



City of Aurora

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

Legistar History Report

File Number: 17-00873

File ID: 17-00873

Type: Petition

Status: Draft

Version: 2

General Ledger #:

In Control: Planning & Development Committee

File Created: 09/14/2017

File Name: District 204 Site / M/I Homes / Commons Drive south of 75th Street / Preliminary Plan/Plat

Final Action:

Title: A Resolution Approving a Preliminary Plan and Plat for Lot 1-43 of District 204 Subdivision Being Vacant Land located on the east side of Commons Drive south of 75th Street (M/I Homes of Chicago, LLC - 17-00873 / NA28/4-17.049-PA/A/SUPD/Ppn/Psd/AGR/RD - JM - Ward 8).

Notes:

Agenda Date: 01/25/2018

Agenda Number:

Sponsors:

Enactment Date:

Attachments: Exhibit "A-1" Preliminary Plan - 2018-01-12 - 2017.049.pdf, Exhibit "A-2" Preliminary Plat - 2018-01-12 - 2017.049.pdf, Fire Access Plan - 2018-01-12 - 2017.049.pdf, Address Plat - 2018-01-12 - 2017.049.pdf, Land Use Petition and Supporting Documents - 2017-09-14 - 2017.049.pdf, Property Research Sheet - ID #69252 - 2017-03-22.pdf, Plat of Survey - 2017-09-14 - 2017.049.PDF, Legistar History Report - Preliminary Plan and Plat - 2018-01-10 - 2017.049.pdf

Enactment Number:

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

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.

2	Planning Commission	01/17/2018	Forwarded	Planning & Development Committee	01/25/2018	Pass
---	---------------------	------------	-----------	--	------------	------

Action Text: A motion was made by Mrs. Cole, seconded by Mrs. Anderson, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Planning & Development Committee, on the agenda for 1/25/2018. The motion carried.

Notes: See attachment or Items 17-00870, 17-00872 and 17-00873.

Aye: 10 At Large Bergeron, At Large Cameron, At Large Cole, At Large Pilmer, Aurora Twnshp Representative Reynolds, At Large Anderson, SD 204 Representative Duncan, Fox Valley Park District Representative Chambers, At Large Owusu-Safo and SD 129 Representative Head

Attachment for Items 17-00870, 17-00872 and 17-00873:

- 17-00870 An Ordinance providing for the execution of an Annexation Agreement with the owners of record providing for R-4A(S) Two Family Dwelling District with a Special Use, OS-1(S) Conservation, Open Space and Drainage District with a Special Use and P(S) Park and Recreation District with a Special Use zoning for the territory which may be annexed to the City of Aurora located on the east side of Commons Drive, south of 75th Street being vacant land in DuPage County, Aurora, Illinois 60504 (M/I Homes of Chicago, LLC – 17-00870 / NA28/4-17.049-PA/A/SUPD/Ppn/Psd/AGR/RD – JM – Ward 8) (PUBLIC HEARING)
- 17-00872 An Ordinance establishing a Special Use Planned Development approving the District 204 Plan Description and amending Ordinance Number 3100, being the Aurora Zoning Ordinance and the Zoning Map attached thereto, to an underlying zoning of R-4A(S) Two Family Dwelling District with a Special Use, OS-1(S) Conservation Open Space and Drainage District with a Special Use and P(S) Park and Recreation District with a Special Use for the property located on the east side of Commons Drive, south of 75th Street (M/I Homes of Chicago, LLC – 17-00872 / NA28/4-17.049-PA/A/SUPD/Ppn/Psd/AGR/Rd – JM – Ward 8) (PUBLIC HEARING)
- 17-00873 A Resolution approving a Preliminary Plan and Plat for Lots 1-43 of District 204 Subdivision being vacant land located on the east side of Commons Drive, South of 75th Street (M/I Homes of Chicago, LLC – 17-00873 / NA28/4-17.049-PA/A/SUPD/Ppn/Psd/AGR/RD – JM – Ward 8)

