



City of Naperville

400 S. Eagle Street
Naperville, IL 60540

Meeting Minutes - Draft

Building Review Board

Wednesday, February 20, 2019

2:00 PM

City Council Chambers

A. CALL TO ORDER:

B. ROLL CALL:

Present 6 - Stephen Brockman, Paul Ghassan, Chairperson Dan Jurjovec, Edward Kuhrt, Donald Russell, and Cory Smith

Absent 2 - Tom Castagnoli, and Brian Kronewitter

C. PUBLIC FORUM:

There were no speakers for Public Forum.

D. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

There were no public hearings.

E. RECOMMENDATIONS & REPORTS:

1. Approve the minutes of the December 19, 2018 meeting.

A motion was made by Russell, seconded by Ghassan, to approve the minutes of the December 19, 2018 meeting of the Building Review Board. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Brockman, Ghassan, Chairperson Jurjovec, Kuhrt, Russell, and Smith

Absent: 2 - Castagnoli, and Kronewitter

F. OLD BUSINESS:

There was no old business to discuss.

G. NEW BUSINESS:

1. Consider the requested variance to Section 5-10-3 Subsection 12 of the Naperville Municipal Code (Rooftop Structures and Equipment) - BRB Case #98.

Peter Zibble, TED Operations Manager, presented background information on the case. The architect representing the applicant, Hemal Purohit, presented information to the board regarding the request for variance. Mr. Purohit indicated that the plan is to allow each tenant to control their own HVAC. The plan currently includes at least 55 roof top units. In an effort to reduce the visual

impacts, all units are pushed as far from the edges of the building as possible and the average height of the proposed units are the same or lower than the existing units. Mr. Purohit indicated that a line of sight analysis was completed for the east and west elevations and additional screening was proposed on the west and south sides. He indicated that the north side is only viewed from commercial property and the east side, when viewed from the property line did not require screening. Additionally, Mr. Purohit indicated that the roof drainage precludes the installation of additional screening on the east side. Mr. Purohit confirmed that the proposed screening would be painted to match the building.

Mr. Ghassan confirmed with Mr. Purohit that the screens are louvered so the RTUs are visible when viewed from certain angles and asked if they units could be moved back from the edge in certain locations. Mr. Purohit agreed to look at moving some of the RTUs but indicated that installing horizontal duct work to move them can be problematic. It was confirmed that the screens would be installed about 8 inches above the roof.

Mr. Brockman asked about future RTUs and Mr. Purohit admitted that they were not entirely sure what additional units would be required for future tenants.

Mr. Russell asked staff if other developers had received such variances. Zibble indicated that there had been no formal BRB requests and Allison Laff, Deputy Director TED, added that over the years staff has worked with various developers on compromise solutions when full screening was not possible.

Mr. Brockman and Mr. Smith asked about line of sight study. Staff confirmed that this method is not included in the city code for determination of screening heights. Chairman Jurjovec acknowledged that the line of sight method can yield very different results as the distance of the observer changes. Mr. Purohit indicated that they thought it a reasonable method for consideration given the size of the building and that it is used in other municipalities.

Mr. Smith asked how future RTUs would be handled and Mr. Purohit indicated that there is language in the lease that none of the tenants would be allowed to install RTUs past a certain grid line so it is not too close to the edge. Mr. Purohit did not have the specific language of the lease available.

Chairman Jurjovec asked if the hardship for the variance request was financially based and Mr. Purohit confirmed that it was, both the cost of the screens and the cost of the structural upgrades to accommodate them.

Mr. Russell indicated concerns that this variance would set bad precedence for the many other buildings in the area and also confirmed that there was no neighbor notification requirement for this request. Mr. Russell asked if a parapet wall would be more cost effective, and Mr. Purohit indicated that it would not due to the size of the building they would need to install nearly 1400 LF of wall and

were concerned about drainage improvements that would be required along the rear of the building to address the sheet flow from the roof. He also confirmed that the cost for the proposed limited screening was estimated to exceed \$100,000 and that the cost for screening would reduce their ability to implement other improvements on the site.

Mr. Purohit offered to plant additional evergreen trees on the east property line to provide screening.

Chairman Jurjovec asked Mr. Purohit if they were unaware of the screening requirement when they had signed the purchase contract, and Mr. Purohit indicated that they were unaware at that time.

A motion was made by Chairperson Jurjovec, seconded by Kuhrt. Do you support the request for a variance to Section 5-10-3 Subsection 12 of the Naperville Municipal Code (Rooftop Structures and Equipment) - BRB Case #98? The motion failed by the following vote:

Aye: 1 - Ghassan

Nay: 5 - Brockman, Chairperson Jurjovec, Kuhrt, Russell, and Smith

Absent: 2 - Castagnoli, and Kronewitter

H. ADJOURNMENT:

A motion was made by Chairperson Jurjovec, seconded by Kuhrt, to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.