



**NAPERVILLE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
FINAL MINUTES OF MAY 15, 2013**

**UNOFFICIAL PRIOR TO PZC APPROVAL
APPROVED BY PZC ON JUNE 5, 2013**

Call to Order

7:00 p.m.

A. Roll Call

Present: Bruno, Coyne, Dabareiner, Frost, Gustin, Hastings, Messer, Williams
Absent: Meyer
Student Members: Meghan Heavener
Staff Present: Planning Team – Ying Liu, Tim Felstrup
Engineer – Andy Hynes

B. Minutes

Approve the minutes of May 1, 2013 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting subject to modifications.

Motion by: Williams
Second by: Messer

Approved
(8 to 0)

C. Old Business

D. Public Hearings

D1.

**PZC 13-1-015
Goldfish Swim
School Sign**

The petitioner requests that the public hearing be continued to the June 5, 2013 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

Planning and Zoning Commission continued the public hearing to June 5, 2013.

D2.

**PZC 13-1-025
1309 Margate Ct.**

The petitioner, Leroy and Debra Klimek, requests a variance from Section 6-6A-7:1 (R1A Low Density Single-Family Residence District: Yard Requirements) of the Naperville Municipal Code to reduce the 30' rear yard setback requirement in order to construct a roofed screened porch at a distance of 20' from the rear lot line for the property located at 1309 Margate Circle.

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

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Is the rear wall of the home at the 30' setback line? Felstrup responded that the rear wall is close but is in compliance with the rear setback requirement.

Leroy and Debra Klimek, owner and petitioner, spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- Klimek's gave an overview of the request.
- The petitioner has not heard any opposition from the neighbors.

Public Testimony: None

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:

- Bruno – The request fulfills the standards for granting a variance.
- Coyne – Will be supporting this project.
- Dabareiner – The location of the house is less than optimal which contributes to the hardship of the property. The existing landscaping in the rear would help screen the addition.
- Frost – Will be supporting this project.
- Gustin – Will be supporting this project.
- Hastings – Will be supporting this.
- Messer – The property is an oddly shaped lot. The petitioner will be covering an existing improvement. Will be supporting the project.
- Williams – There is a hardship associated with the property. The request is reasonable.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 13-1-025,

Motion by: Williams
Seconded by: Messer

Approved
(8 to 0)

**D3.
PZC 13-1-030
725 Willow Road**

The petitioner requests approval of a variance from Section 6-6A-7 (R1A: Yard Requirements) to reduce the 8' interior side yard setback requirement to 5.78' in order to construct a second car garage addition on the property located at 725 Willow Road.

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

Douglas Davis, owner and petitioner, spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- The petitioner showed pictures of the subject property and a cross-section of the addition.
- The garage addition doesn't change the style of the house.

Public Testimony: None

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:

- Bruno – I will support the case.
- Coyne – The request is reasonable.
- Frost – Will support the project subject to the condition that the deck be removed.
- Dabareiner – The property meets one of the standards for granting a variance as the one-car garage cannot yield a reasonable return for the owner. I also agree that the deck on the adjacent property should be removed.
- Gustin – There is a unique hardship on the property. The house faces Diane but the address is on Willow. The petitioner may have enough room on the west side of the home, but the existing garage is on the south side.
- Hastings – A two-car garage is necessary. I will support the case and will be also okay for them to keep the deck.
- Messer – Will support this project.
- Williams – A two-car garage is necessary. I will support the case.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 13-1-030.

Motion by: Messer
Seconded by: Williams

Approved
(8 to 0)

**D4.
PZC Case 13-1-020
Ashwood Pointe**

The petitioner, Pulte Home Corporation, requests rezoning from R1A (Low Density Single-family Residence District) and R3A (Medium Density Multifamily Residence District) to R2 (Single-Family and Low Density Multifamily Residence District) and approval of a preliminary subdivision plat for Ashwood Pointe, a final subdivision plat for Ashwood Pointe Phase 1A and a final subdivision plat for Ashwood Pointe Phase 1B in order to develop 238 single-family lots on the property generally located west of 248th Avenue and south of Wolf's Crossing Road.

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

- The petitioner has requested to eliminate the requirement for a berm in the Normantown Road right-of-way and indicated that the Forest Preserve District, whose land this berm will be located on, doesn't agree with the requirement. Staff would like to seek the Commission's input on this topic.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Has the Forest Preserve District provided a letter regarding their position

on the berm? Liu indicated no.

- Is the Normantown Road right-of-way improved? Liu indicated that the Normantown Road right-of-way is not improved and will be vacated with development of the subject property.
- Is there a berm on the adjacent properties? Liu responded that the berm south of the subject property hasn't been fully constructed since the developments adjacent to the berms have not been completed. But the expectation is that a berm be built along the entire Normantown Road right-of-way as development occurs.
- What is the difference in unit number between the current and original plans? Liu stated that the original plan had 340 townhome and duplex units and the current proposal has 238 single family units.

