



**NAPERVILLE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
APPROVED MINUTES OF MAY 6, 2015**

**UNOFFICIAL PRIOR TO PZC APPROVAL  
APPROVED BY THE PZC ON MAY 20, 2015**

**Call to Order**

**7:00 p.m.**

**A. Roll Call**

Present: Hastings, Williams, Hansen, Crawford, Martinez, Messer  
Absent: None  
Student Members: None  
Staff Present: Planning Team – Sara Kopinski, Kasey Evans, Derek Rockwell  
Engineer – Andy Hynes

**B. Minutes**

Approve the minutes of the April 15, 2015 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

Motion by: Hastings  
Second by: Martinez

Approved  
(6 to 0)

**C. Old Business**

**C1.  
PZC 14-1-142  
First Midwest Bank**

The petitioner requests approval of a variance from Section 6-7I-4:6 (Required Conditions) of the Naperville Municipal Code to allow a drive-through facility in the Transitional Use District, a variance from Section 6-9-6:2.1.1 (Supplemental Standards for Drive-through Stacking Lanes) to allow a reduced drive-through setback from a residential area, and a variance from Section 6-9-3:5 (Stacking requirements for Use with Drive-through Facilities) to allow a reduced number of drive-through stacking spaces, at the property located at 118, 122 and 128 N Washington Street.

Kasey Evans, Planning Services Team, gave an overview of the request.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about: None

Greg Trzupsek, Architect, spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- The combination of the drive through and parking on the property brings about the necessity for the variance request.
- Described the building elevations and their compliance with the City's Building Design Guidelines.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Williams – What are the code required setbacks vs. what is proposed?  
Trzupek – Due to the manner in which the setback is measured, the overall setback should be 40', proposed is 10'. Both the parking and the drive through areas separately comply with minimum setback requirements.
- Hansen – The drive through stacking is a concern. Is there any way to convert the extra parking space area into stacking? Trzupek – It would be difficult due to site geometry constraints (entrance off of Washington). Trying to limit having a vehicle stuck behind a car in front of them.

**Public Testimony:** None

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

**Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:**

- Hastings – Will support.
- Williams – Tougher case than meets the eye. Because it backs up to residential property, this is a sensitive development. This is a transitional area and because of the well laid out site given the constraints, will support.
- Hansen – Still have some concerns, but the maintenance of the 40' setback to the residential is an advantage. If more lanes can best accommodate stacking, then I am for the proposal.
- Martinez – Given the space the site has to work with, the site has been designed nicely. Comfortable that this will blend with the surrounding area.
- Messer – The setback variance is a result of a quirk of the Municipal Code. Appreciate the sidewalk connection proposal, compliance with the 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue Study Streetscape, and an improvement to existing conditions. The traffic study is convincing. Will support.
- Crawford – No issues, supportive of the request.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 14-1-142, a variance from Section 6-7I-4:6 (Required Conditions) of the Naperville Municipal Code to allow a drive-through facility in the Transitional Use District, a variance from Section 6-9-6:2.1.1 (Supplemental Standards for Drive-through Stacking Lanes) to allow a reduced drive-through setback from a residential area, and a variance from Section 6-9-3:5 (Stacking requirements for Use with Drive-through Facilities) to allow a reduced number of drive-through stacking spaces, at the property located at 118, 122 and 128 N Washington Street.

Motion by: Williams  
Seconded by: Hansen

Approved  
(6 to 0)

Ayes: Hastings, Williams, Hansen, Crawford, Martinez, Messer  
Nays: None

## **D. Public Hearings**

### **D1. PZC 15-1-031 Good Health Pharmacy Signage Variance**

The petitioner requests approval of a variance from Section 5-4-5:1 (Commercial Signs; Wall Signs) of the Naperville Municipal Code in order to install a wall sign in a location not permitted by code.

Sara Kopinski, Planning Services Team, gave an overview of the request.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Hastings – Is there a monument sign with the petitioner on it currently?  
Kopinski – Yes.

Russ Whitaker, Attorney, Rosanova and Whitaker, spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- Gave an overview of the development of the property. The development struggled as it was constructed during the economic recession in 2007.
- The subject building was not occupied until 2011. A second tenant joined in 2013, and now the petitioner has occupied their portion of the building.
- The building to the south has fared better from an occupancy standpoint. 6 of the 7 tenants in that building have wall signage on both sides of the building; the 7<sup>th</sup> does not by choice.
- Building elevations from the entitlement phase of the building show an intent for signage on this portion of the building.
- Had the owner been aware of the sign issue, the space would have been demised in a manner which would allow signage for the tenant along Route 59. The space cannot at this point be divided up differently.
- The building itself has roadway frontage; just the tenant space does not.
- Sees this issue as a technicality, and this sign is in harmony with the intent of the Street Graphics Control Ordinance.
- The proposed wall signage is less than half the square footage that would be permitted in the event the tenant space had Route 59 frontage.
- The signs are not too big or too numerous. This would help a small business in the City succeed.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Messer – This particular tenant space has never been occupied? Whitaker – No.
- Hansen – How long has the tenant been there? Whitaker – The petitioner recently occupied the space.
- Martinez – Was the original intent to have only 3 signs on the Route 59

frontage, rather than the 4 being proposed now? Whitaker – There are currently only two signs on the elevation at issue.

