



# City of Aurora

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

## Legistar History Report

**File Number: 19-0908**

**File ID:** 19-0908

**Type:** Resolution

**Status:** Agenda Ready

**Version:** 2

**General  
Ledger #:**

**In Control:** Building, Zoning,  
and Economic  
Development  
Committee

**File Created:** 10/04/2019

**File Name:** Fox Valley Developers, LLC / Avalon Heights / Former  
Copley Hospital / Preliminary Plat

**Final Action:**

**Title:** A Resolution Approving a Preliminary Plat for Avalon Heights Subdivision located along Weston Avenue and Seminary Avenue between S. Lincoln Avenue and S. 4th Street (Fox Valley Developers, LLC - 19-0908 / AU27/1-19.063-SU/PD/Ppn/Psd - JM - Ward 4)

### Notes:

**Agenda Date:** 11/13/2019

**Agenda Number:**

### Sponsors:

**Enactment Date:**

**Attachments:** Exhibit "A" Preliminary Plat - 2019-10-28 -  
2019.063.pdf, Property Research Sheet - 2019-04-24 -  
2019.063.pdf, Land Use Petition and Supporting  
Documents - 2019-10-03 - 2019.063.pdf, Plat of  
Survey Combined - Avalon Heights 2019-10-03 -  
2019.063 .pdf, Plat of Survey - Bardwell School -  
2019-10-03 - 2019.063.pdf, Legistar History Report  
(Preliminary Plat) - 2019-11-01 - 2019.063.pdf

**Enactment Number:**

**Planning Case #:** AU27/1-19.063-SU/PD/Ppn/Psd

**Hearing Date:**

**Drafter:** jmorgan@aurora-il.org

**Effective Date:**

## History of Legislative File

| Ver-<br>sion: | Acting Body:                                                                                   | Date:      | Action:     | Sent To:         | Due Date:  | Return<br>Date: | Result: |
|---------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------------|------------------|------------|-----------------|---------|
| 1             | City Council                                                                                   | 10/08/2019 | referred to | Planning Council | 10/15/2019 |                 |         |
|               | <b>Action Text:</b> This Petition was referred to to the Planning Council                      |            |             |                  |            |                 |         |
| 1             | Planning Council                                                                               | 10/15/2019 |             |                  |            |                 |         |
|               | <b>Notes:</b> <i>Representatives Present: Michael Poulakidas, Ryan Martin and Mike Elliott</i> |            |             |                  |            |                 |         |
|               | <i>I'm Michael Poulakidas, managing member of Fox Valley Developers.</i>                       |            |             |                  |            |                 |         |
|               | <i>I'm Ryan Martin with Mackie Consultants, Site Civil.</i>                                    |            |             |                  |            |                 |         |

I'm Mike Elliott with Kluber Architects, Engineers.

Mr. Poulakidas said so 2 years ago we formed a group that undertook to redevelop and repurpose the old abandoned Copley Hospital. It's worked out in two phases. The first phase was to remediate and selectively demo the inside of the building. That allowed us two things. One is to show that we have the capacity to do that. The other was to allow us to get started on our financing, which a major portion of the project is financed using Historic Tax Credits. All of those wheels have been put into motion. One of the issues with the property, as everyone at this table I'm sure is well aware, there were no drawings on this building and you couldn't access the building to get drawings. For that matter, we couldn't access the building to get complete structural reports. Since we've demoed and remediated the building completely, Kluber Architects has gone in and given us a full structural report showing that the building is sound. They've also redrawn the entire building. The proposed uses for the buildings, and if it's okay I'm going to reference them by year number, so the 1888 building is being repurposed into an old pharmacy with a deli. The 1916 building, the 1932 building and the 1947 building are being repurposed into senior living, of which we have engaged Garden Management Solutions. They are the 10th largest assisted living senior care management provider in the country. We've signed them on to manage the property. Those three buildings we like to informally call the "U" in our circle. Then in the middle of that where there used to be just really the old laundromat and I believe what was back of the house sections for the old hospital is now going to be used as a courtyard, or the proposed use is going to be a courtyard. Then going to the 1950's nurses addition, we have agreements with the East Aurora School District that they will be repurposing that building as their School Administration building and we're also proposing to build them a one story meeting/training facility. Those plans are actually drawn. We have gone in for foundation and remainder of demo permit on those two buildings and I just found out this morning from Cordigan and Clark that their drawings are 100% complete and Conrad Construction will be submitting for permits within the next two days for those buildings. That takes us to the 1970's building and we have broken that up into two portions, if you will. The first two floors will be used, or the proposed use is, a health care center. The first floor would be an urgent care with physical therapy, labs, imaging, as well as a small workout facility for the campus. The second floor we are earmarking for a surgery center. Of course, the surgery center is subject to a Certificate of Need. However, our plans are moving forward with the full expectation that the group that is interested in obtaining the CON would obtain the CON. Then the upper four floors would be an apartment complex for adults with cognitive and developmental disabilities that have low support needs. It is an emerging concept. It is one that is slowly growing across the country, but it is a very successful model. Little by little, developers are becoming more aware of these. There is one in St. Louis. There are two in Phoenix, Arizona. There are two in California. There is one that just opened up in Vancouver, Washington. There is a smaller model that's similar to ours that's in Highland Park, Illinois that has 14 units. Ours is proposed for 53 units. Then we obtained the approvals for the demolition of the 1980 cancer center and the powerhouse, which because of the tax credits, was no small feat, but we believe really squared off the campus. Being an attorney, I really like squares. We all feel and I think everyone agreed as soon as that came down that it really cleaned up the site. The other exciting thing is that, of course, subject to all these approvals that where typically the Historic Society, or SHPO, State Historic Preservation Office and National Park Service, does not allow for many exterior changes, they have in this instance on the two story building that right now is just the brown brick, they are allowing us to put windows in that would mimic the upper floors to open up that area and not just make it look like a brick face. Then, of course, working with the Park District we are very excited to be adding in green space to this area that hasn't had green space before. They feel our frustration in dealing with the current property owner that owns some of the parcels that we don't currently own. The park is going to start out at one size, which right now we are showing that they would own the rain garden. We're actually going to be adjusting that and taking that out where we would own that. I'm very confident that it is going to look fantastic between us and what the park is going to be doing and it will look like it fits, but we will be maintaining the rain garden and not leaving that to the responsibility of the Park District. As some of you already know here, as we obtain the rest, God willing, once we obtain the rest of the lots that we don't own, we will be giving some of those to the Park District to be able to expand that park size. The ideal for us would be to satisfy the city's needs for parking while giving as much green space as we can to the area. Then the other exciting part of all this, which is wrapped up into these three different numbers, is that we are proposing to

close down Seminary near Lincoln, make that a park that would be owned by East Aurora and then we would then expand the alleyway so that the public can access that area and also the school buses can now put their traffic through there to have the kids dropped off in the area behind the school as opposed to Lincoln. I think this is a win/win in a lot of ways, not only because it will clean up, it eliminates the traffic jam that is on Seminary, but it frees up Lincoln where people aren't avoiding that during the day at certain points of the day. My opinion as a homeowner, I would much rather live in an area where it is kind of blocked off and not a through way than the alternate. We feel as though our team has come up with a super exciting concept. We have uses that are backed by providers that have a story of success and are super excited to take the next steps. I know I get wordy at times, so I apologize. I hope that gives everyone a nice little overview and an up to date of what we are doing.

