and Development Committee meeting on Thursday, October 12, 2017, at 4:00 p.m. in the 5th floor conference room of this building.

Aye: 6 At Large Truax, At Large Anderson, At Large Bergeron, At Large Cole, At Large Pilmer and At Large Owusu-Safo