approved to allow the house to encroach into the rear yard setback in order to maintain the 40' platted building line.

- What would be allowed by code? Felstrup indicated that the code allows a 4' open or 3' fence to be maintained in the corner side yard. A 6' privacy fence may only be constructed behind the corner side yard setback.
- Is there any discussion about using a shadow box style fence instead of a board-on-board fence? Felstrup indicated no. The petitioner indicated that the preference of owners is to have a solid fence in order to provide privacy and security.
- How long is the fence? The petitioner indicated that the fence is approximately 375' long along the corner lot line.
- Gustin suggested that the fence to be painted white to be compatible with the house.
- What is the purview of the commission regarding the style or color of the fence? Staff indicated that the request variance is to deviate from the corner side yard requirement for the fence. The style or the color of the fence is not dictated by code.

Public Testimony: None

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:

- Gustin – Gustin was concerned about potential sight distance issues caused by the solid fence. Gustin would not support the fence variance without a condition to require a shadow box style fence to be used.
- Coyne – While Coyne agreed with Gustin's concerns, Coyne didn't want to micro-manage the style or color of the fence.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of a variance from Section 6-2-12:1.4 in order to construct a 6' tall board-on-board fence in the corner side yard on the property located at 504 N. Main Street.

Motion by: Trowbridge	Approved
Seconded by: Meyer	(7 to 2)

Gustin moved to amend the motion to require a shadow-box style fence to be used. There was no second. The motion to amend failed.

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

D3.
PZC Case #12-1-084

The petitioner, Walmart Real Estate Business Trust, requests approval of a major change to the Brach Brodie Property Unit 1 PUD; a preliminary/final PUD plat

Walmart (continued from 8-22-12)

and associated site development details; a preliminary/final plat of subdivision; a deviation from Section 5-4-5 (Commercial Signs) to allow wall signage in excess of the maximum allowed and a monument sign along a private road; and a deviation from Section 6-14-4 (Performance Standards; Standards) to allow light poles in excess of the 25-foot maximum allowed height in a commercial district for the construction of a Walmart.

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

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Clarification on whether the commission can consider the materials included in agenda packet that are for information only.
- Did IDNR approve the proposed LED lights? Smith indicated that IDNR approved the use of LED lights, but they didn't specifically approve the 42' pole heights.
- Whether Walmart should include native plants in the landscape plan per the letter submitted by Naperville resident Joe Suchecki. Smith indicated that the proposed landscape plan meets the City's landscape code. The City doesn't have any requirement for native plants.
- Whether there had been any follow-up discussion with the Forest Preserve. Smith indicated that based on staff's phone conversation with the Forest District staff, the District prefers some native species to be utilized on the site.
- Whether the Commission has the authority to place additional restrictions to require a fence along the perimeter of the site.

Peter Hugh with Hugh Lighting Design, commissioned by the City as a lighting consultant, was available to answer the Commission's questions.

The Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about;

- Hugh's experience with LED lighting. Hugh indicated he has over 20 years lighting design experience and he has never heard an ideal height for LED fixtures.
- What would be the benefits of 42' poles? Hugh indicated that he questions if there is any benefit with the 42' poles. Hugh provided an alternative design which demonstrates that the same lighting results can be achieved with the same number of 30' poles and fewer light fixtures by using a different LED light fixture. The 42' poles are not the most efficient way and are more difficult to maintain.
- Is there a way to shield LED lights? Hugh indicated it is generally difficult to shield LED lights.
- There is no standardization with LED lights currently.
- Would lowering the poles increase glare and light spills as testified by the Walmart petitioner at the last meeting? Hugh responded that he doesn't agree with the statement and that typically it is the opposite. Hugh gave an example where the 28' poles were used while there is no light spill off the property.

- Is it possible to obtain the same light quality with 28' poles? Hugh indicated that it is possible depending on the manufacturer.
- Would City staff support poles higher than 25' (25' is the code requirement)? Smith responded that staff would be open to consider that.
- Whether the space between the light fixtures and the ground would be illuminated if viewed from an angle? Hugh indicated no.
- Whether drivers could be adversely affected by the 42' poles? Hugh indicated the LED lights at 42' height would be more visible than at 25' height and would produce more glare.
- Whether the residences in a distance can see the lights. Hugh indicated that the higher the lights are, the more people can see.
- Whether the Walmart light fixtures are the most up-to-date technology? Hugh indicated that the type of fixtures he used in his alternative design was just released this year. LED lights are becoming more efficient today. Frost noted that for big companies like Walmart, it is not always possible to use the newest technology.

Aaron Matson, Engineer with CESO, Inc., spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- Mr. Hugh didn't take into considerations the unique features of the site.
- Walmart selected the very specific light fixture after exhaustive search.
- Lowering the poles to 25' would result in an over 50% increase in the number of poles and a 40% increase in the number of light fixtures.
- The petitioner will complete all improvements recommended by the Traffic Study.