Mr. Sieben said Jeff Palmquist is here with the Park District. Jeff, you are eventually party to this. Do you want to state any comments you have?

Mr. Palmquist said I don't know if it relates to this or the other item down there, which is the plat we're initiating.

Mr. Sieben said we are talking about all three.

Mr. Palmquist said we can talk about all three. So the park site, my understanding is going to be Lot 7.

Mr. Sieben said let me pull up the plat.

Mr. Palmquist said so Lot 7 on the Preliminary Plat is indicated at 1.34 acres and so that would extend all the way up to the alley and include the right-of-way.

Mr. Phipps said correct.

Mr. Palmquist said that was my understanding and just so everyone else at the table understands where the park site is going to be initially located. That, of course, triggers a number of considerations that we would all have them, you know, the vacation of a right-of-way that's obviously part of the plat consolidation. The accommodation for the underlying utilities. It would be certainly in the best interests of the park to have those contained over the utilities rather than keeping it wide just in terms of giving us a little more flexibility in terms of what we can do with utilities, obviously not putting anything over. We wouldn't put a playground over any pipes in the ground. Then ask about a plan, so the site's not real big and this project is actually funded with IDNR grant money. The initial plan we had actually had a different configuration up there at the northern parking lot because we were dealing with what Fox Developers had ownership of and the primary feature was a playground and we wanted open space, both for the development and for the surrounding area with rather dense small yards a chance to play, so 1.34 acres gives us a little more than what we had originally. That's why I thank you for moving the rain garden. I understand why that was an initial proposal. I'm not sure whether it was going to be seen as an asset or a liability. Ultimately, it would have been a liability for the park, so working with engineering, it appears that we will be able to have a solution that wouldn't encumber the park with a rain garden. So I addressed the vacation, the plat, and utilities as we get into the final platting. Then the other question or issue would be the hammerhead at Weston. I appreciate the effort to make that functional, but as tight as possible so we are not spreading out into the park. The side garages on either side of Weston may prevent it, but in a perfect world that hammerhead could even slide to the east and be totally off the park property. I don't know if that's possible or not Mark.

Mr. Phipps said I think in order to do that then if a snow plow needed to turn around, they would be using the private property owner's driveways.

Mr. Palmquist said those driveways right there at the back?

Mr. Phipps said yes, I think so. The city actually would prefer to have a cul-de-sac there, but we

realize that would be cutting into your park.

Mr. Palmquist said thank you for that. There's only those two driveways too. There will be no park structures there or anything. Obviously, the fire trucks would have those two houses, but nothing beyond it from a park standpoint.

Mrs. Morgan said and we are wanting that dedicated, correct Mark?

Mr. Palmquist said that was going to be my next question is how any portion of the hammerhead that falls on the park, is that going to be part of a right-of-way? So the final platting should show that as part of right-of-way, so the 1.34 acres is going to be 1.28 or something like that.

Mr. Phipps said I was thinking that would be right-of-way. If there is a reason that you think it can't be...

Mr. Palmquist said I would prefer that. That's cleaner with DNR. I don't want to represent that we're getting 1.34 acres and then they see infrastructure, city infrastructure. They may have a problem with that.

Mr. Sieben said so the hammerhead will be right-of-way then, so that's a comment. I think you guys have already made that Mark, I believe. Just to clarify Jeff and Michael, the existing rain garden, which is shown at the south end of the park site, Michael I believe you said you would carve that out and that would not go to the Park District. Is that what I'm hearing?

Mr. Poulakidas said that's what I thought we were doing.

Mr. Martin said it's an option. We have to kind of look at rain gardens pretty holistically.

Mr. Palmquist said we need it off the park site.

Mr. Sieben said but then you are getting less land.

Mr. Palmquist said we need the same amount of land. It has to go somewhere else on the property.

Mr. Sieben said that's what I thought you said, so you guys will have to discuss that.

Mr. Palmquist said and just with the sequence of DNR, I appreciate there may be some land or not in the future and where it is it would preclude a good pedestrian access from the south. That's the beauty of this park is we can get better direction north and south. We just need to assume that.

Mr. Phipps said the flexibility that the city can provide is that what we'd like to see is the Kane County Stormwater Ordinance has a requirement for there to be best management practices as a part of a development like this and so we'd like to see as much of the required stormwater treatment volume provided on-site as we can, but the Kane County Ordinance allows for there to be a fee in lieu of stormwater best management practices, so realizing that all the constraints and the challenges, we'd like to see the effort made to get as much as that retention volume on-site as possible and then if there is a portion of it that can't be relocated or squeezed in somewhere where everybody can be satisfied with it, then we could consider whether paying a fee in lieu of that would be possible. Then the city uses that to put best management practices in other locations in the city.

Mr. Palmquist said and I appreciate the city's understanding of just how tight the space is and the value of usable open space. It is a great project and one of the highlights is that this is an asset to the neighborhood and having something over an acre for open space. It's not going to be unlike Palace Street when we took the parking lot and converted that to a park and you can envision that over here, but now if you are encroaching on half of that green space with a rain garden that really limits the benefit for both the project and the neighborhood, so understanding there may be a fee in lieu of portion or some other openness to a few other areas is really appreciated by me and I'm sure all the residents.

