



City of Aurora

5th Floor Conference
Room of City Hall
44 East Downer Place
Aurora, Illinois 60505
www.aurora-il.org

Planning Council Meeting Minutes

Tuesday
May 28, 2019
10:00 AM

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sieben called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

ROLL CALL

The following members were present: Mr. Sieben, Mrs. Vacek, Mrs. Morgan, Mr. Broadwell, Mr. Phipps, Mr. Beneke, Mr. Curley, Mr. Cross and Mr. Hughes.

OTHERS PRESENT

Others Present: Mike Frankino (Fox Metro), Chris Malensek (Wright Heerema Architects), and Mike Reynolds (Salvation Army).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

19-0457

Approval of the Minutes for the Planning Council meeting on May 21, 2019.

A motion was made by Mrs. Vacek, seconded by Mrs. Morgan, that the minutes be approved and filed. The motion carried by voice vote.

AGENDA

[19-0392](#)

Requesting approval of a Special Use for a Special Purpose Recreational Institution (5200) use on Lot 7 of the Original Town of Aurora located at 1-11 N. Broadway and 100-104 E. Galena Boulevard (Yetee Station Arcade - 19-0329 / AU22/3-19.038-SU - JM - Ward 2)

Mrs. Morgan said they did all their notifications. I haven't had any feedback or any comments from the public. This is scheduled to the June 5th Planning Commission. I do make a motion to move this forward to the June 5th Planning Commission. Mr. Beneke seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Mrs. Morgan, seconded by Mr. Beneke, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Planning Commission, on the agenda for 6/5/2019. The motion carried by voice vote.

19-0395

Requesting approval of a Final Plat for Lots 1-42 of Laurelton Place

Subdivision located north of Hafenrichter Road, east of Barrington Drive, and west of Whitethorn Drive (Pulte Home Company LLC - 19-0395 / WH05/1-19.035-Fsd/Fpn/VAC - JM - Ward 9)

Mrs. Morgan said Planning has sent out comments. The Petitioner is still in review and making those changes. There was nothing major from Planning, some formatting conditions and comments on the elevations and landscaping. We are not expecting any major issues there. The vacation and the landscape vacation will have to go all the way to City Council. The other two can stop at P&D with an appeal period. I do make a motion to move these forward to the June 5th Planning Commission with the conditions that the plans are changed to meet Planning's comments per our last memo and that they meet all of Engineering's comments and that they receive the CLOMR. Mr. Beneke seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Mrs. Morgan, seconded by Mr. Beneke, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Planning Commission, on the agenda for 6/5/2019. The motion carried by voice vote.

19-0396

Requesting approval of a Final Plan for Lots 1-42 of Laurelton Place Subdivision located north of Hafenrichter Road, east of Barrington Drive, and west of Whitethorn Drive for an One Family Dwelling (1110) Use (Pulte Home Company LLC - 19-0396 / WH05/1-19.035-Fsd/Fpn/VAC - JM - Ward 9)

Mrs. Morgan said Planning has sent out comments. The Petitioner is still in review and making those changes. There was nothing major from Planning, some formatting conditions and comments on the elevations and landscaping. We are not expecting any major issues there. The vacation and the landscape vacation will have to go all the way to City Council. The other two can stop at P&D with an appeal period. I do make a motion to move these forward to the June 5th Planning Commission with the conditions that the plans are changed to meet Planning's comments per our last memo and that they meet all of Engineering's comments and that they receive the CLOMR. Mr. Beneke seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Mrs. Morgan, seconded by Mr. Beneke, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Planning Commission, on the agenda for 6/5/2019. The motion carried by voice vote.

[19-0398](#)

Requesting the Vacation of a Landscape Easement for the property north of Hafenrichter Road, east of Barrington Drive, and west of Whitethorn Drive (Pulte Home Company LLC - 19-0398 / WH05/1-19.035-Fsd/Fpn/VAC - JM - Ward 9)

Mrs. Morgan said Planning has sent out comments. The Petitioner is still in review and making those changes. There was nothing major from Planning, some formatting conditions and comments on the elevations and landscaping. We are not expecting any major issues there. The vacation and the landscape vacation will have to go all the way to City Council. The other two can stop at P&D with an appeal period. I do make a motion to move these forward to the June 5th Planning Commission with the conditions that the plans are changed to meet Planning's comments per our last memo and that they meet all of Engineering's comments and that they receive the CLOMR. Mr. Beneke seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Mrs. Morgan, seconded by Mr. Beneke, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Building, Zoning, and Economic Development

Committee, on the agenda for 6/13/2019. The motion carried by voice vote.