Michael Dudley, Architect with Chipman Design Architecture, Inc., spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- Dudley reviewed the requested signage variance.
- Dudley reviewed the improvements made to the south elevation of the building.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Height of the building. The petitioner indicated that the parapet wall of the building is 22' tall while the tallest point of the building (which is the Walmart sign) is 28'.
- Whether the need to have 42' poles is due to the specific light fixture that Walmart selected.
- Why the petitioner wants 42' poles since the parking lot can still be lit 25' poles. The petitioner responded that the 42' poles are desired based on economic reasons. With 42' poles, the site would have fewer poles and fewer fixtures, which cost less to install and operate.
- Bruno noted that with the 25' poles, the light fixtures would have lower wattage. Therefore, the increase in the overall energy usage of the parking lot should be less than 40%.
- The Commission noted that cost is not a consideration in Planning and Zoning Commission's decision as long as it doesn't constitute a hardship.

In this case, there is no hardship.

- The Commission appreciates the changes to the south building elevation.
- Williams commends Walmart on the color scheme of the building.
- Whether additional landscape buffer can be added along the east side of the parcel. The petitioner indicated that the east side of the parcel is restrained by existence of a water line and the proposed multi-use path. There is not enough room to add more landscaping. The proposed Junipers along the east lot line will planted at 6' tall and are expected to grow to 12' tall over time. There is a natural berm and trees on the Forest Preserve land east of the site so that pedestrians on the Forest Preserve path can't see the landscaping along the east lot line.
- Whether there is any invasive species being proposed on the landscape plan.
- Whether the language on the warning sign west of the Beebe Drive entrance can be aggressive. Hynes indicated there is an existing "Curve Ahead" sign on Beebe Drive and the petitioner will add a "Hidden Driveway" sign which contains standard language that the City uses in similar situations.
- Whether the City can have traffic control on private roads. Hynes confirmed yes.

Public Testimony:

Joe Suchecki, Naperville resident, spoke:

- Suchecki is the Volunteer Steward for the Springbrook Forest Preserve.
- The stormwater issues raised in the letter have been addressed.
- Landscape screening won't help much to cover the building; but the proposed elevation changes to the south elevation would mitigate the view of the big building.
- While the proposed lighting won't have an impact on the forest preserve, Suchecki would like to see 25' poles as they are more aesthetically pleasing.
- Fencing on the south side is needed to control debris from being blown into the Forest Preserve. Planning and Zoning Commission inquired that whether a fence along the south property line is needed since it is adjacent to the detention pond.
- Would like to see more native plants along the east and south lot lines.
- The proposed landscape plan may contain invasive species. Suchecki would volunteer to work with Walmart to identify those invasive plants.
- The proposed trees should not have an impact on bird nesting since they are buffered by the detention pond from the Forest Preserve.
- Williams noted that the Forest District has not officially voiced any concern regarding invasive species.
- Trowbridge would like to see Walmart to embrace the Prairie and would support the additional condition that Walmart should work with Mr. Suchecki.

- Gustin noted that a mixture of traditional landscaping and prairie species can be used to serve as a transition between the prairie and the building.
- Coyne would not support the conditions since the Forest District has not come forth with comments. Smith added that based on a phone conversation with the Forest District, they indicated that they generally support the letter provided by Mr. Suchecki.

Petitioner responded to testimony:

- The petitioner would like to move forward with the existing landscape plan and but would forward Mr. Suchecki's comments to the landscape architect.
- The subject property offers an opportunity to experiment with the 42' poles as it is not immediately adjacent to any residences.

Planning and Zoning Commission discussion:

- Meyer inquired about the height of the utility poles along 75th Street. The petitioner indicated they are approximately 40'-45' tall.
- Herzog – Could there be a compromise for the pole height? Coyne suggested 30' to be consistent with the building height.
- Bruno – The building is mostly 22' tall. The Commission should not pick an arbitrary height.
- Williams – The petitioner has provided alternative design to demonstrate that 25' poles are feasible.
- Gustin – The 25' poles can still offer quality lighting while maintaining appropriate architectural scale to the building and preventing light spill to the Forest Preserve.
- Trowbridge suggested adding a condition that the petitioner meets with City staff and the Forest Preserve regarding invasive species.

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:

- Williams – The Forest District has not been forthcoming with their concerns regarding the landscape plan. Williams suggested that the condition stipulate only that staff communicates with the Forest District, but not require that an answer to be received from the Forest District.
- Bruno – Support a condition as recommended by Williams.
- Gustin – There is no enforceability for the landscape condition.
- Herzog – Would not support the condition on the landscaping as this is not required by code.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of the major change to the Brach Brodie Property Unit 1 PUD.

Motion by: Meyer	Approved
Seconded by: Williams	(9 to 0)

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

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of the preliminary/final PUD and subdivision plat, and associated development plans.

Motion by: Williams
Seconded by: Bruno

Trowbridge moved to amend the motion to add a condition of approval to require City staff contact the DuPage County Forest Preserve District and seek their feedback regarding whether the landscape plan includes any invasive species, and City staff communicate any feedback received to Walmart. Messer seconded the motion to amend.

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

Motion to amend is carried (5-4).

The Commission voted on the main motion with the amendment. Approved (9 to 0)

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

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of a deviation to allow a monument sign along a private roadway (Beebe) and signage in excess of the 300 SF maximum allowed for the north elevation, with the condition that no signage be installed on the west elevation.

Motion by: Gustin
Seconded by: Messer
Approved (9 to 0)

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

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of a deviation to allow light poles at a height of 42’ on the subject property.

Motion by: Williams
Seconded by: Bruno
Failed (0 to 9)

Ayes:

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

E. Reports and Recommendations

F. Correspondence

G. New Business

H. Adjournment 10:15 p.m.