

**MINUTES**

**BOARD/COMMISSION:** Architectural Review                      **DATE:** 10/14/2009  
**MEETING:** Regular    **CALLED TO ORDER:** 7:40 p.m.  
**QUORUM:** Yes    **ADJOURNED:** 8:12 p.m.

**MEMBER ATTENDANCE:**                                      **PRESENT:** Commissioners Allen, Wussow,  
Dickie, Faganel, Weisman, Gorz, Albrecht  
Chairman Burdett

**ABSENT:** None

**ALSO PRESENT:**    Trustee Liaison Comerford, Village Planner  
Stegall, Recording Secretary Kornblith

**AUDIENCE ATTENDANCE:**                                      Pam Little, Owner, DKL Investments, LLC

**I.     Call to Order**

Chairman Burdett called the Glen Ellyn Architectural Review Commission (ARC) public meeting to order at 7:40 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 September 23, 2009 Architectural Review Commission meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

**III.   Glen Oak Restaurant, 479 Pennsylvania Avenue - Public Hearing**

A motion was made and seconded to open a public hearing to consider a request for approval of variations from the Glen Ellyn Sign Code for the property located at 479 Pennsylvania Avenue, known as the Glen Oak Restaurant. The motion carried unanimously.

**A.     **Staff Presentation.****

Recording Secretary Kornblith performed the swearing in of Village Planner Michele Stegall.

GLEN ELLYN ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION  
October 14, 2009

Village Planner Stegall gave a brief overview of the project as set forth in the staff memorandum dated October 9, 2009. The petitioner is requesting approval of a variation from Section 4-5-12(E)2 of the Glen Ellyn Sign Code to allow three (3) primary signs to be on the property in lieu of the maximum number of two (2) primary signs permitted. The petitioner is requesting approval of a variation from Section 4-15-12(C) of the Glen Ellyn Sign Code to allow an 18.5 foot tall freestanding sign in lieu of the maximum height of 8 feet permitted for a freestanding sign in the C5B District. The requests are being made to allow a new sign face to be installed on the existing freestanding sign on the property. The subject property is located at the southwest corner of Glenwood Avenue and Pennsylvania Avenue in the C5B Central Business District. Currently, the Glen Oak Restaurant has three (3) primary signs on their property, including two (2) wall signs located on the north and east building elevations respectfully and an 18.5 foot tall freestanding sign located at the corner of Glenwood Avenue and Pennsylvania Avenue. Village Planner Stegall stated that the existing sign was originally built in the 1970's when the building was constructed and with updates to the Sign Code, the height of the freestanding sign now exceeds the maximum height allowed in the C5B District. She also added that the signs are currently considered legal nonconforming, but the replacement of the freestanding sign face triggers conformance with the Code.

**B. Questions from Commission.**

Commissioner Faganel requested clarification of the visual display presented to the Commission. Village Planner Stegall explained that the total sign area is within the Code.

**C. Petitioner's Presentation.**

Recording Secretary Kornblith performed the swearing in of Pam Little, DKL Investments, LLC, owner of the property known as the Glen Oak Restaurant located at 479 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Ms. Little opened up her discussion introducing herself and giving a brief background of current events leading to this forum. She stated that the Glen Oak Restaurant was doing okay as a business, but was in need of updating the interior as well as the exterior. She stated that they received a grant for exterior improvements to the building and that they were restoring the interior with funds of their own. She also added that they had the desire to restore the building back to its natural beauty. The signs were in need of cleaning and updating. She stressed that the appearance of the new sign face was intended to be clean, contemporary and simple.

Commissioner Weisman asked if the wall signs will be the changed. Ms. Little stated that they would remain the same, but be painted.

Village Planner Stegall inquired about the extent of the work planned for the building exterior. Ms. Little stated that the entire interior of the restaurant was totally rehabbed with painting and new furniture. She also added that painting of the exterior and roof will be in

GLEN ELLYN ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION  
October 14, 2009

the future, but they are also planning on asking the city for trees, a bike rack and landscaping. She added that currently they are working with Amazing Signs.

Chairman Burdett questioned the material of the sign face. Ms. Little stated that the material was laminate. The new sign face will be similar to the picture that was submitted but with less leaves. The colors will be blue gray with deep red leaves.

Chairman Burdett inquired about how the petitioner believed the request met the criteria for approval of a sign variation. Ms. Little commented that the request would not alter the character of the area, and that if they were required to lower the sign that it would create a hardship as redoing the freestanding sign to comply with the Sign Code would cost approximately \$10,000-\$15,000.