*Mrs. Morgan said so the road is already vacated. Do we have easements already, or is that being granted?*

*Mr. Martin said Weston Avenue is vacated and easements are granted along with that vacation.*

*Mrs. Morgan said okay, so the easement currently then is over the entire road?*

*Mr. Martin said correct.*

*Mrs. Morgan said so the park prefers it just be running along where the actual lines are?*

*Mr. Palmquist said that would be greatly appreciated to get those easements over the utilities.*

*Mr. Martin said that would be a vacation then.*

*Mrs. Morgan said so we need to vacate and then dedicate?*

*Mr. Martin said correct. The dedication would be part of the Final Plat.*

*Mrs. Morgan said and they would need a separate vacation of city easements.*

*Mr. Martin said correct, city easements and any utilities that have rights to those easements.*

*Mr. Phipps said I would think the easement wouldn't need to be as wide as the right-of-way is, but it would need to be wider than, it wouldn't just be over the top...*

*Mr. Palmquist said oh no you need some area, of course.*

*Mr. Phipps said so we can take a look at the depth of the sewer in that area and see what would be appropriate.*

*Mr. Palmquist said and you'll have to put that diagonal in an easement anyway. You're kind of at the drawing board anyway.*

*Mrs. Morgan said so for Planning, we were planning on just kind of keeping the R-4, but then after looking at it, it made more sense to try to zone it a little closer to what the uses are. As you can see, there are three items coming from Legistar, so the Special Use Planned Development will be over just the portion Avalon Heights owns. So we are doing a Plan Description, which changes the underlying zoning to R-5 with a Special Use on the majority of the parcel. The school portions, the old building as well as the addition, we are going to zone Office with a Special Use and then the park will be Park with a Special Use. The Preliminary Plan, we did ask them to show south of what Avalon Heights owns to show that connection, so the Preliminary Plan does encompass a little more and then the Plat is just, again, the Avalon Heights portion that is part of the rezoning through the Special Use. We are in the process of doing the notifications for that. We are going to go to the November 6th Planning Commission meeting with the Special Use and Preliminary Plan and Plat. We've been back and forth with general comments, but we'll get some additional comments out, nothing major. I think we've touched on most of the major stuff. It sounds like between us and Engineering comments, there are going to be some platting changes and Building's comments about crossing a lot line with a building, so the plat will be kind of altered. We are working on the Plan Description. I hope to get that out soon. I'll send that to you guys. I would recommend, I believe you have a lawyer now too, to have him look at the Plan Description and look at the base zoning because anything that's not altered specifically in the Plan Description, it goes by whatever is in the base zoning, the underlying, so just making sure that staff caught anything that needs to be changed, or changing setbacks, or changing parking requirements, and lot coverage requirements. I'm thinking minimum square footage requirements will be altered.*

*Mr. Sieben said so we are trying to make everything conforming with what your final project is in the*

zoning document.

Mrs. Morgan said in addition to uses.

Mr. Sieben said Mark, I know Tim got comments out a while ago.

Mr. Phipps said we've been in touch with Mackie and the team and we are waiting to see how they want to address those items. A number of the items that we put in our review letter are items that would be addressed at final engineering. This doesn't need to be voted out today, is that correct?

Mr. Sieben said no.

Mr. Martin said there was nothing that we were looking at too that I don't think we can't work through either. It is all very straightforward.

Mr. Beneke said we had a phone conversation yesterday. We just got a revision to our original comments from the Fire Plan, so we'll be looking at those. I haven't had a chance to sit down with the Fire Marshall yet, but I kind of gave you a few heads up on a couple of things, you know, keeping hydrants within 5 feet of the fire lanes and trying to get the 26 foot fire lanes where we are doing new work and some turning requirements and aerial apparatus things. I think that we recognize the difference between existing that's not changing and new and we will work within those guidelines, but we just need to have that delineated well enough. We'll take a look at it. As soon as I can get with the Fire Marshall, we'll get right back to you on anything we may have.

Mr. Frankino said heard mention of a food service area that might just need to have a grease trap, which I'm sure you're expecting anyway. Other than that, it looks like most of the infrastructure on the sanitary side seems to be staying in place, unless you are tearing down a building and rebuilding it doesn't necessarily need to be rehabbed. That would be probably a city spec if that would be more stringent than ours if you had it regarding existing sanitary rehabbing, but we wouldn't require it unless the building was razed and reconstructed. Other than that, it's just a grease trap inside for the food service area.

Mr. Martin said it can be outside, exterior?

Mr. Frankino said we actually prefer it. I'm sure a lot of food service people do as well. You don't want your pumper guy in the middle of the kitchen.

Mr. Poulakidas said exactly. We'll probably push the limit.

Mr. Frankino said we'll help you with sizing on that.

Mr. Poulakidas said yes, perfect.

Mr. Frankino said we'll use a comparable type project.

Mr. Palmquist said the only other thing I wanted to mention, Michael mentioned in his presentation about ownership and assembly and open space and we've been talking for some time and I really appreciate the challenges that they've had in trying to put this together and also help the Park District and the park. You had mentioned about some potential future open space depending on property. I believe if you go up to the upper right, it would be the third parcel over, so that one you don't currently own, correct?

Mr. Poulakidas said we do not.

Mr. Palmquist said and that's one of the reasons why we end up shifting over here because the park was just to the west of that originally shown and that was what our application to DNR was, but we love to add that to the park. I know that there's this challenging question and Special Use that you have to wrestle with and what the parking requirements are. If you are on the fence, know that if it went open

space it would be an asset and it would be rolled into the park.

Mr. Sieben said we agree if we feel that we're comfortable with the parking as is and don't need to add that other road if you add this it could go to the Park District.

Mr. Poulakidas said and the reason, so that everyone knows for that change, is there were certain parcels that there was actually a tax buyer and we fully engaged those tax buyers, fully engaged their attorneys and then as we did our due diligence it came out that they didn't do what they were supposed to do. One of the, we actually tracked them through court, and it, in fact, got kicked out by the judge because they couldn't verify and document how it needed to be done, or they couldn't document that it was done properly. We had gone with in with this excitement that we're in negotiations because we obtained several other parcels through tax buyers who did it the right way and the other parcels, unfortunately, we ran into tax buyers who didn't have their I's dotted and their T's crossed and we kind of hit a brick road and we're now starting the process all over again. We're comfortable that at least a couple of the parcels will come. We'll see how that plays out in the next year or so.

1 Planning Council 10/22/2019

**Notes:** Mrs. Morgan said so this is the former Copley Hospital development. We are set for November 6th for a public hearing. The applicants have sent out their public notifications. We have sent out the Beacon request to notify that in the newspaper. Planning sent out comments last week. Nothing major, mostly some minor comments. The Final Plat will be a little complicated with several vacations and dedications happening, so I think that's probably the biggest thing we are trying to work through with the applicants on just how best to handle that.

Mr. Phipps said we sent our comments out a few weeks ago. I know that they are working to address those, but we haven't seen a resubmittal.

Mrs. Morgan said they've started addressing the Final Plat because I think Planning, Engineering and Fire all kind of commented that some of the layouts don't make sense. They are reducing the number of lots so that most of the existing buildings would be on one lot, all the drive isles and parking would kind of be in a separate lot and then the school would be a lot and then the park is what they are envisioning.

Mr. Beneke said we sent out comments too so we are just waiting for another resubmittal on that.

Mrs. Morgan said but this is set for November 6th.

1 Planning Council 10/29/2019 Forwarded Planning 11/06/2019 Pass  
Commission

**Action Text:** A motion was made by Mrs. Morgan, seconded by Mrs. Vacek, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Planning Commission, on the agenda for 11/6/2019. The motion carried by voice vote.

