



**NAPERVILLE PLAN COMMISSION
MINUTES OF AUGUST 18, 2010**

Call to Order

7:02 p.m.

A. Roll Call

Present: Chairman Edmonds, Herzog, Gustin, Trowbridge, Meyer, Messer, Bruno
Absent: Meschino, Sterlin
Student Members: Stancey
Staff Present: Planning Team – Thorsen, Emery, Zawila
Engineer – Hynes

B. Minutes Approve the minutes of July 7, 2010

Motion by: Gustin
Second by: Meyer

Approved
(7 to 0)

C. Old Business N/A

D. Public Hearings

**D1. PC 10-1-094
ROLC**

Conduct the public hearing and recommend that City Council direct staff to prepare the ordinance amending the Naperville Municipal Code to create the Residential, Office and Limited Commercial (ROLC) Zoning District.

Amy Emery, Planning Services Team, gave an overview of the proposed district.

- Zoning district details are under consideration this evening, not the location of ROLC zoning.
- ROLC is intended to provide a flexible transition or buffer.
- Residential uses would be permitted by right. Non-residential uses would require approval of a conditional use.
- Specific uses, site development conditions, area, setback and height requirements were presented.
- The proposed zoning district has been modified to reflect public feedback received from an open house on August 4, 2010.

Plan Commission inquired about:

- The 8,000 square foot limitation for non-residential use. Staff clarified that it pertains to the total building area.
- The height limitation. Staff clarified that the proposed height limitation of 40' is modeled after residential districts.
- Authorization of non-residential uses. Staff clarified that residential uses would

be permitted by right, but non-residential uses (including mixed-use developments) would require approval of a conditional use or planned unit development.

- Drive-through facilities, and whether single-lane drive-through facilities would create congestion. Staff stated that land use will be partially driven by market demand and site access limitations, and clarified that non-residential uses are intended to be limited in intensity and size.

Public Testimony:

KC Swininoga, 1241 Marls Court: noted support for mixed-use zoning in the area. Expressed concern regarding the height and density requirements: a 40' height limitation should be reduced to 35'; single-family minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet should be increased to 8,000 square feet; single-family attached should require that the sum of lot sizes be at least 4,000 square feet times the number of units; setback requirements should be increased to be minimally equivalent to R1 District. Required conditions should address lighting along boundaries abutting residential areas. Parking location should be considerate of proximity to residential areas.

Maggie Hartigan, 5S624 Tuthill: opposes the proposed ROLC District. Commented on the low density character of her neighborhood, and expressed a wish that it continue to remain low density residential. If ROLC is passed, offices would be the only alternate acceptable land use in the Tuthill Road area if access and entrances are directed away from the residential area.

Kathy Benson, 51 Forest: expressed concern about application of ROLC within the Spring Avenue area. Stated that the 15' rear yard setback which should be increased to 25'; parking in rear or interior side yards may abut residential properties and should have significant buffering or not be allowed. Feels that the proposed density is too high and should not be any greater than the R2 District.

Anissa Olley, 101 Springwood: Inquired about application of ROLC to the 5th Avenue Study and Downtown2030 which include "mixed-use" future land use; whether the zoning district affects the default zoning of R1 and how zoning is applied upon annexation; application of conditions pertaining to drive-through lanes, amplification, and landscape buffering. Believes that signage should be addressed.

Bob Swininoga, 1241 Marls Court: Commented favorably on the public process and supports the goal of ROLC zoning. Expressed concern about a maximum 40' height, curb-cuts to access ROLC areas, site intensity for non-residential uses, and setback requirements. Questioned whether residential use needs to be included in the zoning district.

Staff responded to testimony:

- The 35' height requirement for existing residential districts pertains to mean height, not peak height. The proposed 40' height limitation corresponds to the

teardown regulations and those of home-to-office conversions.

- As ROLC is intended to provide a transition in intensity, the setback requirements are greater than the higher intensity districts and less than the low density residential districts.
- A 100% landscape screening requirement is proposed. Plan Commission can recommend a higher setback or other conditions related to buffering for specific site development proposals.
- Residential density in ROLC may be higher than the adjacent low density residential districts, but will provide a transition from the adjacent high intensity areas.
- The only area with an approved future land use for ROLC is along 75th Street. Areas along Plank Road that were proposed for ROLC as part of the Plank Road Study have not been approved by the City Council.
- ROLC is not intended to apply to the downtown area.
- The proposed 5' parking setback is consistent with the B1 and TU Districts and will include landscape screening.
- The ROLC district specifies that amplification must comply with residential standards.
- Traffic and access are addressed from a site development standpoint and must comply with the limitations that are in place regardless of the zoning district.
- Lighting standards for non-residential abutting residential are established in the Performance Standards of the Municipal Code.

