



City of Aurora

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

Legistar History Report

File Number: 17-00950

File ID: 17-00950

Type: Petition

Status: Draft

Version: 4

General Ledger #:

In Control: Planning & Development Committee

File Created: 10/11/2017

File Name: Aurora University/ Expansion / SUPD Revision / Master Plan Revision

Final Action:

Title: An Ordinance Approving a Revision to the Aurora University Plan Description and Master Plan for 45.7 acres on Property located west of Gladstone Avenue, east of and along the west frontage of Evanslawn Avenue between Marseillaise Place and Prairie Street, south of and along the north side of Marseillaise Place between Calumet Avenue and Gladstone, and north side of Prairie Street (Aurora University - 17-00950 / AU20/4-15.172-SU/PD/R - TV - Ward 4) (PUBLIC HEARING)

Notes:

Agenda Date: 06/14/2018

Agenda Number:

Sponsors:

Enactment Date:

Attachments: Exhibit "A" Legal Description.pdf, PZ Redline Review Comments - 2018-05-24 - 2015.172.pdf, 2018 Master Plan 2018-04-13.pdf, AU Powerpoint Presentation for Plan Commission.pdf, Land Use Petition and Submittal Documents - 2017-10-10 - 2015.172.pdf, Legistar History Report - 2018-05-03 - 2015.172.pdf

Enactment Number:

Planning Case #: AU20/4-15.172-SU/PD/R

Hearing Date:

Drafter: tvacek@aurora-il.org

Effective Date:

History of Legislative File

Version:	Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:	
1	Committee of the Whole	10/17/2017	Forward to Planning Council	Planning Council				
	Action Text: This Petition was Forward to Planning Council to the DST Staff Council (Planning Council)							
1	Planning Council	10/24/2017						
	Notes: <i>Representatives Present: Bruce Goldsmith and Carmella Moran</i>							

I'm Bruce Goldsmith and with me is Carmella Moran from Aurora University. There are 3 houses that we are rezoning that we acquired over time. One is on Gladstone and two are on Prairie. The Prairie

houses are west of what would be Randall extended, or right above where it says Prairie Street. The third house is kind of where that little box is, which is a placement for a future building. That's Part 1. Part 2 is that for some time we've been talking with the city about coming back with a revised Master Plan, so what's different about this is, is that generally Expansion Area #1 was where you see parking lots and the Welcome Center and a future building, a Student Success Center, on the southeast side of the campus. On the southwest side of the campus, which is Expansion Area #2, we have some placeholders; 15 is where we anticipate having a library someday, 33 is just a placeholder.

Mr. Sieben said and again 32, on the right, is the Student Service Center.

Mr. Goldsmith said the Student Success Center. In terms of priority, the Student Success Center probably is the next building to be built. The library would be the building after that. There is no real contemplation of anything else immediately and those depend on fundraising as well. But what we are doing is we are anticipating that we need to get more parking. Where we hope to get the parking is with the vacation of the rest of Southlawn. We are just about under contract with one of the two houses that are left. We are hoping the last house will then follow. With that, then we would have the city vacate the rest of Southlawn and we would build more parking. You see #35, we would keep going west from there and add parking. It is also dependent, one on getting those houses because we need them to feather in the parking in the parking to the south off of Southlawn and then extend it from the existing parking to the east and also again, it is a fairly significant financial commitment as well because we are anticipating we are going to have to do structured detention because we do not want to put detention ponds on the site, so that just raises the cost again. That's kind of the first part of this new plan. The other pieces of it are we have placeholders for other things. We've kind of always contemplated having a placeholder where Vago Field is, which is currently football/soccer and other sports. That's where 33 is. Even with having a new sports facility in Montgomery, we actually see this being a continuing use, so we are not contemplating putting a building there. There is a potential building 26, which could be like a Student Center/Food Service building, but that's not in the cards at the moment. We are contemplating two potential expansion areas.

Mr. Sieben said can you just real quick finish the other blue?

Mr. Goldsmith said these are just potential additions. In the far northeast corner, 11, we've always had a placeholder for the library, to expand the library. That's not practically going to happen because the building just doesn't warrant a redo. We've just always shown it there and we just wanted to leave a footprint there if we wanted to put a building there, but there is no real contemplation. Number 8A is just a potential, actually I think that's the dorms.

Mr. Sieben said that's Jenks addition. You've had that on there for a while.

Mr. Goldsmith that should actually have a different color now.

Mr. Sieben said is that already built?

Ms. Moran said no. That's if we wanted to expand dorms.

Mr. Goldsmith said I'm sorry. That's where we always had a placeholder and then we actually moved the dormitory to the south side. Right now if you read the papers, dormitories are not hot at college campuses. Everybody wants to live off campus, so we are trying to just keep the demand level consistent with what our available housing is, but we don't see a lot of potential for the future, but we are still leaving a placeholder there. 2A, Carmella do you want to explain that?

Ms. Moran said 2A is at the back of our Alumni Hall and UVH, so if wanted to extend a small building on there to add to our food service to make a bigger dining area.

Mr. Sieben said and 2 is just a patio, right?

Ms. Moran said yes. That's already there. It is actually a paver patio. Two weekends ago when we had Homecoming, we actually had a big tent out there and we were able to have many of our

Homecoming festivities under the tent.

Mr. Sieben said before you get to the expansion Bruce, do you want to touch on the north side of Marseillaise there?

Mr. Goldsmith said there are 2 existing houses there. One is called the Founder's House. Those buildings have a limited life expectancy. If it were to be the case that we decide to close them, then we would demolish them and probably put parking there.

Mr. Sieben said with zero setback? That's what you are showing potentially? That looks like it is maxed out.

Mr. Goldsmith said I think that is what it is. We can talk about what would be appropriate there. I suspect that we would end up with a fence on the north side and then landscaping on Gladstone and on Marseillaise.

Mr. Sieben said you think those 2 homes have a certain life span without repair?

Mr. Goldsmith said even with repair.

Ms. Moran said they are pretty old.

Mr. Sieben said do you want to talk about the expansion?

Mr. Goldsmith said from time to time we've talked to the city about going south of Prairie. We don't see putting buildings south of Prairie. We do see the possibility of parking or the possibility of detention, or the possibility of parking and detention on the south side. We wanted a designated area that basically goes to White Avenue if you extended that to the east and so those 2 blocks have some potential for expansion. The other thing we did is in order to be able to do more parking, we need to relocate, in fact remove, some houses that we are currently using as offices, which are along Randall extended and they go into what is 35. In order to get that additional parking, we would need to relocate those functions, but we don't have any buildings on campus to do that relocation. So what we have talked about doing is trying to acquire properties on the west side of Evanslawn between Marseillaise on the north and Prairie on the south and convert, most of those would either be offices or they could be graduate student housing or actually staff or professor housing. In a minor case, probably if you extended the parking lots that are currently there to the west, we might have some parking between Southlawn and a little bit north of Southlawn, but mostly we would like to acquire some homes and just keep them as homes and use them for offices or residential uses. This is kind of the reason why we are trying to move this along. A couple of them, or 2 or 3 of them, are already on the market. One of them, which is not on the market, has contacted us and since there is interest in selling, we are trying to take advantage of that because one of the houses that is available is quite large and would be an excellent place some of our offices. That's why we are trying to move it along.

Mr. Sieben said obviously based on conversations we've had and I think others have had with you, nothing precludes the University from buying those homes that are on the market.

Mr. Goldsmith said no there is nothing that precludes it, but we can't use them as offices, so that's not nothing. That's a big caveat. If we knew we could use them as offices, we'd buy them tomorrow, the ones that are available, but not knowing that we can use them that way, we have to wait until we actually have approval, so that's why as fast as we can get through the process then more than likely we would be able to acquire some that are on the market. As soon as we acquire those, then we can start moving offices and then we can vacate homes that we would like to demolish for parking. It is all part of that plan.

Mr. Sieben said well this is Tracey's case. We've started reviewing it, so we'll be getting comments back to you. Maybe we could even have a sit down in the near future.

Mrs. Vacek said I think what we're looking at instead of calling them expansion areas is we are going

to do like a campus versus a non-campus type thing.

Mr. Goldsmith said that's fine. The only problem is in order to maintain the continuity of the Master Plan, we've always tried to identify the areas as they were defined.

Mrs. Vacek said I don't know if it is that big of a deal. I think it will be easier in the long run because if and when we add more non-campus properties then we don't have to keep redoing these expansion areas and coming up some things. I'm working on reviewing the Plan Description. We will have some comments on it, so we will sit down and talk to you about that. Hopefully I'll have it done by the end of the week and get comments out to you by the end of the week. I did leave you a message, so we were looking to maybe have a special meeting on the 29th of November.

Mr. Goldsmith said we appreciate that and would be happy to do it then. In terms of the overall plan, the general plan is nothing new except that we are adding a lot more parking. The overall plan is to get there we have to get some more houses. There seems to be a fair amount of interest from people in the neighborhood of selling to us, so that kind of works out with what our goals is too.

Mr. Sieben said well we just want to make sure with any expansion we make sure we have proper screening and buffering like before.

Mr. Goldsmith said absolutely.

Mr. Sieben and obviously parking is a big issue, so you guys are looking at trying to address that. We'll have some comments in the Plan Description. I think that's all that I'd like to say right now. We'll have stuff for you by the end of the week that we can discuss.

Mr. Goldsmith said the unfortunate things from the University's concept is that we are ending up with a lot more impervious area, not from a stormwater standpoint, from just the fact it is a campus and you want to have a lot of green space and we are kind of getting stuck with having to put parking in that. I'm not saying stuck in a bad sense. I'm just saying because we are successful at building enrollment, we've got to build a lot more parking.

Mrs. Vacek said you can always go up and not go out.

Mr. Goldsmith said anytime the city wants to partner with us on a deck, we'd be happy to do it. There is apparently quite a bit of resistance to decks in university settings. That's another problem.

