



City of Aurora

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

Legistar History Report

File Number: 16-00845

File ID: 16-00845

Type: Resolution

Status: ATS Review

Version: 3

General Ledger #:

In Control: Planning & Development Committee

File Created: 09/01/2016

File Name: Enterprising / Final Plat / 4000 Ogden Avenue

Final Action:

Title: A Resolution Approving the Final Plat of Enterprise Fox Valley Subdivision located at 4000 Ogden Avenue being northwest corner of Ogden Avenue and Longmeadow Drive.

Notes:

Agenda Date: 09/29/2016

Agenda Number:

Sponsors:

Enactment Date:

Attachments: Exhibit "A" Final Plat - 2016.156.pdf, Land Use Petition and Supporting Documents - 2016-08-30 - 2016.156.pdf, Plat of Survey - 2016-08-30 - 2016.156.pdf, Property Research Sheet 68170.pdf, Legistar History Report (Final Plat) - 2016-09-20 - 2016.156.pdf

Enactment Number:

Planning Case #: NA28/2-16.156-Fsd/Fpn

Hearing Date:

Drafter: jhall@aurora-il.org

Effective Date:

History of Legislative File

Version:	Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:
1	Committee of the Whole	09/06/2016	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)						
1	DST Staff Council (Planning Council)	09/13/2016					
	Notes: <i>Representatives Present: Gerald Alder, Greg Toste, Christopher Lavoie, Andrew Foster</i>						

Mr. Alder said what we are trying to build here is to combine 2 lot, so Lot 100 and 200, and make it into an Enterprise car facility for renting and also car sales. Greg here can kind of expand on the goal and the hope of this particular lot.

Mr. Toste said we're relocating our rental location from Trade Street just about 3 buildings down over to this facility and then we are also going to have a car sales facility that is going to be a co-located business. We have similar facilities like that. We just opened a new one, developed property up in Palatine on Rand Road there. We're hoping to, our goal is to, you know, this former medical building is about 9,000 some odd square feet. I've got contractor bids in right now. I think we are nearing our

building permit for it, and our goal is to try and close on both properties in the next few weeks and get our building permits and then get this site under pavement prior to the asphalt plants closing. So we need about 45 or so days of site work to do so. Then during the winter months, then we will be able to go ahead and continue, while we are doing the site work, we're able to continue to go ahead do the interior improvements and stuff like that. Our goal would be to open up in February of 2017, relocate the branch over, open the car sales property, and start generating revenue for everyone; us and the city.

Mr. Sieben said and your Special Use is?

Ms. Hall said it will be at City Council today. It is on Consent.

Mr. Sieben said so it is just a matter of bringing the Final Plan and Plat with the details.

Mr. Toste said yes sir, that's correct, because we did get our preliminary approval tonight also for the Plat and Plan.

Mr. Sieben said and this is all totally keeping with the Preliminary?

Mr. Toste said yes.

Ms. Phifer said I think the only outstanding thing that we were still continuing to work through on the final was the signage, the question of the design of the signage and then this is the first time we are really reviewing the landscaping, and so you will get comments on that as well. Jill is doing the final review as she did the preliminary.

Ms. Hall said so I'm in review for that, so I'll have to get you guys comments out soon. I spoke to Amy this morning. They are working with internal lots on the easements. I believe we've even been contacted by a sign company about the details of that one.

Mr. Sieben said so we are working with them.

Mr. Toste said through the medical building's monument sign?

Mr. Sieben said yes.

Ms. Hall said I believe. We still have to contact them and follow up.

Mr. Feltman said we got the full submittal. We'll be in review and probably get comments out in about a week or so. Do you have a time set?

Ms. Phifer said I think we are looking at October 5th.

Ms. Hall said for Planning Commission.

Mr. Feltman said for Planning Commission?

Ms. Hall said yes.

Mr. Feltman said technically we can't approve the Engineering plans until you are through the full process.

Mr. Toste said through the full Final Plat and Plan process?

Mr. Feltman said yes.

Mr. Toste said so if Planning is October 5th, what's that push for the Council of the Whole and Council, and is there any way we could expedite that?