**Notes:** Mrs. Morgan said Avalon Heights did a resubmittal just yesterday addressing some of Planning's comments. Nothing major has changed. As you can see, they are still showing the vacation for the park. They did remove off the stormwater detention they were showing per the Park District's comments. They gave us the right-of-way dedication per Engineering/Planning comments. Other than that, they just kind of cleaned up some of the site. They included some extensions of the sidewalk that Planning requested. The Preliminary Plat they've changed to address some of the fire access comments, so there's less lots than had been shown previously. They are only showing 3 lots now. We are still working through some minor comments with some of the platting issues. They are showing some dedications of city easements that we are requesting on the plat. These resubmittals still need to be reviewed, so we are set for November 6th for a public hearing. They met all the advertisement requirements. I would make a motion to move this forward to the November 6th Planning Commission with the conditions that they meet all of Planning's and Engineering's and Fire's comments. Mrs. Vacek seconded the motion.

Mr. Palmquist said I appreciate the fact that there is no rain garden. That was the biggest issue and they have addressed our comments at the last meeting of getting utilities within easements and not doing that blanket over the right-of-way. So I appreciate that. In the review letter, there was some

comment and response regarding the hammerhead and potential sidewalk. We're good with the proposed solution of the two sidewalks and don't need it wrapped around and agree the applicant's comment that we want to keep the amount of pavement to a minimum so as not to encroach into the park. I would continue to look at whatever creative ways we can to keep that hammerhead as tight as possible since there are really only two homes there with side load and there's good access, so whatever we can do to keep that this size or smaller we would certainly endorse. I appreciate the recognition with Engineering and the developer on needing to coordinate engineering of the park with this. As is contemplated, they'll dedicate the park and in all likelihood the park will be done before the project will be very far along. Our hope is to get this constructed by mid-summer next year. There may be some slight adjustments or whatever as we do our engineering of our park that could interface with what they're proposing. They had some notes and some engineering that I'll want to run by our engineers to make sure it is okay as we get to the final.

Mr. Phipps said Jill already added the comment that the final approval would be contingent upon addressing all of Engineering's comments. Obviously, the reason is that we haven't had a chance to review the latest submittal in detail yet. It is good to know that they are working with the Park District to coordinate the Park District's plans for the site with sidewalk connections and ground elevations to match up, so that's good.

Mrs. Morgan said and Herman I also just went ahead and conditioned this for Fire review.

Mr. Beneke said we still need to look at the resubmittal. I understood that they indicated that we'll have the hard copy here today. Once we can get that, I'll get with Javan and we'll see if we have anything and then update you.

The motion carried.

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                     |            |           |                                                      |            |      |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------------------------------------|------------|------|
| 2                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | Planning Commission | 11/06/2019 | Forwarded | Building, Zoning, and Economic Development Committee | 11/13/2019 | Pass |
| <b>Action Text:</b> A motion was made by Mrs. Anderson, seconded by Mrs. Owusu-Safo, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Building, Zoning, and Economic Development Committee, on the agenda for 11/13/2019. The motion carried.                                                  |                     |            |           |                                                      |            |      |
| <b>Notes:</b> See Attachment for Items 19-0902, 19-0903 and 19-0904.                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                     |            |           |                                                      |            |      |
| Aye: 10 At Large Cameron, Aurora Twnshp Representative Reynolds, At Large Anderson, SD 204 Representative Duncan, Fox Valley Park District Representative Chambers, At Large Owusu-Safo, SD 129 Representative Head, SD 131 Representative Hull, At Large Tidwell and At Large Gonzales |                     |            |           |                                                      |            |      |

---

Attachment for Items 19-0907, 19-0908 and 19-0909:

19-0907      An Ordinance establishing a Special Use Planned Development, approving the Avalon Heights Plan Description and amending Ordinance Number 3100, being the Aurora Zoning Ordinance and the Zoning Map attached thereto, to an underlying zoning of R-5(S) Multiple Family Dwelling District, O(S) Office District, and P(S) Park and Recreation District with a Special Use Planned Development for the property located along Weston Avenue and Seminary Avenue between S. Lincoln Avenue and S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street (Fox Valley Developers, LLC – 19-0907 / AU27/1-19.063-SU/PD/Ppn/Psd – JM – Ward) (PUBLIC HEARING)

Mrs. Morgan said as stated, this is a Petition by Fox Valley Developers requesting the establishment of a new Special Use Planned Development. There are multiple zonings currently on the site, so part of the Planned Development will rezone the property to the R-5(S) Multiple Family Dwelling District, O(S) Office District and P(S) Park and Recreation District with a Special Use Planned Development on the property. The property is commonly known as the historic Copley Hospital. This development will be for a mixed use redevelopment of the site, including the historic buildings. So just to give you a little of background to this site if you are not overly familiar with it, it is currently comprised of vacant buildings and lots. I have a map kind of showing an aerial of the site identifying with the different portions of development. The property contains multiple periods of development for the Copley Hospital as a group. Historically the first building dates from 1888 and that's like the Victorian brick building. As the population grew, there were additional blocks added in 1916, 1932, 1947, 1970 and 1980 to meet the needs of the growing city. The hospital also had a nurses training school and they built a dorm for that school in 1957. The dormitory is kind of by itself and the rest of the buildings all kind of just do a little U-shape as the site grew. The developer's proposal will adaptively reuse and rehabilitate all the significant buildings with only minor changes. Those include a demolition of a non-contributing 1932 powerhouse and the 1980 block along with two new additions. Just to let you know, the developers are planning on using Historic Tax Credits for this development, so all alterations, including interior and exterior, has to be approved by the State Preservation Office for those tax credits. The project includes the mixed use redevelopment and a new planned park as well. The 1888 block is planned for a commercial use on the first floor, including a potential pharmacy and with offices above. The 1917 to 1947 block, which is the brick building that kind of does a U-shape, is planned for a senior living community consisting of independent living, assisted living and memory care for a total capacity of 99 residents is what they are planning on. The 1970 block is planned to house several health care providers and services on the lower two floors. The upper floors will be renovated into a 53 unit independent apartment community for adults with cognitive and developmental disabilities, which will require minimal support. The developers can kind of explain that in more detail as well. The nurses building, along with a 7,500 square foot addition, will be repurposed to serve the East Aurora School District. They are going to use it for offices and the addition will be used for a training room. That's kind of a long description of how they are going to use the property. In order to do that, they are asking for a new Planned Development and asking for rezoning. The majority of the site is going to be zoned R-5(S) for Multiple Family Dwelling District, which encompasses the 1888 portion to the 1970 portion and is the majority of the buildings along with most of the parking and the drive aisles. The nurses dormitory and the addition are going to be rezoned O(S) Office District. Then you can see in this map Parcel A is the R-5. Parcel B is what the School District is going to be taking over and is going to be the O(S). To the far right of the site is a park,

