



City of Aurora

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

Legistar History Report

File Number: 16-01077

File ID: 16-01077	Type: Resolution	Status: ATS Review
Version: 3	General Ledger #:	In Control: Planning & Development Committee
File Name: Balaji Partners, LLC / Final Plan / SWC of Sequoia Drive & Randall Road		File Created: 11/09/2016
		Final Action:

Title: A Resolution Approving a Final Plan for Balaji Homes Condominiums Subdivision located at southwest corner of Sequoia Drive and Randall Road for a Multi-Family Dwelling (1140) Use

Notes:

Agenda Date: 02/16/2017

Agenda Number:

Sponsors:

Enactment Date:

Attachments: Exhibit "A-1" Final Plan - 2017-01-27 - 2015.287.pdf, Exhibit "A-2" Landscape Plan - 2017-01-27 - 2015.287.pdf, Exhibit "A-3" Building and Signage Elevations - 2017-01-06 - 2015.287.pdf, Fire Access Plan - 2017-01-27 - 2015.287.pdf, Address Plat - 2017-01-27 - 2015.287.pdf, Property Research Sheet - 2015-12-07 - 2015.287.pdf, Land Use Petition and Supporting Documents - 2016-11-09 - 2015.287.pdf, By-Laws - 2016-11-09 - 2015.287.pdf, CCR's - 2016-11-09 - 2015.287.pdf, Plat of Survey - 2016-11-09 - 2015.287.pdf, Landscaping Material Worksheet - 2016-11-09 - 2015.287.pdf, Legistar History Report (Final Plan) - 2017-02-09 - 2015.287.pdf

Enactment Number:

Planning Case #: AU08/1-15.287-Fsd/Fpn

Hearing Date:

Drafter: tvacek@aurora-il.org

Effective Date:

History of Legislative File

Ver- sion:	Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:
1	Committee of the Whole	11/15/2016	Forward to Planning Council	DST Staff Council (Planning Council)			
	Action Text: This Petition was Forward to Planning Council to the DST Staff Council (Planning Council)						
1	DST Staff Council (Planning Council)	11/22/2016					
	Notes: Mr. Sieben said this has already gone through zoning previously with the approved Preliminary Plan						

and Plat. This is now coming in for a Final for a portion of this.

Representatives Present: Steve Hanson and John Tebrugge

I'm Steve Hansen, Steven W. Hansen, Architect, Sugar Grove. I think you've seen this project before on the Preliminary, but now this is the Final Plan. There's been one kind of slight change. When we first came in, we had 4 buildings. In the upper right hand corner there is a little square, which is a future community building, so I guess that would be considered a 5th building. There were 4 buildings with condos in them. There are now 5 buildings with condos in them across the west edge, which is the top edge. We broke that from 2 buildings into 3 buildings. The building was just pretty long. Because of the market conditions and the number of partners that had bought into the first units, we had to reduce the very first building, which is kind of the northwest building next to the little square off of Sequoia. That's 27 units. That was originally 39 units, I believe, when we first came in. Most of those units are sold and they are also to partners of the Balaji Group and the Balaji Partners.

Mr. Sieben said so the first building to be built is the one off the corner coming south to the left, right, which is now the 27 unit building?

Mr. Hansen said correct. I think we were in for 164 units. Right now this plan John is...

Mr. Tebrugge said 161, I believe.

Mr. Hansen said a few less units because of reconfiguration, so we are under the amount of units that we were originally allowed. We're combining 3 lots into this project and then we are subdividing out 5 lots, one for each building.

Mr. Tebrugge said it will be a total of 6 lots plus the general lot. Each building is its own property.

Mr. Hansen said each building is its own lot and then there is 1 general lot for everything else, including the storm detention pond, which is on the upper left hand corner. That's an existing kind of scrub, non-maintained storm detention pond that we are completely cleaning out and expanding to take care of the whole site. That pond does take some of the water from the commercial center, the storage unit and the Headstart building. It is kind of a complicated set of spaces, but the good news is that that whole area will be completed now and cleaned up and under control. John you can talk about the site and entrances.

Mr. Sieben said the 2 accesses on Sequoia is what we had agreed to. The 1 to the west is a little bit more restrictive, correct?