Ms. Phifer said so you'll have full approval on the 18th. I think we were actually hoping you would have gotten your submittal in a little bit sooner after your Plan Commission date, so I think we were trying to get you to your dates based on your submittal coming in a little earlier than it did. We can take a look at the schedule, but right now it looked like October 5th was the first one we could get on.

Mrs. Vacek said it would be the 25th.

Ms. Phifer said you're right, the 25th, October 25th.

Mr. Toste said based on the initial comments in the Preliminary Plan and Plat review, it is my understanding that there shouldn't be any big variances between the Preliminary Plat and Plan versus the Final for the City Council votes and approval. With that being said, is there a way to go ahead and, since we have the Special Use permit, to go ahead after today and operate business out of there? I would think the rest of this is just more merely of a formality. With that being said, as soon as we get our Final Engineering permits, and our building permits, I think our building permit is the only thing we, I think we resubmitted yesterday on the sidewalk and the door on the east side and some plumbing stuff, and then I know the Engineering, your department is reviewing our submittal. We resubmitted that on 8/26 and prior to that, our other submittal was 8/5 that we had to revise and stuff like that. With all that being said, obviously we can conduct business out of the location with our Special Use permits, so is there a way that we could somehow get some kind of approvals that if we get our building permit that we are able to go ahead and start considering that the plans, if we are talking landscaping and signage, are the 2 things that are primarily outstanding with the exception of whatever Final Engineering comments your department has? I would think that it is...

Ms. Phifer said is it the building permit you are concerned with or the grading permit?

Mr. Toste said the site permit.

Ms. Phifer said so it is more about the Engineering right?

Ms. Toste said yes.

Mr. Feltman said he wants to pave.

Ms. Phifer said but you've issued mass grading permits just for mass grading prior to approval.

Mr. Feltman said yes, but that is only going to get them, you're after trying to get the paving done before the asphalt plants close.

Mr. Toste said and the site work and all that, the storm, the...

Mr. Feltman said the curb and gutter...

Mr. Toste said correct.

Mr. Lavoie said we can turn comments pretty quickly on the Engineering. We can work closely with the Engineering Department to make whatever changes we need to make.

Mr. Alder said I don't believe the comments were that substantial.

Mr. Lavoie said they're not.

Ms. Phifer said well the problem is we just got our submittal for the landscaping and for the signage. You are correct, you do have the Special Use. The Special Use was contingent upon some of those signage things. My understanding right now is the sign still doesn't meet the conditions that were laid out in the Special Use Permit.

Ms. Hall said with the bigger base.

Mr. Toste said well that's a point we have to discuss also is the bigger base. Technically it's not an ordinance and I understand that going for a Special Use Permit, the city is allowed to go ahead and bring extra stuff in. Here are some of our reasoning why the base isn't going to work, the wide base, is that we have a 20 foot high sign. That base would be a 12 foot high structure and if you all wanted the base to be equal to the size of the cabinet, you're looking at a 12 by 15 structure basically. Put that on the lot and then put that next to where the monument sign for the other tenants is going and the fact that the site is below grade, basically we have very limited visibility from cars on our display units going from west to east. Another deal with the wide base is from a grand integrity standpoint if you have a 15 foot wide silver base or aluminum base, that detracts from our very small logo of 1 to 5. I understand that Honda has it where it is basically, but their logo is more of a rectangle like this, they

have a base. With us, we are a 1 to 5 ratio this way and to go ahead and put a structure like that, it detracts from the actual Enterprise branding that's on the sign. The third thing, quite honestly, is going to be the expense because you are talking about a 15 foot wide base on an aluminum cover, you're going to have to build some kind of structure to go ahead and make sure that that can handle the wind load. I mean, it's not like you can punch holes in it and let the wind go through. So those are just a few reasons why our pole signs are pole signs.

Ms. Phifer said however, all of this should have been brought up when we talked about it through the Special Use with the conditions. So right now...

Mr. Toste said with all due respect, I did speak with Jill about it and I told her we were against it.

Ms. Hall said but you said you would look into it and I said...

Mr. Toste said well and I told you I was completely against it.

Ms. Hall said and I did say that that was staff's opinion.

Mr. Toste said right, but there was no direction as saying, you know, I had stated that, you know, this is basically our trade dress pole sign from locally and across...

Ms. Phifer said so we need to find a compromise is what we need to find, and what we haven't seen is any compromise. A pole sign is not in keeping with the look and the feel of this corridor, even for all the different car dealerships that we've shown you.

