



City of Aurora

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

Legistar History Report

File Number: 19-0240

File ID: 19-0240

Type: Resolution

Status: Forwarded to Committee of the Whole

Version: 2

General Ledger #:

In Control: Planning & Development Committee

File Created: 03/21/2019

File Name: Aurora University / 1330 Marseillaise Place / Addition to Parolini Music Center / Final Plan with a Public Hearing

Final Action:

Title: A Resolution Approving a Final Plan and granting a setback variance on Lot 1 of Aurora University 2nd Resubdivision located at 1330 Marseillaise Place for a 1,090 sq. ft. addition to the Parolini Music Center (Aurora University - 19-0240 / AU20/4-19.047-Fpn - TV - Ward 4) (PUBLIC HEARING)

Notes:

Agenda Date: 04/25/2019

Agenda Number:

Sponsors:

Enactment Date:

Attachments: Exhibit "A-1" Final Plan - 2019-04-11 - 2019.047.pdf, Exhibit "A-2" Landscape Plan - 2019-04-09 - 2019.047.pdf, Exhibit "A-3" Building and Signage Elevation - 2019-04-11.pdf, Fire Access Plan - 2019-04-09 - 2019.047.pdf, Aerial.pdf, Land Use Petition and Supporting Documents - 2019-03-21 - 2019.047.pdf, Existing Conditions Plan - 2019-03-21 - 2019.047.pdf, Legistar History Report - 2019-04-10 - 2019.047.pdf, Findings of Facts - 2019-04-10 - 2019.047.pdf

Enactment Number:

Planning Case #: AU20/4-19.047-Fpn

Hearing Date:

Drafter: tvacek@aurora-il.org

Effective Date:

History of Legislative File

Ver- sion:	Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:
1	City Council	03/26/2019	referred to	Planning Council			
	Action Text: This Petition was referred to to the Planning Council						
1	Planning Council	04/02/2019					
	Notes: Representative Present: Bruce Goldsmith						

Mr. Goldsmith said this building has significant physical deterioration and so we are basically rebuilding the building from the inside. The wall structure is staying in place, but the whole inside of the building is being basically gutted. As part of that, the University wanted to add a 1,090 square foot performance area. This is a Music School building. That little "x" to the east is part of the addition.

Mrs. Vacek said are you going to keep the parking lot then?

Mr. Goldsmith said we are talking about that. There are a couple of options.

Mrs. Vacek said so this is a Final Plan with a public hearing. Because the small addition was not shown on the Master Plan and it is within 100 feet of the right-of-way of Marseillaise it does require a public hearing through the Special Use Planned Development. It will be going to public hearing on April 17th and then continuing on from there.

Mr. Sieben said based on our discussion last week, do you want to discuss the issue with the screening panel and then the blue, what was shown as corrugated metal on the plan, but that's really not what you are going to be doing.

Mr. Goldsmith said the blue area is going to be a flat facing material like the facing material that was used on the STEM school building. The rooftop screening is a different material, which is lighter weight so that we don't have to have structural issues with putting it up on the rooftop for screening. We are working on what the actual material will look like, but it will be a complimentary material to the metal facing that's being done in blue.

Mr. Sieben said so to be clear, this will change? It won't be corrugated metal?

Mr. Goldsmith said actually most of these materials are corrugated in a sense, but it is not going to look like it is louvered or something like that.

Mr. Sieben said well this is showing vertical lines.

Mr. Goldsmith said well you may see vertical lines, but it will be...

Mr. Sieben said but it won't be a corrugated metal look, correct?

Mr. Goldsmith said no. It is not going to look like a Quonset hut or something.

Mr. Sieben said I'm just saying what your plan shows and says.

Mr. Goldsmith said it will be a nice material, which we will show you as soon as we finalize that with the architect.

Mrs. Vacek said so are you going to give us a sample or something so I can see what it looks like?

Mr. Goldsmith said I think you are overdoing this. We are not going to put something unsightly up there. We are going to put a nice material. I will assure you that it will be complimentary and not offensive.

Mr. Sieben said okay. If you could just somehow convey that, that would be great.

Mr. Goldsmith said whether I'm going to give you a swatch or not I can't tell you.

Mr. Sieben said before we get to the parking lot, Mark do you want to touch on how we are treating any stormwater that may or may not be required for this small addition?

Mr. Phipps said so the thought here is, I guess, that with a small addition like this, 1,000 square feet,

that there won't be much other site disturbance as a result of this project and that it would fall below the threshold of 5,000 square feet of disturbance, which is what triggers a stormwater management permit. If there is impervious area added to this project, net impervious area possibly by increasing the footprint of the building a small amount, and if there isn't parking lot removed with this, then we'll keep track of any impervious area that's been added with this project and whatever the next project is that would require a stormwater permit throw that in and determine what stormwater management measures are appropriate.

Mr. Goldsmith said so as we looked at this, it is possible the University is going to take advantage of the fact that they could have had some green space. We have two issues. One is to make sure that we have adequate handicap parking for the two dormitories that are next door, Jenks Hall on the west and Wilkinson on the east. The thought was that we would possibly remove the north side of the parking lot and make it green space. So Javan for you, there is a fire hydrant back here, so the only issue is if we remove the north you'd still have access and that's adequate.