Mrs. Morgan said the Petitioner, M/I Homes, is requesting approval of a townhome development. It is located on the east side of Commons Drive, south of 75th Street. The Annexation Agreement, Annexation, Special Use Planned Development, Preliminary Plat and Plan and Roadway Construction Financing Agreement are being reviewed concurrently with separate actions. Before the Commission today is just the Annexation Agreement, Special Use Planned Development and Preliminary Plan and Plat as the Annexation and Roadway Construction Financing Agreement does not come before Planning Commission. Those 2 will go before the Planning and Development Committee and proceed through the process. The Petitioner is requesting approval of an Annexation Agreement and Annexation for 25 acres. The Annexation Agreement includes provisions for establishing the Special Use Planned Development with 3 different zonings. The R-4A(S) Two Family Dwelling District is for the portion for the townhome development. The OS-1(S) Conservation, Open Space and Drainage is for the portion for the stormwater detention. The P(S) Park and Recreation District is for the portion that is for a potential future park. Also in the Annexation Agreement there is going to be dedication of an 80 foot right-of-way with roadway improvements for Commons Drive and dedication of a 66 foot right-of-way along with roadway improvements for the internal roads in the development itself. There is also a provision for a Roadway Agreement for the extension of Commons Drive from its current terminus near the southern end of M/I Homes property to the terminus near Stonehaven Circle near the Stonehaven Subdivision. The details of the Special Use Planned Development include the 3 different zonings along with bulk modification standards to address the requirement for townhomes. Those are the typical standards that the city has used for townhome developments. The Petitioner is also requesting approval of a

Preliminary Plan and Plat. It includes 34 buildings with 171 units. The Preliminary Plan, as you can see on the screen, features a central T-shaped plaza that provides sidewalk and green space for the residents. To the east of the plaza is an area dedicated for a future park, which is positioned to allow the site to eventually be combined with additional acreage when the property to the east develops. The stormwater detention is situated in the southeast corner providing a view of the detention area from the park. The development has 2 entrances off of Commons Drive. The most northern entrance is offset from Thatcher, about 300 feet from the current Thatcher Drive and features a divided entrance that opens onto views of the plaza and the park. The southern entrance road is the planned east/west road that will connect Commons Drive to future development to the east. This road also connects to a north/south road that runs along the park that provides a connection to future development to the north. The 12 buildings around the plaza and the 4 around the park have a rear loaded 2 car garage with 6 units per building. The remaining 18 along the edge of the development have front loaded garages and they are mostly 4 units and there is also one 3 and a 5. The buildings will be a mixture of 2 and 3 stories with a combination of 2 and 3 bedrooms ranging from approximately 1,400 square feet to 2,100 square feet. Lastly, the Petitioner is requesting approval of a Roadway Financing Agreement, which is not before the Commission, but that will be part of the overall project.

The Petitioners were sworn in.

Good evening. My name is Matt Pagoria. I'm with M/I Homes. With me this evening is Mike May. He is our Project Engineer with Cemcon Engineering, as well as his assistant. Jill did a great job of describing the project. At this point, I don't really have anything to add, but if you have questions, I'll do my best to answer them.

Mrs. Cole said the detention area, that's going to be maintained by the Homeowners Association?

Mr. Pagoria said that is correct.

Chairman Truax said the Park District, what's the status of those discussions?

Mr. Pagoria said we've had numerous discussions with the Park District and this is their idea and was what kind of directed us into this site plan. It is not finalized, but we believe that it is pretty close.

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

My name is Mohammad Moizuddin, 4075 Heinz Drive. I've been living in the City of Aurora for 18 years and in Thatcher Grove 18 years. I moved from Chicago. First time in this building. Today our President was not able to come and hear, as well as our attorney, but they gave me this letter to provide to you which says why we are opposing this one. We have 132 petition, which basically put our comments in here saying no to this proposal. I have, I believe, 5 or 6 of them, which is right behind the Commons Drive, they are also proposing against this proposal. I can read the comments from one of the Thatchers Grove Association, which are very good comments. It is written by Afreen Ziauddin. "I would like to give my input regarding the potential construction in the mentioned property. This concerns me because I find that there are more negatives to this project than positives. This impacts our neighborhood because it is damaging to our home property values. We hope to better our community. Doing this

does not achieve this. We hope that we can demonstrate this concern at the upcoming public hearing. We hope that the administration will listen and consider our opinion in this matter, as this will affect us the most. Sincerely, Afreen Ziauddin – Resident since 2000.” The rest of the comments are in our files, so if you get a chance, please read those through. Also if you need an access on-line petitions we can provide you access as well. That’s all I have. Thank you.

Chairman Truax said I’m wondering how we’re going to get those comments in the record, since we haven’t had a chance to look at them.

