



City of Aurora

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

Legistar History Report

File Number: 17-00479

File ID: 17-00479

Type: Petition

Status: Draft

Version: 2

General Ledger #:

In Control: Planning & Development Committee

File Created: 05/24/2017

File Name: Glenn & Laurinda Meisner / Downzoning / 90 S. Chestnut Street

Final Action:

Title: An Ordinance Amending Ordinance Number 3100, being the Aurora Zoning Ordinance and the Zoning Map attached thereto, by downzoning Property located at 90 S. Chestnut Street from R-5 Multiple Family Dwelling District to R-2 One Family Dwelling District (Glenn & Laurinda Meisner - 17-00479 / AU21/4-17.092-DZ - TV - Ward 4) (PUBLIC HEARING)

Notes:

Agenda Date: 07/13/2017

Agenda Number:

Sponsors:

Enactment Date:

Attachments: Exhibit "A" Legal Description.pdf, Land Use Petition and Supporting Documents - 2017-05-22 - 2017.092.pdf, Property Research Sheet - ID 16580 - 2017-05-10 - 2017.092.pdf, Plat of Survey - 2017-05-22 - 2017.092.pdf, Legistar History Report - 2017-06-27 - 2017.092.pdf, Findings of Facts - 2017-06-27 - 2017.092.pdf

Enactment Number:

Planning Case #: AU21/4-17.092-DZ

Hearing Date:

Drafter: tvacek@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	06/06/2017	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)	06/13/2017					
	Notes: Mrs. Vacek said this is going to go on the July 5th Planning Commission.						
1	DST Staff Council (Planning Council)	06/20/2017					
	Notes: Mrs. Vacek said this will move forward to the July 5th Planning Commission, so we will move it forward						

next week.

1	DST Staff Council (Planning Council)	06/27/2017	Forwarded	Planning Commission	07/05/2017	Pass
---	---	------------	-----------	------------------------	------------	------

Action Text: A motion was made by Mrs. Vacek, seconded by Mr. Beneke, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Planning Commission, on the agenda for 7/5/2017. The motion carried by voice vote.

Notes: *Mrs. Vacek said I make a motion to move this forward to the July 5th Planning Commission. This is just a downzoning. Mr. Beneke seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.*

2	Planning Commission	07/05/2017	Forwarded	Planning & Development Committee	07/13/2017	Pass
---	---------------------	------------	-----------	--	------------	------

Action Text: A motion was made by Mrs. Anderson, seconded by Mrs. Cole, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Planning & Development Committee, on the agenda for 7/13/2017. The motion carried.

Notes: *Mrs. Vacek said the Petitioner is requesting to downzone the property at 90 S. Chestnut Street from R-5 to R-2, which is a One Family Dwelling District. The subject property is currently a single family house with R-5 multi-family zoning. The property was converted from a 2 unit to a single family house in 2004. Property Standards was looking into this. They were questioning it for a license for rental. We did realize that it was a single family, so they are coming through to downzone to a single family residential zoning district. It is consistent with the R-2 zoning and the surrounding neighborhood.*

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

Mrs. Vacek said staff would recommend approval of the Ordinance amending Ordinance Number 3100, being the Aurora Zoning Ordinance and the Zoning Map attached thereto, by downzoning the property located at 90 S. Chestnut Street from R-5 Multiple Family Dwelling District to R-2 One Family Dwelling District.

MOTION OF APPROVAL WAS MADE BY: Mrs. Anderson

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mrs. Cole

AYES: Mrs. Anderson, Mrs. Cole, Mr. Divine, Mrs. Head, Mrs. Owusu-Safo, Mr. Pilmer, Mr. Reynolds

NAYS: None

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

Mrs. Cole said these are listed in the staff report.

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

Mr. Pilmer said this is consistent with the surrounding properties.

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. Anderson said there should be no change in traffic pattern and traffic volume at all.

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?

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said there should be no adverse effect on existing public services or facilities.

6. Does the proposal take adequate measures or will they be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to maximize pedestrian and vehicular circulation ease and safety, minimize traffic congestion, and not substantially increase the congestion in the public streets?

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said there should be no change to the existing pattern.

7a. Is the rezoning a consistent extension of the existing land uses, existing zoning classifications, and essential character of the general area?

Mrs. Anderson said it is consistent with the area.

7b. Is the rezoning consistent with the 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?

Vice Chairman Cameron said this is a downzoning and in general in this area that would be part of the policy of the City of Aurora.

7c. Will the rezoning permit uses which are more suitable than uses permitted under the existing zoning classification?

Mr. Pilmer said I think it is the city's Comprehensive Plan to make this a single family residence so it would more suitable with the new zoning classification.

Mrs. Vacek said this will next be heard at the Planning and Development Committee on Thursday, July 13, 2017, at 4:00 p.m. on the fifth floor of this building.

Aye: 7 At Large Cole, At Large Pilmer, Aurora Twnshp Representative Reynolds,
At Large Anderson, Fox Metro Representative Divine, At Large
Owusu-Safo and SD 129 Representative Head
