



**NAPERVILLE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
DRAFT MINUTES OF JANUARY 7, 2015**

**UNOFFICIAL PRIOR TO PZC APPROVAL
APPROVED BY THE PZC ON JANUARY 21, 2015**

Call to Order

7:00 p.m.

A. Roll Call

Present: Coyne, Frost, Gustin, Hansen, Hastings, Martinez, Messer, Williams
Absent: None
Student Members: None
Staff Present: Planning Team – Kasey Evans, Derek Rockwell
Engineer – Rahat Bari

B. Minutes

No minutes to be approved. The minutes of the 12/3/14 and 1/7/15 PZC meetings will be presented at the 1/21/15 meeting.

C. Old Business

D. Public Hearings

**D1.
PZC 14-1-137
Reggi's
Resubdivision**

The petitioner requests approval of a major change to the Planned Unit Development (PUD) for Bailey and Satchel's Subdivision in order to establish a new lot for development of an approximately 7,080 square foot commercial building.

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

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Frost – Sought clarification regarding the traffic pattern of the development. Evans laid out the circulation pattern.
- Hastings – Will there be 5 tenants? Evans – There could potentially be that amount.
- Gustin – How many tenants in the existing retail building on the property? Evans - 15-20 tenants.
- Hansen – Have any of the existing tenants reached out regarding this project? Evans - No.
- Coyne – How much vacancy exists in the current strip center? Evans – There might be one vacant tenant space.
- Gustin – Did the original PUD approvals call for this development?

Evans - What is existing onsite constitutes the entirety of what was approved in the mid 1990's.

Barry Reggi, 1550 Hecht Road, Bartlett, IL, Owner, spoke as the petitioner:

- Clarified that the existing building has no vacancies.
- There will be two tenants located in the new building, a McAlister's Deli and a Lux Massage Spa.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Hastings – Are there any drive through number data available? Reggi - Not at this time, but doesn't believe the McAlister's Deli use will be an intense drive through user.
- Frost – How would patrons of the building head east on 95th Street? Reggi – Customers can exit the site east onto 95th Street from the left turn lane located on the far east of the property.
- Martinez – Will Oberweis have any parking issues as a result of the development? Reggi - Believes that the onsite parking is sufficient for all businesses.
- Hansen – Wants to be comfortable with not only the number of parking spaces, but also the location. Is staff comfortable that should the use types switch in the future (with a restaurant user on the east end of the proposed building), that parking will continue to be sufficient. Evans - Staff is comfortable that the site provides sufficient parking and that customers will be able to adequately utilize the south and east end of the parking lot.
- Gustin inquired about hours of the existing businesses. Reggi – Existing and new business hours will complement one another.

Public Testimony: None

Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:

- Coyne – Accepting staff's recommendation and will support.
- Frost – Parking meets code, in support.
- Gustin – Looking forward to the addition, will support. Believes business hours will complement each other.
- Hansen – Satisfied with staff's position that onsite parking is adequate, in favor.
- Hastings – In favor, live nearby, frequent the area. Will be a great addition.
- Martinez – In favor, live nearby. The parking issue has been satisfied.
- Messer – Sufficient parking, in support.
- Williams – In favor of the request, a welcome addition. Consistent with the preferred type of commercial development in the area. A very viable corner, almost like a second downtown. The parking is within code is therefore sufficient.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of a major change to the Planned Unit Development (PUD) for Bailey and Satchel's Subdivision in order to establish a new lot for development of an approximately 7,080 square foot commercial building.

Motion by: Coyne
Seconded by: Williams

Approved
(8 to 0)

Ayes: Coyne, Frost, Hansen, Hastings, Martinez, Messer,
Williams, Gustin
Nays: None

D2.
PZC 14-1-153
TopGolf Net Height
Variance

The petitioner requests approval of a variance from Section 6-2-10:3 (Accessory Buildings, Structures and Uses of Land) of the Municipal Code to allow the height of an accessory structure to exceed the height of the principal structure to which it is accessory.

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

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Frost: If one story is 10' than the nets are about 15 stories? Rockwell – Yes.
- Hastings: Are there any FAA concerns related to the height? Rockwell - the increased height does not impact FAA height restrictions.

Ted Heilbron, 1717 McKinney Avenue, Suite 800, Dallas, TX, Petitioner's Consultant, spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- Additional research has been conducted to eliminate the possibility of balls escaping the facility and the petitioner feels confident that the increased net height will mitigate approximately 99% of all struck balls from leaving the driving range.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Frost - How many balls are struck per year and what is the number of balls that will be kept within the facility as a result of the requested net height increase? Heilbron - Over time and based on current operations at other facilities (30 million struck balls this year), they have made modifications to prevent balls from leaving facility through a combination of altered flight balls and increased net height. They have a zero tolerance policy regarding balls leaving the facility – patrons would need to be attempting to hit the ball out of the facility at this point.
- Gustin - Do patrons attempt to hit balls out? Heilbron - Vast majority of patrons actually come to play the game in the correct manner. Those who strike balls outside the nets are given one warning; upon a second instance they are expelled from the business.
- Hastings - Has the company experienced any issues with birds/bats becoming stuck in the netting? Heilbron – The netting is constructed so

that a golf ball cannot get through, therefore a bird/bat would be unlikely to get through. They have not had any instances of animals getting stuck in the netting through the company's operational history.

- Williams – Is there a financial component to this request? Heilbron – We want to be good neighbors and not have balls leave the facility.

Public Testimony:

Debbie Gerhardtstein, 2s185 Williams Road, Warrenville:

- How close to Ferry Road and the Prairie Path are the nets/facility and how might that impact traffic, etc?

Gilbert Petecine, 30w125 Ferry Road:

- Only house adjoining the property; concerned about balls going over and damaging his property. House to the north of the facility.

Petitioner responded to testimony:

- Done extensive review regarding the number of parking spaces needed; the nets will preclude anyone from hitting a golf ball into the Prairie Path.
- Here for the same reason, they want to increase the net height to stop balls from landing on adjacent properties. The company has insurance and is liable if a ball causes damage.

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:

- Coyne – Agree; extra netting will help to mitigate safety concerns.
- Frost - 15% increase in the height represents a fair request; safety overrides all other concerns.
- Gustin - In favor, refreshing to see a proactive approach by a business.
- Hastings - In favor, height will help protect adjacent properties.
- Martinez - In favor for safety reasons.
- Messer - In favor for safety reasons.
- Williams – In favor, agrees with member of the public that we don't want balls leaving the facility; nice to see the company doing something to make the facility safer.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of a variance from Section 6-2-10:3 (Accessory Buildings, Structures and Uses of Land) of the Municipal Code to allow the height of an accessory structure to exceed the height of the principal structure to which it is accessory.

Motion by: Coyne
Seconded by: Williams

Approved
(8 to 0)

Ayes: Coyne, Frost, Hansen, Hastings, Martinez, Messer,
Williams, Gustin
Nays: None

**E. Reports and
Recommendations**

F. Correspondence

G. New Business

H. Adjournment

7:45 p.m.