Mrs. Morgan said I can read the letter into the record. “Dear Planning and Zoning Division: We are objecting to the proposed Land Use/Zoning change requested by M/I Homes near Commons Drive and 75th Street in Aurora, Illinois. The proposed building project by M/I Homes is directly adjacent to the eastern border of our subdivision, known as Thatchers Grove Homeowners Association, which has more than 140 single family homes. The subject vacant farmland was originally zoned by the County for single family, low density (one house per acre) homes when the Association was built, and it was with this understanding that we purchased our homes. We stand firmly against this proposal which would have an overall detrimental effect on our subdivision. Furthermore, the area in which we live and pay taxes has already experienced massive growth in population. The additional homes, cars and people coming into the Aurora area is a burden to the existing infrastructure and has lessened the quality of life we sought when we moved to this area and invested in our homes. We simply cannot afford any more high volume residential development in this area. Furthermore, this development, which would provide for townhome style units over this 25 acre area, would likely have an adverse effect on existing roads, traffic congestion and home values. The adverse impact this development will have on these issues should be seriously considered by the Division. We request that the city reject M/I’s proposal to zone this area for multi-family use and otherwise annex this property to be included in Aurora. We look forward to the City of Aurora taking our objections and concerns into account when voting on this matter. Sincerely, Thatchers Grove Homeowners Association.”

Chairman Truax said thank you for reading that. Will the next person like to come forward?

Good evening. My name is Syed Ziauddin. I’m a resident of 4075 Heinz Drive, Aurora, Illinois. I’m on the west side of Commons Drive and the proposed entrance to the new M/I Homes. Our family really objects to this improvement because when we moved to this place, we were told that it is a single family zoning, so we moved to this area. My whole family is opposing the development, other than the single family homes. Thank you.

Good evening. My name is Sajjad Bhatti. My address is 870 Pat Court. It is just west from Commons Drive. My family is opposing this too because when we moved in they said it is going to be a single family house community and this thing is going to create more traffic and more people coming to our area and that’s the reason my family is opposed to that. Thank you.

Hi. My name is Antonio Cerda. I live at 3975 Heinz Drive in Thatchers Grove, also located west of Commons Drive near the Thatcher intersection. I too oppose this improvement. Additional townhomes will increase the number of traffic we already have near our road. I think certainly at the intersection of 75th Street and Commons Drive if anything were to happen, some sort of improvement, there be some

sort of signal at that point. But overall, the increase in the number of townhomes is also a burden. It would also decrease our property values. We have Blackstone Subdivision to the north of us. There are a number of townhomes there already and we are going to create more townhomes with this improvement, which I don't think we really need that. It will lower our property values. I think single family homes would be better. Thank you.

Good evening. My name is Samar Danthurthy. I'm a resident at 890 Pat Court, Aurora, Illinois. I've pretty much been there for close to 18 years. It's been pretty much the same thing that when we moved in it was personally conveyed that it is going to be single family homes. As a lot of other persons have mentioned, there are more and more townhomes in that particular area. Traffic has been a disaster. Since there has been a significant change in the last 18 years, that's one of the reasons why we oppose this. Thank you.

Mr. Sieben said could I respond? If I can just pull up the Property Research Sheet, it shows our Comprehensive Plan. So this is just an area map. In blue is the property in question. You'll see it is a little bit south of 75th, and west of 59 on the east side of Commons. It is just directly to the east of Thatchers Grove. This is the current zoning map, so it is outside the city. That's the white area. The yellow is single family. The orange is really basically townhome zoning. To the south of this property it is zoned for townhomes. That's part of the Calvary Church property. Although they never developed that, when they annexed to the city about 10 or 12 years ago, that area was zoned for future, if they were to go that route, for townhomes. Then this is the particular one in question. This is our Comprehensive Plan. I don't believe this area has changed in 30 years. We constantly tweak the Comprehensive Plan, but I believe going back to the 1980's, the property in question is in the orange area and what that orange area means is medium density residential. Essentially, the yellow is low density residential, which typically equates to the property developing for a single family subdivision. Then the orange typically will develop for townhomes. You see just north of Thatchers Grove, the Blackstone Subdivision, that is townhomes and the 25 acres in question, outlined in the blue, that has been planned for townhomes. The rest of the property wrapping to the north and east of this property is what we call the Brock-Brodie property. I believe it is close to 120 acres. It has not developed yet, but in general we are envisioning potentially medium density residential on the west end of that and commercial on the east side of that closer to Route 59. I guess that's just in response to how the city has been always looking at this property. This may have been zoned single family in DuPage County, but typically when these properties do develop they would annex to the city, so that's what's happening here.