Mr. Tebrugge said yes, that's kind of a right-in/right-out, but it also allows a left turn. It is kind of a combination.

Mr. Sieben said a ¾?

Mr. Tebrugge said I think that's we called it, a ¾ intersection.

Mr. Sieben said you just can't do a left out, correct?

Mr. Tebrugge said correct. The one thing you've noticed with the shaded here is we are doing the buildings and the various improvements in stages and that's something in our civil plans. We tried to make that as easy on Dan as possible to understand, but all of the stormwater detention would be done in the first phase. Since we are doing the northwest building first, that lighter shade of parking lot and entry drive would be put in so it will reconnect to Old Sequoia, which is the east/west road in between the other development and our 5th and 6th building. So that way we would have fire access at all times for each building as it is built. The way we set up is Phase 2 and 3 are the next 2 south buildings, so that's how we would be building out the lot and then eventually the north buildings, and each of those parking lots would then be built once the buildings are built.

Mr. Sieben said and you have access to the underground/underneath parking?

Mr. Tebrugge said yes.

Mr. Sieben said is that on the south side of the building?

Mr. Tebrugge said all of the entrances on the west buildings are off the west, so they will be coming off the new road coming in next to the pond. We will be looping a new water main as part of Phase 1 and then redoing some sanitary. There were utilities along Old Sequoia originally and we're basically either cutting some of them short because of the new building coming in, but all of that would be done in the first phase to make sure the infrastructure is complete. Eventually, we'll have a new entrance going out to Sullivan. That's the only hiccup we had was getting the right to drive through the property that's owned by Headstart. They own all the way to the west side of that entry drive as it goes down to Sullivan. We were forced to put the drive around their property and that was the only thing that made this site really cumbersome. But we have added other sidewalks to get people around. There are sidewalks going in around the perimeter of the property, so they will have a nice walking path. The goal is just to be able to come back if they wanted to walk to the Temple. They'd be able to either come down new Sequoia or Sullivan and access the Temple from there.

Mr. Beneke said I have a question. Are you saying as far as paved surface the lightest color is Phase 1?

Mr. Tebrugge said on the upper right hand corner, yes, that is Phase 1.

Mr. Beneke said because we are going to need 2 entries into this site.

Mrs. Vacek said they will connect it to Old Sequoia.

Mr. Tebrugge said Old Sequoia is still in place. There is an entrance off of Sequoia Drive now.

Mr. Beneke said so going into the dark area where is says Old Sequoia you're still going to have that all?

Mr. Tebrugge said we still have that.

Mr. Beneke said and that's all going to go all the way into this and around?

Mr. Tebrugge said yes. We have a complete looped system at either phase. The front parking for the strip mall, that actually has entrances and there is another building that's currently rented by the School District. Everything really accesses Old Sequoia, so there is a variety of ways to get onto Old Sequoia. We just didn't detail every one of them.

Mr. Beneke said and that curve you're putting in for the restriction, that's going to be a mountable curb?

Mr. Tebrugge said for where?

Mr. Beneke said up in the upper northwest corner going onto Sequoia.

Mr. Tebrugge said that would be a depressed curb. The center island, that would be mountable, I suppose. I think the new $\frac{3}{4}$ is more of a mountable curb.

Mr. Beneke said that is for fire access purposes. If we've only got the 2, if that 1 one and the other 1 is an access, then we'll need that to be mountable.

Mr. Feltman said well it should be raised. There will be another access onto Sullivan.

Mr. Tebrugge said yes.

Mr. Beneke said not now though.

Mr. Tebrugge said well there currently is an access to Sullivan now, yes. You'd be able to...

Mrs. Vacek said not in the first phase.

Mr. Tebrugge said not in the first phase. The first phase you're actually having to go around the storage buildings and strip mall and get to Old Sequoia.

Mr. Beneke said that's the concern, making sure that in the first phase we have it.

