



City of Aurora

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

Legistar History Report

File Number: 17-00871

File ID: 17-00871	Type: Petition	Status: Draft
Version: 1	General Ledger #:	In Control: Planning Commission
File Name: District 204 Site / M/I Homes / Commons Drive south of 75th Street / Annexation		File Created: 09/14/2017
		Final Action:

Title: Requesting the Annexation, pursuant to an Annexation Agreement, of 25 acres located on the east side of Commons Drive south of 75th Street for District 204 Development (M/I Homes - 17-00871 / NA28/4-17.049-PA/A/SUPD/Ppn/Psd - JM - Ward 8)

Notes:

Agenda Date: 01/17/2018

Agenda Number:

Sponsors:

Enactment Date:

Attachments: Property Research Sheet - ID #69252 - 2017-03-22.pdf, Land Use Petition and Supporting Documents - 2017-09-14 - 2017.049.pdf, Kane-DuPage Soil and Water Conservation District Land Use Opinion 17-074 - 2017-09-14 - 2017.049.pdf, Plat of Survey - 2017-09-14 - 2017.049.PDF, Plat of Annexation - 2017-09-14 - 2017.049.pdf

Enactment Number:

Planning Case #: NA28/4-17.049-PA/A/SUPD/Ppn/Psd

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	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)						
1	DST Staff Council (Planning Council)	09/26/2017					
	Notes: Representatives Present: Matt Pagoria and Mike May						

Mr. Pagoria said the project we have before you is 25 acres. We were looking to annex. This is the parcel that is owned currently by the 204 School District. It is south of 75th, just west of 59 along Commons and just north of Calvary. The plan you have is for townhome units. We have 177 townhome units on here. It would be 2 different product lines, a front and a rear load. With this plan,

we are showing the continuation, or I should say, the improvement of Commons for our section, what would be the continuation east of Thatcher Drive along our north property line. Detention is down in the southeast corner. We are working with Calvary Church right now to do an easement so that we can outlet into their pond. We've had several conversations. The most recent was a couple of weeks ago. We're just working some stuff out with their engineers to verify a few things, but everything seems positive so far.

Ms. Phifer said I think there are some things with the Annexation Agreement that we'll work through. There is a lot of shared infrastructure and utilities because it is sort of a corner of a larger piece. As we talked through the DST, there are sort of 2 levels of sort of how this fits into a larger puzzle. One is how it fits into the balance of the Brock-Brodie piece and the Calvary Church to the south, but even more than that, the next item on the agenda is how does this expansion of residential fit into the overall corridor of Route 59 and the train station and how we want to make sure that there is connectivity through all of that. Some of the topics for the Annexation Agreement, negotiations or things that we've already talked about we're going to meet and talk about, and as you mentioned, Commons, not only the improvements adjacent to your property, but the extension of Commons to the south down to Montgomery. That's the topic we want to make sure is addressed in the Annexation Agreement. Also we need to work through school and park donations with regard to land/cash. The Park District does show that they need another park in this area to serve the additional residential that's shown on this property and also some of the residential that's already out there. There is a need for parks so we do need to kind of work through that. I know that you've got some variances that you are looking for with regard to setback, separations between buildings, and we are going to have to work through staff's position on those. Then parking as well to making sure that we are meeting the parking needs for the development. Those are some of the things that I think we are still going to be talking through, which is normal when we go through an Annexation Agreement such as this one. I think looking at the overall Route 59 corridor is something we're going to ask you to help us with, sort of bringing the expertise of what the market is showing and how we can logically develop this so that it is not a standalone development, that we can use this to sort of generate new activity and new reinvestment in the whole corridor.

Mr. Feltman said I think right now the way you are showing Thatcher extension, it doesn't line up with existing Thatcher, so we are going to have to kind of work through that. We have plans for Commons extension already designed that obviously the intent was that when the time came to build it we would implement those plans, so those will be available to you. There is some water main that we need to talk about, but I think for the most part you were showing kind of what we were looking for.

Ms. Phifer said you mentioned the drainage that we need to work in Calvary.

Mr. Feltman said yes.

Mr. Pagoria said and we are doing that. As far as Commons extended, do you guys have funds to do that extension? Is this something that you are looking for us to construct?