Ms. Moran said and do you think the neighbors would want a parking garage?

Mrs. Vacek said honestly, if they want parking off the streets, absolutely they would want it.

Mr. Feltman said the northeast side of the campus, I think we've talked about this before, that's in a combined sewer area, so there is an extension of a storm sewer that's going to be needed if you do any work in there.

Mr. Goldsmith said which is probably going to discourage us from doing any work in there. I think it is very expensive because we have to go how far east?

Mr. Feltman said it more like a block or two.

Mr. Goldsmith said I thought we had to go all the way to Elmwood.

Mr. Feltman said it's been awhile since I looked at it, but I don't remember it being that far.

Mr. Goldsmith said could you check on that and let me know because then we can price that out.

Mr. Feltman said and this is just throwing it out there, but if you did start acquiring properties on Evanslawn, are we going to start discussing any road improvements? I know there is no curb and

gutter out there or sidewalk. Again, just throwing that out there. White Avenue is not right-of-way. It is owned by the Township, so if we were to vacate Calumet, we'd want to have that dedicated as right-of-way just because there are houses that need to be served.

Mr. Sieben said it is a defacto right-of-way, but it is a parcel owned by the Township.

Mr. Feltman said correct. It's got a PIN. It's a parcel, but it is owned by the Township.

Mr. Goldsmith said we wouldn't get to the vacating until we got way, there are 15 houses there, a long time before we got (inaudible), but I appreciate that that would be a condition.

Mr. Feltman said correct. That would just be a condition of us vacating Calumet.

Mr. Goldsmith said the Township would just dedicate it to Aurora? We wouldn't have to acquire it, right?

Mr. Feltman said if you purchased all the properties and annexed into the city...

Mr. Goldsmith said you would automatically get to the far side.

Mr. Feltman said correct, but it would need to be dedicated as right-of-way. Then obviously, you touched on the stormwater management. We are going to have to look through the different expansion areas. This is maybe a little too much detail, but just out of curiosity, Building 32, what's going out to Gladstone? What is that? Is that a driveway?

Mr. Sieben said one issue in the Plan Description, you asked for one more curb cut between the drive on Gladstone down to Prairie. We didn't know if 32 if that was just a walkway.

Ms. Moran said it just a walkway.

Mr. Feltman said it just looked wide enough it could have been a driveway.

Mr. Goldsmith said it kind of like a focal point.

Mr. Sieben said because I don't think our intent was to add another curb cut.

Ms. Moran said what we are going for aesthetically is the building, the architecture of it, we are looking for like a front door of the campus kind of feel, so it is supposed to be a very large walkway, steps. There is massive grading differences there, so we are actually going to have to do kind of 2 steps up, 1 exterior, 1 interior to adjoin it to the Welcome Center building, so that's why we went with kind of this massive step, but it is not a driveway.

Mr. Goldsmith said and the Welcome Center is #31. They are trying to connect it on the back side as well.

Mr. Sieben said it sounds like Bruce what you are saying is any new areas you'll meet the stormwater ordinance, but you'd like to do structured detention. Is that correct?

Mr. Goldsmith said yes with respect to the existing campus. We're not contemplating necessarily doing any new impervious area because we are contemplating using the houses. If we acquire houses on the west, we are planning to use the houses, so we wouldn't be changing the existing terrain at all. On the south, if we either do, and Dan and I have had a little discussion, it is possible that we have parking over detention, not necessarily structured detention, or it is possible that we would just be able to gain detention and have more buildable area on campus. It is going to take a while to get to that, so I don't know if that benefit is going to be there. We are going to need the parking before we start acquiring much of that area. To the extent that these houses become available, we also have a limited pool of money which has to be allocated, particularly to try to deal with the parking issues and relocation issues. That's going to be our first goal.

Mr. Frankino said we have no issues.

1 Planning Council 10/31/2017

Notes: Mrs. Vacek said I'm working on some revisions to the Plan Description and then I will be sending those out, my comments. The 3 houses are ready to go. This is all planned to go on the November 29th Planning Commission. It will be a special Planning Commission.

Mr. Sieben said Dan there are a few comments we are going to need from Engineering on the Master Plan on the Plan Description. If we could just get that this week, that would be great.

1 Planning Council 11/07/2017

Notes: Mrs. Vacek said we met with Aurora University on Friday afternoon to kind of talk through some of the Plan Description Revision changes. I'll be getting those out formally to them and will be moving this to the November 29th Planning Commission for a public hearing.

1 Planning Council 11/14/2017

Notes: Mrs. Vacek said for the Plan Description Revision we did send out comments to them. We did meet with them a couple of weeks ago, so they are aware of that. We are still looking at some of the sections. Engineering needs to get their comments done and send them over to them also.

1 Planning Council 11/21/2017 Forwarded Planning Commission 11/29/2017 Pass

Action Text: A motion was made by Mrs. Vacek, seconded by Mrs. Morgan, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Planning Commission, on the agenda for 11/29/2017. The motion carried by voice vote.

Notes: Mrs. Vacek said this is actually going to be continued at public hearing. We did publish for this for next week. However, it is going to be continued. We do need to vote this out because it is going to go to Planning Commission. I do make a motion to vote this out. There will probably be some conditions. We are still working with Aurora University on some of those discussion items. I do make a motion to vote both of these out and then they would go to Planning Commission next week, but then they would be continued to a date a little bit down the line. Mrs. Morgan seconded the motion.

Mr. Feltman said well Engineering had a few comments. They probably have not seen them because it was just recently added.

Mr. Sieben said right. We had an initial meeting with Aurora University representatives. We've supplied them with those comments. I think we are in general agreement on that, so I think it is really some Engineering comments and then the bigger issue is our resolving the parking issues. We have a motion and a second to vote this out. This will go to the November 29th Planning Commission next week, but it will be continued to a later date.

The motion carried unanimously.

2 Planning Commission 11/29/2017 Held in Planning Commission Pass

Action Text: A motion was made by Mrs. Cole, seconded by Mrs. Head, that this agenda item be continued to a future date to be determined. The motion carried.

Notes: Mrs. Vacek said at the request of the Petitioner we would also like for a continuance on this one. Again, we don't have any future date, so they will need to republish, re-sign, as well as send out new notices.

MOTION TO CONTINUE WAS MADE BY: Mrs. Cole

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mrs. Head

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

NAYS: None

Aye: 9 At Large Bergeron, At Large Cameron, At Large Cole, At Large Pilmer, Aurora Twnshp Representative Reynolds, At Large Anderson, Fox Metro Representative Divine, At Large Owusu-Safo and SD 129 Representative Head

3 Planning Commission 04/18/2018 Held in Planning Commission Pass

Action Text: A motion was made by Mrs. Cole, seconded by Mr. Chambers, that this agenda item be continued until the June 6, 2018 Planning Commission meeting. The motion carried.

Notes: See Attachment for Item 17-00950.

Aye: 11 At Large Bergeron, At Large Cameron, At Large Cole, At Large Pilmer, Aurora Twnshp Representative Reynolds, At Large Anderson, Fox Metro Representative Divine, SD 204 Representative Duncan, Fox Valley Park District Representative Chambers, At Large Owusu-Safo and SD 129 Representative Head

4 Planning Commission 06/06/2018 Forwarded Planning & Development Committee 06/14/2018 Pass

Action Text: A motion was made by Mr. Cameron, seconded by Mrs. Anderson, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Planning & Development Committee, on the agenda for 6/14/2018. The motion carried.

Notes: 9 Our next item is an ordinance

- 10 approving a revision to the Aurora University Plan
- 11 Description and Master Plan for 45.7 acres on
- 12 Property located west of Gladstone Avenue, east of
- 13 and along the west frontage of Evanslawn Avenue
- 14 between Marseillaise Place and Prairie Street, south
- 15 of and along the north side of Marseillaise Place
- 16 between Calumet Avenue and Gladstone, and north side
- 17 of Prairie Street. Aurora University, Ward 4.
- 18 This is a public hearing.
- 19 And I would ask for a motion to
- 20 include the April 18th minutes in this evening's
- 21 hearing minutes.
- 22 COMMISSIONER COLE: So moved.
- 23 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.
- 24 CHAIRWOMAN TRUAX: It's been moved and

24

1 seconded.

2 Would you call the roll, please.

3 MS. JACKSON: Mrs. Anderson.

4 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yes.

5 MS. JACKSON: Mr. Cameron.
6 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes.
7 MS. JACKSON: Mrs. Cole.
8 COMMISSIONER COLE: Yes.
9 MS. JACKSON: Mr. Divine.
10 COMMISSIONER DIVINE: Yes.
11 MS. JACKSON: Mrs. Head.
12 COMMISSIONER HEAD: Yes.
13 MS. JACKSON: Mr. Pilmer.
14 COMMISSIONER PILMER: Yes.
15 MS. VACEK: So I'm just going to give you a
16 brief overview of what the changes were and then
17 I'll turn it over to the petitioner.

18 The petitioner is requesting a
19 revision to the Aurora University Special Use
20 Planned Development and Master Plan.
21 The revision to the documents address
22 the proposed expansion area, the future growth of
23 the campus, the increased parking ratio, the updated
24 storm water requirement for future development, and

25

1 the elimination of the University's participation in
2 the special service area for Evanslawn.
3 In addition to that, since this last
4 was heard on April 18th, staff has worked with the
5 University and we have added language in there to --
6 in regards to the shared cost of replacing and
7 upsizing the existing water main which serves the
8 central part of the current campus.

9 What that does is the north part
10 can't have anymore buildings built on that northern
11 part unless -- until the water main is upsized to be
12 able to handle that fire flow -- or for the fire
13 flow.

14 In addition, the petitioner is
15 proposing a new expansion area, which is
16 approximately 5.7 [sic] acres called Expansion Area
17 in the 2018 master plan. This area is located along
18 the west frontage of Evanslawn between Prairie
19 Street and Marseillaise and it's currently zoned R-1
20 zoning.

