



**NAPERVILLE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
DRAFT MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2012**

**Call to Order**

**7:00 p.m.**

**A. Roll Call**

Present: Frost, Coyne (arrived at 7:03 p.m.), Gustin, Herzog, Meyer, Messer, Trowbridge, Williams

Absent: Bruno

Student Members:

Staff Present: Planning Team – Allison Laff, Clint Smith, Tim Felstrup

**B. Minutes**

Approve the minutes of August 22, 2012, as amended to reflect revised comments from Commission Meyer regarding Ashwood Park Townhomes and Walmart.

Motion by: Gustin  
Second by: William

Approved  
(7 to 0)

**C. Old Business**

**D. Public Hearings**

**D1.  
PZC Case 12-1-080  
Harter Subdivision**

The petitioner, Harter Investment Strategies, LLC, is requesting rezoning to E2 (Medium Density Estate District) upon annexation and approval of a preliminary/final plat of subdivision for the property at 24W255 Hobson Road.

Clint Smith, Planning Services Team, gave an overview of the request.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Herzog – confirmed that no variances are requested. Question raised in response to resident letter received.
- Frost – inquired about properties east of the subject property. Noted that those properties are approximately 2.5 acres and are unincorporated. Questioned why the City wouldn't recommend lot sizes consistent with those unincorporated properties. Smith clarified that our recommendations are based upon the Hobson Road Study recommendations, as well as the history of rezoning in the area. Smith also noted that no further subdivision of the property would be allowed

without a variance to the 90% rule.

Cynthia Tolan, Attorney, submitted the affidavit of notice to the PZC on behalf of the petitioner. The PZC indicated that a presentation from the attorney was not necessary (unless desired) given the straight forward nature of the case. No public speakers were present.

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of rezoning to E2 (Medium Density Estate District) upon annexation and approval of a preliminary/final plat of subdivision for the property at 24W255 Hobson Road.

Motion by: Trowbridge  
Seconded by: Williams

Approved  
(7 to 1)

Ayes: Coyne, Gustin, Herzog, Meyer, Messer, Trowbridge,  
Williams  
Nays: Frost

Commissioner Frost noted his dissenting vote was based upon the proposed E2 zoning. Frost noted his preference to maintain the existing large lot size pattern of the unincorporated properties located east of the subject property.

**D2.**  
**PZC Case 12-1-105**  
**Siena Construction**

The petitioner, Siena Construction, Inc., is requesting rezoning upon annexation to R1A (Low Density Single-Family Residence District) for the property located 5S425 Wright Street.

Clint Smith, Planning Services Team, gave an overview of the request.

Len Monson, Attorney, provided a brief presentation on behalf of the petitioner and noted that the requested case requires no variances.

**Public Testimony:**

Ted Kipping, 5S414 Wright Street noted concerns regarding the fact that upon annexation of this property, his property will be surrounded by City of Naperville incorporated property. Mr. Kipping also noted concerns regarding the City requiring connection of his property to City utilities. Mr. Kipping inquired as to whether notice would be given for the proposed building to be constructed on the site.

Chairman Herzog clarified that annexation will only be required if he chooses to annex. Staff clarified that City utilities are only available to incorporated properties. Staff noted that no additional public hearings are required unless the

proposed home requires a zoning variance.

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of rezoning upon annexation to R1A (Low Density Single-Family Residence District) for the property located 5S425 Wright Street.

Motion by: Gustin  
Seconded by: Trowbridge

Approved  
(8 to 0)

**D3.  
PZC Case 12-1-119  
Main St. Promenade  
Signage**

The petitioner, LFP Holdings, LLC, Yackley Holding Company, LLC and Block 418, LLC, is requesting sign variances for Main Street Promenade, Main Street Promenade West and Main Street Promenade East.

Tim Felstrup, Planning Services Team, gave an overview of the request.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Herzog required additional information regarding the proposed upper floor wall signage. Since no specific signage is proposed today, will approval of this variance allow them to put signs in any location they desire? Staff clarified that that the proposed wall signs will still comply with the size limitations, but more flexibility will be allowed in location on the façade.
- Gustin requested additional clarification regarding the upper floor wall sign variance. Gustin requested information regarding the length of wall which will project out beyond the existing Van Buren parking deck. Staff clarified that this wall will project out an additional 23’.
- Meyer – is the projecting sign problem consistent throughout the downtown? Staff noted that we became aware of the problem with the existing Main Street Promenade building.

Vince Rosanova, Attorney, 23 W. Jefferson Avenue, spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- Provided clarification regarding the upper floor tenant variance requested. Flexibility in sign location will allow the petitioner to avoid conflicts with architectural features on the building, such as windows.
- Walked through the existing conflict created by the presence of awnings blocking the size/location of blade signs allowed by code.
- Proposed variances will allow the development to be harmonious and cohesive, as well as comply with the recommendations of the *Naperville Downtown2030* plan.
- Provided additional information regarding the wall sign proposed on the east façade of Main Street Promenade East. Size requested in order to be visible; proposed sign includes design features to increase the aesthetics