a 1.3 acre park. That will be dedicated to the Fox Valley Park District. Along with the Plan Description there are going to be some modifications to the base zoning because of the uniqueness of the site, including use regulations, bulk restrictions and signage. The R-5 modifications will allow the following uses. We specifically outlined in the Plan Description what uses will be only permitted in the R-5 portion. Those include housing services for the elderly, age restricted multi-family dwelling units, multi-family dwelling units for adults with cognitive and developmental disabilities, health and human services, retail sales and services use and a business and professional office use. There are also some other modifications to allow a smaller minimum floor area because of the nature of it for senior living. So a minimum of 540 square feet and increasing the height because there is currently a historic building that is taller than the minimum height requirement. Then also reducing the setbacks and the lot coverage to zero because of the existing site. The modifications for the O portion of the uses is going to allow everything allowed in the O currently under our base zoning, as well as allowing educational services, so the school can use it for offices and their training center. There are some modifications to the parking because they are going to be doing shared parking. Some of their uses like the cognitive disability don't necessarily need parking so we kind of reduced that requirement. Concurrently with the proposal, the Petitioner is wanting a Preliminary Plat. They are just subdividing into 4 lots. Then the Preliminary Plan is slightly a little larger than what is on the Plan Description and the Preliminary Plat. That is because staff wanted to show Bardwell to the south to show how those two are going to be connected. The development of Bardwell includes the vacation of a portion of Seminary Avenue, so you can see Seminary is being vacated and it is going to be turned into like a greenspace walking area so they can walk from the school to the office complex. Because of that vacation, they are also going to dedicate a new alley so you can get from Seminary Avenue and go through the alley to Marion Avenue. Also to note, Weston Avenue has actually been vacated, so it is technically a city road. The developers are proposing actually kind of creating more of an internal road for their development and it is going to end at the park. The rest of the site is pretty much remaining as is, except with demolitions I noted before and two small additions. They are redoing the parking, adding some additional portion of parking for a total 430 spaces. So just to note, in 2005 this area was part of an overlay district and part of the overlay specifically called out this area to encourage the conversion and reuse of the former Copley Hospital in a manner that preserves the character of the existing campus while also promoting economic reuse of the site and potentially creating a Planned Development, which is what the developers are here for. Staff does believe that this proposed development meets that objective of the overlay district while also reducing some parking traffic to the surrounding communities by directing the residential developments to seniors and adults with disabilities. For those reason, staff does recommend support of this Special Use Planned Development. If you have any questions for me or I can bring the Petitioners up and they can get into a lot more detail about the uses if you have questions on those.

Ms. Tidwell said from what I read, your recommendation is conditioned on Engineering.

Mrs. Morgan said I'm only conditioning the Final Plan on Engineering. Well two conditions on the Final Plan. There was fire. The Fire Marshall has, since my memo, reviewed the Fire Access Plan and has approved it, so I do recommend not including that condition. The Engineering condition is kind of our standard Engineering condition. They are in the process of reviewing the resubmittal. They don't expect any major changes to the site plan. This is preliminary, so they will have to come back through

for final with Final Engineering so they will probably get a lot more detailed comments from Engineering at that point.

Ms. Tidwell said does that come back to this committee then?

Mrs. Morgan said it will.

Mr. Hull said I have a question concerning the alleyway. Is that going to be a complete rebuild on that alley to handle the additional traffic that will going through there? The second part of that is, is there any consideration for snow removal that typically was a part of an alley route? The alley routes are typically the last routes that are done during snow removal. The question is, is it going to be a total rebuild and has staff considered the impact of snow removal?

Mrs. Morgan said I'm not certain if it is a total build. Maybe the Petitioners can address that. I do know that our Engineering Division looked at it and wanted certain width requirements to allow it to pass through as we do typically on our alleys. As far as I know, I don't know if there are any special considerations. I can ask the Engineering or Public Works Department on that if there is any special considerations for this particular alley. The school is also planning on using this to bring their busses through, so I would think they would need to address the snow, but maybe the Petitioner can better answer that.

Mrs. Owusu-Safo said just briefly, how does Weston Road operate? They are showing a driveway or some kind of access, but it leads to nothing, so just trying to see what the purpose of that is.

Mrs. Morgan said currently Weston connects all the way from Lincoln Avenue through. This proposal, Weston basically will become a private drive. They are changing the access slightly and shifting the access north. Currently the access is right south of what you are seeing now. Then it will become a private road that people can access through what you see as Weston to get to their site and then it will just dead-end at the park.

Mr. Owusu-Safo said okay. That's why I was asking what the purpose of that access was where it dead-ends at.

Mrs. Morgan said our Engineering and Public Works Department requested that this actually be dedicated right-of-way so that way if people are coming down Weston they have a turn around. There are two driveways right off of that, so if they are coming to visit those and can't get to the driveway they can turn around in our dedicated right-of-way.

Ms. Tidwell said just a follow up on Weston. Weston will not be vacated all the way to 4<sup>th</sup> Street will it?

Mrs. Morgan said no, not all the way. Basically it is currently already vacated from Lincoln Avenue to basically where that turnaround is. What's shown from 4<sup>th</sup> Street, I think there is like one property on either side, that will still be public road.

Mr. Cameron said as I look at the traffic flow through there, you've got the alley, you've got two entrances on Seminary available only from the east and then the access up on Lincoln. Am I reading that right?

Mrs. Morgan said there are two accesses off of Lincoln.

Mr. Cameron said is the second on into the small front lot?

Mrs. Morgan said yes.

Mr. Cameron said does that go through?

Mrs. Morgan said it does. You can go into the southern entrance and go through this like grey area into the remainder of their parking lot to get to Seminary Avenue or if you needed to get up here toward the park.

Mr. Cameron said so the lower one is basically the access for the East High central office?

Mrs. Morgan said I think that's more probably how it's designed, yes.

Mrs. Head said and when you bring up busses, I'm not understanding. What is the plan for Seminary to the alley? If I understood you correctly, is the alley going to be two way traffic and you're expecting full size busses to go down an alley?

Mrs. Morgan said the alley will be one way traffic. It is wide enough, according to our engineers, for busses to come down that alley. In the hashed area, they are actually going to pull over so that people can pass to the left. The Petitioner might be able to explain that better.

Mr. Cameron said I hope you have a lot of signage because it looks like they could place the drive in at one entry and come out the other entry. It looks to me like it is easy to get lost in there if you don't really put a lot of signage up.

Mrs. Morgan said we have spoken to the School District. They have approved this plan, but that is good to note, maybe make sure we have signage directing people, especially the first days of school and how that flow is going to have to work.