21 The University does not own any of
22 these properties at this time. After the University
23 acquires any of these properties, again, they would
24 need to petition the City to add them into the

26

1 University plan description.

2 These areas would be used for office,
3 graduate or facility housing, rental housing for
4 employees, nontraditional classrooms and studios,
5 and single family residence, excluding fraternities
6 or sororities.

7 In addition, in the 2012 master plan,
8 the 2018 master plan indicates the location of
9 future buildings and additions within the original
10 campus, it also updates and shows the construction
11 of the recent buildings that were built in the last
12 five years and then it also -- the plan also

13 indicates the additional -- the addition to the west
14 side of the Alumni Hall, a future parking deck, a
15 parking lot, and some other future University
16 buildings.

17 With that, I'll turn it over to the
18 petitioner and he can get into a little bit more
19 detail.

20 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Is there a specific
21 definition of north area in regards to that water
22 main thing?

23 MS. VACEK: It's really just based on if they
24 can handle the fire flow.

27

1 There's one water main that they need
2 to upsize in order for the water flow to be met, so
3 we've been working with engineering on that.

4 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: But the north area
5 comes down, is there a definition as to what that
6 area is?

7 MS. VACEK: I can point it out to you.

8 Hold on a second.

9 So, it's basically --

10 MR. SIEBEN: Pick a number, the building
11 number.

12 MR. GOLDSMITH: North of 17.

13 MS. VACEK: North of 17.

14 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: But not including 17?

15 MS. VACEK: No.

16 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Any of the buildings

17 that are above that point would be --

18 MS. VACEK: Correct.

19 And there's some portion of the west

20 side of that area that actually has the 12-inch

21 water main already, so it's just looping that water

22 main to connect to the other 12-inch.

23 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.

24 CHAIRWOMAN TRUAX: Are there other questions

28

1 for staff?

2 If not, if the petitioner would like

3 to make comments.

4 MR. GOLDSMITH: Good evening.

5 Bruce Goldsmith from the Dykema Law

6 Firm. Happy to be here representing Aurora

7 University.

8 I really don't want to take you

9 through this all over again, and I thought Tracey

10 gave you most of the highlights.

11 I thought that it would be useful

12 just to mention that one of the things that we've

13 been working on is the notion of actually building a

14 parking deck and that would be in the general area

15 of No. 35, which is at the southwest -- it's in that

16 Expansion Area No. 2 part of the campus.

17 And -- do you have ability to put an

18 arrow on it?

19 MR. SIEBEN: No.

20 MR. GOLDSMITH: You can't.

21 MR. SIEBEN: *I can zoom in on it.*
22 MR. GOLDSMITH: *With respect to the properties*
23 *west of Evanslawn, if we're allowed to acquire those*
24 *properties, it is the intention of the University*

29

1 *and the commitment to the City that they would*
2 *remain single family residential structures. There*
3 *would be no physical expansion by way of new*
4 *buildings on that west side or by parking lots. We*
5 *would use those houses as we have previously used*
6 *houses for offices. We've never actually used it*
7 *for residential, but we have the ability to use it*
8 *for faculty housing or graduate student housing and*
9 *the other uses like studios and classroom use in the*
10 *existing structures would be things that we could*
11 *do.*

12 *But the intention is to maintain a*
13 *residential buffer to the west, and, therefore,*
14 *there would be no new construction on Evanslawn.*

15 *With respect to Mr. Cameron's*
16 *question about the water main. Some of the water*
17 *main on the north part of the campus is older. Some*
18 *will be replaced just due to obsolescence at some*
19 *point. Some of it may be as old as 80 years old.*

20 *If we build a new building, we'll*
21 *need to get the fire flows up. We currently have*
22 *substantial redundant loop system for the south part*
23 *where all the newer buildings are, and so they are*
24 *all served by adequate flow with 12-inch main.*

1 So it's -- just to be honest, there
2 really is no intention to put another building on
3 the north side of the campus. There's not much room
4 to do it.

5 At one time, some of you may
6 remember, we were actually proposing putting a
7 dormitory on the north side, expanding an existing
8 dormitory, and we ended up putting that on the
9 southwest side of the campus.

10 So I'd be happy to answer any
11 questions.

12 CHAIRWOMAN TRUAX: Any questions for the
13 petitioner?

14 COMMISSIONER COLE: The parking lot, there's a
15 timeline as to when that is to be built; is that
16 correct?

17 MR. GOLDSMITH: Well, we're planning to build
18 it during 2018/'19, so the next calendar year --
19 well, the next class year.

20 Originally we intended to do it after
21 classes ended next spring. We may accelerate that
22 process.

23 And we're looking at different
24 designs which have different capacities, but we've

1 committed to the City to build at least 360 parking
2 spaces.

3 COMMISSIONER COLE: Thank you.

4 CHAIRWOMAN TRUAX: Any other questions for the
5 petitioner?

6 No?

7 I thank you.

8 This is a public hearing, so if you
9 have questions or comments for us, this is your
10 opportunity to address us.

11 MR. SIEBEN: I can swear everyone in at the
12 same time.

13 (Ms. Gloria Moran sworn.)

14 MS. MORAN: My name is Gloria Moran. I have
15 property on Prairie by Gladstone.

16 MR. SIEBEN: What's your address?

17 MS. MORAN: 1210 Prairie.

18 I just had a concern.

19 Does that mean because I'm on the
20 township side but I still received the letter, the
21 University wants to buy off our properties or -- I
22 guess I came in at the end of it, so ...

23 MR. SIEBEN: No. There would not be any
24 expansion south of Prairie.

32

1 MS. MORAN: Okay.

2 CHAIRWOMAN TRUAX: Anyone else wish to address
3 the Commission?

4 If not, I'm going to close the public
5 hearing and ask for a staff recommendation.

6 MS. VACEK: Staff would recommend approval of
7 the revision to the Aurora University Plan

8 Description and Master Plan for 45.7 acres on the
9 property located west of Gladstone Avenue, east of
10 and along the west frontage of Evanslawn Avenue
11 between Marseillaise Place and Prairie Street, south
12 of and along the north side of Marseillaise Place
13 between Calumet Avenue and Gladstone, and north side
14 of Prairie -- and the north side of Prairie Street
15 with the following condition -- and, actually, I
16 take that back.

17 So we actually worked out the plan
18 description so we don't need the condition anymore.
19 So the plan description has been worked out.

20 CHAIRWOMAN TRUAX: Okay. You've heard the
21 staff recommendation.

22 What's the wish of the Commission?

23 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Move for approval.

24 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Second.

33

1 CHAIRWOMAN TRUAX: It's been moved and
2 seconded.

3 Would you call the roll, please.

4 MS. JACKSON: Mrs. Anderson.

5 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yes.

6 MS. JACKSON: Mr. Cameron.

7 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes.

8 MS. JACKSON: Mrs. Cole.

9 COMMISSIONER COLE: Yes.

10 MS. JACKSON: Mr. Divine.

11 COMMISSIONER DIVINE: Yes.

12 MS. JACKSON: Mrs. Head.
13 COMMISSIONER HEAD: Yes.
14 MS. JACKSON: Mr. Pilmer.
15 COMMISSIONER PILMER: Yes.
16 CHAIRWOMAN TRUAX: The motion carries.
17 We'll do the findings of fact.
18 Is the proposal in accordance with
19 all applicable official physical development
20 policies and other related official plans and
21 policies of the City of Aurora?
22 COMMISSIONER COLE: These are listed in the
23 staff report.
24 CHAIRWOMAN TRUAX: Does the proposal represent

34

1 the logical establishment and/or consistent
2 extension of the requested classification in
3 consideration of the existing land uses, existing
4 zoning classifications, and essential character of
5 the general area of the property in question?
6 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yes, it does.
7 CHAIRWOMAN TRUAX: Is the proposal consistent
8 with a desirable trend of development in the general
9 area of the property in question, occurring since
10 the property in question was placed in its present
11 zoning classification, desirability being defined as
12 the trend's consistency with applicable official
13 physical development policies and other related
14 official plans and policies of the City of Aurora?
15 Well, I believe the proposal is

16 consistent with the desirable trend of development
17 and certainly the University is an asset to the City
18 of Aurora.

19 Will the proposal maintain a
20 compatible relationship with the traffic pattern and
21 traffic volume of adjacent streets and not have an
22 adverse effect upon traffic or pedestrian movement
23 and safety in the general area of the property in
24 question?

35

1 COMMISSIONER HEAD: Should not have an adverse
2 affect.

3 CHAIRWOMAN TRUAX: Will the proposal allow for
4 the provision of adequate public services and
5 facilities to the property in question and have no
6 adverse effect upon existing public services and
7 facilities?

8 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: They're either in place
9 or will be provided.

10 CHAIRWOMAN TRUAX: Does the proposal take
11 adequate measures or will they be taken to provide
12 ingress and egress so designed as to maximize
13 pedestrian and vehicular circulation ease and
14 safety, minimize traffic congestion, and not
15 substantially increase the congestion in the public
16 streets?

17 COMMISSIONER HEAD: There should be no change.

18 CHAIRWOMAN TRUAX: No. 9a: Will the special
19 use not preclude the normal and orderly development

20 and improvement of surrounding properties due to the
21 saturation or concentration of similar uses in the
22 general area?
23 This should not be an issue with this
24 property.

36

1 Is the special use in all other
2 respects in conformance to the applicable
3 regulations of the district in which it is located,
4 except as such regulations may in each instance be
5 modified by the City Council pursuant to the
6 recommendations of the Plan Commission?
7 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes, it is.
8 CHAIRWOMAN TRUAX: Those are the findings of
9 fact.
10 MS. VACEK: This will be next heard on the
11 June 14th Planning and Development Committee here at
12 City Hall, 5th Floor conference room, at 4:00 p.m.
13 CHAIRWOMAN TRUAX: Okay. Thank you.
14 Thank you all for coming to talk to
15 us.