[19-0399](#)

Requesting the Vacation of easements for the property north of Hafenrichter Road, east of Barrington Drive, and west of Whitethorn Drive (Pulte Home Company LLC - 19-0399 / WH05/1-19.035-Fsd/Fpn/VAC - JM - Ward 9)

Mrs. Morgan said Planning has sent out comments. The Petitioner is still in review and making those changes. There was nothing major from Planning, some formatting conditions and comments on the elevations and landscaping. We are not expecting any major issues there. The vacation and the landscape vacation will have to go all the way to City Council. The other two can stop at P&D with an appeal period. I do make a motion to move these forward to the June 5th Planning Commission with the conditions that the plans are changed to meet Planning's comments per our last memo and that they meet all of Engineering's comments and that they receive the CLOMR. Mr. Beneke seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Mrs. Morgan, seconded by Mr. Beneke, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Building, Zoning, and Economic Development Committee, on the agenda for 6/13/2019. The motion carried by voice vote.

[19-0434](#)

An Ordinance Granting a Special Use Revision Permit for a Social Service Agencies, Charitable Organizations, Health Related Facilities, and Similar Uses When Not Operated for Pecuniary Profit (6630) Use on the Property located at 550 Redwood Drive

Representatives Present: Mike Reynolds and Chris Malensek

My name is Chris Malensek. Thank you all for having use here. I'm with Wright Herrema Architects. We are working for the Salvation Army. We've been on board for the past year and a half or so. I know the Salvation Army has been looking at the property and has had ownership of this property for a while. We've completed a demolition process already under permit. This new facility would be for their Aurora Core and Community Center. I'll let Mike with the Salvation Army get into a little bit further to the uses that will be taking place within the facility. This would be a replacement of what's currently taking place on the Galena site.

Mr. Reynolds said obviously there is going to be a chapel for religious services as well as classrooms for education and food pantry. We are putting in a kitchen. We are going to hopefully sometime in the future have a canteen service that's actually housed in our building and not housed off site someplace else. That's way down the road, but we will be cooking for our canteen and various services. The youth activities someday would like the green space back there for a nice little soccer field. We would like to build a gym someday, but again, 50 years down the road probably, or less. We have seen the programs that we run out of there and we just need, particularly when it comes to seniors, one level and our building right now is split to kind of three levels.

Mr. Sieben said do you want to touch on the site plan a little bit?

Mr. Malensek said the building that was there was kind of centered on the site and the entire site is currently paved. The entrance was off of Redwood Drive from the east. We are still coming in off of Redwood Drive. We are keeping our parking primarily along the south property line and pushing to the west edge of the property with the intent to maintain green space on the northwest corner. That's increasing, obviously, coming up from a zero in terms of impervious and really improving that. We do have a

service drive to the northeast of the site. Again, the thought behind that is for food deliveries to kind of a storage area for the kitchen. It is separate from the public parking. There is hope that a gymnasium could be added or a garage could be added at a later point. That's not a part of this project so that service entry could potentially be used for that if and when that comes into play. So primarily it is a one story structure. It is a one story office building portion. You see the green steeple area. That is for the chapel. The Salvation Army is in the process of creating what they are calling their prototype, so they are kind of using this as a template for a number of their facilities around the Midwest. This was the kind of guinea pig of them, the first, so we've been trying to utilize what they've already developed. It is a steel structure with steel stud framing and a brick veneer.

Mr. Sieben said Steve Broadwell, our Planner with Planning and Zoning is here. Steve will be reviewing with any comments.

Mr. Broadwell said I'm reviewing it. I'm still putting together some formatting review comments. There are a few. I don't know if Javan and Herman have anything for the fire access. Do you want to do that first?

Mr. Cross said we do. We do have some comments. We reviewed the plan this morning, so I'll be sending those comments out later on this morning or early this afternoon. One thing was the building height that you had on the plan was 35.6. I'm imagining that's the highest point.

Mr. Malensek said it is.

Mr. Cross said so you just need to make sure that the mean height is less than 30 feet. If it is over 30 feet, then that kicks in some additional requirements as far as the size of the lanes, a fire apparatus lane and things of that nature. If we can get that question answered, that will have a bearing on the comments that I have. Additionally, if there is going to be future development of the site, that lane is going to have to basically meet that fire access going forward if that changes going forward.