Ms. Phifer said we may want that. We'll have to figure that out. I think that we would like to have some language in the Annexation Agreement about entering into a substantive roadway agreement for the construction of the off-site Commons. I do know that we do have some fee in lieu that we got for that and I think that it's been sort of a budget item. I think it was more about timing.

Mr. Feltman said we used part of that fee in lieu to design the road because we wanted to make sure that it was at least designed and worked with everything that was in between, but we do have a little bit of money. I don't remember how much, but it wasn't going to be the full amount.

Ms. Phifer said but like I say, we have been keeping this on the radar as far as our budget. It would just be a matter of figuring out timing for that. We are looking at our 2018 budget before Council in the next few months, so I think the timing is good for that for us to sort of see what the options are and have some of that constellated in the Annexation Agreement.

Mr. Wiet said I know you have a larger concept plan here. Was this following the current

Comprehensive Plan that drew the line between commercial and residential?

Mr. Pagoria said for the most part, yes.

Mr. Wiet said I know depending on how the market was we had looked at trying to mirror in concept what the process (inaudible). It doesn't really involve you, but it is something that we would have to look at internally in terms of, I think, exposure on 75th and also maybe a little deepening of the commercial on Route 59. I know the Comp Plan showed a commercial setback. That's the equivalent of Aurora Marketplace, which is to the north and I think that's 30 years old now. I think the trend might be that we need something, the setbacks a little deeper and maybe do something a little deeper (inaudible). That doesn't involve you, but that would be a Comp Plan discussion we are going to be having.

Mr. Beneke said as far as Fire, we've taken a quick glance on it. I guess if you have a few minutes after this meeting, we'd like to kind of just sit down and kind of walk through the concept of design and everything so we have a good understanding of what we have. There are a lot questions that we have on lanes, staging areas, the typical comments. But I guess it will kind of maybe help you to get a feel for what our basic requirements are so you can kind of refine this.

Alderman Mervine said this is something, obviously, that has been anticipated by the residents in the area. They are very interested in it. When you and I first spoke with them where you made the attempt to buy the property, I've talked to all the residents there. They know that it is something that is coming and their concerns are kind of typical for a property of this type. Number one is going to be traffic. They are concerned about overloading the parks. But it is dialogue that's been ongoing. There are concerns. We'll work to kind of figure all that out and see what we can come up with. The obvious, of course, is traffic and (inaudible).

Mr. Feltman said one other thing that Engineering was a little concerned about was the right-of-way width. I think you are going 60 feet. Our typical is 66. I think Stephane touched on this, we are concerned about parking. With the amount of driveways, there is going to be fewer areas that you will be even able to park on the street. Obviously we can work through that as we work through the concept, but that was something that Engineering was a little concerned about. Then that leads towards 31 back to back to allow for on-street parking. With this density, that starts to become a concern. We've all been on these 28 back to backs and you've got even 1 car parked, let alone 2, you are down to 1 lane. So it is something that I think we need to kind of work through.

Mr. Beneke said I guess that kind of follows through with the fire access also of making sure our width is appropriate and if we do have parking on the street that we have enough width to be able to get through. The typical is 20 feet of clear width from the parking space to face of curb. That's something else that should be looked at as you go through it.

Alderman Mervine said and if you could, we have experience in other developments like this that where after they are developed and people get in and use them we are finding that we are having to go back and from a Traffic Engineering point of view having to remove parking in some cases because it is not feasible the way it was originally planned. I've got a couple of examples that I could cite when the time comes. It is an important issue, certainly part of the density.

Ms. Phifer said our townhome standards with regard to parking, which is what we've had in more recent years, some of it based on the problems that we've had in other developments, if there is a 28 foot back to back street, then there has to be 2.75 parking spaces per dwelling unit off-street, so that means providing those little cutouts of off-street parking in order to make sure that the 2.75 is met. If you are not able to meet the 2.75, then you could go to a 31 foot back to back and then the parking requirement is 2 parking spaces per dwelling unit in anticipation that we are going to have parking allowed on both sides of the street. But I think what I'm hearing and what we are saying is that even with the 31 I think we would want to evaluate with all the driveways that are there because you have a lot of units fronting versus the ones that are side load off of a common driveway that we would want to make sure that even with the 31 back to back that there is adequate guest parking without providing some of those cutouts for additional parking. I think that's something we're going to have (inaudible)

as we sort of evolve the plan.

