



**NAPERVILLE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
APPROVED MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 4, 2015**

**UNOFFICIAL PRIOR TO PZC APPROVAL  
APPROVED BY THE PZC ON FEBRUARY 18, 2015**

**Call to Order**

**7:00 p.m.**

**A. Roll Call**

Present: Coyne, Frost, Gustin, Hansen, Martinez, Messer, Crawford  
Absent: Williams, Hastings  
Student Members:  
Staff Present: Planning Team – Kasey Evans, Derek Rockwell  
Engineer – Yifang Lu

**B. Minutes**

Approve the minutes of the January 21, 2015 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

Motion by: Coyne  
Second by: Messer

Approved  
(7 to 0)

**C. Old Business**

**D. Public Hearings**

**D1.  
PZC 14-1-155  
Empire Signage  
Variance**

The petitioner requests approval of a variance from Section 5-4-9:1.2 (Downtown Central Business District; Projecting Signs) of the Municipal Code in order to install projecting signage larger than five square feet; and a variance from Section 5-4-3:7 (Prohibited Signs; Bare Bulb Illumination) of the Municipal Code in order to install bare bulb signage at the property located at 48 W. Chicago Avenue.

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

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Gustin – Is the sign facing the river below the maximum signage size and illumination? Rockwell – Yes.
- Gustin – Do the bare bulbs impact brightness? Rockwell – There are no separate regulations in the sign code for brightness of bare bulb signs.
- Gustin – Are there other bare bulb signs located in the downtown? Rockwell – Not in the downtown, but Maggiano’s received approval of

similar signage.

- Coyne – Will the signs be constant/flashing/blinking? Rockwell – We can confirm with the petitioner but believe the bulbs will be constantly illuminated.

Ed Carroll (Sign Shop Express) and Will Cullen from Ballydoyle, 48 W. Chicago Avenue, spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- Low watt LED bulb proposed gives the brilliance of about 11 watts, not trying to light up the river, bare bulbs within the channel letters, but no cover on channel. The bulbs will be constantly illuminated during business hours and will not flash.
- Gustin – What will the off time of the signs be? Cullen – At the end of business hours.
- Martinez – Will the bulbs be colored? Carroll – The bulbs will be white lights.

### **Public Testimony: None**

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Hansen – Given that the request is significantly below overall allowance for signage, could the petitioner come back seeking additional signage? Rockwell - They could put up additional signage that met all other requirements of the municipal code without the requirement to seek a variance.
- Gustin – If they want to increase the amount of signage? Rockwell – The petitioner would only be required to return to PZC and City Council if the petitioner requested additional bare bulb signage or the size of the projecting signage was proposed to be increased.

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

### **Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:**

- Coyne – In support; chic design.
- Frost – In support.
- Gustin – In support.
- Hansen – Comfortable with proposal, like the design, has a retro feel.
- Martinez – In support, within total signage allowance, tastefully done.
- Messer – In support.
- Crawford – In support.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of a variance from Section 5-4-9:1.2 (Downtown Central Business District; Projecting Signs) of the Municipal Code in order to install projecting signage larger than five square feet; and a variance from Section 5-4-3:7 (Prohibited Signs; Bare Bulb Illumination) of the Municipal Code in order to install bare bulb signage at the property located at 48 W. Chicago Avenue.

Motion by: Coyne  
Seconded by: Messer

Approved  
(7 to 0)

Ayes: Coyne, Frost, Hansen, Martinez, Crawford, Messer,  
Gustin  
Nays: None

**D2.  
PZC 14-1-083  
Hidden Creek  
Subdivision**

The petitioner requests approval of rezoning to R1A (Low Density Single Family Residence District) upon annexation and a preliminary subdivision plat for property located at 10s413 and 10s423 248<sup>th</sup> Street.

