



**NAPERVILLE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 7, 2016**

**UNOFFICIAL PRIOR TO PZC APPROVAL  
APPROVED BY THE PZC ON SEPTEMBER 21, 2016**

**Call to Order**

**7:00 p.m.**

**A. Roll Call**

Present: Bansal, Fessler, Hansen, Hastings, Martinez, Peterson, Williams  
Absent: Crawford, Hajek  
Student Members: Butler  
Staff Present: Planning Team – Sara Kopinski, Erin Venard  
Engineering Team – Michael Pearce

**B. Minutes**

Approve the minutes of the August 3, 2016 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

Motion by: Williams  
Second by: Bansal

Approved  
(7 to 0)

**C. Old Business**

**D. Public Hearings**

**D1.  
PZC 16-1-094  
Edward Elmhurst  
Sign Variance**

The petitioner requests approval of a variance from Section 5-4-5:2.2 (Commercial Signs: Monument Sign Area) to permit a monument sign that exceeds the allowable 45 square feet in size and a variance from Section 5-4-5:2.5 (Commercial Signs: Monument Sign Setback) to permit a monument sign fronting a major arterial to be located closer than 10 feet from the front property line at the subject property located at 1804 N. Naperville Blvd., Naperville.

Erin Venard, Planning Services Team, gave an overview of the request.

Ernie DiFiore, Modern Signs, Inc., spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- Edward Elmhurst moved into the building approximately one year ago; trying to create signage appropriate for their function.
- New, modern sign in the same place and fashion as the existing sign.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Peterson – Is the sign parallel with traffic? DiFiore – Yes.
- Peterson - Any thought given to turning the sign perpendicular to traffic

along Naper Boulevard making it more readable? DiFiore – If the sign is reoriented, it will lose even more distance from the front property line. Originally we requested a triangular sign, but this was not feasible because the sign took up too much space and would have been more obtrusive. The electronic message board (EMB) will make this sign more noticeable.

- Williams – Am an advocate when it comes to the variance for the location of the sign due to the taking, but do not like that the sign area is twice as large as permitted. DiFiore - The proposed sign is not that much larger than what is currently there.
- Williams – The proposed sign is twice as large as Code allows and you are twice as close to the road. DiFiore – If the proposed sign is not approved, the current sign will remain. The sign will maintain the current distance from the road and exceed the permissible size.
- Williams – You should conform to the law and build the correct size of sign. I personally do not see any hardship on your behalf.
- Bansal – How much bigger is the proposed sign than the current sign? DiFiore – The sign is in a planter box which is counted as signage because it contains the building name. The existing sign is 55 sq. ft., the proposed sign is 29 sq. ft. larger.
- Bansal – Is there an issue with keeping the new sign the same size as the current sign? DiFiore – They cannot put an EMB in the sign. Without the new sign, Edward Elmhurst would be allowed to have one small tenant panel. With the new sign, the color would change to Edward Elmhurst colors, an EMB would be added, and the Edward Elmhurst name would be in a larger panel on top.
- Hansen – How much square footage does Edward take up in the building? Kelly Sofer, Edward Elmhurst - Edward is approximately 10,375 sq. ft., the immediate care is 7000 sq. ft. of that space. In an immediate care situation, people often are in distress and the nature of their need is different than a standard doctor appointment. The EMB identifies what the practice can assist people with.
- Hansen – Someone driving by needs to know that it is the Edward Elmhurst facility. I would prefer that if you are increasing the size of the sign, the EMB is removed and you use additional allowance to identify the facility. Sofer – The EMB will also include the hours immediate care facility is open.
- Hansen – I understand why you want the sign to be larger, but I think there are ways to minimize the size of the EMB. DiFiore – The EMB is only part of the reason for the variance request. Half of the sign will still be dedicated to other tenant spaces.
- Hansen – Would you need the variance if the EMB is removed? DiFiore It is possible that we could shrink everything proportionally to fit within existing sign size.
- Martinez – The sign is currently out of compliance.
- Williams – The sign was out of compliance prior to the taking. It is not actually grandfathered, it just continued to exist.

- Venard – In terms of size, there may or may not have been a variance granted. However a new sign would need a variance because it is over the 45sf permitted per Code.
- Williams – The existing sign was built before the condemnation. Now that there is less frontage.
- Venard – Anything new rebuilt on the site would have to comply with our current standards.
- Bansal – If you leave the sign as is, no variance is needed? DiFiore – Correct. I can change tenant panels without a variance. I believe the EMB is important. I can shrink the whole sign proportionally to be the same size as the current size.
- Hansen – Could you read the EMB in that situation? DiFiore – I do not know, but it can be built.

**Public Testimony: NONE**

- Commissioners Peterson, Fessler, Williams, Hastings, and Student Member Butler are not in favor of a continuance.
- Commissioner Bansal finds that a continuance will be a benefit if the petitioner and staff work together on a modified proposal.
- Commissioner Hansen is comfortable approving the proposal subject to conditions.

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

**Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:**

- Peterson – Voting against; no issues with EMB. Sign is parallel to Naper Boulevard and it is not very effective. If there was a hardship request to turn the sign perpendicular to the road, I would support. Making a non-effective sign bigger introduces a negative. I would fully support the reasons to make the sign bigger and add the EMB (marketing), if the sign were perpendicular to Naper Boulevard. There is also a large wall sign on the building.
- Bansal – Size request is too large; don't see a hardship. I would be in favor of amending the request to recommend a sign that is the same size as the current sign.
- Hastings – Supporting the sign as proposed for the reasons staff outlined. Sign area should be larger; what the tenant and the owner put on sign is up to them.
- Hansen – Supporting with the amendment the petitioner was willing to make this evening (shrinking the size to the existing frame).
- Williams – Thinks there is a hardship with respect to taking of 5 feet of roadway. Would support if Commissioner Bansal made an amendment to the motion. Adopts the comments of Commissioner Peterson. This is sign gluttony.
- Fessler – The proposed sign will look better than the existing sign.