Mr. Toste said Max Madsen has a pole sign.

Ms. Phifer said that's a flag, which is a little bit of a different design. I'm not saying we wouldn't be open to some other alternatives, but to date, you haven't provided any other alternatives for staff to look at and evaluate.

Mr. Toste said with due respect, what other alternatives are we looking at?

Ms. Phifer said I mean we can take the time to design a sign for you that we think would meet what it is we're looking for, but we were looking for you to do that. We want something that does not...

Mr. Toste said I'm sorry. That was miscommunication then. I would hate for this to hold up our progress on this.

Mr. Wiet said I'm just asking. So all your signs and across the country are pole signs?

Mr. Toste said our car sale signs that are pole signs have an aluminum cover. This one is from Minnesota. This one is from Arizona. Here is one that's in Chicago itself and then the new Palatine one also has this same design. Again, because as you can see, if you could visualize, our actual letters don't take up the height of the whole sign. Then if you put a structure that goes down, people would be drawn to this aluminum brushed and aluminum structure as opposed to the actual sign itself, and the same with this one here. So if you were to put a structure, a base that's equivalent, or even if you do half or whatever, it really draws away from the brand integrity of the sign.

Ms. Phifer said but we're not looking to have a pole sign in the corridor. Like I said, it is not in keeping with the character that we've established in the corridor. It is not in keeping with the other sales that we have in the area, so we made it clear from the beginning that that is part of the Special Use. So when you said that you were willing to work with that and come up with something, what we interpret that to be was that you were going to come up with some alternative designs for us to look at.

Mr. Toste said again, with all due respect, it was a phone conversation we had. I don't recall it being in a meeting like this.

Ms. Hall said I sent out a memo that specifically mentioned the issues with the sign and one of them was the easement, but one of them was this. I believe our conversation was you were going to go back to see if Enterprise had any type of...

Mr. Toste said and we don't.

Ms. Hall said but I hadn't even heard that. I know we were trying to get the Special Use, so we kind of dropped the signage...

Mr. Wiet said we are trying to expedite a bunch of stuff for you guys. Let's just put this in the mix and just what...

Mr. Sieben said we'll come to an agreement.

Mr. Wiet said the risk is taking a little more time to do this and not getting your stuff for the parking lot, so we've got to package everything swiftly, so let's try to work together on this.

Ms. Phifer said but I guess then, to be clear, are you looking for staff to come up with certain alternatives?

Mr. Toste said no, I'm not. Preferably what I would like to see, to be honest with you, I mean, I don't know how wide this is going to be to get staff's recommendation. I honestly don't because we don't have a direction as far as the width. And honestly with the monument sign, that's going to be a ground sign next to it, display of our vehicles are very important to us and we want to make sure that when the automobiles drive west to east that they will be able to go ahead and see our displays on that corner.

Ms. Phifer said and you can certainly move that sign back if you feel that it is going to be blocking the vehicles. We don't have a requirement that it has to be to the...

Mr. Toste said I don't know where we could move back to, to be quite honest with you, because the easement...

Ms. Phifer said well easement, your sign does not require an easement.

Mr. Toste said no I'm talking about we have that easement on Ogden.

Ms. Phifer said no, I mean back toward your property away from the road.

Mr. Toste said toward the west?

Ms. Phifer said away from the road. If you are feeling that people driving on the road are not going to be able to see your parked vehicles because of the sign, the sign can certainly be moved back away from the road. The placement, I guess, is what I'm saying is something you can look at if you wanted to address the visibility issue.

Mr. Toste said even if we move it back, still with this monument sign, this off premise monument sign, there is still going to be blockage, and even if you move it to the west.

Ms. Phifer said if you would like staff to come up with some options, we can certainly do that. That's not really the intent of this meeting, but I mean, you could look at switching them, maybe the shorter monument sign goes closer to the road and then the taller monument sign goes behind that if you are worried about visibility. That's the kind of thing that we are expecting to review at this point with the final.

Mrs. Vacek said maybe you can do a parking island like right there and put it in a parking island so it will be still moved back, but it will be maybe like in the middle of the lot.

Mr. Toste said somewhere like here?

