

**From:** krishnaswamy nallamreddy [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 10, 2025 3:39 PM  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Case # DEV-0029-2025 - Compliant - Sign Variance

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**Categories:** Blue Category

**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 Officer,

I am writing to formally raise a concern regarding the exterior paint color of the property located at Savers #1250 Naperville, IL. 1125 Ogden Avenue, Naperville, IL 60563 , . The proposed color appears to be in violation of our city’s property maintenance codes or neighborhood design standards.

Proposed color seems inconsistent with the surrounding aesthetics. This change could negatively impact the visual harmony of the neighborhood and could affect property values.

I respectfully request that your office investigate this matter to determine whether the color conforms to applicable city regulations.

Please let me know if any additional information is required to assist with your review.

Sincerely,  
Krishna,

[REDACTED]

**From:** Shari McCormick [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 11, 2025 6:14 PM  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Case # DEV-0029-2025

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**Categories:** Blue Category

**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.

May 11, 2025

Subject: Case # DEV-0029-2025

To: Naperville Planning and Zoning Commission

Dear Commissioners,

It has come to my attention that there is a petition to allow changes to the signage and paint for the Savers Store and its Donation Center at 1125 E Ogden Rd, Naperville, and this will be reviewed at an upcoming public hearing. As a homeowner in the townhome properties due west of this property, I am writing to express my concern.

While I wish this business success, the color choice of the enlarged signage and building color (as shared in available documentation with the petition) of other similar donation centers is an eye sore and not in keeping with the neighborhood that the building adjoins. This is devaluing to the property owners not just in the townhomes, but to the homes down East Bauer that are also within view of this building.

Since the establishment of this business at this address, there have been issues with significant litter and full dumpster bins in the parking lot on the west side of the building. I have personally spoken with the management of Savers expressing my concern that I've removed large cardboard boxes off of the roadway and am embarrassed by the amount of trash accumulation behind the building. This is sufficient enough disruption to the neighboring homes.

From an increased economic perspective for Savers and its Donation Center, I can see little benefit that additional signage or coloration change will increase visibility and improve traffic flow into the store. As it stands presently, it is in keeping with sufficient visibility in the Ogden Ave corridor. And I believe the devaluation potential to property owners immediately to the west is more likely and more significant than any perceived improvement from this proposed change for Savers and its Donation Center.

My request is to deny the petition to the extent it would (1) expand, add to, or change the existing signage size or painted portion of the building on the east and south sides and (2) add signage to, or change the color of the west side of the building.

Sincerely,

Shari McCormick, homeowner [REDACTED]

**From:** Robert Koller [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, May 12, 2025 2:23 PM  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Savers case 3 DEV-0029-2025

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**Categories:** Blue Category

**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 Sirs,

The requested variance by Savers for a sign and/or green paint on the west side (back) that is parallel to East Ave. should be denied. When the original structure was built the architect / developer was astute enough to use brick in an aesthetic manner that would be complementary to the neighborhood. This thoughtful transition from a building zoned for business to a residential area should be maintained.

RE: Exhibit B EXHIBIT 1: Section 6-3-6:2:

1. The variance is NOT in harmony by its impact on the residential buildings on the west side of EAST Ave.
2. Strict enforcement does NOT impose exceptional hardship.
3. The variance, if granted WILL alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

RE: DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF VARIANCE PERCode is 6-16-5:2.2.1

The current Savers sign and/or green paint on the south and east sides are sufficient to provide for both advertisement of the location and directions for drop off. The existing signage is adequate. It's almost distracting.

The proposed signs are NOT essential for the visibility along Ogden Ave.

"Without the variance, the visibility of the donation aspect of the business would be significantly reduced, impacting customer accessibility and economic viability."

What hard data do you have to substantiate this claim? Your statement appears to be based on emotion rather than reason.

"The proposed signs will not create ..... or negative visual impacts on the surrounding properties."  
 FALSE! It will in fact have a NEGATIVE VISUAL impact.

EXHIBIT 1: Section 6-3-6:2:Standards for Granting a Zoning Variance and/or Sign Variance

1-"Savers have.....help to reinvent the commercial area of Naperville"

Costco not Savers has revitalized the area.

2-"the color green ..... responsible resource management"

The acerbic color green you have chosen is eye-catching and will be noticed. If you are concerned about visibility, how about painting the east front entrance of the store green?

