



The following written comments were submitted specific to the “Residential, Office, and Limited Commercial” (ROLC) zoning district prepared by city staff for public review and comment at the August 4, 2010 Open House:

- Do not really understand the need for another zoning category if Naperville already has more than 20! As far as combining residence and limited commercial, they really shouldn't. Category is too broad.
- Please prohibit use by EPA regulated businesses (i.e. drycleaners, gas stations, etc.).
- PUD c. General Retail. Please define.
- I believe the ROLC designation is a great idea for this area. Local residents, as is common, do not embrace change readily.
- Why not separate R out of ROLC and just make the zoning OLC?
- Put into the new code certain things that CANNOT be considered, such as ANY commercial with strong EPA overview (i.e. gas stations, dry cleaners, auto remodeling shops, etc.)
- Separate “OLC” from “R”. The additional restrictions and process for “Conditional Uses” are good, but why mix this with residential? These would be cleaner in situations where multiple landowners are involved.
- Require an overall “worst case” traffic study for an entire area recommended as ROLC. Incremental studies as each property develops have proven ineffective in the past.
- Good. ROLC is good for neighborhood land values will increase.
- I think that residential should be removed from the ROLC. Deal with OLC and R separately
- Even clearer description of the ROLC envisioned – there is much talk of having a “self-contained” development – but it is not stated on the displays.

The following additional comments were made specific to sub-areas 3 and 4 of the Plank Road Study Area and recommendations currently under consideration by City Council:

- I would like to see a traffic study done by the Transportation Department which evaluates the impact on the Plank Road Study Area and Ogden Avenue / Naper Boulevard of:
  - 1) The most intensive proposal for Plank Road Study (including the least intensive ROLC use) ALONG WITH the least intensive proposal for development of Seager Park;
  - 2) The most intensive proposal for each of these two (Plank Road and Seager Park).

The results of this study should guide the decision on the ROLC proposal for Plank Road.

- Low density residential only for sub-areas 3&4
- Low density residential only for sub-areas 3&4
- Leave sub-areas 3& 4 R = residential only
- Feel this zoning should remain residential
- Leave it R = residential only
- I have a home in sub-area 4 on Tuthill Road and concerning ROLC, I am against any commercial development, but I could accept office. I think the area should stay residential. I hope medium density will NOT be allowed and that you will keep the area low density. Medium density is too high for the area. Please do not allow duplexes. The traffic in sub-areas 3 & 4 is bad right now. I wonder if this new zoning is passed how will the residents of the area enter and exit the streets they live on.
- Biggest concern for traffic impact on Tuthill and Plank and Burlington Roads. No access to Naper Boulevard to afford ability to avoid entering from residential streets.
- Be more specific in zoning sub-area 3. [Individual land uses should be recommended not a mixed concept like ROLC]
- Access to Naper Boulevard needed for any commercial uses along Naper.