



Alex Thorpe, Planning Intern, provided background information regarding the variations requested to allow the petitioner to construct a primary wall sign at 577 Pennsylvania Avenue. He cited Sections 4-5-12(E)1 and 4-5-12(B)1 of the Village Sign Code and provided information regarding the location, existing conditions, and details of the proposed signage. He stated that there are three tenants on the ground floor of this building and, according to the Sign Code, the petitioner's business is not permitted to have a wall sign because the establishment does not have street frontage. Therefore, the petitioner is requesting variations to allow the business to have a primary sign where one would not otherwise be permitted and to allow 7.25 square feet of primary signage in lieu of the 0 square feet permitted. The other two tenants on the ground floor of the building have street frontage and installed their signs in 2006 and 2007 through the normal sign permit process.

Commissioner Wussow questioned if granting the variations would set a precedent. Planner Stegall indicated that this was an issue for the Commission to consider and noted that the purpose of the existing regulations is reduce sign clutter on the façade of buildings that may have multiple tenants located in rear or upper floor spaces. General discussion then took place over the design of the existing signage and the design of the proposed sign.

Mr. Tom Williams, the petitioner's attorney, presented information regarding the requested sign variations and stated that the proposed signage would be beneficial to the tenant because most users of this business will not be from Glen Ellyn so it may be difficult to locate the business without the proposed sign. The sign would be the same dimensions and as the other existing primary signs on the building and would be mounted at the same height. Chairman Burdett questioned if the small sign currently located next to the door would be removed if the variations were granted. Ms. Stegall indicated the smaller sign is defined as a nameplate sign which is identified in the Sign Code as an exempt sign. Therefore, it could stay if the requested variations were granted. General discussion took place over the details of the business and the type of services offered at the facility. Commissioner Faganel motioned to close the public hearing. Commissioner Wussow seconded. The motion passed unanimously and the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner comments regarding the requested sign variations were as follows:

- Commissioner Wussow stated that she believed the petitioner had demonstrated a hardship and that the proposed signage was necessary to properly advertise the business.
- Commissioner Faganel stated that she agreed with Commissioner Wussow but was concerned about the possible clutter of signage on the front façade of the building.
- Commissioner Albrecht stated the signage on this building should be aligned with the other primary signs if possible to reduce clutter.
- Chairman Burdett stated that he was in favor of granting the requested sign variations and believes this is a unique circumstance.

Commissioner Wussow motioned to recommended approval of the requested Sign Code variations. Commissioner Keasler seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**IV. Chairman's Report**

Chairman Burdett welcomed the new recording secretary, Chris Ragona to the Commission.

**V. Trustee's Report**

Trustee Comerford provided information regarding the Riford Road project that will begin after July and will run until early November with the St. Charles Road portion being worked on first. He also discussed the status of the Transitional Downtown Advisory Committee (TDAC) and their recommendation for the creation of a new downtown organization which was discussed at a recent Village Board meeting. The Village Board will continue discussion of the TDAC's recommendation at a future workshop meeting. Lastly, Trustee Comerford discussed the current situation revolving around the Hill Avenue bridge and the Village of Lombard possibly closing the bridge. He stated that weight limitations have already been placed on the bridge and that Lombard has asked the Village to contribute roughly \$300,000 to repair the bridge. He asked residents to participate in an online survey discussing this matter. General discussion took place over the request to share repair costs and possible alternative scenarios the Village could explore.

**VI. Traveling Architecture and Landscape Awards**

The Commission discussed the four projects eligible for this year's awards. Ms. Stegall stated that an award does not have to be given each year if the Commission does not feel that any of the eligible projects are worthy. She noted that there have been several years when awards were not granted. The Commission agreed to discuss this agenda item again at the next scheduled meeting to give the Commissioners additional opportunity to view the eligible projects.

**VII. Staff Report**

Ms. Stegall stated that a sign variation request and an exterior appearance application would be placed on an upcoming agenda. She also recapped the recent Municipal Design Review Network event that took place on May 27<sup>th</sup> and stated that over 60 people attended from over 30 different communities and consulting firms.

**VIII. Adjourn**

Commissioner Wussow moved, seconded by Commissioner Keasler, to adjourn the meeting at 8:21 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Submitted by: Chris Ragona, Recording Secretary

Reviewed by: Michele Stegall, Village Planner and Alex Thorpe, Planning Intern