Mr. Cameron said what is the limit on medium density?

Mr. Sieben said technically on the Comprehensive Plan I believe it is 10. I believe it is like 5 to 10, so under 5 is low density, which is single family. The lot sizes can vary on that. I believe the density on this is 6 something.

Mrs. Morgan said 6.8.

Mr. Sieben said 6.8 gross units per acre.

Mr. Cameron said is the Thatcher Subdivision in accordance with the...

Mr. Sieben said the low density.

Mr. Cameron said 1 acre?

Mr. Sieben said I don't know if they are quite 10,000 square foot lots. They may be just under 10,000. I believe they are between 8,000 and 10,000 square foot lots.

Mr. Cameron said they're not the 1 acre?

Mr. Sieben said they are not 1 acre, but they are not intended to be. Low density would be less than 5 dwelling units per acre.

Chairman Truax said so the history of the property is basically ownership by District 204?

Mr. Sieben said it has been owned by 204 for several years. I believe originally it was Brock-Brodie. Is that correct Mrs. Duncan?

Mrs. Duncan said Brock-Brodie was there, but the 25 acres was purchased, I would say, a good 15 years ago for the purpose of holding a school site as the development around it occurred. What they determined was that site was not really big enough for a middle school or a high school. They did not need an elementary school and at that point all of the negotiation with Brock-Brodie to get the bigger property for a high school was underway. When that didn't go through and Matea Valley then was built off of Eola Road, the 25 acres at that point in time wasn't fit for a middle school and certainly not for an elementary school that was not needed at that point in time and the School District knew that that was not property they needed. It has been sitting there vacant, owned by the School District, I'd say, for almost 15 years.

I'm Rick Mervine. I'm the Alderman of the 8th Ward. This is the 8th Ward and I've been following the progression on this and certainly going back over 30 years, but I agree with Mrs. Duncan that this property with her history of it when it then became available and the School District decided that they were ready to dispose of it, there were a couple of suitors and M/I Homes came out with the understanding that this was going to be a multi-property at the time. Also as part of this, many of the surrounding communities have been built and Commons was built as a stub at the end of Stonehaven Subdivision on the north side of it with the classic two red diamonds and a big pile of clay in the middle of the road with the understanding that like many other subdivisions and the growth on the far east side of Aurora when the time came and the development came, it is time to open up and provide for the infrastructure that was necessary at that point to be able to accommodate that. For a little over a year we've been looking at this project and one of the issues that came out of a lot of discussion with homeowners was the need for a park. There wasn't a very close park in the area there and M/I Homes has agreed to do that. My latest discussion on Monday with the Fox Valley Park District was that while this is only part of what they expect to be a larger park in the future, depending on what other future development takes place to the east, this will be enough that they can get a park built in here as part of this whole process. The other part of this as well is that need to have Commons connect and go through

from 75th all the way down through the Stonehaven Subdivision and connect down into Montgomery Road. It will not connect north of 75th at this point. The intention is that there is a developer that is going to be paying for most, although all of that. The Calvary Church has funds that they are responsible for as part of their development that will go into that as well. That's one of the ways to help alleviate any congestion that may be added by the 170 plus units here. The other is that as a community we've just finished a little over 5 years of construction. That's about a quarter of a billion dollars of construction here in the east side. Because of all the other growth we've had over the last 25 years, we needed infrastructure changes. We had to widen Eola. We did an overpass over the now Canadian National railroad tracks. We had to widen Route 59. We had to rebuild New York Street and on and on. There are a number of those different projects. This is another project to connect Commons and to help move traffic safely through the area. I've known from the beginning that this project was set up for multi-family and as a city and as an Alderman, we have experience with this particular developer and builder and at this point we'd like to see this move forward.

The public input portion of the public hearing was closed.

Mrs. Morgan said we also have a representative from Engineering and our Traffic Engineer so if there are any questions about the road or the traffic congestion, they are here.

Chairman Truax said good because that was my first question was about how the traffic is getting in and out of here and how the congestion issues will be resolved.

I'm Bob Greene, the city Traffic Engineer. With the question in and out, do you just mean in and out of the development or out to an arterial?

Chairman Truax said all of the above.

