



City of Aurora

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

Legistar History Report

File Number: 15-00409

File ID: 15-00409

Type: Resolution

Status: ATS Review

Version: 3

General Ledger #:

In Control: Planning & Development Committee

File Created: 05/06/2015

File Name: Aurora Corporate Center Development - Final Plan/Variance

Final Action:

Title: A Resolution Approving a Final Plan on Condo Lot 4 of Lot 5 of Aurora Corporate Center Subdivision and Granting a Setback Variance for property located along the east side of Beverly Drive, south of Ginger Woods Parkway, Aurora, Illinois, 60502

Notes:

Agenda Date: 06/25/2015

Agenda Number:

Sponsors:

Enactment Date:

Attachments: Exhibit "A-1" Final Plan - 2015-06-10 - 2015.024.pdf, Exhibit "A-2" Landscape Plan - 2015-06-10 - 2015.024.pdf, Exhibit "A-3" Elevations - 2015-06-10 - 2015.024.pdf, Exhibit "A-4" Fire Access Plan - 2015-06-10 - 2014.024.pdf, Property Research Sheet - 2015-01-29 - 2015.024.pdf, Land Use Petition and Supporting Documents - 2015-05-05 - 2015.024.pdf, Condominium Declarations - 2015-05-05 - 2015.024.pdf, Recorded Plats - 2015-05-05 - 2015.024.pdf, Legistar History Report - 2015-06-11 - 2015.024.pdf

Enactment Number:

Planning Case #: AU01/2-15.024-Fpn/V

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	City Council	05/12/2015	referred to	DST Staff Council (Planning Council)	05/19/2015		
	Action Text:	This Petition was referred to to the DST Staff Council (Planning Council)					
1	DST Staff Council (Planning Council)	05/19/2015					
	Notes:	<i>Representatives Present: Tom Burgess, Steve Hansen, Brandon Jafari</i>					
		<i>Mr. Burgess said this is the last large lot in Aurora Corporate Center. We've been holding off doing</i>					

any spec development for a while given the past economic conditions, but we are starting to lose folks because we don't have space available, so we are going to go ahead and drop in another spec building pretty much identical to what we've built in the past with a couple of slight modifications. One of the tenants on site wants to double their space. We are probably looking at the east end of the building, another one on site wanting to triple their space looking at the west end and then we've got a few other ones that are kind of looking at the middle. With the expansion of the outlet mall, we have found that for back office, some of the businesses over there like doing their warehousing here because they are a little tight on space over there and it works out easier for them, so we are adding some addition in anticipating that need as well.

Mr. Sieben said this has obviously been a successful product for you in the past.

Mr. Burgess said yes and I know this is kind of running in conjunction with that lot to the north. Were you going to get me some comments on that? Those guys met yesterday and they are moving forward with that.

Mr. Sieben said regarding the easement?

Mr. Burgess said right.

Mr. Sieben said yes, I can do that for you. We can talk about that briefly off the record as soon as we are done with this.

Mr. Hansen said the building is a little under 40,000 square feet precast concrete warehouse industrial building such as the ones that are across the street. They are all of the same architectural style. This building is a little bit unique in that we actually have a high percentage of it that looks like it's sold, so we have real tenants moving into it right away that would like to be in there. Tom mentioned the storage for the people from the Premium Outlet Mall. He has a few spaces like that. They are low intensity users. They are only there occasionally to get back stock when they run out of things. They are not high users or high build outs. They are basic storage space. The building is about 354 by 110½ feet long. We've talked briefly today about some of the things that we are going to talk about, which are the setbacks and what we can do on those as well.