Mr. Sieben said Matt do you want to talk about product? Is it similar to other communities?

Mr. Pagoria said up and down Route 59 we have several townhome communities that have products similar to this. To the northeast, we have a development we just finished up in Naperville. It kind of had a front load and a rear load product. It will be similar to that. We are working on different elevations and floor plans so the units here will be a little different just so we are not competing with some re-sale stuff, but that would give you a good idea of how the 2 kind of play together.

Mr. Sieben said Alderman did you have any other comments that you want to just stay in the loop on this in the future?

Alderman Mervine said yes. I think it is going to be kind of important from the resident's point of view that we can handle any objections at some point or you are part of some of the decisions going forward.

- 1 DST Staff Council 10/03/2017
(Planning Council)

Notes: Mrs. Morgan said Planning is in review of the project. We hope to get out some comments to them shortly.

Mr. Feltman said we should probably send out some just general comments. I think we are kind of both on board with right-of-way and roadway networks.

Mr. Sieben said and you may want to comment on Thatcher alignment, just basic things because we think this is going to change a bit.

Mr. Feltman said yes.

Mr. Beneke said we also met with them after the meeting last week just to kind of give them some preliminary information on design criteria.

Mr. Cross said I will be putting my comments together.

- 1 DST Staff Council 10/10/2017
(Planning Council)

Notes: Mrs. Morgan said Planning is in review. We decided to bring in Matt from M/I Homes just to go over our comments this week as opposed to just trying to send out written comments. There are so many changes that we are looking at.

Mr. Feltman said Engineering has some comments. We haven't formally written any comments as well. We probably should maybe be at that meeting as well too to just go over everything.

Mr. Beneke said Javan and I met with them right after the meeting to discuss some of our thoughts and design criteria.

Mr. Cross said I sent comments to them as well to back up that conversation.

Mr. Sieben said we think there is going to be some significant changes to the layout so you'll probably get another bite at it after it's changed.

Ms. Phifer said it might be beneficial though if Jill maybe before Thursday we just sit down with everybody here and just go over everything, like an internal staff meeting.

Mrs. Morgan said okay. I'll look at everyone's calendar and set something up.

- 1 DST Staff Council 10/17/2017
(Planning Council)

Notes: Mrs. Morgan said staff met with the Petitioner and went over some of the initial comments on the

bigger picture, so they are working on those. We told them just to kind of keep us informed with how their progress is coming.

Mr. Curley said I talked to the engineer yesterday and it sounds like they are starting over.

Mrs. Morgan said Matt didn't seem surprised by any of the comments. He had already talked, unofficially, to the Park Service about the park that they are requesting.

Mr. Feltman said we looked at it, but not thoroughly because we knew there were going to be a lot of changes, so we really didn't want to delve into the review.

Mr. Frankino said we haven't gotten a petition yet, but if they are starting all over, it is not a surprise, I guess, at this point. We haven't been petitioned to annex.

1 DST Staff Council 10/24/2017
(Planning Council)

Notes: *Staff is still working through with the Petitioner on some overall changes. At this point, we are just kind of talking some general ideas and making sure we are all on the same page before he does any more official submittals. He is sending us some sketch ideas.*

Mr. Feltman said we did a general review on their previous submittal. We have not sent out formal comments.

1 DST Staff Council 10/31/2017
(Planning Council)

Notes: *Mrs. Morgan said there is no new update. We are still waiting for a resubmittal. There are some substantial comments. It might take a little bit to get that in.*

1 DST Staff Council 11/07/2017
(Planning Council)

Notes: *Mrs. Morgan said there is really no new update on this. Staff had been previously working with them and they are in the process of trying to get something a little more formal together to resubmit. Staff is also working on a roadway agreement draft to send to M/I Homes. We are hoping to get that out in the next week or so.*

1 DST Staff Council 11/14/2017
(Planning Council)

Notes: *Mrs. Vacek said we did get a resubmittal, so we will be taking a look at that and getting comments out.*

1 DST Staff Council 11/21/2017
(Planning Council)

Notes: *Mrs. Morgan said M/I Homes did resubmit. I think we might still be waiting on some of the hard copies. Planning needs to take a look at that and get some comments back to them. There are some substantial alterations on these new documents.*

Mr. Thavong said this is Tim's case. He may have made some comments. I'm not sure, but I'll double check.