Mr. Hansen said there will be 3 access points to the site right away. There is 3 when we are done with Phase 1. It is just that 2 of them combine right where you see the T into Old Sequoia. That, I'm going to say the southernmost, which is really the easternmost, larger drive and entry to the complex right above the dark grey area, there is a road that is there now that accesses the accounting building and there is also, when you take Old Sequoia, which is the far left darker paved area, there is an access there that is across the front of the strip mall and the School District property. The access that's to the accounting office isn't exactly where that dark entrance is. It is a little bit farther south than that. That will be moved in Phase 3, Phase 4, Phase 5, but we need to maintain some access to that accounting building by rights. We just don't show that road. There is a road that is dotted in that's there now that will be removed in a later phase, which will become the main entrance off of Sequoia.

Mr. Tebrugge said there is good circulation there. We have checked that. I'm sure that's on the fire plan.

Mr. Beneke said okay. We'll look at that.

Mrs. Vacek said I will be reviewing this and getting you comments.

Mr. Sieben said and Dan, who is reviewing for you?

Mr. Feltman said Mary Garza.

Mrs. Vacek said I haven't quite scheduled this one out, but it will probably be next year, early next year to go to Planning Commission.

Mr. Cross said and I sent comments out, fire comments, on the access plan.

Mr. Tebrugge said yes, we received those a few days ago.

Mrs. Vacek said I'll get you that schedule. We are already overbooked for December and we only have 1 in December, so it will probably be early in January.

Mr. Frankino said this looks pretty basic for us. It looks like it is annexed, so we'll just await civil submittal.

Mr. Tebrugge said I thought we might have submitted, but I'll double check on that. I thought we had. We might have sent it to Sandy. Anyway, we'll check on that. It is really just a matter of reconnecting the sanitary and then running services to each building. The sanitary along Old Sequoia has been there. Then it turns and goes south on the other side of the pond.

Mr. Frankino said and it can be abandoned?

Mr. Tebrugge said well we are actually cutting a section out and relaying some new sewer so it is not really abandoning. The building just went through a sewer. Had to reroute it.

Mr. Frankino said you must have sent it to her because I haven't seen it yet. I'll ask about it.

Mr. Sieben said so each department will get you back comments then shortly.

1 DST Staff Council 11/29/2016
(Planning Council)

Notes: Mrs. Vacek said I am in the process of reviewing this, so I will be sending out comments probably in the near future.

Mr. Cross said Fire sent out comments as well.

Mr. Feltman said I think we need to figure out what we're doing with the west access on Sequoia because I think it changed from what was on the original preliminary.

Mr. Cross said the FDC and sprinkler room designations, I think, were some issues too.

Mr. Beneke said that could make some adjustment to the aerial apparatus.

1 DST Staff Council 12/06/2016
(Planning Council)

Notes: Mrs. Vacek said I'll be taking a look at this this week and getting out comments. I should have them out by the end of the week.

Mr. Cross said we have initial comments that are out that have yet to be addressed.

Mr. Sieben said Steve, do you know if Engineering has sent out comments yet?

Mr. Andras said I don't know.

1 DST Staff Council 12/13/2016
(Planning Council)

Notes: Mr. Sieben said we kind of want to go over an update. I know there's been initial review.

Mrs. Vacek said I did send out comments last week. We have set up a meeting tomorrow to go over the comments, as well as I think there are some Engineering things that we need to talk through. Hopefully, we're looking at January 18th to bring this to Planning Commission, so we're trying to get that going for you.

Mr. Cross said we spoke. We had a conference call already, so you know our concerns as far as how to address the comments. We're just waiting for a resubmittal.

Mr. Feltman said we sent out comments.

Representatives Present: John Tebrugge and Harry Koneru

Mr. Tebrugge said we are working on them. I guess the one thing that we're, I guess some of this we will talk about tomorrow, but going back through our notes where we had the different right-of-way that we were donating, we started out with 17 feet and then went to 22 and I guess now it is 27 somehow. I don't have that in my notes. We did the entire final design based on that 22.

Mrs. Vacek said so that was what was approved on the Preliminary Plan and Plat so I think Engineering is going to take a look at that, but that was what was approved on the Preliminary Plan and Plat, a Resolution.

Mr. Feltman for said for 27.

Mrs. Vacek said yes. I think I did forward that Ordinance over to you.

Mr. Tebrugge said yes. For some reason I didn't have that in my files. I don't know what happened and I don't know if that was something that came up at the very end because in my e-mail to you I had 6 submittals where we had been using 22 feet and I said how is it that we never heard about the 27?