Mr. Seiben said I'll just kind of summarize a little bit. I know Tracey had sent over some initial comments and we talked on the phone as recent as yesterday morning and then we talked again before the meeting today because things were a little bit fluid. You guys were requesting setback variances on a few of the sides. The only area that's really obviously along a public street is the Beverly side and we had talked about trying to respect that 25 foot landscape setback there, which we've got pretty consistent along the rest of Beverly Drive there, so we had talked about potentially maybe shaving off a little bit of the building there to try to make that work. The other issue was the setback on the north side where when we had the DST we kind of gave you a little bit of a template. It is a little bit of a unique lot with the condoization. We were looking at either trying to get the 8 foot setback on either the outside of the property or along the building between the parking and the building. Actually since we talked yesterday, we were looking at, there was some possibility of saving some feet how it's laid out on the south side of the building with the parking, we could shorten by 2 feet the striped parking there. Also as we talked this morning, I think staff would be more amenable to lessening the setback on the south side of the property along the detention pond and then try to get that where there is not overhead doors, try to get a little bit of that, meet that 8 foot setback with the area along the north side of the building. I think that can be accomplished without losing any depth of the building north to south if that can be tweaked a little bit. I think we would be supportive of any setback reduction that would be then on the south side of the property there because that's the detention pond. I think that might help too with, I see you dropped off a truck template. It looks like there might be a little bit of a clip with that property across, Fox Valley Farms. I don't know if shifting the building a little south would maybe help that issue too.

Mrs. Vacek said it looks like you are encroaching within those parking spaces to the north, which unfortunately, can't really happen.

Mr. Hansen said right. We've got to work on that corner.

Mrs. Vacek said I think maybe if you are bringing the building down that 8 feet then maybe...

Mr. Burgess said we won't bring the building down. We will just change the dock. Drop the dock and widen it.

Mrs. Vacek said bring the building down because you are going to bring it down anyway to get the setback there, the 8 foot setback. I think that should clean that up.

Mr. Hansen said right. We can also flip the truck dock. It might change the geometry too within that.

Mr. Seiben said I think we would be okay too. You said in the future you may want to put a dock on that east end. Right now you've got a water main there. I think we are fine with that if you guys want to do that either now in the future.

Mr. Hansen said what I was thinking that we would do is just dot it in for now so you are aware that it is there. Most of the tenants right now, the first two tenants anyway, are virtually taking apparently all of it north to south so it won't be two tenants on opposite sides, so we are going to put interior, or a covered truck dock inside their space to the west of the east wall.

Mr. Burgess said so we'll see. If we can do a dotted one outside that's going to make them a lot happier because they are sensitive, obviously, to space that they need to rent as opposed to just use.

Mr. Hansen said but for engineering what I wanted to be clear was that if we were dotting it in, we understand that when we come in for a permit to do the truck dock that we need to look at moving the utilities.

Mr. Feltman said the water main would need to be moved out of the way and then we'd have to make sure we get separation.

Mr. Hansen said we understand that.

Mr. Burgess said so either way, we'll get the dock figured out at a future point. Help me out with the math. I thought I had this figured out yesterday. You are talking about dropping the building 8 feet?

Mrs. Vacek said you are going to shift the building 8 feet to the south. You are not going to lose any building along that side, any square footage of the building along that side.

Mr. Hansen said can I run through that real quick? We have the 20 feet right now, so we can reduce that to 17.

Mrs. Vacek said I would say you can probably go down to 17 there.

Mr. Hansen said and then we still have the 8, so we've got the 17 and then...

Mrs. Vacek said and then if you shift these parking spaces down to 17 here and then if you shift this down to 5 that makes up another foot, so then you have 5 and if you shift the whole parking lot down 3 feet, then you have your 8. The only thing I would be concerned about is let's take a look at the parking spaces. I just don't want the cars to be sticking out into this drive isle, so even with the 17 I know that there is that 2 foot overhang, but we may want to just make that 19 and shift it down, just shift everything down another foot or two.

Mr. Sieben said your far south row of parking there by our south lot line too, I think those you could do 17 if you have an overhang.

Mrs. Vacek said I believe those are already 17. I think it can work. You are going to ask for the variance on the south side along the detention pond, which I feel is a little bit more feasible than having it up on this north side. We'll get some area to kind of breath and I think that would also help for your truck turn around.

Mr. Burgess said I agree.

Mr. Hansen said we had looked at that early on in our process about moving that south.

Mr. Feltman said we sent out comments. I think for the most part they were fairly minor. Probably the one that we should probably talk about is that south property line. Being that there is no barrier curb proposed on any of that parking, we were concerned about, we are suggesting that some type of guardrail get put in along that south parking.

Mrs. Vacek said well I think that we would want to see it curbed. I mean, we always have been curbing parking lots.

Mr. Burgess said it is sheet drained so we would need to come up with a curb that allowed for the drainage to go through it if that's okay.