Mr. Beneke said we've received it, but we haven't had a chance to look at it.

Mr. Frankino said has this moved along enough to where we might expect a petition for annexation soon or is a little early for that?

Mr. Sieben said this is to annex and approve a preliminary. This will not go to public hearing until January. I don't know when that usually occurs. You mean the annexation for Fox Metro?

Mr. Frankino said yes.

Mrs. Vacek said it will have to come back for final, so they will probably do it in between the preliminary and final. That's usually when it occurs. We give them like 90 days after approval of the

annexation to get it done.

Mr. Frankino said sometimes they don't do it soon enough. They fall behind and now like CyrusOne they are really wanting their review a couple of months ago. We're like you haven't annexed. Sometimes they fall behind and I'd like to at least get on the record that they haven't petitioned.

1 DST Staff Council 11/28/2017
(Planning Council)

Notes: Mrs. Morgan said M/I Homes did resubmit. I think everyone is currently in review. Planning has done a preliminary review of the Preliminary Plan and Plat. We are planning on getting comments out on those as well as a draft Roadway Agreement and comments on the Plan Description and Annexation Agreement this week. I believe Fire, Javan, has already sent some comments.

Mr. Beneke said Javan sent something out yesterday. It is actually fairly well for us, but they do have a few buildings that they can't reach the hose stretch on and they either have to make the modification to meet that or sprinkle the buildings.

Mr. Sieben said Dan, you guys just started looking at it, right?

Mr. Feltman said yes.

Mr. Sieben said we talked to Matt Pagoria. We had a few things Jill was asking him. He's going to probably come next week so we can discuss it.

1 DST Staff Council 12/05/2017
(Planning Council)

Notes: Representative Present: Matt Pagoria

Mr. Sieben said Planning and Zoning sent comments back out late Friday. We can kind of touch on some of this. Do you want to maybe go over some of the highlights and then maybe we can touch on some of our main comments?

Mr. Pagoria said one of the earlier comments that kind of created this plan was let's take a look at the overall area again and staff kind of gave us some points to work towards. This is a smaller portion of, obviously, what that whole corner would be. The detention all stayed in the same spot. The southern access point, that road that T's off to the east, the intention would be that that road then connects into the adjacent properties and could create kind of a thoroughfare through there. Other than that, the product stayed the same. We have the front load and the rear load. We just kind of reorganized everything. We were able to create a nice big plaza in the center area. As you can see when you enter the main entrance, which would be the northern one on Commons, you get kind of a viewshed all the way through the site, which would end at the park, which we are now providing about an acre of park land. That's the big block over on the far east side. Again, when the adjacent properties come in, they would probably dedicate more park land to create a bigger park site, but with that, this is where we ended.

Mr. Sieben said Jill do you want to touch on the highlights?

Mrs. Morgan said we definitely like the new layout that you presented. I think that was exactly what we had discussed and I think it worked really well. The staff's biggest comment was parking. With the current layout, they need to have a .75 per unit of parking spaces, either on-street or like little cut outs. So that was the biggest concern. We had a couple other comments like flipping the detention so you can have like a viewshed kind of from the park and potentially even having a bike path that can go from like the park through the plaza connecting to the road, which would have a bike path as well. That was just kind of a minor comment. We had a few setback comments, but I think that was probably easily addressed with just some shifting.

Mr. Sieben said I think the parking is a big thing. I mean you are showing the 28 and the 60 for back to back and right of way. I personally think this should go to a 31 and a 66. If you do that, you don't have to show the extra parking on the streets, although I think from a realistic point of view there still might be some parking issues even with that. So I think that's really the biggest issue to look at. One

of the things was maybe flipping this connection to the street. Did we bring that up?

Mrs. Morgan said we did.

Mr. Sieben said I think what you are trying to do is get this connection through here, but we thought maybe because if this is a future park maybe that might be a better way to do it.

