



**NAPERVILLE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF JUNE 20, 2012**

**Call to Order**

**7: 00 p.m.**

**A. Roll Call**

Present: Bruno, Coyne, Frost, Gustin, Herzog, Messer, Meyer, Trowbridge, Williams  
Absent:  
Student Members: Kevin Wei  
Staff Present: Planning Team – Allison Laff, Ying Liu, Tim Felstrup, Clint Smith  
Engineer – Andy Hynes

**B. Minutes**

Approve the minutes of June 6, 2012 subject to the amendment that adding “due to losing 30+ parking spaces” to the fourth bullet point under “Planning and Zoning Discussion” on Page 3.

Motion by: Gustin  
Second by: Meyer

Approved  
(9 to 0)

**C. Old Business**

**D. Public Hearings**

**D1.  
PZC Case #12-1-075  
Speedway**

The petitioner proposes to replace the face panels on two existing, nonconforming monument signs without bringing the signs into compliance with the current monument-sign regulations. In order to replace the face panels and not bring the sign into compliance, the petitioner requests a sign variance.

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

- The red canopies are currently located on two of the existing three signs. One of the signs that have the red canopy is a conforming sign.
- The red canopies would be replaced with a shorter architectural limestone feature and the variance is not related to the height of the signs, but related to the non-conforming status of the signs.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Which signs have the red canopies?
- Whether the red canopies on the signs would be removed or replaced.
- Whether the variance takes the reduced height into consideration due to the removal of the canopies.
- Whether removal of the canopies should be a condition of approval for this sign variance. Staff agrees that the removal of the red canopies

should be a condition of approval.

**Public Testimony:** None

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- A variance to the size of the signs was previously granted for the property based on the traffic on the adjacent roads and the difficulty to see the signs. Is the petitioner seeking additional variances to the size of the signs? Staff confirmed no.

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

**Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:** None

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 12-1-075 for a sign variance from Section 5-4-13:1 to replace the face panels on two existing nonconforming signs located at 3004 Reflection Drive, subject to the condition that the existing red canopies on the two existing signs shall be removed.

Motion by: Trowbridge  
Seconded by: Gustin

Approved  
(9 to 0)

**D2.  
PZC Case #12-1-022  
Case Name  
FMC Dialysis Clinic**

The petitioner requests to revoke the existing Planned Unit Development (PUD), rezone the property from R1B (Medium Density Single-Family Residence District) to OCI (Office, Commercial, and Institutional District), and obtain approval of a preliminary/final plat of subdivision in order to construct an addition and operate a medical clinic.

Ying Liu, Planning Services Team, gave an overview of the request.

Stephen E. Bolirquein, Land Focus Consulting, spoke on behalf of the petitioner.

- Gave an overview of the request.

Chad Middendorf spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- Anticipates that 10-12 employees will work on 12 stations in the clinic.
- Due to long stay of patients, each station can typically accommodate two patients a day; therefore the total numbers of patients are low.
- A Certificate of Need has been obtained for the use.
- The clinic will typically open during normal business hours.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Whether a text amendment previously approved allows for medical offices along Washington Street.

- The nature and operations of the proposed clinic.
- Whether staff received any correspondence from the neighboring property owners. Staff indicated no.

**Public Testimony:** None

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

**Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:** None

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 12-1-022 to revoke the existing Planned Unit Development (PUD), rezone the property from R1B (Medium Density Single-Family Residence District) to OCI (Office, Commercial, and Institutional District), and approve a preliminary/final plat of subdivision in order to construct an addition and operate a medical clinic.

Motion by: Gustin  
Seconded by: Messer

Approved  
(9 to 0)

**D3.  
PZC Case #12-1-039  
Case Name  
Water Street District  
– North Phase/  
South Phase**

The petitioner is requesting approval of Final PUD Plats, Final Subdivision Plats, a conditional use for a hotel, a parking deviation, approval of a sign regulations package, and related deviations for the Water Street District - North Phase/South Phase.

Commissioner Bruno recused himself for this case due to a conflict of interest.

Allison Laff, Planning Services Team, gave an overview of the request.

Kathy West, Attorney with Dommermuth, Brestal, Cobine & West, Ltd., spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- Reviewed the background of the petitioner, MP Water District, LLC.
- The proposed parking deck is enclosed by commercial buildings on three sides with only one exposed façade.
- Site amenities are provided including a plaza, Riverwalk improvements, and an upper level boardwalk.
- The current proposal is largely consistent with the 2010 proposal.
- Proposed changes to the 2007 PUD include inclusion of 117 Water Street in the Loggia building, addition of a hotel, addition of a floor to the hotel building, conversion of condos to apartments and an increase in the number of residential units.
- The proposed hotel will be a Holiday Inn Express. A minimum of 130 rooms is required in order for the hotel to be economically feasible. The height of the building is increased by one floor in order to accommodate the 130 rooms that are necessary.

- The 5th and 6th floors of the hotel building are set back 7' from the front wall of the building.
- The traffic generation of the development is not significantly changed from the 2007 proposal.
- The proposed Riverwalk improvement continues to the east of Main Street.
- The parking deck itself is 70' tall, but the tower at the roof is 87' tall.

