



City of Aurora

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

Legistar History Report

File Number: 19-0263

File ID: 19-0263	Type: Petition	Status: Draft
Version: 2	General Ledger #:	In Control: Planning & Development Committee
File Name: Pulte Homes / SWC of Meadowridge Drive and 75th Street / Preliminary Plat & Plan Revision		File Created: 03/29/2019
		Final Action:

Title: A Resolution Approving a Revision to the Preliminary Plan and Plat for Property located at the southwest corner of Meadowridge Drive and 75th Street (Pulte Home Company, LLC - 19-0263 / NA28/3-17.234-SUPD/R/Ppn/Psd/R - JM - Ward 8)

Notes:

Agenda Date: 05/30/2019

Agenda Number:

Sponsors:

Enactment Date:

Attachments: Exhibit "A-1" Preliminary Plan - 2019-05-03 - 2017.234.pdf, Exhibit "A-2" Preliminary Plat - 2019-05-03 - 2017.234.pdf, Property Research Sheet #67244 - 2019-03-26 - 2017.234.pdf, Land Use Petition and Supporting Documents - 2019-03-28 - 2017.234.pdf, Plat of Survey - 2019-03-28 - 2017.234.pdf, Fire Access Plan - 2019-05-03 - 2017.234.pdf, Legistar History Report (Preliminary Plan and Plat) - 2019-05-15 - 2017.234.pdf

Enactment Number:

Planning Case #: NA28/3-17.234-PD/R/Ppn/Psd/R

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	04/02/2019	Forward to Planning Council	Planning Council			
	Action Text:	This Petition was Forward to Planning Council.					
1	Planning Council	04/09/2019					
	Notes:	<i>Representatives Present: Dwayne Gillian, Russ Whitaker and Rob Getz</i>					
		<i>Mr. Whitaker said like Ed mentioned, the original plan approval was from 1998 for Ocean Atlantic. The property here that we are looking at consists of roughly 11 acres. As we are looking at it here,</i>					

north is the top of the screen, so you can see 75th Street at the top of the screen and then Meadowridge Drive off of the right. It's zoned B-2 since it annexed in 1998. It is sort of set between an office park that is located east and a separate office park that is located to the west. It has not been developed in the 20 years it's been annexed and zoned. There is really no interconnection between either of those adjacent developments and so the property kind of sits on an island. In the Route 59 Corridor Plan that was recently approved by the city, this property is designated medium density residential, so the townhome plan is and the change to the zoning is consistent with the update Master Plan comments. We are proposing townhomes. It is two story homes with options that are not depicted here in the floor plan, but options for sunrooms and options for habitable attics. So the base floor plan is roughly 1,800 square feet. That could be increased to 2,500 square feet if all of the options were selected. As Ed mentioned, we are proposing R-4A zoning. There are 18 buildings consisting of 4 unit, 5 unit and 6 unit buildings. Architecture is sort of Traditional American, brick wainscot, traditional lap siding, board and batten detail to add some architectural interest. We have a couple of code related issues that we are looking to address. We are proposing a 60 foot right-of-way throughout the development here. It is an efficient design with it being a double loaded road throughout. All of the pavement sections and widths are per code, it is just the reduction in the overall right-of-way from 66 to 60.

Mr. Sieben said what's your back to back on the pavement?

Mrs. Morgan said 31.

Mr. Whitaker said so 31 foot back to back roadway surface, but 60 foot right-of-way. In addition to that, given the sort of unique configuration of the site, there is an issue with the turning radius at each of the four corners. So we've got a horizontal curvature of 40 feet instead of the typical code requirement. We think the reduced right-of-way and the horizontal curvature are appropriate in this situation because there is really no interconnectivity to any other property. It will really be just residents and guests within the subdivision. It will be a very low traffic subdivision with Meadowridge being the collector heading out to 75th. Aside from those two issues, the R-4A code doesn't really address the townhome situation real easily, so we proposed in our petition for zoning relief a set of bulk standards that would be applicable to the property with a 30 foot setback to any exterior property line. We are holding 20 feet between buildings. I think we have a 19 foot side yard setback in some instances to the external property, but we are trying to maximize those setbacks. I would call out though that this is the base floor plan. We do have options for a sunroom. The sunroom would add 6 feet onto the rear of the base floor plan and so as we platted out, that sunroom option would be a 6 foot permitted encroachment in the 30 foot rear yard. All of the setbacks and standards are set forth in our petition that we are looking to adopt as part of the Plan Description on this one. I think that kind of summarizes where we are at.

Mr. Sieben said did you mention you were asking for a variance on the radius on the curve of the street? Is that what I heard?