**D. Public Comment.**

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

Chairman Burdett moved, seconded by Commissioner Gorz to close the public hearing. The motion was unanimously approved by a voice vote of 8-0. Votes as follows: Commissioners Gorz, Weisman, Wussow, Dickie, Faganel, Albrecht, Allen and Chairman Burdett all voted "yes".

**E. Commission Deliberation**

Chairman Burdett asked for comments from the Commission:

- Commissioner Weisman: She stated that she was in agreement with the request. She added that she was very excited about the restoration of the restaurant.
- Commissioner Albrecht: She stated that this was a good plan.
- Commissioner Allen: He indicated that the signage fits the building and that he is in favor of the project.
- Commissioner Dickie: He had no objections. He stated that Ms. Little was essentially keeping the signage the way it currently is, and simply replacing and refurbishing the existing signage.
- Commissioner Wussow: She stated that this was a reasonable request and was in favor of the application.
- Commissioner Faganel: She stated that she was in agreement with the request.
- Chairman Burdett: He indicated that he believed that the petitioner had demonstrated a unique hardship in regard to requested sign variations. He also stated that the new sign was appropriate and that he was in agreement with the request.
- Commissioner Gorz: He was in agreement with the request.

Ms. Little added to the comments that the restaurant will remain the same, but with new items on the menu along with the same items. She also added that they were very excited with their project.

**F. Motion**

Commission Wussow moved, seconded by Commissioner Gorz to approve the requested sign variations based on the following findings of fact:

1. The requested variations will comply with the Statement of Purpose in the Sign Code because the current signage on the property helps eliminate confusion and distractions which jeopardize vehicular and pedestrian safety due to the difficult entrance location.
2. The requested variations will not alter the essential character of the locality because the petitioner is only proposing to replace the sign face on the existing freestanding sign and no increases to the current height, number, or square footage of signage will occur.
3. The petitioner has demonstrated a practical difficulty or particular hardship as a result of adhering to the strict letter of the regulations of the Sign Code because all of the signs are original to the building and to lower the existing freestanding sign would be costly.
4. The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances due to the position of the building on the site which is located close to the corner and if the sign were lowered it would interfere with the roofline of the building.

The motion carried unanimously with eight (8) “yes” and (0) “no” votes. Votes as follows: Commissioners Gorz, Weisman, Wussow, Dickie, Faganel, Albrecht, Allen and Chairman Burdett all voted “yes”.

**IV. Chairman’s Report.**

Chairman Burdett stated that he had one item for open discussion. A letter Lee Marks, Chairman of the Historical Preservation Commission, had submitted requesting that the Architectural Review Commission consider the design of signage during the impending update of the Sign Code. Chairman Marks also suggested a possible joint meeting on the Commissions to share signage ideas.

Village Planner Stegall stated that staff is just beginning to review the Code. However, the Code deals with standards related to such things as the maximum size and area of signs, not design. She indicated that if the Commission wants to review issues related to the design of signage that this may be more appropriately addressed in the Appearance Review Guidelines or during the anticipated future review of wayfinding signage in relation to the downtown plan.

Some Commissioners expressed concerns that requiring private property owners to conform to a given design or style of sign would stifle individuals’ ideas. Other Commissioners questioned if Chairman Marks was referring to public streetscape signage as opposed to private property signage. Chairman Burdett ended the discussion by informing the Commission he would follow up with Lee Marks to clarify and receive more information regarding this request.

GLEN ELLYN ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION  
October 14, 2009

**V. Trustee's Report**

Trustee Comerford reported on the October 5 Village Board special meeting on the Downtown Strategic Plan. At this meeting, the Board reviewed line by line the suggested projects and initiatives in the Plan. There was one issue the Board was in disagreement on which was the South Greenway. The vote was 4-3 against the establishment of green space south of the railroad tracks. The final vote to approve the Plan is anticipated to take place at the October 26 Village Board meeting. He also informed the Committee that the Baker Hill signage was approved. He closed his comments by informing the Committee of the Glen Ellyn Library 's request for funding to address building and site maintenance issues. He then asked if there were any questions from the Commission. There were no questions from the Commission.

**VI. Staff Report**

Village Planner Stegall informed the Commission of the following projects for the upcoming November 11 Architectural Review Commission meeting.

- 479-483 Roosevelt Road-Exterior Appearance
- 880 Roosevelt Road – Dominick's Sign Variations

**VII. Other Business**

Trustee Comerford questioned Village Planner Stegall about the neon signage at the business known as "We Buy Gold" and questioned if it is permitted. He stated that several comments have been stated on the Village Boards. Village Planner Stegall indicated that she was not aware of the issue and would look into it.

**VIII. Adjourn**

The Commission approved a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:12 p.m.

Submitted by: Tina Kornblith, Recording Secretary

Reviewed By: Michele Stegall, Village Planner