



**NAPERVILLE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
DRAFT MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 24, 2014**

**UNOFFICIAL PRIOR TO PZC APPROVAL
APPROVED BY THE PZC ON OCTOBER 8, 2014**

Call to Order

7:00 p.m.

A. Roll Call

Present: Frost, Coyne, Hastings, Martinez, Meyer, Williams, Gustin
Absent: Dabareiner, Messer
Student Members:
Staff Present: Planning Team – Allison Laff, Derek Rockwell
Engineer – Andy Hynes, Anastasia Urban

B. Minutes

Approve the minutes of September 10, 2014

Motion by: Coyne
Second by: Williams

Approved
(7 to 0)

C. Old Business

D. Public Hearings

**D1.
PZC 14-1-100
812 W. Jefferson**

The petitioner requests approval of a variance to Section 7-4-4:2.4 (Ninety Percent Rule) of the Municipal Code for the property located at 812 W. Jefferson Avenue.

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

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Coyne – Commended staff on the report – well done. Noted that he believes that the intent of the rule is to avoid overdevelopment. If subject lot is divided in half, it appears to be comparable to lots immediately adjacent to it, so what is the concern? Rockwell indicated that while it may be consistent with those directly adjacent, it does not comply with the 90% rule, which takes a larger area into account. Coyne indicated that he does not feel that the lot is out of character with the neighborhood.
- Gustin – If you don't adjust the existing large lot (or have it remain vacant), it will be more out of character with the existing neighborhood.

It is rare to have a 19,000 square foot single-family lot in this area.

- Frost – Looking at the map, there are no other lots in the 19,000 square foot range. Is it staff's opinion that the lot, as is, fits in the character of the neighborhood? The choice is between 1 large lot and 2 lots that are within the small lot size range for the neighborhood. Rockwell clarified that there are no code provisions that limit maximum lot size.
- Hastings – Did the petitioner provide designs for the two proposed homes? Rockwell indicated that they have not provided home designs. Hastings believes that the existing home on the lot today fits well with the neighborhood and does not believe that the lot should be subdivided.
- Meyers – isn't it typical to have varying lot sizes in different zoning districts? In Meyers' neighborhood, her lot is larger than her neighbors and well exceeds the minimum lot size of her zoning district. What impact would the subdivision have on property values within the neighborhood? Can houses be built on the proposed lots without variances or is the proposed subdivision opening the door for future zoning variance requests?
- Frost noted that PZC should not be considering market impact.

Russ Whitaker, Attorney, Rosanova & Whitaker, 30 W. Jefferson Street, spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- There are varying lot sizes and lot widths within the subject neighborhood.
- Home could be designed for these lots that comply with the underlying zoning requirements, as these lots are 25% larger than a typical R1B lot. The subject lots are larger than a typical downtown Naperville lot.
- Purpose of the 90% rule is to prevent incompatible subdivisions, prevent overcrowding, and to preserve light and open space. Doesn't believe that the 500' area being included is reflective of the neighborhood in which the subject property is located; instead believes that the neighborhood is comprised of the lots located along Jefferson Street.
- Showed a picture of the proposed homes that might be built on the properties. Homes will range from 3,200 square feet to 3,800 square feet in size. These homes are modest given the sizes of the lots.
- Believes that the proposed homes/lots meet the intended purpose of the 90% rule. The 90% rule for just the properties located along Jefferson Street results in a minimum lot size of approximately 9,800 square feet. The proposed lots are very close to this lot size.
- Inclusion of Centennial Woods lots, which are encumbered by stormwater, skews 90% rule calculation.
- Believes proposed subdivision is consistent with the eclectic feel of the neighborhood/Jefferson Street.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Meyer – Lot 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 as shown on Exhibit C are wrong based on information provided on other exhibits. If you add in the 45,000 square foot lot across Jefferson and the subject property, the 90%

rule calculation is closer to 12,000 square feet. Whitaker indicated that it is reasonable to exclude the subject property as it is proposed to be developed. Whitaker noted that he believes that the 45,000 square foot lot is an outlier and should not be included even though it is in the neighborhood of the subject property.

- Meyer – is the hardship the application of the 90% rule? Whitaker indicated that the hardship is that the lots falling within 500' are not part of the neighborhood of the subject property.
- Coyne requested clarification regarding the size/location of the Centennial Woods lots that include stormwater on them.