The Petitioners were sworn in.

I'm Michael Poulakidas, 346 N. Lake Street, Aurora, Illinois 60506.

I'm Mike Elliott with Kluber Architects/Engineers, 10 S. Shumway, Batavia, Illinois.

I'm Marty Burke with Mackie Consultants, 9575 W. Higgins in Rosemont.

Mr. Poulakidas said if I may, I'd start with a few of the questions that were asked before I start. There was a question regarding the snow removal in the alley. We've been in constant contact with Engineering. I think Jill was absolutely correct that we don't anticipate very many revision because we've been working since day one with them. For the flow of the snow removal trucks, we give them the access that they need to be able to flow freely in that area. As far as signage, for those of you that know the area, it is a minor miracle what the parents and the school do on a daily basis currently and for the past how many years to get the kids off of those busses. Basically Lincoln and Seminary both almost come to a shutdown. I say almost, not completely. You can still get through on Lincoln. What they do is unbelievably spectacular and we feel as though this plan has been created by, not just us, but in conjunction with the city, the engineers and the School District to ease the flow in that area. Is it 100% perfect? It is not, but we are bound by properties and this was a group effort that not only gave us and the School District a part in between what is going to be their School Administration Building and their large elementary school, but then also lets the flow of traffic on Lincoln proceed during the beginning and end of school when busses are then coming down the alley. We've had several meetings with Alderman Donnell and his ward. I can't speak for everybody, but this was also something we had brought up to the neighborhood and we are very excited about that. I believe that was all the questions. I believe I answered all of the questions.

Mr. Cameron said I think her comment on the snow plowing is we are assuming that it meets the Engineering requirements, but the crucial thing is where does it sit on the city's snow removal plan? They don't plow those until last and it needs to be treated other than an alley to make sure that the snow removal comes early in the program.

Mrs. Head said generally the City of Aurora is really good. If they are going to be using that as a bus drop off and pickup, that's why I'm asking these specific questions, then it's going to be one of the first plowed because the city is going to get the calls that it's going to have to get done. My concern is still the tail swing of a bus and the single lane. Someone's got to explain how you are going to get a 71 passenger, if you have both direction of traffic, how someone going west is going to be able to head south onto the street and not get tail swing from either somebody parked illegally, if we are talking congestion, on that street. Maybe I'm just not seeing it. I went there to try to look at this because it was confusing for me.

Mr. Burke said I appreciate your comments there. What we're trying to pull up right at the moment is a turning radius exhibit that we prepared. It addressed fire protection, but still very similar size vehicles. We did carefully look at, not only the circulation through the entire property at both access points, but also as you can see down there where the bus drop off is. We worked on the dimensions there and we felt very comfortable that there is enough dimension there to make what you have commented on work. With regard to the Commissioner's comments about signage, we do recognize that and we have a lot of work to do in our final engineering plans to identify all the appropriate signage throughout the entire property so that whomever is wanting to access one building is going to get to that building rather than have a circuitous route.

Mr. Poulakidas said so for those of you that are not as familiar with the area, as Jill had mentioned, in the 1916 building, the 1932 building and the 1947 building we have a management agreement with Guarded Management Living Solutions, who is the 29<sup>th</sup> largest senior living management in the country

and the 11<sup>th</sup> largest assisted living firm in the country, to manage our units. In the upper 4 floors of the 1970's block Jill had mentioned the IAC. It is an emerging model. It is an independent apartment community. There is 1 in St. Louis, 2 in Phoenix, 1 in California with 1 to be open and 1 in Vancouver, Washington. It is a model that houses individuals with cognitive and developmental disabilities that have low support needs. It is very much an emerging model with the level of population that's growing and in need of those services. We kind of liken it to a college dormitory, if you will, where the individuals have freedom, but they have a resident assistant watching over them. It is not licensed. It is an apartment complex, but it provides those individuals with the level of support that they would need for transportation and for job skills and training. We are very excited about that. On the first 2 floors, as Jill said, this would be our small healthcare center. The first floor we have entered into agreements with Vituity Health Care. It is a healthcare organization that's based out of California. They do have operations in Illinois. They provide the emergency room care at AMITA Mercy and also at Sherman Hospital in Elgin. So we are very excited to have them on board. We've also worked agreements with a local family counseling center and we are working everyday towards our applying for a Certificate of Need for our surgery center, working with Lab Corp for space and also with an x-ray lab and imaging firm that's based out of Illinois. Plans are moving forward. The reason we are obviously in front of you here today is to get this approval. As Jill has mentioned also, the pharmacy. We are working with a local independent pharmacist that has over 20 years of experience in the pharmacy to take the first floor of the 1888 building. We are well on our way to having this proposed development filled. It is no small task and we are working every day to finish it. We are moving on several tracks at once and that is because of the Historic Tax Credits. The Historic Tax Credits are providing the major funding source. They also, as some of you may know, have stringent restrictions. We are working with some of the best consultants in the country to make sure that we follow those restrictions. They limit us on what we can do on the outside, so 95% of the entire structure will remain as is. They did allow us to tear down the cancer center and the power plant and that was for fire access. As Marty and his team and Michael and his team were working with the city, it was determined that we needed a pass through and those were blocking the pass through and so in working with the State Historic Preservation Office and the National Park Service they had granted that modification when normally it wouldn't be something that they would grant. We are also excited that on the first 2 floors of the 1970's building that is brown brick right now, they are allowing us to pop in windows, which will open up that whole 2 story building that is going to be facing the East Aurora School Administration buildings. With that, along with all of the park space that we are working with the Park District on, proposes a very exciting development. As you see on the plan, we are donating or anticipating to donate almost 1.4 acres of property for an all access community park, something that is sorely needed in that area. Then with the vacation of Seminary, that will be a very exciting park space that not only the community will be able to use, but in talking with Bardwell they are very excited to be able to bring the kids out into the middle of that area and actually hold classes out there, something that just a few years ago that that school would never have thought possible. That, for the most, describes what we are doing. We appreciate all of the concerns, but hope that you understand that we are working through all of them. We are working diligently to get closed on our Historic Tax Credit financing by the end of the year. That's why we are in front of you here today with the Preliminary Plan and Plat so that our investors see what is anticipated to be approved on final subject to some of the specifics, which some of the concerns have been mentioned here today, all of which we are well aware of and hope that staff would agree. We are working with them to make sure that everything is followed and as agreed.

Mrs. Anderson said being that these are historic buildings, will they all be ADA compliant?

