NAPERVILLE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
APPROVED MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 4, 2013

UNOFFICIAL PRIOR TO PZC APPROVAL
APPROVED BY THE PZC ON SEPTEMBER 18, 2013

Call to Order **7:00 p.m.**

A. Roll Call

Present:	Coyne, Dabareiner, Gustin, Messer, Meyer, Williams
Absent:	Bruno, Frost, Hastings
Student Members:	Heavener
Staff Present:	Planning Team – Allison Laff, Ying Liu, Clint Smith Engineer – Jon Stelle

B. Minutes

Approve the minutes of the August 21, 2013 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

Motion by: Williams — Approved
Second by: Meyer — (6 to 0)

C. Old Business

Williams recused himself due to a conflict of interest.

C1.
PZC 13-1-083
NaperBridge Teen Center

The petitioner, NaperBridge, requests approval of a conditional use in B4 (Downtown Core District) and a variance to Section 6-7D-4 (B4 Downtown Core District: Required Conditions) for a public assembly use (NaperBridge) to occupy the first and second floor tenant spaces of the property located at 231 S. Washington Street.

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

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Will signage be installed for the Teen Center similar to the existing sign above the alley? Laff - The petitioner has not yet applied for a sign permit. We will need to review their proposal to see if a sign similar to the existing one above the alley is permitted.
- Can you gain access through the alley? Laff - Yes, there is an entrance off the alley.
- How would the City enforce the 40 person occupancy limitation of the

building? Laff - The City will reinforce the occupancy limitation through the building permit process. In addition, the Fire Department will conduct annual inspection as well as random check-in of the space.

- Are there requirements to light the alley on the south side of the building? Laff – Staff will work with the petitioner to make sure adequate lighting is provided for the alley.
- Will the upstairs and downstairs spaces be connected? Laff - No. The spaces will be served by separate entrances.
- What will be the parking arrangement for the use? Laff – The property is located within the downtown parking SSA boundary and will use the City's parking facilities.

Andy Jack, Executive Director of NaperBridge, spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- The petitioner gave an overview of the organization.
- The facility will be geared toward providing services to Naperville teens in the downtown.
- The proposed downtown location is ideal because the downtown is where teens are already hanging out.
- The street level location is desired for the convenience and safety of the teens and is visible and accessible to all teens.
- This is a difficult space for retail, but a good location for a gathering place for teens.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- How will this facility be staffed? Jack – The facility will be staffed with a full-time paid and trained staff and additional volunteers to maintain a student to teacher ratio of 10:1. All visitors will have to check in at the front desk so that we can properly monitor the use of the facility.
- How will access to the center be controlled? Jack – Only NaperBridge staff will have keys to the facility.
- How do you prevent teens just hanging out in the back parking lot? Jack - We will have security cameras to monitor the space and the alley way. We will also light the alley so that we can see everything that is going on.
- What programs will be offered? Jack – Programs are typically initiated by the student board and be implemented by the center.
- How many staff members will use the upstairs space? Jack – we currently have two staff members.
- What would be the normal class size? Jack - 15 students.
- Will staff utilize the rear parking area? Jack - Staff will be required to park offsite.

Public Testimony:

Sam Smith, a Naperville resident and a member of the NaperBrige Board:

- This location doesn't have the visibility to support businesses.
- NaperBridge complements the disadvantages of the location.

Jeff Havel, a Naperville resident and a member of the NaperBridge board:

- As the Chairman of the Riverwalk Commission, I see teens like to congregate on the Riverwalk and in the downtown. This location provides a safe place for teens to gather.
- We will put new light fixtures along the alley and signage off Washington Street to direct people to the place.
- We will keep separate doors for the upstairs and downstairs spaces.
- Gustin – Do you anticipate kids just hanging around? The space will be appropriately monitored.

Petitioner responded to testimony:

- Jack - NaperBrige will not only serve the teens but also serve Naperville.

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:

- Messer – Will be a great addition to the downtown. Given there is no visibility from Washington Street, I don't have the concern that this use will take away valuable retail space. I am in support of this project.
- Meyer – Agree with Messer. Was initially concerned with the public assembly use. But the testimony tonight has addressed my concerns and I think this will be a welcome addition to the downtown.
- Dabareiner – The space is difficult for other uses. Was concerned about safety and lighting, but is now satisfied with the petitioner's testimony.
- Coyne – This is a great use for a weak retail site and a great space for the kids. This furthers the intent of our Downtown Plan. I will be supporting it.
- Gustin – This use supports the Downtown Naperville2030 plan. It is a difficult space for retail. I will be supporting it.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 13-1-083, a conditional use in B4 (Downtown Core District) and a variance to Section 6-7D-4 (B4 Downtown Core District: Required Conditions) for a public assembly use (NaperBridge) to occupy the first and second floor tenant spaces of the property located at 231 S. Washington Street.

