

MINUTES

BOARD/COMMISSION: Architectural Review

DATE: 06/03/2009

MEETING: SPECIAL

CALLED TO ORDER: 7:34 p.m.

QUORUM: Yes

ADJOURNED: 9:17 p.m.

MEMBER ATTENDANCE:

PRESENT: Commissioners Allen, Wussow, Dickie, Loftus, Faganel, Weisman, Gorz, Chairman Burdett

ABSENT: Commissioner Albrecht

ALSO PRESENT:

Trustee Liaison Comerford, Village Planner Stegall, Planning Intern Collison, Recording Secretary Kornblith

AUDIENCE ATTENDANCE:

Bill Beckett, President, WT Development Corporation
Richard Rediehs, Shamrock TBC, Inc.
EDC President Jim Meyers
EDC Executive Director Janie Patch

I. Call to Order

Chairman Burdett called the Glen Ellyn Architectural Review Commission (ARC) public meeting to order at 7:34 p.m. in the Civic Center at 535 Duane Street, Glen Ellyn, Illinois.

II. Approval of Minutes

A. Motion

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes from the March 25, 2009 Architectural Review Commission meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

III. Taco Bell/KFC, 370 Roosevelt Road-Public Hearing

A motion was made and seconded to open the public hearing to consider sign variation requests for a proposed Taco Bell/KFC to be located at the property at 370 Roosevelt Road. The motion carried unanimously.

GLEN ELLYN ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION

June 3, 2009

A. Staff Report.

Recording Secretary Kornblith performed the swearing in of Village Planner Michele Stegall and Planning Intern Christina Collision.

Village Planner Stegall introduced Planning Intern Collision who gave a brief overview of the project as set forth in the staff memorandum dated May 21, 2009. The petitioner is proposing to demolish the existing Taco Bell at 370 Roosevelt Road and replace it with a new Taco Bell/KFC building and has requested sign variations and exterior appearance approval to accommodate the project. The 2,894 square foot Taco Bell/KFC restaurant will also feature a drive thru. The new building is proposed to be oriented toward Hillcrest Avenue rather than Roosevelt Road, as the existing building is today. However, the south side (Roosevelt Road) building elevation has been designed with the same level of detail expected on a front building façade. The petitioner appeared before the Architectural Review Commission for an August 27, 2008 preapplication meeting. The original plans called for a building with nine colors and multiple materials to identify the two-menu branding. The revised building plans feature a cohesive building design with more natural materials and colors. Additional landscaping has also been added to the site.

B. Questions from Commission.

Chairman Burdett asked whether the wall signs were flat and parallel to the exterior building wall or whether they were curved. Village Planner Stegall indicated that the signs were flat.

Commission Loftus commented on the window added on the south wall of the building and asked if it would have a view of the kitchen. The petitioner would respond to the question.

C. Petitioner's Presentation.

Recording Secretary Kornblith performed the swearing in of Bill Beckett, President of WT Development and Richard Rediehs of Shamrock TBC, Inc.

Mr. Beckett extended his gratitude and reintroduced the Taco Bell project. He indicated that nearly all the recommendations made by the Architectural Review Commission at the petitioner's pre-application meeting were satisfied and requested that the Commission recommend approval of the project. The previously proposed wall signs facing Hillcrest Avenue have been eliminated entirely. The stone wainscot has been extended around the base of the building. A spandrel glass window has been added on the south elevation, and does not allow a view into the kitchen from the outside. The Taco Bell tower has been redesigned to eliminate the flying arch, and the white background behind the KFC sign has been eliminated. He stated that the original building was designed based on corporate specifications, but they had agreed to change its appearance. He indicated that the secondary entrance will be facing Hillcrest, with the primary entrance orientated to Roosevelt Road. He does expect employees to enter from the Hillcrest entrance, which will remain unlocked and accessible to the public. The utilities located on the east wall of the building will be painted

GLEN ELLYN ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION

June 3, 2009

bronze to be less visible and more harmonious with the exterior of the building. A trash enclosure will be located on the northeast corner of the lot and will be made of the same materials as the main building.

Chairman Burdett requested clarification of the location of the menu boards. Mr. Beckett indicated that since the building has been moved closer to Hillcrest, this allows the menu boards to be oriented further from view from Roosevelt.

Mr. Beckett reviewed the landscaping plan for the site, indicating that one tree will be added along Roosevelt Road and the seven existing trees on the site will be maintained. Three evergreen trees will also be planted on the northwest corner of the lot. Additional evergreens will be placed near the trash bins to soften exposure, and a variety of shrubs will be planted on the east side of the building in order to provide screening of the menu board. Additional shrubs and evergreens will be installed along the southern elevation the building to soften overall appearance.

