



**NAPERVILLE BUILDING REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES OF May 17, 2017**

**UNOFFICIAL PRIOR TO BRB APPROVAL
APPROVED BY THE BRB ON _____**

C. Public Hearings

C1.

BRB Case #93

**Naperville Elderly
Homes**

Trevor Dick, Development Services Team, gave an overview of the request.

Building Review Board inquired about:

- Russell: Can you provide additional information regarding the proposed cementitious material? Whitaker noted that the intended product with be similar to a hardi-type product.

Russ Whitaker, Attorney with Rosanova & Whitaker, provided an overview of the request on behalf of the petitioner.

- The proposed fiber cement material meets minimum material standards as required by the Illinois Housing and Development Authority.
- Dave Weeks, President of Naperville Elderly Housing board, provided additional information about the use and function of the existing and proposed apartment units, as well as the average rental fees.

Building Review Board inquired about:

- Meyer-Smith: Does not agree with the argument that the intent of the 50% masonry requirement has been met on this site as a result of the combination of the existing building (100% brick) and the proposed building (0% brick). It seems like this building should have some brick to match the overall area (Edward Campus, surrounding residential), as well as the existing building on this property. Meyer-Smith also noted that the financial goals of the organization are not a factor in the variance consideration; the intent of this ordinance is to ensure that buildings are constructed in a manner that ensures their quality, longevity, and durability. Meyer-Smith noted concerns that the request could be precedent setting; Whitaker noted that per law, the outcome of this variance cannot set precedent.
- Meyer-Smith: what is the construction cost of the building? Weeks noted that it is \$11 million (hard costs)/\$16 million overall.
- Brockman: can this product be made to look like brick/masonry? Weng (project architect) noted that the proposed product is a standard product; it cannot be custom fabricated to simulate brick. It is intended to have an appearance of siding. The architects have never considered using brick on the building (even before they realized that it was required by code)

based on massing, design, and other considerations. The proposed material is long lasting and durable.

- Meyer-Smith noted that there is a cementitious product available that does simulate brick, although she did agree that it may be more expensive.
- Smith: agrees with the presenters and noted that the proposed building will lack significant visibility from the street. Smith does not have a concern with the appearance of the building. Laff provided an overview of the genesis of the minimum masonry requirement.

There were no members of the public present to provide testimony.

The BRB closed the public hearing.

Building Review Board Discussion:

- Jurjovec noted that he believes that the proposed product is durable which is a stronger consideration from his perspective than aesthetics.
- Russell noted that it might be appropriate to amend the Municipal Code to permit fiber cement panels to be used to satisfy the minimum masonry requirement.

Building Review Board moved to recommend approval of BRB Case #93.

Motion by: Smith
Seconded by: Jurjovec

Approved
(5 to 1)

Ayes: Jurjovec, Brockman, Smith, Kuhrt, Russell
Nays: Meyer-Smith