Motion by: Meyer — Approved
Seconded by: Coyne — (5 to 0)

Ayes: Coyne, Dabareiner, Gustin, Messer, Meyer
Nays:
Recused: Williams

Williams rejoined the meeting.

D. Public Hearings

D2.
PZC 13-1-089
114 S. Columbia St.
Variance

The petitioner, Janice Dusina, requests approval of a variance from Section 6-6C-7 (R2: Yard Requirements) to reduce the 25' front yard setback requirement in order to construct a front porch at 18.3' from the front lot line on the property located at 114 S. Columbia Street.

Ying Liu, Planning Services Team, gave an overview of the request.

Janice Dusina and Mike Cherry, owners of the subject property, spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- The existing front porch is 18' from the lot line. 7 out of our 10 neighbors encroach into the required front yard setback.
- We will maintain the historic appearance of house.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Why are you tearing down the porch? Cherry - The existing front porch has deteriorated. The slope of the porch floor is hazardous. The most efficient solution is to tear it down and replace it.
- Why do you want to expand the footprint of the porch? Dusina – Even though American Foursquare homes in Naperville typically don't have a wrap-around porch, I found through my own research that a wrap around porches is a traditional feature to Foursquare homes. What we proposes is in character with the style of the home.
- Have any of your neighbors gotten variances as well? Cherry - No, they have non-conforming setbacks.
- Why did the Historic Preservation Commission review the case? Cherry – The house is located within the historic district.
- Will the porch encroach into the side yard? Cherry - No.

Public Testimony: None

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:

- Dabareiner – I will support it.
- Coyne – I have no concerns. The Historic Preservation Commission also supported the case.
- Meyer – I will support the case. I think the wrap-around porch is a great addition.
- Messer – As the Planning and Zoning Commission liaison to the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC), I had an opportunity to review the case last week. All HPC's questions were resolved at the HPC meeting. I will be supporting it.
- Williams – I will support the case. I appreciate the petitioner staying in Naperville and improving the historic house.
- Gustin – I will be supporting the variance. It is difficult to meet the setback requirements in the historic district, and the design of the wrap-around porch has been approved by the Historic Preservation

Commission. Agrees with Williams that we appreciate the petitioner's desire to improve the home.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 13-1-089, a variance from Section 6-6C-7 (R2: Yard Requirements) to reduce the 25' front yard setback requirement in order to construct a front porch at 18.3' from the front lot line on the property located at 114 S. Columbia Street.

Motion by: Meyer — Approved
Seconded by: Williams — (6 to 0)

Ayes: Coyne, Dabareiner, Gustin, Messer, Meyer, Williams
Nays:

D3.
PZC 13-1-091
615 N. Center Street
Variance

The petitioner, Daniel C. Hamburg, is requesting a variance to Section 6-6C-7 (R2 Single-family and Low Density Multiple-family Residence District; Yard Requirements) to reduce the required front yard on the subject property to construct a covered porch at 615 N Center Street.

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

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Has a building permit been submitted for the porch? Smith - Yes, the building permit is currently under review.
- Do we have the elevations of the porch? Smith - A plan view and a section of the porch is enclosed in the agenda packet. The elevations are not available. Since the house is not in the historic district, it is not subject to a design review.

Daniel C. Hamburg, owner of the property, spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- The previous contractor was supposed to address the permit application. But he didn't follow the required process and didn't get a building permit prior to starting construction of the porch.
- A new contractor has been hired and a building permit has been applied for.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Are you moving from other cities to Naperville? Hamburg - I am but my fiancée is from Naperville.

Public Testimony:

Myron Sawyer, 619 N. Center Street:

- I live next door to the petitioner's house.
- I support the variance.
- This house was an eyesore but the petitioner has turned it into a nice house.

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:

- Dabareiner – I am convinced by the testimony that the proposed setback matches the pattern of the neighborhood and the request meets the standards for variances.
- Coyne – This will result in an improvement to the neighborhood. The neighbors are supporting it. I will support it too.
- Meyer – I concur with Dabareiner and Coyne.
- Messer – The house is in an older neighborhood that shares many characteristics of the historic district including the non-conforming setbacks. The variance is minor and will result in a big improvement to the house. I will support it.
- Williams – I will support this case. Thank the petitioner for moving here and improving the house.
- Gustin – The requested variance is in keeping with the character of the community. The house needed a "facelift" and I appreciate the petitioner improving it. Most of the homes in the block have the same setback encroachment.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 13-1-091, a variance to Section 6-6C-7 (R2 Single-family and Low Density Multiple-family Residence District; Yard Requirements) to reduce the required front yard on the subject property to construct a covered porch at 615 N Center Street.

