



**NAPERVILLE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF OCTOBER 21, 2015**

**UNOFFICIAL PRIOR TO PZC APPROVAL  
APPROVED BY THE PZC ON NOVEMBER 4, 2015**

**Call to Order**

**7:02 p.m.**

**A. Roll Call**

Present: Hansen, Messer, Crawford, Williams, Hastings, Hajek, Peterson  
Absent: Martinez, Bansal  
Student Members: None  
Staff Present: Planning Team – Allison Laff, Kasey Evans, Sara Kopinski, Erin Venard  
Engineering Team – Ray Fano, Chris Nichols

**B. Minutes**

Approve the minutes of the September 16, 2015 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

Motion by: Williams Approved  
Second by: Hastings (7 to 0)

**C. Old Business**

**D. Public Hearings**

**D1.  
PZC 15-1-079  
CSH Naperville  
LLC**

The petitioner requests approval of a major change to the Cantore Place Planned Unit Development (PUD) and approval of a Final PUD Plat; a Final Plat of Subdivision for Cantore Place Lot 1 Resubdivision; rezoning of Lot 1 from B2 (Community Shopping Center District) to R3 (Medium Density Multiple-family Residence District) zoning; and a Conditional Use for a nursing home/senior assisted living facility.

Kasey Evans, Planning Services Team, gave an overview of the request.

Vince Rosanova, Attorney with Rosanova and Whitaker, Ltd., spoke on behalf of the petitioner.

- The Cantore Place subdivision was approved in 2004 with ORI, B2, and R3 zoning.
- Several commercial outlots have been developed over the past ten years.

- The interior portion of the site consists of one story office buildings with mostly medical uses.
- The proposed project exceeds the underlying design standards of the PUD and the zoning standards.
- The proposed land use is in perfect harmony with the surrounding land uses.
- The architecture will blend in with adjacent residential uses. The height of the buildings is limited to one story where they abuts the adjacent residential buildings.
- The Cantore Owners Association has approved the proposed plans.
- The petitioner held a meeting with neighbors and received positive feedback.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Williams – There is a four story height limit and the proposal is only two stories? Rosanova – Yes.
- Williams - Is that influenced by the nearby airport? Rosanova - No.
- Messer – What is the maximum building height? Rosanova - 30’.
- Williams – Recently we have seen a lot of senior housing projects. Has anyone done a comprehensive study on how much of this type of housing is needed in Naperville? Rosanova – A market study was conducted for this location. The study showed there are no similar facilities in a 3 mile radius. Similar products are located in the central and north part of the City.

**Public Testimony: NONE**

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:

- Messer – This project is different than a previous senior housing facility that was denied. This property is not sandwiched in between retail. The property will buffer the existing residential from Rt. 59 and commercial uses.
- Williams – This project is not even close to the project that we denied. That was housing for the elderly in a shopping center. Southwest Naperville has diversity and a lot of space. This project will add to the energy and excitement of Southwest Naperville.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 15-1-079, approval of a major change to the Cantore Place Planned Unit Development (PUD) and approval of a Final PUD Plat; a Final Plat of Subdivision for Cantore Place Lot 1 Resubdivision; rezoning of Lot 1 from B2 (Community Shopping Center District) to R3 (Medium Density Multiple-family Residence District) zoning; and a Conditional Use for a nursing home/senior assisted living facility for the property located at 2640 Forgue Drive.

Motion by: Williams  
Seconded by: Hastings

Approved  
(7 to 0)

Ayes: Hansen, Williams, Hastings, Messer, Peterson,  
Crawford, Hajek

Nays: None

Absent: Martinez, Bansal

**D2.  
PZC 15-1-102  
Zoning  
Amendments  
Process  
Improvements**

- Staff requests amending various chapters of Title 6 (Zoning Ordinance), Title 7 (Subdivision Ordinance) and other sections as necessary, in order to improve existing processes related to requirements for the approval of temporary uses,
- administrative zoning approvals, annexation notice, administrative plat approvals, the 90% rule, and other related items.

Allison Laff, Planning Team Leader, gave an overview of the request to increase the allowance for the administrative approval of temporary uses.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Williams – You are asking for one, six month extension? Laff – That is correct.
- Williams – The maximum amount of a time a temporary use can be approved by staff is one year? Laff – That is correct.

Laff gave an overview of the request to increase the threshold for administrative approval of PUDs and Conditional Uses.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Peterson – With a major change, when it goes back to Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council, does that open up public comment again? Laff – Yes. A major change is a public hearing before the Planning and Zoning Commission which requires neighbors within 300' to be notified, a sign posted on the site and notice in the newspaper. A minor change appears before the City Council and still requires a sign posted on the site and notice to neighbors. An administrative change is a staff level approval and does not require notice to the public.

Laff gave an overview of the requests to require written notice to be given to surrounding property owners for annexation cases, to permit more than one multi-family building to be located on one lot, to allow administrative approval of plats which include right-of-way dedication and the dedication/vacation of access easements, and to use “median” instead of “average” when calculating the 90% rule minimum lot size.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Peterson – Staff has added in the designation of single-family in the 90% rule? Laff – Under the proposed code, you will be able to have several multi-family buildings per lot. Staff did not see the relationship between the underlying lot size and the 90% rule in this situation. The 90% rule was intended for single-family projects and came from the issue of tear downs. In calculating the 90% rule for multi-family, you can only use other multi-family developments and sometimes there are none.

