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. Sodaro, Mr. Minnella, Mr. Dick, Mr. Phipps and Mr. Beneke.

OTHERS PRESENT

Others Present: Tom Burgess (Gripple), John Tebrugge (Tebrugge Engineering), Steve Hansen (Steve Hansen Architect), Tracy Willie (Warren Johnson), Adam Patterson (K. Hovnanian Homes), Russ Whitaker (Rosanova and Whitaker), Mike Schoppe (Schoppe Design Associates), John Philipchuck (Attorney representing KEKA Farms).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

19-0978 Approval of the Minutes for the Planning Council meeting on October 15th, 2019.

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

19-0979 Approval of the Minutes for the Planning Council meeting on October 22, 2019.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

AGENDA

19-0825 Requesting approval of a Final Plan for Lot 3 of Citizens First National
Bank Business Park Subdivision located at 1521 Ogden Avenue for a mixture of Business and Professional, Office (2400), Retail Sales or Service (2100), and Restaurant with a drive-through facility (2530) uses
(Param Vijay - 19-0825 / OS01/1-19.054-Fpn - JM - Ward 9)

Mrs. Morgan said Planning has met with the applicant. We have some major comments. They seem to be addressing some of our site planning concerns. Right now I believe they are working on getting the Engineering. After Planning took a preliminary review of the site plan it feels that it addressed all of our concerns.

Mr. Phipps said Engineering prepared a letter advising of our review comments from the first submittal. We are still waiting for a resubmittal to see what they’ve done.

19-0901

Requesting approval of a Revision to the Final Plat for West Ridge Corporate Center Phase III 1st Resubdivision generally located at the southeast corner of Bilter Road and Mitchell Road (Liberty Property Trust - 19-0901 / AU02/1-19.118-Fsd/Fpn/R - JS - Ward 1)

Mr. Sodaro said Planning just received a resubmittal and we are going over the landscape revisions now. We are ready to vote it out to next week’s Planning Commission.

Mr. Phipps said the only comment from Engineering is there are a few details to work out with Final Engineering, so we’d like to attach a condition that it be approved subject to satisfactorily addressing the Final Engineering comments.

Mr. Sodaro said I make a motion to move this forward to the November 6th Planning Commission with the condition that they address the Final Engineering comments along with potential landscape as well. Mrs. Vacek seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Mr. Sodaro, 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.

19-0902

Requesting approval of a Revision to the Final Plan for Lot 1A of West Ridge Corporate Center Phase III 1st Resubdivision located at 701 Bilter Road for a Warehouse, Distribution and storage services (3300) Use (Liberty Property Trust - 19-0902 / AU02/1-19.118-Fsd/Fpn/R - JS - Ward 1)

Mr. Sodaro said Planning just received a resubmittal and we are going over the landscape revisions now. We are ready to vote it out to next week’s Planning Commission.

Mr. Phipps said the only comment from Engineering is there are a few details to work out with Final Engineering, so we’d like to attach a condition that it be approved subject to satisfactorily addressing the Final Engineering comments.

Mr. Sodaro said I make a motion to move this forward to the November 6th Planning Commission with the condition that they address the Final Engineering comments along with potential landscape as well. Mrs. Vacek seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Mr. Sodaro, 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.

19-0907

Requesting the Establishment of a new Special Use Planned Development, and to change the underlying zoning district from R-4(S) Two Family Dwelling District, R-4 Two Family Dwelling District, R-3(S) One Family Dwelling District, and R-3 One Family Dwelling District to 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 located along Weston Avenue and Seminary Avenue between S. Lincoln Avenue and S. 4th Street and commonly known as the historic Copley Hospital (Fox Valley Developers, LLC - 19-0907 / AU27/1-19.063-SU/PD/Ppn/Psd - JM - Ward 4)

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 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. Out 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...
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.

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.

19-0908

Requesting approval of a Preliminary Plat for Avalon Heights 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)

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. Out 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.

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.

19-0909

Requesting approval of a Preliminary Plan for Avalon Heights located along Weston Avenue and Seminary Avenue between S. Lincoln Avenue and S. 4th Street for a mix used development (Fox Valley Developers, LLC - 19-0909 / AU27/1-19.063-SU/PD/Ppn/Psd - JM - Ward 4)

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. Out 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.

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.

19-0958

Requesting approval of a Final Plat Revision, Consolidating Lot 7 and Lot 8 of Fermi Corporate Park, Phase II Subdivision, located at 1611 and 1621 Emily Lane, Establishing Lot 1 of Gripple Subdivision (Gripple, Inc. - 19-0958 / AU01/2-18.231-Fsd/Fpn/R - SB - Ward 1)

Representatives Present: Tom Burgess, John Tebrugge and Steve Hansen

I’m Steve Hansen, Architect for the project. This is an existing facility for a manufacturer of basically construction supplies. They make hangers for heating and electrical equipment. They are an English company and this is the US subsidiary of their company. They currently have up in the left hand corner, they’ve got a 15,000 square foot office and manufacturing facility. We will be adding approximately 38,000 square feet on the footprint and consolidating two lots in the subdivision. I think it is Fermi Subdivision. They currently are going to be going to two shifts, so they currently have street parking, which we are adding all the new parking to pick up the current load of the employees. The load will actually go do down a little bit in reality because of the two shifts that they are going to. They are looking forward to staying here and making a quality international facility.

Mr. Sieben said I know we’ve been dealing with Gripple. They’ve been looking at doing this for a few years. We’re glad to see them staying in Aurora. They are an international company, like you said. I know we’ve had a few different preliminary DST meetings, so I think this lays out to what we had agreed on with the setbacks and the parking. You guys are cleaning up the lot lines. Steve of our office will be taking a look at this, but I believe we are moving this forward then to the November 6th Planning Commission. Due to our lag process, it took a little while to get here, so we’re going to vote this out today.

Mr. Broadwell said I think the plans are where they need to be for Zoning. I think we
are all set. Herman, I don’t know if you have any comments.

Mr. Beneke said Fire is approved. We are good to go.

Mr. Sieben said Zoning should be pretty good. Fire is good. Engineering?

Mr. Phipps said Engineering review is ongoing. You haven’t gotten a letter, but I expect you will get one this week. I don’t foresee any major issues. I would be okay voting this out with a condition that all of the Final Engineering comments be addressed prior to final approval.

Mr. Frankino said it is just domestic waste water discharge?

Mr. Hansen said yes. There is no processing or anything. Basically they take a roll of metal cable and they run it through a machine that cuts it. They have a little tiny metal fastener that puts the wire through it, they make a loop and they singe it with compressed air.

Mr. Frankino said then we’ll just expect the plan like the city is getting so when you submit to the city please submit to us and we’ll see that is done for you.

Mr. Broadwell said I would like to make a motion to vote this out to the November 6th Planning Commission. Mr. Minnella seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Mr. Broadwell, seconded by Mr. Minnella, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Planning Commission, on the agenda for 11/6/2019. The motion carried by voice vote.

19-0959

Requesting Approval of a Final Plan Revision for Lot 1 of Gripple Subdivision, located at 1621 and 1611 Emily Lane, for a Business and Professional, Office (2400) Use and a Warehouse, Distribution and Storage Services (3300) Use (Gripple, Inc. - 19-0959 / AU01/2-18.231-Fsd/Fpn/R - SB - Ward 1)

Representatives Present: Tom Burgess, John Tebrugge and Steve Hansen

I’m Steve Hansen, Architect for the project. This is an existing facility for a manufacturer of basically construction supplies. They make hangers for heating and electrical equipment. They are an English company and this is the US subsidiary of their company. They currently have up in the left hand corner, they’ve got a 15,000 square foot office and manufacturing facility. We will be adding approximately 38,000 square feet on the footprint and consolidating two lots in the subdivision. I think it is Fermi Subdivision. They currently are going to be going to two shifts, so they currently have street parking, which we are adding all the new parking to pick up the current load of the employees. The load will actually go down a little bit in reality because of the two shifts that they are going to. They are looking forward to staying here and making a quality international facility.

Mr. Sieben said I know we’ve been dealing with Gripple. They’ve been looking at doing this for a few years. We’re glad to see them staying in Aurora. They are an international company, like you said. I know we’ve had a few different preliminary DST meetings, so I think this lays out to what we had agreed on with the setbacks and the parking. You guys are cleaning up the lot lines. Steve of our office will be taking a look at this, but I believe we are moving this forward then to the November 6th
Planning Commission. Due to our lag process, it took a little while to get here, so we’re going to vote this out today.

Mr. Broadwell said I think the plans are where they need to be for Zoning. I think we are all set. Herman, I don’t know if you have any comments.

Mr. Beneke said Fire is approved. We are good to go.

Mr. Sieben said Zoning should be pretty good. Fire is good. Engineering?

Mr. Phipps said Engineering review is ongoing. You haven’t gotten a letter, but I expect you will get one this week. I don’t foresee any major issues. I would be okay voting this out with a condition that all of the Final Engineering comments be addressed prior to final approval.

Mr. Frankino said it is just domestic waste water discharge?

Mr. Hansen said yes. There is no processing or anything. Basically they take a roll of metal cable and they run it through a machine that cuts it. They have a little tiny metal fastener that puts the wire through it, they make a loop and they singe it with compressed air.

Mr. Frankino said then we’ll just expect the plan like the city is getting so when you submit to the city please submit to us and we’ll see that is done for you.