Mr. Pagoria said we can work with you guys on it. The original thought on this one was we flipped kind of this area of detention to get open space up here. It also helped us break apart these townhome units through here. Knowing that you are going to have some, maybe, additional park land coming this way and probably some additional detention down here, we figured it wasn't necessary to have this over there and you talk about like a bike path coming down here. So we come in and we build a bike path. What's going to happen to the end of the bike path here? What are you going to connect to?

Mr. Sieben said we've been having some discussions with the Alderman and we have a meeting set up with the church next week, so that might be something we might just discuss with them. That's a future townhome area. Whether they ever do that, we don't know.

Mrs. Vacek said it would just continue through the townhouse development.

Mr. Pagoria said through theirs.

Mrs. Vacek said through theirs.

Mr. Sieben said we also has a long phone call discussion with Jeff Palmquist Friday. Jeff was going to kind of follow up whether this totally works for them. We're going to confirm that shortly. I think it is pretty good for them, but we are waiting to hear back real soon on that.

Mr. Pagoria said backing up to the parking, so we did a parking analysis of this plan and what we could fit on here, street parking, and we ended up with 81 parking places. So 81 parking places. I think with the .75 we needed 130. My thing is a lot of the parking on this site is dictated by the front load townhomes and the drives up front, so you're not going to be able to park on that side of the street even if you have a 31 foot back to back. So what are you gaining by adding the pavement if you are not really gaining a bunch of parking spaces?

Mrs. Sieben said you are not gaining much that way. You are gaining breathing room and elbow room, quality of life.

Mr. Beneke said fire-wise you need to have 20 foot clear between a parking space to a parking space or curb. That's their access to get through.

Mr. Sieben said what you say though is absolutely correct.

Mr. Pagoria said but if you had 28 foot and a car parked on one side you still have fire access down that street.

Mr. Feltman said but it is only on one side. We've all been on roads where it is 28 and you've got parking on both sides.

Mr. Pagoria said so is the real goal to get 31 versus 28 on the pavement side?

Mr. Sieben said there are 2 goals.

Mrs. Vacek said honestly if you can make it work where you can get some off-street parking throughout the entire site, that would...

Mr. Pagoria said like down here. One of the comments was an early sketch version, we didn't have as

many buildings, we increased the size of this open space area and made it larger. That's why we have more buildings around it. So now this is a kind of a larger open space area. What we were thinking about doing is in this Lot 36 actually making some pull in parking spaces off the road. If all you want is parking, I could pave this whole entire Lot 36 and make a parking lot.

Mrs. Vacek said I don't think that's out point though.

Mr. Pagoria said we could do say 10. You could probably have another 10 or 15 spaces that would be put in here and you are still going to get to that number. If we're going down the road where we are going to have to do 31 foot, can I keep the 60 foot right-of-way? That's a bigger issue on this site than the roadway. You start changing right-of-way widths now we are...

Mrs. Vacek said I think the point is that it is either 31 or you have to come up the .75 off-street.

Mr. Sieben said I think it should be 31/66.

Mr. Feltman said it can't be 31/60.

Mr. Pagoria said why?

Mr. Feltman said because the parkway is going to be way too narrow.

Mr. Pagoria said but we have that elsewhere in Aurora, right?

Mr. Feltman said not 31/60.

Mr. Pagoria said you don't have any 31/60's in Aurora?

Mr. Feltman said I'm sure there are some.

Mr. Pagoria said are you going to work with me on reducing setbacks or are you just telling me increase your right-of-way and lose units?

Mr. Sieben said what are you at, 25 front? Is that what you have?

Mrs. Vacek said you are going to probably lose some units.

Mrs. Morgan said it came in a lot denser than I think we felt with adding the park.

Mr. Pagoria said but it is still less units than when we started.

Mrs. Morgan said 3.

Mr. Pagoria said yes.

Mr. Cross said in addition to that, you have my comments where you have your hose stretches on 2, 3, 5, 12 and 16. They are too long. If those units are smaller, because the dimension would be short, you'd be underneath that 300 feet.

Mr. Pagoria said which ones were those?

Mr. Cross said 2, 3, 5, 12 and 16.

Mrs. Vacek said you guys need to look at those because we were thinking that these might not meet it either.

Mrs. Morgan said if you want to double check that.