Mr. Feltman said however you want to address that. Being that there is nothing stopping a car at this point...

Mr. Sieben said but a barrier curb would work as long as he meets his overland drainage, correct?

Mr. Feltman said yes. That would obviously help. I don't see cars coming in with real high speed, but there is some concern that it is 4 to 1 down into the pond off the edge of that parking lot.

Mrs. Vacek said if we curbed it and then put landscaping in there, because there will be landscaping along that side, I think between those two things, I think that would...

Mr. Feltman said I mean it is a private property issue as well. Obviously, this isn't a right-of-way, a car exiting the right-of-way, but it was a concern. If you put barrier curb, we are just going to need to figure out where that break is going to happen and then the other concern would then be erosion long-term, but again, that is a private property issue as well. Like we pointed out on the southwest corner, there is that berm, so all the water is traveling along that berm, and where it hits that corner it could start eroding away the shoreline, so you might think about how you want to address that.

Mr. Burgess said now on the barrier curb to the south, because we are sheet draining that to the pond, we're going to drop it so that it can flow through and that's the erosion points that you're concerned about?

Mr. Feltman said yes. It would start concentrating...

Mr. Burgess said I get it, and we have some of that going on elsewhere and we are looking at these, it's not really a permeable paver, but it's got the grass that grows through the paver type of thing. We might drop a few of those in. The Association management company is working on a couple of items. It is nothing major right now.

Mr. Feltman said so if you want to show barrier curb, just show where you are going to break it. It would make more sense to break it, obviously, on the parking stall lines so that you still have that barrier for the car. That would, obviously, help.

Mr. Burgess said right it would help, but I need it also to be something that you are going to say works.

Mr. Krientz said I already sent out a few comments. They were pretty minor. Just as far as fire plan review, I asked you just to remove the hatching when you resubmit it just so we can look at it and you can show the dimensions, it is just tough to read, so you can do our dimensions layout for the fire plan. Just remove all that stuff for our fire plan to show the fire lanes with the dimensions. We really like to see that you are aware of the dimensions and that they are shown in the fire lane and move that fire department connection and make sure it faces Beverly, the address side. That's about it for the plan. With that fire department connection, I put in the notes that the sidewalk to the fire lane be cleared and maintained without a parking stall.

Mr. Frankino said I don't believe we received a submittal on this yet. I'll double check.

Mrs. Vacek said this is tentatively scheduled for, I believe, the June 17th Planning Commission. It will be a public hearing. I will be sending out comments. I know there were some formatting comments that I had as well as some of the content comments that we just discussed, so I will be sending out both of those in probably the next couple of days. For the notice, I will be sending those out I think probably tomorrow.

Mr. Burgess said so we get the sign up and get the neighbors notified?

Mrs. Vacek said you just need to send out the notices. I need to have the notice back, I believe, next week so then I can publish in the newspaper and then the day that you bring the notice to me then I should be able to give you your sign to put out there.

Mr. Sieben said are you sure there is a sign for the variance?

Mrs. Vacek said oh, it's a variance, so there is no sign.

Mr. Sieben said so it is just going to be the notice to the neighbors and then our notice.

1 DST Staff Council 05/26/2015
(Planning Council)

Notes: Mrs. Vacek said we've been working with them. I will be getting formal comments out this week.

1 DST Staff Council 06/02/2015
(Planning Council)

Notes: Mrs. Vacek said I'm going to be sending out comments today on that. It will be going to the June 17th Planning Commission. If Engineering has any conditions, please let me know.

Mr. Feltman said okay.

Mr. Sieben said anything with Fox Metro?

Mr. Frankino said no.

1	DST Staff Council (Planning Council)	06/09/2015	Forwarded	Planning Commission	06/17/2015	Pass
---	---	------------	-----------	------------------------	------------	------

Action Text: A motion was made by Mrs. Vacek, seconded by Mr. Minnella, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Planning Commission, on the agenda for 6/17/2015. The motion carried by voice vote.

Notes: Mrs. Vacek said this will be going to the June 17th Planning Commission. Staff has not received revisions back, so there may be conditions that are added on once we review the revisions. They are supposed to be submitting tomorrow. I make a motion to move this forward. Mr. Minnella seconded the motion.