Mr. Broadwell said I would like to make a motion to vote this out to the November 6th Planning Commission. Mr. Minnella seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Mr. Broadwell, seconded by Mr. Minnella, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Planning Commission, on the agenda for 11/6/2019. The motion carried by voice vote.

19-0960

Requesting Approval of a Final Plan Revision for Lot 2 of Oakhurst Commons Resubdivision Subdivision, located at 2889 East New York Street, for a Restaurant with a Drive-through Facility (2530) Use (Tri City Foods of Illinois, Inc. - 19-0960 / NA20/3-19.070-Fpn/R - SB - Ward 8)

Representative Present: Tracy Willie

I’m with the architect. My name is Tracy Willie with Warren Johnson. This is for a remodel of the existing restaurant. The interior will be done in the customer areas only and then there is substantial site work. We are going to be adding a double drive-through. There is one single one there now with some new concrete in the drive-through lane and then updating ADA stalls. They are not currently in compliance. Then the exterior of the building will be updated with new finishes to match their new look.

Mr. Broadwell said I think everything is checked out for Zoning. I don’t really have anything else to add.

Mr. Sieben said we are going to vote this out today, again, for the November 6th Planning Commission.

Mr. Beneke said Fire has also reviewed and approved this.
Mr. Phipps said no Engineering approval is needed for the proposed site improvements.

Mr. Frankino said we have no comments.

Mr. Broadwell said I make a motion for this to be voted out for the November 6th Planning Commission. Mr. Beneke seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Mr. Broadwell, seconded by Mr. Beneke, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Planning Commission, on the agenda for 11/6/2019. The motion carried by voice vote.

19-0961 Requesting approval of an Annexation Agreement for 67.57 acres located at the southeast corner of Ogden Avenue and Farnsworth Avenue for KEKA Farms Development (KEKA Farms, LLC / K. Hovnanian Homes - 19-0961 / OS01/1-18.150-PA/A/SUPD/Ppn/Psd - TV - Ward 9)

Representatives Present: Adam Patterson, Russ Whitaker, Mike Schoppe and John Philipchuck

My name is John Philipchuck. I’m the attorney. I represent the KEKA Farms, LLC. With me today is David Hamman, one of the managers. They own the 67.57 acre parcel.

I’m Mike Schoppe with Schoppe Design Associates representing both K. Hovnanian on the single family component of this as well as KEKA Farms on the balance of the property.

I’m Adam Patterson with K. Hovnanian Homes, the home builder for the 84 single family home lots.

I’m Russ Whitaker with Rosanova and Whitaker, attorney for Hovnanian on the development of the residential subdivision.

Mr. Sieben said whoever wants to start. I know this kind of overall concept in both the non-residential and the residential we’ve been talking about this for a little while and we finally got a submittal in, so whoever would like to start.

Mr. Philipchuck said I’ll start. Obviously, the preliminary plat that you see on the Concept Plan, that’s the parcel that is under contract to be sold to K. Hovnanian and Russ will speak to the specifics of their plan. The balance of the property owner by KEKA Farms is planned for several use categories. We’ve located some B-2 commercial along the Route 34 frontage, some O office across from the Copley Hospital, that 13 acres, and then we’ve got a multi-family parcel on Farnsworth Avenue. The large outparcel in the middle is Prairie Material. They have a redi-mix plant there. It goes in and out of operation from time to time, but they have no intention of abandoning the use. The property is somewhat interesting in that it straddles both Kane County and Kendall County, so we have various entities that we are going to be dealing with here as far as what Park District we’re in. We are in Oswegoland for part of this and Fox Valley for part of it. The same with the Fire District and the same with the Library District, so we’ve got a combination of things. Mike, is all that in Fox Metro? I know we’ve got a sewer running through the middle of the property.
Mr. Frankino said it needs to be annexed.

Mr. Philipchuck said all that has to come in yet?

Mr. Frankino said to be honest with you I was looking at the preliminary information and I thought we were only talking about this area here. I think the boundary is somewhere in here John. I can send you an existing limits.

Mr. Philipchuck said we've gone back and forth with staff a few times with regard to the plan and what the uses are. In fact, some of what happens on this property is going to be really dependent on how the access works out. We need access to the light at that Copley entrance to be able to property develop Parcel C. There's a history on this.

Mr. Sieben said Tracey can go into detail after you guys are done. She'll give you a little bit more detail.

Mr. Philipchuck said okay.

Mr. Sieben said there is an actual Resolution or Ordinance that was passed in 2002 by the city.

Mr. Philipchuck said there was. I have copies of all that stuff. It went back and forth and all around and we need to clarify where that's at. Another issue is the staff's request to extend Keating Drive through the property along the alignment of the current private drive, which at this point only serves the Prairie Material Redi-Mix plant. I guess part of my question on that is that doesn't follow the Comp Plan and so I'm wondering why the deviation. Has the staff come up with a good reason why Keating has to go to 34 and not to Farnsworth per the Comprehensive Plan?

Mr. Sieben said we can address that.

Mr. Philipchuck said otherwise, I think the working out the details on the uses while we were noodling it in-house talking about that Parcel C, we've had some inquiries in the past for types of hospital related housing and people who might need short-term care in a housing environment. I don't know if that's going to be an office parcel or not. That's what our thinking is now. We also had the idea would the city staff consider, I don't know how we would necessarily put it into the zoning at this point, but even a hotel use might be a possible use for that site. People who need a place to stay where they have folks that are in the hospital and very convenient for them and also some of the doctors that practice at different hospitals for them to sometimes get back and forth and having the availability of a place to maybe stay overnight so they could do a surgery in the morning. It might be somewhat beneficial, so I'd like you to think about that to see what your thoughts might be on that. With that, obviously, depending on how these improvements go on 34, we just have to figure out what we can work out with the city on those access points and then what public improvements are going to have to follow along with that and then the simple fact of how are we going to pay for them.

Mr. Sieben said do we want to maybe at this time, because there's kind of the colored area is the non-residential versus the K. Hovnanian property, do we want to maybe just kind of touch on some staff comments at this time because they are almost like two different things?
Mrs. Vacek said I guess I’ll kind of comment on the access up at the office portion. Staff did do a support letter that we would support the access across from Rush-Copley for that to be turned into a full access. I believe what the Resolution says is that we would support that fully with IDOT, knowing well that there needs to be some improvements done, meaning that Pointe Boulevard would have to be turned into a right-in/right-out. We are aware of that. How the Resolution states is all of that work would be done by the developer, so that’s what we would be expecting, that the developer would be taking care of all that work.

Mr. Sieben said and per IDOT standards, IDOT requirements.

Mrs. Vacek said but there was a Resolution that did state that we would support that.

Mr. Philipchuck said excuse me. Are you talking about that ancient one back in ’02?

Mrs. Vacek said back in ’02.

Mr. Sieben said that’s the latest we’ve got.

Mr. Philipchuck said you didn’t mention the fact that the city wanted there to remain a left-in and that never flew past IDOT. IDOT was solely right-in/right-out, but that Resolution said and a left turn in.

Mrs. Vacek said it did and I believe that, obviously, we would still have to work with IDOT to see if that would possibly…

Mr. Philipchuck said a lot of time has gone by.

Mr. Sieben said so that would be 17 years and it will be 18 years, so we can revisit it, but you have the general concept of what we are all looking at.

Mr. Philipchuck said okay, perfect.

Mr. Sieben said Mark, did you want to comment on that?

Mr. Phipps said I think it would be appropriate to bring it up with IDOT again the possibility of a left-in and see where it goes.

Mr. Philipchuck said so is that something that you would initiate like soon, like tomorrow, to see what the mood might be up there?

Mr. Phipps said well my understanding from the Resolution is that the coordination with IDOT and the actual construction would be done by the developer. I wasn’t expecting that that would be something brought up by city staff with IDOT. That would be on the developer.

Mrs. Vacek said John, I think that we would be happy to be at the table, but I think that’s something that you guys need to kind of initiate.

Mr. Philipchuck said well we can, but you’re prepared to take the argument to IDOT about the left turn in, right?

Mr. Sieben said we would coordinate the argument, yes.
Mr. Philipchuck said I was going to say because that’s something the city came back with and IDOT said no back then.

Mr. Sieben said when we get to that point, we would coordinate that with the developer.

Mr. Philipchuck said okay.

Mr. Sieben said regarding in general the land uses as presented, do you want to touch on those Tracey?

Mrs. Vacek said I think that we are pretty good with the land uses that you have set forth. I haven’t totally looked into everything, but I know that one of the land uses that you guys were looking at was maybe some self-storage or mini-storage on Parcel D. I think that we would be fine with that if it is no outdoor storage and it was all indoor corridor storage. I don’t think that we would want to see garages or anything like that. I haven’t looked at it fully yet. I’m still in the midst of reviewing it. I will get you comments on that. I haven’t considered the hotel use, that just was brought up today. We’ll take a look at that and we’ll get back with you on that. As far as the other remaining uses, I think that we are good with the uses.

Mr. Sieben said and the other option on C, the office area, was maybe if there was any assisted or senior living may be a possibility there, so we’ll take a look at that too. Obviously, all the access points are going to be IDOT controlled.

Mrs. Vacek said did you want to touch on the road?

Mr. Phipps said yes. John brought it up and was asking the question what’s the reason that staff has been asking for a connection for the residential subdivision and Ogden and I think your own traffic study shows the amount of traffic at Ogden and Farnsworth and we think that by providing that direct connection from Keating out to 34 would…

Mr. Sieben said well not direct, direct.