Mr. Cross said yes. It is the location of right where they are at. Because if they were like switched around, let's say they had a 4 unit where a 6 unit was at and they switched them, because of just the way the road is, it would accommodate in one area a bigger unit, but the other one needs to be smaller to accommodate still that 300 feet.

Mr. Beneke said how it works Matt is the fire truck comes in. You can stage the fire truck as close as you possibly can on the fire lane, but from that truck from the edge of the lane you go 150 feet of hose around the back side of the building. You can also stage another truck at another location and get another 150 feet. Those two hoses have to touch each other around the building. In the center area, you have other fire lanes and stuff in there and you are fine. Those aren't problematic. It is where you get into like some of the corners of the buildings, the ones where you have a fire lane in front of the building and not going around the outside.

Mr. Pagoria said what's the issue on this one?

Mr. Cross said so because of the location, when you do the measurement for the hose stretch, it was like 345 feet. It needs to be 300, so there is that overlap. That's the issue with each one of them. So if the unit sizes were diminished, that would make you be able to reach around.

Mr. Beneke said there is an exception. You can sprinkle the buildings and then you can modify that to get 400 feet. They allow the exception to increase that an extra 50 feet on each of those hoses.

Mr. Pagoria said we'll take a look at it.

Mr. Beneke said and it is a domestic sprinkler system on a townhome. That's also a possibility. We looked at a couple of things when we were looking at it and it looked like maybe if you flipped this building and that one you might have the same scenario and still end up making the hose stretch and stuff. If you take a look at the overall design you may be able to do a few flips and not really lose a lot on our side.

Mr. Cross said I think what we computed, it was a net loss of either 4 or 5 units total by switching. That's just to accommodate ours, not the parking requirement, but just on the hose stretch it was like a 4 unit difference, but as far as for them it probably would be even more.

Mr. Feltman said we've got a few comments that we'll probably be sending out. One thing just looking at the plan, you need to meet setback for the detention from the right-of-way, so that little finger might have to move a little.

Mr. Pagoria said what is that?

Mr. Feltman said it is 10 feet plus 1½ times the depth. I don't think we've looked specifically at it, but just me looking at it, it looks like it might be a little too close to the right-of-way. That's a minor change. The other thing is we started working on the roadway agreement. The one thing that we wanted to kind of discuss with you to see how you wanted to handle it, our thought was that the side of Commons that's adjacent to your development would be part of the development plans and then we would have what we are calling Section B, which is the Calvary side that we're 100% responsible for, would be a separate set of plans.

Mr. Pagoria said okay.

Mr. Feltman said now we've engineered the entire stretch, including your section because at the time when we were looking at it we thought we were going to do it. We just assumed that we were probably going to be the prime on it and that we were going to just build it. So we hired Intech and they designed everything. What we probably want you to do is maybe contact them and get the plans adjusted so that it just shows what we are calling Section B and yours is Section A. So A would be on the development plans and then B would be on the Intech. The quantities would need to be adjusted. We didn't get a cost estimate because at the time we weren't sure when we were going to really be doing this, so we need to get a cost estimate as well so that we can move forward with the

roadway agreement and at least have a target of what the costs are going to be and that way we can agree on the cost share and all that.

Mr. Pagoria said got it.

Mr. Feltman said does that seem okay?

Mr. Pagoria said yes. So Intech is going to basically handle this section and I'll handle this section.

Mr. Feltman said correct.

Mr. Pagoria said do you guys have money budgeted? Is this able to be funded next year?

Mr. Feltman said we have fee in lieu that we got from Chicory and Thatchers Grove, but nothing else is budgeted.

Mr. Pagoria said so how are we building it?

Mrs. Vacek said we would be looking at some kind of payment plan over a couple of years.

Mr. Sieben said we are drafting that up. As we said in the beginning we like the general layout. I think there is some room to play there if you did go a little bit larger. Your westerly north/south road, you've got that area on the east side of it where you've got space to play with if that moved over. Maybe you might lose an end unit on those far easterly ones going east/west. I think there is a little bit of room to play with there if you had to go that route.

Mr. Pagoria said okay. Anything else?

Mr. Sieben said we are still shooting for a January 17th Planning Commission, so we'll need to try to get this finalized in the next couple of weeks.