Mr. Malensek said you are speaking to the lane on the northeast corner, correct?

Mr. Cross said correct. Right now the hydrant that's there, and I'll put this in the comments, there's a hydrant that is actually too close. You can see your dimension there showing that circle there. That radius is 50. It has to be more than 50 and less than 100. I'll put that in the notes. As far as that building height, if I can get a confirmation of that.

Mr. Malensek said we can get that for you.

Mr. Cross said okay. Then I'll wait on the comments rather than sending out a comment that doesn't have any bearing.

Mr. Malensek said I'm certain it is. I will get you the actual number on it.

Mr. Beneke said it is the highest roof that needs to be under that 30 foot.

Mr. Malensek said the mean has to be below 30 feet or the highest point?

Mr. Beneke said the highest roof portion mean.

Mr. Curley said the mean of the highest roof.

Mr. Malensek said understood.

Mr. Beneke said a couple of other things. We need to have 2 hydrants indicated on the plan, not just the 1. You are going to have to show the Fire Department Connection and a supply hydrant within. Like Javan was saying, an aerial apparatus lane is required along one entire side if it is over 30 feet. That's got to be within the 15 minimum, 30 feet max requirement, so that would affect what you've got here. That's why the question. If you're not there, then it doesn't come into play, but your sheet shows it being higher. Then also that would affect your lanes and require them to be 26 feet wide. Those are all things that kind of kick into extra things if you are over that 30 foot.

Mr. Cross said then one additional was the sprinkler room needs to be clearly shown on there. We need to have exterior access with an approved walkway that goes up to that sprinkler room.

Mr. Broadwell said I had one comment kind of following up with the elevations. I think we had talked about this on the phone last week. The building height is 35 feet, 6 inches, so there is a provision in the Zoning Ordinance for the B-2 zoning district, which this property is zoned. If it is over 35 feet, that actually increases the setback requirement. So if you can reduce the height of the steeple to be under 35 feet then the site plan setbacks will match what the requirements are. That's just one comment.

Mr. Beneke said Steve, to clarify, your height is to the top. Ours is the mean height.

Mrs. Vacek said or you can just push the building back a little bit.

Mr. Malensek said that would be off of the main street or that would be off of the northern property line as well?

Mr. Broadwell said it is the northern and the...

Mr. Malensek said so it is both.

Mr. Broadwell said yes.

Mr. Malensek said I think of the two, we could lose 6 inches off the height.

Mr. Broadwell said I think the other comments I have coming up are the site is a little bit short on landscaping. I'm going to put together comments. I'm still working through that right now and where they might need to be. The notes I have I think will clarify that.

Mr. Phipps said Kane County has adopted a new Stormwater Management Ordinance that becomes effective June 1st. For your site it is going to have a benefit. What I understand is that as you've been working with one of my reviewers and that you've been planning on paying a fee in lieu of stormwater detention for the site. Under the new ordinance, this site, which was almost entirely impervious, and then with the site you are proposing, which has much less impervious, stormwater detention would not be required, so the fee that you were planning to pay in lieu of stormwater detention wouldn't even be required. There is a bit of a tradeoff though. The new ordinance

would require something in the way of stormwater best management practices. I think it will be much less than what stormwater detention would have been, so I think there would be a net positive for your site. I couldn't tell you right off the top of my head what would be required, but it is something that we can probably work with Steve on and your staff to figure out what works in the landscape plan.

Mr. Malensek said well when you speak of best management practices that's a bio-swale or something of that nature, that extent to be determined?

Mr. Phipps said that's what we are leaning toward, yes.

Mrs. Vacek said and we can even look to see if we could do it in the parking lot in some of the parking islands.

Mr. Malensek said that's great news. Thank you.

Mr. Sieben said we have Alderman Franco of the 5th Ward whose ward this is in. Do you have a comment Alderman?

Mr. Franco said questions and comments. So the original plan was you have a gymnasium. If the gymnasium is going to be a later date, is there a reason why it is not going to be in this plan coming forward?

Mr. Malensek said currently it is simply funding. It is planned as if it would be and all future connections would tie to it, but currently it is a funding issue.