Mrs. Vacek said between the residential and the commercial.

Mr. Sieben said there may be a turn there. That’s what I mean by that.

Mr. Phipps said right now that private drive ends at the residential subdivision. There is a lot that’s marked out in between the end of that private drive and Keating and we’d like to see that connection between those two.

Mr. Philipchuck said but that doesn’t answer the question as to why you are deviating from the Comprehensive Plan with Keating. Keating right now on the current Comprehensive Plan for the city shows it coming down and interconnecting with Farnsworth Avenue across from Summerlin, not going out to 34.

Mrs. Vacek said correct, but we still want that interconnection between the subdivision and the residential, so if it goes out to Ogden and/or Farnsworth, there is still that interconnection that we would like to have a public route. We can take a look at it if we want it down to Summerlin or if we want it to go out to Ogden. It makes sense to me that it would go out to Ogden because there is a full access already existing there and I think that’s where we are trying to get people to go anyway, so everybody that is making a right then wouldn’t have to go to that intersection at Farnsworth and Ogden.
where there is already some backup. I think that that’s what your traffic study is kind of showing right now. If it is a matter of that or not, I think that we do want to see that interconnection between the subdivision and the commercial area. So if it goes to Summerlin or if it goes to Ogden, I mean obviously, it made sense for us that it just was Ogden.

Mr. Whitaker said so you’re looking for that as a public road and not as a private drive?

Mrs. Vacek said correct. I think we’ve stated that many times.

Mr. Sieben said do you want to move onto anything with the non-residential?

Mrs. Vacek said no. I have just started taking a look at the Annexation Agreement, so there is going to be probably a lot of comments on that.

Mr. Sieben said the good thing is I think we are good on the uses. I think we’ve come to that meeting of the minds on the uses and we can see if we can be maybe even a little bit more flexible on that other stuff that you mentioned.

Mr. Phipps said I’ve got one more comment on the residential. Have we already moved on past that that?

Mr. Sieben said we haven’t gotten to the residential yet.

Mr. Whitaker said and I think that was the point of emphasis for us is we’ve been working on this project through some fits and starts for a year or more at this point in time. We have a strong desire to be able to able to push this forward. I understand that there may be other IDOT or public roadway or other issues that may or may not impact our subdivision as significantly. I think our perspective is though we need to be able to move forward presently on this. The intent is that this is a 2020 project and so we are kind of on a timeframe like we’ve been on and there is going to be extended debates with IDOT. An IDOT process on what’s going to happen with some of these intersections on Route 34 is going to have us back at this table next year with no annexation having been done yet. From a timing standpoint, that’s a non-starter for us. We need something that can move forward on a more expedited basis. If we can get something done…

Mr. Sieben said but we’re not looking at slowing you guys down. I think with regard to your development, you show as Lot 29 there, I think if that pretty much converts to right-of-way I think we are good to go on that end of it.

Mrs. Vacek said I think there are other issues going on.

Mr. Sieben said on that issue.

Mrs. Vacek said however, I think that this is a concept so I don’t think that we are thinking that we are going to have 100% everything worked out at the concept level. The Annexation Agreement has to address the whole thing, so we will continue to work on that. I don’t, again like I said, I don’t think IDOT is going to be completed before this is done. We are well aware of that.

Mr. Whitaker said so I guess from our standpoint the way we envision this happening is there would be the Annexation, there would be Preliminary Plat. I think we’ve got it set up as we would be one lot on that Preliminary Plat and then we would be able to
move forward while the issues continue to be resolved on the commercial portion and there is some additional development of information on the commercial portion. Again, we would be moving forward in 2020 with physical development of the property if possible. It is an 84 lot subdivision, R-2 Special Use zoning. I think we are generally consistent with the R-2 lot standards, general lot sizes 60 by 125, which is a 7,500 square foot typical lot, which is slightly under the R-2 standard, but I think if you look at the average lot size, we are over that 8,000 minimum. Setbacks are generally consistent. I know we specified the setbacks that we are seeking in our application materials. Otherwise, it is fairly straightforward from a subdivision standpoint. I think we are trying to be flexible in sort of roadway design and meet your standards for Keating as more of a collector road and then narrowing down a little bit on the local roads within the subdivision.

Mr. Sieben said when you say Keating, you mean that north/south road?

Mr. Whitaker said where Keating comes into the subdivision, we’re showing a 66 foot right-of-way.

Mr. Sieben said wasn’t this one also?

Mr. Whitaker said yes and you’re right. Then also that comes down on (inaudible), that is also 66 foot, 31 back to back and then more internal where you don’t have your through routes, it is the 60 foot right-of-way with, I think, 31 foot back to back. The other thing I would note is we are looking for some level of concurrence on elevations. It is an important element for us to be able to work out sort of the financials for the project to be able to get not necessarily a final approval of elevations, but to be able to a set character.

Mr. Sieben said and understanding.

Mr. Whitaker said yes. I know we submitted to the city a whole extensive product matrix with a combination of ranch and two story homes ranging from 1,700 square feet up to roughly 3,200 square feet, provided some variety in the homes with 40 foot product ranging up to 48 foot product, which would all fit on a variety of the lots. That will be further refined as we move forward, but all of the elevations and the floor plans that we’ve selected are sort of similar in character, so we would look to kind of drill down on those elevations or the character of the subdivision and then we can narrow it down on exactly what floor plans would be included.

Mr. Sieben said Tracey, do you want to comment on the elevations?

Mrs. Vacek said we still need to take a look at them. I think that there will probably be some, obviously, things that we are going to have to change. For the most part, I think that they were pretty good. We’ll take a look at that as we move through the process. If that’s going to be an attachment to the Annexation Agreement, I’m not sure. I haven’t quite gotten there yet. We’ll continue to take a look at that though.

Mr. Whitaker said were there other sort of site planning related comments? I obviously heard the Lot 29 concern with respect that what we are showing as a private drive connecting through into our roadway network. Was there anything else?

Mrs. Vacek said I haven’t really dug into it too deep. I did notice though that a lot of the formatting comments that I sent back still were not addressed, so I was a little taken aback that those weren’t addressed before you submitted as I went through it.
The Plat of Survey’s are still overlapping from what you and the Hamman’s are giving me, so we need to clean that up. Match lines weren’t given on the plat, so some of that needs to be cleared up. I’ve had conversations with the Alderman. He is still a little leery about the lot sizes, especially the two that are smaller. I explained why there were smaller. I think he is still feeling that they can maybe get bigger in width to kind of meet that average lot size that you kind of were talking about. Those may be some of my comments. I haven’t totally dug into everything, so we’ll be continuing to do that and I’ll be getting comments probably out by hopefully next week.

Mr. Sieben said we’ve also talked to the Alderman a little bit about the elevations, so that’s where Tracey is coming up with some of that. We want to make sure, since this is an important project for Ware 9, that we get as much resolved up front as we can.

Mr. Phipps said the Engineering review is still going on, so this isn’t final by any means. I will try to get a letter out to you as soon as we can once the detailed review is complete. One item I wanted to bring up, because I think it is a significant item, is that you mentioned not providing a 66 foot right-of-way for all of the streets in the subdivision and that’s an issue for us. It will be a comment on our letter that we would be looking for 66 foot right-of-way on all the streets, not just on the main road.

Mr. Beneke said Fire and I have looked at this and it looks like it is fine with us. Obviously, any modifications to access points or roads will need to be reviewed.

Mr. Sieben said and Mike, with Fox Metro you already commented this will need to be annexed.

Mr. Frankino said I believe the entire site, but I will confirm that with John and whoever else wants to be copied on that, the existing current limits.

Mr. Sieben said I think the summary, we still have to look at it in more detail and, obviously, get you comments on the elevations too, so we’ll be doing that in the next week or so. It sounds like there may be some tweaking of this, but I think in general we want to definitely get you guys going in 2020, so we’ll be able to meet somewhere and we’ll get this thing going. That’s our goal.

Mr. Beneke said just as another piece, I’d say feel free to start getting ready for your master plan review and get those into us and we can start that process.

Mr. Sieben said we’ll be getting back to you shortly.

Requesting the Annexation, pursuant to an Annexation Agreement, of 67.57 acres located at the southeast corner of Ogden Avenue and Farnsworth Avenue (KEKA Farms, LLC / K. Hovnanian Homes - 19-0962 / OS01/1-18.150-PA/A/SUPD/Ppn/Psd - TV - Ward 9)

Representatives Present: Adam Patterson, Russ Whitaker, Mike Schoppe and John Philipchuck

My name is John Philipchuck. I’m the attorney. I represent the KEKA Farms, LLC. With me today is David Hamman, one of the managers. They own the 67.57 acre parcel.

I’m Mike Schoppe with Schoppe Design Associates representing both K. Hovnanian on the single family component of this as well as KEKA Farms on the balance of the
I'm Adam Patterson with K. Hovnanian Homes, the home builder for the 84 single family home lots.

I'm Russ Whitaker with Rosanova and Whitaker, attorney for Hovnanian on the development of the residential subdivision.

Mr. Sieben said whoever wants to start. I know this kind of overall concept in both the non-residential and the residential we've been talking about this for a little while and we finally got a submittal in, so whoever would like to start.