Mrs. Vacek said unfortunately I wasn't involved in the Preliminary so I'm not exactly sure where that came from.

Mr. Tebrugge said we even added a 5 foot sidewalk, so that was my one comment to maybe talk to Dan about if there was any way we could keep it at the 22 and have a 5 foot sidewalk easement on our property versus in the right-of-way because it really does affect our pond, so that's the main thing. The other thing is we're trying to get back in and have additional meetings with Two Rivers Headstart about the fire access easement, if we could even call it that, versus a full easement through there. So that is one thing we are opening discussions again since that is really affecting our fire lane.

Mrs. Vacek said obviously we would prefer that they give you an ingress/egress easement all the way through and then...

Mr. Tebrugge said everyone else has one.

Mrs. Vacek said and then that road be reconfigured to accommodate that. I think it would help you out a lot in stormwater too, I think.

Mr. Tebrugge said otherwise, things are moving forward. Steven Hansen has been finishing all the architectural plans and, I guess, that has been submitted for review and he has had, I think, some review comments from permitting. We've had some discussions with 2 or 3 different contractors bidding on the project so we are getting close as far as working with one, so it is something that we are

hoping to work through as far as the spring.

Mr. Koneru said we'd like to start in March.

Mr. Tebrugge said if at all possible.

Mr. Wiet said start construction in spring maybe?

Mr. Tebrugge said yes, that's what we're hoping to.

Mr. Wiet said which buildings were you planning to do first?

Mr. Tebrugge said the 3 buildings that are up against the pond, it would be the furthest north one where the square community center is, so that would kind of be the sequence is going to the south 1, 2, 3 and then we would come up and possibly build the community center with Building 4 and then to 5. That's the way we've discussed it over the last year or two. It kind of depends on just the demand.

Mrs. Vacek said did you understand the comments in regard to the landscaping and just having a typical building and then we don't have to show all the landscaping on each individual building? We would just do a typical building foundation landscaping plan.

Mr. Tebrugge said yes. That's what Hitchcock came up with and we can certainly show one typical building. The only thing is the first 3 buildings are very close to the same size. Building 4 and 5 are, again, we could at least discuss the type of plantings around. They did have that on the drawing. Of course, that scale is pretty small.

Mrs. Vacek said and then the last thing is I know that you guys are looking for addresses for those. We have to have a conversation with Engineering and I think Building because we're just trying to figure out what makes the most sense to...

Mr. Tebrugge said that was one of the things we had discussed as far as where the fire connection would be. They typically like that on the side of the address.

Mrs. Vacek said I think Engineering came up with something different than, I think, Fire wants, so we are going to sit down and actually have a conversation on what the addresses should be.

Mr. Tebrugge said okay, because all of our infrastructure is kind of in the middle along Old Sequoia and then wrapping around so we don't have any...

Mrs. Vacek said we'll come up with those and we'll let you know once we come to an agreement. I'm going to set that meeting up probably for later on this week.

Mr. Beneke said the sooner the better because that does affect where the FDC is at, which is part of what he's got to resubmit to us.

Mr. Koneru said I have one question. You said that they wanted only 2 parcels now.

Mr. Tebrugge said that was a comments that they had talked about going from a 7 to 8 lot sub down to 2.

Mrs. Vacek said correct. Right now how the plan is if you separate the lots out onto building pads, you don't meet the lot requirement under the R-5A, so if you do 2 lots, then you can go back and condo those lots afterwards. That would meet the intent of the zoning. So it would be a 2 lot subdivision and then you can go back and condo the lots once it is built and once they are sold. Usually that's what happens anyway with condominiums. They'll go back and condo the lots so then each individual person would have their own portion of that building.

Mr. Tebrugge said for those buildings yes. That's one thing we did talk about. Every unit will have its own final legal description.

Mrs. Vacek said correct. Would have its own legal description and basically parcel number.

Mr. Koneru said currently it is the 3 parcels and it is titled under 2 names. So all these 3 parcels will merge now?

Mrs. Vacek said it would be basically the detention pond lot, which would be 1 parcel and then everything else, which would be another parcel, another lot.

Mr. Koneru said can I change the name now to Balaji Homes from Balaji Group and Balaji Partners?

