



30 foot sight triangle. Village Planner Stegall noted the significant width of the parkway in this area as a factor that would assist with visibility.

Lisa Voight, with Parvin-Clauss Sign Company, provided background information regarding the sign request and stated the sign would help guide motorists into the townhome development and should not cause any issues with safety. Commissioner Albrecht questioned if the sign variation was approved if it would make sense to eliminate the existing sign for redundancy issues. Village Planner Stegall stated that the Sign Code permits two signs on the property.

Commissioner Faganel questioned why the variation was being requested now since the townhomes have been at this location for a while. Mr. Sloweski, representing the Baker Hill Condominium Association, stated the reasoning for this signage was to increase visibility of the development. He noted that there is another drive south of this drive leading into the commercial portion of the Baker Hill development and the proposed sign would help identify the entrance to the residential development.

Commissioner Burdett questioned why the font on the proposed sign was different than the existing signage. Ms. Voight stated she felt the new font was much bolder and easier to see and the proposed design also fits in with the community character.

Commissioner Faganel questioned if other townhomes have needed variations for their signage located within the 30 foot setback. Village Planner Stegall stated she would need to confirm these numbers for certain parcels of land and noted that currently the Sign Code is under review and the current draft calls for the complete elimination of the required setback.

Commissioner Albrecht questioned the type of material that would be used on the sign. Ms. Voight stated the material would be an alternative to stone which is very durable and would match the color of the townhomes as close as possible. General discussion took place over the coloring of each townhome building and how it compares to the proposed signage.

Commissioner Dickie questioned if the sign would be illuminated. Mr. Sloweski stated that the sign would not be internally illuminated but that a light may be installed to illuminate the sign at night. General discussion took place over the color of the proposed sign and also the proposed font. Commissioner Albrecht stated she would like to see some kind of color and font match to the existing sign on the property as it should not increase the cost of the project and would provide a more consistent image.

Commissioner Wussow questioned if certain characteristics were changed if it would alter the price of the project significantly. Ms. Voight stated it would certainly alter the price but should not put the cost of the project out of reach to the applicant. Commissioner Wussow requested that the signage be designed as close as possible to the existing signage. General discussion took place regarding the design of the existing signage compared to the proposed signage.

As no members of the public desired to comment on the request, Chairman Burdett asked for a motion to close the public hearing. Commissioner Wussow motioned to close the public hearing. Commissioner Loftus seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Albrecht stated she would be in favor of approving this variation if the sign was modified to be more compatible with the existing sign.

Commissioner Faganel stated she was in favor of the variation with the changes discussed.

Commissioner Dickie stated the setback was the major issue but felt that the requested variation was necessary as without it the sign would be located on an individual townhome owner's property. He also stated he was in favor of matching the design to the existing sign including the piers and font.

Commissioner Wussow indicated that she was in favor of the requested variation with the changes discussed.

Commissioner Loftus stated she was in favor of the requested variation if the sign was matched to the existing signage.

Chairman Burdett stated he believed the petitioner demonstrated a hardship and that a sign is needed at this location.

Commissioner Wussow motioned and Commissioner Faganel seconded that the Architectural Review Commission recommend approval of a variation from Section 4-5-5(M) of the Glen Ellyn Sign Code to allow a permanent large-scale development sign with a setback of as little as 3 feet in lieu of the minimum setback of 30 feet required, based on the following findings of fact:

- A. The requested variation complies with the purpose of the Glen Ellyn Sign Code because the addition of the proposed permanent large-scale development sign will help eliminate any confusion as to where the Baker Hill townhome development is located;
- B. The requested variation will not alter the essential character of the locality because the proposed sign is made of materials that are attractive and in keeping with the design of the subdivision;
- C. The petitioner has demonstrated a practical difficulty in adhering to the strict regulations of the Sign Code because placing the proposed sign at the required setback of 30 feet would place the sign on a homeowner's property and make it difficult to see from the street;
- D. 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 the Baker Hill townhome development has no signage at the specified entrance, and signage is necessary to provide visual identification for the development.

The Architectural Review Commission's recommendation was subject to the following conditions:

1. The signage shall be installed in the substantial conformance with the dimensions proposed and the testimony presented at the meeting;

2. The piers and font on the proposed sign shall visually match the existing sign and all capital letters shall be used.

#### **IV. Treasure House, 497 Pennsylvania Avenue – Pre-application Meeting**

Village Planner Stegall stated that Metropolitan Family Services owner of The Treasure House located at 497 Pennsylvania Avenue in the C5A zoning district was requesting preliminary feedback from the Commission about proposed changes to the building. She stated a façade renovation was planned with new windows, awnings and an addition in the back of the building that will almost double the size of the building. The plans indicate that the addition would be constructed with EIFS. However the petitioner has recently indicated that they may be open to using stucco. She suggested that the Commission may wish to inquire about the color of the addition because the existing building is painted white and the Appearance Review Guidelines call for the addition to match the color of the existing building, however white is a discouraged color in the Appearance Review Guidelines. She also discussed the timeline for this project and that the petitioner would like to complete the façade renovation prior to the holidays.