Mr. Philipchuck said I'll start. Obviously, the preliminary plat that you see on the Concept Plan, that's the parcel that is under contract to be sold to K. Hovnanian and Russ will speak to the specifics of their plan. The balance of the property owner by KEKA Farms is planned for several use categories. We've located some B-2 commercial along the Route 34 frontage, some O office across from the Copley Hospital, that 13 acres, and then we've got a multi-family parcel on Farnsworth Avenue. The large outparcel in the middle is Prairie Material. They have a redi-mix plant there. It goes in and out of operation from time to time, but they have no intention of abandoning the use. The property is somewhat interesting in that it straddles both Kane County and Kendall County, so we have various entities that we are going to be dealing with here as far as what Park District we're in. We are in Oswegoland for part of this and Fox Valley for part of it. The same with the Fire District and the same with the Library District, so we've got a combination of things. Mike, is all that in Fox Metro? I know we've got a sewer running through the middle of the property.

Mr. Frankino said it needs to be annexed.

Mr. Philipchuck said all that has to come in yet?

Mr. Frankino said to be honest with you I was looking at the preliminary information and I thought we were only talking about this area here. I think the boundary is somewhere in here John. I can send you an existing limits.

Mr. Philipchuck said we've gone back and forth with staff a few times with regard to the plan and what the uses are. In fact, some of what happens on this property is going to be really dependent on how the access works out. We need access to the light at that Copley entrance to be able to properly develop Parcel C. There's a history on this.

Mr. Sieben said Tracey can go into detail after you guys are done. She'll give you a little bit more detail.

Mr. Philipchuck said okay.

Mr. Sieben said there is an actual Resolution or Ordinance that was passed in 2002 by the city.

Mr. Philipchuck said there was. I have copies of all that stuff. It went back and forth and all around and we need to clarify where that's at. Another issue is the staff's request to extend Keating Drive through the property along the alignment of the current private drive, which at this point only serves the Prairie Material Redi-Mix plant. I guess part of my question on that is that doesn't follow the Comp Plan and so I'm wondering why the deviation. Has the staff come up with a good reason why Keating has to go to
Mr. Sieben said we can address that.

Mr. Philipchuck said otherwise, I think the working out the details on the uses while we were noodling it in-house talking about that Parcel C, we’ve had some inquiries in the past for types of hospital related housing and people who might need short-term care in a housing environment. I don’t know if that’s going to be an office parcel or not. That’s what our thinking is now. We also had the idea would the city staff consider, I don’t know how we would necessarily put it into the zoning at this point, but even a hotel use might be a possible use for that site. People who need a place to stay where they have folks that are in the hospital and very convenient for them and also some of the doctors that practice at different hospitals for them to sometimes get back and forth and having the availability of a place to maybe stay overnight so they could do a surgery in the morning. It might be somewhat beneficial, so I’d like you to think about that to see what your thoughts might be on that. With that, obviously, depending on how these improvements go on 34, we just have to figure out what we can work out with the city on those access points and then what public improvements are going to have to follow along with that and then the simple fact of how are we going to pay for them.

Mr. Sieben said do we want to maybe at this time, because there’s kind of the colored area is the non-residential versus the K. Hovnanian property, do we want to maybe just kind of touch on some staff comments at this time because they are almost like two different things?

Mrs. Vacek said I guess I’ll kind of comment on the access up at the office portion. Staff did do a support letter that we would support the access across from Rush-Copley for that to be turned into a full access. I believe what the Resolution says is that we would support that fully with IDOT, knowing well that there needs to be some improvements done, meaning that Pointe Boulevard would have to be turned into a right-in/right-out. We are aware of that. How the Resolution states is all of that work would be done by the developer, so that’s what we would be expecting, that the developer would be taking care of all that work.

Mr. Sieben said and per IDOT standards, IDOT requirements.

Mrs. Vacek said but there was a Resolution that did state that we would support that.

Mr. Philipchuck said excuse me. Are you talking about that ancient one back in ’02?

Mrs. Vacek said back in ’02.

Mr. Sieben said that’s the latest we’ve got.

Mr. Philipchuck said you didn’t mention the fact that the city wanted there to remain a left-in and that never flew past IDOT. IDOT was solely right-in/right-out, but that Resolution said and a left turn in.

Mrs. Vacek said it did and I believe that, obviously, we would still have to work with IDOT to see if that would possibly…

Mr. Philipchuck said a lot of time has gone by.
Mr. Sieben said so that would be 17 years and it will be 18 years, so we can revisit it, but you have the general concept of what we are all looking at.

Mr. Philipchuck said okay, perfect.

Mr. Sieben said Mark, did you want to comment on that?

Mr. Phipps said I think it would be appropriate to bring it up with IDOT again the possibility of a left-in and see where it goes.

Mr. Philipchuck said so is that something that you would initiate like soon, like tomorrow, to see what the mood might be up there?

Mr. Phipps said well my understanding from the Resolution is that the coordination with IDOT and the actual construction would be done by the developer. I wasn’t expecting that that would be something brought up by city staff with IDOT. That would be on the developer.

Mrs. Vacek said John, I think that we would be happy to be at the table, but I think that’s something that you guys need to kind of initiate.

Mr. Philipchuck said well we can, but you’re prepared to take the argument to IDOT about the left turn in, right?

Mr. Sieben said we would coordinate the argument, yes.

Mr. Philipchuck said I was going to say because that’s something the city came back with and IDOT said no back then.

Mr. Sieben said when we get to that point, we would coordinate that with the developer.

Mr. Philipchuck said okay.

Mr. Sieben said regarding in general the land uses as presented, do you want to touch on those Tracey?

Mrs. Vacek said I think that we are pretty good with the land uses that you have set forth. I haven’t totally looked into everything, but I know that one of the land uses that you guys were looking at was maybe some self-storage or mini-storage on Parcel D. I think that we would be fine with that if it is no outdoor storage and it was all indoor corridor storage. I don’t think that we would want to see garages or anything like that. I haven’t looked at it fully yet. I’m still in the midst of reviewing it. I will get you comments on that. I haven’t considered the hotel use, that just was brought up today. We’ll take a look at that and we’ll get back with you on that. As far as the other remaining uses, I think that we are good with the uses.

Mr. Sieben said and the other option on C, the office area, was maybe if there was any assisted or senior living may be a possibility there, so we’ll take a look at that too. Obviously, all the access points are going to be IDOT controlled.

Mrs. Vacek said did you want to touch on the road?

Mr. Phipps said yes. John brought it up and was asking the question what’s the reason that staff has been asking for a connection for the residential subdivision and
October 29, 2019

Planning Council Meeting Minutes

Ogden and I think your own traffic study shows the amount of traffic at Ogden and Farnsworth and we think that by providing that direct connection from Keating out to 34 would…

Mr. Sieben said well not direct, direct.

Mrs. Vacek said between the residential and the commercial.

Mr. Sieben said there may be a turn there. That’s what I mean by that.

Mr. Phipps said right now that private drive ends at the residential subdivision. There is a lot that’s marked out in between the end of that private drive and Keating and we’d like to see that connection between those two.

Mr. Philipchuck said but that doesn’t answer the question as to why you are deviating from the Comprehensive Plan with Keating. Keating right now on the current Comprehensive Plan for the city shows it coming down and interconnecting with Farnsworth Avenue across from Summerlin, not going out to 34.

Mrs. Vacek said correct, but we still want that interconnection between the subdivision and the residential, so if it goes out to Ogden and/or Farnsworth, there is still that interconnection that we would like to have a public route. We can take a look at it if we want it down to Summerlin or if we want it to go out to Ogden. It makes sense to me that it would go out to Ogden because there is a full access already existing there and I think that’s where we are trying to get people to go anyway, so everybody that is making a right then wouldn’t have to go to that intersection at Farnsworth and Ogden where there is already some backup. I think that that’s what your traffic study is kind of showing right now. If it is a matter of that or not, I think that we do want to see that interconnection between the subdivision and the commercial area. So if it goes to Summerlin or if it goes to Ogden, I mean obviously, it made sense for us that it just was Ogden.

Mr. Whitaker said so you’re looking for that as a public road and not as a private drive?

Mrs. Vacek said correct. I think we’ve stated that many times.

Mr. Sieben said do you want to move onto anything with the non-residential?

Mrs. Vacek said no. I have just started taking a look at the Annexation Agreement, so there is going to be probably a lot of comments on that.

Mr. Sieben said the good thing is I think we are good on the uses. I think we’ve come to that meeting of the minds on the uses and we can see if we can be maybe even a little bit more flexible on that other stuff that you mentioned.

Mr. Phipps said I’ve got one more comment on the residential. Have we already moved on past that that?

Mr. Sieben said we haven’t gotten to the residential yet.

Mr. Whitaker said and I think that was the point of emphasis for us is we’ve been working on this project through some fits and starts for a year or more at this point in time. We have a strong desire to be able to able to push this forward. I understand that there may be other IDOT or public roadway or other issues that may or may not
impact our subdivision as significantly. I think our perspective is though we need to be able to move forward presently on this. The intent is that this is a 2020 project and so we are kind of on a timeframe like we’ve been on and there is going to be extended debates with IDOT. An IDOT process on what’s going to happen with some of these intersections on Route 34 is going to have us back at this table next year with no annexation having been done yet. From a timing standpoint, that’s a non-starter for us. We need something that can move forward on a more expedited basis. If we can get something done…

Mr. Sieben said but we’re not looking at slowing you guys down. I think with regard to your development, you show as Lot 29 there, I think if that pretty much converts to right-of-way I think we are good to go on that end of it.