Public Testimony:

Peter Kuefler, Maple Park, Illinois:

- Owns 804 W. Jefferson which is 14,000 square feet in size.
- Believes that the proposed subdivision will impact the value of his property.
- Concerned regarding water problems resulting from the two new houses.
- Believes the subject property should remain as a single-lot.
- Does not believe that a 19,000 square foot lot is out of character for the neighborhood.
- Believes that two homes on that lot will look out of character for the neighborhood.

Kathy Benson, 51 Forest Avenue:

- Concurs with some of the petitioner's statements regarding the breadth of homes in the area.
- Agrees that some of the lots located farther south don't make sense given the similarities in the neighborhood.
- Reminded PZC that the 90% rule was put in place in response to infill development. Homes on these lots are being built out to the setbacks to maximize the home value.
- Calculated lot size based on the six lots directly east and six lots directly west of the subject property, as well as the 6 lots located north across Jefferson. Looking at these 18 lots, she found an average of approximately 11,000 square feet and the proposed lots are 15% less than this average. This is a significant difference.
- Believes ordinance was put in place to protect existing residents.
- There is a lot of difference between the width of the lot and the length of the lot. The proposed lots will be narrower than what is typical along this block.
- Believes it is better to have 1 larger lot than 2 smaller than average lots. It keeps distance between properties, keeps open space.

Martha Kuefler Hirsch, 1034 N. Mill Street:

- Owns 804 W. Jefferson Avenue.
- Concerned about drainage issues on this property if the two homes are constructed.

Walter Kiselyic, 113 S. Stauffer Drive:

- What is the proposed frontage of the property?
- Believes that the lot as is today is in character with the neighborhood. The proposed lots are too small. The proposed lot widths are too narrow.
- Too much traffic on Jefferson; proposal will result in more cars and more traffic.
- Proposed lots are out of character with the surrounding area.

Petitioner responded to testimony:

- There are only two 90'+ wide lots on Jefferson today, of which the subject property is one.
- Jefferson is a collector road. Believes that the road is equipped to handle more density.
- "In City" lots are never intended to be 19,000 square feet in size.
- The character of the neighborhood changes at Parkway, where the neighborhood becomes "suburban sprawl". This portion of Jefferson clearly has a downtown feel.
- Petitioner will be required to have engineered drawings that adequately account for drainage.
- Maximum house size intended is 3,800 square feet. Petitioner is agreeable to a condition restricting the maximum house size.
- Property value will increase as a result of the proposed subdivision.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Frost – isn't the 19,000 square foot lot, as it exists today, out of character for the neighborhood?
- Gustin – requested that staff provide information about the engineering requirements pertaining to drainage for new single-family construction.
- Hastings – as he visited the site, he could not envision how two homes could fit on the subject property. Also concerned that all trees will need to be removed to accommodate the proposed home construction. Whitaker clarified that the proposed homes shown could be constructed on the subject properties (following subdivision) with no variances.
- Hastings would be more comfortable seeing a proposed site plan for the homes so that he could understand how it lays out on the lots. Whitaker pointed to the subdivision exhibit which demonstrates the buildable area on each lot. Whitaker noted that he would be willing to include a condition that limits the size of the homes to 3,800 square feet and a maximum 2,000 square foot footprint.
- Martinez – what is the average home size along Jefferson? Whitaker indicated that he does not have that information available.
- Coyne - greater drainage problems might result if 1 large home was to be

built on the existing lot vs. 2 new homes on 2 smaller lots. Hynes indicated that it depends on the amount of impervious surface proposed.

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:

