



# City of Aurora

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

## Legistar History Report

**File Number: 17-00611**

**File ID:** 17-00611

**Type:** Ordinance

**Status:** ATS Review

**Version:** 3

**General Ledger #:**

**In Control:** Planning & Development Committee

**File Created:** 07/06/2017

**File Name:** ATMI / Special Use / 659 S. Elmwood Drive

**Final Action:**

**Title:** An Ordinance Granting a Special Use Permit for a Parking Facilities, Non-Residential (4170) Use on a portion of the property at 659 S. Elmwood Drive located along Hartford Avenue

**Notes:**

**Agenda Date:** 08/10/2017

**Agenda Number:**

**Sponsors:**

**Enactment Date:**

**Attachments:** Exhibit "A" Legal Description.pdf, Exhibit "B" - Memorandum of Agreement.pdf, Final Plan - 2017-07-06.pdf, Landscape Plan - 2017-07-19.pdf, Land Use Petition and Supporting Documents - 2017-07-06 - 2016.018.pdf, Property Research Sheet - 2017-07-11 - 2016.018.pdf, Plat of Survey - 2017-07-06 - 2016.018.pdf, Legistar History Report (Special Use) - 2017-07-25 - 2016.018.pdf

**Enactment Number:**

**Planning Case #:** AU29/2-16.018-Su/V

**Hearing Date:**

**Drafter:** jmorgan@aurora-il.org

**Effective Date:**

### History of Legislative File

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

1	Committee of the Whole	07/11/2017	Forward to Planning Council	DST Staff Council (Planning Council)			
<b>Action Text:</b>		This Petition was Forward to Planning Council to the DST Staff Council (Planning Council)					

1	DST Staff Council (Planning Council)	07/18/2017	<b>Notes:</b> <i>Representatives Present: Dave Burroughs, Marty Jaycino, Chris Barone</i>				
---	--------------------------------------	------------	---	--	--	--	--

*Mr. Sieben said so the Special Use would be on the new parking lot to the west, which would enter and exit off of Harford, so that's a Special Use to allow that commercial parking and then there would be a variance within that Special Use. Then the second variance is for the existing parking lot to the east to add that row of parking on the west side there in the dark area due to the setback to that residential lot on Ridgeway. So these will both go concurrent. Do you want to give a little background of what's going on here, the need for the additional parking?*

Mr. Jaycino said our plant has been growing and fundamentally we just don't have enough space to keep people off the streets in the area. We've owned that little parcel that abuts Hartford since we purchased the property and that just seemed like a good place to be able to increase the parking for our office area and reduce the pressure on the neighborhood around us. The same with the additional parking that we are looking for in the main lot. We are also looking actually at a parcel that is across the street from the main parking lot on Ridgeway. We purchased a house that is at that location next to that Stoney's bar and we want to add that to our parking area as well.

Mr. Sieben said and that we can set up a separate DST meeting and go over that.

Mr. Jaycino said I just wanted to get the big picture in a sense that if you drive down there, every spot on the street is taken up. I'm sure that we are putting pressure on the neighbors and quite frankly we want something that is a little bit safer for our employees and this will allow us to provide that.

Mr. Burroughs said and this engineering Dan, just so you remember, was submitted as part of a building plan for the Double T Building down here, so it was somewhat reviewed at that time as well.

Mr. Feltman said right, but then we asked you to grade out because we were going to approve that plan with...

Mr. Burroughs said right.

Mr. Sieben said the permit was just for that addition and that portion and this one is going to be separate, correct?

Mr. Burroughs said yes.

Mr. Feltman said and I don't know if we totally formalized the whole stormwater management with that new parking lot. There was a lot of talk about different ways to handle, whether it was porous pavement or...

Mr. Burroughs said correct and that's what we are showing because that downstream storm sewer has limited capacity. We recognize that.

Ms. Phifer said it is a public hearing, but staff is supportive. You are trying to be a good neighbor and get the parking on site instead of in the neighborhood and so through these 2 actions it would bring the property into conformance and allow you to do what you want. I think we are looking to move this forward.

Mrs. Morgan said yes. We have already advertised for the August 2nd Planning Commission, so we will vote this out next week. I had a few landscaping comments. I think they've already been addressed. Just some additional buffering for the extra parking spaces there that do border residential.

Mr. Barone said do you want to touch on that corner?