- 1 DST Staff Council 12/12/2017
(Planning Council)

Notes: Mrs. Morgan said they have resubmitted. I gave comments back out to them on the Planning side. We've spoken to the applicant, Matt, kind of informally with some thoughts, so we just need to get some formal comments out.

Mr. Sieben said so Planning and Zoning sent comments back and you had some discussions on some of the ways he may remedy those comments. One of them is, obviously, right-of-way and roadway that he's looking at.

Mrs. Morgan said yes.

Mr. Sieben said we want to indicate that we do need Engineering's preliminary comments to go out ASAP.

Mr. Feltman said well this is the first time that we really looked at the plan because there were going to be a lot of changes on the previous one. We are in review and will be getting out comments this week.

- 1 DST Staff Council 12/19/2017
(Planning Council)

Notes: Mrs. Morgan said Planning staff has sent comments back a week or so ago. We've had follow up conversations with the Petitioner on those comments. He is addressing all the changes that we have requested, so right now we are just waiting for a resubmittal.

Mr. Beneke said I communicated with the engineer yesterday, actually, in regard to some of the fire comments.

Mr. DuSell said Engineering has submitted comments to them. We are still awaiting their

resubmittal.

Mr. Sieben said we are anticipating that this will go to the January 17th Planning Commission, so provided everything comes back in order and meets the 3 different department's criteria, then this could move forward, but we will hold it here until we, obviously, get revisions.

1 DST Staff Council 01/02/2018
(Planning Council)

Notes: Mrs. Morgan said Engineering and Planning spoke with the Petitioner, Matt, to discuss some of the changes that we were asking for. We discussed the roadway agreement as well. They are making changes and they are supposed to get them back to us ASAP. We are going on the 17th for Planning Commission. They sent out their notifications for that.

Mr. Feltman said we sent out comments. We haven't seen revisions back yet.

Mr. Sieben said they indicated they were going to meet both our comments and Engineering's comments.

Mr. Frankino said the District hasn't seen any plans because they haven't annexed yet, so our comments right now still lie at annexation required for the site before we can start a review. I understand that's a little early still.

Mr. Beneke said Fire has had contact with the engineer and he is working on some of our comments. It looks like part of it is being taken care of by public streets, so that's helpful, which he is showing us now. We are waiting for revisions too.

1 DST Staff Council 01/09/2018 Forwarded Planning 01/17/2018 Pass
(Planning Council) Commission

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 1/17/2018. The motion carried by voice vote.

Notes: Representative Present: Matt Pagoria

Mrs. Morgan said staff has reviewed the resubmittals. We've had conversations with Matt about some ideas about some slight changes. Other than that, just some minor labeling things we would like. We are still kind of working through one issue near the townhomes around the pond and maybe trying to shift them slightly.

Mr. Feltman said we sent out comments. I think you are aware of it Matt, there are some off-site easements there that deal with Calvary.

Mr. Pagoria said yes and we are working with Calvary to try and get that done.

Mr. Feltman said and we had a meeting with them too and it went pretty well. They had some questions about what's happening and they had some questions about their site as well. It was a positive meeting. I think the water main that's on the south side that needs to be looped around may need to go onto Calvary's property because there might not be enough space, so we need to look at that. I think that was in the comments. Then, obviously, as we vote it out just the condition would be that all the Engineering comments are addressed at Final.

Mrs. Vacek said Engineering said that they did not get engineering revisions.

Mr. Feltman said we have not received a resubmittal.

Mr. Sieben said so if you could get that to them ASAP that would be great. Just one note Jill, I don't know if you said that, but one of the key changes on this is that this went to 66 foot right-of-way and 34 foot back to back streets along with other changes such a lot more 4 unit buildings instead of the 6 to address fire. With the way the current plan is shown, Javan and Herman do you want to touch on that?

Mr. Cross said as it is presently configured, we're fine with everything, except there is the need for

some signage here in these designated spots so that it designates that that's the end of the fire lane, even though the drive extends past. So in these 4 areas, in these 4 spots specifically, that there needs to be some permanent signage that's there.

Mr. Beneke said and what that needs to say is "End of Fire Lane" and it should be on the driver's side so that the driver of the truck can see it. This is actually a new code that we're going to be adopting here in the near future that will allow a lane that is over 150 feet to be able to have a sign on it rather than saying you can't be any further than 150.