Mr. Whitaker said correct. We have a horizontal curvature of 40 feet, so the curves at each of the four corners on the loop internal to the site is shaper than what would be permitted by code. You can see Meadowridge obviously has a curve to it, but it is a much gentler curve on a collector that you've got a lot of people traversing. Internal to this site, we have what are effectively right hand turns. We just don't have a T intersection, so it is a little sharper curve.

Mr. Sieben said I have a couple of general comments before Jill comments. You mentioned that the city just approved the Route 59 Corridor Study where this is shown as medium density residential. We had Pulte contact School District 204 early on, I want to say maybe a year or so ago. Do you want to just discuss briefly what that correspondence has been?

Mr. Whitaker said yes, and my understanding is that there is a letter from District 204 of no objection to this plan. I think that was obtained some time ago when we had originally started on this project. We had initial discussions with the city probably a year ago at this point in time and we kind of waited for the city to go through the process with the Route 59 Corridor Plan in concert with the seller, who has been very patient. I would not, and we kind of talked about this before everybody else came into

the room, while this is also a Preliminary Plan on both New Song and Meadowridge, these are 2019 projects, so we are very sensitive to the timing on both of these projects. We need to be in the ground this year with all of our utilities, grading, etc. and be ready to move forward with vertical construction before the, it is hard to even say before the season breaks, as we head back into winter as we're just coming out of it, but that is the fact of what we're racing against right now.

Mr. Sieben said we just started to take a look at this so we do not have a date yet for you for Planning Commission, but we'll work with you on trying to move this forward as quick as we can. You are asking for several waivers of typical townhome setbacks. I do appreciate the sunroom comment, but we do need to look at that seriously and see what may or may not be acceptable with some of the variations you are asking for. We're going to take a look at that this week. Our goal is to hopefully try to get you comments by the end of the week. That is what we are going to shoot for, so then we can discuss those comments at that point. Regarding the roadway, I think we do appreciate the 31 foot back to back. I'll let Engineering comment on the 60 foot right-of-way.

Mr. Whitaker said just dovetailing on your comment about the sunroom. If you look at the plan, we have different spaces in different areas of the project, so it is not uniformly that that sunroom would actually be an encroachment into the 30 foot setback. There are places where that sunroom could actually be added onto it and would not be an encroachment into the 30 foot setback or would not be a 6 foot encroachment into the 30 foot setback, but would less than a 30 foot.

Mr. Sieben said what's the size of that sunroom approximately?

Mr. Getz said that's what I was going to note. It is half of the back of the house. You can see on the back of the home where that notch that kind of comes in, that's actually where the sunroom goes, where that notch that comes in is. It is only half the back of the house that would come out an additional 6 feet. It is basically 10 by 10.

Mr. Sieben said another 6 feet beyond the back point that you currently show.

Mr. Gillian said because it is indented and it gives you 12 feet for the actual sunroom.

Mr. Getz said yes.

Mr. Sieben said well we'll take a look at all that.

Mrs. Morgan said I haven't had a chance to take a look at this. I will do that this week. Some of the general concerns may be the setbacks. I'll just have to take a look at that. Also I will work on the Plan Description, kind of figuring out how we are going to do it.

Mrs. Vacek said so my understanding, and maybe I'm wrong, but my understanding was that we were going to put you in the same Plan Description, we were just going to change what parcel you are looking at, at the Plan Description. I think what we're looking at is that you would meet the Plan Description, the setbacks that are laid out in the Plan Description that already exists of what you guys are already under, if that makes sense. You are under the Ocean Atlantic Plan Description.

Mr. Sieben said for example, the Blackstone townhome development.

Mrs. Vacek said right. We would expect that you are meeting basically what Blackstone is meeting with respect to setbacks and respects to everything else. That's what we'll take a look at to see where you fall with that.

Mr. Whitaker said I guess I looked at it as the property was zoned B-2. The Blackstone development is...

Mrs. Vacek said with a Special Use.

Mr. Whitaker said I totally understand. It kind of encompasses everything around it, so I get it.

Mrs. Vacek said the one thing that I think that we're going to probably have a major concern about is the front setback. You guys are at 20 right now. I think that we would want to at least see the 25, which is our normal setback for townhouses. With the lack of parking on street, just because it is a townhouse subdivision to begin with, and now you are reducing that back even more, so cars can't even fully park in the property without being over the sidewalk. That's a huge issue.

Mr. Whitaker said 20 feet is a standard parking stall depth.

Mrs. Vacek said correct if you are up against the door.

Mr. Whitaker said cars aren't 20 feet long.

Mrs. Vacek said I think that's a huge issue for us, so we are going to want to see that 25.

Mr. Whitaker said the 20 is something that we've held in other projects, recognizing that the 20 foot is your typical parking stall. I could go back and pull you some detail, but I mean that's been something that we've looked to move toward that smaller setback as people aren't, and there's not necessarily a whole lot of utility to that front yard. If we know that we can park a car in the front yard and be able to put two cars on the driveway, that's absolutely an essential component, but if we can then otherwise create more separation in the rear yards and more separation from 75th Street, I think that's what's going to be more beneficial to the ultimate buyers.