Mr. Franco said originally when I talked to Captain Rich Forney about this is I wanted to see if we could have extra lights back there. I think this particular geographic location could use some more illumination at night so if we could put extra lights in there, you know, the parking lot and the green space, that would be good. Then my other question is assuming everything goes as planned, what would your target date, your desired target date of starting be? Then once you start, how long would the project take to be up and going?

Mr. Malensek said we would start as soon as we have permits. We have approved funding. It has been bid out through Wegman Construction here locally. Their numbers came back favorably. It has been approved through the client. They are anxious to start as soon as they can. We anticipate a 12 month construction.

Mrs. Vacek said do you have a design for the gymnasium already?

Mr. Malensek said again, based on the prototype there is a gymnasium layout and design that's been kind of approved and has been tentatively shown.

Mr. Sieben said is that an addition to the back?

Mr. Malensek said it is. It moves to the west of the existing...

Mr. Sieben said I guess where Tracey is going there, we may want to show that and get it approved now with this and then you do not have to come back through the entitlement process to essentially do that.

Mrs. Vacek said if you have a size and you kind of have an idea of what it is going to look like, I think that would be our preference. Then you don't have to go through

another process.

Mr. Sieben said and just call it Phase 2. You have a footprint. Show it on the site plan. You have a proposed elevation that's close to what you want to do. I would recommend that.

Mr. Malensek said it is currently not designed to affect. So the way the current building is laid out, it wouldn't affect the parking or really anything else. The idea is we can kind of just plop it in there. It is just going to be green space right now.

Mrs. Vacek said I would highly recommend that. Then you don't have to go through another process.

Mr. Beneke said would that building also be over 30 feet high?

Mr. Malensek said I will go back and look. I don't believe it was and it was a single story as well, obviously taller than the others, but that was a flat roof construction.

Mr. Beneke said because that also affects all those fire comments. Make sure that we've got that planned appropriately.

Mr. Malensek said well 35 feet is the critical there and then 30 feet from the fire perspective.

Mr. Beneke said for mean.

Mr. Malensek said understood.

Mr. Broadwell said I think you guys are working on the public notice mailings, so those are due back tomorrow. We are getting ready for the June 19th Planning Commission, so this will be on the Planning Council agenda next week and the following week. I'll get started on these comments and then if you can get revisions for those.

19-0435

A Resolution Approving the Final Plat for Lot 1 of the Salvation Army Subdivision, Located at 550 Redwood Drive

Representatives Present: Mike Reynolds and Chris Malensek

My name is Chris Malensek. Thank you all for having use here. I'm with Wright Herrema Architects. We are working for the Salvation Army. We've been on board for the past year and a half or so. I know the Salvation Army has been looking at the property and has had ownership of this property for a while. We've completed a demolition process already under permit. This new facility would be for their Aurora Core and Community Center. I'll let Mike with the Salvation Army get into a little bit further to the uses that will be taking place within the facility. This would be a replacement of what's currently taking place on the Galena site.

Mr. Reynolds said obviously there is going to be a chapel for religious services as well as classrooms for education and food pantry. We are putting in a kitchen. We are going to hopefully sometime in the future have a canteen service that's actually housed in our building and not housed off site someplace else. That's way down the road, but we will be cooking for our canteen and various services. The youth activities someday would like the green space back there for a nice little soccer field. We would like to build a gym someday, but again, 50 years down the road probably, or less. We have seen the programs that we run out of there and we just need, particularly when it

comes to seniors, one level and our building right now is split to kind of three levels.

Mr. Sieben said do you want to touch on the site plan a little bit?

Mr. Malensek said the building that was there was kind of centered on the site and the entire site is currently paved. The entrance was off of Redwood Drive from the east. We are still coming in off of Redwood Drive. We are keeping our parking primarily along the south property line and pushing to the west edge of the property with the intent to maintain green space on the northwest corner. That's increasing, obviously, coming up from a zero in terms of impervious and really improving that. We do have a service drive to the northeast of the site. Again, the thought behind that is for food deliveries to kind of a storage area for the kitchen. It is separate from the public parking. There is hope that a gymnasium could be added or a garage could be added at a later point. That's not a part of this project so that service entry could potentially be used for that if and when that comes into play. So primarily it is a one story structure. It is a one story office building portion. You see the green steeple area. That is for the chapel. The Salvation Army is in the process of creating what they are calling their prototype, so they are kind of using this as a template for a number of their facilities around the Midwest. This was the kind of guinea pig of them, the first, so we've been trying to utilize what they've already developed. It is a steel structure with steel stud framing and a brick veneer.