Mr. Jaycino said at the northwest corner of the property, to be honest I'm not really sure what to do about the situation we have there. There are a couple of large trees in that corner and the berm kind of creates this sort of secluded little spot and we've had quite a bit of trouble with transients literally sleeping and sitting there. There is a lot of trash in the area. We are wondering if, as part of this, we took down the 2 large trees that are in that spot to kind of clean that space up so that it is a little more accessible for police patrol or just to kind of have it a little bit more open. I know we have a lot of landscaping that's pushed in the back, but we are kind of nervous for our employees. We have people sitting there at lunchtime now. I think it makes a lot of people uneasy.

Mrs. Morgan said is it right on the street?

Mr. Barone said it is right on Ridgeway. I'm surprised this guy hasn't complained. Is this Aurora is this unincorporated?

Mr. Burroughs said it is in the township.

Ms. Phifer said we'll go out there and take a look at it understanding the concern and see if we can come up with a solution that is good because we don't want to see that either.

Mr. Jaycino said no, and like I say when we have people, younger kids that are working there until 9:00 or 10:00 o'clock at night sometimes it makes us uneasy with regard to their safety. Quite frankly, they are making a mess for the rest of the neighborhood as well. I think as kind of an addition to that, right now we have a lot of people parking on the streets and we are hoping this will reduce the pressure that is on the streets, but we are wondering if we could have no parking signs posted along the frontage of the parking lot area because what happens is people literally park right up to the driveway exit right now and you've got people flying down Ridgeway at 30 miles an hour. They are not looking to see who is coming out. I don't know if that is something we look at now or if that is something we deal with later.

Ms. Phifer said we can definitely deal with sight distance issues right now. As far as posting, you know, being able to paint the curb line yellow, at least, for sight distance from the driveway, that's something you can show on the plans right now. As far as posting something "no parking" though, that needs to go through a process.

Mr. Feltman said Government Operations.

Mr. Jaycino said I'm good with painting the yellow curb and keeping 20 feet from the driveway clear because right now you come out of there and it is like a game of roulette. You're not sure who is going to be flying by.

Mr. Feltman said well I'd have to talk to the city Traffic Engineer and figure out what the proper distance is instead of just eyeballing it. I mean, if there is more that needs to be striped, to be honest with you, it needs to be posted. Just putting paint down is not going to...

Ms. Phifer said but a here to corner thing, which is more of a sight distance versus no parking signs is a little different.

Mr. Jaycino said and we don't want this to hold things up because, obviously, the year is rapidly moving forward on us and we want to make sure we can still pave this year. That's a concern that we have and I think that's probably a concern that the city has too and we want to work the city on that part of it.

Mr. Feltman said I don't recall seeing final engineering submitted on this to be honest with you. Is it forthcoming?

Mr. Burroughs said well like I said, we already submitted that with the Double T Building. It is the same set of plans.

Mr. Sieben said so it was submitted with the building permit of the other thing, so do you need a copy then?

Mr. Feltman said yes. Again, we asked you to bring all that out and we kind of ignored it because we knew this was going to be another phase that you are coming in with now, so we really need final engineering submitted.

Mr. Burroughs said I can resend it, but we did get extensive comments on that parking lot at that time. It was 2 pages worth, so I'm hopeful that we are there.

Mr. Feltman said we need to have this plan then ready to be approved because we didn't approve it as that at first phase.

1	DST Staff Council (Planning Council)	07/25/2017	Forwarded	Planning Commission	08/02/2017	Pass
---	---	------------	-----------	------------------------	------------	------

**Action Text:** A motion was made by Mrs. Morgan, seconded by Mrs. Vacek, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Planning Commission, on the agenda for 8/2/2017. The motion carried by voice vote.

**Notes:** Mrs. Morgan said staff sent out just some minor comments on landscaping. They've addressed all those and have resubmitted.

Mr. Feltman said we partially reviewed this under the first phase. We'd still need to do a formal review on this new parking lot, but there shouldn't be anything major with it.

Mrs. Morgan said I do make a motion to move this forward to the August 2nd Planning Commission for

a public hearing. Mrs. Vacek seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

2	Planning Commission	08/02/2017	Forwarded	Planning & Development Committee	08/10/2017	Pass
---	---------------------	------------	-----------	----------------------------------	------------	------

**Action Text:** A motion was made by Mr. Pilmer, seconded by Mr. Cameron, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Planning & Development Committee, on the agenda for 8/10/2017. The motion carried.