- Coyne – believes that the proposed lot sizes in the existing neighborhood are comparable to proposed lots. Believes the intent of the 90% rule is to avoid awkwardly designed neighborhoods and believes that PZC is within their right to approve the variance.
- Frost – understands position of neighbors, but supports requested variance.
- Gustin – supports project. Hardship is that there are lots in the area that are larger due to floodplain, drainage, etc., rather than being large in order to build larger homes. Confident that staff will account for drainage requirements. The 90% rule was intended for “McMansions” where people were putting too much on the properties. There are variables to consider when looking at the application of the 90% rule. Believes proposed homes will fit within the character of the existing neighborhood and will be a good fit. Supports 3,800 square foot limitation on home size.
- Hastings – Might be inclined to support the case, but in absence of a more definitive site plan, struggles with approving the case.
- Martinez – supports variance. Believes it is consistent with the lots to the east of the subject property.
- Meyer – will not support case. Understands petitioner’s concerns regarding the 90% rule, but it is a safeguard for the entire neighborhood that was put in place after much thought. Would rather err on the side of a larger lot than approve smaller lots. The 90% rule is a minimum lot size – not a maximum. Varying lot sizes add to the character of the neighborhood and should not be discouraged.
- Williams – inclined to deny the request. If variance is granted, the result will be claustrophobic. Does not believe that the proposed lot size is the trend or density of the neighborhood. The existing narrow lots likely have old homes on them today. Believes that people will be interested in lot whether it is 1 larger home or improved with 2 smaller homes. If the variance is approved, the lots just won’t look right in the neighborhood and the resulting impact would be on the existing neighborhood.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of a variance to Section 7-4-4:2.4 (Ninety Percent Rule) of the Municipal Code for the property located at 812 W. Jefferson Avenue, subject to the restriction that each house be no greater than 3,800 square feet in size.

Motion by: Williams
Seconded by: Coyne

Approved
(4 to 3)

Ayes: Coyne, Frost, Gustin, Martinez
Nays: Hastings, Meyer, Williams

**D2.
PZC 14-1-102
North Central
College Residence
Hall**

The petitioner requests approval of a variance to Section 6-2-4:1 (Building Height and Bulk) and Section 6-7G-10:6.1 (Height Limitations / Bulk Regulations) of the Municipal Code in order to construct a residence hall which exceeds the maximum height (50') as established by the datum point, and the maximum number of stories (4) on the subject property.

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

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Gustin – what is the height of the stadium?
- Williams – a story is typically 9-10'. How did they gain a story, but only increase height by 1.5'? Rockwell clarified that the definition per the code and how it determines what is a story differs from how the building will be appear as constructed.

Paul Loscheider, North Central College, spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- NCC is a place based institution. Resident students are an important component of NCC.
- The proposed dorm will not result in new student residents, but will help to retain students on campus (vs. move off campus).
- Existing dorms will be lost as facilities are re-used during campus reconstruction projects (Science Center).
- Proposed dorm project fits within the Master Land Use Plan.
- A 5-story building works very well for their proposed facility.
- Height variance is triggered by the varying topography on the site and the ordinance pertaining to the measurement of height (datum point).
- The proposed building is 400' away from the nearest residence and largely hidden by evergreen trees. The trees that exist on the site today will remain following construction.
- The fifth floor, which accommodates their needs that much better, only requires a 17 1/8" variance to the maximum height limitation.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Coyne – what percentage of students will drive and need parking? Any concerns regarding increased number of students crossing at Chicago?
- Gustin – what is approximate height of existing trees?
- Gustin – concern with water runoff?
- Hastings – clarification regarding number of floors?
- Meyer – where is the building entry?

Petitioner responded to Planning and Zoning Commission questions:

- Loscheider indicated that NCC has just completed a parking analysis and will be meeting with staff to discuss. Current studies show that parking needs have dropped from 50% of students with cars to 30%. Parking needs have declined due to zip cars, red bike program, shuttle service, etc.
- Loscheider indicated that they have conducted a traffic and pedestrian study to account for impacts.
- Loscheider indicated that the existing trees range from 40' – 60' and are evergreens.
- Loscheider indicated that NCC is part of the Steeple Run Watershed. Pond has been enlarged over time to make it an amenity. With current dorm proposal, CEMCON has identified ways that the existing pond can be reshaped and expanded to accommodate stormwater requirements.
- Loscheider indicated that the rear of the building has 5 floors plus a walk-out basement due to the topography of the land.
- Loscheider indicated that there will be a front door on the north side of the building.

Public Testimony: None

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Gustin noted that PZC received a letter from the public regarding the proposed dorm and asked for comment. Loscheider indicated that the proposed dorm has been consistently identified on the Master Land Use Plan, which stresses that growth should occur within the campus boundaries. To do this, you have to maximize the use of the land that you do have to work with.

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:

- Coyne – the request is modest, beautiful building, and keeps students on campus.
- Frost – well hidden and supports for that reason.
- Gustin – supports. Believes hardship exists due to the topography.
- Hastings – completely reasonable request. Wonderful building.
- Martinez – concurs with Hastings.
- Meyer – supports.
- Williams – concurs with Commissioner Frost and finds that the percentage variance is de minimis.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of a variance to Section 6-2-4:1 (Building Height and Bulk) and Section 6-7G-10:6.1 (Height Limitations / Bulk Regulations) of the Municipal Code in order to construct a residence hall which exceeds the maximum height (50') as established by the datum point, and the maximum number of stories (4) on the subject property.