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

Attachment for Item 17-00950:

17-00950 An Ordinance approving a Revision to the Aurora University Plan Description and Master Plan for 45.7 acres on property located west of Gladstone Avenue, east of and along the west frontage of Evanslawn Avenue between Marseillaise Place and Prairie Street, south of and along the north side of Marseillaise Place between Calumet Avenue and Gladstone, and north side of Prairie Street (Aurora University – 17-00950 / AU20/4-15.172-SU/PD/R – TV – Ward 4) (PUBLIC HEARING)

Mrs. Vacek said the Petitioner is requesting a revision to the Aurora University Special Use Planned Development and Master Plan. The revisions to the document address the proposed expansion area, the future growth of the campus, the increased parking ratio, the updated stormwater requirement for future development and the elimination of the University's participation in the Special Service Area for Evanslawn Avenue. The Petitioner is proposing a new expansion area, which is approximately 5.7 acres called Expansion Campus on the 2018 Master Plan. The area is located along the west frontage of Evanslawn between Prairie Street and Marseillaise and is currently single family dwelling with R-1 zoning. The University does not own any of the properties in the area at this time. After the University acquires any of the properties within the expansion area, the University would need to petition the city to add them to the Aurora University Planned Development as you saw the two that were before this. The area can be used for office, graduate and faculty housing, rental housing for employees, non-traditional classrooms and studios and single family residents, excluding Fraternities and Sorority houses. As in the 2012 Master Plan, the proposed 2018 Master Plan indicated the locations of future buildings and additions within the original campus. These included the future buildings just north of the Parking Lot 19 and the additions to Jenks Hall and the Phillips Library. The 2018 Master Plan is also updated to show the construction of the recently built STEM Partnership Center, the Welcome Center, the Wackerlin Center addition and the additions in the reconfigurations of the parking lot. The proposed plan also indicates the additions to the west side of the Alumni Hall, a future parking deck, a future parking lot and future University buildings. With that, I will turn it over to the Petitioner and he can go into a little bit more detail unless you have questions for me.

Good evening. Bruce Goldsmith again from Dykema law firm representing Aurora University and with me is Carmella Moran, Vice President of Administration. We have 3 slides really to show you. We'll start with this one and I'll kind of walk you through it. This is actually the plan that many of you have seen at various times as we brought new properties in. The campus, the main campus, is kind of scattered with little blue squares and those blue squares are potential places where a building could go. So the library in the northeast corner could have an expansion. There is a dormitory, Jenks Hall, it could have an expansion. There is a series of small additions to buildings around the Parking Lot 24. There is a potential of putting a building where currently there is a flag field, Vago Field, on the west side of the campus, which could also be a location for a possible parking deck. On the south side of the campus, south of Southlawn, so Southlawn is the main street, a very short street, coming in off Evanslawn on the southwest side of the property. We have 35, which is probably the location in which a parking deck would go. There is a placeholder for a library south of that, which would face Prairie. There is a placeholder for what is called a Student Success Center, which is kind of a counseling facility, which is to the west of the proposed library. There is a placeholder without a purpose yet west of the parking deck. So I can give that to you in a little more detail here. So this is a blowup of just the southwest, this is

really Expansion Area #2 for the most part where the light yellow is, actually what's left of Southlawn. The rest of it has been put into parking. The buildings I described are there in a little more easily referenced picture. The newest feature to this is the University would like to have the ability to have some room for expansion. With the amount of parking that has been put on and the addition of a parking deck, that leaves very little room left for new buildings without sacrificing the open space on the campus. So in order to have some room for growth and, in fact, in order to build a parking deck we have to take down a series of houses that are currently in Expansion Area #2, so we want a relief valve from that so we are proposing that we could cross Evanslawn and acquire houses along the west of Evanslawn. Again, these would only be voluntary purchases. If people want to stay there, they can stay there as long as they want. It, obviously, took us many years before we acquired properties in Expansion Areas 1 and 2, so we are in no hurry. If houses became available, we would make them probably initially for offices and then the other uses that Tracey described. That's the real big tweak to this. Otherwise, it is just kind of putting placeholders where we might put buildings and most immediately addressing concerns of the neighbors for parking and our solution to that is actually a parking deck. This would be a 3 story deck. It would hold about 360 cars. This is just an architect's rendering of what it might look like. The final design hasn't been decided, but the general design would be parking would be right at grade for the first level and then 2 grades above that. The whole deck would not be much more than 20 feet high, so it wouldn't be an imposing structure. Initially it will be visible from Prairie when the library goes in. The library will basically mask the deck and so it will be really a structure that's internal to the campus for all practical purposes. The idea is that that would increase the on-site parking substantially. We have a program that we are putting in place that would maximize the use of the deck by staff and faculty to insure that we get maximum use of the deck. We actually have maximized the use of the parking lots that are there. We currently have 1,057 parking spaces and this would add 360 more. In addition to that, if we go back to this picture, so as we acquired houses on Southlawn from what was Randall Road extended we put parking in what is 33A and that parking would continue west all the way to Southlawn because the city has allowed us to vacate the street when there are no longer any single family residences on the street. At the time we acquire the last house, we would then vacate that and we would acquire an additional 45 parking spaces. The short range plan is to build the deck in 2019. The long range plan is to have the flexibility, if we acquire the last house, to vacate the rest of Southlawn and to give us a relief valve, the right to buy a house if it became available. I'd be happy to answer questions.

Chairman Truax said what is the timeframe for the library then?

Mr. Goldsmith said the library depends on fundraising, so the stars have to align and then it could happen. Actually the original plan was to build a Student Success Center, which is a fairly small, 6,000 to 7,000 square foot building. The library would have a roughly 20,000 square foot footprint, a 2 story building. We are still in the initial stages of design. Do we want 2 buildings or do we want 1 building? Could both functions be in a single building that would be multi-purpose? Do we have fundraising potential to do that? It is not yet on the horizon, but if things happen in a nice way it could happen fairly soon.

Chairman Truax said and then what would be the plans for the current library on Gladstone?

Mr. Goldsmith said it would be repurposed. There are other uses the University could make of the space.

Mrs. Head said how many houses is that that you are looking at that will be taken off the tax rolls eventually?

Mr. Goldsmith said I haven't counted. I think Tracey is counting them. While she is looking, what I would note is the University has a tremendous economic engine capability for the city and so while it is true that some homes would be taken off the tax rolls, the generation through taxes, sales taxes, salaries and staff, faculty and students who live in Aurora generate a lot of money to the city independent of that.

Mrs. Vacek said I believe it is 13.

Mr. Goldsmith said she said 13.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said I have a question about the expansion areas and those property owners. If they decide to sell, can they sell it to anyone or you become the only potential buyer of those properties?

Mr. Goldsmith said they can sell to anyone. The history has been that the University has always offered more than the current market value in order to make it attractive to sell to the University and I don't think we've had a single house that didn't turn over and sell to the University because the University would get an appraisal and offer something more than the appraisal. Actually through the last round you might appreciate because the housing market was tough for a while and the University was not only probably the only buyer other than people were buying to use for rental housing, but it was also the strongest buyer because it was paying more than fair market value for the homes.

Mr. Cameron said has there been any further prevention? We're looking at 2020 for occupancy of the parking garage my guess would be.

Mr. Goldsmith said it would be the fall of 2019.

Mr. Cameron said completed then?

Mr. Goldsmith said yes. It is a 6 month project. It would start in the spring of 2019 and be complete for the fall semester.

Mr. Cameron said so that would be 8 months from now?

Mr. Goldsmith said a year and 4 months from now.

Mr. Cameron said what about parking in place? We're going to have a disturbed torn up campus. Have there been any thoughts or suggestions for the timeframe?

Mr. Goldsmith said we have an interim plan and we also have a construction plan. So the interim plan is that the University has committed to the city and the neighbors that we would move 150 cars off the streets this coming year and we would do that by regulating certain people who currently don't have to park on campus to park on campus or find other ways to deal with it. It may be relocating classes because we have a facility on Sequoia as well, so we have several different ways we can adjust. Class schedules may be another way, so that is 150 off this year. Then, of course, in the following year we would have the 360 spaces. During construction, we have left the land between Prairie and the parking deck open with the understanding that the construction staging would be south of the parking deck, so it wouldn't interfere with any of the parking lots or on campus parking. We would not lose any capacity during the construction process.

Mr. Cameron said on the height of the placeholder buildings, you mentioned certain spaces from Prairie and from the external streets are 30 foot height and then 50 or 60 foot height. What is the height of the existing new center that has the auditorium and stuff in it?

Mr. Goldsmith said I'm thinking it is in the 35 to 40 foot range, maybe a little less. The top off is the main administration building, which is 45 feet high. The way the Plan Description is written, based on the setback from the street it allows us to have more height the farther you are set back. But we don't have plans for any building at this point. That's more the equivalent of a 2 story building, but we do have the right to build a taller building under the existing plan and that right wouldn't change under the next plan.

Mr. Cameron said and that would be typically if you added additional student housing or would that be classrooms?

Mr. Goldsmith said so we build a dormitory that may be 30 feet plus that is kind of interior to the campus next to the Institute Building. But the type of buildings we are talking about building are either 1 or 2 story buildings. With the deck, even though it is 3 levels, it is really no more than a 2 story building.

Mr. Cameron said I think it is a great thing that you are finally putting a parking deck in. My question would be the guidelines and trigger mechanisms and all of that. Is there a change other than the change to 25% to 30%? Are all the other factors still the same in that what are the trigger mechanisms? Does it just apply to full time students? Is it full time equivalent students? What are those factors? It seems overtime formulas that have been used have a relatively slow response time and I would hope that we could solve that problem where the reaction is closer to it and that might be to Ed.