Motion by: Williams — Approved
Seconded by: Meyer — (6 to 0)

Ayes: Coyne, Dabareiner, Gustin, Messer, Meyer, Williams
Nays:

D1.
PZC 13-1-024
Washington Street
Mixed-Use

The petitioner seeks approval of the following requests to allow development of a mixed-use office/residential building on the properties located at 604-620 N. Washington Street.

Ying Liu, Planning Services Team, gave an overview of the request.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Do the Downtown Design Guidelines prohibit use of aluminum panels? Liu – This property is not subject to the Downtown Design Guidelines as it falls outside of the boundaries of the downtown. It is subject to the recommendations of the 5th Avenue Study, which provides no specific material recommendations for buildings in the study area. The use of aluminum panels will be limited to the upper floors of the proposed building. Given the building's location outside of the downtown, staff

agrees with incorporation of some contemporary material such as aluminum panels.

- Are there other examples of this material (aluminum panels) being used? Liu – Not in this exact area, but there are other examples of this material used on dealership buildings.
- Will this be the tallest and bulkiest building in the area? Liu – It will be the tallest building. The existing Fifth Avenue Station is 43' but has a larger footprint than the proposed building.
- What was included in the Design Guidelines regarding primary material? Liu – The Citywide Building Design Guidelines require that the primary material (at least 70%) on a building façade be brick or stone. The guidelines allow for metal cladding if compatible with surrounding properties and done in a quality way.

John Martin, Attorney, 1755 S. Naperville Road, Wheaton, IL introduced the speakers who will present on behalf of the petitioner.

Bruce George, Charles Vincent George Architects, 1245 E. Diehl Road, Suite 101:

- Hired by Tom Harter to create a mixed-use building at the subject property. First floor office will be occupied by the owner (approximately 9,000 sq.ft. with 6-7 employees); upper stories will be utilized for 34 residential units.
- Gave an overview of the existing buildings on the subject property, as well as existing uses surrounding the subject property.
- Have worked with staff to address most issues raised; the only remaining issues relate to height and bulk.
- Agrees to staff's conditions related to the proposed parking variance.
- Petitioner's parking consultant has determined that their peak residential parking demand will be 1.2 spaces per residential unit. The residential and office parking peaks are offset.
- Building has been sited on the lot to provide the largest buffer possible between the proposed building and the adjacent residential uses to the east.
- Provided an overview of what the building would look like if built in accordance with the height requirement and noted that their building design, which is in excess of the height, will allow for upper-story building setbacks and variations.
- Petitioner showed the PZC samples of the proposed exterior building materials, including the proposed aluminum material which he considers to be a high-end product. The aluminum panels will be setback from the brick façade which will help the building to appear as a series of brick buildings, rather than one large flat building.
- Building will serve as a transition between downtown and office buildings found along Diehl Road.
- Residential units will be within walking distance of the train station, will have proximity to the downtown, and will be an aesthetic and financial

improvement to the general area.

- George was the previous owner of 604 Washington Street. Based on his experience with his individual property, he believes it would be very difficult to redevelop these properties on a lot by lot basis. Lot consolidation needs to occur in order for properties to redevelop.
- Believes that proposed building fits the character of the Washington Street Corridor. Did their best to design the building in a manner to be sensitive to the adjacent residential properties.

Javier Millan, KLOA Consultants, 9575 W. Higgins Road, Rosemont, IL presented additional information regarding the traffic and parking studies conducted:

- Surveyed nearby residential communities adjacent to the rail line in Naperville and Lisle and concluded that the actual parking demand for these apartments is 1.2 parking spaces/unit (vs. 2 parking spaces per unit required by Naperville code).
- Provided an overview of peaks of residential vs. office parking and how the parking demands of both uses will complement each other on the property.
- Would like to see the first floor parking spaces be used as shared parking between the office and the residential uses.