**Public Testimony: None**

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

**Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:**

- Hastings – Will be supporting. Understand Crawford and Williams’s point of view. A sign fronting 59 will help the business, which trumps the other aspects of the request.
- Williams – Agree with Crawford. The idea that more or bigger signs will help the business could be universally applied to every business in the City. The property manager made a mistake, which the PZC does not have a responsibility to correct. Will not support.
- Hansen – Finds merit in both arguments, but inclined to agree with Crawford and Williams. Concerned about the precedent this request could set in this building or the other building in the development. Will not be supporting.
- Martinez – Will be supporting. The area has struggled from a business standpoint. While not a fan of sign clutter, they are necessary for this development.
- Messer – Ordinarily I would hesitate to support the request. The placement of the Edward sign supports the intention to have signage on this frontage. Will be supporting.
- Crawford – Understand the petitioner’s reasoning, however, the development is focused around an internal parking court which is intended to minimize the signage along Route 59. Will not support.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 15-1-031, a variance from Section 5-4-5:1 (Commercial Signs; Wall Signs) of the Naperville Municipal Code in order to install a wall sign in a location not permitted by code.

Motion by: Williams  
Seconded by: Hansen

No  
Recommendation  
(3 to 3)

Ayes: Messer, Hastings, Martinez  
Nays: Williams, Hansen, Crawford

**D2.  
PZC 14-1-063  
Iron Gate Phase 2A**

The petitioner requests approval of a Major Change to the Iron Gate Motor Condos PUD in order to establish controlling site development plans and building elevations for Phase 2A; A Preliminary / Final PUD Plat and associated site development details; A conditional use in the I (Industrial) District for motor vehicle sales in conjunction with a Planned Unit Development; and Variances from Section 6-9-3 (Schedule of Off-Street Parking Requirements) to reduce the required off-street parking onsite and required vehicle stacking for a car wash

facility.

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

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Hastings – Can this development have the ability to use Calamos parking for overflow? Rockwell – Staff has not seen any documentation regarding this, and would need to review how this might function.
- Hastings – Has this petition been fast-tracked? Rockwell – The plans have been through a number of reviews and have reached the point that additional feedback is necessary.
- Williams – Can you explain concierge parking in more detail? Rockwell – The petitioner has included in the application that there will be concierge services for picking up and dropping off vehicles and the petitioner is using this as a component of the justification for their variance request.

Tom Burgess, Petitioner, spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- Carwash is not a hand-wash, but is a detailing facility by appointment only (Brighton Carwash).
- The cars are the customer. There is no reason for the general public to show up. Customers only come because they have an appointment. The main focus of the commercial users is the car condo owners.
- The proposed service center is a high-end business conducting lengthy modifications that picks up customer's cars.
- The customers do not have time and the car services on site accommodate the car condo owners.
- The required off-street parking does not apply because these are different kind of businesses than those provided for in the Municipal Code.
- Parking concerns for the carwash are addressed by the carwash owner's letter.
- We don't know exactly what parking is going to be required and open to land-banking additional parking.
- Condo restrictions will allow only auto oriented businesses in the development.
- The multi-tenant building will have glass overhead doors so customers can drive-through.
- Brighton will use the front "stacking" space to provide before and after photos for the detailing they perform.
- Would agree to the land-banking option only after Phases 2A and 2B are complete. Will do a portion of the parking (Phase 3) with Phase 2B and then evaluate the parking demand and issues.
- Calamos parking would be utilized for large scale events, but people would not typically be crossing Route 59 between the two properties.
- Will work with staff on the proposed pre-cast concrete building elevations, or perhaps a masonry building.