John Philipchuck, Attorney with Dommermuth, Cobine, West, Gensler, Philipchuck, Corrigan & Bernhard, Ltd., Peter Pluwska, Cemcon Ltd., Matt Worline, Vice President of Cemcon, Ltd., Greg Sagen, the Signature Design Group, spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- Philipchuck gave an overview of the request. The Park District and School District both agree with the proposed project. There is a 400' distance between the proposed homes and the Canadian National railroad. Pulte has agreed to plant a row of shrubs between the homes and the Forest District's property, which will provide a visual barrier for the railroad. The berm is not necessary.
- Pluskwa gave an overview of the subdivision design and layout.
- Worline gave an overview of the proposed drainage system and the benefits of the system to the properties in the area.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Who will construct the community park? Pluskwa indicated that the Park District will improve the park.
- How will this development affect the engineering of adjacent parcels? Pluskwa responded that Ashwood Park North Unit 4 currently has approved engineering plans, and the parcel southeast of the site is currently zoned R1A with a plan for a church.
- What are the concerns from the homeowners in Pheasant Ridge? Worline indicated that Pulte has had meetings with the homeowners in Pheasant Ridge. They were pleased to see this project and understood the benefits of the project to help with flood control in the Pheasant Ridge subdivision.
- Can you address the issues brought up in an opposition email from Melissa Dunn? Philipchuck indicated that Dunn had incorrect information since the proposed project would reduce the residential density on the subject property, not increasing it.
- How will the home design look as they compare with the surrounding areas? Liu responded there is no architectural design requirement for single-family homes.
- How many lanes 248th Avenue will be improved to? Hynes indicated

that 248th Avenue will be a 5 lane road.

- Is there going to be a safety concern without the berm? Philipchuck responded that not having a berm would actually be safer as people would have a clear sight to see the railroad.

Public Testimony:

Doug Hidad, with the Tall Grass Homeowners Association, spoke in support of the project:

- The Tall Grass HOA is in support of the development.
- The HOA has some concerns about the buffering along 248th Avenue, and which schools students from the subdivision will go to?
- Sagen, on behalf of the petitioner, gave an overview of the proposed berming and landscaping along 248th Avenue and the North Perimeter Road. The proposed landscaping along 248th Street is outside of the 248th Avenue right-of-way and won't be impacted by future road widening in the right-of-way.

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:

- Bruno – This is a great project. The proposed stormwater system will increase the value of the subject property and adjacent properties. I don't see a need for the berm.
- Williams – This is a marvelous project. I don't see a need for a berm. I think the horseshoe section of the subdivision is a little crowded and recommend the petitioner to take another look at it.
- Coyne – The development only looks cramped on the plan, but in reality, their lot sizes are sufficient. I am glad that the density is being reduced and there is minimum objection from the neighboring properties. The berm is an annexation issue and I don't see a need for it.
- Dabareiner – I am pleased to see the reduction in density and well-designed stormwater system. I don't see a need for the berm.
- Frost – I am very pleased to see that the density is being reduced and the storm water design has been approved by staff. I don't think the berm is necessary since the Forest District doesn't want the berm and the homes will be buffered by landscaping.
- Gustin – This is a wonderful development. The market is dictating the housing type in the area. I would recommend the petitioner reconsider the design of the horseshoe area if possible.
- Hastings – I would ask that the petitioner consider Ms. Dunn's concerns and further reduce the density of the project. The berm is a non-issue. I am happy to hear the support from the Tall Grass HOA and will support the project.
- Messer – I am pleased with the reduced density and hydrology. I don't see a need for a berm.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 13-1-020.

Motion by: Williams
Seconded by: Hastings

Approved
(8 to 0)

E. Reports and Recommendations

F. Correspondence

G. New Business

G1 PZC Case 13-1-036 Training Studios & Automotive Uses

Title 6 currently includes regulations pertaining to training studios and automotive uses. Staff requests that the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) initiate an amendment to review the allowances for such uses in various zoning districts, as well as consider corresponding amendments to the definition and parking requirements for each.

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

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Frost - Can staff also address signage related to Industrial properties in this text amendment? Liu indicated that any issues related to signage in the industrial district will be addressed when staff works on the comprehensive sign code amendment in this fiscal year. Staff would prefer to limiting this proposed text amendment to Title 6.
- Gustin - Do we have a defined term for automobile facilities? Liu stated that in the code the term for auto repair uses is automobile service station and repair facility.
- Frost expressed concerns with some of the existing industrial properties containing incompatible uses and noted that the proposed amendment is necessary to address the situation.
- Bruno stated that the recent high vacancy in industrial buildings may not be the norm. The next five years may be different as economic conditions improve. We should be careful in maintaining a balance between addressing the issues related to training studios and protecting industrial land.
- Bruno – It seems that the Commission has limited input on staff's recommendation when it comes to text amendments. Liu stated that staff will be developing a recommendation to the Commission and it is the within the Commission's purview to review staff recommendation and proposed modifications to it. The Commission can also approve staff's recommendation with conditions or not to approve it. Staff's recommendation is not intended to limit the Planning and Zoning Commission's input, but to provide information to help the

Commission's review and discussion.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to initiate the text amendment.

Motion by: Frost
Seconded by: Williams

Approved
(8 to 0)

H. Adjournment

9:00 p.m.