Motion by: Williams
Seconded by: Meyer

Approved
(7 to 0)

Ayes: Williams, Meyer, Martinez, Hastings, Frost, Coyne,
Gustin
Nays: None

**D3.
PZC 14-1-108 &
PZC 14-1-109
Water Street
District –
North/South**

The petitioner is seeking approval of a major change to the Water Street District – North Phase/South Phase PUD in order to establish revised Final PUD and Subdivision Plats with respect to lot lines, building square footages and uses, building height and elevation changes, and Riverwalk improvements and to seek approval of a variance to Section 6-7D-4 to allow for a general service use on the first floor in the B4 district.

Allison Laff, Planning Services Team, gave an overview of the request.

Jeff Prosapio, 401 S. Main Street, spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- Water Street District will be a high quality mixed use development and received approvals from the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council in 2012.
- The City developed the Water Street Vision Statement in 2007 and set forth the vision for the area.
- Preliminary PUD approvals in 2008 included residential, commercial, restaurant, office and open space uses.
- In 2012, the residential component was eliminated and a hotel use was added. This proposal was approved in 2012 / 2013 by City Council.
- Water Street is bounded by the DuPage River, Webster Street, Aurora Avenue and Main Street. The development excludes the southwest corner of Main and Water Street as well as the Naperville Township building.
- The proposal consists of four buildings and a parking deck. The first building is a hotel with retail and restaurant uses on the first floor with rooms and suites above. The parking deck will accommodate 520 parking spaces.
- The theater building includes restaurant space and office uses.
- The second phase will include an office building at the corner of Aurora and Webster.
- Hotel Indigo is a boutique hotel concept under the umbrella of IHG.
- The heights of the building remain consistent with prior approvals.
- Marquette is requesting 7 modifications to the approved PUD.
- The first modification is an increase in the size of the theater building and a decrease in the plaza size. Feedback from the development community is that the footprint is too narrow. Thus, a bump out is proposed to increase the footprint and usability by potential tenants. It represents a net increase of 1% in square footage.
- The plaza size is down approximately 4.5% as a result of the increased floor square footage.
- The second change is the addition of a banquet space. A restaurant user

has committed to the first floor space. The proposal is to keep the space previously committed to private dining as a potential restaurant use with a maximum capacity of 248 seats in the private dining space. A pre-reception space is to be utilized as overflow space. All reservations will be organized and sent through IHG's central reservation service in order to provide a high level of consistency and service. Most weekend events will be small weddings of approximately 150-200 guests.

- Michael Recktorik, V3 Engineering, provided an outline of the changes in traffic and parking for the project. Assumptions in the worst case scenario included no banquet guests staying at the hotel, all guests parking in the parking deck, and the maximum size of each event was used. This scenario is comparable to the plans approved in 2013. The increased vehicular wait time is approximately 2 seconds per intersection involved in the development.
- The parking requirement for the project is 379 spaces, which this proposal is compliant with through utilization of the parking deck.
- Jeff Prosapio explained that on any given day should parking demand exceed supply, the IHG parking operator will coordinate contingency plans through the multiple users of the development in order to appropriately respond to these situations. There will also be full scale valet services. These services will utilize contingency plans in order to most efficiently utilize the parking deck as well as surrounding public parking. These plans will be in place prior to the issuance of a tenant build out permit for the banquet space. This will satisfy the worst case parking scenarios.
- The approved PUD allows for 21,500 square feet with outdoor dining space of 1,500 square feet. The revised request presented tonight includes 26,900 square feet of restaurant space plus 1,300 square feet of outdoor dining area. Hotel Indigo will also include a dinner and bar space. The totality of the modifications results in a ratio of 43% retail use and 57% restaurant.
- Additional mechanical equipment will require additional screening, though all of the architectural heights of the building (parapet, top of roof, etc) will remain at the same height elevations as the 2013 approvals.
- The next modification is the incorporation of an upscale children's boutique and event programming space consisting of 2,600 square feet, 1,000 of which will be dedicated for sale of upscale children's clothing. The programming space is to be utilized for classes, arts and crafts, etc. It will not be a day care as most classes last approximately 1 or 2 hours. Annual retail sales of approximately \$300,000 are projected for this use.
- A modification to the pedestrian bridge design eliminates the bump outs as they were deemed unnecessary. The proposed walkway connection will utilize materials approved in prior entitlements for the project.
- The final modification is to extend the Riverwalk to connect with the covered bridge to the west of the site. The upper level boardwalk will connect to this bridge in order to divert pedestrian traffic away from the Naperville Township building's parking facilities. It will thus eliminate a