Mr. Beckett indicated that the petitioner is requesting a sign variation as a result of the two-restaurant branding and the need for menu boards. A total of 88.7 square feet of incidental signage is proposed in lieu the allowable 14.4 square feet. A variation is also being requested to allow six primary signs in lieu of the two primary signs allowed. He also noted that the total area of primary signage is 1/3 less than allowed.

Chairman Burdett requested clarification on the order location in the drive-thru. Mr. Beckett indicated that there was one point of order with speaker post, a preview menu board and a main menu board. Mr. Beckett stated that the use of two boards promotes speed of service.

Commissioner Weisman asked about the size of these boards. Mr. Beckett indicated that the main menu board is 7 feet tall and the preview board is 6.5 feet tall.

Mr. Beckett then reviewed the signs proposed for the site. The KFC letters will be mounted to lighted louvers. Per the Code, the louvers are considered to be part of the sign. The KFC bucket will be flat and mounted to the wall. A ground sign is also proposed at the southwest corner of the site. Some parking was eliminated to accommodate the sign and allow landscaping to be installed around the base. At the request of staff, the height of the sign was reduced to 10 feet.

Commission Burdett asked Mr. Beckett to address the sign variation criteria. Mr. Beckett then stated hardship with a redevelopment of the site. The site is small, and the new building will feature two business brands, each of which requires signage. He also stated that two menu boards were needed in order to increase speed of service at the drive thru, which is a major part of the business. In regards to the other criteria, he stated that they recognize commercial zoning of the ordinance and that the petitioner made efforts to address the architectural requirements and modify the signage. He added that the proposed signage increases visibility, gives time for safe turning and improves pedestrian safety. Mr. Beckett stated that the new building and site improvements will offer an improvement over the

GLEN ELLYN ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION

June 3, 2009

current site and will not have a negative impact on the surrounding area. The proposed project is replacing a building that is 25 years old, and it would enhance Roosevelt Road and provide employment, which he feels are further reasons to support this plan.

D. Public Comment.

No members of the public were present to comment on the request.

E. Commission Deliberation

Chairman Burdett asked for comments from the Commission:

- Commissioner Weisman: She stated that this was a well thought out project. The changes were good.
- Commissioner Loftus: She stated this was a good plan.
- Commissioner Allen: He indicated that the commission had asked a lot out of the petitioner and that they addressed all of the issues. He commented that this was a nice building, he appreciates the landscaping and has no problems with the signage.
- Commissioner Dickie: He agreed with previous comments and commended the petitioner. He also stated that he was in favor of the project. The menu board along with the preorder signage is nicely hidden, yet visible. The landscaping was handled appropriately.
- Commissioner Gorz: He stated that he did not see the original plan, but was in favor of the project and that the petitioner appears to have been responsive to the Commission's requests.
- Commissioner Wussow: She agreed with all the comments made by other Commissioners.
- Commissioner Faganel: She agreed and commented positively in saving the existing trees on the site.
- Chairman Burdett: He stated that he appreciated the petitioner listening to the Commission and that this is a suitable building. He indicated that he believed that the petitioner had demonstrated a unique hardship in regard to requested sign variations.

F. Motion

Commissioner Dickie moved, seconded by Chairman Weisman, to recommend approval of the proposed exterior appearance and requested sign variations with a condition that the project shall be constructed and maintained in substantial conformance with the plans as submitted and the testimony presented at tonight's meeting. The motion to recommend approval of the requested sign variation to allow 6 primary signs on the property in lieu of the maximum number of 2 primary signs permitted was based on the following findings of fact:

1. The requested variation will not alter the essential character of the locality because the building will be located within a commercial corridor where there is already a

GLEN ELLYN ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION

June 3, 2009

variety of signage, the proposed signage will be scaled to the building, there will only be one freestanding sign and all of the signs will still be within the total permitted sign area.

