

City of Aurora

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

Legistar History Report

File Number: 17-00256

File ID: 17-00256 Type: Resolution Status: ATS Review

Version: 3 General In Control: Planning &

Ledger #: Development Committee

File Created: 03/16/2017

File Name: Taylor Morrison of Illinois, Inc. / Verona Ridge, Unit 4 Final Action:

/ Final Plan Revision

Title: A Resolution Approving a Revision to the Final Plan for Unit Four of The Estate Homes of Verona Ridge Subdivision, Located at Verona Ridge, Unit

4 for a One Family Dwelling (1100) Use

Notes:

Agenda Date: 04/27/2017

Agenda Number:

Sponsors: Enactment Date:

Attachments: Exhibit "A" Floor Plans & Elevations, Property Enactment Number:

Research Sheet, Land Use Petition and Supporting

Documents, Legistar History Report

Planning Case #: SG12/3-17.023-Fpn/R Hearing Date:

Drafter: esieben@aurora-il.org Effective Date:

History of Legislative File

Ver-	Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:
1	Committee of the Whole	03/21/2017	Forward to Planning Council	DST Staff Council (Planning Council)	03/28/2017		

Action Text: This Petition was Forward to Planning Council to the DST Staff Council (Planning Council)

1 DST Staff Council 03/28/2017

(Planning Council)

Notes: Representative Present: Rick Zirk

Mr. Sieben said do you want to kind of tell us kind of your product layout now and then why you are adding these 2 products in there?

Mr. Zirk said this is my by-annual migration to the City of Aurora. Every couple of years the architects go through and freshen product, and add product. During the course of every couple of years, we get a lot of feedback from the buyers, what people like today versus what they liked before. Internally, a lot of things you don't see, drop stations by mud rooms. There's always an evolution of interior product. Bricks are very popular for a while and then it changes. As you see now, more of a Craftsman Farmhouse seems to be the more popular elevations. They are continually trying to make the product fresh, obviously, to keep people interested in and revising interest in the subdivisions. A lot of it is based on buyer feedback. We were here a couple of years ago after the project sat for a

very long time. We had originally had product approved in Verona Ridge. When we came back around 2 years ago, we asked for some updated product. We provided that and now we have a few more lots left in the development and they are looking to add some product. The other thing, as Ed touched on, is we seem to find, and it used to be based on which house plan you modeled, it always seemed to get the most attention, and it seems like when a few people in the neighborhood buy a certain house, everybody has to have that house. So that house becomes the best house and most popular house and in this one we've had a lot of Preston's and Sterling's or whatever the name for the house is now. You just need to provide an alternative in that price, size and footprint, so you don't have everybody trying to buy the same house and you run into monotony issues where you are trying to find elevations and distinguish elevations so that you can get around the monotony standard. We've seen evolutions like this in a floor plan. We had a couple of years ago where everybody wanted a first floor master. It got very popular. Nobody bought them. Everybody wanted them, so everybody had to find first floor master plans. Everybody loves a ranch and except for this development, nobody buys a ranch. We've had a very high number of ranch buyers here, which we generally find good because those are generally the folks that are downsizing and moving to a single story living space. They generally have the most discretionary income and are really the buyers that put the least amount of impact on the schools. We still offer the ranch product. We're not looking to substitute these 4 existing product lines. We are simply asking to add these to the product lines.

Mr. Sieben said let's just briefly talk about the 2 models. Tracey maybe go back to the Becker. I think that's the slightly smaller one. Where does this fit into your product? What is the minimum square footage? Then we'll go to the Goodwin.

- Mr. Zirk said I provided, I believe, the square footages.
- Mr. Sieben said if you want to just touch on it where this falls.
- Mr. Zirk said right now the Lexington is 2,600.
- Mr. Sieben said the Lexington is the ranch.
- Mr. Zirk said the 2,900 foot square Prescott has been one of the more popular. The Fordham was the other most popular. The Becker fits in slightly below that at 2,800. The Goodwin, which we will talk about, fits in more with the Fordham, which is running right around 3,000.
- Mr. Seiben said so the Becker falls in where?
- Mr. Zirk said at 2,804. The minimum out there is 2,800 for a 2 story. The Lexington is 2,600, I believe, for a 2 story, which is at 2,607. The existing Prescott is 2,908, so this fits in slightly below the Prescott and the Goodwin, again, slightly above it to kind of bracket that popular plan.
- Mr. Sieben said and these are all 3 car and depending on if it is a 90 or 100 foot wide lot, it is either a front load or a side load and you are providing both. This is showing front load, but you also have the side load.
- Mr Zirk said right. Even if it is a front load lot, many times there is an option of a side load. The plans, I think, show the side load options in the drawing elevations.
- Mr. Sieben said go back down to the Goodwin, which is a slightly larger one then. What's the Goodwin square footage?
- Mr. Zirk said 2,900. It varies from 2,952 to 2,974. Those are usually those slight variations. There are different bump-outs on different elevations, so you can gain a little bit of square footage.
- Mr. Sieben said and these will meet all the standards of all the ones you currently are building, all the same finishes and options and all the other stuff, correct?
- Mr. Zirk said correct. The idea is to make these blend in with the neighborhood, but not be the same as what everything else is and to provide more option. We are not looking for any deviations from our development agreement. We are not looking for any deviations from any of the estate residential zoning or estate residential building codes.
- Ms. Phifer said Rick I know you said it, but I think it is an important point to make that these are additional elevations. We are not removing any elevations from options, so homeowners will still have

a lot of choice, it is just adding a little more variety.