pedestrian safety concern. The connection at this point to the bridge will be widened and will serve as a beautification project.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Frost- will the public spaces remain? Urban clarified that 120 spaces in the deck will be reserved for hotel and banquet guests with the remainder being available for public parking. 400 spaces will be available for general public use.
- Meyer – does the deck parking provide required parking spaces in surplus? Urban – The total surplus to the downtown area would be 19 parking spaces while the parking deck would be available for the general public. During buildout the surplus will be much greater than 19 as the parking deck will be constructed early in the development.
- Gustin – this parking accounts for the parcels to the south? Urban – Yes.
- Frost – have we lost surplus parking from prior approvals? Urban – the parking deck accommodates all of the required parking demand for the development. In 2013 the parking surplus represented 76 parking spaces.
- Williams – is the proposed mechanical screening necessary because of a height issue? The sizing of the equipment will be approximately 2-4 feet higher, necessitating a higher screen wall.
- Williams – is 19 surplus parking spaces an estimate? Yes.
- Frost – can you explain the role Chef David Miller plays in this proposal? The owner - operator and head chef of Chefs by Request. He will be leasing the banquet space and it will be his kitchen for private dining events. Hotel Indigo will not be operating the banquet space, but that space will be branded to complement Hotel Indigo.
- Frost – in the worst case scenario, how will the contingency plan work with respect to public parking availability? This parking deck should attract drivers from the other parking decks in the downtown, and conversely, in the event that that the parking deck is full, those drivers can pursue other public parking locations, including other parking deck facilities.
- Gustin – will the 120 parking spaces dedicated to the hotel accommodate all hotel guests? A 72% occupancy rate model is utilized in this type of hotel format, which aligns with the 2013 approvals for this project.
- Gustin – was there discussion of one way traffic flow? No, but there is the ability to place a certified traffic control person to accommodate large concentrations of vehicles entering and exiting the property for banquet events. Frost added that TAB had come to the conclusion that a one way configuration would be very confusing and was not found to be preferable to a two way configuration.
- Frost – what are the concerns regarding overflow parking into the Municipal Lot? Urban: the Municipal Lot is currently underutilized, especially on weekends. Per code, valet operators are able to park in the City's parking decks, including the Municipal deck.
- Meyer – what is staff's position on the requests? Laff indicated that staff supports the individual requests as well as the overall request, as outlined

in the staff report. The mechanical screening is necessary. While a parapet wall is preferable, the proposed screen wall is an appropriate solution as new construction, especially of this nature, must have mechanical screening. The upscale children's boutique and event programming space makes sense at the specific location within the development and will be not be permitted by right district wide.

- Frost – what is staff's position on the parking and traffic modifications? Urban gave an overview of the proposed parking modifications and clarified that staff supports these revisions. Hynes explained that a comprehensive study of the area was completed in 2010 that considered a wide variety of traffic mitigation measures. Some have been implemented while others are contingent of the development of this project. Staff feels that the intersection levels of service are acceptable and traffic management will be effective.
- Frost – can the parking capacity at the Municipal parking deck accommodate the worst case parking scenario? Urban – there are approximately 350 spaces at the Municipal parking lot, which can accommodate most of the overflow parking demand in the worst case scenario, depending on time of day, week and year.
- Williams – how does the parking request correspond to tonight's request? Urban – this is a request for a Major Change to the PUD. The parking calculations utilized for this development have been aggressive, above and beyond the requirements of the Continuous Improvement Model. Hotel occupancy rates and parking demand have been calculated at a conservative rate, and aligns with calculations used for other hotels recently approve and constructed in the City. This request is not specifically seeking a parking variance.
- Williams – could staff provide a summary of the building height request history for this project? Laff provided this history with a comparison of the height modification before the PZC tonight. Laff also clarified that in this instance, mechanical screening and parapet walls were included in the height calculations, due to the focus on height for this project in an effort to provide clarity.
- Coyne – was the shadow study updated? No.
- Gustin- is the height measured to the parapet or the screening wall? In 2013 they were the same height. The screening wall proposed is the structure height outlined in the staff report as part of this request.

