



**NAPERVILLE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
APPROVED MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 19, 2014**

**UNOFFICIAL PRIOR TO PZC APPROVAL  
APPROVED BY THE PZC ON MARCH 19, 2014**

**Call to Order**

**7:00 p.m.**

**A. Roll Call**

Present: Bruno, Coyne, Dabareiner, Frost, Gustin, Hastings, Messer, Meyer, Williams  
Absent:  
Student Members: Heavener  
Staff Present: Planning Team – Tim Felstrup, Derek Rockwell

**B. Minutes**

Approve the minutes of the January 22, 2014 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

Motion by: Meyer  
Second by: Williams

Approved  
(9 to 0)

**C. Old Business**

**D. Public Hearings**

**D1.  
PZC 13-1-128  
Falcone's  
Subdivision**

The petitioner, Aspen Creek Partners Inc., requests approval of PZC 13-1-128, which includes rezoning a portion of the property located at 1124 Edgewater Drive from OCI (Office, Commercial, and Institutional) to R1A (Low Density Single-Family Residence) zoning and approval of the Preliminary/Final Plat of Subdivision for Falcone's Subdivision.

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

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Gustin - Will there be a document to preclude the erection of any structure on the traded land? Rockwell – Yes, the First amendment to the Hobson Glen Townhomes Association Declarations preclude any structures from being constructed on the traded land.

Attorney/Petitioner, address, (title) spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- Herb Getz, with Aspen Creek Partners Incs, gave a brief overview of the request on behalf of the owner, Denise M. Falcone.

**Public Testimony: None**

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

**Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:**

- Coyne – It appears to be a cleanup request and I will support it.
- Gustin – It is a housekeeping matter.
- Hastings – I will support it. No public opposition is heard.
- Williams – It is a housekeeping matter and also a down zoning.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 13-1-128, rezoning a portion of the property located at 1124 Edgewater Drive from OCI (Office, Commercial, and Institutional) to R1A (Low Density Single-Family Residence) zoning and approval of the Preliminary/Final Plat of Subdivision for Falcone’s Subdivision.

Motion by: Williams  
Seconded by: Bruno

Approved  
(9 to 0)

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

**D2.  
PZC 13-1-152  
Roscich & Martel  
Wall Sign**

The petitioner, Roscich & Martel Law Firm, proposes to install wall signage for Roscich & Martel Law Firm on the north elevation of their tenant space which is not eligible for wall signage as it is not adjacent to a public roadway. The petitioner requests a variance from Section 5-4-9:1.1 (Special Areas of Control, Downtown Central Business District) of the Naperville Municipal Code in order to install wall signage on an ineligible frontage of the building located at 214 S. Washington Street.

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

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Can the building to the north be expanded and what happens if it does? Felstrup - The structure to the north could expand if it met code requirements and the subject property would lose sign visibility.
- Are there any other signage options? Felstrup - They could install a sign of the same size on the Washington Street frontage. However, the architectural features on that façade make it difficult to install such a sign.
- Could they install a sign on the first floor? Felstrup - Not without a variance to install a first floor sign for a second floor business.
- Is a projecting sign an option? Felstrup - Yes, but the square footage of the sign would be limited to five (5) square feet.

- Would they be allowed a Washington Street frontage sign along with the proposed sign? Felstrup - Staff recommends conditioning approval of the proposed sign upon no wall signage on the Washington Street frontage.
- Are there any other signs of this nature in the downtown? Felstrup - Staff cannot recall any, but this is a unique situation.
- Does window signage count against the allowable square footage? Felstrup – No, window signage would be allowed separate from the wall signage allowance.

Dave Johnson, sign contractor with DMJ Design and Advertising, spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- Outlined the limitations of installing wall signage on the front façade as well as the aesthetically pleasing nature of the proposed sign. The existing window sign is recessed and difficult to see from Washington Street.

Zach Martel, 704 Regency Drive, business owner:

- Explained the reasoning for the signage request. Sign placement on the Washington façade wasn't feasible to design due to the nature of the façade.
- Williams - How long have you gone without any signs for the current business? Martel - One year.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Can you locate a smaller sign on the Washington Street frontage? Johnson – With the architectural features on the front façade, even a smaller sign would be functionally difficult to locate there.
- Is there another tenant on the second floor? Johnson - Yes, a photography studio.
- What would be the allowable square footage for the photography studio in the future? Felstrup – The same regulations would apply to the second tenant. But the second tenant would not be allowed a sign on the north façade due to its lack of adjacency to the north façade.
- If this was a corner lot, would the proposed signage require a variance? Felstrup – No, they could locate a sign on each frontage, and could potentially be larger than proposed sign.
- What is the makeup of the sign? Johnson – The sign will be made of aluminum but will appear to be wood.

**Public Testimony: None**

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

**Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:**

- Bruno – Businesses need signs. Liked the fact that it's not illuminated. A hardship exists due to the unique nature of the Washington façade.
- Coyne – Preferred this to awkwardly trying to place the sign on the

Washington façade.

- Dabareiner – Concerned that alternatives weren't fully explored. The forty square-foot sign is not a requirement, but a max. Worried that it will set a precedent elsewhere in the downtown.
- Frost – It is a reasonable solution to a unique problem and allows the building to maintain its historic character.
- Gustin – Liked the sign and the location. Motorists will have a long opportunity at the stop light to view the sign. Thanked the petitioner for keeping the integrity of a downtown building.
- Hastings – Great solution. No public was opposing it.
- Messer – Liked that it isn't illuminated and will support it.
- Meyer – Appreciated and recognized the hardship.
- Williams – Concerned about legibility of the proposed sign and believed that a sign would work on the Washington façade. But if the petitioner wants it on the north façade, he was comfortable supporting it.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 13-1-152, a variance from Section 5-4-9:1.1 (Special Areas of Control, Downtown Central Business District) of the Naperville Municipal Code in order to install wall signage on an ineligible frontage of the building located at 214 S. Washington Street.

Motion by: Meyer  
Seconded by: Messer

Approved  
(8 to 1)

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

## **E. Reports and Recommendations**

## **F. Correspondence**

## **G. New Business**

## **H. Adjournment**

7:53 p.m.