Cliff Pixler, Intech Consultants, 1989 University Lane, Lisle, Illinois gave an overview of the proposed stormwater facilities on the property.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Clarification on the entrances to the residential units from the 1st floor? George – The access off of Washington Street is for the office only. The primary entrance for the residential units will be off of 6th Avenue. There is another exit on the north side of the building for the required 2nd point of egress.
- Where will garbage collection be? George- Garbage collection is located in the 1st floor and can be accessed from the parking garage. Garbage dumpsters will be rolling units which will be taken out to 6th Avenue for pick-up.
- What is the purpose of the bump out on the north side of the building? George – The bump out area is to accommodate the required turnaround for cars within the parking garage.
- Are the proposed residential units apartments or condos? George – Apartments at this point, but could be potentially converted to condos in the future if warranted.
- Are there any concerns regarding the shadow effect of the building on neighboring residential properties due to the building height? George walked through the projected shadow impact using the proposed building elevation. There are existing high growth trees along the residential property lines today that can contribute more to the shadow effect than the proposed building.

- The parking variance being requested is significant. What will happen if the parking demand of the office use cannot be accommodated by the 13 parking spaces? George – The parking study shows that the proposed parking supply will be sufficient to support the proposed uses.
- What will be allowed in the balconies? Balconies will project along the front and back of the building and the petitioner intends to allow for grills to be placed on these balconies as an amenity to residents. The balconies will be enclosed by a solid wall and therefore the grills won't be visible from the street.
- Is there any storage area provided to the residents? George – Each floor includes significant interior storage space for the residential units.
- Is parking assigned? George – The underground parking will be reserved for the residents. In the 1st floor parking garage, 13 stalls will be reserved for the office use. The remaining stalls will serve as residential overflow parking.
- Do we know the height of the building to the north of the subject property? Liu – Staff doesn't have the exact height of the building but it is a 2.5-story building.
- What is the remedy if the parking conditions recommended by staff are not met? Liu – We will enforce the conditions through issuance of code violations if parking problems cannot be remedied. Potential remedies include reducing the number of employees, control guest parking through appointment, finding an off-site parking location, etc.
- Williams does not agree that the fourth floor is needed due to the building's design features. Williams does not agree with the statement that the building height is consistent with the downtown since this project is not in the downtown. He believes there are problems with height and bulk of the building, sign setback, and shininess of aluminum building material.
- Dabareiner would like more explanation regarding the increased height requested. He believes that the building has been sensitively designed, but doesn't understand why the building height cannot be reduced by only an additional 4'.
- Are there concerns regarding potential lease of parking spaces for commuter parking. George - The petitioner will prohibit any allowance for parking spaces to be leased for commuter usage.
- What percentage of renters is assumed to be commuters? Millan – 20% based on census bureau data.
- What will be the rental rates and the square footage of the units? George – The rental rates have not been established. The unit sizes range from 800 sq.ft. to 2000 sq.ft.

Public Testimony:

Thom Higgins, 725 N. Ellsworth Street (2 blocks away from the subject property):

- The City should have considered rezoning the properties along

Washington Street to TU in accordance with the Fifth Avenue Study.

- The mixed use building is appropriate for this area, but the height is not.
- Has concerns about how the height of the building is measured.
- Believes that the proposed density is inappropriate.
- What we decide on this project will set the tone for future developments along Washington Street.
- Believes that George's example of how the building could be built by right is not valid because it doesn't account for all factors, including FAR.

Jeff Havel, 725 N. Center Street (directly northeast of the subject property):

- Does not believe that the proposed building is sensitive to the neighborhood, as recommended by the Fifth Avenue Study.
- There are no surrounding buildings of this type and Diehl Road should not be used as a relevant comparison.
- If duplicated along the corridor, the result could be canyonization.
- The petitioner is seeking a significant number of variances.
- Is concerned with height, density, FAR, and parking. There is a lot being proposed on this lot given its size; it's a floor too high and too dense.
- The Fifth Avenue Study and the Washington Street Corridor Study indicated failing intersections without additional development occurring.
- Believes that underground detention is warranted given the size of the building.

Myron Sawyer, 619 N. Center Street (directly east of the subject property):

- His property backs up to subject property and has lived there for 50 years.
- He is not opposed to redevelopment and prefers it to seeing properties remain vacant.
- Concurs with statements made by Higgins and Havel. Does not agree with the height and density.
- Would prefer to see the site being developed similar to what was previously approved for the DePaulo's site further to the north of this property.
- Would have appreciated if the developer had sought input from the neighborhood.
- Does not believe the development will create a traffic problem.

Bob Graham, 29 W. 6th Avenue (on west side of Washington Street):

- Has a vested interest in the design and safety of the intersection of Washington and 6th, as he uses it daily, living on the west side of Washington. 6th Avenue is used frequently by Naperville North high school students and buses.
- Would like North Washington Street to retain its suburban feel. Not opposed to improvement of the property, but shares concerns raised by previous speakers.