**Notes:** Mrs. Morgan said the subject property is currently located at 659 S. Elmwood Drive. Just for a little background on it. The property is one piece of property, but it is zoned M-2 as well as R-1. The M-2 portion is that portion between Ridgeway Avenue and Rathbone Avenue. The R-1 portion is the portion that goes from the M-2 portion over to Hartford Avenue. It is the little side portion that abuts the residential. The Petitioner is currently coming before you for a Special Use for a Parking Facilities, Non-Residential (4170) Use on the R-1 portion, so that is the portion to the west, the smaller portion. It is for a Special Use for a 44 space parking lot. The ingress and egress will be from the current parking lot on the M-2 portion to Hartford Avenue. Currently there is a 6 foot fence along the boundaries of the residential portion to the north and south and they are adding a row of landscaping to the north and south. The applicant is proposing this additional parking lot to try to alleviate some of the on-street parking their employees are currently doing. In addition to the Special Use, they are asking for an Authorized Setback Variance from 8 feet to 7.7 feet. It is an Authorized Variance and the Zoning Administrator can approve that. Also concurrently with this petition, the Petitioner has requested a variance on the M-2 portion that just came before ZBA. It was approved by ZBA to add the additional 12 parking spaces to the west. That's just kind of for background information because that was before ZBA and has been approved by ZBA. You are just looking at the Special Use for the non-residential parking. To note, there is a photometric plan on this portion in your packet showing they are adding lighting, but there is a photometric plan for you to look at to see where it ends going up to the 0.0 requirement.

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

My name is Phil LaDeur. I'm the current resident of 624 Hartford Avenue. I've been the resident there for the past 5 years with my fiancé and we also take care of our 3 year old nephew during the week. This lot presents some issues to us as we've looked at the plans here now. As a resident, this factory has sort of caused some problems. The blinding light, there is a large light that Mr. Cameron mentioned in the last session that is at the top of the building when workers are working and they work throughout the night at all hours and that light is extremely bright. As he mentioned in the last session, it not only can be blinding to drivers, it is blinding to us as residents. It goes straight into our window at night. Of course, we have blinds and things like that, but still it is sort of un-nerving to have such a large light going straight into your house. As residents, we've been tending to this lot next door. It is a big open green grass lot. We have been mowing it. We have been pulling weeds. We have been using it for family get-togethers. We have been taking care of this lot for the past 5 years without any sort of assistance or help or any sort of neighborly acknowledgement from the owners of the company or the actual owners of the property. On top of that, the owners of 624 Hartford have been using the driveway that falls just a few feet within their property line for the past 50 years. Additionally, they've been taking care of this lot for the past 40 years without any assistance, any sort of compensation, any sort of acknowledgement toward the care of this lot. There proposal is to create a fence right next to our property that is 6 inches off the property line. To us that is pretty devastating because we've taken care of this lot for so many years and to have a large not super high quality fence standing straight up next to our windows, we're planning on owning this property in the near future as well and this is going to depreciate the value of the house and we are going to lose out on that driveway that we have been using for the past 50 years. Some other things. They are planning to create an additional entrance to the parking lot coming down Hartford. There is one, I believe, off of Ridgeway or Elmwood, but they plan on making an additional entrance off of Hartford. Now if you've been to that neighborhood, it has no sidewalks, but there are a lot of families in that neighborhood and there are a lot of families right around our house. There are about 5 families living next to or around that lot and there are no sidewalks. So when kids want to play, when they want to go for a walk, whatever, they are in the street and that's going to be added traffic down that street going up and down. So that raises quite a few concerns as well. I think those are all of my concerns. If they are going to continue this plan without working with the neighbors, we have not heard anything. There is no one knocking on our doors saying by the way we are going to bring a bobcat right next to your house at 5:00 or 6:00 o'clock in the morning and start digging a huge hole in the lot that you've been using for your nephew or your family or whatever you've been taking care of for us for the past 5 years for us and the past 40 years for the past family. So there has been no sort of communication and from what we've heard it doesn't sound like there is too much flexibility in these plans and we find that really, really upsetting and if communication doesn't start opening up we will file for adverse possession of this lot. That's all I have.