Plan Commission inquired about:

- ROLC as compared to other zoning districts such as R2.
- Default zoning upon annexation.
- Parcel size requirements for a PUD and whether a PUD would be feasible on a residentially-sized parcel, as well as whether more than a single structure would be permitted on any given parcel.
- Why residential use is included in ROLC.
- The impacts of rear parking on the functionality and aesthetics of a building as well as the adjacent residences.
- Consistency of landscaping opacity requirements with the TU District.
- Amplification and how requests exceeding the residential limit would be addressed.

Plan Commission Discussion:

- Gustin: Delete reference to “multiple-family” and “attached single-family”. Height should be reduced to 35'. Clarification of landscape screening should also be provided.
- Herzog: Building size restrictions should refer to “floor area”. The requirement for rear parking may be overly restrictive and a 15' setback with no parking should be established between the parking and the residential lot line or parking should be placed in the front.
- Edmonds: Landscape buffering along the rear lot line only should be broadened

to other areas. Does not have a problem with the 40' height restriction.

Plan Commission continued this case to the meeting of September 1, 2010

**D2. PC 10-1-078
WATER
STREET
DEVELOPMENT**

Conduct the public hearing and recommend the City Council approve the Water Street Development including approval of the final plat of subdivision, final plat of PUD, conditional use for a hotel, a street graphics deviation, and a setback deviation to Section 6-7E-7 (Yard Requirements for the B5 Zoning District).

Jason Zawila, Planning Services Team, gave an overview of the request.

Kathleen West, DBCW, 123 Water Street, Attorney on behalf of the petitioner:

- Described the location of the development and components of the development.
- Plaza and Riverwalk amenities enhance the vibrancy of the development and provide linkages to the downtown.
- Three modifications are proposed to the approved development in response to economic changes, acquisition of 117 Water Street, and interest in hotel development in the downtown:
 - Expansion of the Loggia Building to incorporate 117 Water Street and corresponding internal changes related to commercial square footage, residential units and interior parking areas
 - Provision of a pedestrian bridge for residents of the Loggia Building to access the parking garage
 - Inclusion of a hotel concept – this would result in consolidation of the Tower and Mixed-Use Buildings and an additional floor would be added for a total of six stories plus the rooftop lounge (hotel scenario only)
- Market conditions will determine whether the condominium or hotel scenarios are constructed.
- The design, intent and character of the approved PUD are retained in the proposal.
- The floor area ratios for both the condominium and hotel scenarios comply with the maximum floor area ratio for the B5 District.
- Hotel proposal:
 - Banquet facilities are not proposed.
 - Parking garage capacity may be increased.
 - Market requirements necessitate the additional floor to accommodate minimum rooms.
- Sign deviations are requested for the ground floor commercial spaces which are oriented to the plaza and Riverwalk that are not permitted signage on those facades by right. Signage in these areas is consistent with what was recommended for approval by the Plan Commission in 2008 and is subject to guidelines that are more stringent than what would be permitted along Water Street.
- The petitioner requests approval of both scenarios presented this evening.

Also available for questions;

Bruno Bottarelli and Nick Ryan of Marquette Companies (the Developer)

Mark Sullivan, Sullivan Goulette and Wilson, Architect on behalf of the petitioner

Andy Heinen and Mike Rechterik, V3 Companies, Engineers on behalf of the petitioner

Plan Commission inquired about

- Why the petitioner is requesting votes on both proposals.

Public Testimony:

Kathy Benson, 51 Forest: spoke on behalf of the Naperville Area Homeowners Confederation (NAHC). NAHC's position on this matter in 2007 recommended that the height of all buildings be reduced especially those adjacent to the river, and that the pedestrian and vehicular aspects be further developed. NAHC does not support the proposed increased building height for the hotel proposal and believes that the pedestrian bridge is an infringement upon the Water Street right-of-way. Concerns were expressed with regards to traffic congestion associated with the hotel proposal.

Anissa Olley, 101 Springwood: concurs with the NAHC. Expressed concern about traffic congestion resulting from the development proposal in conjunction with future development and changes to Naperville Central High School.

Petitioner responded to testimony:

- Height of the condominium is not increased from the approved PUD. Hotel includes one additional floor in order to make it viable (plus the rooftop lounge).
- The pedestrian bridge will not further reduce the right-of-way width along Water Street.
- The residential density of the hotel and condominium alternatives is reduced compared with the approved PUD.
- The difference between traffic impact of both alternatives is negligible, thus the traffic impact is not substantially increased above the approved development.
- Mike Rechterik, V3 Companies, clarified that the condominium alternative was evaluated in the South Downtown Traffic Study and a separate study for the hotel scenario was submitted with the development proposal. The trips associated with the Water Street Development are comparable between the hotel and condominium options.
- Bruno Bottarelli, Marquette Companies, clarified that the 2nd floor of the hotel building would be the main lobby floor. The private pedestrian bridge to the Loggia Building will have an entry point from the lobby and will provide secure doors to the residential area. The bridge may also be utilized as gathering space for the hotel.
- Nick Ryan, Marquette Companies, discussed the pedestrian bridge. The Loggia Building provides secure access to the building. Use for public space would accommodate small gatherings with access through the hotel lobby.
- Plan Commission approval in 2008 provided that signs along the Riverwalk could not be backlit and that awning signage would be subject to review by city

staff.