Mr. Feltman said Engineering sent out comments and we have not received a resubmittal back, but probably the most major comment was a concern of the parking lot, as it is adjacent to the detention basin, and how that barrier would be created. There was discussion with the property owner that there would be barrier curb installed, but we have not seen a revised plan yet.

Mrs. Vacek said we also made that comment also. I believe that they are making that revision, but once we get that, if it is not, we will put that as a condition. I do make a motion to move this forward. Mr. Minnella seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

2	Planning Commission	06/17/2015	Forwarded	Planning & Development Committee	06/25/2015	Pass
---	---------------------	------------	-----------	--	------------	------

Action Text: A motion was made by Mrs. Cole, seconded by Mr. Cameron, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Planning & Development Committee, on the agenda for 6/25/2015. The motion carried.

Notes: 3 CHAIRMAN TRUAX: The first item on our agenda

- 4 is a resolution approving a final plan on Condo Lot 4
- 5 of Lot 5 of Aurora Corporate Center Subdivision and
- 6 granting a setback variance for property located
- 7 along the east side of Beverly Drive, south of Ginger
- 8 Woods Parkway in Ward 1. This is a public hearing.
- 9 MS. VACEK: Good evening. The specific
- 10 property is located at the east -- or on the east
- 11 side of Beverly Drive south of Ginger Woods Parkway
- 12 and is currently vacant property with PDD, planned
- 13 development district zoning, which is part of the

14 *Farnsworth International Special Use Planned*
15 *Development.*
16 *The proposal that is before you*
17 *tonight is for the construction of a 38,626 square*
18 *foot multi-tenant contractor building with ten truck*
19 *doors on the north side of the building. There will*
20 *be a total of 103 automobile parking spaces, of which*
21 *four are handicapped.*

22 *As part of the petition, the*
23 *petitioner is requesting a setback variance along the*
24 *south and the east property line. The setback along*

GROVE & ASSOCIATES REPORTING

6

1 *the south property line would reduce -- be reduced*
2 *from 8 feet to 4.35 feet, being a 3.65 foot variance.*
3 *And the setback along the east property would be*
4 *reduced from 15 to zero, being a 15 foot variance.*

5 *Access to the site would be off of*
6 *Beverly Drive via the two private drive roadways*
7 *which has already been constructed, and there will be*
8 *a 5 foot concrete sidewalk being constructed -- or*
9 *constructed as part of this development.*

10 *Storm water has already been taken*
11 *into account to -- or account for the subject*
12 *property and landscaping is being implemented.*

13 *There is a representative here. I*
14 *can turn it over to the representative unless you*
15 *have any questions for me.*

16 *CHAIRMAN TRUAX: Any questions for staff?*

17 *Okay. We can turn it over to the*

18 petitioner, see if we have any questions or --

19 (Witness sworn.)

20 MR. JAFARI: My name is Brandon Jafari. I'm

21 the engineer for the site. I represent the owner,

22 and I'm here for any questions that you ask, I can

23 answer.

24 CHAIRMAN TRUAX: Anybody have questions for

GROVE & ASSOCIATES REPORTING

7

1 the petitioner?

2 I guess not.

3 MR. JAFARI: Thank you very much.

4 CHAIRMAN TRUAX: Okay. This is a public

5 hearing, and so this is an opportunity for those in

6 the audience who have a comment or question to come

7 forward and talk to us.

8 (No response.)

9 CHAIRMAN TRUAX: Okay. Seeing that no one

10 came forward, I'm going to close the public hearing.

11 Tracey?

12 MS. VACEK: The staff would recommend

13 conditional approval of the resolution approving a

14 final plan on Condo Lot 4 of Lot 5 of Aurora

15 Corporate Center Subdivision and granting a setback

16 variance for the property located at the south -- or

17 I'm sorry, along the east side of Beverly, south of

18 Ginger Woods Parkway, Aurora, Illinois, 60502 with

19 the following conditions:

20 That the percent and number of

21 canopy trees or equivalent be corrected in the

22 *landscape material table; that the four trees along*
23 *the south side that are not within the subject*
24 *property be relocated to along the west property line*