*I'm Jean Bitter from 1109 McMillan. My family has lived there since the early 50's and I truly recognize this gentleman's issue with it. The other issue that I would bring to light from a resident in the area is we are very happy that that building and business is so very successful. I'm in construction, or have been in construction, and I know they run 24/7 a lot of times. I recognize the light that the gentleman is talking about. It doesn't affect my property. However, one can see it from Jericho Road like baseball lights. So I appreciate his comment. My greater concern is if you live in the neighborhood there, quite frankly, all the surrounding public thoroughfares there are dominated by the trucks that go in and out, the huge flatbeds with the big plank concrete on them, preformed concreted, and not only is it very difficult sometimes to even traverse those highways because the trucks are parked, they're really not used for public thoroughfares. It is like they are treated like they are private property. Secondly, the other thing that happens is all of the roads that are around there are in devastating condition. That's Township there. I don't know who maintains them in terms of blacktopping or resurfacing or anything, but the tracks that are down on Rathbone, I think that is Rathbone that head into Lake Street, you could lose a tire in them. So my concern is not only is it disrupting to add yet another block that's going to have that risk exposure, although I understand from this hearing that it is probably just for cars and not any other trucks, they are not going to be moving truck through there. I don't know who actually owns the piece of property. Again, I know the family that lived there 50 years ago, but that's long gone. So that's my concern in living there. Who's going to maintain all of that traffic that's disrupting currently the roads and if you ever go down there, the roads are a nightmare. Secondly, I'm not real happy either with an exit coming out onto Hartford Avenue. It will not only cause congestion, but also add added traffic. He's correct. There is a ton of little kids that play around in there on the streets and ride their bikes. That's all I have to say.*

*The public input portion of the public hearing was closed.*

*The Petitioners were sworn in.*

*Chairman Truax said I can tell you what I have on my summary of the issues. The brightness of the lights on the existing factory building. Is that something that we can take a look at as part of this?*

*Mr. Burroughs said yes.*

*My name is Martin Jacyno and I'm with ATMI. I believe the lights that are being discussed are the lights on the new building that was put up at the south end of the property. Those lights do need to get tipped down and I'll make sure that they get tipped down and when I get back to the office I'll make sure they start doing that. I've been telling our maintenance folks that they need to knock those down.*

*Mr. Cameron said there is probably some kind of a visor, a shield for that light to help make the cutoff.*

*Mr. Jacyno said I'll verify that. I think there was a shield put on them. I think they are just pointed up a little bit too high, but I'll verify that.*

*Mr. Cameron said it might not hurt to do a photometric study.*

*Mr. Jacyno said that I can certainly have done.*

*Chairman Truax said I'm assuming that ATMI currently owns this lot. Has it been owned for 50 years or what's the history of the ownership?*

*Mr. Jacyno said that lot was purchased when the partnership that bought that property, the Stevens Adamson property, so that lot was part of the parcel that was purchased. To be honest, I can't tell you who owned the property before that. I believe Stevens Adamson actually owned that land and then when the Stevens Adamson property was purchased by the ATMI partnership, or the 930 Ridgeway Partners, that lot was part of that acquisition.*

*Chairman Truax said has the lot been maintained by ATMI?*

*Mr. Jacyno said that, to be honest, I don't know.*

*Chairman Truax said I thought in the Zoning Board hearing that I didn't realize that there was a discussion of an entry onto Hartford Avenue. Is that part of this?*

*Mr. Jacyno said yes. The purpose of that drive onto Hartford is not to create in essence another*

access point for the people coming. It is just not to have it dead-end. It is a very long narrow parking lot, so the idea there would be that that would only be an egress. The plan would be that the employees would use the existing entrance off of Ridgeway to access that lot as well. There is no intention to use that as a main entry point. We are literally right across the street from Staab, so there is another business right across the street and then right next to Whitt Brothers as well, so there is some commercial access to that.

Chairman Truax said so the employee access would be into the existing parking lot and their egress would be through the Hartford?

Mr. Jacyno said the idea would be that the ingress and egress out of this parking area would be off of Ridgeway Avenue. The access onto Hartford is just so that there isn't a total dead-end at that portion of the lot.

Chairman Truax said as far as trucks parked on the street, are you aware of that?

Mr. Jacyno said I know there are trucks parked on the streets. As we are trying to clean everything up, this is part of trying to get cars off the streets. We also have purchased a property in Montgomery and what we are trying to do is shift a portion of the trucks that we have out onto the property that we have on Lake Street, which is literally just south of the corporate border of Aurora. But this is the production facility, so it is hard not to have trucks coming in and out.