Mr. Goldsmith said no, I can answer those questions. So there are several things going on. One thing is in order to address parking without actually building more parking is we moved graduate student programs to the Orchard Center. That moved hundreds of cars off the street, at least at nighttime, and also changed the demand on campus. That's one thing. The second thing is that we do use full time equivalent as the measure. We report to the city every fall the full time equivalents. The standard was .25. It is now, in the new plan that you will hear about, .3, but it also gives us the flexibility again to move other programs off campus as opposed to just building more parking. Parking is confiscatory in 2 ways. One, it takes up land that we would like to use, and this is already a really tight urban campus to

begin with and secondly it costs a lot of money to build. This deck is a \$10 million dollar improvement. That's the equivalent of a library or an academic building. So to the extent that we can avoid that, that would be great, but the time has come that we need to do it. On the other hand, we've been successful in increasing under graduate enrollment. Whether that can continue is unclear because there is a lot of changes in financing of public universities and private universities, in this case too, with state funding, which a great number of the students coming to Aurora University are from the Aurora area and rely on support from state funding. The state funding is uncertain from year to year and so that could affect the enrollment. We are also seeing students who can't afford the living costs, so they are living at home and commuting to school. There are a lot of things changing in the marketplace. You saw a few years ago that all of a sudden parents were buying houses for students. People were buying rental houses for students and that created a different dynamic so that we had less demand for a dormitory. Now the change in the marketplace is it is harder to pay your tuition and pay for room and board too, so we are seeing other types of changes in the marketplace that may affect students going to private universities like Aurora University, even though it is the most economical private university in the state.

Mr. Cameron said is there anything you could post or anything that shows how a full time equivalent student body how that gets calculated? Is there a break point at 1 class or 3 classes?

Mr. Goldsmith said it is a federal standard. We have to report to the federal government every year. I don't know if Carmella wants to answer that question. It is called IPEDS, but it is a federal formula, so we just follow the formula the federal government gives us. It has worked as a reasonable measure too. What we provide for is if in 2 or 4 semesters we see an increase of more than the equivalent of 50 spaces then we have to do something. Either we have to find alternative ways or we have to build more parking or whatever. So what's been operative up to now is that the 10,057 until this year met the requirements and now with an increase in enrollment we have to do something else and so we're not going to just meet the formula, but we are going to build beyond the formula in order to have excess capacity, so that's the purpose of the deck.

Mr. Cameron said and that would be a part of my question because if 10,057 meets the requirements, but the neighborhood has been worsened over that timeframe in terms of penetration of student parking into, I realize that's a multi-factor. It is also part of the problem we had in 2008/2009 with a lot of rental properties being added to the community and that has worsened the parking intended to move it out. I don't know where to point, but there is supposedly an Ordinance coming to help regulate some of that rental parking and my question would be is does that have the potential for solving some of the problems in parking in the rental housing, which I understand you don't control, because it is taking care of your students?

Mr. Goldsmith said I don't want to speculate because that's a whole different policy issue, but from what we've seen so far it is also possible that less students will want to live near campus and will live at home, basically in Aurora, and commute. So it may have the unintended consequence of putting more demand on the University relating to parking. It is really difficult to say at this time how the City Council will ultimately decide how to regulate. That may change it too because right now it is designed to regulate single family homes and also other kinds of residential housing where you have more than 3 unrelated persons living there. Yes it could affect some of the housing that students currently rent. It could change the economics of renting such that landlords decide to reduce the 3 to avoid the cost of

the additional changes that would have to be made to the physical structures and as a result, that could boost the price and, therefore, push some of our students out of the market.

Mr. Cameron said I hate to sound like an old fogey, but we have a unit with 6 not too far from our house and we live about 5 blocks from the campus and it seems as though none of them can find shoes to buy because they all drive their cars the 5 blocks and further clog up the campus.

Mr. Goldsmith said well we're not quite yet into those lifestyle changes. What we have done is we've substantially controlled the conduct of our students in the neighborhood other than walking so that we've reduced the complaints from the neighbors with respect to the students living off campus. We are proud of the work that we've done.

Mr. Cameron said I was going to say over the last year that has definitely improved in a couple of spots.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said I was looking at the Master Plan expansion area. Apparently the proposed area abuts private properties. Have there been any community outreach to the property owners? What kind of responses have you received or what are some of the ideas that you've come up with to kind of separate private residents from potential public area right in their back yard?

Mr. Goldsmith said so as part of our Master Plan we have a commitment to meet with the community annually and actually we've met with them twice in the last 3 months and we presented these concepts during those meetings. In fact, the original plan had more expansion with going south of Prairie and we backed off of that. With respect to the west side of Evanslawn, we've restricted the use so that other than the fact that the University will own the house, it won't look any different to the neighbors than it does today, the neighbors to the west, unless the physical structure is just dilapidated and can't be reused. All those houses will be reused for functions that would appear to be the same as a single family home. They might be an office. They may be a studio. They might be a faculty housing, but they won't change their physical appearance so there won't be any real impact on the neighborhood from that standpoint.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said so there is no like thoughts to maybe return all the lawns into like parking around building?

Mr. Goldsmith said no. If they are rental housing, apparently they are going to be regulated by a new Ordinance. But as properties of the University the goal is to just use them for the functions that allow us to get some relief valve for offices and stuff that we need in order to tear down buildings in order to build the parking deck.

Chairman Truax said what's the current enrollment?

Mr. Goldsmith said well the FTE is a little over 4,000 under grads. Most of the graduate programs are now at the Orchard Center.

Mrs. Cole said I have a question on the parking deck. One place in the report I read there was going to be 350 parking spaces and then I read there were going to be 355 and then tonight you said 360. If we wait another 6 months we might be up to 400.

Mr. Goldsmith said the exact configuration has not been submitted to the city for approval. We have to have so many handicap spaces and stuff like that so it is just an estimate. In fact, I was kind of leaving it at 350. I don't know why I said 360. It is significantly in the neighborhood of 350, but the exact configuration hasn't been worked out yet. We have a theoretical design, but we don't have the practical design worked out yet, but we knew enough to know that we can get that many spaces in the 350 range.

Mrs. Cole said I have another question in regard to the height of a building on the campus. Did I read or misread that the maximum height would be 60 feet?

Mr. Goldsmith said I think you misread because the administration building, I believe, tops off at 45 feet and I think that's what everything is measured at.

Mrs. Cole said I thought it was in...

Mr. Cameron said it says 60.

Mrs. Cole said okay. I did not misread. It does say 60 somewhere in the report.

Mr. Cameron said in the spot where the setbacks and that type of thing are. In that portion.

Mr. Goldsmith said from the original plan I think we preserved this in the newest version, we always use the administration building as the measuring standard.

Mrs. Cole said so if there is, in fact, in the report that's been printed, it might be an incorrect number and maybe it needs to be corrected back to what you thought it was.

Mr. Goldsmith said I think part of it was that, and there may have been general standards where up to a certain feet from the street you had one level. If you were back more than it is another level.

Mrs. Vacek said so the Plan Description for the height of the buildings hasn't changed since the 2012 one. If a portion of the structure is located within 30 feet from the public right-of-way, the height is 40 feet within that zone. If a portion of the structure is located within 50 feet or more from the public right-of-way the max is 60 feet.

Mr. Goldsmith said I guess your question had me fixated on the height of the administration building, which I remember we actually measured because somebody asked well how does it relate to what's there and that's 45. We have no plans to build any higher, but we want the flexibility if the right opportunity came.

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

My name is Douglas Kullan. I live at 239 S. Calumet, just north of the University. I haven't heard anybody say anything about compensatory stormwater storage with the new plan. It looks like some of those new facilities are going to take up quite a bit of space. Where is the stormwater going to go? Is there a plan for that?

My name is Elijor Heli. I just bought the property at 303 Evanslawn, just west of the University. Nobody can buy a house and sell back maybe within the next 3 or 5 months. It was not my idea. I assume that there were plans maybe around 2013 or 2012, so maybe there is some (inaudible) information. It is not too transparent for the public. From the City of Aurora and from the University you did not give enough information to the public for those especially buying new houses in that area. If I knew that maybe the house was listed for sale and there is information telling me that well these properties will be maybe bought by the University, I would not have gone for the transaction. So maybe you need to make the process more transparent for the public. Thank you very much.

Hello. My name is Bonnie Kunkle and I live at 1527 Prairie Street, which is just 1 house away from some of the property that is highlighted to be added to the Master Plan. So I have a personal interest and familiarity with the area. The first thing that I would like to ask is how can we, the interested persons, get copies of the map and the proposals because when we had this hearing scheduled before I tried to get copies and I was told I had to FOIA it? I FOIA'd the city to which the city sent me a copy of my own FOIA request. They didn't even give me a copy of the written proposal, whatever you want to call it, agenda, ordinance, proposed ordinance and just said that that was not available under FOIA. That's crazy. I'm sorry, but in order for people who are interested and affected to be able to give you good input and give our Alderman and Mayor good input, we need to have access to this information. That's number one. But now to go more substantively to the things that we heard about tonight. First I'd like to talk about some things that are, well one, the whole 60 foot idea. We've been told it won't be more than 45 feet, but gee they'd like flexibility. Well we in the neighborhood don't really appreciate that sort of flexibility. We request that at a minimum, the maximum height be decreased to the 45 feet. That's number one. Number two, we saw a picture tonight of the proposed parking garage and the big AU on it certainly looks pretty garish to me when I think about the residential character of the neighborhood where my house and most in the area were built in the early 1950's. Indeed, a Prairie style house is one story and so we are going to have a 20 to 25 foot high big AU possibly in blue letters. It does not fit with the character. It does not fit with the character of the neighborhood unless you want to make the statement, and perhaps the University does, that this is the University neighborhood and, indeed, that's kind of what's going on is as a neighborhood we feel like the University is taking over and perhaps putting a little too much claim. We want to keep our neighborhood. I like the University, but we don't want to lose the character of our neighborhood in order to give the University more expansion and certainly more expansion than it might need. So that's one thing about that. The other thing I want to say pertains to the issue of taking property to the west of Evanslawn. Now as we looked at the pictures, we saw nice bright colors and numbers indicating what the specific plans were for that block of area, which is pretty much property that they have acquired and they have certain things they want to do with it and that's great or at least for the most part understandable. But then there is this large grey area to the west of Evanslawn where there are 13 homes that are going to be put into the Master Plan and, of course, there are at least another 13 homes, which are immediately contiguous to those that are going to be very much affected by being literally shoulder to shoulder with these new AU properties.