Mrs. Vacek said I think there are other issues going on.

Mr. Sieben said on that issue.

Mrs. Vacek said however, I think that this is a concept so I don’t think that we are thinking that we are going to have 100% everything worked out at the concept level. The Annexation Agreement has to address the whole thing, so we will continue to work on that. I don’t, again like I said, I don’t think IDOT is going to be completed before this is done. We are well aware of that.

Mr. Whitaker said so I guess from our standpoint the way we envision this happening is there would be the Annexation, there would be Preliminary Plat. I think we’ve got it set up as we would be one lot on that Preliminary Plat and then we would be able to move forward while the issues continue to be resolved on the commercial portion and there is some additional development of information on the commercial portion. Again, we would be moving forward in 2020 with physical development of the property if possible. It is an 84 lot subdivision, R-2 Special Use zoning. I think we are generally consistent with the R-2 lot standards, general lot sizes 60 by 125, which is a 7,500 square foot typical lot, which is slightly under the R-2 standard, but I think if you look at the average lot size, we are over that 8,000 minimum. Setbacks are generally consistent. I know we specified the setbacks that we are seeking in our application materials. Otherwise, it is fairly straightforward from a subdivision standpoint. I think we are trying to be flexible in sort of roadway design and meet your standards for Keating as more of a collector road and then narrowing down a little bit on the local roads within the subdivision.

Mr. Sieben said when you say Keating, you mean that north/south road?

Mr. Whitaker said where Keating comes into the subdivision, we’re showing a 66 foot right-of-way.

Mr. Sieben said wasn’t this one also?

Mr. Whitaker said yes and you’re right. Then also that comes down on (inaudible), that is also 66 foot, 31 back to back and then more internal where you don’t have your through routes, it is the 60 foot right-of-way with, I think, 31 foot back to back. The other thing I would note is we are looking for some level of concurrence on elevations. It is an important element for us to be able to work out sort of the financials for the project to be able to get not necessarily a final approval of elevations, but to be able to a set character.
Mr. Sieben said and understanding.

Mr. Whitaker said yes. I know we submitted to the city a whole extensive product matrix with a combination of ranch and two story homes ranging from 1,700 square feet up to roughly 3,200 square feet, provided some variety in the homes with 40 foot product ranging up to 48 foot product, which would all fit on a variety of the lots. That will be further refined as we move forward, but all of the elevations and the floor plans that we've selected are sort of similar in character, so we would look to kind of drill down on those elevations or the character of the subdivision and then we can narrow it down on exactly what floor plans would be included.

Mr. Sieben said Tracey, do you want to comment on the elevations?

Mrs. Vacek said we still need to take a look at them. I think that there will probably be some, obviously, things that we are going to have to change. For the most part, I think that they were pretty good. We'll take a look at that as we move through the process. If that's going to be an attachment to the Annexation Agreement, I'm not sure. I haven't quite gotten there yet. We'll continue to take a look at that though.

Mr. Whitaker said were there other sort of site planning related comments? I obviously heard the Lot 29 concern with respect that what we are showing as a private drive connecting through into our roadway network. Was there anything else?

Mrs. Vacek said I haven't really dig into it too deep. I did notice though that a lot of the formatting comments that I sent back still were not addressed, so I was a little taken aback that those weren't addressed before you submitted as I went through it. The Plat of Survey's are still overlapping from what you and the Hamman's are giving me, so we need to clean that up. Match lines weren't given on the plat, so some of that needs to be cleared up. I've had conversations with the Alderman. He is still a little leery about the lot sizes, especially the two that are smaller. I explained why there were smaller. I think he is still feeling that they can maybe get bigger in width to kind of meet that average lot size that you kind of were talking about. Those may be some of my comments. I haven't totally dug into everything, so we'll be continuing to do that and I'll be getting comments probably out by hopefully next week.

Mr. Sieben said we've also talked to the Alderman a little bit about the elevations, so that's where Tracey is coming up with some of that. We want to make sure, since this is an important project for Ware 9, that we get as much resolved up front as we can.

Mr. Phipps said the Engineering review is still going on, so this isn't final by any means. I will try to get a letter out to you as soon as we can once the detailed review is complete. One item I wanted to bring up, because I think it is a significant item, is that you mentioned not providing a 66 foot right-of-way for all of the streets in the subdivision and that's an issue for us. It will be a comment on our letter that we would be looking for 66 foot right-of-way on all the streets, not just on the main road.

Mr. Beneke said Fire and I have looked at this and it looks like it is fine with us. Obviously, any modifications to access points or roads will need to be reviewed.

Mr. Sieben said Mike, with Fox Metro you already commented this will need to be annexed.

Mr. Frankino said I believe the entire site, but I will confirm that with John and whoever else wants to be copied on that, the existing current limits.
Mr. Sieben said I think the summary, we still have to look at it in more detail and, obviously, get you comments on the elevations too, so we'll be doing that in the next week or so. It sounds like there may be some tweaking of this, but I think in general we want to definitely get you guys going in 2020, so we'll be able to meet somewhere and we'll get this thing going. That's our goal.

Mr. Beneke said just as another piece, I'd say feel free to start getting ready for your master plan review and get those into us and we can start that process.

Mr. Sieben said we'll be getting back to you shortly.

19-0963

Requesting the Establishment of a Special Use Planned Development, pursuant to an Annexation Agreement, with an underlying B-2 Business, General Retail, O Office, R-5 Multiple Family Dwelling, and R-2 One Family Dwelling zoning districts on the property located at the southeast corner of Ogden Avenue and Farnsworth Avenue (KEKA Farms, LLC / K. Hovnanian Homes - 19-0963 / OS01/1-18.150-PA/A/SUPD/Ppn/Psd - TV - Ward 9)

Representatives Present: Adam Patterson, Russ Whitaker, Mike Schoppe and John Philipchuck

My name is John Philipchuck. I'm the attorney. I represent the KEKA Farms, LLC. With me today is David Hamman, one of the managers. They own the 67.57 acre parcel.

I'm Mike Schoppe with Schoppe Design Associates representing both K. Hovnanian on the single family component of this as well as KEKA Farms on the balance of the property.

I'm Adam Patterson with K. Hovnanian Homes, the home builder for the 84 single family home lots.

I'm Russ Whitaker with Rosanova and Whitaker, attorney for Hovnanian on the development of the residential subdivision.

Mr. Sieben said whoever wants to start. I know this kind of overall concept in both the non-residential and the residential we’ve been talking about this for a little while and we finally got a submittal in, so whoever would like to start.

Mr. Philipchuck said I'll start. Obviously, the preliminary plat that you see on the Concept Plan, that's the parcel that is under contract to be sold to K. Hovnanian and Russ will speak to the specifics of their plan. The balance of the property owner by KEKA Farms is planned for several use categories. We've located some B-2 commercial along the Route 34 frontage, some O office across from the Copley Hospital, that 13 acres, and then we've got a multi-family parcel on Farnsworth Avenue. The large outparcel in the middle is Prairie Material. They have a redi-mix plant there. It goes in and out of operation from time to time, but they have no intention of abandoning the use. The property is somewhat interesting in that it straddles both Kane County and Kendall County, so we have various entities that we are going to be dealing with here as far as what Park District we’re in. We are in Oswegoland for part of this and Fox Valley for part of it. The same with the Fire District and the same with the Library District, so we’ve got a combination of things. Mike, is all that in Fox
Metro? I know we’ve got a sewer running through the middle of the property.

Mr. Frankino said it needs to be annexed.

Mr. Philipchuck said all that has to come in yet?

Mr. Frankino said to be honest with you I was looking at the preliminary information and I thought we were only talking about this area here. I think the boundary is somewhere in here John. I can send you an existing limits.

Mr. Philipchuck said we’ve gone back and forth with staff a few times with regard to the plan and what the uses are. In fact, some of what happens on this property is going to be really dependent on how the access works out. We need access to the light at that Copley entrance to be able to property develop Parcel C. There’s a history on this.

Mr. Sieben said Tracey can go into detail after you guys are done. She’ll give you a little bit more detail.

Mr. Philipchuck said okay.

Mr. Sieben said there is an actual Resolution or Ordinance that was passed in 2002 by the city.

Mr. Philipchuck said there was. I have copies of all that stuff. It went back and forth and all around and we need to clarify where that’s at. Another issue is the staff’s request to extend Keating Drive through the property along the alignment of the current private drive, which at this point only serves the Prairie Material Redi-Mix plant. I guess part of my question on that is that doesn’t follow the Comp Plan and so I’m wondering why the deviation. Has the staff come up with a good reason why Keating has to go to 34 and not to Farnsworth per the Comprehensive Plan?

Mr. Sieben said we can address that.

Mr. Philipchuck said otherwise, I think the working out the details on the uses while we were noodling it in-house talking about that Parcel C, we’ve had some inquiries in the past for types of hospital related housing and people who might need short-term care in a housing environment. I don’t know if that’s going to be an office parcel or not. That’s what our thinking is now. We also had the idea would the city staff consider, I don’t know how we would necessarily put it into the zoning at this point, but even a hotel use might be a possible use for that site. People who need a place to stay where they have folks that are in the hospital and very convenient for them and also some of the doctors that practice at different hospitals for them to sometimes get back and forth and having the availability of a place to maybe stay overnight so they could do a surgery in the morning. It might be somewhat beneficial, so I’d like you to think about that to see what your thoughts might be on that. With that, obviously, depending on how these improvements go on 34, we just have to figure out what we can work out with the city on those access points and then what public improvements are going to have to follow along with that and then the simple fact of how are we going to pay for them.

