



**NAPERVILLE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF AUGUST 22, 2012**

Call to Order

7:00 p.m.

A. Roll Call

Present: Bruno, Coyne, Frost, Gustin, Messer, Meyer, Trowbridge, Williams, Herzog

Absent:

Student Members:

Staff Present: Planning Team – Clint Smith, Ying Liu
Engineer – Andy Hynes

B. Minutes

Approve the minutes of the August 8, 2012 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting subject to amendments.

Motion by: Gustin

Approved

Second by: Messer

(9 to 0)

C. Old Business

D. Public Hearings

**D1.
PZC Case #12-1-121
Quick Service
Auto Center**

The petitioner is requesting a variance from Section 5-4-5:1 (Commercial Signs) to allow a Secondary Business Wall Sign that would exceed the maximum allowed by current regulations.

Clint Smith, Planning Services Team, gave an overview of the request.

Adam Acosta, with Divine Signs, spoke on behalf of the petitioner.

- Acosta answered Planning and Zoning Commission's questions.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Whether Kmart is agreeable to the condition recommended by staff. Staff confirmed yes.
- Whether the petitioner would be a sub-tenant of Kmart. Staff confirmed yes.
- Whether the proposed business can be accessed from Kmart. Staff confirmed yes.
- What are the hours of the business? The petitioner responded that the business hours would be 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.
- Whether there will be overnight parking generated from the business. The petitioner indicated no.

Public Testimony: None

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:

- Messer – The proposed business is different from most secondary businesses as it has a separate entrance for customers.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 12-1-121 for a variance from Section 5-4-5:1 (Commercial Signs) to allow a Secondary Business Wall Sign that would exceed the maximum allowed by current regulations.

Motion by: Meyer
Seconded by: Messer

Approved
(9 to 0)

**D2.
PZC Case #12-1-093
Ashwood Park
North Townhomes**

The petitioner is requesting approval of a major change to the Ashwood Park North - Townhomes Planned Unit Development to allow the removal of an age restriction on residency.

Clint Smith, Planning Services Team, gave an overview of the request.

Mike Steck, owner of Crestveiw Builders, Inc. spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- Only one building has been constructed and one unit has been sold partially because of the age restriction.
- Three-bedroom townhomes will be developed on the site.
- The intent is to sell the units rather than renting them out.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- The type of residential housing to be developed on the site. Staff indicated that the development will remain as approved which are townhomes.
- Whether this development will restrict rentals. Commissioner Frost indicated that the development allows for renters now.
- Whether the parking requirement are different for rental and owner-occupied dwelling units. Staff indicated the parking requirement stays the same for rental and owner-occupied dwelling units.
- Will the site layout be able to accommodate school buses. Staff indicated that the existing site layout was approved to accommodate fire trucks and therefore, would be able to accommodate school buses.
- Whether future changes to the layout, height or bulk of the buildings would trigger another Planning and Zoning Commission review.

Public Testimony: None

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:

- Bruno – The request meets the standards for granting a major change to the PUD.
- Gustin – Gustin will support the request, although Gustin is concerned about the rental aspect of the development, which can have an impact on traffic generation.
- Meyer – The best use of the site is not an age-restricted community. There are elementary and middle schools in close proximity to the site. The site is not close to commercial or other community amenities, and is not ideal for senior housing. Meyer will support this request.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 12-1-093 for a major change to the Ashwood Park North - Townhomes Planned Unit Development to allow the removal of an age restriction on residency.

Motion by: Trowbridge
Seconded by: Meyer

Approved
(9 to 0)

**D3.
PZC Case #12-1-084
Walmart**

The petitioner requests approval of a major change to the Brach Brodie Property Unit 1 PUD; a preliminary/final PUD plat and associated site development details; a preliminary/final plat of subdivision; a sign variance from Section 5-4-5 (Commercial Signs) to allow wall signage in excess of the maximum allowed and a monument sign along a private road; and a deviation from Section 6-14-4 (Performance Standards; Standards) to allow light poles in excess of the 25-foot maximum allowed height in a commercial district for the construction of a Walmart.

Clint Smith, Planning Services Team, gave an overview of the request.

Aaron Matson, Engineer with CESO, Inc., spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- Matson identified pedestrian access to the site from the multi-use path along 75th Street.
- 200 watts LED light fixtures are proposed for the parking lot. LED light is a new technology that provides very directional light with minimal spill or glare. It also provides more uniformity in term of light intensity across the parking lot.
- The optimal pole height for maximum LED light efficiency for the parking lot is 42’.
- Bugs are attracted to ultraviolet light, which the LED light doesn’t produce.