Mr. Sieben said Steve Broadwell, our Planner with Planning and Zoning is here. Steve will be reviewing with any comments.

Mr. Broadwell said I'm reviewing it. I'm still putting together some formatting review comments. There are a few. I don't know if Javan and Herman have anything for the fire access. Do you want to do that first?

Mr. Cross said we do. We do have some comments. We reviewed the plan this morning, so I'll be sending those comments out later on this morning or early this afternoon. One thing was the building height that you had on the plan was 35.6. I'm imagining that's the highest point.

Mr. Malensek said it is.

Mr. Cross said so you just need to make sure that the mean height is less than 30 feet. If it is over 30 feet, then that kicks in some additional requirements as far as the size of the lanes, a fire apparatus lane and things of that nature. If we can get that question answered, that will have a bearing on the comments that I have. Additionally, if there is going to be future development of the site, that lane is going to have to basically meet that fire access going forward if that changes going forward.

Mr. Malensek said you are speaking to the lane on the northeast corner, correct?

Mr. Cross said correct. Right now the hydrant that's there, and I'll put this in the comments, there's a hydrant that is actually too close. You can see your dimension there showing that circle there. That radius is 50. It has to be more than 50 and less than 100. I'll put that in the notes. As far as that building height, if I can get a confirmation of that.

Mr. Malensek said we can get that for you.

Mr. Cross said okay. Then I'll wait on the comments rather than sending out a

comment that doesn't have any bearing.

Mr. Malensek said I'm certain it is. I will get you the actual number on it.

Mr. Beneke said it is the highest roof that needs to be under that 30 foot.

Mr. Malensek said the mean has to be below 30 feet or the highest point?

Mr. Beneke said the highest roof portion mean.

Mr. Curley said the mean of the highest roof.

Mr. Malensek said understood.

Mr. Beneke said a couple of other things. We need to have 2 hydrants indicated on the plan, not just the 1. You are going to have to show the Fire Department Connection and a supply hydrant within. Like Javan was saying, an aerial apparatus lane is required along one entire side if it is over 30 feet. That's got to be within the 15 minimum, 30 feet max requirement, so that would affect what you've got here. That's why the question. If you're not there, then it doesn't come into play, but your sheet shows it being higher. Then also that would affect your lanes and require them to be 26 feet wide. Those are all things that kind of kick into extra things if you are over that 30 foot.

Mr. Cross said then one additional was the sprinkler room needs to be clearly shown on there. We need to have exterior access with an approved walkway that goes up to that sprinkler room.

Mr. Broadwell said I had one comment kind of following up with the elevations. I think we had talked about this on the phone last week. The building height is 35 feet, 6 inches, so there is a provision in the Zoning Ordinance for the B-2 zoning district, which this property is zoned. If it is over 35 feet, that actually increases the setback requirement. So if you can reduce the height of the steeple to be under 35 feet then the site plan setbacks will match what the requirements are. That's just one comment.

Mr. Beneke said Steve, to clarify, your height is to the top. Ours is the mean height.

Mrs. Vacek said or you can just push the building back a little bit.

Mr. Malensek said that would be off of the main street or that would be off of the northern property line as well?

Mr. Broadwell said it is the northern and the...

Mr. Malensek said so it is both.

Mr. Broadwell said yes.

Mr. Malensek said I think of the two, we could lose 6 inches off the height.

Mr. Broadwell said I think the other comments I have coming up are the site is a little bit short on landscaping. I'm going to put together comments. I'm still working through that right now and where they might need to be. The notes I have I think will

clarify that.

Mr. Phipps said Kane County has adopted a new Stormwater Management Ordinance that becomes effective June 1st. For your site it is going to have a benefit. What I understand is that as you've been working with one of my reviewers and that you've been planning on paying a fee in lieu of stormwater detention for the site. Under the new ordinance, this site, which was almost entirely impervious, and then with the site you are proposing, which has much less impervious, stormwater detention would not be required, so the fee that you were planning to pay in lieu of stormwater detention wouldn't even be required. There is a bit of a tradeoff though. The new ordinance would require something in the way of stormwater best management practices. I think it will be much less than what stormwater detention would have been, so I think there would be a net positive for your site. I couldn't tell you right off the top of my head what would be required, but it is something that we can probably work with Steve on and your staff to figure out what works in the landscape plan.