2. The petitioner has demonstrated a practical difficulty and particular hardship as a result of adhering to the strict letter of the regulations of the Sign Code because the building is proposed to house two businesses. Each brand has its own identity and therefore more primary signs are required than are permitted by the Code to promote both businesses effectively from Roosevelt Road.
3. The property in question cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used only under the conditions allowed by the regulations governing the district in which it is located because there are two businesses located within one building on the property and in order for these businesses to yield a reasonable return each business must be able to provide their companies distinct primary signage.
4. The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances because due to escalating development and construction cost, a dual-brand building is preferred and required in these difficult economic times. Providing the necessary primary signs to adequately promote two restaurants within one building proves to be challenging and unique to the owner without a variation to the sign code. Also,

In regard to the petitioner's request to allow Taco Bell/ KFC to have 88.7 square feet of incidental signage in lieu of the maximum area of 14.4 square feet permitted, the Architectural Review Commission made the following findings of fact:

1. The requested variation will not alter the essential character of the locality because the proposed building and site are located in a commercial district that is intended to promote commerce. Having well scaled and placed menu and preview signs will allow customers waiting in the drive-thru to view the menu choices while they are waiting to place their order which promotes speed of service, minimizes order delays and benefits the site with less traffic congestion. Additionally, having a reader sign located underneath the primary sign is common for restaurants and other commercial uses.
2. The petitioner has demonstrated a practical difficulty and particular hardship as a result of adhering to the strict letter of the regulations of the Sign Code because providing customers with all of the items available at both restaurants requires a menu board and a preview menu board will assist with traffic flow through the drive-thru. Without the variation the restaurants will not be able to advertise their entire menu to customers. Also, the reader sign that will be attached to the ground sign will allow customers to see specials or promotions from the street which will help attract additional customers to the restaurants.

GLEN ELLYN ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION

June 3, 2009

3. The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances because the current Sign Code does not take into consideration the incidental signage needed to successfully operate two distinct businesses within one building. Therefore, to adequately provide customers with the full choice of food items available by both restaurants a variation from the Sign Code is needed.

The motion carried unanimously with seven (7) “yes” and (0) “no” votes.

IV: Initial Discussion – Sign Code Update

Village Planner Stegall began initial discussion regarding an impending comprehensive update of the Glen Ellyn Sign Code.

Village Planner Stegall gave a brief overview of this matter, stating the staff will use the Commission’s input to draft proposed text amendments that will be reviewed at a future date. She stated that the last time the Village conducted a comprehensive update to the Sign Code was 1993. She informed the Commission that the ARC is the body that is most familiar with the Code, therefore the Commission will be reviewing the currently impending update. She informed the Commission that this will take several months to complete, anticipating the review to begin September 2009. Referring to the May 21, 2009 memorandum addressed to the Architectural Review Commission, Village Planner Stegall indicated two of the goals of the Sign Code update are:

- Reorganize the Code to make it more user friendly. The code is currently difficult to follow; therefore any input in the reorganization of the Code is requested.
- Rewrite the Code to make it as content neutral as possible to prevent any possible First Amendment violations. She used the example of contractors’ and developers’ signs and suggested that they be removed from the Code and instead that regulations be established in each district allowing a total number and area for all temporary signs regardless of their content.

Village Planner Stegall also conveyed to the Commission other ideas to consider such as allowing corner buildings and units to have two wall signs, creating an allowance for residential developments under 20 acres to have a permanent large scale development sign, separating R0, R1, and R2 regulations from R3, R4 and R5 regulations and adding in the RE, R2B and CC districts, which were recently created. She then closed her presentation by asking the Architectural Review Commission for input and any comments to the May 21, 2009 memorandum.

Commissioner comments were as follows:

- Commission Weisman: Suggested that it would be helpful to have a map showing where the various zoning districts are.

GLEN ELLYN ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION

June 3, 2009

Village Planner Stegall indicated that approximately 80% of the Village is single family residential neighborhoods zoned R2, Multi-family is R4 and R5, Roosevelt Road is zoned mostly C3. She indicated that she would include a zoning map in the commission's materials when the first draft is forwarded to them.

- Chairman Burdett: Questioned if anything in the Code regulates window signage, and questioned if there would be a regulation on attention-getting signs. He also requested staff look into prohibiting or limiting the use of neon signs in the Village.

Village Planner Stegall replied that window signage is currently exempt provided that the signage covers less than 25% of the total window area or 50% of an individual pane and that if the Commission would like, staff could look into and proposing a lesser percentage. She stated that there is no regulation on neon lighting.

Chairman Burdett inquired about policies regarding non-conforming signs and whether they were grandfathered in. He also asked staff to look into an amortization policy to bring non-conforming signs into compliance. Village Planner Stegall stated that some communities have policies amortizing such signs and indicated she will research this possibility and provide more information to the Commission.

- Commission Faganel: Stated that she likes the idea of amending the Code to eliminate some of the commonly requested sign variations.
- Chairman Burdett: He indicated that some aspects of the Code seem strict and would like to see more flexibility.
- Commission Faganel: Commented in favor of requiring landscaping around all monument and freestanding signs.
- Chairman Burdett: Ended the discussion, stating that this appears to be a good project.

