

**MINUTES  
NAPERVILLE PLAN COMMISSION  
January 20, 2010 - 7:00 P.M. – COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

<b>Call to Order</b>		<u>Time:</u> (7:00pm)	
<b>A. Roll Call</b> Commissioners:		<u>Present:</u> Mike Brown, Chairman Ann Edmonds, Vice Chairman Patty Gustin, Secretary John Herzog Paul Meschino Timothy Messer Patricia Meyer Reynold Sterlin Janet Trowbridge	<u>Yes</u> X X X X X X X X X
Student Members:		Thomas Stancey Kelsey Stimple	X X
	*Chairman Brown Abstained Due to Conflict of Interest in PC Case 09-1-186		
Staff Present:	Community Planner – Amy Emery Project Engineer – Andy Hynes Project Assistant – Dina Hagen		
<b>B. Approve Minutes</b> 1/6/2009	Motion to approve by: Trowbridge Seconded by: Herzog		Approved (8 to 0)
<b>C. Old Business</b>	None		
<b>D. Public Hearings</b>			
<b>PC 09-1-186</b> <b>204-226 W. Van Buren</b>	Petitioner: Simper Fi Properties, LLC, 204 W. Van Buren Avenue, Naperville, Illinois 60540 Location: Southwest corner of Van Buren and Webster  Request: The petitioner requests approval of a preliminary/final plat of subdivision with associated variances to combine four lots (1.008 acres) zoned Transitional Use (TU) into a single, legal lot of record and construct a 3-story, 24-unit residential condominium building.  (Published in the Naperville Wednesday, December 30, 2009)		
	<b>Staff Presentation:</b> Community Planner Amy Emery presented an overview of the case noting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff continues to work with the petitioner to finalize the landscape plan. It is hoped that tree species can be selected that will eliminate the need for the required variance to reduce the number of parkway trees.</li> <li>• The variance requested for the required rear setback is for the accommodation of screening wall around the electric transformer. This wall compliments the building façade in its design and material. The building itself is fully</li> </ul>		

	<p>compliant with the city's rear setback requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The variance requested for the reduction in lot area is to allow for 24-units to be built on the property. 12-units are allowed by the TU zoning.</li> <li>• Several letters of support for the project have been received since the agenda was distributed. Copies of all correspondence were provided on the dias for Plan Commission consideration.</li> </ul>	
	<p><b>Petitioners Presentation:</b> Attorney Russ Whitaker of Rosanova &amp; Whitaker, Ltd. (23 W. Jefferson, Suite 200 Naperville, Illinois 60540) representing the petitioner gave an overview of the proposed project. During his presentation he noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project is one building but has three (3) segments that can be developed in three (3) separate phases.</li> <li>• Special attention has been focused on outdoor living spaces with a central courtyard and a roof plan which includes private rooftop decks as well as common roof top areas.</li> <li>• A traffic study for the project resulted in five (5) additional vehicles during peak hours, which is a three percent (3%) increase of traffic.</li> <li>• Proposed Webster and Van Buren streetscape improvements are consistent with the Downtown Comprehensive Plan.</li> <li>• Although the Downtown Comprehensive Plan recommends only residential use in the project area; the TU zoning district allows for multi-family mixed use between downtown commercial areas adjoining residential neighborhoods. As such, the site could be developed with first floor office uses and upper story retail.</li> <li>• The developer is seeking a lot area variance in order to maintain a completely residential project that would offer 2,500 square foot units, consistent with their market study completed for the project, instead of larger residential units with commercial space in the lower level of the building.</li> <li>• Prior to the Plan Commission Public Hearing, the developer has reached out to neighboring property owners as well as other interested citizens. Meetings were also held with School District 203 and Naperville Park District representatives. Feedback received has been positive.</li> <li>• Developer is also participating in upcoming meetings with the Downtown Advisory Commission as discussions are held relative to the update of the Downtown Comprehensive Plan.</li> </ul> <p>Chuck Bokar (204 W. Van Buren), owner and developer of the subject property, conveyed his vision for the site as a means of sharing the unique lifestyle and amenities available to those who live in downtown Naperville. Mr. Bokar currently lives on the property and will live in the proposed development. It is his experience as a Downtown Naperville resident that motivated him to pursue this project.</p>	