Mark Sullivan, Architect with Sullivan Goulette Wilson, spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- Reviewed the design intent and rationale for this project.
- A major consideration of the design is to engage pedestrian activities.
- The main tower element on the south side of Water Street links the south building to the Riverwalk and the north side of Water Street.
- Has reached out to the community.
- The stone towers are incorporated in order to create a rhythm of the different materials and break up the building façade.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about

- The number of required parking spaces for the commercial uses.
- Whether the code requirement for 1 parking space/room should be adjusted to the industry standard for 0.6 parking spaces/room for hotels. Staff indicated that each case should be reviewed on its own merits.
- Whether the parking variance is based on the specific type of hotel that is being proposed. Staff indicated that the parking study utilized comparable data specific to the size and type of the proposed hotel.
- Whether the proposed parking ratio of 1.5 spaces/unit would be still applicable if the apartments were to be converted to condos. Staff indicated that the code does not differentiate parking requirements for residential rental vs. ownership. Staff indicated that if more parking spaces are needed for the residential units, staff will work with the petitioner to reserve more spaces in the parking deck.
- How the reserved parking spaces for the apartments/hotel would be guaranteed.
- The total number of parking spaces as compared to previous proposals.
- Whether valet parking would be provided. The petitioner indicated yes, most likely for the hotel and restaurants.
- Whether additional parking spaces can be added to the basement of the garages.
- Whether staff has any concerns about changing the proposed condos to apartments. Staff indicated that there is no concern regarding the ownership structure of the residential units.
- How the development of this scale is consistent with the Water Street Vision Statement, which stated that that taller structures shall have a minimal impact on the surrounding area. Laff responded that the development is mostly surrounded by non-residential uses and is lower

in grade than the houses on Aurora Avenue, which mitigate the impact of the development on surrounding properties.

- Whether the apartments are intended for college rental similar to Naper Place. Laff clarified that the target market for the proposed apartments is young couples and seniors. The units are larger than Naper Place and also have designated parking spaces.
- Is concerned that the overhanging balconies would increase the bulk of the buildings in addition to the increased height.
- Is concerned about the south elevation of the garage which appears towering over the properties along Aurora Avenue and will be visible from a distance.
- What are the building materials for the south elevation of the garage. The petitioner indicated that the south elevation will utilize precast concrete products (form liners).
- Is concerned about the height of the hotel as viewed from the Riverwalk, which sits lower. The petitioner responded that people would not be able to see the hotel from the Riverwalk.
- Whether a rooftop garden would be included to soften the look of the hotel building.
- Whether the 90' tower on the hotel building can be lowered. The petitioner responded that the tower will be the demarcation for this development and cannot be lowered.
- How far the rooftop lounge will be setback from the cornice of the 6th floor of the hotel building. The petitioner indicated that the rooftop lounge will be set 15' back from the front wall of the 6th floor.
- The design of the parapet/guardrail for the rooftop dining area.
- Why the cornice of the 4th floor of hotel building doesn't follow the cornice line of the Northern Trust Building. The petitioner indicated that the 4th floor cornice line of the proposed building is lower than the Northern Trust Building and the 4th floor cornice line is carried throughout the Water Street development.
- Whether all of ground floor uses (with exception of the office building) are retail/restaurants.
- Whether the proposed brick color would match the Northern Trust Building.
- Is concerned that installing an additional traffic light at Aurora & Webster would result in more traffic back-up on Washington Street.
- Traffic impact of the project. Andy Hynes, Engineering Services Team, indicated that a comprehensive traffic study (SDTMS) was completed for the greater area in the vicinity of the subject property. The development represents some changes to the traffic study; however, the changes are not significant enough to change the result of the study.
- How vehicles will enter and exit the parking deck and the functions of the alley. Bryan Rieger, Engineer with V3 Companies of IL spoke on behalf of the petitioner and reviewed traffic movements associated with the garage.

- The location of the loading zone in the development.
- Whether it is possible to have a pedestrian bridge or underpass connecting to Naper Settlement.
- Whether pedestrians can access the elevators through the alley.
- The location of the bike racks.
- What is the vision for the signage proposal along Riverwalk. How will the canopies be lit? Bruno Bottarelli, with Marquette Companies, reviewed the signage proposal for the Riverwalk including awning signs, blade signs, and wall signs. The awnings will be lit by shepherd crook external lights.

**Public Testimony:**

Dan Avjean, a Naperville resident, spoke in support of the development:

- The project completes the Riverwalk.

Kathy Benson, a Naperville resident, spoke against the development:

- Recognizes that the hotel is a highly desirable use.
- Is concerned about the density of the development and the height of the buildings.
- An updated shadow study should be done to reflect the increased height.
- Appreciates the increased alley width, but feels the width is still not sufficient.
- The proposed parking ratio for the hotel (0.6 spaces/room) would be insufficient if taking the restaurant/bar and employee parking into consideration.
- Valet parking should not use parking spaces designated for the hotel.
- Requests a comparison of the available public parking spaces in the original plans and the current plans.