Mrs. Cole said I have a question about the parking lot and the ingress and egress. You say that your idea is that people will come in off of Ridgeway and they would possibly exit onto Hartford?

Mr. Jacyno said I think our preference would be that no one would exit out onto Hartford.

Mrs. Cole said but your preference may not be your employee's choice. I can see if I was parked at the west end of that parking lot and I wanted to get out of the parking lot I probably wouldn't go all the way back to Ridgeway. Is there some way that you could make it so that you could only exit out of that area?

Mr. Jacyno said I think short of signage or possibly a gate at the other end, that's something else that potentially could be put up in order to close that off except for, potentially, emergency vehicles.

Mrs. Cole said that was my next question. Is that going to be gated at that end?

Mr. Jacyno said we are not currently looking at that, but that is something that we could certainly do.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said I think that's a good idea to mitigate any of the safety concerns with children playing in the street. At least for emergency purposes you have another means of egress.

Mr. Jacyno said I don't think that we would have a problem with that.

Mr. Chambers said I think that if that's the issue or concern, that maybe looking at an alternative option besides a gate because that gate can be left open and it still leaves us to who is going to be monitoring the staff that are parked on that side of the parking lot.

Mr. Cameron said what typically would you foresee as use of that parking lot from a time standpoint? People would be using it at what kind of a timeframe? It is 24/7?

Mr. Jacyno said it wouldn't be 24/7. I believe right now it is basically being looked at as an extension of the office parking. Our office employees typically come in, some of the earliest ones come in sometime around 6:00. Usually most are out by 5:00. A few would be there a little bit later. If we did have some of the supervisors from the plant using that, some of those guys come in a little bit earlier, but the fact of the matter is we do have other parking and we could make sure that we limit the time of operation of that lot.

Mr. Cameron said and what time is the end of use they normally work, until 6:00, 8:00, 10:00?

Mr. Jacyno said for the plant, that is a fairly long day. We will have guys show up at...

Mr. Cameron said but this is typically not for their parking.

Mr. Jacyno said this would not be for their parking at all. For office parking, what we are looking at is the day starts at 7:00 and ends at 4:00 or 5:00, depending on when you come in. There might be a few people that come in early, but in general we are talking a half a dozen people and most of those people will probably park closer to the office.

Mr. Cameron said that might be a grounds for some conservation, at least, with the neighbors. It is potentially a valid use, but it intrudes on what it's not been used for and you might be able to gain some points for reducing parking there at night so that the kids have a place to use that parking lot to ride their trikes or whatever. You could, I think, gain some credibility with the neighbors by looking at trying to work something out to a mutual satisfaction on that that would be good for everybody. It is a mixed thing as to when you light it and when you don't light it, but it could be a late night as long as it doesn't become a collection spot, which is not good for anyone. That might be a spot to at least aim in that direction and see if something can be worked out that works for everybody.

Mr. Jacyno said sure. The reality is the other part of it is the lights that will be put in. They will have the...

Mr. Cameron said shields.

Mr. Jacyno said well not only shields, but also timers on them.

Mr. Cameron said but there is at least some area that you might have a discussion on.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said I have one question about the question that was brought up regarding the maintenance of that Township road. Are you expecting additional traffic on this road due to this improvement? Is there any additional truck traffic than what is currently on the road? If that is so, has that been discussed with the owner of the road to see about the condition and impacts to it?

Mr. Jacyno said for Hartford specifically, we're not expecting any real increase of use on Hartford, especially if we gate it and we make sure that our employees aren't using that as their exit. Ridgeway between Elmwood and Hartford, we're hoping that we can reduce some of the traffic, that's the car traffic, that's parked along the street there because now those employees will have some place to park on a lot that's on our property and we're hoping that between basically Elmwood and the railroad crossing there is also a lot of our cars that are parked along the street now and we are hoping to get those off the street and into the parking lots. I know that the streets, S. Elmwood is a little beat up and to be honest I don't know what the disposition of that is. The traffic on that isn't changing because it is the same production that we have. I think you were mentioning Rathbone. To be honest, I'm not sure how much of our traffic actually uses that because our vehicles can't actually make the turn off of Rathbone onto Lake because the viaduct is at that location.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said the main concern, obviously, if you are not generating additional traffic then what is currently there is what is there.