Mrs. Vacek said yes, either there or like even a little further down.

Mr Toste said down here maybe?

Mrs. Vacek said right. Like in here you can maybe do a parking island and put it in there. There are options that you can do.

Mr. Toste said and the reason why that might be tough is because that's the entrance, so that would be tough. The reason why we chose the corner was that way the customers know how to get there. But we will look at something. We will commit to look at something and then go from there.

Ms. Phifer said our expectation is that you are going to be submitting some alternatives to us for us to look at.

Mr. Toste said if the monument sign wasn't there, to be honest with you, it might not be as much as an issue.

Ms. Phifer said the monument sign can move though. You have full ability to move that monument sign around. It is on your private property. They shouldn't have put it there in the first place. All we're saying is you said that you wanted to be a good neighbor and keep that sign, which I think that we are happy that you are willing to do that, but we still feel that you have control over where and how that sign gets put in. We don't want that to be a burden to you.

Mr. Toste said that sounds good.

Mr. Beneke said a separate thing. You had mentioned that you think that the building permit has been resubmitted. I don't see that it has.

Mr. Foster said it was just shipped out to you yesterday.

Mr. Beneke said we haven't received it yet, so it is not in our hands. We are waiting for that for our next review comments. We have also looked at the fire plan and we have no issues.

1	DST Staff Council (Planning Council)	09/20/2016	Forwarded	Planning Commission	09/21/2016	Pass
	Action Text:	A motion was made by Ms. Phifer, seconded by Ms. Hall, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Planning Commission, on the agenda for 9/21/2016. The motion carried by voice vote.				
	Notes:	Representatives Present: Greg Toste and Amy Kurson				

Ms. Phifer said so we've been continuing to work with the Petitioner on the landscape plan and on the signage. I think they are in the midst of addressing staff's concerns with regard to the landscaping and I think we are still working through with the signage, but I think that both parties are committed to coming to an agreement on that, so we were looking to move this out to the Planning Commission meeting, which is tomorrow night. I don't know if you guys have any update on where you are at with either of those plans.

Ms. Kurson said we would expect to have the landscape plans back from the landscaper today. I think in order to save time, we figured it would be better not to increase the caliper of the trees. We are not quibbling with the amount of landscaping. We are going to do that. The only question is might we later upgrade to a larger tree? But at least for now, the plan is to just leave the smaller caliper trees with the more volume as suggested by the staff plan. So we anticipate having that today. We had also asked the sign company to come back to us with some renderings of the sign designs per our conversations with staff. We'll take a quick look at those. I would expect we'll have something back from the sign guys today as well.

Mr. Toste said yes, hopefully this afternoon.

Ms. Kurson said that is the plan. So Greg and I were actually out on site today with yard sticks and measuring and mockups to see what the signs would look like out there so we can have a good sense of what to report back to corporate.

Mr. Wiet said the goal is to move this forward quickly so you guys can get going on...

Ms. Kurson said and we are so grateful for that.

Mr. Wiet said and so we are working hard to get that done.

Ms. Kurson said we understand that and we are doing our best to cooperate as much as we can given the constraints from corporate.

Mr. Wiet said signs can be installed in the winter, but asphalt can't.

Ms. Kurson said absolutely. Thank you so much for understanding that.

Ms. Phifer said and we did send you a couple of just redline drawings just again trying to sort of

convey sort of what staff was looking for and also a couple of options on locations, understanding the visibility is key, and so hopefully those were helpful as you are moving forward.

Mr. Kurson said they were very helpful. Thank you so much.

Mr. Toste said and I think the question is going to be that monument sign. We were out there today measuring it and basically it is pretty wide. It is 13 feet.

Ms. Phifer said the multi-tenant sign, just to clarify, right?

Mr. Toste said yes. I'm going to go back to MVRE and just let them know that they need to shrink that size up because it is very wide and we'll probably have to move that north just a smidge, but that will be a work in progress also to do that so I guess that part of the plan, we'll move that monument sign, that's the top one, over just a bit. That way, at least, there is some visibility in between the two sign structures.