Mr. Poulakidas said we will be ADA compliant in all buildings except for the 1888 building on the second and third floor and that's because it is such an old building that we're not going to have elevators. Let me start from the beginning. It is a little complicated. The State Historic Preservation Office was able to give us certain variances for the inside of all the buildings to allow for elevators, to allow for access, to allow for widening of the hallways where needed. In that building, because it is so historic and because they consider that for lack of a better term the gem of the property historically, they want us to bring it back as much as possible to the way it was in 1888. We are literally working with the experts to define all the mill working, the trim working, the stair railings, the exterior brick work, the old roof, and the windows. The windows can't be new. We have to rebuild every single window from scratch. All the buildings will be except for that. Now the first floor of the 1888 building will be accessible, but the second 2 floors will not be accessible.

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

My name is Christina Rivas. My question is I live on S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street and my neighbors are either on the corner of Weston and 4<sup>th</sup> or at the little store. There is an alley behind there. Is this where you are putting the park? What happens to the alley back there? How do people get in and out of the store if you close that off because there are several houses behind the store that use that parking? What do I have that's guaranteed once that park is there that nobody is destroying my fence and stuff behind there, the properties behind there?

Mr. Sieben said what's your address?

Ms. Rivas said 459 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street. The parking is right behind me and then there's a little medical building and then the old Copley.

Chairman Pilmer said what we'll do, if you have any other questions, let us know, but at the end we will answer everyone's questions at once.

Ms. Rivas said is it going to raise our taxes? Because it is a historic neighborhood, how is it going to affect that?

I'm Alexandra Ruiz from 551 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street, Aurora, Illinois. I just wanted to know how that's going to affect the churches being that there is lack of parking closing that alley.

Chairman Pilmer said so the question was how it will affect the parking given that the street is being closed?

Ms. Ruiz said yes and the churches nearby that use those alleys.

Mr. Poulakidas said I'd like to address a few of those. Unfortunately, the one as far as the taxes are concerned, I can't answer whether or not it would raise taxes. What I can say is that we commissioned a study by a gentleman by the name of Joseph Pulaski who completed the study some years ago on the

outlet mall, a well-respected third party. We are anticipated to, during construction, to provide 740 jobs to the local economy and once construction is completed to have sustained 261 new jobs in the economy. I think everyone who knows the area knows what it is to not do anything with the level of police, fire and life safety issues that have happened prior to us being there. Since us being there I can tell you and I don't want to speak for the APD, but I can tell you the level of calls, I believe, have gone down. Now regarding the fact of the park, I can say this. We have an agreement with East Aurora School District that this community development will be providing 24 hours a day 7 days a week security. We will be providing that, so that will be on-site. There had been comments from the neighbors of the concern of the park on how it would be kept clean and if there would be traffic. I can say that we will be having our own security. Not to mention that, but also the great job that our Aurora Police Department does is second to none. I hope that would address that issue. As to the alley, we are not closing down that alley. That alley will be unaffected by the park. The park is being proposed only on the parcels that we have purchased. The alley will remain completely open to the public as it is now and so that will remain unaffected. As to the churches, I guess I'm unfamiliar, and maybe staff would have to answer that. Again, if it has anything to do with the alley, we are not affecting the alley. If it has anything to do with the fact that they may or may not need overflow parking, I hesitate to want to put anything on public record, but I can say that as a businessman in the Aurora community for the last 20 years, my family being in the Aurora community since 1975, I believe we are nothing but good neighbors and if there is an issue with a local church that has an issue with parking, the majority of our parking is going to be during the week for the School District. Our uses don't provide for very much parking. We'll have parking for the independents. We'll have parking for the staff. However, if a church had any issues, we would be more than welcome to talking to them and if the city had no issues, we want to be nothing but good neighbors, for not just the churches, but for everybody.

Mr. Hull said could you elaborate a little bit more about the issues related to crime? You brought it up that there are some things that are going on that you hope that this development will help put in a better light or help out the situation. I took it as there is a lot of crime and a lot things that are going on currently in the Seminary area and around the school.

Mr. Poulakidas said I apologize. I appreciate you letting me clarify that. I'm strictly speaking to the nuisances and the trespassing that was happening on the property. In fact, we are proud to become a part of that neighborhood. That is fantastic neighborhood. We are excited to becoming partners in that neighborhood. We've met several of the neighbors. For those of you that would drive by there, the houses are well kept. The neighbors do a great job of community support. I can definitely say this, in the 6 to 8 months where we were really having a problem on the property, 9 times out of 10 the kids that we would catch were from out of town. We believe that we have eliminated those nuisances, those phone calls to the Aurora Police Department. The trespassing to that property is what I was referring to, not to anything other than that.

Mrs. Anderson said I think it is great that you guys are doing this. These buildings have been here for a long time in the city and they are worthy of being saved and repurposed, so thank you for that.

Mr. Poulakidas said I have to say once we cleaned it up, once we remediated and selectively demolished the interior, and Michael and his team and Marty and their team determined that the building was structurally sound, bringing through, for instance, Guarded Management Solutions, again, I apologize if I

didn't say it properly before, but they are the 29<sup>th</sup> largest senior living provider in the country, the 11<sup>th</sup> largest assisted living provider in the country and the number 1 assisted living provider in the State and they can't wait to get started to filling this senior living facility in this property. Walking them through with the tall ceilings, walking them through and seeing what once was the back of the courtyard that's going to be now, which was the back of the house for the hospital before and now it is going to be the courtyard, so all the seniors will be looking over the courtyard on the south view. They are super excited to get started and very excited. They love that neighborhood, so again, I do apologize if I made any reference that this neighborhood is in our opinion second to none, not just in Aurora but in any town. We are beyond excited to be part of that community.

Mr. Cameron said I'm still confused. The lady here that was asking about, I don't know if she was talking about the alley off of Seminary or if she was talking over off Weston.

Mr. Poulakidas said can I just point on the screen? So 4<sup>th</sup> Street is here. On 4<sup>th</sup> Street there is an alley that runs on the north side of the property. There is an alley that runs east and west across several houses and that's an access way for them to get to their garages.

Ms. Rivas said there is a little store and then there are 3 houses and then there is the stone house on Weston. Right behind the 3 houses connecting to the store, there's an alley there and it goes right behind the 3 houses. That's the alley I'm referring to.

Mr. Sieben said the alleys aren't being touched.

Ms. Rivas said how is that going to connect to the park? Right behind that alley is where you are putting the park, correct?

Mr. Sieben said you are referring to the alley behind South Avenue, correct?

Ms. Rivas said this is 4<sup>th</sup>? This is Weston, so this is the third house and the middle one is where I'm at and directly behind these 3 is an alley and they drive from the store entrance all the way back here because a lot of them park behind their houses there. That's what I was referring to.

Mr. Poulakidas said that's our property. Unfortunately, if it's what they are using as a quasi-alley right now, that's technically our property and that would be deeded to the Park District for a park. I guess I would imagine that over the years the neighborhood has been using that in different ways to get through, but that's part of the overall parcels and what was anticipated to be donated to the Park District for their park.