Mrs. Morgan said I guess we've see people hanging over onto sidewalks and gotten complaints about that.

Mrs. Vacek said so we just want to take a really close look at that. I just don't know where we in the City of Aurora have actually allowed the 20 foot setback for townhouses. That's just one of our concerns.

Mr. Gillian said like Russ said, if you are giving away 5 feet in the front yard it's driveway you are eliminating because you have all these driveways lined up next to each other. It is just a lot of asphalt in the front. We'd much rather have the green space in the back or a buffer in the back.

Mrs. Vacek said correct, and I understand that, but we also have to be concerned about parking. Honestly, townhouses, especially where you guys aren't doing any additional parking anywhere, it is a huge concern.

Mr. Sieben said these generate a lot of parking, so we have to look at what we've experienced with some of the other ones down in that area. I'll turn it over to Mark to start.

Mr. Phipps said before I get started, I'd like to allow Mike Frankino to ask a question about the sanitary sewer connection.

Mr. Frankino said Dwayne I noticed that there is a discharge point to the southeast of the site for sanitary heading off site and through a developed area. Whereas, about the same distance to the south there is a 10 inch sanitary sewer at the right-of-way stubbed to the north that appears to have service area for this particular site. Was there a reason why this location was chosen to connect to?

Mr. Gillian said where is the other one in?

Mr. Frankino said I can actually show you on here. It seems like a 10 inch was designed to take that area here. You've got 10 inch coming this way and this way and there is a 10 inch stub right to here. So instead of this way, I think we would recommend that you utilize what appears to have been already planned to serve this area without encroaching on an already developed area.

Mr. Gillian said the problem is we looked at that years ago and I don't remember why we went this way. I'll have to dust off some old notes.

Mr. Frankino said it seems obvious that this was, do you agree, that that was intended to be the area to serve so you could look at that 10 inch coming to here with the stub. Nothing else would be served over here. It seems like that's the...

Mr. Gillian said and it is all going to the same place.

Mr. Frankino said correct.

Mr. Gillian said I'm just wondering if there were utility conflicts or other issues.

Mr. Frankino said we'll talk about it with Engineering. I just wanted to ask if there was some background knowledge of that. It sounds like there might be, but it is dusty.

Mr. Gillian said that is definitely something we've got to look into.

Mr. Phipps said the Engineering Division is concerned about the small right-of-way width. Beyond that, I wanted to mention that our understanding from some communication with Kane County is that right there at the intersection of Meadowridge and 75th Street there is a left turn lane right now, but it is only 9 feet wide and our understanding is that they're going to be looking for you guys to take the curb line on the west side of Meadowridge Drive and move that 6 feet further to the west.

Mr. Gillian said you are talking about DuPage County, right?

Mr. Phipps said yes DuPage County has been looking for that. I don't know if you've had any conversation with them yet.

Mr. Gillian said we exchanged e-mails with them last week and that did not come up. They mentioned a traffic study and we told them that we had this meeting coming up with you guys and we wanted to see what the city's point of view was.

Mr. Phipps said when the city used the existing pavement width and created a left turn lane there, it was out of necessity because one or two cars that are trying to turn left would back up an awful lot of traffic. I think it has worked okay, but the thought is that with the number of cars that are going to be coming out of this subdivision, a few more of them are going to want to turn left on 75th Street and so in order to make that work you're going to have to a little bit wider turn lane, a little more storage and a taper. I wanted to make you guys aware of that, that DuPage County is thinking that. They mentioned it to us. Of course, I think the city would be pleased with that too.

Mr. Getz said did they mention whether they feel there is room in their existing right-of-way or are they looking for additional right-of-way as well?

Mr. Phipps said I think it is within the existing right-of-way. I think it would fit.

Mr. Gillian said that's an 80 foot right-of-way right there, 31 back to back currently. We'll look into that and let you know. I just don't know that there is enough traffic going left out of the development and then left down 75th Street to truly warrant that. I don't know if it is a matter of doing a traffic study or what.

Mr. Beneke said so on the Fire side, we would also need to make sure that access is adequate for fire equipment through the whole subdivision, including the turns being narrower. We are going to need to make sure that you've looked at the fire traffic and make sure the equipment can make those turns.

Mr. Gillian said we did do a Fire Plan and that's already been submitted. I think we got the approval for that.

Mr. Beneke said did you confirm this turn around can happen with the trucks?

Mr. Gillian said trucks were routed through there.

Mr. Beneke said because I know we looked at the basics, but I did not realize you were going less than the norm. As long as you've looked at it and made sure that everything can comply then I think we'll be okay.