Ms. Kurson said and let us just say too how grateful we are to staff that you heard us about the visibility along Ogden. We just want to say that we acknowledge your moving the trees to the back side. We may come back in the future and talk to you about the sight lines over on that side with parking along there, but that would just be more about whether or not we need some parking restrictions so people can see in. We don't have to deal with that right now, but mostly I just wanted to say thank you so much for hearing us on the visibility on Ogden. As I understand it, the engineering is coming along fine and there are no holds on that.

Mr. Feltman said well we sent out comments. I think they were pretty minor. I'm thinking probably this next submittal will be wrapping everything up.

Ms. Kurson said great.

Mr. Toste said hopefully you'll have that back today, I think, our revisions, because they are minor.

Mr. Feltman said good.

Ms. Phifer said we do have two conditions; one that the landscape plan be revised pursuant to the staff's comments; and that the signage be revised to address staff's concerns.

Ms. Kurson said we agree with those conditions.

Ms. Phifer made a motion to move this forward to the September 21st Planning Commission meeting. Ms. Hall seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

2	Planning Commission	09/21/2016	Forwarded	Planning & Development Committee	09/29/2016	Pass
---	---------------------	------------	-----------	--	------------	------

Action Text: A motion was made by At Large Bergeron, seconded by At Large Cameron, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Planning & Development Committee, on the agenda for 9/29/2016. The motion carried.

Notes: See Attachment for 16-00845 (Final Plat), 16-00846 (Final Plan).

Aye: 10 At Large Bergeron, At Large Cameron, At Large Cole, At Large Pilmer, Aurora Twnshp Representative Reynolds, At Large Anderson, At Large Divine, At Large Engen, At Large Truax and Fox Valley Park District Representative Chambers

See Attachment for 16-00845 (Final Plat) and 16-00846 (Final Plan).

16-00845 A Resolution Approving the Final Plat of Enterprise Fox Valley Subdivision located at 4000 Ogden Avenue being northwest corner of Ogden Avenue and Longmeadow Drive

16-00846 A Resolution Approving a Final Plan on Lot 101 of Enterprise Fox Valley Subdivision located at 4000 Ogden Avenue being the northwest corner of Ogden Avenue and Longmeadow Drive

17 Our next item of business is requesting
18 approval of a Final Plat for Lot 101 of the Enterprise
19 Fox Valley subdivision located at 4000 Ogden Avenue
20 being the northwest corner of Ogden Avenue and
21 Longmeadow Drive by Enterprise Leasing Company of
22 Illinois in Ward 10.

1 MS. HALL: Can you please read in the last item,
2 too?

3 CHAIRMAN TRUAX: Okay. I'm sorry.

4 That's requesting approval of a Final Plan
5 for Lot 101 of Enterprise Fox Valley Subdivision
6 located at 4000 Ogden Avenue being the northwest corner
7 of Ogden Avenue and Longmeadow Drive for a car
8 dealership entirely used in vehicle rental use by
9 Enterprise Leasing Company of Illinois in Ward 10.

10 MS. HALL: Enterprise Leasing Company has come in
11 for approval for a Final Plan and a Final Plat on the
12 property located at 4000 Ogden Avenue.

13 A Special Use and Preliminary Plan and
14 Plat was approved on the subject property on the
15 September 13th, 2016 for the vehicle car dealership
16 entirely used use associated with vehicles rental use.

17 The details of the project includes a
18 Final Plat which would consolidate the two lots into
19 one large lot.

20 The Final Plat is in conformance with the
21 approved Preliminary Plat. The Final Plat is also in
22 conformance with the approved Preliminary Plan.

1 The Final Plan will rehab the existing
2 building on the lot. It will rehab the existing
3 parking lot, as well as put additional parking for the
4 used car dealership on the currently vacant lot.

5 The approval also includes the building
6 and elevation plan that shows the wall signage,
7 monument sign along Healthway Drive, and large
8 identification sign along Ogden Avenue and a separate
9 multi-tenant sign along Ogden Avenue.

10 The staff has reviewed the Petition and
11 comments have gone back and forth and the petitioner
12 has made changes. Most of the changes the staff has
13 had, with the exception regarding issues regarding sign
14 issues to large identification sign and landscaping.

15 Although there is an existing sign as we
16 mentioned during the Preliminary Plan and Plat, that's
17 a multi-tenant sign. Enterprise does not have to, but
18 they would like to keep that sign, in addition to
19 having a large sign advertising Enterprise.