III. Other Business

Village Planner Stegall reported that the Economic Development Corporation has been working with local downtown businesses to offer extended hours. The merchants have expressed interest in being allowed to display banners indicating they are open for extended hours and the EDC is working to facilitate this. Allowing such banners would require an amendment to the Village's Sign Code, which would have to be considered by the Village Board. Village Planner Stegall requested feedback from the ARC regarding size, appearance, shape and colors. She also recommended that any hanging brackets be required to be turned in and secured when not in use so as not to create a hazard. Village Planner Stegall presented three different banner styles to the Commission to facilitate discussion: a banner that projects parallel to a window (used in downtown Batavia), banners that hang flush to the window and photos similar to banners proposed by the EDC that project from the building facade. Commissioner comments would be forwarded to the Village Board for consideration. EDC President Jim Meyers and Executive Director Janie Patch provided more details to the

GLEN ELLYN ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION

June 3, 2009

Commission. Ms. Patch displayed a prototype banner. She states that they were proposing a 12" x 18" banner that would hang down from a pole attached to exterior of the building. Ms. Patch said it was the EDCs intent for the banners to be the same colors, design and size for all businesses participating in the Extended Hours Program for both recognition and cost purposes.

The Commissioners generally preferred the protruding banner option to increase visibility by pedestrians and motorists passing through the Central Business District.

Commission Faganel stated that she thought that 12" x 18" seemed small. Mr. Meyers agreed with Commissioner Faganel, but added that they were trying to keep cost to a minimum. The retailers would cover this cost, therefore the bigger the banner, the more cost to the retailer.

Ms. Patch stated that the retailers would support the idea of a projecting bracket because it can be viewed easily by passing motorists. She also stated that this would be a three-color scheme, making it recognizable and consistent in appearance. Construction would be on heavy polyester fabric, hanging by a sleeve on a bracket.

Commissioner Weisman questioned if there could be multiple colors. Ms. Patch indicated that she would discuss color preferences with retailers. She also indicated the cost of a bracket banner would be \$35.00 each for 30 banners. A custom banner would be approximately \$60.00 each for 30 banners. The participating merchants would pay for the cost of the banners.

Commissioner Weisman asked if the banners would be hung at the same height. Ms. Patch indicated that there would be some variability due to differences in the building facades. Village Planner Stegall stated that the Americans with Disability Act (ADA) and the Village Sign Code requires the banners to be installed at a minimum height of 7 feet.

Mr. Meyers requested that the Commission provide their thoughts on possible banner colors. He stated that the retailers will also be consulted.

Commission Weisman asked if there was enough interest from retailers to consider offering banners in two sizes. Ms. Patch stated that the retailers were flexible. Commission Faganel suggested that the banners coordinate with the green and white colors often found in the Village. Commissioner Dickie suggested colors that would compliment specific businesses, such as gold and black for a jewelry store. He also suggested different colors for different storefronts to break up the streetscape format. Mr. Meyers indicated that different colors for different stores may not be cost effective. Chairman Burdett agreed with the same color scheme for all stores indicating that all stores are participating. Commissioner Gorz agreed with Chairman Burdett stating the simpler the better. Commission Wussow suggested avoiding any color combination that may be identified with a different country.

Ms. Patch and Mr. Meyers thanked the Board for their time.

GLEN ELLYN ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION
June 3, 2009

V. Chairman's Report:

Chairman Burdett welcomed Michael Gorz as a new member to the Commission.

VI. Trustee's Report

Trustee Comerford reported on the May 11, 2009 Village Board meeting. Three new trustees were appointed as well as a new president. The presentation of the Downtown Plan to the Board is set for the July 16 Village Board Workshop. He then introduced and recommended the publication "Architectural Resources in the Glen Ellyn North-Central Survey Area -- A summary and Inventory" conducted by Granacki Historic Consultants. The survey contains a total of 826 principal structures and out of the 826 surveyed, 91 were rated significant. He extended the invitation to borrow his copy of the report or it can be viewed at the Village's website.

VII. Staff Report

Village Planner Stegall thanked everyone for being able to attend this special meeting. She also indicated that there would be no meeting next time as there are no construction projects needing review at this time.

VIII. Adjourn

The Commission approved a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:17 p.m.

Submitted by: Tina Kornblith, Recording Secretary

Reviewed by: Christina Collison, Planning Intern and Michele Stegall, Village Planner