Mr. Gillian said that's like Russ said. It is not dissimilar from a T intersection. If a fire truck is turning left through an intersection, it is still 31 feet back to back on the curb.

Mr. Beneke said it is just that they've got a certain radius that they've got to maintain on those big trucks.

Mr. Sieben said we'll start circling back with you then. Hopefully Zoning will get you something by the end of the day Thursday and then we can start discussion. Mark, who is your engineering reviewing this?

Mr. Phipps said Mary Garza. I know she has almost finished her review. I would think that she will get it out this week too.

Mr. Whitaker said the other thing, and I think we've had some preliminary conversations about this, but the other thing I would throw out just as you are reviewing it, keep in mind the option for that habitable attic. So we are looking at a portion of a third story space that would be built out with the ability to have a deck off the back...

Mr. Getz said a rooftop deck.

Mr. Whitaker said it is off the back of the unit even on the two story, right?

Mr. Getz said so what happens is basically you've got a two story roof like this. We are lifting up the roof at the back end and so you'd have habitable area here and you'd have a rooftop deck right outside that habitable area.

Mrs. Morgan said and that is an option?

Mr. Whitaker said it is an option, correct. We are currently building it in Naperville and Bloomingdale.

Mr. Getz said the two story product we are currently building in Bloomingdale and our three story row homes we are currently doing at Woodridge Uptown at Seven Bridges and at Naperville at Columbia Park Towns.

Mrs. Vacek said can you guys get us some pictures of those?

Mr. Whitaker said I think the elevations include a cut sheet that shows this.

Mr. Getz said we gave you rear elevations that show with and without it.

Mr. Whitaker said it is one of those things that could easily be glossed over, so I wanted to make sure I called it out when everybody was paying attention.

1 Planning Council 04/16/2019

Notes: Mr. Sieben said we should be getting comments to them within a couple of days. That did not get out before Jill went to conference on Friday, but we'll get something out this week.

Mr. Phipps said we got our comments out already.

1 Planning Council 04/23/2019

Notes: Mr. Sieben said we had some correspondence just in the last 24 hours. Mark maybe you can comment too. They've agreed to make some of the changes so that they are going to meet the

setbacks that are part of the 1998 Ocean Atlantic Plan Description for the townhome areas. We are asking for a 25 foot front setback. They need to meet some other rear setbacks, which I believe they are going to meet. I believe they are going to lose 2 units out of the 82 so they will be down to 80. They are doing 31 foot back to back, but they are asking for 60 foot right-of-way, which is allowed for under the original Plan Description. I know Mark you and I talked about it and I think Jill responded back to them.

Mr. Phipps said I mentioned at the last meeting that I was concerned about the 60 foot right-of-way because it was less than the standard right-of-way required by the city's specifications, but I understand that 60 foot was what was agreed to in the Plan Description and I also understand that the setback will be increased from what they previously were showing as a 20 foot setback to a 25 foot setback.

Mr. Sieben said correct and just clear for the record, this is not setting a precedent for other developments. This was already in the zoning from 1998.

Mr. Phipps said thanks for that clarification.

1 Planning Council 04/30/2019

Notes: Mrs. Morgan said Planning and Engineering sent comments out. They are making revisions now. They are supposed to have a resubmittal by Friday. That's to reflect a lot of Planning comments. They weren't meeting setbacks, front yard and rear yard setbacks, so that is to address those comments along with others.

Mr. Sieben said how is Building and Fire?

Mr. Cross said we signed off on those.

Mr. Sieben said Engineering?

Mr. DuSell said we are in the middle of our review.

Mrs. Morgan said Javan, they are changing probably road locations. The road is going to probably shift south. You'll need a new Fire Plan.

Mrs. Vacek said you'll need to take a look at it again, just so you know, because we asked for some pretty big revisions.

Mr. Cross said okay.

Mr. Sieben said they are probably losing 2 of the units in the inner circle. The 2 drives on the north and south will shrink a little bit to get setback. It is not a major change, but it is a little bit of a change.

Mr. Cross said we'll take a look at it.

Mr. Beneke said are the buildings moving with the shift of the road?

Mrs. Morgan said all the 3 buildings, the groups of buildings to the north, will be shifted south. Other than losing the 2 units, I don't think the center ones will be shifted, well they will be shifting in. I don't think south, but who knows. They might shift slightly for a reason.

Mr. Sieben said one of our big comments was the 25 foot front setback and then they were not meeting the setback to 75th Street were some of the bigger issues we had. We've already talked to them and they are making the changes. Mike, did you have any issues.

Mr. Frankino said we did not.

Mr. Sieben said so we'll wait for those revisions.