Mrs. Vacek said absolutely. If you want to just send us a letter to that effect that it would be under a different owner instead of both, that would be fine.

Mr. Tebrugge said because I know that was a question as we were going through this. Why are there 2 names?

Mrs. Vacek said we were trying to figure out what was going on too.

Mr. Koneru said and also we are kind of marketing it as Balaji Homes. Because of the partnership (inaudible) in the past, we had to designate 2 names, but it now it seems we are going to be dissolving. Most likely I will be buying out the rest of the partners. But for marketing purposes, Balaji Homes looks better. That's why if we can do it, we'd like to go forward in that direction.

Mrs. Vacek said if you just want to send me a letter to that effect, then we can change that in the system.

Mr. Tebrugge said on the Petition.

Mrs. Vacek said yes.

Mr. Sieben said so the goal is to get you guys on the January 18th Planning Commission and onto the City Council after that.

- 1 DST Staff Council 12/20/2016
(Planning Council)

Notes: *Mrs. Vacek said we did meet with them last Wednesday and went over a few things. They are supposed to get some revisions into us hopefully by tomorrow.*

Mr. Feltman said I talked with the city Traffic Engineer and he really is adamant about having that western access be a right-in/right-out. His concern, and it's understandable, is that you have vehicles and trucks wanting to turn left in the same vicinity and it is a conflict. If you think about it too, if somebody is coming off of Randall on Sequoia, they would have passed a full access to then get to this western access, so it doesn't seem like it is really that big of a deal to just have them force them to come into that first full access and go around. We are going to make that comment. I'm going to contact Tebrugge and let him know.

- 1 DST Staff Council 01/03/2017
(Planning Council)

Notes: *Mrs. Vacek said I did send out comments in December, so waiting to get those back. I'm not sure if they have submitted yet.*

Mr. Cross said the same for Fire.

Mr. Thavong said Engineering-wise, I don't think we received anything yet.

Mr. Frankino said we have comments out for review and are awaiting a response.

- 1 DST Staff Council 01/10/2017
(Planning Council)

Notes: *Mrs. Vacek said I got revisions yesterday from them, so I'll be taking a look at them this week. I know Engineering has not received anything as well as Fire hasn't.*

Mr. Thavong said correct. Engineering has sent out comments and we have not received resubmittals. We still have some concerns regarding right-of-way and stormwater management.

Ms. Phifer said including them meeting the volume required, correct?

Mr. Thavong said correct.

Mr. Cross said we are still waiting for a resubmittal as well.

Mr. Sieben said there are several issues, right?

Mr. Cross said yes. They are very clear. We've actually spoke with them and walked them through some of the concerns as well.

Mrs. Vacek said we were shooting for next week's Planning Commission, but we're going to be holding this until the 1st one in February so we can resolve these issues.

Mr. Frankino said Fox Metro has also got comments out, but we are awaiting responses on those.

1 DST Staff Council 01/17/2017
(Planning Council)

Notes: Mr. Feltman said I talked with the design engineer. He is going to be resubmitting by the end of the week.

Mr. Cross said I'm still trying to figure out this FDC location to make sure that that works for us.

Mr. Beneke said we actually had a resubmittal and looked at it, directed them in a direction and they just sent something back to Javan that isn't what we told them to do, so he's got to look and see whether he is comfortable or if it needs to be changed.

Mr. Sieben said as far as timing goes, this is tentative to the February 8th Planning Commission, so I believe we have up to 2 weeks until we need to vote this out, so hopefully we can get these issues resolved.

Mr. Feltman said one thing in talking to the city Traffic Engineer, he still wants to have a right-in/right-out on that far western access, which they are showing a ¾ right now. The other thing that needs to be clarified for Engineering is how they are phasing all of this work. It wasn't really clear on what they were building in the first phase.

Mr. Beneke said what they told us was Phase 1 is that first building. Phase 2, 3 and then they are coming down with Phase 4 and the building with Sequoia to the west side with the community center and then Phase 5 is the further east.

Mr. Cross said you are thinking about the paving and that stuff too?

Mr. Feltman said correct, and all the utilities. The other thing that was resolved, we asked the design engineer to show use whether full build-out of Sullivan could fit in 22 feet of right-of-way and it can, so that will be 55 feet from centerline that they'll be dedicating, so that won't affect their setback for the detention basin, but we are also going to ask for a 15 foot city easement.