Mr. Zirk said correct. Like I said, we tend to find something like the Prescott that winds up being a very popular plan and everybody hones in on it. You offer 6 plans and everybody hones in on 2, you wind up with a monotony issue. The city's got standards by which we have to keep these houses looking different, so you wind up with everybody wanting that plan and you either wind up with a plan you can't sell, which everybody wants or you wind up trying to bracket it with this plan slightly smaller, just making it slightly larger and hopefully the people that are focused on the Prescott can be directed to one of the other plans and still provide enough floor plan to use as they want, but also provide some more relief from the monotony difficulties we run into.

Mr. Sieben said I don't know if we've already talked tentative dates. Are we looking at the 19th? It is not a public hearing, so it is just a matter of putting it on an agenda. I think we are looking at April 19th for Planning Commission and then it will be done at the first City Council in May, which would be, I think, the 9th. We'll stay in touch.

1 DST Staff Council

04/04/2017

(Planning Council)

Notes: Mr. Sieben said I'll be moving this out next and moving this forward.

 DST Staff Council (Planning Council) 04/11/2017 Forwarded Planning

4/11/2017 Forwarded Planning Commission

Action Text: A motion was made by Mr. Sieben, seconded by Mrs. Vacek, that this agenda item be Forwarded to

the Planning Commission, on the agenda for 4/19/2017. The motion carried by voice vote.

Notes: Mr. Sieben said I'll make a motion to move this forward to the April 19th Planning Commission. Mrs.

Vacek seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

2 Planning Commission

04/19/2017 Forwarded

Planning & 04/27/2017

04/19/2017

Pass

Pass

Development Committee

Action Text: A motion was r

A motion was made by Mrs. Cole, seconded by Mr. Cameron, that this agenda item be Forwarded to

Notes:

the Planning & Development Committee, on the agenda for 4/27/2017. The motion carried. Mr. Sieben said this is for the Verona Ridge Subdivision out on Deerpath and Indian Trail, the far west side of Aurora. Taylor Morrison of Illinois is what became of Orleans Homes, who was the original developer. Rick Zirk is here to answer any questions in a minute. Essentially, I believe there are 18 lots left in Unit 4, which is the last unit of the development on the north side. They currently have a number of floor plans that were approved in 2015 when Taylor Morrison kind of reinvigorated Verona Ridge. They really upped some of the elevations. What they are proposing then is to keep the current elevations that are already approved and then add 2 additional. The 2 additional they are looking at are the Becker, which is about a 2,800 square foot 2 story, 4 bedroom. There are all 3 car garages, either front load or side load, depending on the lot width if you recall. Then the second model they are proposing is the Goodwin, which is another 2 story, about 2,950 square feet, again 2 story, 4 bedroom and 3 car garages. Currently their 2 biggest sellers right now is they have 1 ranch, the Lexington, which is just over 2,600 square feet and then one of their smaller 2 stories, the Prescott, which is 2,908 square foot is another big seller. These two 2 stories, the Becker will be slotted right between the ranch and the Prescott and then the Goodwin will be then a little bit larger than the Prescott, so it is kind of in their niche range there of square footage and this will allow more options for the buyers for the remaining properties. Again, these meet the minimum square footage and standards from when this was approved in 2005 and there should be no impact on the surrounding properties and current residents that are already there.

Mr. Cameron said it seems to me I remember, are there street faced variations that are required so that you need the mix of elevations and styles?

Mr. Sieben said correct. As with any subdivision, there is anti-monotony, so that's correct. This will actually help that a little bit because everyone wanted those same 2 models, so this will help break it up a little bit.

Mr. Zirk said Ed did steal pretty much all of my thunder. The real point of what we are trying to do is every few years we try to update product to keep things current and keep things updated based on what folks want, so it is two sides. One is trying to provide some additional floor plans that address the desires of the current buyers and then as Ed said, the real issues we have is we have a lot of people, it seems like this happens in a lot subdivisions, people come in and everybody wants the same house. They really like the style, they really like that floor plan or the size or whatever. Here we have a lot of ranches surprisingly. As you were saying Mr. Cameron, we were running into monotony

issues where everybody wants the same house. You have 3 or 4 elevations. We have an anti-monotony provision internally in addition to what the city has, so we try to add floor plans and elevations so that we don't run into a situation where someone comes in and wants the same thing. I think it is further complicated or exasperated in this case because as you said, there are a couple of different garage orientation requirements. I think most of the homes that are left are on the 100 foot lots and they require the side load 3 car garage. Then we have a handful of homes and they all have to be side load and it makes it even more difficult to keep the monotony down, so by adding these in, in a 3 car side load condition will give us more options of the 3 car side load at a square footage and a floor plan that folks seem to prefer. It is really nothing more than that. It is pretty straightforward. It is a consumer demand on us and a consumer demand response on our part.

Mr. Cameron said have you found that for the 18 lots left that you've had to also change the definition of the specs and what's desirable and change that at all?

Mr. Zirk said no, I think we have a wide enough array of that that everybody that comes through the door can kind of find what they want. We do special design requests for folks that what something very specific, but for the most part I think there is enough different. These last floor plans we submitted were just 2 years ago, so we haven't seen that big swing in spec, we just see a preference in a certain size house and certain style house and that's we are kind of focusing on.

Mr. Sieben said staff does recommend approval of the Resolution approving the Revision to the Final Plan for Unit 4 of the Estate Homes of Verona Ridge Subdivision.

MOTION OF APPROVAL WAS MADE BY: Mrs. Cole

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mr. Cameron

AYES: Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Bergeron, Mr. Cameron, Mrs. Cole, Mr. Divine, Mrs. Head

NAYS: None

Mr. Sieben said this will next be heard at the Planning and Development Committee on Thursday, April 27, 2017, at 4:00 p.m. on the fifth floor of this building.

Aye: 6 At Large Bergeron, At Large Cameron, At Large Cole, At Large Anderson,
Fox Metro Representative Divine and SD 129 Representative Head