Mr. Beneke said so the drive goes all the way back in there. You are just taking the parking spaces itself.

Mr. Goldsmith said that's what we are looking at right now, just the north side.

Mr. Cross said so not coming down here and eliminating that, it would just be no spaces there. I just want to be clear.

Mr. Goldsmith said so the north side of spaces would be eliminated and we would leave, I guess that would be the question, how much do we have to leave to get you access to this hydrant if you need to get to it?

Mr. Beneke said you need to have the full fire lane, 20 feet of it.

Mr. Cross said so where the spaces end from the north and from the south, that space has to be maintained.

Mr. Goldsmith said and Mark for you I just have to see how much square footage we would be...

Mr. Phipps said I just did a quick calculation. It looks like if you took out 8 parking spaces that are 9 by 18 that comes out to about 1,300 square feet.

Mr. Goldsmith said actually that's what we had calculated. So it would be the equivalent of actually removing impervious area to compensate for the new impermeable area. We are looking at that. Now we know what Javan is telling us so we can work around that. We will either take advantage of the crediting process or we will...

Mr. Sieben said the city is giving you the option.

Mr. Goldsmith said if we can adequately serve really the handicap population then the only question is would we like to take advantage of the green space. We'll figure that out in the next week or so and let you know.

1	Planning Council	04/09/2019	Forwarded	Planning Commission	04/17/2019	Pass
---	------------------	------------	-----------	---------------------	------------	------

Action Text: A motion was made by Mrs. Vacek, seconded by Mr. Minnella, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Planning Commission, on the agenda for 4/17/2019. The motion carried by voice vote.

Notes: Mrs. Vacek said this is going on April 17th. They are supposed to be revising their plans and getting them back into us today. I hope to see that. I think that they are making some changes to the original plan, but I don't think it will be significant. I think that they should meet everything. I make a motion to move this forward. There may be some conditions on this, depending on what the resubmittal is.

Mr. Beneke said the conversation that Bruce is having with the Fire Marshall is going to require a

revision if they end up taking that whole thing out of there. I don't know they are going to be able to comply with fire access requirements for existing buildings. As it is currently, we are okay. If they make this change, we are going to have to see a revised Fire Plan showing the whole development.

Mrs. Vacek said it sounded like they were going to maybe make a change, but it might not be the entire thing.

Mr. Sieben said they need to get you a new Fire Plan.

Mr. Beneke said like I said, if the fire lane stays in place, not a problem. But it sounds like they may do it. Then we've got to look at the other surrounding buildings.

Mr. Minnella seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

2	Planning Commission	04/17/2019	Forwarded	Planning & Development Committee	04/25/2019	Pass
---	---------------------	------------	-----------	--	------------	------

Action Text: A motion was made by Ms. Tidwell, seconded by Mr. Hull, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Planning & Development Committee, on the agenda for 4/25/2019. The motion carried.

Notes: Mrs. Vacek said the Petitioner is requesting approval of a Final Plan with a setback Variance for the Parolini Music Center. The Music Center is actually located on the north part of the campus along Marseillaise Place between S. Randall Road and S. Calumet Road. The University is in the process of renovating the Music Center building. Concurrently with that renovation, the University is proposing to construct a 1,090 square foot addition to the east portion of the building for a performance area. An 8.28 setback variance is being requested along the north property line, as the existing building and the building addition does not meet the current 20 foot setback required in the Plan Description. The existing building is a setback at 11.72 feet and the addition would be a setback at 14 feet from the property line. As part of the proposal, the elevation of the Music Center building is also being updated. The building addition will match the brick that's on the existing building. The mansard roof is being removed and replaced with a flat accent panel and there is additional metal equipment screening on the roof of the building. We can pull that elevation up. That's the new elevation of the Music Center. The University is also proposing to remove the parking lot on the south side of the building with the exception of the access road going into that area, which would remain there for a fire access. They would also be relocating a hydrant so it is adjacent to the access road. The removal of the parking lot is actually offsetting the additional stormwater requirement for the addition of the building. I can turn it over to the Petitioner unless you have questions for me.

Good evening again. David Bressler from the Dykema Law Firm, 2300 Cabot, Lisle, Illinois. As staff indicated, we are looking to put an addition on the Parolini building pursuant to permits. That building has been gutted. It is an older building and it has been taken down to the studs inside, so the work on the existing building is ongoing. We are looking for an addition that's about a 34 by 35 foot footprint on the east end of the building. The setback issue, as staff indicated, will be actually set back from the current setback, so it will be about 2.75 feet further back from the setback, but still we do need a variance because it is within those 20 feet. The external appearance, the flat panels, I believe on your elevations, they are shown as blue and silver, but I believe they are all going to be blue. It was my understanding that that was all changed to blue flat panels consistent with the STEM building that is also on the property.

Mrs. Vacek said the only thing is that it will be silver for the screening, the equipment screening, on the roof.