Mr. Sieben said outside of the right-of-way.

Mr. Feltman said correct.

Mr. Sieben said so we've still got a bunch to review in the next 2 weeks.

Mr. Wiet said this meets the preliminary, right?

Mr. Sieben said yes. Do you want to explain Dan on the preliminary that were still outstanding issues you guys had that were going to be resolved with the final?

Mr. Feltman said well it was the right-of-way and it was the right-in/right-out on Sequoia.

Mr. Wiet said nothing really changed from the preliminary. They just took their time coming back with the final because...

Mr. Beneke said well also with us, a lot of the fire comments that were generated in the preliminary were never resolved, so they are just now being taken care of.

Mr. Sieben said the detention also was a little influx because they were looking at sharing with the neighbor to the west.

Mr. Wiet said but things were influx for a while on their side.

Mr. Sieben said correct. They went a long time negotiating with the property owner to the west.

Mr. Wiet said for stormwater?

Mr. Sieben said correct.

1 DST Staff Council 01/24/2017
(Planning Council)

Notes: *Mrs. Vacek said they resubmitted early last week. I sent comments out to them yesterday. They are getting pretty close. The landscaping, we needed to add a little bit more, so I sent those comments back to them.*

Mr. Cross said we are going to have some additional comments just to make sure the location of the FDC actually meets our needs as far as in case of an emergency. We went and actually talked to the Two Rivers Headstart about what was the hold up or the impediment to having that cross easement agreement with them. They said they had had no one talk to them for over a year about anything like that. So despite our advising Tebrugge to revisit it and gave them some things and mentioned to them, the Executive Director was totally oblivious that the development was still even going on. We are going to reach out to John again and kind of say this is what may be able to help to have that easement actually take place, and so we'll handle at least that part from there. That might impact the way they change the plan potentially.

Mr. Sieben said so Two Rivers wasn't amenable?

Mrs. Vacek said maybe to a fire access.

Mr. Cross said right.

Mr. Beneke said the Director was, yes, for fire purposes with a gate.

Mr. Cross said it didn't sound like a whole lot of information had been shared with them and so that's the stance that they had taken was no, but there was no revisiting of that conversation despite our advising the opposite of that. It seems as though that will happen and at minimum be a fire access easement. It didn't appear as though they had any problem with that, but they have a Board of Directors it has to go through and so if I can have a conference call with them and see if I can get permission from the developers to see if they'll let me share that plan with them for them to be able to see it and then walk them through it and maybe even have that all ironed out.

Mr. Beneke said and Javan clarified where he wants the FDC since it is a very unusual location because anywhere you are at you are not going to see these buildings and the FDC, so he is looking at it based on where they are coming into the site and the access with the Fire Department requirements.

Mrs. Vacek said I sent those comments back for the Address Plat to them, so right now all the addressing is going to off of Sequoia.

Mr. Beneke said we talked about that too. This is not the norm. Sequoia is fine if that's what makes sense for everybody. Instead of saying it's got to be located facing Sequoia, because they'll never see it, we're just going to tell them where we want them.

Mrs. Vacek said then I will follow up the question in regard to the community center.

Mr. Feltman said Engineering sent out comments and we are waiting for a resubmittal.

Mrs. Vacek said but that was your first round of comments, right?

Mr. Sieben said so you never got a resubmittal?

Mr. Feltman said no.

Mr. Wiet said you were going to contact Tebrugge, or Tracey will?

Mrs. Vacek said I'm going to contact Tebrugge and talk to him. Actually, I'm going to have him just give them a call so I'm not the middle man trying explain everything.

1	DST Staff Council (Planning Council)	01/31/2017	Forwarded	Planning Commission	02/08/2017	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 2/8/2017. The motion carried by voice vote.

Notes: *Mrs. Vacek said I was hoping that Fire was going to be here, but I'm looking to vote this out today. I got revisions to all of my comments and they have made all of the changes. I believe Engineering is okay to move this forward.*

Mr. Thavong said correct. Engineering has received revised engineering plans and stormwater calculations and it looks like they provided sufficient stormwater management. I think we should be okay to vote it out.