Mr. Malensek said well when you speak of best management practices that's a bio-swale or something of that nature, that extent to be determined?

Mr. Phipps said that's what we are leaning toward, yes.

Mrs. Vacek said and we can even look to see if we could do it in the parking lot in some of the parking islands.

Mr. Malensek said that's great news. Thank you.

Mr. Sieben said we have Alderman Franco of the 5th Ward whose ward this is in. Do you have a comment Alderman?

Mr. Franco said questions and comments. So the original plan was you have a gymnasium. If the gymnasium is going to be a later date, is there a reason why it is not going to be in this plan coming forward?

Mr. Malensek said currently it is simply funding. It is planned as if it would be and all future connections would tie to it, but currently it is a funding issue.

Mr. Franco said originally when I talked to Captain Rich Forney about this is I wanted to see if we could have extra lights back there. I think this particular geographic location could use some more illumination at night so if we could put extra lights in there, you know, the parking lot and the green space, that would be good. Then my other question is assuming everything goes as planned, what would your target date, your desired target date of starting be? Then once you start, how long would the project take to be up and going?

Mr. Malensek said we would start as soon as we have permits. We have approved funding. It has been bid out through Wegman Construction here locally. Their numbers came back favorably. It has been approved through the client. They are anxious to start as soon as they can. We anticipate a 12 month construction.

Mrs. Vacek said do you have a design for the gymnasium already?

Mr. Malensek said again, based on the prototype there is a gymnasium layout and design that's been kind of approved and has been tentatively shown.

Mr. Sieben said is that an addition to the back?

Mr. Malensek said it is. It moves to the west of the existing...

Mr. Sieben said I guess where Tracey is going there, we may want to show that and get it approved now with this and then you do not have to come back through the entitlement process to essentially do that.

Mrs. Vacek said if you have a size and you kind of have an idea of what it is going to look like, I think that would be our preference. Then you don't have to go through another process.

Mr. Sieben said and just call it Phase 2. You have a footprint. Show it on the site plan. You have a proposed elevation that's close to what you want to do. I would recommend that.

Mr. Malensek said it is currently not designed to affect. So the way the current building is laid out, it wouldn't affect the parking or really anything else. The idea is we can kind of just plop it in there. It is just going to be green space right now.

Mrs. Vacek said I would highly recommend that. Then you don't have to go through another process.

Mr. Beneke said would that building also be over 30 feet high?

Mr. Malensek said I will go back and look. I don't believe it was and it was a single story as well, obviously taller than the others, but that was a flat roof construction.

Mr. Beneke said because that also affects all those fire comments. Make sure that we've got that planned appropriately.

Mr. Malensek said well 35 feet is the critical there and then 30 feet from the fire perspective.

Mr. Beneke said for mean.

Mr. Malensek said understood.

Mr. Broadwell said I think you guys are working on the public notice mailings, so those are due back tomorrow. We are getting ready for the June 19th Planning Commission, so this will be on the Planning Council agenda next week and the following week. I'll get started on these comments and then if you can get revisions for those.

[19-0436](#)

A Resolution Approving a Final Plan on Lot 1 of the Salvation Army Subdivision, Located at 550 Redwood Drive, for a Social Service Agencies, Charitable Organizations, Health Related Facilities, and similar uses when not operated for pecuniary profit (6630) Use

Representatives Present: Mike Reynolds and Chris Malensek

My name is Chris Malensek. Thank you all for having use here. I'm with Wright Herrema Architects. We are working for the Salvation Army. We've been on board for the past year and a half or so. I know the Salvation Army has been looking at the property and has had ownership of this property for a while. We've completed a

demolition process already under permit. This new facility would be for their Aurora Core and Community Center. I'll let Mike with the Salvation Army get into a little bit further to the uses that will be taking place within the facility. This would be a replacement of what's currently taking place on the Galena site.

Mr. Reynolds said obviously there is going to be a chapel for religious services as well as classrooms for education and food pantry. We are putting in a kitchen. We are going to hopefully sometime in the future have a canteen service that's actually housed in our building and not housed off site someplace else. That's way down the road, but we will be cooking for our canteen and various services. The youth activities someday would like the green space back there for a nice little soccer field. We would like to build a gym someday, but again, 50 years down the road probably, or less. We have seen the programs that we run out of there and we just need, particularly when it comes to seniors, one level and our building right now is split to kind of three levels.