of the sign and improve the otherwise blank masonry wall.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Gustin – describe what the buildings would look like if the large multi-tenant wall sign was not permitted. Do the proposed blade signs (size/location) present any safety concerns?
- Meyer – the subject property has no frontage on Washington, but visibility from this street would be desired.
- Frost – are the sidewalks adjacent to the Promenade particularly wide? This increased sidewalk clearance will help to make the proposed projecting signs more acceptable.
- Trowbridge – how often does the City allow a petitioner to reallocate their signage to other facades? Staff noted that this is typically only done in association with variance requests. Questioned why blade sign/awning conflict was not realized prior to installation? Petitioner noted that it was only apparent when installed in the field.
- Herzog – does not believe that the blade sign variance is needed. Supports moving the blade sign out further than 6” from the building, but feels that the proposed blade sign size is more targeted towards vehicles than pedestrians, as intended. Herzog noted that conflict is resulting from inconsistent awning size and location, but agrees that the blade signs should be shifted 18” from building to help with proportionality of sign to sign arm.
- Herzog – discomfort with language proposed for the upper floor tenant wall signage. Concern that all of the upper floor wall signs will be clustered at the building corners because these areas are the most visible. Staff noted that we would support a condition that prohibits clustering signs in these locations and instead evenly dispersing the signs over the entire façade.
- Herzog – believes that the proposed multi-tenant wall sign presents clutter and a potential safety hazard resulting from drivers looking at the sign while driving down Washington Street. Would be supportive of a sign that advertises the name of the development (Main Street Promenade), but not one that includes all of the tenant panels.
- Gustin – prefers multi-tenant wall sign vs. increased wall signs along remainder of facades. Gives consolidated point of signage for visitors coming into downtown and parking in deck. Supports staff’s recommendation regarding proposed blade signs.
- Frost – supports proposed blade signs because they will be proportionate to the existing arm.

Petitioner responded to Planning and Zoning Commission questions:

- With no multi-tenant wall sign, the remaining facades would maximize their allotted wall signage (which would constitute approximately 3 times more signage than exists today).
- Blade signs will be securely mounted to the building and will present no safety concerns.

- Promenade sidewalks have a 10' clear space.
- Clarified that the proposed blade signs will not be mounted higher than exists today. Clarified that tenant needs are driving the size/location of the requested blade signs.
- Dwight Yackley noted that the requested blade sign variance is not targeted towards vehicles, but instead is intended to capture the interest of pedestrians standing at the corners of the development, such that they can see all of the store signs for the overall development, thus drawing them down the block.
- Opperman, petitioner's architect, clarified why upper floor wall signage may shift noting architectural details such as clocks, mansard roofs.
- Ruth Yackley clarified intent of multi-tenant wall sign. It is important to future tenants that they have some visibility from Benton Street. They are trying to promote the importance of Benton/Main Street corner, as Van Buren/Main Street is the predominate corner today. This is a necessity to successfully lease the retail spaces located along Main Street north of Van Buren.

There were no public speakers present.

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

**Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:**

- Gustin – prefers multi-tenant wall signage over increased wall signs on other facades; supports a condition limiting shifting of upper floor wall signage to 20-30 feet and prohibiting clustering upper floor wall signage at visible corners; supports proposed blade signs.
- Coyne - supports all variances; the proposed signage leads to aesthetic improvement and helps to guide visitors. Supports conditions regarding placement of upper floor wall signage.
- Frost – concurs with Commissioner Coyne's comments.
- Messer – has no concerns regarding the upper floor wall signage variance provided that a restriction is place to prevent clustering of signage in most visible areas. Has no concerns regarding the proposed projecting signs. Likes idea of combining the signs as a multi-tenant sign, but the proposed size is too big and the property has no Washington frontage.
- Meyer – shares concerns that the upper floor wall signage variance could result in clustering of tenant signage in most visible areas and would like to place some restrictions on the wall signage variance. Doesn't see the problem with existing projecting signs and doesn't see how these buildings are any different than others in the downtown. Believes that the proposed multi-tenant wall signage is a slippery slope; visibility on Washington should be reserved for tenants on Washington. Would be supportive of a sign that advertises the name of the development (Main Street Promenade), but not one that includes all of the tenant panels.
- Trowbridge – has no concerns with requested variances. Monument sign is important for visitors to the downtown. Blade sign extension and size

makes sense. The request is reasonable.

- Williams – concurs with statements made by Trowbridge. Supports the multi-tenant wall sign in lieu of additional wall signs over the remainder of the building – this will help guide people to the stores without needing to drive around the building. All three variance requests are appropriate. Will support.
- Herzog – supports upper story wall sign variance with conditions requiring distribution of upper story wall signage to prevent sign cluster. With the additional information gained through discussion, is comfortable with proposed blade signs. Opposed to the proposed multi-tenant wall signage which will set a bad precedent. Supports a sign to identify the name of the development but not individual tenants.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of a variance to Section 5-4-9:1 to allow upper floor wall signs which are not located directly over the leased area, per staff's recommendation, and subject to the additional condition that these wall signs not be clustered in one location but be evenly dispersed over the facade.

Motion by: Williams  
Seconded by: Messer

Approved  
(8 to 0)

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of a variance to Section 5-4-9:1.2 (Projecting Signs) to allow blade signs up to eight square feet in size, projecting 6' from the building and exceeding the 6" distance requirement from the building façade, per staff's recommendation.

Motion by: Trowbridge  
Seconded by: Gustin

Approved  
(7 to 1)

Ayes: Frost, Coyne, Gustin, Herzog, Messer, Trowbridge,  
Williams  
Nays: Meyer

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of a variance to Section 5-4-9:1 to allow the proposed multi-tenant wall sign on the east wall of Main Street Promenade East, per the staff recommendation.

Motion by: William  
Seconded by: Gustin

Meyer moved to amend the main motion to stipulate that the proposed multi-tenant sign include only identification of the Main Street Promenade development and not include any tenant panels. Seconded by Herzog. Failed (3 to 5)

Ayes: Messer, Meyer, Herzog  
Nays: Frost, Coyne, Gustin, Trowbridge, Williams

Planning and Zoning Commission voted on the main motion. Approved  
(5 to 3)

Ayes: Frost, Coyne, Gustin, Trowbridge, Williams  
Nays: Messer, Meyer, Herzog

**H. Adjournment**

8:30 p.m.