1	Planning Council	05/07/2019				
	<p>Notes: <i>Mrs. Morgan said Planning has received a resubmittal. We are in review. There were somewhat substantial changes that we're addressing with the setbacks not being met, which also would change the location of the roads, so we are in review to see if all those changes have been met.</i></p> <p><i>Mr. Phipps said we've got a resubmittal that we're in the process of reviewing also.</i></p> <p><i>Mr. Frankino said we had a question about the discharge point for the off-site sewer, but that's been resolved. We didn't realize it had gone as far as it had through the city process and we're finding the way. We just questioned whether or not they need to go to that 10 inch sewer and I think it is fine where they are going. They are going to another 10 inch, it is just off-site through an easement. We have no more issues.</i></p> <p><i>Mr. Beneke said this is the one they were switching the road. It probably is fine, but we've got to see the revision.</i></p> <p><i>Mr. Sieben said they tweaked it. We are all going to take a look at it. If we are lucky, maybe this could be voted out next week, but we'll have to take a look at it.</i></p>					
1	Planning Council	05/14/2019	Forwarded	Planning Commission	05/22/2019	Pass
	<p>Action Text: A motion was made by Mrs. Morgan, seconded by Mr. Phipps, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Planning Commission, on the agenda for 5/22/2019. The motion carried by voice vote.</p> <p>Notes: <i>Mrs. Morgan said staff is in review of the resubmittal documents. They are advertised for the May 22nd Planning Commission. They have made some major changes in setbacks that Planning has asked, so we were just reviewing some minor technical issues.</i></p> <p><i>Mr. Phipps said our review is ongoing also. I don't think there are major issues to be resolved though.</i></p> <p><i>Mrs. Morgan said Fire reviewed their original and signed off on it, but they will have a new Fire resubmittal due to the change of the roads, but I don't think they mentioned anything major changing. I make a motion that we move this forward to the May 22nd Planning Commission with the minor conditions that Engineering and Planning may have. Mr. Phipps seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.</i></p>					
2	Planning Commission	05/22/2019	Forwarded	Planning & Development Committee	05/30/2019	Pass
	<p>Action Text: A motion was made by Mrs. Duncan, seconded by Mr. Cameron, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Planning & Development Committee, on the agenda for 5/30/2019. The motion carried.</p> <p>Notes: <i>See the Attachment for Items 19-0262 and 19-0263.</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Aye: 9 At Large Cameron, At Large Pilmer, Aurora Twnshp Representative Reynolds, At Large Anderson, Fox Metro Representative Divine, SD 204 Representative Duncan, At Large Tidwell, At Large Gonzales and At Large Elsbree</p>					

Attachment for Items 19-0262 and 19-0263:

Mrs. Morgan said Pulte Homes is requesting a revision to the Plan Description to amend the parcel located at the southeast corner of Meadowridge Drive and 75th Street. This includes amending the land use parcel to the multiplex parcel and changing the zoning district from B-2(S) to R-4A(S) and creating a new OS-1(S) Conservation, Open Space and Drainage zoning. The Plan Description Revision includes allowing additional acreage for the multiplex parcel and removing a grid from the parcel identified as commercial in the Plan Description, along with zoning the stormwater detention to the city's OS-1 zoning standards. This Plan Description Revision will allow them to develop the property with 80 townhomes and associated stormwater detention. Concurrently with the proposal, the Petitioner is requesting approval of a Revision to the Preliminary Plan and Plat for Right-of-Way Dwelling use. This includes the development of townhomes with 18 buildings containing 80 front loaded units. The stormwater detention is located at the corner of 75th Street and Meadowridge Drive. The development is accessed by a road south of the detention that runs in a rectangle around the townhome development and creates a center unit containing 4 buildings. The townhomes to the north of the internal road have a 40 foot setback from 75th Street to provide some buffer from 75th Street. The rear of the townhomes to the east overlook the detention facility. The townhomes to the south abut a park. The three corners of the roads contain a private drive that access three additional building. All units are front loaded with 2 car wide driveways and they are 25 feet deep. Some of the units will also have an option to add a sunroom and they all will have an option to have a habitable attic. Just to kind of give you a little background, the property has been zoned commercial. It has been vacant for 20 years since it was annexed. In 2016 there was a plan before the city to build a daycare on the property, which was approved but the developers never pursued that project. The city has just recently completed a Route 59 Corridor Study Comprehensive Plan. In that study, it recognized that the commercial real estate sector has really changed drastically in the last few years, especially since this property was annexed, due to retail trends. As we all know, people are shopping more on-line. Due to this, the study suggested doing more commercial nodes at key locations rather than widespread strip commercial development. It also concluded with identifying this as Medium Density Residential. After working with the Petitioner, the development now meets the requirements for attached single family homes found in the surrounding neighborhoods, which is outlined in the Plan Description. The surrounding neighbors also have a similar Plan Description. This includes the setbacks, maximum gross density of 8.5 and minimum floor area requirements. With the adherence to the surrounding townhome developments and the conclusions of the Corridor Study, staff supports the Plan Description Revision and the change of the underlying zoning to residential. Staff has received a few calls concerning this development asking for some additional information as well as there are some concerns regarding the amounts of units on the 11 acres as well as how would this development affect the surrounding townhome properties.