Bob Fischer, representing the Naperville Homeowners Confederation, spoke against the development:

- The development is far too dense.
- Is concerned about traffic congestion resulting from the development and feels that converting 30 condos to 60 apartments would only amplify the traffic problem.
- The tall buildings as proposed will canyonize Water Street and intrude upon the Riverwalk.
- The overhang canopies are not appropriate along the Riverwalk.
- The bulk of the hotel building has been significantly increased.
- The proposed box sign on the hotel tower is neither appropriate nor necessary.
- Doesn't agree with the parking variances.
- Supports the elimination of the sky bridge and widening of the alley.
- Will there be sufficient revenue generation from the TIF.
- This development is not beneficial to the city.

Barb Enwright, a Naperville resident, spoke:

- How the noise generated from the rooftop bar/restaurant would impact the residential area south of Aurora.
- Requests restricting valet parking from the neighborhood streets.

Thom Higgins, a Naperville resident, spoke against the development:

- Is against narrowing the right-of-way from 66' to 57'.
- Compares the proposed sidewalks along Water Street to the sidewalk in front of the Gap store.
- Believes that pedestrian experience will be compromised with the reduced right-of-way width.

Anissa Olley, a Naperville resident, spoke against the development:

- The 2010 proposal was never approved by the City Council. Therefore, the commission should compare the 2012 proposal with the 2007 proposal.

Dick Furstenau, a Naperville resident, spoke against the development:

- Believes that Water Street is not an appropriate location for a hotel.
- Believes that apartments need 2 parking spaces per unit.
- As part of the TIF, the Township parking lot will be removed and some spaces will be reserved in the parking deck close to the Township building. The petitioner and staff clarified there were a lot of discussion regarding the Township parking lot. However, nothing has been finalized.
- Some of the upper level setbacks were removed in the current proposal.
- Is concerned with the overhanging balconies along the Riverwalk and how they will impact the Riverwalk aesthetically.
- Suggests a height comparison drawing to illustrate the increased heights in the current proposal.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- How to prevent residents and hotel guests from parking in the public spaces in the garage. Staff indicated overnight parking is not permitted in existing city decks.
- Noted that the Township employees will be able to utilize the parking deck as well.
- Whether there would be limitation for 3-hour parking in the deck.
- How parking would be handled if the hotel is booked. The petitioner indicated that they anticipate that there will be excess parking for the apartments, which will serve as overflow parking for the hotel.
- Age brackets and parking ratio of the River Place development. Nick Ryan, with Marquette Companies, indicated that the River Place development has a parking ratio of 1.01 spaces per unit.
- Whether there will be any banquet space in the hotel. The petitioner

- indicated there will be meeting rooms but no banquet facility.
- Whether truck traffic will utilize the alley. The petitioner indicated no.
- A summary of the height changes to the buildings. The petitioner indicated that the height of the Loggia and Theatre buildings have not changed from the 2007 plan. The hotel building has increased from 83' to 90'. The height of the garage has increased slightly.
- Whether a variance is required for the box sign of the hotel. Staff indicated that a variance might be needed for the size and the location of the sign.
- Suggests red brick to serve as the background of the black box sign.

**Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:** None

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to continue the case to July 18, 2012 and requested the following additional information:

- A summary of the signage variances including the size for each of the known sign.
- A rendering of the Riverwalk signage.
- A summary of the calculations and the number of parking spaces that will be available to the public from outside of the Water Street overall development as well as a comparison of the numbers to the 2007 proposal.
- Information about the TIF agreement as it relates to parking.
- A rendering looking down Water Street to illustrate the overhanging balconies, the canyon effect, and cornice height.
- Revised FAR taking the balconies into consideration.
- Requests the petitioner to consider lowering the height of the tower.

**D4.  
PZC Case #12-1-070  
1150 Muirhead Ave.**

The petitioner requests approval of a variance from Section 6-6B-7 (R1B Medium Density Single-Family Residence District: Yard Requirements) and Section 6-9-2:4.2 (Off-Street Parking Facilities) of the Municipal Code to allow construction of a bus drop-off facility in the required 30' front yard setback for the property.

Ying Liu, Planning Services Team, gave an overview of the request

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about

- The hardship of the case. Staff indicated that the variance is requested based on the hardship that there is not a good location behind the 30' setback line to accommodate a bus drop-off lane.
- Safety is also a consideration to support the variance.

**Public Testimony:** None

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

**Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:** None

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 12-1-070 for a variance from Section 6-6B-7 (R1B Medium Density Single-Family Residence District: Yard Requirements) and Section 6-9-2:4.2 (Off-Street Parking Facilities) of the Municipal Code to allow construction of a bus drop-off facility in the required 30' front yard setback for the property.

Motion by: Meyer  
Seconded by: Williams

Approved  
(9 to 0)

**E. Reports and  
Recommendations**

**F. Correspondence**

**G. New Business**

**H. Adjournment**

10: 40 p.m.