



City of Aurora

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

Legistar History Report

File Number: 21-0714

File ID: 21-0714

Type: Petition

Status: Draft

Version: 2

**General
Ledger #:**

In Control: Building, Zoning,
and Economic
Development
Committee

File Created: 09/08/2021

File Name: Fox Valley Apartments, LP / Lincoln School / 631 and
641 S. Lake Street / Final Plat

Final Action:

Title:

Notes:

Agenda Date: 10/13/2021

Agenda Number:

Sponsors:

Enactment Date:

Attachments: Exhibit "A" Final Plat - 2021-09-29 - 2021.265, Land
Use Petition and Supporting Documents - 2021-09-03
- 2021.267, Qualifying Statement - 2021-09-10 -
2021.267, Plat of Survey - 2021-09-03 - 2021.267,
Address Plat - 2021-09-03 - 2021.267, Property
Research Sheet ID 21367-21366 - 2021-10-01-
2021.268

Enactment Number:

Planning Case #: AU28/1-21.267-CUPD/Rz/Fsd/Fpn

Hearing Date:

Drafter: morganj@aurora.il.us

Effective Date:

Related Files:

History of Legislative File

Ver- sion:	Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:
2	Planning and Zoning Commission	10/06/2021	Forwarded	Building, Zoning, and Economic Development Committee	10/13/2021		Pass
Action Text: A motion was made by Mr. Chambers, seconded by Mr. Elsbree, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Building, Zoning, and Economic Development Committee, on the agenda for 10/13/2021. The motion carried.							
Notes: Mrs. Morgan staff would recommend conditional approval of a Resolution approving the Final Plat for Lot 1 of the Fox Valley Apartments-Lincoln School Subdivision located at 631 and 641 S. Lake Street with the following condition:							
1. That all the review comments per the Engineering Department be addressed prior to approval of							

the Final Engineering Plans.

MOTION OF CONDITIONAL APPROVAL WAS MADE BY: Mr. Chambers

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mr. Elsbree

AYES: Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Chambers, Mr. Choudhury, Mr. Elsbree, Mr. Gonzales, Mrs. Owusu-Safo

NAYS: None

Mrs. Morgan said this will next be heard at the Building, Zoning and Economic Development Committee meeting on Wednesday, October 13th at 4:00 on the 5th floor of City Hall, Conference Room B.

Aye: 6 At Large Anderson, Fox Valley Park District Representative Chambers, At Large Elsbree, At Large Gonzales, At Large Owusu-Safo and At Large Choudhury

Legistar Items: 21-0713, 21-0714 and 21-0715 – Lincoln School

21-0713 An Ordinance establishing a Conditional Use Planned Development, approving the Fox Valley Apartments-Lincoln School Plan Description and amending Chapter 49 of the Code of Ordinances, City of Aurora, by modifying the zoning map attached thereto to an underlying zoning of R-5 Multiple Family Dwelling District for the property located at 631 and 641 S. Lake Street (Fox Valley Apartments, LP / Lincoln School – 21-0713 / AU28/1-21.267-CUPD/Rz/Fsd/Fpn – JM – Ward 4) (PUBLIC HEARING)