The Petitioners were sworn in.

Good evening. I'm Russ Whitaker. I am an attorney at the law firm of Rosanova and Whitaker, 127 Aurora Avenue in Naperville. I'm here this evening on behalf of Pulte Home Company as contract purchaser of the property that Jill described. Jill kind of did a good overview of the history of how we got here, so I'll skip over some of those details. I just have an aerial of the property here, so we are at the corner of Meadowridge Drive and 75th Street. Again, it is approximately an 11.5 acre property. I would just point out that there is a commercial industrial park to what would be to the west and an existing office park to

the east. There is an adjacent park to the south, which would provide a nice amenity for us and then kind of kitty-corner to the south and east would be the adjacent townhomes. This was just some detail that was included in the update to the Comp Plan recently, the Route 59 Corridor Study. As Jill mentioned, the property was designated for Medium Density Residential here on this plan. You can just see the Route 59 Corridor Study specifically calling out this is a key development parcel and identifying it for Medium Density Residential. When we looked specifically at the plan, as Jill mentioned, there are 18 buildings consisting of 80 total units. The stormwater detention is located at the corner off of Meadowridge Drive, so that's an approximately 2½ acre wetland bottom stormwater detention basin so that will create sort of a nice open space as you enter off of 75th Street. The buildings will be setback a little bit and sort of maintain some of that open feel when you enter Meadowridge Drive off of 75th. The access to the community is off of Meadowridge Drive. There is a single point of ingress and egress, which is located to the south of the screen and I guess just for orientation purposes, you can see 75th Street to the north here and then Meadowridge Drive to the right. The single point of access ultimately circles around and comes back on itself, so it is a very efficient design. It would be designated as public right-of-way. The road construction would meet all of the applicable standards in the City of Aurora. I would note that there are a couple of private drives that will extend off of the public roadway. So if you look at sort of the three corners you can see little extensions going out and those are private driveways that will provide access to the additional units that are in that location. Those private drives would be owned and maintained by the Homeowners Association. The homes being proposed will be traditional 2 story townhomes with front loaded garages. You can see that all of the driveways are located around the street. I would note, and I didn't mention when we were looking at the street, but if you were to zoom in on the plan, to the north and south on that circle drive you can see that we are actually showing some on-street parking. There are 7 on-street parking spaces to the north and 7 on-street parking spaces to the south for a total of 14 parking spaces. Outside of those parking spaces, there would be no parking permitted on the street. That's some detail that we've worked through with the Fire Department as we were coordinating the development plans. The basic floor plans for the homes is an 1,800 square foot home, so it is a sizable townhome unit. However, there are multiple options off of that base plan that would allow you to expand up to 2,500 square feet on an individual townhome unit. Two of the main options that would actually change the footprint of the unit are a sunroom addition, which would be a 10 foot by 10 foot addition off the back of the building and if you look at the plan here, you can see sort of the little squares off the back of each of the units. That is where a sunroom option would be available. That 10 by 10 square there would not be built as a standard feature, but would be an option, 100 feet on the first floor and it actually carries forward and is also 100 feet on the second floor. So that space, that option space, would take the total square footage of the unit up to 2,000 square feet. In addition to that option, there is also what is a pretty unique option in the market, which is a habitable attic space. This is not changing the overall height of the building. It is not changing the front elevation of the building, but we changed the roofline to the rear of the unit. We are able to build out a 700 square foot space, which is effectively in the attic, just converting the attic to usable space. It also creates a nice, very unique outdoor space that is on effectively the third floor of the home. That's been an option that's been incorporated that Pulte's developed and has incorporated into a number of subdivisions in the western suburbs and has been very popular, so that is something that we are looking to add here. Again, that's increasing the square footage of the base plan, so we would be moving from 1,800 square feet up to 2,500 square feet with that habitable attic option. Jill mentioned that the overall site plan complies with all of the requirements of the underlying Plan Description. The property was annexed in 1998. There is a Plan Description for townhomes. That's how the townhomes

