



**NAPERVILLE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF JUNE 8, 2011**

Call to Order

7:02 p.m.

A. Roll Call

Present: Bruno, Messer, Herzog, Meyer, Edmonds
Absent: Gustin, Trowbridge
Student Members: Wallace
Staff Present: Planning Team – Forystek
Code Enforcement – Terreberry
Engineer – Louden

B. Minutes

Approve the minutes of May 18, 2011

Correct p.3 under PC 11-1-052, add Edmonds concurrence
with Herzog.

Approved
(5 to 0)

Motion by: Meyer
Second by: Herzog

C. Old Business

D. Public Hearings

Planning and Zoning Commission continued NAR Business Park (PC# 11-1-050) to June 22, 2011.

**D1. 11-1-055
Harvest Bible
Chapel**

The petitioner proposes to install a 204 square-foot banner on the east elevation of the building, which already has a 227.5 square-foot wall sign, and exceed the maximum square footage of wall signage allowed on the elevation. In order to install the banner and exceed the maximum square footage allowed for wall signs, the petitioner requests a variance from Section 5-4-5:1.2 (Commercial Signs; Wall Signs; Wall Sign Area) of the Naperville Municipal Code for the property located at 1805 High Point Drive.

Trude Terreberry, Code Enforcement Team, gave an overview of the request.

- A banner is proposed to be displayed on the building through October 2011.
- A variance is required because the total square footage will exceed the allowances made in the sign regulations.

Russ Whitaker, Rosanova & Whitaker, 23 W. Jefferson Avenue, Suite 200, spoke on behalf of the petitioner.

- The building abuts I-88 right-of-way and has access from High Point

Drive.

- Harvest Bible has weekly services and offers programs, as well as housing office space within the building. The use brings significant traffic to the area which generates sales tax revenue.
- The proposed banner will advertise service times to people traveling on I-88 in order to identify the building as a church and attract patrons.
- Wall signs are permitted on all four sides of the building; however, the north and south elevations are not the most effective sign locations.
- Signage that would otherwise be permitted on the north elevation would be moved to the east elevation. The proposed variance will allow the petitioner to test sign visibility.
- The location of the north façade adjacent to the I-88 right-of-way is a hardship because it is not set far back.
- Petitioner does not believe that there will be negative impacts associated with the signage.
- Petitioner agrees not to install electronic message signage so long as the banner sign is up. A monument sign is planned for late 2011 or 2012.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about

- Whether the banner would be removed by November 1 and what type of signage would go in its place.
- Whether banners on the front of the building are permitted.
- How the petitioner has demonstrated hardship given three alternate options to locate the sign on the north side, install monument signs on the north side or put up a temporary sign on the northeast corner facing I-88.
- The process for a temporary use as opposed to a variance.
- Why the church would not pursue a permitted sign that is just as visible.

Public Testimony:

No members of the public provided testimony.

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:

- Bruno – believes that the request is associated with a practical difficulty and that the height of the building also justifies the increased signage, as it will represent an overall lower proportion of the façade. Also finds the request acceptable as the sign is temporary in nature.
- Messer – will support the variance because it is temporary in nature.
- Meyer – concurs with Commissioner Herzog but will support the request due to the temporary nature of the sign.
- Herzog – the petitioner has not demonstrated a hardship as there are multiple alternate signage options that would be permitted. Feels that a temporary variance to test signage is a bad precedent. The impact to the community is that more signage than is necessary is being installed.
- Edmonds – is not concerned about a precedent as variances are

considered case-by-case. Believes that the conditions for a variance are met, as the sign will not impact the surrounding area. Feels comfortable that the sign is temporary in nature and that the petitioner will defer installing other permitted signage until the temporary sign is removed.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PC 11-1-055, Harvest Bible Chapel, requesting a variance for signage as set forth in the June 8, 2011 memo with the additional condition that the petitioner will not erect or install any permitted signage on the property until the temporary banner is removed.

Motion by: Bruno
Seconded by: Meyer

Approved
(4 to 1)

Ayes: Bruno, Messer, Meyer, Edmonds
Nays: Herzog

**D1. 11-1-056
Brighton Car Wash**

The petitioner requests approval of a conditional use to construct a ground-mounted small wind energy system in the B3 (General Commercial) District for Brighton Car Wash, PC 11-1-056.

Katie Forystek, Planning Services Team, gave an overview of the request.

- Petitioner proposes to install a wind turbine 32.5' in height.
- The proposed turbine complies with all setback, color, height and performance standards of the Zoning Regulations.
- The proposed turbine furthers the intent of the Zoning Regulations by furthering renewable energy in the city.
- If there are future concerns about compliance with performance standards staff may request additional information or conduct field observations.

Jennifer Loudon, Engineering Services Team, discussed traffic accident history in the vicinity of Millbrook and 75th Street

- The traffic situation is attributable to the proximity to the intersection of 75th Street and Plainfield-Naperville Road.
- Most accidents result from stop-and-go traffic and extended queuing. No traffic-related injuries were noted.

Mark Sullivan, Sullivan Energy Group, 1752 Marilyn Drive, Montgomery IL spoke on behalf of Brighton Car Wash,

- The proposed turbine at Brighton Car Wash is 1kW.
- The unit is aesthetically pleasing and not noisy.
- The blades will be 8'10" and the diameter will be 5' 8".
- Noise data is derived from independent third party testing in accordance with industry standards.
- The turbine has received UL 1731 certification to allow for the turbine to tie into the electric grid.

- The petitioner originally wanted a larger unit however a smaller unit was selected due to the height restrictions. Although a taller tower would be preferred, wind speeds observed at the site are expected to accommodate some energy production.
- A 1kW unit will produce up to 1500-3500 kWh per year depending on wind speeds.
- Energy that is produced by the unit will go directly into the grid and will not be stored on-site.
- The petitioner already has solar and geothermal facilities on-site.

