



**NAPERVILLE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
APPROVED MINUTES OF APRIL 1, 2015**

**UNOFFICIAL PRIOR TO PZC APPROVAL
APPROVED BY THE PZC ON APRIL 15, 2015**

Call to Order

7:00 p.m.

A. Roll Call

Present: Coyne, Frost, Gustin, Hastings, Williams, Hansen
Absent: Martinez, Messer, Crawford
Student Members: None
Staff Present: Planning Team – Sara Kopinski, Kasey Evans, Erin Venard, Derek Rockwell
Engineer – Rahat Bari, Michael Pearce

B. Minutes

Approve the minutes of the March 18, 2015 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting, as amended.

Motion by: Williams
Second by: Coyne

Approved
(6 to 0)

C. Old Business

**C1.
PZC 14-1-142
First Midwest Bank**

The petitioner requests a continuance of the public hearing to consider a variance from Section 6-7I-4:6 (Required Conditions) of the Naperville Municipal Code to allow a drive-through facility in the Transitional Use District, a variance from Section 6-9-6:2.1.1 (Supplemental Standards for Drive-through Stacking Lanes) to allow a reduced drive-through setback from a residential area, and a variance from Section 6-9-3:5 (Stacking requirements for Use with Drive-through Facilities) to allow a reduced number of drive-through stacking spaces, at the property located at 118, 122 and 128 N Washington Street to the May 6, 2015 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

Planning and Zoning Commission continued the case to May 6, 2015.

D. Public Hearings

**D1.
PZC 15-1-028
Naperville Executive
Center Sign Variance**

The petitioner requests approval of a variance from Section 5-4-3:5 (Prohibited Signs; Off Premises Signs) of the Municipal Code in order to install off premises signage on an existing non-conforming pole sign.

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

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Gustin – Is this property located in incorporated Naperville? Kopinski – Yes.
- Gustin – Is the owner’s name on any of the panels? Kopinski – The name of the owner of the building is not on the sign.

Brian Rohe, 248 Hampshire Court, New Lenox, spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- The sign was removed without our consent and we are seeking to replace the sign at the same location.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Gustin – Why was the sign taken down? Rohe – The sign was removed without our knowledge or consent. We’ve had rights to the sign since 1987 and through a lawsuit won back the right in court to replace the sign.

Public Testimony: None

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:

- Coyne – This is a technical point of issue. Will be approving.
- Frost – Agree.
- Gustin – It would create a hardship to require the petitioner to conform with the Municipal Code. This is a particular case that warrants the replacement of a pole sign panel.
- Hastings – Agree.
- Williams – Agree.
- Hansen – Agree.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 15-1-028, a variance from Section 5-4-3:5 (Prohibited Signs; Off Premises Signs) of the Municipal Code in order to install off premises signage on an existing non-conforming pole sign.

Motion by: Williams
Seconded by: Coyne

Approved
(6 to 0)

Ayes: Coyne, Frost, Gustin, Hastings, Williams, Hansen
Nays: None

**D2.
PZC 14-1-154**

The petitioner requests approval of rezoning to R1B (Medium Density Single-Family Residence District) zoning upon annexation and a Preliminary/Final

Maple Knoll Farm Subdivision Plat.

Erin Venard, Planning Services Team, gave an overview of the request.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Hastings – Why is R1A zoning not proposed? Venard – In order to be consistent with the zoning of the surrounding properties, the petitioner is proposing R1B zoning.

Paul Mitchell, Attorney for the Petitioner, 111 E. Jefferson, spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- The average lot size is over 16,000 square feet and the proposed zoning is consistent with the surrounding incorporated residential property.
- We are not requesting any variances.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Gustin – What is the square footage of the lot that is proposed to be built upon? Mitchell – The petitioner lives on Lot 1; Lots 2 and 3 have no building plans, buyers, etc at the moment.

Public Testimony:

Leslie Powers, 1508 N. Vest Drive:

- Is the Edgewood Subdivision zoned R1B?
- Concerned about the proposed density and the size of the lots.

Petitioner responded to testimony:

- Edgewood Subdivision is zoned R1B.
- These lots are similarly sized to those of the properties surrounding the area.

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:

- Coyne – Will be supporting.
- Frost – I agree.
- Gustin – Agree.
- Hastings – Agree.
- Williams – A reasonable request. Will be supporting.
- Hansen – These lots are at least as large as most of the surrounding properties. The zoning is appropriate.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 14-1-154, rezoning to R1B (Medium Density Single-Family Residence District) zoning upon annexation and a Preliminary/Final Subdivision Plat.

Motion by: Coyne
Seconded by: Williams

Approved
(6 to 0)

Ayes: Coyne, Frost, Gustin, Hastings, Williams, Hansen
Nays: None

D3.
PZC 14-1-042
184 Shuman
Boulevard Variance

The petitioner requests approval of a variance from Section 6-8B-7 (Yard Requirements) and Section 6-9-2:4.5 (Off Street Parking Facilities) of the Naperville Municipal Code to allow for the construction of off-street parking facilities in a portion of the required front yard, at the property located at 184 Shuman Boulevard.