The question, of course, becomes why? That is a major, major impact upon the neighborhood. That's blocks of homes and why? Why is that necessary? Why is it necessary to take 3 blocks along Evanslawn and take all those homes? Why is it necessary to encroach upon Prairie and put up another sign? I'm sure it will say Office of something or another, Aurora University, on Prairie. Why? For what reason? Because, as their lawyer has told us, they are running out of open space. Well so are we. We are running out of open space too and by giving properties over to them, that doesn't improve anybody's open space. In fact, they said they intend to keep the buildings as is. No open space, no. That's not the reason. So what did he say they are going to do with those spaces? Well we want to have them available for graduate students to be able to live in was one of the things. Well, we've already heard that graduate classes aren't even taking place on this campus, so it makes no sense to have graduate students need to take over neighborhood homes. What else? Well, we might need them for offices. Why do offices have to be in these little spaces? These are small ranch houses for the most part that they are looking to take over. They were never built for offices. It is going to be incredibly inefficient. It doesn't make any sense and there is no reason to think that the offices would need to be contiguous to Vago Field anyway. That's doesn't make a lot of sense. He said well we'd like to be able to have them for rental property. And boy, this is really where I get excited because I say you know I spend about \$1,000 a month on property taxes to live in this neighborhood and if I were to rent my house I have to factor that extra \$1,000 a month into my rent, but I'm going to compete with folks who are renting from the University and guess what? Because they are renting from the University there's no \$1,000 in property taxes that the University is paying. The University is going to be paying nothing in property taxes, so they can give out lower rental rates to compete with neighbors whose actual property values are going higher because the University when it occasionally buys property, buys it at a premium, which makes all of us look like we can sell our property for a lot more. Well no, not all of us. Only the few selected who are on the Master Plan. So this is just simply not fair and it doesn't make good economic sense that you take property off the property rolls to give it to a not for profit that actually intends to use it to compete with the neighborhood homeowners who are actually paying taxes. It doesn't make sense at all. We have not been told any reason that the University needs these properties or certainly that they need them now, in which case I say, and I think most of the neighborhood would say, take those 13 houses out of this proposed plan because we are very upset about it. You'll find lots of people have lots of different reasons they are upset about it. Me personally because I'm on Prairie and like I said, just one house away from what is the house likely to be acquired by them. By the way, they are cutting in the middle of the block of Prairie too, which is sort of front corridor, a show street for the City of Aurora. Realize that this is the front of not just leading into the University, but also fronts on the Aurora Country Club, so they are encroaching into that area, which previously these homes have been considered to be high value, high visibility homes and now they are taking more and more of those. In addition, I know for me, I anticipate there being some traffic problems because it happens streets aren't always entirely level and just going a block to the east of me, which is about where they are going to be acquiring the home, it is higher and I can't see cars that are coming toward me until they are just about maybe one house away and since they are going unfortunately a little more than 25 or 30 miles an hour, usually 40, it is already kind of dangerous and I think that simply just by building the parking garage we are going to have even more cars on Prairie and that's something that we need to take into consideration. I think we are more likely to be having some accidents in that area. But interestingly, oddly, although I think that there is some value to having the parking garage it is not going to be very valuable for that particular house that's on the corner of Prairie and Evanslawn. Whoever is going to that is not going to walk a couple of blocks over to the parking garage. They are not going to park in the

parking garage. They are going to park on Prairie. So whatever advantage there was to homeowners on Prairie from the parking garage is going to be diminished by the fact that another home on Prairie is going to become University and be drawing additional cars. So I think those are some pretty good reasons that I'm not happy about it and I'm sure other people have their reasons too. Thank you for your time.

I'm Emmy Lou John. I live 1541 Kenilworth Place in Aurora, Illinois. I've lived there over 18 years. I knew I was moving into a university area when I moved in. However, I did not expect the University to expand as much as it did and I'm sure the University is very proud of it; however, the neighbors are not so ecstatic about that fact. When our property was platted in the beginning, it was listed as a country estates so, of course, that means there are no sidewalks and there are no curbs or gutters for cars to park on. Over 3 years ago, we had some meetings at Wesley United Methodist Church where the neighbors were brought in to talk about some of the things and the major one issue was parking. So I must say thank you to Aurora University for the idea of the parking garage. However, if they continue to expand their population of students, it is not going to do much for the neighborhood. Yes, the graduate students when they moved off campus, it was a help, but we still have parking on our streets. I did take a picture, which I won't bore you with tonight, except that I want to tell you that it is mud in our streets right now because the students park on the grass of people's, at least their right tires are often on the grass and when it is muddy like this it just comes out, goes on the road and our roads are muddy when we drive into our house over those roads and then the mud comes onto our driveway and then it gets into our house. The parking problem is going to be alleviated for a while, but I am still quite concerned about what it going to be happening. The first gentleman spoke about the water concerns. This neighborhood has had grave water issues because I believe some of the original piping that was put in by the University went into smaller city piping and so it was not unusual for the sewer across the street from we when there was a rain for it to be shooting up this high out of the sewer. We did get some new pipes in. It helped a bit, but still is a problem, so I do hope that the University will be addressing the issue of permeable parking and that the water situation will be taken care of. I think that's really one of the major things. Then the speaker before me asked the question, and I think you talk about it after we are all through, about what the impact would be on the neighborhood and I do wonder what it means to have 350 more cars exiting through the day where they are going to come out, how they are going to move into the city and what it really will mean if eventually the Aurora University "owns" Evanslawn and what will happen there. So those are some of the questions. Yes, the University has been working with their students to have them mature more speedily than they had in the past and we've appreciated it. We have nice young women who live across the street from us. However, there are 6 people in that house. The driveway holds 2 cars and there are 4, at least, cars out in front of that house all the time and it is a mess. I know this is a difficult situation for all of you, but I hope you will take it into consideration how the neighbors are feeling about it. I am, indeed, happy about the parking. It will alleviate it for a while, maybe until I die. Thank you.

Hi. My name is Sherry Pierce. I am here speaking for my sister Annette Olin, who purchased a property over at 1539 Southlawn just recently. I would like to know, and my sister would like to know, where those 2018 proposed plans are. I've looked on all of the city website. I can't find anything. I've looked at Aurora U website and I can't find anything. That's where I actually found the 2012 plan. They've got it up on their site. Let's get it out to the neighborhood and to the people who actually own property in that area so they can see and make up their minds about what's going on and whether they agree or

disagree with it. My understanding about the 2012 plan is that there is supposed to be a buffer of properties in between the University and personal properties. I would like to know where that's going to come in if they purchase those houses along Evanslawn and then decide to use them as offices. Where is that buffer going to be and what is it going to look like? The University is a great boom to Aurora. I like the idea, but it is like moving in near an airport. You are going to get airplane noise and if you don't like it then maybe you shouldn't live there, but in the same way, the University needs to balance what's going on between the neighborhood who has been there for about the same amount of time, since the 50's. I would like to see a little bit more from the University saying this is what we are looking at doing, this is what we are looking to alleviate certain issues that are going on, and this is what we've done so far. My other question is when the University purchases properties, do they automatically go off the tax rolls at that point or do they go off after they've been rezoned as part of this plan? (Inaudible) college students aren't going to add a lot of revenue, not as much as the property taxes do. They are not spending \$1,000 to \$2,000 a month to make up on those property taxes. Thank you.

My name is John Voelker, 231 S. Glenwood. I had just kind of a technical question. Is the parking deck and the 350, is that net gain or is it going to be built over some existing parking that we'll lose? It is a good thing either way. I'm happy about, but I'm just wondering if the net gain might be a little less. The other thing is an observation that if Evanslawn will be absorbed by the University and closed off then the only connection between Galena and Prairie west of Gladstone will be Western, I guess, and Western is going to see more traffic. Thank you.

Hi. My name is Mary Landers. I live at 328 S. Buell Avenue. I wrote a letter, so I'm just going to read. I am one of the unfortunate 13. This is the map that I wish you were looking at because it is very apparent what will happen to the 13 on S. Buell. It's been our pleasure to watch Aurora U expand and become a beautiful, vibrant University. Whenever somebody asks me where I live I say near Aurora University and they always respond it is beautiful there and I agree. We've always been happy and considered the University a great neighbor. But if you look at the map of the new project, you are going to notice that only one half of the block along Evanslawn is being offered a chance to sell to the University. Unfortunately, those of us who live on the Buell side will see our property values plummet. It is unconscionable to do this to half a block of families. This will increase the number of houses sold to investors, parents of students for University student residences and also dragging the resale of our properties. Please don't let this happen. Don't wait for our property values to decline and then propose buying our homes. I'm asking the University to remain a good neighbor and along with the city include those of us on the Buell side of the block in the same offer as those on the Evanslawn side of the block. Thank you.

Good evening. My name is Mike Timm. We live on Carriage Hill Drive out in San Souci, but my family owns a house at 523 S. Randall and it's been in the family since 1951. Our big concern is traffic and looking at their proposed parking, right now if you are trying to exist S. Randall Road extended on Prairie anytime during the day on a school day you're taking your life into your hands. It seems convenient that the University side of Prairie has no parking allowed on the street. The other side of Prairie has parking allowed to the street. You can't see left. You can't see right. Now they are talking about adding 350 more parking spaces that are going to be exiting somewhere on Prairie, I assume, and what's going to control that traffic? Right now when the students are getting out and they are coming out of the

parking lots that are already there and they are turning left or right onto Prairie, it is just a quagmire. There is no control. You never see anybody out there and you can't see left and you can't see right and it is a real hazardous condition. We are just wondering how they are going to address that now that we've got another 360 cars exiting at the same time. The other question is S. Randall, if a fire truck had to get there during the day, they couldn't because the University students are parking there and once again there are no curbs. They are parking half on the mud and on the street, but you cannot get down it. If the University is going to put 360 more parking spaces on there, what method are they going to use to force students to use that? Thank you.