The Red Cross is a worthy charity. Savers' success in helping to provide monetary donations through the resale of "one man's junk is another man's treasure" is commendable. The denial of your request for variance will not negatively impact your business .

Tenant's Screened Dumpster needs to be addressed:

1. It appears that Savers has been using Construction Rolloff Dumpsters due to the large amount of unsaleable or nonrecyclable donations. These are normally 30 or 40 yard dumpsters. These are usually up to 8' tall and up to 24' long. Your plans show a 12' x 12' screened concrete pad. This is inadequate if construction dumpsters will be continued to be used.

2. Bales of recyclable items have also been stacked out back.

A 8' foot high wall/ fence with probably a minimum length of 32' should be erected to shield the Bauer Place TownHouses from this unsightliness. (The reason for the minimum length is that the end door is about 8'. When opened  $24' + 8' = 32'$ )

Businesses that border Residential properties need to make sure that they are not having a negative impact. It's best not to forget that these residents are in fact your customers.

Thank You for your attention to these matters.

I have lived in Naperville for 65 years. Savers property was originally farmland. It was then used by an Auto Dealership that wanted to expand and chose to move because their expansion would have negatively affected the adjacent area. The people of Bauer Place Townhomes keep their complex manicured and deserve to have Savers not debase its beauty.

Sincerely,

Robert Koller

████████████████████  
████████████████████  
████████████████  
████████████████████

**From:** Ponda Barnes [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 14, 2025 10:05 AM  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Savers in Naperville-DEV-0029-2025/Concern Regarding Proposed Neon Sign Installation

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**Categories:** Blue Category

**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.

I am writing as a concerned resident of the townhomes situated on Bauer Rd. in opposition to the proposed neon sign slated for installation at the Savers located on the corner of Ogden Avenue. While I understand the intent may be to increase visibility or branding, the introduction of a glaring neon sign would significantly undermine the quiet, upscale character of our neighborhood and detract from the aesthetic integrity we LIVE for and work hard to maintain.

We are already contending with 4:00 AM delivery disturbances, which have made restful sleep a challenge. Adding a bright, intrusive light fixture would only further disrupt the peace and comfort of the surrounding homes, without necessarily offering any meaningful benefit to the business, which is already highly visible due to its bold neon green exterior and prime corner location with consistent traffic exposure.

I respectfully urge you to reconsider the placement of this signage and to prioritize the quality of life for the neighborhood's residents. Please do not proceed with the installation of this sign in our community.

Sincerely,

Thomas and Ponda Barnes

---

**From:** Sookhyang Lee [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 14, 2025 2:16 PM  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** 1125 E. Ogden Ave.

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**Categories:** Blue Category

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.

My house is located  
[REDACTED]  
1125 E Ogden Ave. building  
got already very jarring painting.  
That building and my house is very close.  
I don't like that color.  
It will make very bad viewing.  
Talk to them, stop it, please.  
Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

---

**From:** yun si [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 14, 2025 3:07 PM  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Concern about Case# DEV-0029-2025

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**Categories:** Blue Category

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.

To who may concern,

I am an owner and resident at Bauer Place townhouse, and I'm writing about my concern with the proposal in DEV-0029-2025.

The proposal will alter the facade on the Saver's building, and the main concern is the bright neon green color. The current store already has part of the sign finished and it is an eyesore to the neighborhood. The color does not match the surrounding buildings and landscape, and it's a nuance to this residential neighborhood and unsightly scene driving down the US-34. This proposal will enable the business to gain functionality at the expense of the entire neighborhood and surrounding streets.

Also, not related to the proposal but concerning the business in question. The delivery track with semi-trailer has increased significantly on East Avenue. The trucks come very early in the morning (4-5am) and do not shutoff (idling) for hours. This cause noise and air pollution in an otherwise peaceful and safe residential neighborhood. The early hour of operation disturbs the rest of the surrounding residents and the fume of the diesel engine is so prevalent that it is the first thing I smell in the morning. The increased traffic often blocks both Bauer Road and East Ave causing backups.

As owner and resident of the neighborhood, I welcome business to build and develop the surrounding business area, but not at the expense of the neighborhood and its residents. The conduct of the Saver's has been inconsiderate to the community since its creation. I sincerely advise that the committee carefully consider this proposal, so all businesses will come to Naperville to contribute to the community, instead of destroying it.