Mr. Pagoria said other than the verbiage, do you guys have a certain spec on the sign or anything like that or is it just a sign? Do you have a template that you want to put out there or anything like that?

Mr. Beneke said probably similar to like a fire lane sign.

Mr. Cross said or a no parking sign. Something that is about that size.

Mr. Beneke said just something that is clear enough that they can see it. If you do make changes to a few of the buildings, right now our hose stretch works with this criteria, so we will need to have a modification to show us that you still meet that hose stretch around those changes. Like for instance, Tracey was mentioning maybe adding this way on this. We can get around that building now, so if that doesn't go this way, we'll probably be okay. Just have your engineer confirm and provide us a revised Fire Plan that shows any change like that. But the buildings that are shown as they are right now work.

Mr. Pagoria said got it.

Mrs. Vacek said we did give you a draft of the roadway agreement. I don't know if you've had time to take a look at it.

Mr. Pagoria said we took a quick look at it. The engineers are finalizing the estimates so I should maybe have something maybe later today. I'll get you kind of a quick estimate on it, what we think it is going to be, and then we'll shoot it out to our subs and get actual numbers put on it so we know what we are talking about. I don't know if we want to talk about it, but there were just a couple of comments that I had about the agreement. One of them was in the agreement it talked about M/I Homes posting security for the entire roadway improvement. I would say that we are okay with submitting security for our section, but I don't know why we would post security for the off-site road improvement, so that would be just a tweak on that.

Mr. Feltman said that's fine.

Mr. Pagoria said then the term of the deal was to cover it 2019 through 2021. I'd like to see if there is a chance that we could wrap that up in 2020. Obviously we are going to have the road done this year, so 3 years instead of 4, if we could take a look at that.

Mr. Sieben said so your plan is the road would be done in 2018, correct?

Mr. Pagoria said yes with final punch and stuff extending into 2019, but 2018 would be the road. Then, obviously, if we are carrying this for a couple of years, like other roadway agreements, there would be some sort of carry costs. I didn't see anything in the agreement about that.

Mr. Feltman said as far as?

Mr. Pagoria said an interest carry for outstanding balance on it.

Mr. Feltman said a lot of this is going to get predicated on what the cost estimates come back as. We've got to try to, obviously, budget for it and we need to know what that is.

Mr. Pagoria said the quick number that we were coming up with looked like the section across

Calvary was going to be about \$800,000.

Mr. Feltman said okay.

Mr. Pagoria said so, again, I'll send that out and we'll get some real numbers to it, but we are thinking it is probably around that \$800,000 number give or take. I don't know if that's more or less than what you thought.

Mr. Feltman said it is a little more than what I thought.

Mrs. Vacek said and Dan just so you know, we also told them to put the 10 foot bike path in instead of a sidewalk on the east side.

Mr. Feltman said okay.

Mr. Pagoria said the current plans show a sidewalk. We'll kind of just update that and we'll show the new numbers with the 10 foot path.

Mr. Sieben said so based on staff comments, you're going to make a little bit of a tweak in the layout, which, obviously, fire would still have to approve any changes.

Mr. Pagoria said yes. I think you guys had met with Mike from Cemcon and kind of explained to him how the fire stuff works so I think he's got a pretty good grasp of it now. We'll take a look at some of these revisions and see if we can make it work with fire and stuff.

Mrs. Vacek said I think it is only really one building that we'll be looking at. Everything else is just going to be a shift. I think that we can probably accommodate it.

Mr. Pagoria said we are going to try and move those 3 buildings a little further to the west and if we can add another unit on that one we will. If not, we'll work through it.

Mr. Sieben said okay, as long as whatever you change Fire would need to sign off on it. So this is going to go to the January 17th Planning Commission. Again, this is for the Annexation, Annexation Agreement, the Special Use Planned Development and the Preliminary Plan and Plat. So this will all come back for final then.

Mrs. Morgan said I do make a motion to move this forward with the conditions that plans meet Planning and Engineering's comments. Mrs. Vacek seconded the motion. Mr. Beneke said and that they add the "End of Fire Lane" signs for Fire. The motion carried unanimously.