Mrs. Morgan said this is for a Conditional Use Planned Development with a Final Plat and Final Plan. The subject property is located at 631 and 641 S. Lake Street. Right now I am showing the Final Plan. I have elevations I can show as well and then the Petitioners are here with some nice renderings and a presentation as well. The subject property is currently zoned R-3 One Family Dwelling District. The Petitioner is requesting the establishment of the Conditional Use Planned Development and to change the zoning district from R-3 One Family Dwelling District to R-5(C) Multiple Family Dwelling District with a Conditional Use. The details include a Plan Description with variations to the Zoning Ordinance and to the Building Code to allow the historic school to be repurposed into 14 workforce housing units and the construction of a new building housing 22 units. These variations include varying setbacks, allowing two buildings on one lot, increasing the height for the historic school and reducing some of the parking requirements. There are also requirements on the elevations. Concurrently with this proposal, they are requesting a Final Plat to consolidate the multiple lots into one lot. They are also requesting a Final Plan for the multiple family dwelling use. This includes reducing the entrances on Lake Street. There are currently 3 and they are going to reduce them to 2. That circular drive will remain with 2 slight alterations to it. They are proposing a total of 58 parking spaces. Behind the building currently there is concrete. That will be changed into a new parking lot for the two buildings. The new building entrance will face the parking lot. Here is the Final Plan. I'm going to go ahead and change to the elevations while I talk about the historic school so you can see the school if you are not familiar with it. The historic school appears to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. As the developer is pursuing Historic Preservation Tax Credits, the historic school will remain mostly unchanged from the exterior. The renovations also include preserving many of the significant interior elements, including lockers, doors, chalkboards. The new school will be compatible to the old through the use of red brick veneer, regularly arranged window openings and hipped roof lines. While the entrance to the new building will face the internal parking lot, the more decorative elevation will face Woodlawn. That will feature 4 gable cantilever bays and some bays on the end. It will be clad in brick on the ends and the bay and then in the center, as you can see in the picture, and then the rest of it will be Hardi board and in different sizes. The landscape plan has some additional understory trees along Woodlawn, some beds of shrubs along the entrances and foundations, and some evergreen trees and shrubs along the perimeters abutting the single family for some buffering and screening. As I mentioned, this is potentially eligible for the National Register. A local stonemason and carpenter, Clark Brown Colwell, designed and built the original block of the school when it opened in 1891. It was remodeled in 1920, 1926 and 1928. It served as a school until 2009 when it was closed and has sat vacant since. There are Prairie style architectural details in the original school building. As I mentioned, they are pursuing Historic Tax Credits. I'll stop there with my presentation. Are there any questions for staff before I hand it over to the Petitioner?

The Petitioners were sworn in.

My name is Shelly J. Tucciarelli, 232 S. Oak Street, Itasca, Illinois 60143. I'm honored to be here this evening. I'd also like to introduce members of our team. We have Therese Thompson, Viral Shah, and John Hoffman. We're looking forward to moving this rezoning process forward. As mentioned, I'd just like to give a little background about myself. I'm a tribal member of the Oneida Nation of Wisconsin. My reservation is up near Green Bay, and yes, my family members are all Packer fans. We do have an Oneida Nation gate at Lambeau Field, so they are very proud about that. I'm also the Executive Director of Visionary Ventures. It is a Native American non-profit. We also have 100% Native American board members. Previous to working with Visionary Ventures, I worked for over 20 years with the Illinois Housing Development Authority, IHDA. They are the state housing finance agency that finances affordable housing for the entire state. I worked in the Asset Management Department and in the Multi-Family Department and I actually managed the Low Income Housing Tax Credit program for several years. I think we can get started now. We are going to start with the Lincoln building. As Jill mentioned, it is located at 641 S. Lake Street. The scope of work will include the renovation of the historic property into 14 housing units and new construction of 22 units for a total of 36 housing units. It will include a community room, library, computer lab and gymnasium. It was originally built in 1891 and the school has been closed since 2009. Here are some elevations of the property and site plans. Here it shows the new construction building also.