Mr. Jacyno said correct.

Mr. Pilmer said is this only for employee, or I guess, car and light duty parking?

Mr. Jacyno said yes 100%. We don't want anything other than employee vehicles. This is all office personnel.

Mr. Pilmer said this may be a question for staff. At some point, could they park flatbed trailers in there if they needed that capacity?

Mr. Jacyno said that is something and we would be willing to have that written in. We have no desire to put any sort of truck traffic on these parcels. We need it for our office employees and that's what it will be used for.

Mr. Pilmer said that might help with the neighbors as well.

Chairman Truax said has the company ever approached the Township about the condition of the roads down there?

Mr. Jacyno said that I don't know. I think there have been discussions with the city with regard to Elmwood, but to be honest, I'm not really involved in that part of it. I do know that that part of the

street does need a bit of work. The part of the street that I know needs work is actually the portion of the street that is between our plant, basically it straddles the plant itself, so it is the portion between Ridgeway and Rathbone. That is a little bit rough.

Mrs. Cole said little doesn't quite describe it. I have several comments. One, you are using pervious pavement for this parking lot. Is that correct?

Mr. Burroughs said permeable pavers, yes.

Mr. Jacyno said so that is part of the best management and that was in a discussion with the city.

Mr. Burroughs said to control the runoff.

Mrs. Cole said thank you for doing that. My next comment is you don't have a bike rack on your property. I noticed that the manufacturer across the street from you on Elmwood has a bike rack there and there were actually bikes parked there. Have you ever considered putting a bike rack up?

Mr. Jacyno said I don't know if it is still there. While all this construction was going on a number of things were moved around. I don't know how familiar you are with the property, but as you are coming down Elmwood there is that 1940's set of transformers that sort of separates sort of the office areas from where the production area is and we did have a series of bike racks set out there for our employees and they did use it. I'll find out. If it's out, I'll just make sure that it gets put back in.

Mrs. Cole said does truck traffic use Hartford at all?

Mr. Jacyno said no.

Mrs. Cole said okay so there are no big trucks that use Hartford?

Mr. Jacyno said no. Number one, I'm not sure it would even be legal for our trucks to use that.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said one quick question on the permeable pavers. Is any of that stormwater being discharged out of the site or is it all being retained?

Mr. Burroughs said the purpose of the permeable pavers is to allow that water to drain down into the stone underneath. We have under-grade pipe underneath that that ties into the existing storm sewer.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said so it is not like a bio-swale or anything?

Mr. Burroughs said no.

Mr. Reynolds said I maybe missed this. How many employees do you have?

Mr. Jacyno said we have around 100 people in the office because it is not just ATMI. Cordogan Clark has their offices there as well. I think there are somewhere in the neighborhood of 200 plus personnel out in the plant itself.

Mr. Reynolds said if I understand correctly, you're not working 24 hours. You're not open 24 hours.

Mr. Jacyno said the office certainly isn't, but the plant does have operations that can start as early as 3:00 o'clock in the morning and go until 9:00 or 10:00 o'clock in the evening.

Mr. Reynolds said those employees will not be parking there, correct?

Mr. Jacyno said no. What we did was when we did the new production building that we have, we added 80 additional spots along Elmwood for those employees to get those off the street. Actually I think they just finished the paving on that, so we should be seeing striping and hopefully they are moving to their new location soon.

Mrs. Cole said I think there was a question from the gentleman about the type of fence. I think he was interested in exactly what type of fence was going to be going up.

Mr. Jacyno said our intention is to do a board on board wood fence similar to the fence that the neighbors have to the north. To be honest, I'd have to follow up with Wally Mundy who did our



landscape plans to verify exactly what he is specifying.

Mrs. Coles said and you might have some conversations with the neighbors that this fence is going to impact?

Mr. Jacyno said we certainly will do that.

Mrs. Morgan said staff would recommend approval of the Ordinance granting a Special Use Permit for a Parking Facilities, Non-Residential Use on a portion of the property at 659 S. Elmwood Drive located along Hartford Avenue.

Chairman Truax said what conditions are you recommending?

Mrs. Morgan said I did not recommend any conditions, but the Planning Commission can add conditions if you want and I will update that for the P&D meeting.

Mrs. Cole said I think we should add some conditions. I'm not exactly sure how to word them.

Mrs. Anderson said one condition would be adjusting lights so not blinding the neighbors. That would be one of the conditions for sure.