adjacent to us were built. We are complying with all of the setbacks and design standards. In fact, we are beating some of them in a positive way. By way of example, the Plan Description would allow 8½ units an acre and we are at 7 units an acre on this project. This is just a depiction of the Preliminary Plat of Subdivision, which is pretty standard for a townhome subdivision. What we are showing here is that there will be individual building pads for each building. The units will then be subdivided off of that building pad and everything that is not owned by individual homeowners would then be conveyed to the Homeowners Association. The Homeowners Association would be responsible for all the common maintenance of the Association. With respect to architecture, I know this isn't part of the Preliminary Plan approval process here, but I think it is always helpful to provide some context so you can understand what it is that we are looking to do. So this is the front elevation. You can see it is a very nice front elevation, Traditional, or sort of Modern American architecture, a combination of building elements with brick across the first story of the front façade and combination of lap siding, board and baton siding is some of the feature details on that front elevation. I would note that there is one foot recesses, or one foot of separation between each unit, so there is some horizontal relief across the face of the building. You can see the ridge of the roof includes some elevation changes also, so it is not that large monotonous singular roofline that you see on some lower end townhome products. You can see we've got peaks and some dormers incorporated in a couple of different dormer styles, looking to mix it up and trying to find that sort of Contemporary Modern American architecture that's become very popular in the market, which is, of course, what you see a lot with the board and baton siding here. As we look at the rear of the unit, the one thing I wanted to point out here is we're not just a straight flush 6 unit building across the back. You can see there are some elevation changes here. There is actually a roof element that's helping to really break up the massing of the rear of that building, which will be helpful. This is the other elevation that I wanted to point out. This shows how the habitable attic would function. Of course, you are looking at this in a 2D view. You would never actually see this view from the ground because the roofline would prohibit you from seeing all of that third story space. Again, we're not actually changing the roofline. What we are really doing is just taking that sloped roof on the back and we're tilting up a small shed roof. It is actually a very small change. If you were looking at it from a profile, it's a very small change with the shed roof, but it creates some very unique usable space with some pretty cool views here. That's kind of an exciting option. I don't know where that would otherwise be available in the Aurora market, so we think that would be something that would help drive buyers to the site. I think that kind of runs through what we've got this evening. We'd be certainly happy to answer any questions you might have.

Mr. Gonzales said I have a question for you. The habitable attic, so it is 750 square feet that can be added on?

Mr. Whitaker said correct.

Mr. Gonzales said will that also be in conjunction if the owner or somebody who is buying the home, can they also add in the sunroom?

Mr. Whitaker said no. They are either or. You can't see it on a single slide, but the roof structure of the sunroom and the habitable attic don't work together, so it is an either or proposition.

Mr. Gonzales said and my second question, can they build decks and patios right off of the back here?

Mr. Whitaker said so you are saying a first floor deck or a patio.

I'm Rob Getz, Vice President of Land for Pulte Homes. It will come standard with a patio behind that opening in the back. When Pulte controls the board, our rules will be no decks on the back. Certainly once it is turned to the Homeowners Association, the Homeowner Association would have the ability to change those declarations if they so choose and allow decks. As we're in control, we don't want to get in the situation where we're arguing between folks whether this person could have deck and that person could have a deck. Our covenants out of the gate will be no decks on these. It will just come with a standard patio.

Mr. Gonzales said does that also include fencing around there?

Mr. Getz said again, there will be no fencing allowed as well.

Mr. Cameron said do you have an example of the sunroom on any of them?

Mr. Whitaker said I don't. We did on an earlier iteration and it ended up getting knocked out in a subsequent iteration. It adds 10 feet off of the rear and the 10 feet goes straight up the rear elevation, so it adds a change in the roof structure coming off of the second story.

Mr. Cameron said is that a full vertical area or is there area on the second floor?

Mr. Whitaker said there is area. It would be 100 feet on the first floor and also 100 feet on the second floor, so you are adding 200 square feet with that sunroom option.

Mr. Cameron said so does that add to one of the bedrooms or what does that space do?

Mr. Getz said so I think the one thing I'd mention is if you are curious, we do have this, we call it the Denali, it is a model at our Bloomingdale Walk Subdivision in Bloomingdale at the northeast corner of the Strafford Square Mall, so you could certainly walk it and that model does have the sunroom on that model so you can walk and look at it. What happens on the first floor is you get an additional 10 feet off the back. On the second floor it is off the master bedroom, so what happens is that 10 feet off the back of the master bedroom actually becomes the master bath and what currently is the master bath on the right side of the master bedroom becomes a very large walk-in closet. So you pick up a nicer master bathroom configuration and you also get a second very large closet. It is quite a popular option. People like that better bathroom configuration and the extra closet.

Mrs. Anderson said do you have any landscaping plans?

Mr. Whitaker said I don't believe we do at this point in time. I think they would just come with the Final. There are landscape requirements incorporated into the Plan Description, so our intent is that we would meet all of the landscape requirements from the Plan Description.

Mr. Elsbree said I've got a question. Just a general question maybe for one of the engineers. I know aesthetically why, but why do we build on wetlands and then move our stormwater to the other side of the property? Can you ease my mind that that wetland is not going to be in someone's basement?

