



**NAPERVILLE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
APPROVED MINUTES OF JUNE 18, 2014**

**UNOFFICIAL PRIOR TO PZC APPROVAL  
APPROVED BY THE PZC ON JULY 9, 2014**

**Call to Order**

**7:00 p.m.**

**A. Roll Call**

Present: Bruno, Coyne, Dabareiner, Gustin, Hastings, Messer, Meyer, Williams  
Absent: Frost  
Student Members:  
Staff Present: Planning Team – Derek Rockwell, Tim Felstrup, Ying Liu  
Engineer – Rahat Bari

**B. Minutes**

Approve the minutes of the June 4, 2014 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

Motion by: Williams  
Second by: Bruno

Approved  
(8 to 0)

**C. Old Business**

**D. Public Hearings**

**D1.  
PZC 14-1-026  
Chuck E. Cheese's**

The petitioner, CEC Entertainment, Inc., requests approval of PZC 14-1-026, which includes a major change to the Naper West Plaza PUD to grant:

1. A conditional use in the B2 District for an amusement establishment, in accordance with 6-7B-3 of the Naperville Municipal Code, and
2. A variance from Section 6-9-3:7 (Schedule of Off-Street Parking Requirements) of the Municipal Code to reduce the number of required off-street parking spaces from 148 to 94 spaces on the property located at 506 S. Route 59.

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

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Compliance with the Building Design Guidelines. Rockwell confirmed that the proposed exterior changes comply with the City's Building Design Guidelines.
- Whether peak hour parking counts are available from other Chuck E. Cheese's (CEC) locations. Rockwell indicated that the petitioner didn't

submit such information.

- Confirmation that the proposed CEC would expand into a portion of the adjacent vacant tenant space. How would the expansion impact on the leasability of the adjacent space? Rockwell – After the CEC expansion, the adjacent tenant space is still of sufficient size to be leased in the future.
- Whether CEC would fill the center up. Rockwell – About 7,000 SF of vacant spaces would remain in the shopping center.
- Would a new parking variance be required if a new tenant wants to occupy the CEC space? Rockwell – No, if the new tenant is a similar use to CEC.
- Operation hours of the proposed facility.

Deborah Shannon, with CEC Entertainment, Inc., spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- Submitted a new parking study, which shows parking data from other CEC sites.
- CEC has different operation hours than a traditional retail store. Our hours of operation are changing to Monday- Thursday 10 am – 9 pm, Friday-Saturday 10 am – 10 pm, and Sunday 11 am – 9 pm.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Whether the exterior of the building would be similar to the existing CEC on Ogden Avenue. Shannon – No, the proposed elevations would be different.
- Whether the proposed CEC will replace the existing facility on Ogden Avenue. Shannon – Yes, the facility on Ogden Avenue will be relocated to the proposed Route 59 location.
- The parking data from other CEC sites show peak hour parking ratios ranging from 6 to 14 spaces per 1000 SF, which is higher than the City's parking requirement.
- CEC's peak hours seem to overlap with the peak hours of typical retail stores. Shannon – CEC's peak hours during the weekend are mostly in the morning and at noon, while retail stores are typically busy in the afternoon.
- How many seats would be available? Shannon - 420 seats.
- Given that the parking counts at other CEC's showed a parking ratio higher than the City's parking requirement, what is staff's justification for the proposed variance. Liu – Staff considered the existing tenant mix in the shopping center. Burlington Coat Factory is the largest tenant and based on our experience with the shopping center, it requires a parking ratio less than 4.5 spaces/1,000 SF. This would allow the proposed CEC to have a parking ratio higher than the code requirement.

**Public Testimony: None**

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

**Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:**

- Bruno – Supports the use and building elevations and is inclined to vote in favor of the parking variance. Recommends the petitioner to provide better parking analysis before the City Council.
- Coyne – Supports the use, but is concerned with a lack of parking justification. Wants to see better justification for the parking variance before finally approving it.
- Dabareiner – Not satisfied with the parking analysis. Wants better parking analysis to understand whether the proposed use would negatively impact on the existing tenants.
- Hastings – Recommends that the petitioner provide better quantitative data to share with council.
- Messer – Sees no problem with the parking variance.
- Meyer – Likes the use. The petitioner’s letter with justification for the parking variance is telling. The shopping center has abundant parking based on her experience.
- Williams – Has no problem with the conditional use request. Is concerned with parking and the amount of variance being sought. Doesn’t agree with the statement that this proposed use will negatively impact on the Burlington Coat Factory. Concurs with staff’s comments. Overall, Williams is in favor of this.
- Gustin – Believes Chuck E. Cheeses will want adequate parking to be successful. The parking variance is big but we are dealing with a big shopping center with many vacant parking spaces.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 14-1-026, which includes a major change to the Naper West Plaza PUD, a conditional use in the B2 District for an amusement establishment, in accordance with 6-7B-3 of the Naperville Municipal Code, and a variance from Section 6-9-3:7 (Schedule of Off-Street Parking Requirements) of the Municipal Code to reduce the number of required off-street parking spaces from 148 to 94 spaces on the property located at 506 S. Route 59.