**Public Testimony: NONE**

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:

- Williams – Not troubled by any of the amendments. All for additional notice.
- Messer – Good, reasonable changes. Largely driven by City Council. Fine with temporary uses. In favor of more public notice. 90% rule is a fine change.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 15-1-102, amending various chapters of Title 6 (Zoning Ordinance), Title 7 (Subdivision Ordinance) and other sections as necessary, in order to improve existing processes related to requirements for the approval of temporary uses, administrative zoning approvals, annexation notice, administrative plat approvals, the 90% rule, and other related items.

Motion by: Williams  
Second by: Hastings

Approved  
(7 to 0)

Ayes: Hansen, Williams, Hastings, Messer, Peterson, Crawford, Hajek  
Nays: None  
Absent: Martinez, Bansal

**D3.  
PZC 15-1-103  
Zoning  
Amendments –  
Common Variances**

Staff requests amending various chapters of Title 5 (Building Regulations), Title 6 (Zoning Ordinance), Title 7 (Subdivision Ordinance) and other sections as necessary, in order to address common variance requests related to residential monument signs, bay windows, front porches, fences, accessory structures, driveway bump-outs, visitor parking, required stacking and setbacks for drive-through facilities, platted setback lines, and other related items.

Allison Laff, Planning Team Leader, gave an overview of the request to permit non-conforming residential monument signs to be reconstructed by right.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Messer – The variance requests I am familiar with have been simple replacements. Have there been any new requests? Laff – There is a group that is waiting on this text amendment. There are also groups that leave the existing sign in place after finding out that replacement requires a variance.
- Messer – Are there content restrictions on residential monument signs? Laff - Yes, the sign is restricted to the subdivision name. Sometimes the sign can also have the builder's name or the year of construction.

Laff gave an overview of the request to allow covered front porches and bay windows to encroach in certain required yards by right.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Williams – A cantilevered bay window gives the illusion of taking up less side yard.
- Hansen – Was any consideration given to permit covered porches to encroach into the required rear yard? Laff – We do not see many variances requests for this, but we don't see a problem adding this in to the Code.

Laff gave an overview of the requests to amend the code with respect to size and location of detached accessory structures, to address a variety of issues related to the existing fence code and to increase allowances for driveway bump-outs at single-family properties.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Messer – What are the dimensions of a standard parking space? Laff – A commercial parking space is required to be 9' by 17.5'. A driveway bump-out will likely be smaller because it has to meet yard setbacks.
- Hastings – Can you add a drive-way bump out no matter how large your garage is? Laff – Yes. Staff believes it is reasonable to allow one bump out that has to meet the setback.

Laff gave an overview of the requests to require visitor parking at duplex, townhome, and multi-family complexes, to reduce the required stacking spaces for a bank drive-through and to amend the measurement of the 40' setback from a drive-through facility to a residential area.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Hansen – To clarify, the amended setback distance is for any drive-through? Laff – Yes.

**Public Testimony: NONE.**

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

#### Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion

- Williams – Very comprehensive. All points we deal with on a regular basis. Modern changes worthy of being adopted. Appreciate of the fence changes.
- Hansen – Applauds staff. Tremendous amount of work goes into 14 text amendments. Amendments make it easier for petitioners, staff and PZC.
- Messer – Comprehensive. Glad to see visitor parking requirement.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend PZC 15-1-103, amending various chapters of Title 5 (Building Regulations), Title 6 (Zoning Ordinance), Title 7 (Subdivision Ordinance) and other sections as necessary, in order to address common variance requests related to residential monument signs, bay windows, front porches, fences, accessory structures, driveway bump-outs, visitor parking, required stacking and setbacks for drive-through facilities, platted setback lines, and other related items, subject to the addition of allowing covered patios, decks and porches to extend 5' into the required rear yard.

Motion by: Williams  
Second by: Crawford

Approved  
(7 to 0)

Ayes: Hansen, Williams, Hastings, Messer, Peterson, Crawford, Hajek  
Nays: None  
Absent: Martinez, Bansal

#### **F. Correspondence**

#### **G. New Business**

Sara Kopinski, Planning Services Team, gave an overview of the request.

##### **G.1**

#### **PZC 15-1-108 Sleep Clinic Text Amendment**

- Hansen – Maybe a conditional use would be the right way to go. There may be other types of overnight uses that may not be as compatible to a neighborhood. Kopinski – The intent is to amend the code to include sleep clinics with overnight operations. Staff will conduct research to determine the best alternative.
- Williams – I would think this is brought about by sleep studies becoming more popular. This is just a modernization of an antique provision in the Code.
- 

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to direct staff to initiate a text amendment to the Medical Clinic/Office definition in Section 6-1-6 to be inclusive of sleep clinics with overnight operations.

#### **H. Adjournment**

8:12 p.m.