Mr. Greene said I would imagine that with Commons being a collector, typically traffic control would be set up, stop sign control, to go out onto Commons. Once you get up to an arterial like 75th it could be at first stop sign controlled, but then eventually a signal. Eventually going over to 75th Street and Commons, as traffic would warrant traffic control to go higher up on the food chain so to speak, you look at signal warrants and that would be a logical progression.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said has there been any studies so far of the existing traffic volumes there?

Mr. Greene said I don't think, because of the lack of connection, I don't think there is much going on in the way of that. I would say that pieces of Commons are serving as collector to capture the residential traffic and distribute it to 75th Street or down to Montgomery.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said I guess I was just hearing what the residents were saying that they think there is significant traffic already. I'm assuming during specific peak times and if there has been any review of any additional need to evaluate at least 75th Street during like in the morning rush or evening rush hours to determine if there is a need or warrant for either full stop controlled or traffic.

Mr. Greene said as it stands right now with the existing conditions, I'm not aware of a study at 75th and Commons or Montgomery and White Eagle Commons at this point, but as connection presents itself, certainly that is a possibility.

Mrs. Cole said currently the subdivision that the residents were from would be the only traffic on Commons. It looks like that's the only subdivision that accesses Commons because Commons dead-ends just a short way south of there, doesn't it?

Mr. Greene said right.

Alderman Mervine said it would be Blackstone just to the north of it there as well.

Mrs. Cole said okay.

An audience member said I have a question.

Chairman Truax said I'm sorry the public hearing is closed.

The audience member said because the statement which you guys are making, there is heavy traffic coming out of the church, which right now Commons is used as a private driveway for church, which Saturday and Sunday it is very heavy traffic, more than 100 cars, so adding this subdivision it is going to be congested more than what we are thinking, which the city is ignoring that part. The traffic of Saturday and Sunday, if you review those things, I live behind that. It is more than 100 cars pass through Saturday and Sunday and if you are adding this property there...

Chairman Truax said thank you for your comments.

Mrs. Duncan said typically the church or the city is providing police officers for traffic direction. If they are not at Commons, then I think that is an issue that certainly a conversation can be held with the church and make sure if there is not an officer there that there will be during those peak times because I certainly know, I live very close to that area, that there are always officers there to help with that traffic on Wednesdays as well. They have services on Wednesdays as well.

The audience member said but they are basically on 59, not on Commons.

Mrs. Duncan said my point being the church is, I think, keenly aware and really does attempt to be a great neighbor that if you have those concerns, I would call the church office and see what they can do because they are clearly hiring traffic officers for 59 and if there is an issue on Commons they may not be aware of it and I think they would be happy to work with the neighborhood. They really are, Calvary is a very good neighbor, and I think they would want to be able to work with you, so that would be my recommendation to you.

Mrs. Cole said my other question is there are 2 areas of ingress and egress out of this new townhome development. Are those going to be full access entrances and exits?

Mrs. Morgan said yes.

Mr. Greene said yes, I believe so.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said are there any plans to really connect Commons all the way with this development?

Mr. Greene said that's what we had talked about with the connection...

Mrs. Morgan said to the south.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said the south connection as well.

Mr. Greene said I guess it is Thatcher down to Stonehaven Circle.

Mr. Cameron said what is the current status of Commons? As I look at the map, it shows it as still being in grass immediately to the west of the church. Is that correct?

Mrs. Morgan said correct.

Mr. Cameron said and it doesn't look like there is anything until you get up to Heinz Drive, which looks to me at that point that it is a 2 lane right-of-way through at that point and then widens only as it gets closer to 75th. Is that correct?

Mr. Sieben said no.

Mrs. Morgan said so adjacent to this current property, M/I Homes is half of a road that Calvary did. Instead of building their half along their frontage, Calvary built the extension from Thatcher Drive to the top of their property, half of a road on the west side, in order to have their connection to that little drive area. Then past that, it does widen to the actual 2 lanes. So M/I Homes will be completing the half of the road that abuts their property for their portion of the requirement for the roadway.

Mr. Cameron said the black line that runs along the south side of this property, where does the church discharge?

Mrs. Morgan said right at the top of their property and the bottom of M/I Homes property, so basically the blue line right below that is where they have a little drive area from their church onto Commons Drive.

Mr. Cameron said and that's basically a 1 lane, they use it as an exit after services, would it feed that way?