Mrs. Vacek said I do make a motion to move this to the February 8th Planning Commission.

Mr. Beneke said what I would say as far as Fire is concerned, I would make it contingent upon the location of the Fire Department connections per Fire Marshall Cross's requirements. I think everything else was in good shape.

Mrs. Morgan seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

2	Planning Commission	02/08/2017	Forwarded	Planning & Development Committee	02/16/2017	Pass
---	---------------------	------------	-----------	----------------------------------------	------------	------

Action Text: A motion was made by Mr. Chambers, seconded by Mrs. Duncan, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Planning & Development Committee, on the agenda for 2/16/2017. The motion carried.

Notes: *Chairman Truax said the first item on our agenda is a Resolution approving the Final Plat for Balaji Homes Condominiums Subdivision, being vacant land located at the southwest corner of Sequoia Drive and Randall Road in Ward 5.*

Associated with that is a Resolution approving a Final Plan for Balaji Homes Condominiums Subdivision located at the southwest corner of Sequoia Drive and Randall Road for a Multi-Family Dwelling (1140) Use also in Ward 5.

Mrs. Vacek said the Petitioner is requesting approval of a Final Plat for Balaji Homes Condominiums Subdivision. The Final Plat includes a 2 lot subdivision with dedication of 55 feet of right-of-way along Sullivan Road and 17 feet of right-of-way along Randall Road. The proposal for Lot 2 would include the stormwater detention facility for the development and then proposed Lot 1 would contain the community center and 5 condo buildings that would be condoized after they were constructed. Concurrently with the proposal, the Petitioner is requesting approval of a Final Plan for the condominiums. The details of the request include 5 multi-story condominium buildings, each at 4 stories high and a community center building. The buildings are proposed to have 161 dwelling units and will be developed as an age restricted retirement community associated with the Swami Temple located across the street on Randall Road. There are 324 individual accessible parking spaces proposed on the site, which includes 122 surface spaces and 202 enclosed spaces, which does meet the city's requirement for 2 parking spaces per unit, 1.25 of those being enclosed. The proposal also shows the vehicle access off of Sullivan Road. It is a full access off Sullivan Road and then 2 access points off of Sequoia with the westerly one being a right-in/right-out. Old Sequoia Road will run through the property. While no longer a public right-of-way, it has been mostly incorporated into the plan to retain the internal access that has been there. The Petitioner is proposing to pay a fee in lieu of the Sullivan Road improvements, as this will be completed as a larger project. Lastly, there is an existing private access drive on the subject property that is owned by Two Rivers Headstart Agency. The plan currently shows this access being gated off. The Petitioner is negotiating with them to allow for a cross access easement over that private drive, but it will either be a general access where the gate would just be removed or it would be an emergency access where it would remain gated but then there would be a keyed access for the police and the fire.

Representatives Present: Steve Hansen, John Tebrugge and Harry Koneru

Mr. Hansen said I can give you the overall of the project and John can talk about the specifics on the site plan. When we came in before, we were 4 buildings with a total of 5 stories per building. We originally has 164 units. We've since reduced that to 161 units. As Tracey mentioned, there are 2

lots. We had 5 lots, I believe, before and it's been agreed that it should be a 2 lot subdivision; 1 for the common area and then 1 for the buildings that will later be divided up in to the condominiums. It is an all exterior masonry building per the city's codes with stone and brick throughout the whole exterior. Now that we went from 5 stories down to 4 stories, we added a pitched roof to it, which we thought looked better at that height. When the building was 5 stories, we thought with a pitched roof it was just getting too high. In addition to that, we've gone from 4 buildings, exclusive of the little common area building, to 5 buildings on the site now, so along the west line of the property we now have 3 buildings, which are shorter. They average around 260 to 300 feet rather than 2 buildings that were 340 to 400 feet long. I think it is a much better site plan and a much more aesthetic set of buildings too and more to scale on the property. As far as the buildings go, there are all interior condos. The first building is 27 units. They average about 1,800 square feet, 3 bedrooms. They are all larger condos in the building. The other buildings might have a slightly smaller market rate, but the first building is typically most of the partners in the project that are buying into it. I'm not sure I have anything else. I know there were some site changes, a couple of things that John can talk to.