20 And staff supports allowing this having
21 the multi-tenant sign.

22 With regards to the large identification

1 sign along Ogden Avenue, staff has conveyed to the
2 petitioner that we want to see a pole style sign, but
3 we're in discussions with the petitioner as far as
4 changing that sign to a larger base.

5 Staff's recommendation at this point is to
6 have the base increase to 81 inches. That was
7 determined based on looking at this current sign and
8 trying to come up with a proportion so that it's more
9 visually appealing to not be top-heavy. Staff doesn't
10 feel that that 81 inches is too onerous.

11 So the staff is currently still working
12 with the Enterprise on some of these issues.

13 Landscaping was also another concern.
14 Originally they came in under with the requirements for
15 landscaping. They have currently resubmitted
16 landscaping. We're still in review of that new updated
17 plan, but it does look like it meets the requirements
18 that staff has had.

19 Regarding the signage, staff did get a
20 submittal for an updated sign package actually just
21 today.

22 We're working with Enterprise in order to

1 try to move them along in the process so they can get
2 into paving before the plants close. So we're just
3 kind of been allowing them to just get it into us
4 today, so we don't have it for you, unfortunately. I
5 think we have a couple copies that Enterprise can kind
6 of pass around to some renderings that they are
7 considering for signage.

8 I think I'll just -- do you have any
9 questions for staff?

10 CHAIRMAN TRUAX: Are there questions from staff?
11 Okay.

12 MS. WALL: And I'm sorry. This is the first sign
13 that was originally proposed, and I think there's some
14 current more rendering from Enterprise.

15 CHAIRMAN TRUAX: Okay. We would be happy to hear
16 from the petitioner if you'd like.

17 MS. KURSON: Madame Chairman and Commissioners.
18 I'm Amy Kurson. I'm from Reyes Kurson on behalf of
19 Enterprise Leasing Company of Chicago.

20 I'd just like to point out that slight
21 scrivener's error in the agenda which I sent a little
22 note to staff about when I was sitting in the back

1 listening to the school matters.

2 So we'd like to thank everyone most of all
3 for allowing us to go quickly. Obviously you heard us
4 when you said we were nervous about the asphalt plants
5 closing and you can't sell cars from a lot that's full
6 of mud. So thank you. And our intention is to be open
7 in February. We're very grateful for that.

8 Jill and the staff have been terrific,
9 really accommodating and helpful. We believe that
10 we're just inches away from being complete on the
11 landscape plan. We just have a couple more things.
12 But we're going to get to the caliber count that is
13 agreed upon with staff, and we're grateful for that.

14 We have pointed out to you a few drawings
15 and renderings about signs. Now, I don't know how much
16 the Commission likes to get into this sort of thing and
17 I did talk to staff about it before the hearing. They
18 asked that I just say a few words about the sign.

19 You'll see in front of you that Enterprise
20 came in with a box at the bottom half of its sign. We
21 believe that original box to be approximately two
22 and-a-half feet wide. So it's not exactly full sized

1 box, but it's about the size of the left turn that I'm
2 standing in front of.

3 Staff has encouraged us to do something
4 wider, and Enterprise really wants to be accommodating.

5 This is not a matter of my taste or Greg's
6 taste. This is a matter for Enterprise corporate that
7 has to go through the marketing department. The
8 marketing and branding is very important to this
9 company, because they believe, based on their research
10 and people who are paid to think about this stuff, that
11 the shape of the sign, the ratios between the pole base
12 and the top of the base are important for emphasizing
13 lettering and for maintaining brand identity throughout
14 the country. So that's why this has not been easy for
15 us.

16 Otherwise, we love the idea of cooperating
17 with staff and being swift to turn around things that
18 are being reasonable comments. We're not saying these
19 are unreasonable by any means. Just that it's not easy
20 for this company.

21 Accordingly, I do have the sets in front
22 of you that we sent in today. We talked about

1 potentially changing to two bases at the bottom, each
2 at three feet. We understand it's not a look that
3 Aurora is trying to have around the community.

4 We note that in other places you just have
5 one base in the center instead of two poles. So we are
6 throwing that in for illustrative purposes to show you
7 thought about it, you don't like it. We're okay with
8 that.