Project Architect, Craig Pryde provided information regarding the upcoming project. He stated that The Treasure House is in need of expansion because it is growing out of its current size. He outlined the area where the addition would take place and the existing characteristics of the property. He stated that the existing storefront window needs to be replaced because currently it is only single pane glass and in the winter it becomes frosted over and is difficult to see inside. He stated the proposed changes will be similar to the current design and an ADA entrance will be constructed as well as HVAC, sprinkler, and utility upgrades. Mr. Pryde indicated there would be no rooftop equipment on the building.

Mr. Pryde described the building materials that are slated to be used and presented information on the material of EIFS, the different types that can be used and other details of the proposed plan. He also provided a presentation illustrating the visibility of the addition from different vantage points in the downtown. General discussion took place over the location of EIFS in the rest of the downtown area. Planner Stegall also inquired if the petitioner had looked into the possibility of receiving a façade improvement grant. General discussion continued over the design and certain characteristic of the building; particularly the existing glass block on the front façade which was not believed to be original and is discouraged by the Appearance Review Guidelines. The Commission discussed if this may be an opportunity to remove the glass block and extend the storefront window into this area.

Commissioner Albrecht expressed her concerns over the design of the building and how the character of the building will be restored on a smaller renovation budget.

Commissioner Wussow questioned the use of EIFS in the Village. Village Planner Stegall stated that it is discouraged as a primary building material but that the Village has allowed it as an accent material. She stated EIFS has historically been prone to water damage. General discussion continued over certain details of the building design.

Commissioner Wussow stated this was a great proposal and regarding EIFS vs. stucco, exterior appearance is roughly equal, either would be fine, and she was in favor of either approach. She also showed preference for the off-white color. The addition proposed is fine and the storefront signage, awning, and window design are suitable. She stated she would prefer if the glass block was removed and replaced with similar windows that will be going into the front façade, however if this was not done it would not be a deal breaker. She also mentioned that she prefers the 3/2 window design with three window panes on the top and two on the bottom.

Commissioner Dickie encouraged the use of EIFS and was on the fence about the glass block. He wondered if this is something that could be done later or as a phased project.

Chairman Burdett stated looking at the big picture and long term this is a great plan, he raised concerns regarding the glass block and he questioned if other alternatives could be used.

Commissioner Faganel raised concerns over the use of EIFS in the downtown area and stated she could not support that material. She stressed that is discouraged by the Appearance Review Guidelines which were recently updated in 2006. She did not have a preference in regard to the glass block window and shared a preference for the 3/2 window design.

Commissioner Albrecht stated she was in favor of removing the existing glass block in the front of the building to balance the façade. She stated she was looking for a rich and warm color on the building and was not in favor of the use of EIFS. She expressed a preference for the 3/2 window design.

Commissioner Loftus stated she was in favor of the use of EIFS because it is more energy efficient than stucco and that she was in favor of keeping the glass block because it adds to the character of the building.

Chairman Burdett stated he was against the addition being painted white, he suggested that a traditional window design be installed on the addition to try and match the character of the original building. He was in favor of keeping the glass block in the front of the building and the 3/2 window design.

## **V. Trustee's Report**

Trustee Liaison Comerford stated the Historical Society received a \$200,000 donation and it was used to pay off a debt that was owed on the property, an agreement was settled between the Village and the donor and the remaining debt was removed. He briefed the Commissioners on the status of the College of DuPage signage and he urged the Commissioners to view the signage that was recently installed. The signs violate a number of Village Codes and the Village is still negotiating the future of these signs with COD. He stated that safety is the main concern right now and ongoing negotiations will continue to take place.

## **VI. Traveling Architecture and Landscape Awards**

Village Planner Stegall introduced the properties up for awards and asked the Commissioners for nominations for each of the awards. General discussion took place over the properties nominated and highlights of the work completed at each of these respective properties. The Waters Edge project was nominated unanimously by the Commission for the Vivian Bell Landscape Award and it was decided none of the other properties would be eligible for an honorable mention. General discussion took place over the nominations for the Traveling Trophy Design Award. The Commission nominated the newly designed Taco Bell/KFC at 370 Roosevelt Road with all members in favor with the exception of Commissioner Faganel who voted for First United Methodist Church at 424 Forest Avenue. After a brief discussion the Commission was in favor of nominating First United Methodist Church as an honorable mention in this category.

## **VII. Chairman's Report**

Chairman Burdett welcomed Commissioner Loftus to the Architectural Review Commission.

## **VIII. Staff Report**

Village Planner Stegall stated that a normal meeting schedule will be taking place in the following months with a number of items on upcoming agendas.

## **IX. Adjourn**

Commissioner Wussow moved, seconded by Commissioner Faganel, to adjourn the meeting at 9:49 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Submitted by: Chris Ragona, Recording Secretary

Reviewed by: Michele Stegall, Village Planner