Derek Rockwell, Planning Services Team, gave an overview of the request.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Frost – Is the existing parking within guidelines for required parking? Rockwell - Yes. The owners feel the need for additional parking? Rockwell - Yes. Is our 3.3 parking requirement accurate? Rockwell - Yes, the additional parking being requested will allow for greater flexibility with the future tenant mix at the site. Is staff comfortable with the 3.3 requirement for office users? Rockwell – Yes.
- Gustin - Frost makes a good point – how often have variances been needed for 3.3 office users? Rockwell – Staff could research into the issue concerning whether the amount of off-street parking required for offices users is appropriate.
- Hansen – Is this request tied to a particular user that they are trying to lease to? Rockwell - Yes, the additional parking will provide flexibility in the future.
- Hansen - Has the petitioner conducted any parking studies? Curious to hear from the petitioner how they determined the additional parking was necessary.

Peter Nelson, PANCOR Construction and Development, spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- We recognize the importance of the green spaces and are never looking to unnecessarily remove landscaping.
- One of the key items here is that corporate clients are looking for a parking ratio for office users of at least 4.0 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet. This issue is driven by the evolution of the American office. Offices are being converted to more compact workstations resulting in a denser worker population in the same amount of square footage.
- We researched other alternatives such as reducing parking space width,

which drivers are uncomfortable with.

- We are landlocked with a large detention pond to the south and Shuman and Park Streets to the west and north. This is the only location on the site where parking could be added.

Jason Green, W-T Civil Engineering, 2675 Pratham Avenue, Hoffman Estates:

- Described the layout of the parking lot and the requested setback variance.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Hastings – Do you currently have a tenant on the fence due to the parking issue? Nelson – We did lose a tenant due to the parking ratio on the property.
- Williams - Could staff clarify the comment regarding the parking being located 10' from the road to the new parking area? Rockwell - The required parking setback on site is 30'. The petitioner is proposing to locate the parking at its nearest point 10' from the property line. The petitioner is designing the parking lot with the greatest setback possible while maintaining City's parking lot standards. Williams - What does the Code require for setback? Rockwell - 30'
- Gustin – Is a portion of the existing sidewalk on private property? Green – Yes.
- Williams - The proposed parking addition is warranted and heavily landscaped.
- Hastings - What exists currently in the new parking area? Nelson - Grass and trees; new landscaping is proposed to comply with current Code.
- Hastings – Are there concerns regarding excess runoff? Green – The existing drainage pattern will be maintained on site and the property is engineered to meet runoff standards.
- Frost - Can the piping handle the volume? Green - Yes
- Gustin - When was the building built? Nelson – The late 1980's.

Public Testimony: None

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:

- Coyne – Petitioner's presentation compelling; will be supporting staff's recommendation.
- Frost – Petitioner's presentation was persuasive; the runoff concern has been alleviated.
- Gustin – I concur with fellow commissioners; staff should keep an eye on the changes in office occupancy and modify ordinances as necessary.
- Hastings – I concur with my fellow commissioners.
- Williams – Would like to commend the applicant; planning for the future. Frost and Hansen's comment were intelligent; would rather see more trees than concrete, however, an over-used building is a dream

come true; am in favor of the petition.

- Hansen – The petitioner addressed concerns. The bigger issue is looking at the City’s parking requirements; required retail parking is trending high and office trending low. The petitioner hopefully will be able to replace the lost tenant.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 14-1-042, a variance from Section 6-8B-7 (Yard Requirements) and Section 6-9-2:4.5 (Off Street Parking Facilities) of the Naperville Municipal Code to allow for the construction of off-street parking facilities in a portion of the required front yard, at the property located at 184 Shuman Boulevard.

Motion by: Coyne
Seconded by: Williams

Approved
(6 to 0)

Ayes: Coyne, Frost, Gustin, Hastings, Williams, Hansen
Nays: None

**D4.
PZC 15-1-012
Van Someren’s
Place**

The petitioner requests approval of PZC 15-1-012, to rezone 727 S Julian Street to R1A (Low Density Single-Family Residence District) upon annexation.

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

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Williams – What is the minimum required lot size? Evans - 10,000 square feet.
- Williams – There is only one lot? Evans – Yes.

Paul Mitchell, Attorney, 111 E. Jefferson, spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- The proposed zoning is consistent with surrounding properties.

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:

- Hastings – Looks good.
- Williams – Similar to the first case. The lot is larger than required by the Code.
- Frost – Agree.
- Coyne – Will accept staff’s recommendation.
- Gustin – The lot size is larger than required, will support. The low density nature is in character with surrounding properties.
- Hansen – Agree.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 15-1-012, to rezone 727 S Julian Street to R1A (Low Density Single-Family Residence District) upon annexation.

Motion by: Williams
Seconded by: Coyne

Approved
(6 to 0)

Ayes: Coyne, Frost, Gustin, Hastings, Williams, Hansen
Nays: None

**E. Reports and
Recommendations**

F. Correspondence

G. New Business

H. Adjournment

7:52 pm