Mr. Sieben said do we want to maybe at this time, because there’s kind of the colored area is the non-residential versus the K. Hovnanian property, do we want to maybe just kind of touch on some staff comments at this time because they are almost like two different things?
Mrs. Vacek said I guess I’ll kind of comment on the access up at the office portion. Staff did do a support letter that we would support the access across from Rush-Copley for that to be turned into a full access. I believe what the Resolution says is that we would support that fully with IDOT, knowing well that there needs to be some improvements done, meaning that Pointe Boulevard would have to be turned into a right-in/right-out. We are aware of that. How the Resolution states is all of that work would be done by the developer, so that’s what we would be expecting, that the developer would be taking care of all that work.

Mr. Sieben said and per IDOT standards, IDOT requirements.

Mrs. Vacek said but there was a Resolution that did state that we would support that.

Mr. Philipchuck said excuse me. Are you talking about that ancient one back in ‘02?

Mrs. Vacek said back in ’02.

Mr. Sieben said that’s the latest we’ve got.

Mr. Philipchuck said you didn’t mention the fact that the city wanted there to remain a left-in and that never flew past IDOT. IDOT was solely right-in/right-out, but that Resolution said and a left turn in.

Mrs. Vacek said it did and I believe that, obviously, we would still have to work with IDOT to see if that would possibly…

Mr. Philipchuck said a lot of time has gone by.

Mr. Sieben said so that would be 17 years and it will be 18 years, so we can revisit it, but you have the general concept of what we are all looking at.

Mr. Philipchuck said okay, perfect.

Mr. Sieben said Mark, did you want to comment on that?

Mr. Phipps said I think it would be appropriate to bring it up with IDOT again the possibility of a left-in and see where it goes.

Mr. Philipchuck said so is that something that you would initiate like soon, like tomorrow, to see what the mood might be up there?

Mr. Phipps said well my understanding from the Resolution is that the coordination with IDOT and the actual construction would be done by the developer. I wasn’t expecting that that would be something brought up by city staff with IDOT. That would be on the developer.

Mrs. Vacek said John, I think that we would be happy to be at the table, but I think that’s something that you guys need to kind of initiate.

Mr. Philipchuck said well we can, but you’re prepared to take the argument to IDOT about the left turn in, right?

Mr. Sieben said we would coordinate the argument, yes.
Mr. Philipchuck said I was going to say because that's something the city came back with and IDOT said no back then.

Mr. Sieben said when we get to that point, we would coordinate that with the developer.

Mr. Philipchuck said okay.

Mr. Sieben said regarding in general the land uses as presented, do you want to touch on those Tracey?

Mrs. Vacek said I think that we are pretty good with the land uses that you have set forth. I haven’t totally looked into everything, but I know that one of the land uses that you guys were looking at was maybe some self-storage or mini-storage on Parcel D. I think that we would be fine with that if it is no outdoor storage and it was all indoor corridor storage. I don’t think that we would want to see garages or anything like that. I haven’t looked at it fully yet. I’m still in the midst of reviewing it. I will get you comments on that. I haven’t considered the hotel use, that just was brought up today. We’ll take a look at that and we’ll get back with you on that. As far as the other remaining uses, I think that we are good with the uses.

Mr. Sieben said and the other option on C, the office area, was maybe if there was any assisted or senior living may be a possibility there, so we’ll take a look at that too. Obviously, all the access points are going to be IDOT controlled.

Mrs. Vacek said did you want to touch on the road?

Mr. Phipps said yes. John brought it up and was asking the question what’s the reason that staff has been asking for a connection for the residential subdivision and Ogden and I think your own traffic study shows the amount of traffic at Ogden and Farnsworth and we think that by providing that direct connection from Keating out to 34 would…

Mr. Sieben said well not direct, direct.

Mrs. Vacek said between the residential and the commercial.

Mr. Sieben said there may be a turn there. That’s what I mean by that.

Mr. Phipps said right now that private drive ends at the residential subdivision. There is a lot that’s marked out in between the end of that private drive and Keating and we’d like to see that connection between those two.

Mr. Philipchuck said but that doesn’t answer the question as to why you are deviating from the Comprehensive Plan with Keating. Keating right now on the current Comprehensive Plan for the city shows it coming down and interconnecting with Farnsworth Avenue across from Summerlin, not going out to 34.

Mrs. Vacek said correct, but we still want that interconnection between the subdivision and the residential, so if it goes out to Ogden and/or Farnsworth, there is still that interconnection that we would like to have a public route. We can take a look at it if we want it down to Summerlin or if we want it to go out to Ogden. It makes sense to me that it would go out to Ogden because there is a full access already existing there and I think that’s where we are trying to get people to go anyway, so everybody that is
making a right then wouldn’t have to go to that intersection at Farnsworth and Ogden where there is already some backup. I think that that’s what your traffic study is kind of showing right now. If it is a matter of that or not, I think that we do want to see that interconnection between the subdivision and the commercial area. So if it goes to Summerlin or if it goes to Ogden, I mean obviously, it made sense for us that it just was Ogden.

Mr. Whitaker said so you’re looking for that as a public road and not as a private drive?

Mrs. Vacek said correct. I think we’ve stated that many times.

Mr. Sieben said do you want to move onto anything with the non-residential?

Mrs. Vacek said no. I have just started taking a look at the Annexation Agreement, so there is going to be probably a lot of comments on that.

Mr. Sieben said the good thing is I think we are good on the uses. I think we’ve come to that meeting of the minds on the uses and we can see if we can be maybe even a little bit more flexible on that other stuff that you mentioned.

Mr. Phipps said I’ve got one more comment on the residential. Have we already moved on past that that?

Mr. Sieben said we haven’t gotten to the residential yet.

Mr. Whitaker said and I think that was the point of emphasis for us is we’ve been working on this project through some fits and starts for a year or more at this point in time. We have a strong desire to be able to able to push this forward. I understand that there may be other IDOT or public roadway or other issues that may or may not impact our subdivision as significantly. I think our perspective is though we need to be able to move forward presently on this. The intent is that this is a 2020 project and so we are kind of on a timeframe like we’ve been on and there is going to be extended debates with IDOT. An IDOT process on what’s going to happen with some of these intersections on Route 34 is going to have us back at this table next year with no annexation having been done yet. From a timing standpoint, that’s a non-starter for us. We need something that can move forward on a more expedited basis. If we can get something done…

Mr. Sieben said but we’re not looking at slowing you guys down. I think with regard to your development, you show as Lot 29 there, I think if that pretty much converts to right-of-way I think we are good to go on that end of it.

Mrs. Vacek said I think there are other issues going on.

Mr. Sieben said on that issue.

Mrs. Vacek said however, I think that this is a concept so I don’t think that we are thinking that we are going to have 100% everything worked out at the concept level. The Annexation Agreement has to address the whole thing, so we will continue to work on that. I don’t, again like I said, I don’t think IDOT is going to be completed before this is done. We are well aware of that.

Mr. Whitaker said so I guess from our standpoint the way we envision this happening is there would be the Annexation, there would be Preliminary Plat. I think we’ve got it
set up as we would be one lot on that Preliminary Plat and then we would be able to move forward while the issues continue to be resolved on the commercial portion and there is some additional development of information on the commercial portion. Again, we would be moving forward in 2020 with physical development of the property if possible. It is an 84 lot subdivision, R-2 Special Use zoning. I think we are generally consistent with the R-2 lot standards, general lot sizes 60 by 125, which is a 7,500 square foot typical lot, which is slightly under the R-2 standard, but I think if you look at the average lot size, we are over that 8,000 minimum. Setbacks are generally consistent. I know we specified the setbacks that we are seeking in our application materials. Otherwise, it is fairly straightforward from a subdivision standpoint. I think we are trying to be flexible in sort of roadway design and meet your standards for Keating as more of a collector road and then narrowing down a little bit on the local roads within the subdivision.

Mr. Sieben said when you say Keating, you mean that north/south road?

Mr. Whitaker said where Keating comes into the subdivision, we’re showing a 66 foot right-of-way.

Mr. Sieben said wasn’t this one also?

Mr. Whitaker said yes and you’re right. Then also that comes down on (inaudible), that is also 66 foot, 31 back to back and then more internal where you don’t have your through routes, it is the 60 foot right-of-way with, I think, 31 foot back to back. The other thing I would note is we are looking for some level of concurrence on elevations. It is an important element for us to be able to work out sort of the financials for the project to be able to get not necessarily a final approval of elevations, but to be able to a set character.

Mr. Sieben said and understanding.

Mr. Whitaker said yes. I know we submitted to the city a whole extensive product matrix with a combination of ranch and two story homes ranging from 1,700 square feet up to roughly 3,200 square feet, provided some variety in the homes with 40 foot product ranging up to 48 foot product, which would all fit on a variety of the lots. That will be further refined as we move forward, but all of the elevations and the floor plans that we’ve selected are sort of similar in character, so we would look to kind of drill down on those elevations or the character of the subdivision and then we can narrow it down on exactly what floor plans would be included.

Mr. Sieben said Tracey, do you want to comment on the elevations?