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

I'm Rick Lawrence, 27 S. Calumet in Aurora. I have a business right around the corner from there. I'm also the former 4th Ward Alderman for that area there, so I actually understand that area quite well and worked with the residents for 8 years on that street. I'm actually kind of surprised that we are even here looking at this plan because it was just recently that the Mayor and everybody worked to kill a deal at the old YMCA and said that we would never do this type of project over there because of the challenges that we faced in that area. They come in here with their workforce development and they say in their own documents on why they're doing that so that they can get around our ordinances, reduce the parking, the setbacks, the elevations and things like that. You know, we do all of this in the city and we look at it, oh it's an old building. Well we learned our lesson also with Aurora Christian, which was the old West High at the time, on the challenges of these old schools. Not everything needs to be saved. That area there, we worked really hard with the residents in there. It is very congested there. ATMI is right around the corner. There are several other factory businesses right in there. There is probably somewhere near 1,000 trucks a day come up and down Ridgeway and Lake Street, wide load trucks with big concrete panels. It diverts a lot of traffic onto Woodlawn then. We ended up working with the residents for a long time because it was really unsafe for their kids and busses and everything else to pick up, so we removed all the parking off of the east side of Woodlawn between Ridgeway and Prairie and that's still today. On the west side, it's completely jammed with parking for the residents that live there currently. Now we've seen this model. It is a cheaply built barrack type building. I know they make it look nice on these drawings, but you can go to Monomoy, and all around and Nantucket and we've seen these projects throughout the history of Aurora come forward and we know what they end up turning into and the maintenance on them. These people come in from out of town and then they're gone. Around the city, if we're talking about workforce development, price point and everything

else, Woodlawn, the entire stretch of Woodlawn, would be considered workforce development price point targets. The only thing that makes anything expensive is taxes. I would argue that half of the city in the price points of the properties would be in that price range. So they come in here with their workforce development. It is only 14 units. The other 22 units they are calling multi-family. So that would probably then feed into Freeman. Freeman is crowded because once Lincoln closed, everything went to Freeman. But they don't have to worry about it. Their kids don't go to these schools. They are from somewhere else. Also in the documents there, they say they have a minimum requirement of 420 square foot per unit and then they call it multi-family. I think, you know, at one point Aurora has enough of this and we have enough of outside developers that just come in and say oh we can get it through in Aurora. I mean there is a reason why the YMCA is still sitting there the way it is because we killed that deal. We had a gentleman that ran very small apartments like the 400 square foot apartments in there and it was a real problem, and so we finally got that sold and the Mayor and everybody worked not to have it. I don't know what changed now. It is just a couple of blocks away, but the people that live in that area there and also multi-family, if anybody took their time and went down to ATMI, the people on Woodlawn currently you can't open up your windows because of the dust and everything that comes out of ATMI. On a windy day it literally is a cloud of concrete dust that blows across there. So now we're going to put more people into that area. It is a real challenging area. When you go through your questions, will it impede the lifestyle of the people there? Yes, it is going to add more congestion to the area. Is it going to impact our schools? Yes, if you are doing multi-family, yes, it is. These developers, they come into our city, they don't care. They don't care what they're putting in. It is about the dollar thing. They do the workforce deal just to get the grants and then get around our ordinances. City staff should have shut this down immediately. As soon as they started going with parking and setbacks and height, you should have shut this thing down and not let it pursue this, and not giving the people that live on Woodlawn a second thought. We worked really hard with those people on Woodlawn to try to get that place not as congested and now we are going to do this. I appreciate your time. I tell you, I used to sit up there. I know it is hard to say no to these projects, but sometimes you've got to. This is not the right development for that street. The best use of that piece of property there, tear it down, put green space there, let those kids have a park. I know we say we have Fox Valley Park District right there. There's no playthings for the Park District there. There is a ballfield there. But this thing here should be a park for the residents on Woodlawn and Lake Street. That's what they use it currently for. That's why we never pushed to get the playground equipment taken down. It should be fixed up and the kids over there should get a park. Thank you.

My name is Fernando Garcia. My address is 416 Lakelawn Boulevard in Aurora 60506. My dad actually lives right in front of the school at 625 Woodlawn. He's been there since I was 5 years old, so 35 years he's been in the same house. When they did close the parking on that one side, he's on the side where all the cars park, so it is already a nightmare for him. He's 81 years old. Especially in the wintertime when it snows and the plows can't get to it because all the cars are parked there. He has a hard time as it is right now, so if you are going to add more people living there, it is going to be even worse. I don't think it's fair for somebody to have that much of a hard time already. There's even a fire hydrant that's right in front of his house and there are still cars parked right there. It is just going to add a lot more traffic, and like the gentleman that just spoke before me, there is so much dust and semis going down that street right there on Ridgeway. This is just going to be worse. Are these going to be low income housing?