Mrs. Morgan said correct.

Mrs. Vacek said I'm going to try to get a better aerial for you.

Mr. Sieben said unfortunately, that was our GIS right before they built that, so let us pull up the Google Earth. It will show the church drive, but Commons is half built to the south edge of this property, to the south edge of that blue line that you saw.

Mr. Cameron said will that road be improved along the south side of M/I property...

Mr. Sieben said the road will be fully improved along the west edge of this property from a half to a full and down to where it dead-ends now to the south.

Chairman Truax said so where would you anticipate the people living in the new, presuming we have a new townhouse development there, where do they go to go to work?

Mr. Sieben said well they would go north or south, depending on where they work.

Chairman Truax said on Commons?

Mr. Sieben said on Commons, yes. They have to exit on Commons.

Chairman Truax said so they either go up to 75th Street or down to...

Mr. Sieben said or south to Montgomery Road. So they have 1 or 2 choices.

Chairman Truax said is it too early to determine what kind of intersection is going to be at Commons and 75th Street?

Mr. Sieben said I'll turn it over to Mr. Greene.

Mr. Greene said right now I think the existing approach is a left through and a right lane as you get to the intersection of 75th.

Chairman Truax said is it a stop light at the intersection?

Mr. Greene said no. It is currently un-signalized.

Chairman Truax said what would you anticipate the process or the timing for getting something there if 100 and some townhouses for the people that need to get out?

Mr. Greene said the first thing I would have to do is perform a traffic study and a traffic count and look at warrants, crash history at the intersection. We follow the manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, so I would have to meet the warrants for a signal based on the traffic volumes coming out there.

Chairman Truax said okay, which I think goes back to Yvonne's question of...

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said my question went back to that and that is there going to be a study done and warrant analysis performed to determine if a signal or stop control, especially on Sundays, for instance, there is a significant volume of traffic already plus the number of townhomes and the trips generated from those townhomes, how is that going to impact those 2 intersections? I wasn't aware that it was going to be connected. Connection improves that, but I'm not exactly sure it completely resolves the additional volume of traffic that's going to be added.

Mr. Greene said and I'm sure when that connection is made there will probably be a request to review that intersection for a traffic count and signal.

Mr. Pilmer said it is probably not much different than the intersection at Meadowridge already.

Mr. Greene said right.

Mr. Pilmer said I mean Meadowridge already goes into 75th and it is probably a light type intersection. That handles everything that comes out of those existing subdivisions today, so this would be an additional feeder.

Mr. Greene said correct.

Mr. Sieben said Mr. Cameron, is you can see on the new, I think this is from spring, if I zoom in you can see Commons goes to the south end of this property. You see the slightly different shade of the dirt there. That's this property and then you see the drive coming over to Calvary Church. So the public road does end at the southwest corner of this 25 acre parcel. That's a half width road, so that will be fully improved and then it will be connected fully down to where it terminates at the north end of the Stonehaven Subdivision.

Mr. Cameron said is there access through Calvary to this other site?

Mr. Sieben said no. That is just strictly really an exit, I think, during services.

Mr. Cameron said where do we sit on the requirement for 2 points of entry or exit into the subdivision for firefighting?

Mr. Sieben said this does meet that with the 2 remote access points on Commons.

Mr. Cameron said you don't have an access on the horizontal street along the south side of the property. You only have the exit on Commons.

Mr. Sieben said you have 2 on Commons.

Mrs. Morgan said there are 2 on Commons.

Mr. Cameron said does the 2 on Commons meet that requirement?

Mrs. Morgan said yes.

Mr. Sieben said yes it does. It meets fire requirements.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said what is kind of the approximate price range for the townhomes that are being proposed?

Mr. Pagoria said this project will have 2 different styles of townhomes. We are going to have a traditional, what we would call the traditional front load 2 story product and then it will also have a rear load more 3 story product. We have several subdivisions up and down Route 59. We had built some townhomes in Lehigh Station just to north of here. That's a rear load product. We will have a version of that here and then we also built some front load townhomes in Savannah Crossing, which is just behind the Wal-Mart off of Kirk Road. We'll have a front load product like that. Based on kind of where we are selling other projects along Route 59, you are probably going to see pricing in the \$200,000's to \$300,000's.

