

Franco, Anna

From: Joseph Geraci <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, May 31, 2026 8:04 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Opposition to Naperville Ridge Duplex Proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Red Category, Anna

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.

Opposition to CityGate Centre II Apartment Variances

I oppose the CityGate Centre II proposal as currently presented.

This is not a question of whether Naperville should allow housing. It is a question of whether every large apartment project should receive the same package of zoning relief: increased density, increased height, reduced parking, setback variances, and PUD flexibility, while nearby residents and road networks are expected to absorb the impacts afterward.

CityGate already received a major apartment approval nearby with Dominion CityGate. Now the City is being asked to approve another 297-unit apartment building with a five-story parking deck and multiple variances. At some point, this stops being careful planning and becomes a pattern: developers ask for more density than the zoning allows, less parking than the code requires, more height than contemplated, and the City calls it “appropriate” because it is near commercial activity.

The AMI argument also deserves scrutiny. Saying that units are “within reach” of households earning 80% of Naperville AMI does not make this affordable housing in any meaningful sense for working families, first-time buyers, seniors on fixed incomes, or residents trying to build equity in Naperville. These are market-rate rentals. They may help the developer justify density, but they do not create ownership opportunities or long-term housing stability.

Naperville should be asking harder questions:

- Why are repeated variances needed if this is truly the right project for the site?
- What cumulative traffic impact occurs when CityGate, Dominion CityGate, office, hotel, restaurant, event, and commuter traffic are considered together?
- Is the parking supply realistic for 297 units plus guests, deliveries, rideshare, service vehicles, and peak activity?
- Why should height, density, setbacks, and parking all be relaxed in one approval?
- What enforceable protections exist if the traffic and parking assumptions are wrong?
- How does another large rental project advance attainable ownership or neighborhood stability?

The concern is not apartments in theory. The concern is Naperville repeatedly approving large rental projects through variances and calling them “balanced” after the fact.

If the City wants density, it should require better design, stronger transportation analysis, realistic parking, enforceable mitigation, and true public benefit. A market-rate apartment building with a five-story parking deck and multiple zoning exceptions should not be rubber-stamped simply because similar exceptions were granted nearby before.

Opposition to Naperville Ridge Proposal as Currently Presented

I oppose the Naperville Ridge proposal at 75th and Ranchview as currently presented.

This project asks the City to annex 32 acres of heavily wooded wetland area, remove more than 800 trees, rezone the property, approve a conditional-use PUD, and grant multiple variances in order to build 94 market-rate duplexes starting around \$700,000. That is not modest infill. That is a major land-use change with permanent environmental, stormwater, traffic, and neighborhood-character impacts.

The proposal is also being framed as housing for an “aging demographic,” but that claim needs to be enforceable. If the City is being asked to approve this project partly because it serves older residents, then the approval should require 55+ age restriction and accessible design. Otherwise, the “aging demographic” language is just marketing, not a planning commitment.

At minimum, the City should require:

- 55+ age-restricted occupancy if senior-oriented housing is part of the justification;
- Zero-step entries and meaningful accessibility features;
- Preservation of mature trees and reduction of the proposed tree removal;
- Stronger wetland, stormwater, drainage, and runoff protections;
- Lower density and fewer units;
- A real traffic analysis for 75th, Ranchview, and nearby residential streets;
- Clear findings showing what public benefit justifies annexation, rezoning, PUD approval, and multiple variances.

Naperville should be asking harder questions:

- Why should more than 800 trees be removed for \$700,000 market-rate duplexes?
- Why should wooded wetland-adjacent land be converted into dense private housing?
- If this is truly for older residents, why are zero-step entries not required?
- If it is not age-restricted, why should the City accept reduced school-impact assumptions?
- What happens to drainage, flooding, wildlife habitat, and mature tree canopy?
- What public benefit justifies the requested zoning relief?

This is not opposition to housing. It is opposition to treating every remaining open, wooded, or environmentally sensitive parcel as a blank development opportunity. Once 800 trees are removed, they are gone. Once wetland-adjacent land is disturbed, the stormwater and environmental impacts are not easily undone.

If the applicant wants the benefit of a senior-housing argument, then the City should require senior-housing commitments. If not, this should be reviewed as ordinary \$700,000 market-rate housing with full traffic, school, stormwater, and neighborhood impacts.

Joseph Geraci us