Chairman Pilmer said we'll take all the questions and then we'll answer them all at once.

Mr. Garcia said well I mean that would add to the problem. If there are going to be like 400 square foot apartments I'm assuming they are going to be low income and it is just going to bring more, I'm sorry to say, but like bad people maybe to that area, which is already overlooked because it is kind of in the corner of Aurora that no one really cares so much about. That's all.

Chairman Pilmer said I have a number of questions that we'll ask the Petitioner if they'd like to provide feedback on. Again, tonight's hearing, the Planning Commission is a volunteer committee made from citizens of Aurora, so we are here to hear testimony on behalf of the city. We will make a recommendation, but we are a recommending board, so the final decision rests with our City Council, so we will provide feedback based on the questions we heard tonight. We are not here to provide a debate, but we do provide minutes to the city Aldermen that will review these as the case progresses. I know there are comments regarding traffic. I know there was a traffic study done, but if you could just comment on the traffic study and then how it impacts the traffic on Woodlawn and well as the additional congestion in the area.

Ms. Tucciarelli said again, for Lincoln there's only going to be 36 units at this site. We did have a traffic study that was prepared and has been submitted. The results of that study does show that it will have minimal impact in that area.

Chairman Pilmer said and then if you could comment maybe on is this low income housing?

Ms. Tucciarelli said it is considered workforce housing. It will be income to 30% of the area median income and 60% of the area median income. That's the income ranges.

Chairman Pilmer said I don't know if you talked to the School District, but the expected impact on schools, if you could comment on that.

Ms. Tucciarelli said yes, we have and they did submit information saying that because there are only going to be 36 units and 11 at the other that it will definitely only have a minimal impact at the school also.

Chairman Pilmer said and then the minimum size of the units?

Ms. Tucciarelli said we only have, I believe, I think 5 studios and the rest are going to be 1, 2 and 3 bedroom units. It will only affect the studio apartments. It is based on the configuration because we're working with, when you are doing adaptive reuse you have to work with the confined space that you do have.

Chairman Pilmer said I might just ask staff if they can maybe provide a comment on, I know ATMI the neighbor, I think there are city standards, but is that's something, I assume, staff or the city does monitor?

Mr. Sieben said yes we've, at times, had complaints with ATMI. I know going back over the last 10 years or so, we've had complaints from some of the properties on Prairie Street and so on that are in the city and occasionally we've worked with our Zoning and Property Standards inspectors on that, so if we do get complaints we can check them out. Unfortunately, we have an area where we have M-2 zoning next to primarily single family development. We do have a few areas in town like that and, unfortunately, this is one of those areas.

Chairman Pilmer said are there any other additional questions of the Petitioner?

Mrs. Anderson said I have a question. When was the traffic study performed?

Ms. Tucciarelli said actually I think we received one yesterday, the results yesterday, and one today, so very recent.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said I have one other question on the traffic study. Just looking at, and I have to apologize because I didn't get to read the entire thing, but looking at the traffic study it seems like a lot of it is comparing the previous usage of the school to what is being proposed. Did it truly analyze the current conditions or was it basically comparing what trips were generated from the school versus what you are going to be using, but maybe during that time the usage was a little different? Is there any thought behind what is being used now compared to what...

Ms. Tucciarelli said I think that was the general consensus was that trying to view it because of how the traffic was used previously as a school in that area until what it's going to be used as now. It is going to be a lot less impact as the use now because there's going to be a lot less traffic. Before there was parents coming picking children up so it is going to be a lot less minimal traffic going to that area.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said and I fully understand it. I was just trying to see if there was any like the number of trucks now versus when it was a school zone versus when it was a two way parking, two sides parking versus currently just one. How have those dynamics changed compared to, because I think looking at this specific site, there's only one extra parking space more than what is required? Am I correct on that?