	<p><b>Public Testimony:</b> The following individuals provided testimony:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paul Junkroski, 180 W. Benton Ave., Unit 304, Naperville</li> <li>• Sid Scott, 117 S. Eagle Street, Naperville</li> <li>• Michael Boomgarden, 308 Big Rail Drive, Naperville</li> <li>• Rick Hitchcock, 1130 Omaha Court, Naperville (Owner of 221 &amp; 225 W. Jefferson Ave)</li> <li>• Kathy Benson, 51 Forest Avenue, Naperville</li> <li>• Michelle Zajac, 221 W. Benton Avenue, Naperville</li> </ul> <p>Notable comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compliments about the architectural design and the opinion that the project will fit well within Downtown Naperville and add to the draw of the downtown</li> <li>• Positive effect of the proposal on the tax rolls</li> <li>• Opinion that the proposal meets the intent of the TU zoning and offers a transition between the downtown core and outlying residential area</li> <li>• Support for the access being restricted to Webster to limit traffic impact on negative Van Buren Avenue and Eagle Street</li> <li>• Questions about how the project will impact existing infrastructure</li> <li>• Questions about the plans for phasing of the construction and how that will translate on the landscape</li> <li>• Concern about the height of the building being intrusive to the surrounding residential homes</li> <li>• Concern about the extent of the density variance required</li> <li>• Concerns about how notification was completed for the meetings facilitated by the developer</li> </ul>	
	<p><b>Plan Commission Questions / Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commissioners Meschino and Gustin asked for a definition of TU and questioned the intent of the TU zoning as it pertained to the Downtown Comprehensive Plan.</li> <li>• Commissioner Edmonds inquired as to staff's position on the requested lot area variance. Ms. Emery stated that residential use is appropriate for the site and that although the size of the building complies with all TU setback requirements, staff believes the building footprint and scale is more similar to development in the Downtown Core. Staff has suggested the applicant petition for B5 zoning which would eliminate the need for the requested variance.</li> <li>• Commissioner Meschino asked if any economic review was done by city staff. Ms. Emery stated that staff's purview would be the use of the land as guided by the Downtown Plan. Attorney Whitaker stated that a market study had been.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Commissioner Meyer sought information about the building height.  Attorney Whitaker responded that the height to the roof deck is at 40-feet and the cornice is three-foot two-inches (3'2") for a total of 43-feet 2-inches. The height of the elevator shaft is 50 feet. The code allows cornice and elevator shafts to extend above the roof deck height.</li><li>• Commissioner Edmonds and Meyer sought clarification about the parkway tree landscape variance. Ms. Emery indicated the petitioner is requesting to reduce the spacing of the parkway trees from the code standard of every 40-feet to every 20-feet. The City Forester has suggested that the spacing remain at 40-feet and up to half of the proposed parkway trees be omitted. The petitioner is working with the City Forrester to select species that will accommodate the desired spacing without reducing the number of trees.  Geoff Roehll of Hitchcock Design (221 W. Jefferson Avenue, Naperville, Illinois 60540) also commented that due to the setback requirements for site distances from the intersection of Van Buren and Webster, reducing the spacing between trees is necessary and the landscaping is designed to avoid encroachment while keeping the maximum amount of trees.</li><li>• Commissioner Meschino received confirmation from Attorney Whitaker that that the underground stormwater management will meet city code and county requirements as well as approval through a review process by city engineers.</li><li>• Commissioner Gustin received confirmation from staff that the available parking exceeds the required spaces of two (2) per unit. She also questioned "whether or not there is a green incentive for the rooftops or if there will be some evaluation done with respect to having it be green on the rooftop verses having asphalt up on top."</li><li>• Commissioner Edmonds requested additional information regarding the aforementioned market study.  Rob Getz of V3 Companies (7325 Jane Avenue, Woodridge, Illinois 60517) indicated that a study of demographics, market comparables, economics and social issues was completed. A focus group study was also done with area realtors to help determine what the Naperville market group is looking for.</li><li>• Commissioner Herzog inquired of the study results with</li></ul>	
--	---	--

	<p>respect to the marketability of ground floor units. Mr. Getz responded that the first floor units have been designed to be a half story above the sidewalk level to maintain privacy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Commissioner Herzog questioned the access of the building if it were to be built in three (3) segments as well how rooftop access was to be obtained. He expressed concern about the height, visibility and style of roof access structures.</li></ul> <p>Architect Brian Kidd of Pappageorgehaymes Partners (814 N. Franklin Street Chicago, Illinois 60654) stated that while the unit designs have not been completed, the intent for the optional rooftop decks would be to push the access to the interior of the project to provide less visibility from the street.</p> <p>Attorney Whitaker added that any structure providing rooftop access would comply with height requirements as well as any screening requirements for rooftop structures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Commissioner Meyer inquired as to any requirements for lighting on the rooftop decks. Ms. Emery indicated that the city code standards for photometrics would be applicable. Attorney Whitaker added that the development would meet all photometric requirements.</li><li>• Commissioner Meyer also indicated a desire to see any marketing renderings of the rooftop decks to get a better idea of what to expect of the usage.</li><li>• Commissioner Sterlin inquired whether or not the developer would consider adding elevators for roof access in lieu walkup structures. Mr. Kidd responded that the concept was to provide private access from the individual units for the residents.</li><li>• Commissioner Herzog requested that the petitioner submit revised renderings of the rooftop structures showing an effort to cluster them together and making them architecturally similar looking to an elevator bank.</li><li>• Commissioner Edmonds inquired as to the monitoring of the project with respect to the building stages. Ms. Emery indicated that the standard is based on the City's Design Guidelines to assure a four (4) sided building with completed landscaping; adding that requirements would need to met with regards to the city's infrastructure as well.</li><li>• Commissioner Trowbridge received assurance that a phased building approach would require compliance with the City's teardown requirements and regulations.</li></ul>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commissioner Messer questioned the attendance of the public at the other meetings facilitated by the developer before the Public Hearing. Attorney Whitaker responded that one (1) person attended the resident meeting.</li> <li>• Commissioner Messer also stated that he would like to see a comparison of nearby heights from the rooftop deck and parapets as well as FAR calculations. Ms. Emery clarified that the requested comparison for height would include the height of the roof deck, the parapet and the distinction between both. She informed the commission that there are no FAR requirements in the TU and residential districts.</li> </ul>	
	<p>Vice Chair Edmonds upon commission consensus continued the meeting to February 17, 2010 with a request for the following deliverables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Market Study</li> <li>• Traffic Study</li> <li>• Revised rooftop renderings showing roof access</li> <li>• FAR calculations</li> <li>• Comparison of nearby building heights (to roof deck and parapet)</li> <li>• Clarifications of the photometric standards</li> </ul>	
<b>E. Reports</b>	None	
<b>F. Correspondence</b>	None	
<b>G. New Business</b>	None	
<b>H. Adjournment</b>	<p><b><u>Motion to Adjourn:</u></b>          Motion by: Trowbridge          Seconded by: Herzog</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Time: 9:03pm</b></p>	<p>Approved          ( 8 to 0)</p>