Michael Dudley, Architect with Chipman Design Architecture, Inc., spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- Dudley gave an overview of the building's architecture and exterior materials.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Whether there is any lighting proposed on the south side of the building and whether there are any special provisions to reduce lighting impacts on the Forest Preserve.
- Whether any variances have been granted for light pole heights for adjacent properties or for any other properties in the City. Staff indicated no.
- Staff's reasons for recommending denial of the proposed pole height. Staff was concerned about the broader visual impact of taller light poles and a greater amount of sky to be illuminated.
- The commission noted that this development is mostly surrounded by other commercial properties and the Forest Preserve. The nearest residential is on the north side of 75th Street east of Fort Hill Drive.
- What would be the impact on the lighting design if the height of the poles is reduced below 42'. The petitioner indicated that the cost of lowering the pole height is more light poles with double heads and shedding more light on the ground which causes sky glow.
- Location and number of the light poles if the pole height were reduced to 25' in accordance with the city ordinance.
- Information regarding the existing LED lights along Modaff Road. Hynes responded that the LED lights along Modaff were installed as an experiment of the city to save energy consumption. It was not done based on the proximity to the Forest Preserve.
- Whether diming the lights per the request of the IDNR letter would be possible. The petitioner indicated that the proposed Walmart will operate 24 hours a day and therefore, diming the lights is not an option.
- The heights of the telephone poles and light poles along 75th Street. The petitioner indicated that they are probably at least 42' or higher.
- The Commission noted that the Lexus dealership on Aurora Avenue and the Naperville Jeeb/Eagle Dealer have LED lights. What are their pole heights?
- Whether sidewalk access from the parking lot to the building should be required as part of the PUD requirements.
- How bicyclists and pedestrians can get from 75th Street to the building.
- Location of the Southern DuPage County Regional trail.
- Location of any proposed landscaping along the south and east property lines.
- The possibility of changing the proposed trees along the south and east lot lines to evergreen trees.
- Whether the site layout can be modified to provide a landscape buffer along the east lot line the lot.
- The effort of screening the site is inadequate. Whether berming can be provided along the east lot line as recommended by the Forest Preserve

District? The petitioner indicated that berming is prohibited by the limited space as well as the location of a stormwater detention pond along the east lot line. The petitioner believes that the building will be screened by the existing natural vegetation on the Forest Preserve property.

- Whether stormwater runoff and filtration have been accommodated by the development. The petitioner responded that all stormwater facilities required by the DuPage County Stormwater Ordinance have been installed at the time of the original PUD development. Stormwater from the Walmart will enter into the existing detention pond and flow to the west (it will not enter the Forest Preserve site).
- Traffic circulation and access to the site.
- The commission is concerned about sight line issues for the south entrance on Beebe Drive.
- Does staff agree with the IDNR (Illinois Department of Natural Resources) recommendations as noted in the Forest Preserve District's letter? Staff indicated that staff has not formulated a response to the IDNR recommendations but will request the petitioner to respond to the recommendations and staff will review their responses before City Council.
- The commission would like to see the recommendations of IDNR being addressed by the petitioner.
- What are the architectural features of the proposed building that are above and beyond the prototype design?
- Location of the trash enclosure and loading area.
- Interior energy-efficient features.
- The commission would like to see the building to be four-sided and requested additional articulations be added to the south façade of the building. The petitioner indicated that they can add additional architectural features to the south façade.
- Whether the petitioner has reached out to Aero Estate residents and the airport regarding the 42' tall poles. Petitioner indicated that they have reached out to the Aero Estate airport and also filed the plans with FAA for review. No response has been received from FAA.

Public Testimony: None

Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion: None

Planning and Zoning Commission continued the case to September 19, 2012 and requested the following additional materials to be provided.

- A copy of the traffic study with details on any proposed modifications to 75th Street.
- The petitioner's responses to the IDNR letter, including any necessary changes to the site plan.
- The Forest District and IDNR's second review on the petitioner's responses to the IDNR letter and any potential site changes.

- City Engineer's opinion on LED lighting as it relates to the necessity for the 42' pole height and information on the existing roadway lights along Modaff.
- City Engineer to provide information regarding the impact of the development on the stormwater drainage system and the features in place to protect the Forest Preserve.
- FAA's response regarding the development if it is received prior to September 19th.
- Heights of the adjacent buildings particularly the XSport building.
- Revised south elevation of the building to add additional architectural elements.
- A copy of the sightline study of the south entrance on Beebe Drive.
- Information on whether the development would affect the healthiness of the stormwater retention pond.
- Signage proposal along Beebe Drive.
- A rendering of the parking lot with the 42' poles.
- A rendering of the site and building as viewed from the Forest Preserve pathway to demonstrate the existing vegetation buffer plus the proposed landscaping.
- Petitioner to provide a comparison of the lighting poles (including the number of poles, pole height, and wattage) at the standard 25' pole height, the proposed 42' pole height and approximately 30-35' pole height.
- Examples of the LED light application at existing Walmarts.

**E. Reports and
Recommendations**

F. Correspondence

G. New Business

H. Adjournment

9:50 p.m.