Ms. Tucciarelli said yes.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said okay. If that's the case and the neighborhood is already complaining about inadequate parking in the area, was that really taken into account based on the current use as opposed to prior when it was a school? That's the question that I couldn't answer from the study.

My name is Therese Thompson. I'm with Cordogan Clark & Associates, the architects. My address is 4726 N. Campbell Avenue in Chicago 60625. Regarding the parking, we actually have 1.5 spaces per unit. That's more than a 1 to 1 ratio. It is a reduction from the 2.0 spaces per unit, but historically residents in affordable workforce housing do not have the rate of car ownership that other people do. We've done many, many workforce housing projects over the last 10 to 12 years and can provide a lot of data showing little parking is actually needed for a project of this type if that would be helpful. I also

think it is worth noting regarding the parking on the west side of Woodlawn and any concerns that there will be more parking on Woodlawn or the parking on the street will be exacerbated. There are no entrances to the building on Woodlawn, so from a convenience standpoint, all the residents who have cars will be parking in the parking lot and not on Woodlawn because that will be the way that they've got to get into both buildings to access their units. There won't be any incentive for anyone to park on Woodlawn. It will be far less convenient for them.

Mr. Elsbree said I have a question for staff. Do we have another workforce housing program in Aurora? Are there any like this going on?

Mrs. Morgan said there are a couple of other workforce housing units. The former St. Charles Hospital here close to downtown. The Artisan Lofts in downtown as well. Coulter Court in downtown. Those are really the closest ones.

Mr. Sieben said you guys had a study, I think, that had surrounding, but those were the main ones.

Mrs. Morgan said those are, I think, the closest ones in this proximity.

Mr. Elsbree said and we saw no rise in crime, which kind of concerned me, or those people moving in? That was a comment, but is there any concern to Aurora about crime going up in any of those places?

Mr. Curley said staff is not aware of a causation between this use and crime increases.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said maybe for some of us who don't understand workforce housing, can you please just give us a 101?

Ms. Tucciarelli said I sure can. We consider workforce housing as there's a gap in housing because you have luxury housing and then you have federally subsidized housing and with 30% of the area median income and 60% of the area median income, it kind of falls in between that gap. They really can't afford to rent luxury housing and if they do then they are paying more than 35% of their income for rent and because they are working, they are workforce and they are working, they don't qualify for the subsidized housing, so they are in that range of the 30% to 60% area median income and they qualify for workforce housing.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said so that's subsidized?

Ms. Tucciarelli said no.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said just the pricing?

Ms. Tucciarelli said just the price. There are rents, but if it's able to, because of the Low Income Housing Tax Credit program and the incentives that are involved there, the developers are able to have a less debt coverage and so then they can lower the rents.

Mr. Choudhury said I think that you mentioned that there will be single bedroom, two bedroom and three bedroom units over there. Do you have a breakdown of that?

Ms. Tucciarelli said I sure do. At Lincoln there's going to be in the school, in the adaptive reuse in the school, there are going to be 2 studios, 5 two bedrooms and 7 three bedrooms. In the 22 units of the new building it will have 3 studios, 3 one bedrooms, 1 two bedroom and 15 three bedrooms.

Mr. Choudhury said so it seems like there would be more units which have more than one bedroom, right?

Ms. Tucciarelli said yes.

Mr. Choudhury said do you think 1.5 parking ratio is enough for that per unit?

Ms. Tucciarelli said we did have a market study done and in the market study according to the study, it did show that 1.5 parking ratio would be adequate because there are some people that don't own cars and use public transportation.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said so is there a walkability factor that was used?