My name is Tim Kane. I live at 1539 Prairie Street, also representing for lack of a better word, my sister Joanne who owns the house at 1515 Prairie and 1221 Kenilworth. With respect to the closing down of Evanslawn, is there yet a traffic study for what will happen both on Gladstone, which is to the east and Western, which is the north/south street to the right as far as the traffic impact of the close down and if we do have one, can we, we seem to have a lot of requests for documents or extra knowledge?

Carl Franco, 5th Ward Alderman. My address 2070 Carolyn Road. A couple of things. I'm fairly in tune with some of the concerns that the citizens have and have had with AU. Parking is very important, or lack thereof and housing and students and parking on the streets and all the things that come up with the rental properties. The city is working with a group to mitigate, to address the housing for students, housing multi-families, the whole things, so that's probably going to be a benefit going forward. But I will say that parking has always been the number one issue over there in some way, shape or form. The parking deck appears to be a great idea. I've heard concerns before that I've never heard before. Some I think are fairly legitimate. Some I'm trying to figure out exactly how that was going to work with the concerns, but nevertheless, the parking deck overall, from what I've heard from most people, is a good deal. With respect to purchasing the houses on Evanslawn, I've heard concerns tonight that I once again have never heard before. They have not been brought to me, but I will say and I have thought about this in the past, if the University were to purchase those homes and utilize them for what they said they were going to do, that's not a bad deal in that, because we've had this before, and believe me I know because I deal with neighbors all the time, is it better to have the University control that property so if there is a problem they will maintain it, they will not be a bad neighbor. You know exactly who to go to as opposed to a person buying it living in Texas and renting it to some people and not be responsible for the upkeep of the property and other stuff. I kind of look at it a little bit differently. I look at it as though the University is a good neighbor. They certainly do take care of the students and their conduct, so having them purchase properties over a period of time and using them for what they did, I think that might be a good thing. I think we like them responsible because we know if there is a problem we go to the University and they are going to fix it. I don't know if people are taking that into consideration, but I think that's an enhancement or could be, depending on who your neighbor is and, unfortunately, we have some bad neighbors in the City of Aurora. I deal with them all the time. So this kind of mitigates that potential problem. Then talking about vacating the street on Evanslawn, we have not really talked about vacating the street. If AU purchases the house on Evanslawn we'd have that discussion about potentially vacating someday and that was going to be based upon a traffic study and my concern was if the surrounding streets are negatively impacted because of more traffic, then vacating would not be supported by the 5th Ward Alderman, at least this current 5th Ward Alderman because we do not want to negatively affect traffic patterns and that traffic study will come into play. I know I've had that in some other parts of the Ward where people were very concerned about traffic patterns. It didn't

materialize, but there was a traffic study that said that. So I would not be in favor of putting more traffic on Western and all those other streets to vacate Evanslawn unless a study showed there wouldn't be no negative to the community. That is certainly a concern of mine. So I just wanted to throw that out there too. I would ask afterwards, because I have not talked to a lot of the constituents, they have not contacted me, so if you have some concerns afterwards, please see me about those because I have not had a one on one talk with any of you. Thank you.

The public input portion of the public hearing was closed.

Chairman Truax said there was a question for Ed I was going to ask first, but let me go ahead and ask the Petitioner. Compensatory stormwater storage or generally stormwater management.

Mr. Goldsmith said one on one on stormwater, there is developmental storage and there is compensatory storage. This is easily confused, and I'm not making a criticism of the speaker, I just want to make the distinction. If you are in a flood plain and build in a flood plain you have to have compensatory storage outside the flood plain to compensate for taking land into development in the flood plain. Developmental storage is any time you add impervious area on a site and you get over a certain size, which is like a half acre under the city's code, you have to provide developmental storage. So when the University built Parking Lot 19, the University put vaults under that parking lot to actually take care of all of the impervious area from Vago Field, from the parking lots and to have the capacity to build in that area, so that already exists. Any new development in that would require a new developmental storage and because the University prefers vaults over detention ponds, the University would actually build vaults along Prairie. We have one now on the east side of the campus along Prairie where you just see a row of trees and there's actually a vault under those trees south of the Institute Building and south of the parking lot south of the Institute Building. So we would have additional vaults on Prairie and they would be landscaped so it would just be part of the perimeter landscaping of the University. We would meet the city's requirements. That's actually a change in the plan. In the 2012 plan the city gave the University credit for the existing impervious area and the houses we were buying and there was a formula and there was a calculation and we built up these credits. But times have changed and the thinking about stormwater management has changed and so under the new plan the University is committed to building stormwater detention wherever it builds new impervious area and will not get a credit even though there is currently many rooftops that we are taking down in order to build new facilities.

Chairman Truax said I think this is a question maybe for Ed. Generally information, information for people buying new houses, copies of the plan so people can access. Where do people go to get that?

Mr. Sieben said correct me if I'm wrong Tracey, it is on our website, is that correct, under agendas?

Mrs. Vacek said once the agenda is up on the website, then all of the packet is up on the website. It is usually 2 days before the public hearing is when we do the agenda, so everything would be up on the website 2 days before. Other than that, they can FOIA the information. There is certain information that they cannot get through the FOIA process, as the lady said that she couldn't get the information. Under the statute, some of the information is not allowed to be handed out. That's all through the Law Department.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said how long does the information stay on the website?

Mrs. Vacek said it is up there. It will stay on there now until it goes through the rest of the process. Actually I believe it is up there, I think they keep it up there now, I'm not really sure when they take it down. I believe the last time I've seen it's probably been a year or two that there are still packets up there.

Chairman Truax said so the City of Aurora website will have this on there if folks want to look at it?

Mrs. Vacek said yes. It is under Planning Commission. It is a little difficult to get to. I totally agree. Unfortunately we just got a new website so we are kind of working out some of those bugs. But if they look under the Planning Commission, there is a packet there.

Chairman Truax said and if they can't find it they can call?

Mrs. Vacek said they can just call.

Chairman Truax said the other question the gentleman asked was about information for people buying houses. What would you suggest?

Mrs. Vacek said their realtor should know kind of the area and should know Aurora University. I'm sure if they called the University they would more than happy to talk to them also.

Mr. Goldsmith said but there is a Catch 22 on that one and I'd like to explain it. We cannot say that we are intending to expand in a new area until we start this whole process, give notice to everybody within 250 feet, have a public hearing, go to P&D, and go to City Council and get approved. So if somebody comes in today and they look on Western and say are you ever going to be on Western? We're not going to be able to say anything. We have no intentions of going that far. We can't say that we are going to be across Evanslawn today. If somebody asks today are you going across Evanslawn? No. We hope to be able to get permission to do that, that's why we are going through this public hearing process, but this is the way we get the opportunity to expand the campus. There is no way to predict what will happen. In fact, we committed to the city to put a plan in 2015 and for a variety of reasons we are here today in 2018. So until we could actually get to a public hearing we can't even talk really intelligently about what is the potential for expansion because it is all up to the city to decide what's possible, but that goes into a second point that I want to make clear. The University would have potentially wilted on the vine if it couldn't, the University wanted to expand from the late 70's and couldn't do anything because in the original zoning approval it was not allowed to expand at all. The University chose at a very expensive way to stay in Aurora and to expand by buying homes as they became available and for the time being when that was set up actually in 2 previous plans, there was a buffer requirement so that if the University wanted to tear down a building and build a parking lot or build a building you had to leave a house in between, I'm sorry you had to leave a lot in between where you were building and where you actually had existing homes. So that buffer concept worked through Expansion Area #1 and has worked through Expansion Area #2. There is no buffer in this expanded campus because we are not taking anything down. We're going to use the houses as they are. It is

somewhat disingenuous to say that it changes the neighborhood because we were doing this, we will have taken all of Prairie out except for the Wackerlin and enhanced landscaping and put other things in to make it part of an integrated campus. There is no question because of the overall impact from the neighbors we were told to move south rather than moving north and by moving south Prairie becomes a main street. Just to address one of the comments because traffic patterns come up on 2 ways, so if we take people off the street, the same number of cars that are apparently on the street are going to be on the campus. So it is not like it is going to change the traffic patterns of the neighborhood. There will be more traffic on Prairie, but the answer to that probably is to put some kind of traffic control at what is Randall and Prairie because it is also kind of a crown, but also we're not taking 350 people who are all going to show up at 9:00 in the morning and leave at 5:00 in the afternoon. We are taking the same kinds of people who come. Our professors come in and out of the campus as they need for teaching and for office hours and our staff is on a more regular schedule and the students who use the parking deck have all kinds of different schedules because most of them work in addition to going to school. It is not like at 5:00 o'clock you're going to have like rush hour with everybody leaving the parking deck or leaving the parking lots. There are 350 cars parked south of the Institute lot now. They don't all come out at 5:00 o'clock.

Chairman Truax said but the 350, another question the gentleman asked, was there is no parking lot now that's being taken away?

Mr. Goldsmith said there is no parking that's being taken. That's correct. It is actually homes.

Chairman Truax said so it is a net gain?

Mr. Goldsmith said it is. I was going to get to that, but thank you for reminding me. So all the parking we are talking about is net gain. If we vacate the rest of Southlawn, the net gain is 45 more parking spaces. We have the potential of getting over 400 spaces between the parking deck and Southlawn. But I'm not suggesting that we are committing to that because we're not telling the last resident on Southlawn she has to move and she seems to be happy staying there, so we won't have those 45 spaces for a while and that's okay because we will adhere to the formula as Mr. Cameron asked me and we will continue to do what's necessary, whether it means relocating classes or offloading classes to the Orchard Campus or whatever to meet those requirements. That's the one thing I don't understand about the complaints about the parking deck. To the extent the parking deck is there, it is taking demand off the streets, so that's what we were told was the main reason for building more parking on campus and so it is taking the same cars and just putting them in a different place.