Plan Commission inquired about

- The height of the hotel building and how a “floor” is defined. Clarification of height measurements.
- The nature of the pedestrian bridge.
- The quantity of parking within the deck that will be available for public use as compared to the approved PUD.
- Traffic associated with each scenario.
- Stormwater management.
- Amenities that would be provided within the limited service hotel proposal.
- Public access and wayfinding to the parking deck.
- Differences in signage along Riverwalk as compared to what was approved in 2008.
- Zoning districts in which hotels are permitted.
- Whether the hotel could be accommodated with fewer rooms or lower height.
- Calculation of FAR on a lot-by-lot or PUD basis.
- How the reduction of setbacks on Water Street relates to the B5 District versus the downtown core.
- Future development of property along Aurora Avenue and at the northwest corner of Water Street and Main Street.
- The location of loading activity.
- Phasing of development.

Plan Commission closed the public hearing.

Plan Commission Discussion:

- Meyer: Supports the notion of the hotel but does not support the increase in building height.
- Herzog: Supports the condominium development as proposed. Generally supports the development. Concerns expressed about the height of the hotel and the pedestrian bridge if it does not provide a public amenity.
- Gustin: Finds that the development is creative and supports a hotel in the area to accommodate Naper Settlement and North Central College visitors. Struggles with offering recommendations on two options and has reservations regarding the viability of condominium units as well as the pedestrian bridge.
- Messer: Likes the idea of a hotel but has some concerns with the increase in height over the condominium option. Likes the upper story setbacks on the hotel building. Thinks that the bridge could be a positive feature. Has some difficulty with approving both options.
- Trowbridge: Overall thinks the project is great and thinks the pedestrian bridge is unique and aesthetically pleasing. The increase in height of the hotel is not optimal but stepping back helps to negate some of the height issues. Market situations necessitate flexibility in voting on both options.
- Bruno: The economic conditions are unique and drive the need to consider two

different plans. A hotel would be a wonderful amenity to have downtown. A pedestrian bridge could be an interesting aesthetic feature.

- Edmonds: Thinks the project is too big but the height increases are not significant relative to what was already approved and are within the limitations established by the PUD. Riverwalk amenities are substantial, and inclusion of the pedestrian bridge is not a deciding factor.

North Phase with Condominium Alternative :

Plan Commission moved to recommend approval of north phase and the south phase condominium alternative as proposed to incorporate 0.34 additional acres into the north phase PUD and modify the existing site plan as noted in the staff memo, which will increase the size of the Loggia building from 24,409 to 64,870 square feet, increase the number of residential units from 24 to 32, eliminate parking within the Loggia Building and incorporate a pedestrian bridge across Water Street, and with respect to the south phase and increase the number of residential units from 39 to 40, increase the height of the parking structure from 66 feet to 71 feet, and increase the floor area ratio of the Water Street District PUD from 1.96 to 2.02, all in accordance with the staff memorandum.

Motion by: Trowbridge
Seconded by: Messer

Herzog moved to amend the motion to remove the pedestrian bridge across Water Street from the proposal.
Seconded by Gustin

Amended motion:
Aye: Herzog, Meyer
Nay: Trowbridge, Messer, Bruno, Gustin,

Denied
(2-5)

Original motion:
Aye: Trowbridge, Gustin, Bruno, Herzog, Edmonds
Nay: Meyer, Messer

Approved
(5-2)

North Phase with Hotel Alternative:

Plan Commission moved to recommend approval of north phase and the south phase hotel alternative to incorporate additional acres into the Water Street District north phase PUD and modify the existing site plan, increase size of the Loggia building as set forth in the staff memo, increase the number of residential units as set forth in the staff memo, eliminate parking on the second floor of the Loggia building and incorporate a pedestrian bridge across Water Street, and with respect to the south phase change the use from residential to hotel, increase the height of the Tower/Building, Multi-Use Building and parking structure from 83' to 90', increase the size of the Tower Building as set forth in the staff memo, increase the number of parking spaces in the parking structure from 559 to 699 spaces, and increase the floor area ratio of the Water Street District, all as set forth in the staff memorandum of August 18.

Motion by: Messer
Seconded by: Trowbridge

Aye: Messer, Herzog, Trowbridge, Bruno, Gustin, Edmonds
Nay: Meyer

**Approved
(6-1)**

**E. Reports and
Recommendations** None

F. Correspondence None

G. New Business None

H. Adjournment

11:03 p.m.