Ms. Tucciarelli said well there's a bus stop.

Mr. Choudhury said the drawing did not show that, but are you saying that there will be a wall beside Woodlawn Avenue, which will be shielding the buildings from Woodlawn Avenue?

Ms. Tucciarelli said will there be what?

Mr. Choudhury said will there be a wall over there or some sort of fence or something?

Ms. Tucciarelli said I think it is going to be landscaping along there.

Mr. Choudhury said I'm trying to understand the statement the lady made before saying that there will be no incentive parking on Woodlawn. Why are you saying that?

Ms. Tucciarelli said because they'll park in the parking lot.

Chairman Pilmer said the entrance isn't on Woodlawn.

Mrs. Morgan said I thought we showed the doors on here. There are doors proposed coming out onto Woodlawn. These are exit only doors. There's not going to be an entrance for them. The only entrance is the main entrance that's facing the parking lot. She is saying that like if you park on Woodlawn you are going to have to walk all the way around the building to get inside.

Chairman Pilmer said there is nothing to preclude people from parking on Woodlawn and there is ingress and egress onto Woodlawn, but it's highly likely, based on the parking, that they are being encouraged to park in the lot, which is closest to their front door.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said and is there a retaining wall all the way through the entire length of the building, so it's another barrier?

Mrs. Morgan said it is a retaining wall that's needed.

Mr. Elsbree said if I can just comment on that wall real quick. That wall is already there.

The public input portion of the public hearing was closed.

Mrs. Morgan said staff has some comments on the Findings of Facts. For the Conditional Use Findings of Fact:

1. Will the establishment, maintenance or operation of the conditional use be unreasonably detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort, or general welfare?

It will not be detrimental as the development will reuse a building that has historic significance to the community and reuse a building that has sat vacant for over 10 years for rental housing providing for diverse housing types to accommodate the needs of the Aurora population.

2. Will the conditional use be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted or substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood, factors including but not limited to lighting, signage and outdoor amplification, hours of operation, refuse disposal areas and architectural compatibility and building orientation?

It will not hurt the enjoyment of the properties in the immediate area as it allows for transition from manufacturing across Lake Street and high density residential to single family uses along Woodlawn. It will also create less people using the site than the former school. It will also prevent the property from sitting vacant and possibly becoming a blighted property.

3. Will the establishment of the conditional use impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding property for uses permitted in the district?

No, as there are setbacks and landscape screenings provided to the single family. It will develop a vacant property and thus improve the neighborhood.

4. Will the proposal provide for adequate utilities, access roads, drainage, and/or other necessary facilities as part of the conditional use?

There is currently adequate water and sewer capacity to serve the project.

5. Does the proposal take adequate measures, or will they be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets?

It does have adequate ingress and egress. The main access points will be reduced from 3 curb cuts on Lake Street to 2 and 1 access from Woodlawn that will be shifted west. The traffic generated by residents should have less of an impact on the neighborhood than the school, which had high amounts of traffic at specific times of the day. Why not providing 2 spaces per unit? Staff feels that workforce housing does not produce the standard 2 parking spaces per unit parking need. As per the traffic study, it also (inaudible) its Findings.

6. Does the conditional use in all other respects conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located, except as such regulations may in each instance be modified by the City Council pursuant to the recommendations of the Commission?

The Conditional Use in all other respects conforms to the applicable regulations of the R-5 zoning district.

For the Rezoning 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?

That is noted in the staff report. There are several items listed where it meets those development policies.

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?

The proposal does represent the logical establishment as it is high density residential development that is adjacent to manufacturing and single family housing providing a buffer and it reflects the character of the school site.

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?

The proposal is consistent as it provides additional housing options in the area, provides additional range of housing prices, provides buffers to the surrounding uses, and reuses a vacant historic building.

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

Yes, it is more suitable as it is not feasible to reuse a historic school for single family.

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

It brings additional residential housing options to a property that abuts manufacturing across the street.