Mr. Sieben said do you want to touch on the site plan a little bit?

Mr. Malensek said the building that was there was kind of centered on the site and the entire site is currently paved. The entrance was off of Redwood Drive from the east. We are still coming in off of Redwood Drive. We are keeping our parking primarily along the south property line and pushing to the west edge of the property with the intent to maintain green space on the northwest corner. That's increasing, obviously, coming up from a zero in terms of impervious and really improving that. We do have a service drive to the northeast of the site. Again, the thought behind that is for food deliveries to kind of a storage area for the kitchen. It is separate from the public parking. There is hope that a gymnasium could be added or a garage could be added at a later point. That's not a part of this project so that service entry could potentially be used for that if and when that comes into play. So primarily it is a one story structure. It is a one story office building portion. You see the green steeple area. That is for the chapel. The Salvation Army is in the process of creating what they are calling their prototype, so they are kind of using this as a template for a number of their facilities around the Midwest. This was the kind of guinea pig of them, the first, so we've been trying to utilize what they've already developed. It is a steel structure with steel stud framing and a brick veneer.

Mr. Sieben said Steve Broadwell, our Planner with Planning and Zoning is here. Steve will be reviewing with any comments.

Mr. Broadwell said I'm reviewing it. I'm still putting together some formatting review comments. There are a few. I don't know if Javan and Herman have anything for the fire access. Do you want to do that first?

Mr. Cross said we do. We do have some comments. We reviewed the plan this morning, so I'll be sending those comments out later on this morning or early this afternoon. One thing was the building height that you had on the plan was 35.6. I'm imagining that's the highest point.

Mr. Malensek said it is.

Mr. Cross said so you just need to make sure that the mean height is less than 30 feet. If it is over 30 feet, then that kicks in some additional requirements as far as the size of the lanes, a fire apparatus lane and things of that nature. If we can get that question answered, that will have a bearing on the comments that I have. Additionally, if there is going to be future development of the site, that lane is going to have to

basically meet that fire access going forward if that changes going forward.

Mr. Malensek said you are speaking to the lane on the northeast corner, correct?

Mr. Cross said correct. Right now the hydrant that's there, and I'll put this in the comments, there's a hydrant that is actually too close. You can see your dimension there showing that circle there. That radius is 50. It has to be more than 50 and less than 100. I'll put that in the notes. As far as that building height, if I can get a confirmation of that.

Mr. Malensek said we can get that for you.

Mr. Cross said okay. Then I'll wait on the comments rather than sending out a comment that doesn't have any bearing.

Mr. Malensek said I'm certain it is. I will get you the actual number on it.

Mr. Beneke said it is the highest roof that needs to be under that 30 foot.

Mr. Malensek said the mean has to be below 30 feet or the highest point?

Mr. Beneke said the highest roof portion mean.

Mr. Curley said the mean of the highest roof.

Mr. Malensek said understood.

Mr. Beneke said a couple of other things. We need to have 2 hydrants indicated on the plan, not just the 1. You are going to have to show the Fire Department Connection and a supply hydrant within. Like Javan was saying, an aerial apparatus lane is required along one entire side if it is over 30 feet. That's got to be within the 15 minimum, 30 feet max requirement, so that would affect what you've got here. That's why the question. If you're not there, then it doesn't come into play, but your sheet shows it being higher. Then also that would affect your lanes and require them to be 26 feet wide. Those are all things that kind of kick into extra things if you are over that 30 foot.

Mr. Cross said then one additional was the sprinkler room needs to be clearly shown on there. We need to have exterior access with an approved walkway that goes up to that sprinkler room.

Mr. Broadwell said I had one comment kind of following up with the elevations. I think we had talked about this on the phone last week. The building height is 35 feet, 6 inches, so there is a provision in the Zoning Ordinance for the B-2 zoning district, which this property is zoned. If it is over 35 feet, that actually increases the setback requirement. So if you can reduce the height of the steeple to be under 35 feet then the site plan setbacks will match what the requirements are. That's just one comment.

Mr. Beneke said Steve, to clarify, your height is to the top. Ours is the mean height.

Mrs. Vacek said or you can just push the building back a little bit.

Mr. Malensek said that would be off of the main street or that would be off of the

northern property line as well?

Mr. Broadwell said it is the northern and the...