I'm Dwayne Gillian with V3 Companies. So the wetlands on this property are farm wetlands. Basically they farm all the areas. There are a couple of depressional area that you can see the shadows of it towards the west side of the property. Basically it is a depressional area that is about a foot deep that holds water during big storm events. The high point of the property is near the west property line and everything drains as it is out toward Meadowridge Drive, so that's why we're proposing the basin to be where it is. The wetlands are being mitigated. Like I said, they are farm field. It is corn. They will be restored as natural wetlands at the bottom of the stormwater basin. It is one of the reasons the basin is big is because the area is very large and bounce from high water to normal water is relatively low.

Mr. Elsbree said on slide 17, I believe it is, the wetlands it shows there, are those the ones you are talking about on the west side?

Mr. Gillian said yes. Those are the wetlands that are about a half an acre in total.

Mr. Elsbree said I believe they are going to have like 3 or 4 units on it, right?

Mr. Gillian said the development is going over that area.

Mr. Elsbree said and that's just going to flow across everybody's to that?

Mr. Gillian said right. We are installing a storm sewer system in the streets. The streets will drain toward the storm sewer system. Everything will drain to the pond. To call those a wetland is kind of a stretch. It doesn't have any wetland vegetation, but it does meet the requirements of wetlands as they are defined.

Mr. Elsbree said that answers that better.

Mr. Cameron said the sub-grading and stuff will raise that wetland area up and then you've got compensatory storage in the detention area.

Mr. Gillian said that is correct.

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. Morgan said for Plan Description Revision, staff would recommend approval of an Ordinance approving a Revision to the Ocean Atlantic Woodland Corporation Plan Description on 11.34 acres for property located at the southwest corner of Meadowridge Drive and 75th Street and to amend the Land Use Parcel on the property to the Multiplex Parcel and creating a new Conservation, Open Space and Drainage Parcel and amending Ordinance Number 3100, being the Aurora Zoning Ordinance and the

Zoning Map attached thereto, to an underlying zoning of R-4A Two Family Dwelling District and OS-1 Conservation, Open Space and Drainage District.

MOTION OF APPROVAL WAS MADE BY: Mrs. Anderson

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mrs. Duncan

AYES: Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Cameron, Mr. Divine, Mrs. Duncan, Mr. Elsbree, Mr. Gonzales, 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 represents 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 again, the proposal 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 based on the plans that have been submitted, the proposal should maintain a compatible relationship with traffic, as the traffic enters in off of Meadowridge Drive.

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?

Chairman Pilmer said there should be no impact and they are all listed on the proposed plans.

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?

Mr. Cameron said it will be provided according to the plans.

7a. Is the rezoning a consistent extension of the existing land uses, existing zoning classifications, and essential character of the general area?

Chairman Pilmer said this is an appropriate transition between more intensive adjacent uses and also well-established residential communities to the south and east.

7b. Will the rezoning permit uses which are more suitable than uses permitted under the existing zoning classification?

Chairman Pilmer said based on the proposed plan, the rezoning will permit more suitable uses than what the existing classification is.

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

Chairman Pilmer said based on the Route 59 recent Corridor Study of Route 59, it is showing that this area should be designated residential and should not be a saturation.

9b. Is the special use in all other respects in conformance to the applicable regulations in 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?

Chairman Pilmer said I would say it is in conformance.

Mrs. Morgan said this will next be heard at the Planning and Development Committee on Thursday, May 30, 2019, at 4:00 p.m. on the fifth floor of this building.

Mrs. Morgan said for the Revision to the Preliminary Plan and Plat staff would recommend conditional approval of a Resolution approving a Revision to the Preliminary Plan and Plat for property located at the southwest corner of Meadowridge Drive and 75th Street with the following conditions:

1. That the Preliminary Plan be revised to show the exterior side yard setback lines at 20 feet per the Plan Description.
2. That the Preliminary Plat be revised to shift the building pad for Lots 9-11 so that they adhere to the 20 foot exterior side yard setback.
3. That all the comments of the Engineering Division be addressed prior to approval of Final Engineering.

Mrs. Morgan said just to note, Items 1 and 2, the buildings meet setbacks. The plans just need to be altered to show the correct setback, so it is just a formatting issue.

MOTION OF CONDITIONAL APPROVAL WAS MADE BY: Mrs. Duncan

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mr. Cameron

AYES: Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Cameron, Mr. Divine, Mrs. Duncan, Mr. Elsbree, Mr. Gonzales, Mr. Reynolds, Ms. Tidwell

NAYS: None

Mrs. Morgan said this will next be heard at the Planning and Development Committee on Thursday, May 30, 2019, at 4:00 p.m. on the fifth floor of this building.