Thank you,

-YS

## I. Introduction

I am a resident of a townhome at Bauer Place; my property is less than 300 feet from the Property.<sup>1</sup> The operators of the businesses on the Property and the Property Owner are not good corporate citizens, much less good neighbors.<sup>2</sup> They opened and continue to operate the businesses in violation of Naperville's zoning ordinances, including signage, noise, and outside processing/storage. They leave merchandise and donations outside, allow trucks to dock well before 7am, and routinely process inventory outside. They permit trash and debris to remain on the Property, only some of which have been removed months after initially requested. Their maintenance of vegetation is inadequate and below the standards of their corporate neighbors. They have made no effort to communicate with adjacent property owners until compelled to do so.

Their lack of respect for the law and their neighbors is also evident in the Notice, which is deficient, and in the Petition, which is legally insufficient, vague, and contradictory. I request the Zoning Administrator order the correction of the Property's violations of Title 6, Chapter 16 of the Naperville Municipal Code (the "Code"), investigate the violations of Code Sections 6-7C-4-2, 6-7C-4-3, and 6-14-4-1.2.1, impose fines for each of the violations as prescribed by Section 6-3-10 of the Code, and that the PZC recommend against the Petition.

## II. The Notice of Public Hearing is insufficient.

The Notice of Public Hearing (Notice) is insufficient as to portions of the Petition, is (together with the Petition) so vague and contradictory to as to defy understanding by a reasonable lay person, and was untimely given. If the PZC finds the notice to be insufficient, I request the PZC postpone the hearing until Petitioner and staff agree on an accurate Petition and the Petitioner gives proper notice. Because the Property Owner and the Petitioner are responsible for any delay, I request the Zoning Administrator to continue, without suspension or stay, the daily fines for the current zoning violations.

### A. The Notice is insufficient as to any changes to the west elevation.

Because the west elevation is not mentioned in the Notice, any action taken by the PZC regarding the west elevation would be null and void. See Village of

---

<sup>1</sup> Defined terms have the meaning provided in the Notice of Public Hearing for this case or Title 6 of the Naperville Municipal Code unless stated otherwise.

<sup>2</sup> The prior occupant of the property, Staples, caused no issues during the entirety of my five-year residence.

## **Objection to Signage Variance – Case# DEV-0029-2025**

Riverwoods v. County of Lake (1968), 146 Ill. App. 3d 348 (voiding approval of rezoning when hearing notice contained an incomplete property description).

### **B. When coupled with the Petition, the Notice is vague and contradictory.**

The Notice is for a sign variance to exceed the size limit on the east and south building elevations. Much of the material filed in support of the Petition describes signage that is already in place. (See, e.g., “Sign Plans - Savers.”) But there is no narrative that explains this. In fact, the narrative pertaining to these signs is written in the future tense (e.g., “will be installed,” “to be installed”). (See “Project Narrative – Variance Request Details.”) At the expense of accuracy and clarity, Petitioner seeks absolution for the Property’s current and continued violations of the Code without admission of fault.

The seventh file in the online petition file (labeled “Site Plan”) contains a “Site Analysis” drawing. The only markings on this drawing pertain to the west elevation and a portion of the south elevation which have both remained unpainted and do not yet have signage. Why does the “Sign Plan - Savers” document note only awnings without signs at these locations? Why does the “Site Plan” refer to signage (“DC Signage here”) at these locations? Why is the west elevation included at all when the “Sign Plan - Savers” document makes no reference to signage on the west elevation? These inconsistencies coupled with future tense wording to describe signs currently in place render the Petition unreadable and the Notice insufficient.

The “Response to Standards” document adds more confusing and conflicting information. The “Project Narrative” document discusses dark green signs and the importance of a standard paint color and consistency. The “Response to Standards” document contains pictures of white signs over both dark green and lime/neon/safety green similar to Pantone #2292C (“Savers Green”) walls. It also contains pictures of walls painted in Savers Green topped by either white or dark green signs. Sometimes the entire building seems to be painted; other times, halfway across or halfway down. Does the Petition seek to maintain the current paint scheme? Does it seek to paint full walls in Savers Green? Half walls? Columns? Will the signs be white and lighted (as they exist) or changed to dark green? Such obfuscation is consistent with the businesses’ and Property Owner’s disregard for the law and for their neighbors.