Those are the Findings of Fact with the staff's comments. Staff would recommend approval of an Ordinance establishing a Conditional Use Planned Development, approving the Fox Valley Apartments-Lincoln School Plan Description and amending Chapter 49 of the Code of Ordinances, City of Aurora, by modifying the zoning map attached thereto to an underlying zoning of R-5 Multiple Family Dwelling District for the property located at 631 and 641 S. Lake Street.

MOTION OF APPROVAL WAS MADE BY: Mr. Chambers

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mr. Elsbree

AYES: Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Chambers, Mr. Choudhury, Mr. Elsbree, Mr. Gonzales, Mrs. Owusu-Safo

NAYS: None

Chairman Pilmer said we do have Findings of Fact to cover, which will be 6 items on the Conditional Use and 5 items on the Rezoning Petition. If there is nothing additional to add or comments regarding what's included in the staff report and what was read in by staff, I'd ask for a motion to approve the Findings of Fact based on what staff read into the transcript tonight.

MOTION OF APPROVAL WAS MADE BY: Mr. Chambers

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mrs. Anderson

AYES: Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Chambers, Mr. Choudhury, Mr. Elsbree, Mr. Gonzales, Mrs. Owusu-Safo

NAYS: None

Mrs. Morgan said this will next be heard at the Building, Zoning and Economic Development Committee meeting on Wednesday, October 13th at 4:00 on the 5th floor of City Hall, Conference Room B.

21-0714 A Resolution approving the Final Plat for Lot 1 of Fox Valley Apartments-Lincoln School Subdivision located at 631 and 641 S. Lake Street (Fox Valley Apartments, LP / Lincoln School – 21-0714 / AU28/1-21.267-CUPD/Rz/Fsd/Fpn – JM – Ward 4)

Mrs. Morgan staff would recommend conditional approval of a Resolution approving the Final Plat for Lot 1 of the Fox Valley Apartments-Lincoln School Subdivision located at 631 and 641 S. Lake Street with the following condition:

1. That all the review comments per the Engineering Department be addressed prior to approval of the Final Engineering Plans.

MOTION OF CONDITIONAL APPROVAL WAS MADE BY: Mr. Chambers

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mr. Elsbree

AYES: Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Chambers, Mr. Choudhury, Mr. Elsbree, Mr. Gonzales, Mrs. Owusu-Safo

NAYS: None

Mrs. Morgan said this will next be heard at the Building, Zoning and Economic Development Committee meeting on Wednesday, October 13th at 4:00 on the 5th floor of City Hall, Conference Room B.

21-0715 A Resolution approving a Final Plan on Lot 1 of Fox Valley Apartments-Lincoln School Subdivision, located at 631 and 641 S. Lake Street for a Multi-Family Dwelling (1140 Use (Fox Valley Apartments, LP / Lincoln School – 21-0715 / AU28/1-21.267-CUPD/Rz/Fsd/Fpn – JM – Ward 4)

Mrs. Morgan said staff would recommend conditional approval of a Resolution approving a Final Plan on Lot 1 of Fox Valley Apartments-Lincoln School Subdivision located at 631 and 641 S. Lake Street for a Multi-Family Dwelling (1140) Use with the following conditions:

1. That the elevations of the Final Plan be contingent upon approval of the State Historic Preservation Office.
2. That all the review comments per the Engineering Department be addressed prior to approval of the Final Engineering Plans.

MOTION OF CONDITIONAL APPROVAL WAS MADE BY: Mrs. Anderson

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mrs. Owusu-Safo

AYES: Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Chambers, Mr. Choudhury, Mr. Elsbree, Mr. Gonzales, Mrs. Owusu-Safo

NAYS: None

Mrs. Morgan said this will next be heard at the Building, Zoning and Economic Development Committee meeting on Wednesday, October 13th at 4:00 on the 5th floor of City Hall, Conference Room B.