Mrs. Vacek said we still need to take a look at them. I think that there will probably be some, obviously, things that we are going to have to change. For the most part, I think that they were pretty good. We’ll take a look at that as we move through the process. If that’s going to be an attachment to the Annexation Agreement, I’m not sure. I haven’t quite gotten there yet. We’ll continue to take a look at that though.

Mr. Whitaker said were there other sort of site planning related comments? I obviously heard the Lot 29 concern with respect that what we are showing as a private drive connecting through into our roadway network. Was there anything else?

Mrs. Vacek said I haven’t really dug into it too deep. I did notice though that a lot of the formatting comments that I sent back still were not addressed, so I was a little
taken aback that those weren’t addressed before you submitted as I went through it. The Plat of Survey’s are still overlapping from what you and the Hamman’s are giving me, so we need to clean that up. Match lines weren’t given on the plat, so some of that needs to be cleared up. I’ve had conversations with the Alderman. He is still a little leery about the lot sizes, especially the two that are smaller. I explained why there were smaller. I think he is still feeling that they can maybe get bigger in width to kind of meet that average lot size that you kind of were talking about. Those may be some of my comments. I haven’t totally dug into everything, so we’ll be continuing to do that and I’ll be getting comments probably out by hopefully next week.

Mr. Sieben said we’ve also talked to the Alderman a little bit about the elevations, so that’s where Tracey is coming up with some of that. We want to make sure, since this is an important project for Ware 9, that we get as much resolved up front as we can.

Mr. Phipps said the Engineering review is still going on, so this isn’t final by any means. I will try to get a letter out to you as soon as we can once the detailed review is complete. One item I wanted to bring up, because I think it is a significant item, is that you mentioned not providing a 66 foot right-of-way for all of the streets in the subdivision and that’s an issue for us. It will be a comment on our letter that we would be looking for 66 foot right-of-way on all the streets, not just on the main road.

Mr. Beneke said Fire and I have looked at this and it looks like it is fine with us. Obviously, any modifications to access points or roads will need to be reviewed.

Mr. Sieben said and Mike, with Fox Metro you already commented this will need to be annexed.

Mr. Frankino said I believe the entire site, but I will confirm that with John and whoever else wants to be copied on that, the existing current limits.

Mr. Sieben said I think the summary, we still have to look at it in more detail and, obviously, get you comments on the elevations too, so we’ll be doing that in the next week or so. It sounds like there may be some tweaking of this, but I think in general we want to definitely get you guys going in 2020, so we’ll be able to meet somewhere and we’ll get this thing going. That’s our goal.

Mr. Beneke said just as another piece, I’d say feel free to start getting ready for your master plan review and get those into us and we can start that process.

Mr. Sieben said we’ll be getting back to you shortly.

19-0964

Requesting approval of a Preliminary Plan and Plat on Parcel E for Ogden Ridge Subdivision located at the southeast corner of Ogden Avenue and Farnsworth Avenue for detached single family dwellings (KEKA Farms, LLC / K. Hovnanian Homes - 19-0964 / OS01/1-18.150-PA/A/SUPD/Ppn/Psd - TV - Ward 9)

Representatives Present: Adam Patterson, Russ Whitaker, Mike Schoppe and John Philipchuck

My name is John Philipchuck. I’m the attorney. I represent the KEKA Farms, LLC. With me today is David Hamman, one of the managers. They own the 67.57 acre parcel.
I’m Mike Schoppe with Schoppe Design Associates representing both K. Hovnanian on the single family component of this as well as KEKA Farms on the balance of the property.

I’m Adam Patterson with K. Hovnanian Homes, the home builder for the 84 single family home lots.

I’m Russ Whitaker with Rosanova and Whitaker, attorney for Hovnanian on the development of the residential subdivision.

Mr. Sieben said whoever wants to start. I know this kind of overall concept in both the non-residential and the residential we’ve been talking about this for a little while and we finally got a submittal in, so whoever would like to start.

Mr. Philipchuck said I’ll start. Obviously, the preliminary plat that you see on the Concept Plan, that’s the parcel that is under contract to be sold to K. Hovnanian and Russ will speak to the specifics of their plan. The balance of the property owner by KEKA Farms is planned for several use categories. We’ve located some B-2 commercial along the Route 34 frontage, some O office across from the Copley Hospital, that 13 acres, and then we’ve got a multi-family parcel on Farnsworth Avenue. The large outparcel in the middle is Prairie Material. They have a redi-mix plant there. It goes in and out of operation from time to time, but they have no intention of abandoning the use. The property is somewhat interesting in that it straddles both Kane County and Kendall County, so we have various entities that we are going to be dealing with here as far as what Park District we’re in. We are in Oswegoland for part of this and Fox Valley for part of it. The same with the Fire District and the same with the Library District, so we’ve got a combination of things. Mike, is all that in Fox Metro? I know we’ve got a sewer running through the middle of the property.

Mr. Frankino said it needs to be annexed.

Mr. Philipchuck said all that has to come in yet?

Mr. Frankino said to be honest with you I was looking at the preliminary information and I thought we were only talking about this area here. I think the boundary is somewhere in here John. I can send you an existing limits.

Mr. Philipchuck said we’ve gone back and forth with staff a few times with regard to the plan and what the uses are. In fact, some of what happens on this property is going to be really dependent on how the access works out. We need access to the light at that Copley entrance to be able to property develop Parcel C. There’s a history on this.

Mr. Sieben said Tracey can go into detail after you guys are done. She’ll give you a little bit more detail.

Mr. Philipchuck said okay.

Mr. Sieben said there is an actual Resolution or Ordinance that was passed in 2002 by the city.

Mr. Philipchuck said there was. I have copies of all that stuff. It went back and forth and all around and we need to clarify where that’s at. Another issue is the staff’s request to extend Keating Drive through the property along the alignment of the current private drive, which at this point only serves the Prairie Material Redi-Mix plant. I guess
part of my question on that is that doesn’t follow the Comp Plan and so I’m wondering why the deviation. Has the staff come up with a good reason why Keating has to go to 34 and not to Farnsworth per the Comprehensive Plan?

Mr. Sieben said we can address that.

Mr. Philipchuck said otherwise, I think the working out the details on the uses while we were noodling it in-house talking about that Parcel C, we’ve had some inquires in the past for types of hospital related housing and people who might need short-term care in a housing environment. I don’t know if that’s going to be an office parcel or not. That’s what our thinking is now. We also had the idea would the city staff consider, I don’t know how we would necessarily put it into the zoning at this point, but even a hotel use might be a possible use for that site. People who need a place to stay where they have folks that are in the hospital and very convenient for them and also some of the doctors that practice at different hospitals for them to sometimes get back and forth and having the availability of a place to maybe stay overnight so they could do a surgery in the morning. It might be somewhat beneficial, so I’d like you to think about that to see what your thoughts might be on that. With that, obviously, depending on how these improvements go on 34, we just have to figure out what we can work out with the city on those access points and then what public improvements are going to have to follow along with that and then the simple fact of how are we going to pay for them.

Mr. Sieben said do we want to maybe at this time, because there’s kind of the colored area is the non-residential versus the K. Hovnanian property, do we want to maybe just kind of touch on some staff comments at this time because they are almost like two different things?

Mrs. Vacek said I guess I’ll kind of comment on the access up at the office portion. Staff did do a support letter that we would support the access across from Rush-Copley for that to be turned into a full access. I believe what the Resolution says is that we would support that fully with IDOT, knowing well that there needs to be some improvements done, meaning that Pointe Boulevard would have to be turned into a right-in/right-out. We are aware of that. How the Resolution states is all of that work would be done by the developer, so that’s what we would be expecting, that the developer would be taking care of all that work.

Mr. Sieben said and per IDOT standards, IDOT requirements.

Mrs. Vacek said but there was a Resolution that did state that we would support that.

Mr. Philipchuck said excuse me. Are you talking about that ancient one back in ’02?

Mrs. Vacek said back in ’02.

Mr. Sieben said that’s the latest we’ve got.

Mr. Philipchuck said you didn’t mention the fact that the city wanted there to remain a left-in and that never flew past IDOT. IDOT was solely right-in/right-out, but that Resolution said and a left turn in.

Mrs. Vacek said it did and I believe that, obviously, we would still have to work with IDOT to see if that would possibly…
Mr. Philipchuck said a lot of time has gone by.

Mr. Sieben said so that would be 17 years and it will be 18 years, so we can revisit it, but you have the general concept of what we are all looking at.

Mr. Philipchuck said okay, perfect.

Mr. Sieben said Mark, did you want to comment on that?

Mr. Phipps said I think it would be appropriate to bring it up with IDOT again the possibility of a left-in and see where it goes.

Mr. Philipchuck said so is that something that you would initiate like soon, like tomorrow, to see what the mood might be up there?

Mr. Phipps said well my understanding from the Resolution is that the coordination with IDOT and the actual construction would be done by the developer. I wasn’t expecting that that would be something brought up by city staff with IDOT. That would be on the developer.

Mrs. Vacek said John, I think that we would be happy to be at the table, but I think that’s something that you guys need to kind of initiate.

Mr. Philipchuck said well we can, but you’re prepared to take the argument to IDOT about the left turn in, right?

Mr. Sieben said we would coordinate the argument, yes.

Mr. Philipchuck said I was going to say because that’s something the city came back with and IDOT said no back then.

Mr. Sieben said when we get to that point, we would coordinate that with the developer.