Public Testimony:

Dick Galitz, 1017 Bailey Drive:

- The growing height of the development is concerning, particularly as it relates to the impact of the shadows of the proposed buildings on the north side of the Riverwalk. Would like to see this studied.

Bob Fischer, 91 Quail Hollow Court:

- Outlined concerns regarding the reduction in the size of the plaza, the

addition of the banquet facility, the conversion of the boutique hotel into a full service hotel, and whether there will be adequate parking available. Perhaps the building should shrink if the size of the mechanical units must be enlarged in order to not add bulk to the buildings. Has traffic concerns regarding the departure of a large amount of vehicles from the banquet facility in a short amount of time. Would like to ensure that the pedestrian bridge will not be utilized for advertising.

Planning and Zoning Commission extended the meeting to 11:20 p.m.

Kathy Benson, 51 Forest:

- Concerned about the reduction of surplus parking from prior approvals and how this will relate to the increased tax revenue onsite. Questioned how the occupancy numbers for the hotel are calculated and their corresponding effect on parking and traffic impact. Would like to see these numbers broken down specifically for boutique hotels.

Planning and Zoning Commission extended the meeting to 11:30 p.m.

Chuck Wesnick, 519 S. Main Street

- Feels that the petitioner could have the mechanical screening vendor custom fabricate this equipment in order to meet prior height approvals.
- Has concerns regarding parking demand proposed with the development.

Anissa Olley, 101 Springwood

- Would like the PZC to deny the request. Feels that an overview of the history of this project would have been helpful. Would like to see the project to be developed as was approved in 2013 and would prefer that the requests tonight be denied.

Petitioner responded to testimony:

- Access for Traveling Tots will have a normal storefront and streetscape and will appear similar to other retail stores within the downtown area.
- The boutique hotel does not have a greater occupancy rate than other hotel formats, and the 72% hotel occupancy rate is accurate, if not high.
- The pedestrian bridge will not have signage and is agreeable to a condition stating as such.

Planning and Zoning Commission extended the meeting to 11:45 p.m.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Martinez – is the valet parking for hotel guests only? No. The valet is available for the entire district and for all uses within the district.

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:

- Coyne – Fantastic development and perfect tenant mix. Would like to see

more specific valet plans as this project goes forward to City Council. The Municipal Lot for overflow parking is a dangerous proposition. Would be comfortable with conditioning approval upon a more detailed valet plan and the prohibition of commercial signage on the pedestrian bridge.

Planning and Zoning Commission extended the meeting to 12:00 p.m.

- Frost – the requests aren't objectionable but it will have an impact on parking. Supports the project.
- Gustin – Biggest concern is parking. Agrees that a condition that a proposal regarding detailed valet parking on the property should be imposed as the project moves forward to City Council.
- Hastings – No concerns whatsoever. Believes the changes will enhance the south side of the Riverwalk significantly.
- Martinez – A great project, will be supporting. Supports a prohibition on signage on the pedestrian bridge.
- Meyer – Will not be supporting the project due to the intensity and density of the project. Not thrilled that the amenities have been decreased. Parking and traffic concerns will result from the success of the project.
- Williams – Would like a condition of approval that no signage be permitted on the pedestrian bridge. Enthusiastically in favor of the project. Feels it will add to the City's reputation as a world class city which can compete with any market. Increased parking demand is a good problem for the City to have.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of a major change to the Water Street District – North Phase/South Phase PUD in order to establish revised Final PUD and Subdivision Plats with respect to lot lines, building square footages and uses, building height and elevation changes, and Riverwalk improvements and to seek approval of a variance to Section 6-7D-4 to allow for a general service use on the first floor in the B4 district, subject to the condition that a valet agreement be proposed as a component of City Council's review of this case, as well as a condition that no signage on the pedestrian bridge be permitted.

Motion by: Williams
Seconded by: Coyne

Approved
(6 to 1)

Ayes: Williams, Martinez, Hastings, Frost, Coyne, Gustin
Nays: Meyer

E. Reports and Recommendations

F. Correspondence Planning and Zoning Commission tabled consideration of the 2015 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting calendar until the October 8, 2014 meeting.

G. New Business

H. Adjournment

11:47 p.m.