

From: Planning
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2020 1:45 PM
To: Laff, Allison
Subject: FW: Public Commentary on October 20th's Planning and Zoning Commission PZC #20-1-089, Zoning text amendment

Allison,

See below.

Gabrielle Mattingly

Community Planner | Planning & Development | TED Business Group

City of Naperville | 400 S. Eagle St. Naperville, IL 60540

(630) 305-5316 | mattinglyg@naperville.il.us

The content of this email, including any attachments, is intended for the designated recipients and may be confidential. If you are not the intended recipient or received this message by mistake, be advised that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this email or any attached material is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender by e-mail and delete all copies of this message and any attachments immediately.

From: Marilyn L. Schweitzer [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2020 1:41 PM
To: Planning <Planning@naperville.il.us>
Cc: Council <Council@naperville.il.us>
Subject: Public Commentary on October 20th's Planning and Zoning Commission PZC #20-1-089, Zoning text amendment

CAUTION: This e-mail originated outside of the City of Naperville (@naperville.il.us).

DO NOT click links or open attachments unless you confirm the incoming address of the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Planning and Zoning Commissioners,

I support these changes to the zoning text particularly in relationship to standardizing the minimum lot size per unit for a duplex, townhome, and/or multi-family residential developments that will be managed by an association offering shared amenities, open space, access, and/or parking. Even as a layperson, trying to understand the code in relation to the Heritage Place proposal, I found the code to be inconsistent and restrictive. I appreciate staff's effort towards these changes and hope you recommend them to council.

I would like to point out that there are further inequities in the code regarding duplex, townhome, and/or multi-family residential developments that I wish to have resolved in the near future. They are:

- TU zoned properties were overlooked when make the proposed changes described by PZC #20-1-089 for R2, R3A, and R3.
- The existing code does not define “two family dwellings”, yet there are numerous references to “two family dwellings” as district from duplexes through the code.
- The intent of R2 zoning is for it to be less dense than R3A or R3, yet conditional use for single-family attached dwellings is less restrictive in R2 than it is in R3A and R3 wher such dwellings are permitted by right. I wish to have these resolved in the near future and encourage staff and this commission in the meantime to take this discrepancy into consideration when granting conditional use in R2 redevelopments. It would provide for less controversial and provide better transitions between permitted R2 uses and conditional R2 uses. The discrepancies as I see them are:
 - R2 lacks the R3A lot area restriction that “There shall be no minimum lot area provided that the sum of the area of the lots on which the structure(s) is located shall not be less than the number of dwellings times four thousand (4,000) square feet and shall not be more than eight (8) dwelling units per acre on a modified gross density basis.”
 - R2 lacks the R3A and R3 yard requirements that adjust for additional height, specifically:
 - Front yard: 25 feet plus 1 foot for each 2 feet by which the building or structure exceeds 28 feet in height
 - Interior side yard: 15 feet plus 1 foot for each 2 feet by which the building or structure height exceeds 28 feet
 - Corner side yard: 15 feet plus 1 foot for each 2 feet by which the building or structure height exceeds 28 feet
 - Rear yard: 25 feet plus 1 foot for each 2 feet by which the building or structure exceeds 28 feet in height

Sincerely,

Marilyn

Marilyn L. Schweitzer

████████████████████

████████████████████

████████████████████

████████████████████

████████████████████

████████████████████