Mrs. Cole said and actually the lights that are blinding are not connected to the parking lot. They are currently on the building.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said another condition could be access into Hartford, making sure it is only for emergency use.

Mr. Pilmer said I think we should maybe get some feedback from staff on that because I think those things are hard. We could put the condition on and put a gate on there, but then it really serves no purpose and there is ongoing monitoring. It is an extension of an existing commercial district and while I'm sensitive to the neighbors there, there is direct commercial to the north. Either we should block it completely, but I think it is probably good to have some egress there.

Mr. Sieben said we looked at the aerial. Whitt Brothers is directly to the north of this proposed parking lot. You certainly have residential going south. I would agree with Commission Pilmer. I'm not sure what signage would do or I'm not sure what the point of a gate would be and then still build the access point. I would say either have the access point open or don't do an access point. I think the parking lot would be fine without the access to Hartford. You would just have to build a slight little flare, so when you pull out of those last two spaces you can just back out and go back east toward Elmwood. It does create an additional access point in case there is an issue. There is already an access point onto Ridgeway and I believe onto Elmwood too. That would be an option just to recommend removing the access to Hartford. It would not impact the operation of this new parking lot.

Mr. Cameron said I think also there should be some conversation that I suggested with the neighbors as to some mutually beneficial uses of that site. There should be a line of communication opened up.

Mr. Burroughs said just a quick comment just to clarify. There is no access onto Elmwood. The existing is just access onto Ridgeway.

Mr. Cameron said if they were to have a discussion with the neighbors, there could be some things put in place that the access be valuable to have because it would allow the kids in the neighborhood and stuff access to that lot. I wouldn't like to rule it out, but I'd like to have it that if there are any changes that that be part of a discussion that they have with the neighbors that make it work better.

Chairman Truax said would somebody like to word this as a motion with some conditions?

Mr. Cameron said I think we should probably suggest the ideas that have been recorded and mentioned here are incorporated into a series of conditions that would apply to this with the comments that the various Commissioners have made.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said the motion is still for approval, except with these additional conditions?

Mr. Pilmer said I think the two conditions I heard was as part of this approval that a study be done, or at least the company be required to look at the existing lights that are not really part of this petition, to

make sure there is not spillover and then the second item would be that the Petitioner work with the, at least have a meeting with, the neighbors and maybe city attend that to see alternatives to egress and ingress onto Hartford and then try to have that resolved prior to P&D if possible. As Ken said, there could be some benefit at times. Maybe some of the neighbors would want to use that as excess parking in the event of a party or something at their home and they may find it beneficial. I don't know if the Petitioner will allow that, but there could be some benefits I think. Instead of us putting a strict condition on it, I think they should try to get it resolved before it goes to P&D.

MOTION OF CONDITIONAL APPROVAL WAS MADE BY: Mr. Pilmer

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mr. Cameron

AYES: Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Bergeron, Mr. Cameron, Mr. Chambers, Mrs. Cole, Mr. Divine, Mrs. Owusu-Safo, Mr. Pilmer, Mr. Reynolds

NAYS: Mrs. Head

#### 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 were 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 an extension of the Petitioner's existing property, as well as an extension of a commercial property with similar zoning classifications to the north.

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. Reynolds said the proposal represents the highest and best use of the property.

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?

Mrs. Cole said with the additional parking, it will take cars off of the street for parking and with the condition that Mr. Pilmer put on, hopefully it will benefit all in the neighborhood.

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. Cameron said they are either in place or will be provided.

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. Cole said with the additional parking, this should reduce the traffic congestion in the streets.

9a. Will the Special Use not preclude the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding properties due to the saturation or concentration of similar uses in the general area?

Mr. Cameron said to a large extent, the neighborhood is already built out.

9b. Is the Special Use in all other respects in conformance 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 Plan Commission?

Chairman Truax said I believe it is conformance in all other respects.

*Mrs. Morgan said this will next be heard at the Planning and Development Committee on Thursday, August 10, 2017, at 4:00 p.m. on the fifth floor of this building.*

Aye: 9 At Large Bergeron, At Large Cameron, At Large Cole, At Large Pilmer, Aurora Twnshp Representative Reynolds, At Large Anderson, Fox Metro Representative Divine, Fox Valley Park District Representative Chambers and At Large Owusu-Safo  
Nay: 1 SD 129 Representative Head

---