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

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- None

Patti Bernhard, 111 E. Jefferson Avenue, Petitioner's attorney, spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- A similar plan came through in 2007 and was approved by the PZC and City Council. The market crash in 2008 stalled the project. With the market picking up, petitioner is seeking entitlement once again.
- At that time, the PZC determined that the development of a stub street toward the east would be more detrimental than beneficial to the area. The City Council concurred with this determination.
- The project meets the standards for rezoning and complies with the Comprehensive Plan and the trend of development in the area.
- A Tree Preservation survey will be provided at the time of final platting.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Gustin – Do the plans before the PZC tonight indicate the petitioner's request to forgo the reservation of the stub street? Evans – The submitted plans indicate a reservation of Lot 5A for the potential connection to the east.
- Frost – Are we talking about Lot 5 or 5A as the reservation area? Evans – 5A
- Hansen – If Lot 5A is reserved for future right of way, how would potential purchasers of Lot 5 be given notice beyond the Plat of Subdivision of the potential for a roadway adjacent to them? Would the yard adjacent to any future street be treated as a corner side yard? Evans – The lot is wide enough to meet the corner side yard setback requirements in the future, and future homeowners, through a covenant signature upon purchase of the property, would be given notice of the potential of the right-of-way construction adjacent to their property.
- Gustin – Why does this require PZC review? Bernhard - Relevant documents upon the initial entitlement process were not recorded and have lapsed.
- Coyne – Would there be access to the east without a stub street?

Bernhard – The petitioner doesn't feel that requiring access to the east is logical.

- Gustin – Are you requesting that the lot be reserved as shown on the submitted plans? Staff has asked that Lot 5A be reserved for future access and the petitioner would like that requirement waived and removed from the Plat of Subdivision.

**Public Testimony:**

Steven Gibson, 10529 Royal Porthcawl Road:

- Are there 20 or 21 lots proposed? Evans - 21 including Lot 5A.
- Believes that the lot sizes are too small for the surrounding area.
- How will the residents access 248<sup>th</sup> Street?
- Feels that turning left onto 248<sup>th</sup> Street will be difficult.
- Are the lots contiguous to the City limits?

Petitioner responded to testimony:

- The larger lots in the area are located in the county, and are generally served by well and septic.
- The proposed R1A zoning is a low density residential designation and the proposed lots meet the requirements of that district.
- The subject property is contiguous to the corporate limits of the City through the right-of-way located to the west (248<sup>th</sup> Street).
- There will be a left hand turn lane leaving the subdivision onto 248<sup>th</sup> Street. Ashwood Park also does not have a traffic signal.
- The properties to the north are fairly new lots that would not be bought for redevelopment purposes in the near future.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Gustin - Would legal notice be impacted by removing Lot 5A? Evans – No, if the PZC desired to include in their recommendation the removal of Lot 5A as reserved, that could be a condition of approval. The plans provided to the PZC indicate the reservation of Lot 5A.
- Coyne - Does staff have an opinion regarding the access lot? Evans – Staff recommends that Lot 5A be reserved for future right of way.

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

**Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:**

- Coyne – Support the petition, but feels okay moving forward with Lot 5A as a buildable lot.
- Frost – The project is reasonable. I have no problem with Lot 5A being designated as a buildable lot.
- Gustin – Would like to take a straw poll regarding whether the inclusion of Lot 5A as being reserved for future right of way is appropriate.
- Hansen – A little conflicted. Agree with staff that it is wise to reserve land for future access. This petitioner does not control the property to the

east and cannot predict its development.

- Martinez – Agree with Frost. This fits with the Southwest Area Community Plan.
- Messer – In support of the request, no variances are sought. Lot 5A being reserved is sound planning and will support its inclusion.
- Crawford – Support the rezoning, would like to see 5A be reserved as future right of way.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of rezoning to R1A (Low Density Single Family Residence District) upon annexation and a preliminary subdivision plat for property located at 10s413 and 10s423 248<sup>th</sup> Street, including the designation of Lot 5A as reserved for future right-of-way.

Motion by: Messer

Approved

Seconded by: Martinez

(4 to 3)

Ayes: Hansen, Crawford, Messer, Gustin

Nays: Coyne, Frost, Martinez

## **E. Reports and Recommendations**

## **F. Correspondence**

## **G. New Business**

Chairwoman Gustin welcomed Commissioner Crawford to the PZC. Commissioner Crawford shared with the PZC his experience and background.

## **H. Adjournment**

7:59 p.m.