

March 15, 2019

Ref: Case # 19-01-05 on March 20, 2019

Dear City of Naperville Plan Commissioners:

I have submitted for the record to the planning team a separate letter with seven questions which the planning teams' reply will arrive after I have submitted this letter and prior to me viewing packet information.

It is confusing to me who is actually the legal party in this case taking the responsibility for the second monument sign. During the meeting if this can be clarified for the record. Is it Wes Investments, Seigle's, Luna or other. The Notice of Public Hearing states it is for Seigle's but also I have been told from the Planning team it will also include Luna.

There was an incorrect property legal description given in the first Notice of Public Hearing that was mailed out which I brought to the attention to Gabriel. Later a second notice was mailed out which should have the correct property legal description for this case.

The property in this case was approved under the PM Bedroom Gallery subdivision plat and it was for one business. Later it was approved for the building to be subdivided into additional retail spaces changing it to a multi-unit building which now consists of three businesses.

The original monument sign is located on the SW corner of this property which hosts the name Penny Mustard f/k/a PM Bedroom Gallery. The Petitioner is requesting a second monument sign on the same property. I do find it odd why two monument signs are needed for the same property and what are the valid reasons why a second monument sign is needed on the property's west lot line to support a variance(s).

I am a co- owner of the commercial property located just across Henley Lane that fronts Route 59. We do not support a variance if it will prohibit, add sign restrictions, or bring nuisances for reasons not allowing a monument sign to be put on my commercial property for my developer especially if to be placed on the Route 59 frontage of my property.

My phone contact information is with Garbriel at the Planning Team Services. If you have questions please feel free to contact me. Please include this letter as matter of record for Case # 19-01-05.

Thank you

Sincerely,
Rosalyn Urbanek

[REDACTED]

March 15, 2019

Ref. Case # 19-1-05, petitioner Doyle Signs, Inc.(Penny Mustard f/k/a PM Bedroom Gallery)

Dear Gabriel Mattingly, City of Naperville planner:

I am writing to you in regards to Case # 19-01-05 with questions that we do have about this case.
Please email me your reply.

The site for this case originally was approved for one business under its PM Bedroom Gallery subdivision plat and later approved for its building space to be subdivided into two additional store fronts for Luna and then Seigle's. Essentially it is now a multi-unit retail space for more than one business.

1. Does Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) have any jurisdiction on the Petitioner's case because the site fronts Route 59 if there is anything needing to be addressed about visibility, setback, location etc. in need of IDOT's approval?
2. Correct me if I am wrong, but if the Petitioner, Doyle Signs is the contractor and Seigle's and Luna stores are leasing these spaces from the property owner then do we know that their Lease terms allow them to do for what they are petitioning for? Who is paying for it and to whom will the legal terms and responsibility fall upon for this new sign monument?
(if the Lessee changes, about maintenance, sign ownership, or other)
3. Why does the Notice of Public Hearing only list Seigle's Cabinet center when it is likely Luna will advertise on this monument sign too making it a multi-use business sign?
4. What are the Petitioner's reasons why a second monument sign is being requested on the same property which one already exists for the developed site?
5. If the City Council approves the Petitioner's Case # 19-01-05 for two monuments signs on the same property will it prohibit, add sign restrictions or bring nuisances for reasons not allowing a monument sign on my commercial property when a developer wants it for business advertising and especially if its wanted on the Route 59 frontage of my property?
(My property location is approx. 66 feet south of the property in Case # 19-01-05, at the corner of Henley Lane and Route 59 and it has 150 feet of Route 59 frontage)
6. Is the original monument sign at 1120 South Route 59 that hosts the name Penny Mustard a nonconforming sign?
7. Is the property's legal description corrected on this case for public notice?

Please include my letter on record for Case # 19-01-05.

Thank you.
Sincerely,
Roselyn Urbanek