It may be tempting for the PZC members to dismiss the defects in the Notice and the Petition as simply sloppy or misinformed. But the parent company of the primary business involved is Savers Value Village, Inc. (“Savers”), a publicly-traded company whose stock is listed on the New York Stock Exchange with 2024 annual revenues of

## **Objection to Signage Variance – Case# DEV-0029-2025**

\$1,537,617,000.<sup>3</sup> Savers is the largest for-profit thrift operator in the United States and Canada.<sup>4</sup> The Petitioner's LinkedIn profile indicates he is a professional construction manager with ~30 years' experience and a full-time employee of Savers.<sup>5</sup> So it is more likely the "defects" in the Petition are actually intentional "features" intended to benefit Saver's.

### **C. The Notice was untimely mailed.**

The Notice was dated May 5, 2025, and sent via regular U.S mail from Bellevue, WA. I received the notice, without a postmark, on May 8, 2025, only 13 days prior to the hearing and only six days prior to the deadline for package materials. The Petitioner knew or should have known that First Class mail from Bellevue to Naperville would take 3-5 business days. Therefore, petitioner knowingly failed to meet the standard that "notice must be given at least 15 . . . days prior to the meeting date."

### **III. The Petitioner's request for signage variance is insufficient as a matter of law and should be denied.**

Petitioner fails to provide: (A) any evidence of "special and unusual conditions" that exist at the property and (B) sufficient information to grant a permit for new or additional signage on the south and west elevations.

#### **A. The Petitioner fails to present any evidence of special or unusual conditions as required by Section 6-3-6-2.2.**

The PZC's recommendation must be "predicated on evidence and finding that," among other things, "Strict enforcement of this Title would result in practical difficulties or impose exceptional hardships due to special and unusual conditions which are not generally found on other properties in the same zoning district." Code Section 6-3-6-2.2.

The Petitioner describes no characteristics of the Property that are either special or unusual. Indeed, the Petitioner states: "The proposed color scheme and signs are essential for the *visibility of the store along Ogden Avenue, a high-traffic commercial corridor.*" (Emphasis added.) This puts Petitioner and the Property in the same position as every other business within the Ogden Avenue Corridor Enhancement Initiative (January 25, 2010). A drive through this corridor reveals no other operative

---

<sup>3</sup> See Form 10-K of Savers Value Village, Inc. filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on Feb. 21, 2025 ("Saver's 10-K") cover, p67.

<sup>4</sup> Savers 10-K, p.45

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.linkedin.com/in/scott-scanlan-477a65a/>

## Objection to Signage Variance – Case# DEV-0029-2025

building or business with such a signage or paint scheme. Petitioner has wholly failed to meet the burden imposed by this requirement.

B. The information contained in the petition as it may pertain to additional “DC Signage” on the south and west elevations is insufficient to meet the standards for a permit, much less a variance.

The seventh file in the online petition file labeled Site Plan.pdf contains three manual modifications to the drawing: a directional arrow labeled North, orange highlights on the southwest corner of the building, and the phrase “DC Signage here” with chevrons pointing to the orange highlights. Section 6-16-9 of the Code requires, among other things, that a sign permit application requires a “[d]etailed, scaled drawing of building elevation where sign will be placed (wall signs).” No such drawing is provided for the any “DC Signage,” so there are no grounds for the PZC or the Zoning Administrator to approve any such signage.

### IV. Petitioner Fails to Carry its Burden of Proof

Petitioner must “demonstrate both the need and appropriateness of the variance request.”<sup>6</sup> Petitioner must establish that: (A) The variance is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of this Title and the adopted comprehensive master plan; (B) Strict enforcement of this Title would result in practical difficulties or impose exceptional hardships due to special and unusual conditions which are not generally found on other properties in the same zoning district; and, (C) The variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood and will not be a substantial detriment to adjacent property.<sup>7</sup> Petitioner fails on all three points.

A. The variance is neither in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Code nor the Ogden Avenue Corridor Enhancement Initiative.