Mr. Hull said how is it currently maintained? Does the city currently maintain that property?

Mr. Poulakidas said no. From my knowledge, the city only maintains the alley. We have been and are maintaining all of the property now.

Mr. Hull said are there garages on the alley there?

Mr. Poulakidas said no. Their access is from their driveway off of 4<sup>th</sup> to the property. In essence, their property would back up to the park.

Ms. Rivas said actually there is one garage at the edge of that alley in between the store and when you start down the alley. That is 457 S. 4<sup>th</sup> I think, which is my neighbor. Right here is her garage. This is my fence and my garage goes here, but this would be her garage and it comes off if here, so this would all be park here?

Mr. Poulakidas said correct. The garage she is referring to leads to the alleyway that's there currently, not going to our property. She would have access. This access for this alley is not changing at all.

Ms. Rivas said okay, what about the one behind here?

Mr. Poulakidas said what she is referring to would be the back of the properties that are facing 4<sup>th</sup> Street that would be now the park. This would all be park.

Ms. Rivas said it would all be park. And what's to keep kids from dealing with our fence and our garages?

Mr. Poulakidas said again, we can bring that issue up with the Fox Valley Park District, but we also intend on maintaining 24 hour security. The park has its hours of when this can be opened and closed. I would hope that that would eliminate any issues late at night.

Ms. Rivas said and how are you going to stop them from being in the park? Is it going to be fenced in?

Mr. Poulakidas said I apologize. I don't have those details from the Park District. I would believe that since it is a community park it would not be fenced in.

Ms. Rivas said okay, but I have to maintain my fence.

Mr. Poulakidas said correct.

Chairman Pilmer said as far as the fence, that's part of your property and you have to maintain it. The park has to maintain their property and provide security whether it be after hours or during hours of operation. That property will be deeded to the Park District. Right now it is part of the parcel.

Ms. Rivas said it is going to go right up to my fence?

Chairman Pilmer said well it would go right up to the property line. The property line today of the property goes right up to your fence, so that portion will be deeded to the Park District. It will be green space instead of concrete.

Ms. Rivas said okay, thank you.

The public input portion of the public hearing was closed.

Mrs. Morgan said for the Special Use Planned Development staff would recommend approval of the Ordinance establishing a Special Use Planned Development, approving the Avalon Heights Plan Description and amending Ordinance Number 3100, being the Aurora Zoning Ordinance and the Zoning Map attached thereto, to an underlying zoning of R-5(S) Multiple Family Dwelling District, O(S) Office District, and P(S) Park and Recreation District with a Special Use Planned Development for the property located along Weston Avenue and Seminary Avenue between S. Lincoln Avenue and S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street.

MOTION OF APPROVAL WAS MADE BY: Mr. Cameron

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mr. Hull

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

NAYS: None

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Is the proposal in accordance with all applicable official physical development policies and other related official plans and policies of the City of Aurora?

Mr. Chambers said yes and those are listed in the staff report.

2. Does the proposal represent the logical establishment and/or consistent extension of the requested classification in consideration of the existing land uses, existing zoning classifications, and essential character of the general area of the property in question?

Mr. Reynolds said yes the proposal represents the highest and best use of the property.

3. Is the proposal consistent with a desirable trend of development in the general area of the property in question, occurring since the property in question was placed in its present zoning classification, desirability being defined as the trend's consistency with applicable official physical development policies and other related official plans and policies of the City of Aurora?

Mr. Reynolds said again, the proposal represents the highest and best use of the property.

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

Mr. Cameron said it is typically not a high traffic use for the site, but it has been vacant for a number of years and it looks as though in general the accesses are similar to what was there before so there should be no problem.

5. Will the proposal allow for the provision of adequate public services and facilities to the property in question and have no adverse effect upon existing public services and facilities?

Mr. Cameron said they are either in place or will be provided.

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

Chairman Pilmer said I might add that based on the testimony we heard tonight that I believe the design is less intense than the existing use so it should help to decrease congestion on the public streets.

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

Mr. Cameron said it seems to be an improvement of the vacant facility that's been there for some time and has deteriorated and it is being renovated in the basis of the program that was set up some years ago by the city.

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

Chairman Pilmer said I would state that given the shift in the zoning we are accommodating the office use in accordance with the school along with a former parking lot that will be rezoned Park and Recreation, which should be an improvement in that area.

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

Mrs. Head said there is no saturation in that area.

- 9b. Is the special use in all other respects in conformance to the applicable regulations in the district in which it is located, except as such regulations may in each instance be modified by the City Council pursuant to the recommendations of the Plan Commission?

Mr. Chambers said yes it is.

Mrs. Morgan said this will next be heard at the Building, Zoning and Economic Development Committee on Wednesday, November 13, 2019, at 4:00 p.m. on the fifth floor of this building.

19-0908      A Resolution approving a Preliminary Plat for Avalon Heights Subdivision located along Weston Avenue and Seminary Avenue between S. Lincoln Avenue and S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street (Fox Valley Developers, LLC – 19-0908 / AU27/1-19.063-SU/PD/Ppn/Psd – JM – Ward)

Mrs. Morgan said staff would recommend approval of a Resolution approving a Preliminary Plat for Avalon Heights Subdivision located along Weston Avenue and Seminary Avenue between S. Lincoln Avenue and S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street.

MOTION OF APPROVAL WAS MADE BY: Mrs. Anderson

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mrs. Owusu-Safo

AYES: Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Cameron, Mr. Chambers, Mrs. Duncan, Mr. Gonzales, Mrs. Head,  
Mr. Hull, Mrs. Owusu-Safo, Mr. Reynolds, Ms. Tidwell  
NAYS: None

Mrs. Morgan said this will next be heard at the Building, Zoning and Economic Development Committee on Wednesday, November 13, 2019, at 4:00 p.m. on the fifth floor of this building.

19-0909      A Resolution approving a Preliminary Plan for Avalon Heights Subdivision located along Weston Avenue and Seminary Avenue between S. Lincoln Avenue and S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street (Fox Valley Developers, LLC – 19-0997 / AU27/1-19.063-SU/PD/Ppn/Psd – JM – Ward)

Mrs. Morgan said staff would recommend conditional approval of the Resolution approving a Preliminary Plan for Avalon Heights Subdivision located along Weston Avenue and Seminary Avenue between S. Lincoln Avenue and 4<sup>th</sup> Street with the following condition:

1. That all the comments of the Engineering Division be addressed prior to approval of Final Engineering.

MOTION OF CONDITIONAL APPROVAL WAS MADE BY: Mr. Chambers

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mrs. Head

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

NAYS: None

Mrs. Morgan said this will next be heard at the Building, Zoning and Economic Development Committee on Wednesday, November 13, 2019, at 4:00 p.m. on the fifth floor of this building.