- Increased density means increased traffic which means more accidents.
- Hopes developer is willing to make some changes to reduce variances and address some of the concerns raised.

Sam Davies, 816 N. Brainard Street:

- Lives very close to Ogden Avenue. Moved to Naperville 3 years ago and has since realized some of the shortcomings of the property he purchased, including traffic, on-street parking, impact of the commercial properties on Ogden, cut-through traffic, overcrowding in the north side schools.
- Believes that the proposal is not appropriate to the area.
- Development should support the qualities of the neighborhood and not make it worse.

Dan Hamberg & Jenny Fischer, 615 N. Center Street:

- Concurs with concerns raised including height and density. Have concerns with the "party room" and the roof patio proposed on back side of the building. Believes the size of the units will attract younger renters, potentially college aged, and they have concerns with resulting party scenes.
- Supports development and lot consolidation, but believes the proposal is not in style with what Naperville typically has.
- Have concerns with privacy issues resulting from residents in the 4-story building being able to see into the rear yard of their property.
- Renters will have visitors, which will increase parking demand and generate parking concerns.

Petitioner responded to testimony:

- Martin requested a continuance in order to allow time to meet with staff to address concerns raised tonight by the PZC and public speakers.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- School and park donations. Liu – The petitioner will be required to provide school and park donations in compliance with our ordinance.
- Is stormwater detention required for this development? Stelle – Stormwater detention is not required as the development does not meet the threshold to provide on-site stormwater storage.

Planning and Zoning Commission outlined concerns for the petitioner to address prior to the next meeting:

- Dabareiner – Believes that the development is on the right track and will be an improvement to the Washington Street corridor. The existing conditions are not attractive. Is not satisfied with the increased height beyond 43'. Parking situation needs to be resolved and agrees with recommendations made by the petitioner's parking consultant. Seven variances are too many – it's a sign that either the code is wrong or the development is wrong.

- Coyne – Appreciates the design of the building. Has many reservations about the variances requested. Parking is a major concern and believes that the development will generate overflow parking into the neighborhood. Believes the building is too bulky and too tall for the area and may require more than a small reduction in height and bulk to get his support. The sign variance is a smaller issue, but it seems like an extreme request. Recommends that the petitioner hold a meeting to meet the neighbors before the next PZC consideration of this item.
- Meyer – Likes mixed use concept, but has concerns about stormwater, FAR, bulk, density, height and parking. Also has concerns about the aluminum panels proposed; doesn't believe that this is the right location for use of that material.
- Messer – Believes the building is too bulky and too tall for this area. Has concerns about parking and lack of stormwater. Would like the petitioner to hold a neighborhood meeting. Doesn't appreciate the "threat" of what could be built by code during the petitioner's presentation or comparisons to areas within the City that do not hold the same characteristics.
- Williams – Likes the project and design of the building, but would like to see it revised. Will not support the height. Believes that the petitioner needs to be more forthcoming in their analysis of the site and impacts it will have. Believes that a better enforcement mechanism needs to be put in place if the agreed upon parking conditions are violated. Doesn't believe the office space will only house 7 employees based on the size of the space. Does not like the proposed sign being located too close to the street. Unsure about the aluminum material and is concerned about glare off of the material.
- Gustin – This is a wonderful opportunity to make Washington Street north of the tracks inviting and appealing. Has always envisioned Washington Street north of the tracks as little shops; we should have considered rezoning this area to TU. Agrees that there are significant traffic issues near this property; development on this property will exacerbate these concerns. Would prefer more of a suburban feel with respect to the character of the building. Believes that 9,000 sq.ft. of office space seems too big for a single-user. Has concerns regarding the potential of the parking spaces on the property being sold for commuter usage. If parking is assigned, it needs to be assigned for residents, office employees, and visitors. Has concerns regarding the bulk of the building. Believes the proposed landscape improvements on the second floor add a positive impact, but believes the rear façade of the building is still too bulky. Has concerns with increasing the building height above 43' since there was so much discussion about the appropriate height when the Fifth Avenue Study was considered. This building will have a major impact on the Washington Street Corridor.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to continue PZC 13-1-024 to the October 2, 2013 meeting.

Motion by: Williams
Seconded by: Meyer

Approved
(6 to 0)

Ayes: Coyne, Dabareiner, Gustin, Messer, Meyer, Williams
Nays:

E. Reports and Recommendations

F. Correspondence

G. New Business

H. Adjournment 10:20 p.m.