Chairman Truax said the design you showed us is not finished, it's an idea?

Mr. Goldsmith said right. As will happen with architects, somebody got kind of wild with the AU logo. What we are trying to do is just say to you look it's 3 stories but it is only the equivalent of a 2 story building, so 3 levels, 2 story.

Chairman Truax said one more traffic question that I had on here and maybe it is a question for Ed and Tracey. Will something trigger a traffic study?

Mr. Goldsmith said well I can answer that. Just as the University looked at parking, the University would look at Evanslawn. If Evanslawn were to be vacated, the main reason for doing that would be to build more parking, which would relieve the neighborhood. So the tradeoff is do you lose some access to Prairie in order to get another 200 spaces if we eventually acquire all of the homes on Evanslawn, but alternatively we will do a study and we will see what is the impact because again, many of the people coming down Evanslawn are coming to the campus. So the question is and if we own all the homes then you are taking all those residents of the neighborhood and so you have less demand immediately in Evanslawn. How that all works out is a traffic study. It's not my speculation and then once we do that we'll see whether there is any real impact and then the city has to make a decision. It is not our decision.

Chairman Truax said the other corner, and I think people pointed this out, or the other areas, Prairie between Gladstone and what used to be Calumet and Randall where there are a lot of cars. That stop sign is the only way you can get on Prairie in the afternoon. At some point that probably needs to...

Mr. Goldsmith said that's a separate issue. I want to clarify this for the neighbors too. To the extent that there is no parking on one side of Prairie or no parking on one side of the street, it is all because the city has implemented that. Actually in some respects in prior years without even consultation with the University. So every time you make one street parking on one side and no parking on the other side you push people farther out from the campus to the extent that there is not full parking on the campus. There will never be full parking on the campus. I grew up on Gladstone in 1946. There's always been parking outside the campus, but it is a lot nicer, newer place than it was then. That's the other thing that's really hard to explain. It is a stabilizing influence on the west side. It is anchor for property values and the fact that there's been modest expansion over now 15 years and hopefully there would be some expansion over the next 10 years, makes it vibrant and makes it viable. If you don't have those factors, then the University won't be there to hold the neighborhood and that's important.

Mr. Cameron said just on the comment in regard to the gentleman that was disappointed by finding out the circumstances that he might not have bought the house, but in the process of buying homes you really, and I don't know if he had a local attorney, but it is usually wise to have someone that basically is functioning as a third party representing you who may know the rumors, the ongoing talk and that type of thing. I can speak as Commissioner that it was Friday afternoon or Monday morning was the time that as a Commission member we got that information. We had had a hearing back in November that we had a preliminary and then it was delayed and moved and it was in the newspaper. When you move into a new area or a new home, it is contingent that we each individually look at those things and try to get a grasp of what is going in. I don't have that problem because I live about 5 blocks away from the University, in June it will be 49 years for me there. So I last had to make that decision a long time ago. It doesn't necessarily appear until the last minute because things are being changed up until that minute and that's why there is a lag time. That's always the case with housing purchases. It is generally our biggest investment and that's why it is important that we do take the time and do try to employ third parties to help safeguard. It seems like a waste of money at the time, but sometimes you need to go to local sources and that can be helpful. That doesn't help you at this moment I understand.

Mr. Goldsmith said so there was a question about, it kind of relates to 2 parts of this discussion. One is if the University buys a house, does it go off the tax rolls. Yes, if it is part of a Master Plan the University

has a right to seek an exemption from real estate taxes. The flip side is the University could be buying houses now and using them for rental housing without any additional permission from the city. In fact, the University has specifically decided not to do that. The University is not looking to get into rental housing. It is just that as a placeholder for the uses that we could make of the houses we just said that these are the kinds of uses which would be typical of a single family home. It would be no different if we went across Evanslawn. There is some rental housing there. There are some houses for sale. The University could go across the street, buy a house and put it immediately into rental housing. We're not doing that. We are only going to buy a house when somebody wants to sell to us and we are going to keep the house there for the houses, and this is the first time the University has ever made this commitment in an expansion area. We are going to keep the house as is for the future. Just to answer a related thing, the University has been using houses as offices since we started Expansion Area #1, so the last 15 years we've done it numerous times. The only problem is on the Gladstone side where there were some houses that were in such poor condition we eventually had to take them down and just leave the land. In fact, you notice the south end of Gladstone is just vacant land. The reason for that is the houses were no longer functional. If those houses had been functional they'd be used for offices and we'd have less of a problem getting ready to build a parking deck because we wouldn't have to relocate a bunch of functional offices in houses that are along Southlawn and Randall Road extended. I'd be happy to answer any other question you may have.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said there was someone that asked a question was there ever consideration to not purchase or expand only to mid-block as opposed to going full block? Was that ever reviewed?

Mr. Goldsmith said if we were thinking about 30, 40, or 50 years out, maybe we'd be thinking about it. The question is if the University is going to be successful how long can it stay within its boundaries? Okay, well we've made 3 efforts in this regard, one in 2004, one in 2009; Expansion Area #1 in 2004, which was everything up to Randall Road from Gladstone to Randall; Expansion Area #2 in 2009 from Randall to Evanslawn and now we are here 9 years later saying well if we could pick another half a block up over a period of time, it's been like 6 or 8 years for each of those areas, and maybe it would be longer. It just depends on what the preferences of the homeowners are, we would pick up a block. But we wouldn't go farther because the commitment was, unlike the other 2 expansion areas, we wouldn't change the physical appearance of those houses, only the use. The only reason we have to do that is, and I don't know what the city's rules on home office is, but we can't use it as an office unless we rezone it. We can only use it as a residence, so we are stymied for now in that what we need is office space and so going west is one way to get there. Another way is have to just go off campus completely, but the more you do that the more this becomes a less viable place to operate the University. We are trying to make that balance between what it is a concern to the neighbors, but also being a stabilizing influence in the larger neighborhood so that we can grow incrementally without impinging on a lot of other people's concerns.

Mrs. Cole said I have one question regarding your drainage choice. Apparently you are going to use the underground vaults again or cisterns?

Mr. Goldsmith said they are underground vaults, yes.

Mrs. Cole said am I mistaken, but the blue area in the middle of the football field, could that possibly be used for a parking lot at some point in time?

Mr. Goldsmith said it could be used for a parking lot or a building, but that is already an area where we have detention and that in the existing Parking Lot 19. We have the capacity, well actually because it is an impervious, and this may sound odd to you, but it is an all season field, so it is considered impervious from the city's standpoint, even though it does absorb water. So it absorbs water, but not like vacant land. So we have treated that as part of our first stormwater vault project as being all impervious area. So if we built over the football field...

Mrs. Cole said my question is you've not considered or are not considering permeable pavers at all for use?

Mr. Goldsmith said well at this point we are talking about a deck. The original concept actually, and that changed from fall when you asked about that, was to build a 300 space parking lot, which would have matched most of the west part of the campus. We decided that that was not the best way to use our land, so by using the deck we saved a lot more land for either development or open space, and that was a tradeoff.

Mrs. Cole said and one more question. The water drains from cisterns. Do you reuse that water for irrigation or does it just go to the Sanitary District?

Mr. Goldsmith said it goes to storm sewers right now. We actually upgraded the storm sewer in Southlawn, upgraded the storm sewer in Evanslawn and then connected to the storm in Prairie, so we actually improved the conveyance from the campus. Prairie is a regional issue as to what capacity it can have or what it could have, but unlike normal flow which would happen unrestricted we hold that water in the vaults and pump it out over time so the release rate meets the city's standard, so we are not sending the water downstream as fast as it would go if it were sheeting off the property and going right into the storm sewers.

Mrs. Vacek said at this time, the University is actually asking to continue this public hearing until the June 6th Planning Commission. This hearing would be continued. The other 2 that did get voted out tonight will meet up with the hearing for tonight at the Planning and Development Committee later in June, which would be, I think, June 14th.

Chairman Truax said why are we continuing?

Mrs. Vacek said the University requested a continuance.

Mr. Goldsmith said I can explain the continuation. Unlike the city that meets on a regular basis, the University's Board of Trustees only meets a couple of times a year and they are meeting the end of this month, so in order to make a huge capital investment that we are talking about making we need to get the Board's approval. So before we ask you to make a recommendation we want to make sure that we've advised our Board and the Board is comfortable. The Administration is committed to this package to the extent it gets approved in particular in putting in the parking deck, but it needs to have the

Board's approval to move forward. The coincidence was we couldn't time it right to get the Board to consider it until we had some input and I think it is healthy to have the input before we go to the Board. Then for other reasons May was just taken out. We would have come back in May, but Ed's got a little issue and I've got a little issue and so we are just going to wait until June.

Mrs. Cole said I move that we continue this hearing until June 6, but I have question. Nothing changes. Is that correct? Because we've closed the public hearing.

Mr. Goldsmith said under the new rulings about the Open Meeting Act, any time you have a meeting, you have to open it up, so the public will have another round of opportunity at the June 6th meeting even though I know historically we've always had a meeting closed at the end of the public presentations. So we understand that if people want to comment again or there are new comments on June 6th we will hear those and respond to those, but we will also be in a position to tell you what the University is prepared to do.

Mr. Sieben said Mr. Goldsmith is correct. It would be reopened. Obviously, hopefully, there would be no change from the University then. Obviously, if there is a proposed change, that change would be made known then and there could be comment. If there was going to be any change, that would be made known prior to June 6th.

MOTION OF TO CONTINUE TO JUNE 6, 2018 WAS MADE BY: Mrs. Cole

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mr. Chambers

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

NAYS: None