Mr. Philipchuck said okay.

Mr. Sieben said regarding in general the land uses as presented, do you want to touch on those Tracey?

Mrs. Vacek said I think that we are pretty good with the land uses that you have set forth. I haven’t totally looked into everything, but I know that one of the land uses that you guys were looking at was maybe some self-storage or mini-storage on Parcel D. I think that we would be fine with that if it is no outdoor storage and it was all indoor corridor storage. I don’t think that we would want to see garages or anything like that. I haven’t looked at it fully yet. I’m still in the midst of reviewing it. I will get you comments on that. I haven’t considered the hotel use, that just was brought up today. We’ll take a look at that and we’ll get back with you on that. As far as the other remaining uses, I think that we are good with the uses.

Mr. Sieben said and the other option on C, the office area, was maybe if there was any assisted or senior living may be a possibility there, so we’ll take a look at that too. Obviously, all the access points are going to be IDOT controlled.

Mrs. Vacek said did you want to touch on the road?
Mr. Phipps said yes. John brought it up and was asking the question what’s the reason that staff has been asking for a connection for the residential subdivision and Ogden and I think your own traffic study shows the amount of traffic at Ogden and Farnsworth and we think that by providing that direct connection from Keating out to 34 would…

Mr. Sieben said well not direct, direct.

Mrs. Vacek said between the residential and the commercial.

Mr. Sieben said there may be a turn there. That’s what I mean by that.

Mr. Phipps said right now that private drive ends at the residential subdivision. There is a lot that’s marked out in between the end of that private drive and Keating and we’d like to see that connection between those two.

Mr. Philipchuck said but that doesn’t answer the question as to why you are deviating from the Comprehensive Plan with Keating. Keating right now on the current Comprehensive Plan for the city shows it coming down and interconnecting with Farnsworth Avenue across from Summerlin, not going out to 34.

Mrs. Vacek said correct, but we still want that interconnection between the subdivision and the residential, so if it goes out to Ogden and/or Farnsworth, there is still that interconnection that we would like to have a public route. We can take a look at it if we want it down to Summerlin or if we want it to go out to Ogden. It makes sense to me that it would go out to Ogden because there is a full access already existing there and I think that’s where we are trying to get people to go anyway, so everybody that is making a right then wouldn’t have to go to that intersection at Farnsworth and Ogden where there is already some backup. I think that’s what your traffic study is kind of showing right now. If it is a matter of that or not, I think that we do want to see that interconnection between the subdivision and the commercial area. So if it goes to Summerlin or if it goes to Ogden, I mean obviously, it made sense for us that it just was Ogden.

Mr. Whitaker said so you’re looking for that as a public road and not as a private drive?

Mrs. Vacek said correct. I think we’ve stated that many times.

Mr. Sieben said do you want to move onto anything with the non-residential?

Mrs. Vacek said no. I have just started taking a look at the Annexation Agreement, so there is going to be probably a lot of comments on that.

Mr. Sieben said the good thing is I think we are good on the uses. I think we’ve come to that meeting of the minds on the uses and we can see if we can be maybe even a little bit more flexible on that other stuff that you mentioned.

Mr. Phipps said I’ve got one more comment on the residential. Have we already moved on past that that?

Mr. Sieben said we haven’t gotten to the residential yet.

Mr. Whitaker said and I think that was the point of emphasis for us is we’ve been working on this project through some fits and starts for a year or more at this point in
time. We have a strong desire to be able to push this forward. I understand that there may be other IDOT or public roadway or other issues that may or may not impact our subdivision as significantly. I think our perspective is though we need to be able to move forward presently on this. The intent is that this is a 2020 project and so we are kind of on a timeframe like we've been on and there is going to be extended debates with IDOT. An IDOT process on what's going to happen with some of these intersections on Route 34 is going to have us back at this table next year with no annexation having been done yet. From a timing standpoint, that's a non-starter for us. We need something that can move forward on a more expedited basis. If we can get something done…

Mr. Sieben said but we’re not looking at slowing you guys down. I think with regard to your development, you show as Lot 29 there, I think if that pretty much converts to right-of-way I think we are good to go on that end of it.

Mrs. Vacek said I think there are other issues going on.

Mr. Sieben said on that issue.

Mrs. Vacek said however, I think that this is a concept so I don’t think that we are thinking that we are going to have 100% everything worked out at the concept level. The Annexation Agreement has to address the whole thing, so we will continue to work on that. I don’t, again like I said, I don’t think IDOT is going to be completed before this is done. We are well aware of that.

Mr. Whitaker said so I guess from our standpoint the way we envision this happening is there would be the Annexation, there would be Preliminary Plat. I think we’ve got it set up as we would be one lot on that Preliminary Plat and then we would be able to move forward while the issues continue to be resolved on the commercial portion and there is some additional development of information on the commercial portion. Again, we would be moving forward in 2020 with physical development of the property if possible. It is an 84 lot subdivision, R-2 Special Use zoning. I think we are generally consistent with the R-2 lot standards, general lot sizes 60 by 125, which is a 7,500 square foot typical lot, which is slightly under the R-2 standard, but I think if you look at the average lot size, we are over that 8,000 minimum. Setbacks are generally consistent. I know we specified the setbacks that we are seeking in our application materials. Otherwise, it is fairly straightforward from a subdivision standpoint. I think we are trying to be flexible in sort of roadway design and meet your standards for Keating as more of a collector road and then narrowing down a little bit on the local roads within the subdivision.

Mr. Sieben said when you say Keating, you mean that north/south road?

Mr. Whitaker said where Keating comes into the subdivision, we’re showing a 66 foot right-of-way.

Mr. Sieben said wasn’t this one also?

Mr. Whitaker said yes and you’re right. Then also that comes down on (inaudible), that is also 66 foot, 31 back to back and then more internal where you don’t have your through routes, it is the 60 foot right-of-way with, I think, 31 foot back to back. The other thing I would note is we are looking for some level of concurrence on elevations. It is an important element for us to be able to work out sort of the financials for the project to be able to get not necessarily a final approval of elevations, but to be able
Mr. Sieben said and understanding.

Mr. Whitaker said yes. I know we submitted to the city a whole extensive product matrix with a combination of ranch and two story homes ranging from 1,700 square feet up to roughly 3,200 square feet, provided some variety in the homes with 40 foot product ranging up to 48 foot product, which would all fit on a variety of the lots. That will be further refined as we move forward, but all of the elevations and the floor plans that we’ve selected are sort of similar in character, so we would look to kind of drill down on those elevations or the character of the subdivision and then we can narrow it down on exactly what floor plans would be included.

Mr. Sieben said Tracey, do you want to comment on the elevations?

Mrs. Vacek said we still need to take a look at them. I think that there will probably be some, obviously, things that we are going to have to change. For the most part, I think that they were pretty good. We’ll take a look at that as we move through the process. If that’s going to be an attachment to the Annexation Agreement, I’m not sure. I haven’t quite gotten there yet. We’ll continue to take a look at that though.

Mr. Whitaker said were there other sort of site planning related comments? I obviously heard the Lot 29 concern with respect that what we are showing as a private drive connecting through into our roadway network. Was there anything else?

Mrs. Vacek said I haven’t really dug into it too deep. I did notice though that a lot of the formatting comments that I sent back still were not addressed, so I was a little taken aback that those weren’t addressed before you submitted as I went through it. The Plat of Survey’s are still overlapping from what you and the Hamman’s are giving me, so we need to clean that up. Match lines weren’t given on the plat, so some of that needs to be cleared up. I’ve had conversations with the Alderman. He is still a little leery about the lot sizes, especially the two that are smaller. I explained why there were smaller. I think he is still feeling that they can maybe get bigger in width to kind of meet that average lot size that you kind of were talking about. Those may be some of my comments. I haven’t totally dug into everything, so we’ll be continuing to do that and I’ll be getting comments probably out by hopefully next week.

Mr. Sieben said we’ve also talked to the Alderman a little bit about the elevations, so that’s where Tracey is coming up with some of that. We want to make sure, since this is an important project for Ware 9, that we get as much resolved up front as we can.

Mr. Phipps said the Engineering review is still going on, so this isn’t final by any means. I will try to get a letter out to you as soon as we can once the detailed review is complete. One item I wanted to bring up, because I think it is a significant item, is that you mentioned not providing a 66 foot right-of-way for all of the streets in the subdivision and that’s an issue for us. It will be a comment on our letter that we would be looking for 66 foot right-of-way on all the streets, not just on the main road.

Mr. Beneke said Fire and I have looked at this and it looks like it is fine with us. Obviously, any modifications to access points or roads will need to be reviewed.

Mr. Sieben said and Mike, with Fox Metro you already commented this will need to be annexed.
Mr. Frankino said I believe the entire site, but I will confirm that with John and whoever else wants to be copied on that, the existing current limits.

Mr. Sieben said I think the summary, we still have to look at it in more detail and, obviously, get you comments on the elevations too, so we’ll be doing that in the next week or so. It sounds like there may be some tweaking of this, but I think in general we want to definitely get you guys going in 2020, so we’ll be able to meet somewhere and we’ll get this thing going. That’s our goal.

Mr. Beneke said just as another piece, I’d say feel free to start getting ready for your master plan review and get those into us and we can start that process.

Mr. Sieben said we’ll be getting back to you shortly.

**PENDING**

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Sieben adjourned the meeting at 10:40 p.m.

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