Motion by: Williams  
Seconded by: Bruno

Approved  
(8 to 0)

Ayes: Bruno, Coyne, Dabareiner, Gustin, Hastings, Messer,  
Meyer, Williams  
Nays: None

**D2.**  
**PZC 14-1-036**  
**27W130 48<sup>th</sup> St.**  
**Annexation**

The petitioner, Imran N. Ahmad, requests annexation to the City of Naperville and rezoning to R1 (Low Density Single-Family Residence District) upon annexation for the property located at 27W130 48<sup>th</sup> Street.

Felstrup, Planning Services Team, gave an overview of the request.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- The missing information on the application form.
- Do they need to go through Nike Park to get utilities? Felstrup – The subject property is already hooked up to city water. Other utility services are available just to the west of the subject property. They won't need to go through Nike Park.
- Do they have plans for the new home yet? Felstrup - No plans have been submitted yet.
- What is the anticipated timing for the new construction? Felstrup – The petitioner plans to submit plans in the next 30 days.

Imran Ahmad, property owner, spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- Ahmad was available for questions.
- Has been working with an engineer and an architect. The new home will be two stories including approximately 3,500 square feet.

**Public Testimony: None**

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

**Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:**

- All commissioners indicated their support for the case.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 14-1-036, annexation to the City of Naperville and rezoning to R1 (Low Density Single-Family Residence District) upon annexation for the property located at 27W130 48<sup>th</sup> Street.

Motion by: Williams  
Seconded by: Hastings

Approved  
(8 to 0)

Ayes: Bruno, Coyne, Dabareiner, Gustin, Hastings, Messer,  
Meyer, Williams

Nays: None

**D3.  
PZC 14-1-059  
TopGolf**

The petitioner, TopGolf International Inc., requests approval of PZC 14-1-059, which includes:

1. A variance from Section 6-2-10:3 (Accessory Buildings, Structures and Uses of Land) of the Municipal Code to allow the height of an accessory structure to exceed the height of the principal structure to which it is accessory;
2. A variance from Section 5-4-5:1 (Wall Signs) of the Municipal Code to allow total wall signage on a single frontage in excess of 300 square feet;
3. A variance from Section 6-8C-7 (Yard Requirements) of the Municipal Code to allow off-street parking facilities to encroach into a required

- corner side yard; and
4. Approval of a Preliminary / Final Subdivision Plat for TopGolf Subdivision.

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

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- The amount of EIFS on the building. Rockwell – The EIFS material is primarily concentrated at the entrance area where EIFS is used to facilitate location of a sign.
- What is included in the sign calculation? Rockwell clarified that both the logo and brand name of TopGolf and both facades of the sign are included in the sign area calculation.
- The location of the prairie path.
- Whether FAA would require lighting on the top of the 150' tall net? Messer – The FAA requirement for lighting applies to towers above 200'.

Zach Shor, Director of Real Estate with TopGolf, and John Zemenak, Attorney spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- TopGolf is the contractor purchaser of the site.
- Gave an overview of the TopGolf business.
- The shield-shaped sign is based on the typical sign design of TopGolf.
- 150' is necessary to keep the golf balls in the range.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Size of the TopGolf sign on the Wooddale facility. Shor – That sign is almost the same size as the proposed sign for the Naperville location.
- Location of the color changing metal mesh.
- Whether you can see through the netting. Shor – The proposed netting will be 93% transparent and in black color.
- Whether a bar is included in the facility. Shor – The facility will offer full food and beverage services and people don't have to play golf in order to eat there.

**Public Testimony: None**

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

**Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:**

- Bruno – Perfect project. The variance requests are reasonable. The proposed sign is beautiful.
- Coyne – This is an exciting development and would be a wonderful addition to the city.
- Dabareiner – This is an extremely exciting concept. Agrees with the variance requests.
- Hastings – This is an appropriate location for the proposed use.

- Messer – Messer is pleased to see this project. The proposed building is attractive with minimum EIFS. Agrees with the sign variance and net height variance requests.
- Meyer – This is going to be a wonderful addition to the City. Complimented the petitioner for their complete submittal materials.
- Williams – This is an excellent development. The proposed variance requests are reasonable. Supports the net height variance based on safety concerns.
- Gustin – Supports the project. Had some concerns with the corner side yard variance because of the presence of an adjacent prairie path, but is comfortable with the variance request since the City and the County agrees with it. No problem with the net height variance. Fine with the sign area variance in order to provide good direction for people on I-88 and in the area.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 14-1-059, which includes:

1. A variance from Section 6-2-10:3 (Accessory Buildings, Structures and Uses of Land) of the Municipal Code to allow the height of an accessory structure to exceed the height of the principal structure to which it is accessory;
2. A variance from Section 5-4-5:1 (Wall Signs) of the Municipal Code to allow total wall signage on a single frontage in excess of 300 square feet;
3. A variance from Section 6-8C-7 (Yard Requirements) of the Municipal Code to allow off-street parking facilities to encroach into a required corner side yard; and
4. Approval of a Preliminary / Final Subdivision Plat for TopGolf Subdivision.

Motion by: Williams  
Seconded by: Dabareiner

Approved  
(8 to 0)

Ayes: Bruno, Coyne, Dabareiner, Gustin, Hastings, Messer,  
Meyer, Williams  
Nays: None

## **E. Reports and Recommendations**

## **F. Correspondence**

## **G. New Business**

## **H. Adjournment**

8:35 p.m.