Mr. Bressler said but it will it will have a consistent appearance with the STEM building, which you may be familiar with, which is another building on the campus. At this point, we are not requesting that the parking lot be removed. The Fire Marshall, there are some issues with the ability to reach the hose to the necessary buildings and so at this point he's out of town and that is not part of our request today. We may come back in the future with the Fire Marshall, but that's not part of the request at this point.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said I thought Tracey mentioned something about stormwater and the parking lot. How is that impacted if you are not taking it out?

Mr. Bressler said at the present time, there is a sufficient stormwater capacity elsewhere on the property to handle that. It is only a 34 by 35 foot addition and there is additional compensatory storage elsewhere on the property, so I don't believe it is an issue if the parking lot remains.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said I guess there will be something from staff to confirm for us.

Mr. Sieben said it is kind of a moving target. This has been going back and forth, remove, not remove, remove part of it, keep it, remove. Apparently now it is going to stay.

Mr. Bressler said for the time being until we can work out the access issues with the Fire Marshall. It obviously needs to be done before anything happens with the parking lot.

Mr. Sieben said I would say we would leave the condition in case you wanted to remove the parking lot if you could work it out with the Fire Marshall. We would just leave the condition. We are okay either way as long the Fire Marshall is okay.

Mrs. Head said and how many parking spaces are we going to lose?

Mr. Sieben said there's about 12 or 14.

Mr. Bressler said not a lot. I believe there 1 or 2 handicap spaces.

Mrs. Vacek said 13.

Mrs. Head said and where are you going to make those up at?

Mr. Bressler said I don't think we need to.

Mr. Sieben said well they are going to make it up in the deck, which is being built right now.

Mr. Bressler said that's what I meant, taking that into account.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said I saw that you are asking for, and this is just on a layman's view, but you are asking for a variance for the setback where the building doesn't match the back of the building. Is there a reason it couldn't just align?

Mr. Bressler said it is actually further back from the setback. We didn't want to have just a slab, so it looks better to actually step it back a little bit and then these architectural panels will actually make a visual transition. It is stepped back because it looks better than having just a slab of the building there. Like I said, that will be 14 feet back from the right-of-way as opposed to 11.5 or 11 whatever is that the existing building is.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said the only reason I ask is the minimum requirement is 20 feet, so aesthetically you prefer to get a variance so that aesthetically it looks better?

Mrs. Vacek said correct. The existing building is already in need of a variance so it makes sense to just kind of keep it in line and have it stepped back just a little bit instead of all the way back to 20 feet, which might look odd.

Mr. Cameron said is the new addition 2 stories?

Mr. Bressler said a story and a half. It is a performance center so, you know, you have a stage.

Mr. Cameron said you need the height on it. Architecturally it looks better offsetting the lines and raising it up.

Mr. Bressler said right and those architectural panels and screening kind of make a transition to the higher roof line.

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

Mrs. Vacek said staff would recommend conditional approval of the Resolution approving a Final Plan and granting a setback variance on Lot 1 of the Aurora University 2nd Resubdivision located at 1330 Marseillaise Place for a 1,090 square foot addition to the Parolini Music Center with the following conditions and this would only be if the parking lot was to be removed:

1. That prior to the removal of the parking lot that the Fire Access Plan should be approved by the Fire Marshall.

MOTION OF CONDITIONAL APPROVAL WAS MADE BY: Ms. Tidwell

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mr. Hull

AYES: Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Cameron, Mr. Divine, Mrs. Duncan, Mr. Elsbree, Mr. Gonzales, Mrs. Head, Mr. Hull, Mrs. Owusu-Safo, Mr. Reynolds, Ms. Tidwell

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. Anderson 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 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 and represents the highest and best use of the property.

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

Chairman Pilmer said it is compatible with the existing traffic pattern and should not have an adverse effect.

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 these are already in place or will be part of the proposal.

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

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said there should be no adverse impact.

8a. Is the variance based on the particular physical surroundings, shape or topographical conditions of the specific property involved so that a particular hardship to the owner would result, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if a strict letter of regulations were carried out?

Chairman Pilmer said I would say a particular hardship would evolve based on the existing setbacks of the property. This is greater setback than the existing.

8b. Is the variance based on unique conditions to the property for which the variance is sought and are not applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification?

Chairman Pilmer said I would say it is definitely unique to the property for which the variance is sought.

Mrs. Vacek said this will next be heard at the Planning and Development Committee on Thursday, April 25, 2019, at 4:00 p.m. on the fifth floor of this building.

Aye: 12 At Large Cameron, At Large Pilmer, Aurora Twnshp Representative Reynolds, At Large Anderson, Fox Metro Representative Divine, SD 204 Representative Duncan, At Large Owusu-Safo, SD 129 Representative Head, SD 131 Representative Hull, At Large Tidwell, At Large Gonzales and At Large Elsbree

3 Planning & Development Committee 04/25/2019 recommended for approval Pass

Action Text: A motion was made by Alderman Jenkins, seconded by Alderman Franco, that this agenda item be recommended for approval. The motion carried.

Aye: 3 Chairperson Saville, Alderman Jenkins and Alderman Franco