GROVE & ASSOCIATES REPORTING

8

1 *on the berm; that the Honey Locust street tree be*
2 *replaced with an acceptable street species list -- or*
3 *tree -- species listed in the city's approved street*
4 *tree species list, and that no genus shall be*
5 *accounted for more than 33 percent of any land*
6 *planting material type and that no more than three of*
7 *the same species shall be clustered together.*

8 *I know that the petitioner is*
9 *looking to make those changes so they are in*
10 *agreement with that, and that would be my*
11 *recommendation.*

12 *CHAIRMAN TRUAX: Okay. Thank you.*

13 *Having heard the staff*
14 *recommendation, do we have a motion?*

15 *COMMISSIONER COLE: Move for approval with the*
16 *recommendations.*

17 *COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.*

18 *CHAIRMAN TRUAX: Moved and seconded.*

19 *Sue, would you call the roll,*
20 *please.*

21 *MS. JACKSON: Mrs. Anderson?*

22 *COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yes.*

23 *MS. JACKSON: Mr. Bergeron?*

24 *COMMISSIONER BERGERON: Yes.*

GROVE & ASSOCIATES REPORTING

1 MS. JACKSON: Mr. Cameron?

2 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes.

3 MS. JACKSON: Mrs. Cole?

4 COMMISSIONER COLE: Yes.

5 MS. JACKSON: Mr. Divine?

6 COMMISSIONER DIVINE: Yes.

7 MS. JACKSON: Mr. Pilmer?

8 COMMISSIONER PILMER: Yes.

9 MS. JACKSON: Mr. Reynolds?

10 COMMISSIONER REYNOLDS: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN TRUAX: Okay. Motion carries.

12 I believe we have some new findings

13 of fact. We need to evaluate the proposal with

14 respect to the following:

15 No. 1, is the proposal in accordance

16 with all applicable official physical development

17 policies and other related official plans and

18 policies of the City of Aurora?

19 COMMISSIONER COLE: It's in accordance with

20 the -- this is in accordance with the policies and

21 guidelines listed in the staff report.

22 CHAIRMAN TRUAX: No. 2, does the proposal

23 represent the logical establishment and/or consistent

24 extension of the requested classification in

GROVE & ASSOCIATES REPORTING

1 consideration of the existing land uses, existing

2 zoning classifications, and essential character of
3 the general area of the property in question?

4 Well, it is an area of similar
5 property to this one, warehousing and related uses,
6 so I believe it does represent a logical
7 establishment.

8 Is the proposal consistent with a
9 desirable trend of development in the general area of
10 the property in question, occurring since the
11 property in question was placed in its present zoning
12 classification, desirability being defined as the
13 trend's consistency with other applicable official
14 physical development policies and other related
15 official plans and policies of the City of Aurora?

16 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: It's similar to
17 existing uses in the area.

18 CHAIRMAN TRUAX: No. 4, will the proposal
19 permit uses which are more suitable than those uses
20 permitted under the existing zoning classification?

21 COMMISSIONER COLE: Actually, they're just
22 asking for a very small variance, so the answer would
23 be yes, this is suitable.

24 CHAIRMAN TRUAX: No. 5, will the proposal

GROVE & ASSOCIATES REPORTING

11

1 maintain a compatible relationship with traffic
2 pattern and traffic volume of adjacent streets and
3 not have an adverse effect upon traffic or pedestrian
4 movement and safety in the general area of the
5 property in question?

6 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Basically it's
7 developed as commercial area, and therefore should
8 not affect the adjoining uses.

9 CHAIRMAN TRUAX: And No. 6, will the proposal
10 allow for the provision of adequate public services
11 and facilities to the property in question and have
12 no adverse effect upon existing public services and
13 facilities?

14 I believe the facilities and
15 services are all in place.

16 Will this then go forward?

17 MS. VACEK: Yes. This will next be heard at
18 our planning and development committee on Thursday,
19 June 25th here at City Hall, 5th floor conference
20 room, at 4:00 p.m.

21 CHAIRMAN TRUAX: Okay. Thank you. Good luck
22 with your project.

Aye: 7 At Large Bergeron, At Large Cameron, At Large Cole, At Large Pilmer,
Aurora Twnshp Representative Reynolds, At Large Anderson and At
Large Divine