- The glass and design elements are relevant to the use. A lot of time and energy went into the design of the building to come up with a design that works with the use and ties in with the other buildings.
- Is considering large public art installations on the north and east elevations of the building.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Martinez – Is the elevation shown by the petitioner different than the one in the packet? Burgess – We should have provided plans for 2A and 2B at the same time.
- Messer – Reviewed past PUD approval; at that time the petitioner said the elevations would invoke a carriage house and paddock feel, but that is not apparent in the proposed elevations. The use is driving the design? Burgess – Definitely on the car retail building. The back car condos are more residential looking. The customers want the commercial space to have a more commercial look. The front will look more characteristic of a commercial center, including the different building materials. Burgess displayed photos of other buildings constructed of pre-cast concrete that are dressed up with earth tones and articulation provided. Both buildings are made of the same material, but painted different colors with different details.
- Hansen – The original entitlement spoke about eating and drinking establishments? That will probably be included in Phase 3 and we will focus on car-centric businesses for Phase 2. The wetland feature would be a good feature for dining establishments in Phase 3.
- Hastings – Loves the development, but there seems to be a disconnect in communication. Seems this is due to the way the Code is written and the proposed uses do not fit. If the Commission approves the case with point 4 requiring revised elevations; what if staff says the revised elevations do not fit? What happens then; this seems like a legal concern? How would proposed changes be able to be made? Rockwell – Plans when they go to PZC do not have to be in full technical compliance, but should generally be “close-enough” to understand what entitlements are being requested and how the site is going to function. However, plans need to be in full technical compliance before going to City Council. The PZC could condition their approval on revisions to the elevations/plans. Staff would review the revised plans and would provide any comments to City Council as necessary when the petition moved forward. If the petitioner came back with substantially different than what was reviewed by PZC, they could be sent back to PZC prior to City Council.
- Martinez – Is staff comfortable with Mr. Burgess’s responses to staff’s concerns? Yes, provided that the recommended staff conditions are included in the petition. Cannot know what staff’s position will be on any revised plans being proposed without reviewing them.

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

**Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:**

- Hastings – In support of the project. Usually see more detail in the plans but comfortable that the items being worked out between staff and the petitioner.
- Williams – Liked this project back when it was first presented; but believes it has deviated from the original intent of the PUD and has gone downhill. Instead of high-end buildings, there is now a car sales building much like what you would expect to see on Ogden Avenue. The proposal tonight is vague. Without staff's conditions, there is no concept at all. The plan is so all over the place; the project is being considered prematurely. Does not have a feel for what he is voting on and disappointed in the direction the project is headed.
- Hansen – Concur with Martinez; role as Commissioners is to review planning and zoning elements of plans. Full confidence in staff's review of the plans prior to Council. PUD's are unique and this project seems to be a moving target. Concerned about the land-banking in an area where future dining establishments may go. Would like to see more detail.
- Martinez – Would like the project to go forward with the condition that the 4 points are addressed to staff's satisfaction.
- Messer – Thankful for the staff report. It was hard to tell if there was contention between staff and the petitioner from the staff report, but the petitioner's testimony seems to indicate he has been working with staff. In support of the project; has a similar hesitation about the vagueness. Can support if staff's conditions are addressed. Polled the Commissioners regarding the proposed conditions.
  - Williams – Can't get my head around the conditions and think it is a mess to send to Council. The conditions are the bare minimum. Would be better to defer recommendation to review more detail.
  - Hastings – Would the case go to Council in 2 weeks? Rockwell - No, it is dependent on resubmittals from the petitioner and staff reviews.
  - Hansen – Agree with Williams and the conditions are the bare minimum and staff needs to be 100% confident in the plans and revisions. If staff is not, than the plans should be brought back to PZC for further review.
  - Messer – Would the Commission be comfortable making a recommendation or would rather continue: Recommendation: Hastings, Martinez, Hansen, Crawford; Continuance: Williams
- Crawford – Terrific unique development. Hansen had great points. Main concern is the land-banked parking. However, Williams has a good point that the information is vague. Is staff comfortable with conditions? Rockwell – Not in a position to state whether staff could support changes to the plans until we have an opportunity to review and do not yet know what will be going to Council.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 14-1-063, a Major Change to the Iron Gate Motor Condos PUD in order to establish controlling site development plans and building elevations for Phase 2A; A Preliminary / Final PUD Plat and associated site development details; A conditional use in the I (Industrial) District for motor vehicle sales in conjunction with a Planned Unit Development; and Variances from Section 6-9-3 (Schedule of Off-Street Parking Requirements) to reduce the required off-street parking onsite and required vehicle stacking for a car wash facility, subject to the four conditions outlined in staff's PZC memo dated 5/6/15:

1. The petitioner shall reserve a landbanked parking area for construction of additional parking, if deemed necessary.
2. The petitioner shall conduct parking occupancy studies upon completion and occupancy of Phase 2A in order to determine if the existing parking is sufficient. Additional commercial development shall not be permitted until such time that it is confirmed that sufficient parking exists for Phase 2A and any future commercial phases.
3. The petitioner shall provide City staff with a material sample of the precast concrete lap siding formliner proposed for the inline commercial building for review against the Citywide Building Design Guidelines.
4. The petitioner shall provide revised building elevations for the northern motor vehicle sales building which more closely align with the intent of the PUD regulations to provide a cohesive aesthetic between and among structures within a PUD.

Motion by: Williams  
Seconded by: Hansen

Approved  
(6 to 0)

Ayes: Williams, Hansen, Hastings, Martinez, Crawford,  
Messer  
Nays: None

## **E. Reports and Recommendations**

## **F. Correspondence**

## **G. New Business**

**H. Adjournment**

8:45 pm