Mr. Malensek said so it is both.

Mr. Broadwell said yes.

Mr. Malensek said I think of the two, we could lose 6 inches off the height.

Mr. Broadwell said I think the other comments I have coming up are the site is a little bit short on landscaping. I'm going to put together comments. I'm still working through that right now and where they might need to be. The notes I have I think will clarify that.

Mr. Phipps said Kane County has adopted a new Stormwater Management Ordinance that becomes effective June 1st. For your site it is going to have a benefit. What I understand is that as you've been working with one of my reviewers and that you've been planning on paying a fee in lieu of stormwater detention for the site. Under the new ordinance, this site, which was almost entirely impervious, and then with the site you are proposing, which has much less impervious, stormwater detention would not be required, so the fee that you were planning to pay in lieu of stormwater detention wouldn't even be required. There is a bit of a tradeoff though. The new ordinance would require something in the way of stormwater best management practices. I think it will be much less than what stormwater detention would have been, so I think there would be a net positive for your site. I couldn't tell you right off the top of my head what would be required, but it is something that we can probably work with Steve on and your staff to figure out what works in the landscape plan.

Mr. Malensek said well when you speak of best management practices that's a bio-swale or something of that nature, that extent to be determined?

Mr. Phipps said that's what we are leaning toward, yes.

Mrs. Vacek said and we can even look to see if we could do it in the parking lot in some of the parking islands.

Mr. Malensek said that's great news. Thank you.

Mr. Sieben said we have Alderman Franco of the 5th Ward whose ward this is in. Do you have a comment Alderman?

Mr. Franco said questions and comments. So the original plan was you have a gymnasium. If the gymnasium is going to be a later date, is there a reason why it is not going to be in this plan coming forward?

Mr. Malensek said currently it is simply funding. It is planned as if it would be and all future connections would tie to it, but currently it is a funding issue.

Mr. Franco said originally when I talked to Captain Rich Forney about this is I wanted to see if we could have extra lights back there. I think this particular geographic location could use some more illumination at night so if we could put extra lights in there, you know, the parking lot and the green space, that would be good. Then my other question is assuming everything goes as planned, what would your target date,

your desired target date of starting be? Then once you start, how long would the project take to be up and going?

Mr. Malensek said we would start as soon as we have permits. We have approved funding. It has been bid out through Wegman Construction here locally. Their numbers came back favorably. It has been approved through the client. They are anxious to start as soon as they can. We anticipate a 12 month construction.

Mrs. Vacek said do you have a design for the gymnasium already?

Mr. Malensek said again, based on the prototype there is a gymnasium layout and design that's been kind of approved and has been tentatively shown.

Mr. Sieben said is that an addition to the back?

Mr. Malensek said it is. It moves to the west of the existing...

Mr. Sieben said I guess where Tracey is going there, we may want to show that and get it approved now with this and then you do not have to come back through the entitlement process to essentially do that.

Mrs. Vacek said if you have a size and you kind of have an idea of what it is going to look like, I think that would be our preference. Then you don't have to go through another process.

Mr. Sieben said and just call it Phase 2. You have a footprint. Show it on the site plan. You have a proposed elevation that's close to what you want to do. I would recommend that.

Mr. Malensek said it is currently not designed to affect. So the way the current building is laid out, it wouldn't affect the parking or really anything else. The idea is we can kind of just plop it in there. It is just going to be green space right now.

Mrs. Vacek said I would highly recommend that. Then you don't have to go through another process.

Mr. Beneke said would that building also be over 30 feet high?

Mr. Malensek said I will go back and look. I don't believe it was and it was a single story as well, obviously taller than the others, but that was a flat roof construction.

Mr. Beneke said because that also affects all those fire comments. Make sure that we've got that planned appropriately.

Mr. Malensek said well 35 feet is the critical there and then 30 feet from the fire perspective.

Mr. Beneke said for mean.

Mr. Malensek said understood.

Mr. Broadwell said I think you guys are working on the public notice mailings, so those are due back tomorrow. We are getting ready for the June 19th Planning Commission, so this will be on the Planning Council agenda next week and the following week. I'll get started on these comments and then if you can get revisions for those.

PENDING

ANNOUNCEMENTS

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Sieben adjourned the meeting at 10:19 a.m.

**VISIT OUR WEB SITE FOR CURRENT AGENDAS:
<https://www.aurora-il.org/AgendaCenter>**