Mr. Tebrugge said we've probably spent the last year to year and a half working things out with Engineering and the Fire Department on getting all the access points, stormwater detention, and overflow routes. It's been an interesting site with the shape. It's led to some challenges, but we were able to finally get everything done, so we are really looking forward to breaking ground here this spring. It's been quite a project. I think we've got everything accomplished on the plat and then on the landscaping. That was the last thing that took a little time getting everything worked out with how we are doing it in phases. This project right now is set up for 5 phases with the first building and as demand should go, the phases could go more than 1 at a time, but that's how we are working is 1 building at a time for right now and then add the parking along with each building as we construct them.

Chairman Truax said the question that I had just driving around the site is do you anticipate that people will want to get from the condos to the Temple across Randall Road? If so, how are they going to do that?

Mr. Koneru said the Temple has a proposal to have a second access to Randall Road and we contemplated about 3 years ago, maybe 4 years ago when we expanded the parking lot west of the Temple, about 400 parking spaces. As the Temple is getting busier, we feel that having a Randall Road access as a secondary access on only certain days that are required, maybe about 15 to 20 days. We are going to submit also an expansion plan for the Temple in the next 2 or 3 months. We want to include the parking at that time and the second entrance at that time, so that will be across the current Sequoia Road there to match the entrance.

Chairman Truax said the corner on Sullivan and Randall I don't believe would be a very safe place for people to be crossing and then there is no sidewalk on the north side of Sullivan, so there is really no way to get over unless you get in your car and drive over, which doesn't make sense since this is so close.

Mr. Koneru said I don't anticipate the condo owners will walk across to the Temple. As you know, this is a 55 plus community, so most of them like to drive. Also, a lot times the Temple functions and timings will be the later part of the day. Sometimes they have to stay to 7:00 to 8:00 o'clock. They would prefer to drive and go to the Temple rather than walking across. By the way, I am one of the founders of the Temple, so I know the area since 1984. There are many members that come to the Temple that requested to have a retirement community close to their Temple so that they can often visit the temple.

Mrs. Vacek said I'll do the first recommendation and let you vote and then we'll do the second. Staff would recommend approval of the Resolution approving the Final Plat for Balaji Homes Condominiums Subdivision being vacant land located at the southwest corner of Sequoia Drive and Randall Road.

MOTION OF APPROVAL WAS MADE BY: Mrs. Cole

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mrs. Duncan

AYES: Mr. Bergeron, Mr. Chambers, Mrs. Cole, Mr. Divine, Mrs. Duncan, Mr. Pilmer, Mr. Reynolds

NAYS: None

Mrs. Vacek said staff would recommend conditional approval of the Resolution approving a Final Plan for Balaji Homes Condominiums Subdivision located at the southwest corner of Sequoia and Randall Road for a multi-family dwelling use with the following condition:

1. That the number of enclosed and surface parking constructed with each building phase meet the parking requirement for the number of units being built in each building phase. Basically we just want them to meet the parking if they are going to do it by phases.

Mrs. Cole said can I ask a question? If they are doing this in phases, what will the rest of the property be? Will it be just mowed lawn or what will the rest of the property look like before it gets developed?

Mr. Tebrugge said under Phase 1 we will be doing all the landscaping around the detention pond and the first building, which is in the northwest corner. So the only other parcel that really isn't going to be touched too much is the 2 lots on the north side that currently have grass and trees on them, so that will just probably remain grass.

Mrs. Cole said but it will be maintained?

Mr. Tebrugge said yes. We'll have to comply with the city ordinance.

MOTION OF CONDITIONAL APPROVAL WAS MADE BY: Mr. Chambers

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mrs. Duncan

AYES: Mr. Bergeron, Mr. Chambers, Mrs. Cole, Mr. Divine, Mrs. Duncan, Mr. Pilmer, Mr.

Reynolds

NAYS: None

Mrs. Vacek said this will next be heard at the Planning and Development Committee meeting on Thursday, February 16, 2017, at 4:00 p.m. in the 5th floor conference room of this building.

Aye: 7 At Large Bergeron, At Large Cole, At Large Pilmer, Aurora Twnshp Representative Reynolds, At Large Divine, SD 204 Representative Duncan and Fox Valley Park District Representative Chambers