Mrs. Morgan said we'll take recommendations for the Annexation Agreement. Staff would recommend approval of the Ordinance providing for the execution of an Annexation Agreement with the owners of record providing for R-4A(S) Two Family Dwelling District with a Special Use, OS-1(S) Conservation, Open Space and Drainage District with a Special Use, and P(S) Park and Recreation District with a Special Use zoning for the territory which may be annexed to the City of Aurora located on the east side of Commons Drive, south of 75th Street being vacant land in DuPage County, Aurora, Illinois 60504.

MOTION OF APPROVAL WAS MADE BY: Mr. Chambers

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mrs. Owusu-Safo

AYES: Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Bergeron, Mr. Cameron, Mr. Chambers, Mrs. Cole, Mrs. Duncan, 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. Reynolds said the proposal does represent the logical establishment and it also represents the best use of the property at this time.

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. Pilmer said I would say it is consistent with the desirable trend of development in the area. It is consistent also as outlined on the Comprehensive Plan.

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?

Mr. Chambers said the traffic will be consistent to the property to the west, so it shouldn't have any adverse effect on the traffic pattern.

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?

Mr. Cameron said it will be a part of the project.

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. Anderson said there will be adequate measures to insure that ingress and egress will maximize pedestrian and vehicular easement.

Mrs. Morgan said this will next be heard at the Planning and Development Committee on Thursday, January 25, 2018, at 4:00 p.m. on the fifth floor of this building.

Chairman Truax said so we will go onto the Special Use Planned Development.

Mrs. Morgan said staff would recommend approval of an Ordinance establishing a Special Use Planned Development, approving the District 204 Plan Description and amending Ordinance Number 3100, being the Aurora Zoning Ordinance and the Zoning Map attached thereto, to an underlying zoning of R-4A(S) Two Family Dwelling District with a Special Use, OS-1(S) Conservation, Open Space and Drainage District with a Special Use, and P(S) Park and Recreation District with a Special Use for the property located on the east side of Commons Drive, south of 75th Street.

MOTION OF APPROVAL WAS MADE BY: Mrs. Duncan

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mr. Chambers

AYES: Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Bergeron, Mr. Cameron, Mr. Chambers, Mrs. Cole, Mrs. Duncan,
Mrs. Owusu-Safo, Mr. Pilmer, Mr. Reynolds

NAYS: Mrs. Head

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. Reynolds said the proposal represents the logical establishment and also can be considered the highest and best use of the property.

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 is consistent with the desirable trend of development in the general area.

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?

Mr. Cameron said feeder streets will be improved as a result of this project.

Chairman Truax said I would add that the neighbors have expressed some issues with congestion and so we hope as this goes forward those kinds of issues can have some attention paid to them.

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 adequate public services and facilities are part of the overall Planned Development.

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. Duncan said adequate planning is part of the overall plan.

9a. Will the Special Use not preclude the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding properties due to the saturation or concentration of similar uses in the general area?

Mr. Pilmer said the surrounding area currently exists of single family homes and developed townhome units and I believe this will continue that residential trend.

9b. Is the Special Use in all other respects in conformance 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 Plan Commission?

Mr. Cameron said it is.

Mrs. Morgan said this will next be heard at the Planning and Development Committee on Thursday, January 25, 2018, at 4:00 p.m. on the fifth floor of this building.

Chairman Truax said we have a final Resolution approving a Preliminary Plan and Plat.

Mrs. Morgan said staff would recommend conditional approval for the Resolution approving a Preliminary Plan and Plat for Lots 1-43 of District 204 Subdivision being vacant land located on the east side of Commons Drive, south of 75th Street with the following condition:

1. That a city easement be added to the Preliminary Plat along the eastern edge of the detention for a future bike path.

Mrs. Morgan said we've discussed this with the Petitioner. It was kind of a last minute addition. We talked about having a bike path and at the time we also talked to Calvary Church and at this time we don't feel that there is one needed, but if that southern property does ever develop maybe there might be a future bike path, so we are just asking for an easement now in case that we do want to develop a bike path.

MOTION OF APPROVAL WAS MADE BY: Mrs. Cole

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mrs. Anderson

AYES: Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Bergeron, Mr. Cameron, Mr. Chambers, Mrs. Cole, Mrs. Duncan, Mrs. Head, Mrs. Owusu-Safo, Mr. Pilmer, Mr. Reynolds

NAYS: None

Mrs. Morgan said this will next be heard at the Planning and Development Committee on Thursday, January 25, 2018, at 4:00 p.m. on the fifth floor of this building.