A quick drive down the Ogden Avenue Corridor reveals no combination of color scheme, illuminated signage, and paint area as already exists on the Property, much less with any additions or alterations that may be proposed by the Petition. This is because the hundreds of other businesses in the corridor respect the law and the value of “aesthetic appreciation for the visual environment and compatibility with the surroundings.” Petitioner seeks to enhance “the visibility of the store along Ogden Avenue.” Petitioner wants the property to stand out from the rest of the stores. This is why the signage is larger than permitted and contains both red and

---

<sup>6</sup> Guide for Petition for Zoning Variance, City of Naperville, TED Business Group (January 1, 2021)

<sup>7</sup> See Code Section 6-3-6-2

## Objection to Signage Variance – Case# DEV-0029-2025

Savers Green, a safety color designed for maximum visibility. Such a scheme seeks to stand apart from “the visual character” of Ogden Avenue, “the aesthetic of the site and architectural style of associated buildings” and the “signs that further advance adopted City guidelines and plans included in . . . the Ogden Avenue Corridor Enhancement Initiative.”<sup>8</sup> In short, Petitioner deliberately seeks disharmony so that Savers and its Donation Center can be more visible than any other business.

B. The Petition demonstrates no practical difficulties or exceptional hardships due to special and unusual conditions which are not generally found on other properties in the same zoning district.

As discussed above, the only hardship identified in the Petition is the building’s existence “along Ogden Avenue, a high-traffic commercial corridor.” The Petition simply offers no grounds for the PZC to find in Petitioner’s favor on this point. To the extent that a subsequent argument is raised, the Property Owner and the businesses were well aware of any and all conditions before they renovated the building and began operating the businesses. Moreover, the enhanced visibility is not even necessary. Savers’ business is largely dependent on repeat customers, not impulse shoppers. Savers has “a highly engaged customer base, with over 5.9 million active loyalty program members in the U.S. and Canada who shopped with us during fiscal year 2024, driving 72.4% of retail sales for the year.”<sup>9</sup>

C. The variance, if granted, would be a substantial detriment to adjacent property.

In one respect, Petitioner has made a valid point. The businesses already violate Naperville’s zoning ordinances pertaining to noise and outside processing and storage. They leave merchandise and donations outside, allow trucks to dock well before 7am, and routinely process inventory outside. They permit trash and debris to remain on the Property. So what would the continuance or exacerbation of the sign variance hurt?

The variance would hurt the consistency and integrity of the Ogden Avenue Corridor, both now and in the future. The signage already stands out. If it is permitted to remain (or worse yet be enlarged), other businesses, especially those dependent on impulse shoppers (e.g., Taco Bell, Chik-Fil-A, smoke shops) would want to also stand out from the other Ogden Avenue businesses. This would defeat the very purpose of zoning regulations and the Ogden Avenue Corridor Enhancement Initiative.

---

<sup>8</sup> See, generally, Code Section 6-16-1, especially points 3, 8 and 9.

<sup>9</sup> Savers 10-K, p5

## **Objection to Signage Variance – Case# DEV-0029-2025**

More immediately, the color, signage size and signage illumination already serve as detriments to the adjacent property. They are not in keeping with the building as constructed nor the character of the other nearby commercial properties. The Savers Green color is an eyesore designed to stand out, not blend in, that is already too visible from the Bauer Place Townhomes. Savers and its Donation Center came to the townhomes, not the other way around. I should not have to suffer diminution of my property value due to Savers' eyesores and violations. And it's not just the townhomes closest to the Property that will be affected – comparable listing data would impact every property East of Vest Street and North of Ogden Avenue.

### **V. Request for Relief**

The Petition has failed to meet any of the elements required to grant a variance, much less provide evidence sufficient for the PZC to recommend a variance be approved. Therefore, I request the PZC recommend against the Petition in the strongest professional language and instruct its representative to do the same at the corresponding meeting of the Naperville City Council.

I further request the Zoning Administrator order the correction of the Property's violations of Title 6, Chapter 16 of the Naperville Municipal Code (the "Code"), investigate the violations of Code Sections 6-7C-4-2, 6-7C-4-3, and 6-14-4-1.2.1, and impose fines for each of the violations as prescribed by Section 6-3-10 of the Code.

Finally, I request that the PZC and the Zoning Administrator order (or if required, request City Council to grant authority to order) that no signage or paint, even if within Code on its own, be approved on the western elevation of the Property without a public hearing. Such paint or signage must be considered in light of the entirety of the Property's signage and appearance; it cannot be viewed properly in isolation.

Thank you for your consideration.

William A. McCormick

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]