9 At this time I think where we are is that
10 Enterprise has come in with a sign base that's five
11 feet wide and it's 60 inches, and staff is asking us to
12 go up to 81 inches. So we're literally inches away
13 from achieving some compromise on this.

14 The reason it's difficult I think is that
15 under the original scenario, the word car appears to be
16 emphasized at the center of the pole.

17 When you go wider, then the Enterprise is
18 concerned that that might look like a big wall; that it
19 connotes something that's writing.

20 We had been initially concerned that it
21 might block visual access. I think we achieved some
22 solutions for that particular problem by potentially

1 reducing our monument sign that's our accommodation to
2 our neighbors. We'll make that a little bit skinnier.
3 We'll move that off to the side a little bit. So we
4 are feeling comfortable on visual aspects.

5 For us it's just a matter of getting to
6 people department and getting with people at corporate
7 and convincing them that something wider is better.

8 Five feet, Greg and I have a yes. Wider
9 than five feet, we do not have authorization at this
10 time. But again, we're very grateful. Staff has
11 accommodated us. They have taken our phone calls.
12 They are so fast to return phone calls. They are so
13 helpful. You've got a great team working for you, and
14 we're doing our best to work with them too.

15 CHAIRMAN TRUAX: Okay. Does the sign that you're
16 suggesting meet the sign requirements in Aurora?

17 MS. KURSON: It is my understanding that the size
18 of our sign does meet the sign requirements.

19 We had needed a variance in order to
20 accommodate the monument sign which is not ours, but
21 belongs to our neighbors, and we're doing that as an
22 accommodation to them.

1 But the size of our sign, yes. I think
2 this is a matter of sort of paste and --

3 CHAIRMAN TRUAX: Aesthetics.

4 MR. SIEBEN: Right. Because it's a Planned
5 Development, the City does have some regulations on
6 signage.

7 And what we've tried to do, because they
8 are kind of right in the middle of some other car
9 dealers. We have Max Madsen Mitsubishi, Valley Honda
10 Napleton Hyundai. We've all allowed those to have kind
11 of larger signs than we would typically allow in the
12 Fox Valley Planned Development area. It's just a
13 matter of now kind of now kind of aesthetics and look
14 and ratio of the base. So I think we're real close.

15 And like Jill said and Amy said, we just
16 got this today. We would like to just chew on it a
17 little bit. But if the Commission has any comments
18 based on the five-foot width, we'd like to hear that.

19 CHAIRMAN TRUAX: Okay. Comments on the sign? Or
20 other issues or questions for the petitioner or
21 questions for staff?

22 I don't think the sign is bad at five

1 feet.

2 MR. SIEBEN: And that's the old one up there. And
3 that's the original one.

4 MS. KURSON: I'm sorry, I didn't bring copies for
5 everybody, but there are copies that should have been
6 at the end and with you, Madame Chairman, to see the
7 two poles, all right. We rejected that. That's fine.
8 The one skinny one, we're also prepared to say no to
9 that, although that was our preference from the outset.

10 You have a drawing of a five-foot pole
11 there. I mean if the Plan Commission loves it, then of
12 course that makes us happy. But this is an
13 illustration of us just being inches away.

14 And Jill was kind enough to give me a
15 mockup of something that's bigger. We had received
16 written comments like this earlier back in the home
17 office. They are not wider.

18 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: What is that?

19 MS. KURSON: This one is 81 inches, which is
20 staff's recommendation.

21 Jill was kind enough to do a mockup for
22 us. This is what we think 81 inches might look like.

1 This is not a perfect rendering, but this is an
2 illustration of how accommodating your staff is. They
3 are trying to be helpful. They really are. We're just
4 21 inches a part.

5 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I can say for myself, I
6 think that one is out of scale. The base is too big
7 and overwhelming.

8 MS. KURSON: I agree.

9 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: It looks like a couple
10 small sticks up at the top. It may meet the code, but
11 it doesn't meet my --

12 MS. KURSON: I appreciate that. It's not a matter
13 of code; it's just a matter of taste.

14 CHAIRMAN TRUAX: Okay. Thank you. I guess we had
15 the recommendation?

16 MS. WALL: For the Final Plat, staff would
17 recommend approval of the Resolution improving a Final
18 Plat on Lot 101 of Enterprise Fox Valley Subdivision
19 located at 4000 Ogden Avenue being the northwest corner
20 of Ogden Avenue and Longmeadow Drive?