Agrees it would be much more advantageous to be perpendicular to Naper Boulevard. Edward is a good tenant that needs visibility. Do not like that the planter box is included in the Code.

- Butler – Not supporting; does not see necessity of making the sign bigger.
- Martinez – Torn; does not like EMB signs. However, one of those signs helped me find Edward in Plainfield. Struggling with the size. Will support if the size is the same as the current size.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to adopt amended findings of fact as based upon the PZC discussion and approve PZC 16-1-094, a variance from Section 5-4-5:2.2 (Commercial Signs: Monument Sign Area) to permit a monument sign that exceeds the allowable 45 square feet in size and a variance from Section 5-4-5:2.5 (Commercial Signs: Monument Sign Setback) to permit a monument sign fronting a major arterial to be located closer than 10 feet from the front property line at the subject property located at 1804 N. Naper Blvd., Naperville, subject to the condition that the proposed sign be revised to be consistent with the sign area of the existing sign on the subject property.

Motion by: Williams  
Seconded by: Bansal

Approved  
(4 to 3)

Ayes: Bansal, Hansen, Martinez, Williams  
Nays: Peterson, Hastings, Fessler  
Absent: Crawford, Hajek

**D2.  
PZC 16-1-113  
Water Street  
District Sign  
Variance**

The petitioners request approval of a variance from Section 5-4-3:5 (Prohibited Signs; Off Premises Signs) of the Municipal Code in order to install an off premises wall sign at 120 Water Street, Naperville, IL 60540.

Erin Venard, Planning Services Team, gave an overview of the request.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Williams – The essence of the request is that the sign is on the parking garage as opposed to the hotel itself. Venard – Correct.
- Peterson – Clarifies that if the hotel owned the garage and they were on the same lot, there would be no need for the variance. Venard – Correct.

Kathleen West, Attorney with Dommermuth, Cobine, West, Gensler, Philipchuck & Corrigan, spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- Water Street consists of a mixed-use development with a variety of uses between Aurora and the River, and Main and Webster.
- Major component of this district is Hotel Indigo. The Hotel is on both sides of Water Street and is connected by a pedestrian bridge.
- Hotel Indigo and the parking garage are two separate buildings that are intricately connected; shared walls and building functions.

- Stairwells in the parking garage provide emergency egress out of the hotel.
- Hotel Indigo is a destination for visitors, needs to be readily identifiable; Marquette proposes to install a sign at the top of the building.
- Integrated design of building and parking garage makes this the only viable location for this sign to be seen.
- Off premises signs are not permitted per Code.
- Design is simple and straightforward, backlit, and under 63 sq. ft.
- Meets the standards for granting a variance.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Martinez – To clarify, the hotel sign is proposed on the east tower; the sign will be facing Main Street? West – Correct. However, if you are at Walgreens, you will not be able to see the sign because it would be too high. You will be able to see it from Washington Street.
- Bansal – Will this be the only sign for the hotel? Jeff Prosapio, Marquette Properties – There will be additional signs; however, the other signs are on our property and will not require a variance.
- Bansal – How many signs will be located on the top of the building? If you have multiple signs around the top of the building, is there really a hardship? Only concerned with signs at top elevation. Prosapio - There is also a sign on the south side.
- Williams – If the parking lot were owned by the hotel, would the sign be allowed? Venard – Yes.
- Williams – Is Hotel Indigo a chain? Prosapio – British based brand, ING hotels. Hotel Indigo is a boutique brand.
- Williams – How many locations are there? Prosapio – 60.
- Williams – Is Hotel Indigo a registered trademark? Prosapio – Yes.
- Hansen – Is the parking for Hotel Indigo provided within deck? West – Yes, there are spaces reserved within the garage for Hotel Indigo, as well as entrances to the Hotel.

**Public Testimony: None.**

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

**Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:**

- Bansal – Supporting.
- Fessler – Supporting.
- Hansen – Supporting; thinks it is important to have a sign at that height. Only hotel downtown and people may have trouble getting to it.
- Hastings – Supporting.
- Martinez – Excited for this project and will be supporting.
- Peterson – Supporting; I would put sign facing north where everyone would see it downtown.
- Williams – Congratulations on Water Street; coming along beautifully.

Two comments. First, do you need sign on south side? Second, I will be supporting your request tonight but I think the sign is too big and doesn't look quite right.

- Butler – No problems; supporting.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to adopt the findings of fact as presented by the petitioner and approve PZC 16-1-113, a variance from Section 5-4-3:5 (Prohibited Signs; Off Premises Signs) of the Municipal Code in order to install an off premises wall sign at 120 Water Street, Naperville, IL 60540.

Motion by: Williams  
Seconded by: Bansal

Approved  
(7-0)

Ayes: Bansal, Fessler, Hansen, Hastings, Martinez, Peterson,  
Williams

Nays: None

Absent: Crawford, Hajek

**E. Reports and  
Recommendations  
F. Correspondence**

**H. Adjournment**

**7:54 p.m.**