Jason Morin, 1532 Sequoia Road, general manger at Brighton Car Wash discussed the turbine and proposed energy savings.

- Energy consumption has been reduced by almost 50% due to measures taken to date. Additional energy savings projected as a four-year average.
- The pending Naperville Greener Business Program Grant and grants from the State of Illinois and Federal Government reduce the cost of the turbine to about \$8-9k, and expects to have a payback period of 6-8 years for the turbine.
- The turbine will be painted white and will blend with surroundings, it will be a distraction.
- The petitioner has spoken with various neighbors regarding the proposed turbine and existing solar facilities, and believes that the renewable energy installations are a statement about the need to reduce fossil fuel consumption and generate energy on-site.
- The solar installation on the site has far exceeded initial expectations.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about

- The extent to which the wind turbine complies with the performance standards.
- The source from which noise data and energy savings data is derived.
- The maximum height by which a ground-mounted turbine can exceed roof height.
- A reference point for sound, what does 60 decibels sound like?
- How many traffic accidents have occurred in the vicinity of the subject property.
- The dimensions and finishes of the turbine and whether they comply with the zoning requirements.
- How many turbines of this model have been installed.
- Confirmed that data regarding the turbine is published and publicly available.
- Whether the petitioner believes the siting for the turbine is an efficient location.

Public Testimony:

Mike Perkins, 915 Havenshire Court – does not believe that any economic benefit will be derived from the turbine and stated that the turbine will not be efficient due to proximity to the building. Concerned about traffic distraction. Neighbors do not want to see the turbine in this location.

Petitioner responded to testimony

- Small wind turbines produce less noise and present fewer safety concerns as transmission lines are not connected.

Planning and Zoning Commission requested additional information:

- The petitioner should present data to show the benefit of the proposed turbine.
- Data sources for sound/noise should be provided.
- Data for power generation should also be provided along with the wind speed data for what has been collected on the subject property.
- Specific information for the proposed turbine model should also be forwarded.

Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:

- Bruno – expressed concern about drivers being distracted, causing an increased number of accidents due to the distance to the street (appx. 90’).
- Herzog – does not believe that the benefits of the proposed installation outweigh the detriment (aesthetics, traffic distraction and noise). Believes that the question of cost savings is tied to the benefit.
- Edmonds – the ordinance does not require the petitioner to demonstrate savings or any minimum level of energy production and return on investment is not within the Plan Commission’s purview.

Planning and Zoning Commission continued this matter to July 6, 2011.

**D1. 11-1-035
Bieniek Subdivision**

The petitioner requests annexation to the City of Naperville, rezoning to R1 (Low Density Single-Family Residence District) upon annexation, a preliminary/final plat of subdivision and a front yard setback variance for the subject property.

Katie Forystek, Planning Services Team, gave an overview of the request.

Jennifer Loudon, Engineering Team, discussed sidewalk installation in the area and clarified that the driveway for the property will come off of Driftwood and will not connect to Gartner.

Len Monson, attorney with Kuhn Heap and Monson, 552 S. Washington, spoke on behalf of the petitioner

- The subject property is unique and challenged due to an existing dry creek bed that traverses the property which conveys stormwater after rain events. This condition results in significant wetland area and necessitates that construction be at least 50' from the wetland delineation.
- The wetland buffer, in accordance with zoning setback and underground sewer/water main installations, restricts buildable area to a small portion of the lot.
- Relocation of utilities will require tree removal and will be very expensive.
- The requested 10' variance is for the attached garage, not the entire structure. Despite this, the house will still be located 50' from the street (inclusive of setbacks and right-of-way).

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about

- The location of the proposed home on the lot and the extent of the encroachment.
- The extent to which the neighboring property owner's tree canopy extends over the lot line and whether trimming would be required for construction.
- The location of existing sidewalk.
- Whether the city could impose tree preservation requirements for trees on adjacent property.

Public Testimony:

Michelle Piazza 616 Driftwood Court – inquired why someone would want to build on the lot and expressed concern that the size of the house (2,400 square feet) will degrade property value in the neighborhood. Concerned about traffic and congestion.

Joe Ross, 415 E. Gartner – resides adjacent to the subject property. Not opposed to annexation or the variance, but wants to ensure that large oak trees along the property line are not damaged or removed.

Jim Kerns, 611 E. Gartner – does not believe that the zoning variance is necessary as the garage could be relocated with a wetland variance or the layout could be reconfigured. Would like to see sidewalk on both sides of the street.

Petitioner responded to testimony

- The petitioner has not completed plans for the house. The square footage of the home has not been determined.
- Home will be distinctive and commensurate with the cost of the lot and the neighborhood character.
- Driveway will not be near the curve and will not impact traffic.
- Petitioner agrees with the neighbor's concerns about trees and selected the lot because of the wooded character. A tree preservation plan will be

required for development. Petitioner has no intent to trim the neighboring trees.

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:

- Bruno – believes that the water and sewer present a hardship.
- Messer – the property is very challenging and the petitioner has done a good job in addressing the site constraints.
- Herzog – the proposed development is the best possible solution as the wetland and wooded areas are being undisturbed and the density will remain low.
- Edmonds – agrees with Commissioners Messer and Herzog.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PC 11-1-035, requesting annexation, rezoning to R1 and a variance for the front yard setback which would be limited to the triangular section (garage) presented during the public hearing.

Motion by: Meyer
Seconded by: Messer

Approved
(5 to 0)

**E. Reports and
Recommendations**

F. Correspondence

G. New Business

H. Adjournment

9:50 p.m.