21 CHAIRMAN TRUAX: With no conditions?

22 MS. WALL: No conditions on the Final Plat.

1 CHAIRMAN TRUAX: Okay. All right. You've heard
2 the recommendation. What's the wishes of the
3 Commission?

4 COMMISSIONER BERGERON: Move for approval.

5 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.

6 CHAIRMAN TRUAX: It's been moved and seconded.
7 Would you call the roll, please?

8 MR. SIEBEN: Mr. Bergeron.

9 COMMISSIONER BERGERON: Yes.

10 MR. SIEBEN: Mr. Cameron.

11 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes.

12 MR. SIEBEN: Mrs. Anderson.

13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yes.

14 MR. SIEBEN: Mr. Chambers.

15 COMMISSIONER CHAMBERS: Yes.

16 MR. SIEBEN: Mrs. Cole.

17 COMMISSIONER COLES: Ys.

18 MR. SIEBEN: Mr. Divine.

19 COMMISSIONER DIVINE: Yes.

20 MR. SIEBEN: Mr. Pilmer.

21 COMMISSIONER PILMER: Yes.

22 MR. SIEBEN: Mr. Reynolds.

1 COMMISSIONER REYNOLDS: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN TRUAX: Okay. The motion carries.

3 We have a recommendation on the Final
4 Plan.

5 MS. WALL: Staff would recommend conditional
6 approval of the Resolution approving the Final Plan on
7 Lot 101 of Enterprise Fox Valley Subdivision located at
8 4000 Ogden Avenue being the northwest corner of Ogden
9 Avenue and Longmeadow Drive with the following
10 condition:

11 1, that a sign easement be established on
12 the Plat by separate instrument for the business park
13 multi-tenant sign which delineating among other
14 provisions addresses the maintenance responsibilities
15 and beneficiaries of the signage.

16 2, that large identification sign shown as
17 ground sign number 1 on the building and elevations be
18 revised to provide a wider solid base reporting the
19 sign base, not a pole-- sign.

20 In light of the concerns raised regarding
21 site lines and visibility for -- vehicles, staff would
22 support an 81-inch base, proportionally half of the

1 152-inch rental car sign element.

2 We believe this compromise will
3 effectively meet the goals and objectives of both
4 parties.

5 This revision should also be reflected in
6 the elevation data.

7 3, that the landscape plan B approved
8 pursuant to staff comments.

9 CHAIRMAN TRUAX: Okay. You've heard the staff
10 recommendation. What's the wish of the Commission?

11 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I would vote for approval
12 with conditions except that in Item 2, the 81-inch
13 width be changed to a five-foot width.

14 MR. SIEBEN: 81 to 60 inches then?

15 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: To 60 inches, right.

16 CHAIRMAN TRUAX: Is there a second?

17 COMMISSIONER ENGEN: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN TRUAX: Would you call the roll, please?

19 MR. SIEBEN: Mr. Cameron.

20 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes.

21 MR. SIEBEN: Mr. Engen.

22 COMMISSIONER ENGEN: Yes.

1 MR. SIEBEN: Mrs. Anderson.
2 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yes.
3 MR. SIEBEN: Mr. Bergeron.
4 COMMISSIONER BERGERON: Yes.
5 MR. SIEBEN: Mr. Chambers.
6 COMMISSIONER CHAMBERS: Yes.
7 MR. SIEBEN: Mrs. Cole.
8 COMMISSIONER COLE: Yes.
9 MR. SEIBEN: Mr. Divine.
10 COMMISSIONER DIVINE: Yes.
11 MR. SIEBEN: Mr. Pilmer.
12 COMMISSIONER PILMER: Yes.
13 MR. SIEBEN: Mr. Reynolds.
14 COMMISSIONER REYNOLDS: Yes.
15 CHAIRMAN TRUAX: Okay. The motion carries. And
16 this will go onward.
17 MS. HALL: This will next be heard at the planning
18 Development Committee meeting on Thursday, September
19 29th at 4:00 on the fifth floor of City Hall.
20 CHAIRMAN TRUAX: Okay. Thank you. Good luck with
21 your project.
22 MS. KURSON: Thank you very much.