

Planner Stegall stated the sign code permits window signage to cover 25% of the total window area and 50% of an individual window pane, she suggested that the Commission may wish to recommend that the permitted window signage be further restricted as a condition of approval and that the petitioner had indicated he was amicable to installing no more than 3 window signage with no more than 25% coverage of an individual window pane. The last condition she touched on was that the landscaping around the proposed freestanding sign be expanded and enhanced to more fully cover the island and that a landscape plan be submitted before the request is forwarded to the Village Board. She suggested that Commissioners may wish to be mindful of the current signage adjacent to the easternmost access drive to the Pickwick Place Shopping Center as the proposed freestanding sign for the Advance Auto Parts store could potentially impede the visibility of the Pickwick sign, especially for westbound traffic. Therefore, she suggested that the proposed freestanding sign be pushed back in the island as far as possible or that the island be slightly expanded to allow the sign to be setback further. For aesthetic reasons she also suggested that the width of the sign be made equal to the width of the sign face. Upon questioning by a Commissioner she noted that increasing the width of the base could result in further blocking the visibility of the Pickwick sign. Another suggestion made by staff included eliminating the red background on the wall sign. Planner Stegall displayed a picture of another Advance Auto Parts store utilizing individual letters on the wall sign with no red background.

Commissioner Albrecht questioned if it is possible to set the sign farther back within the existing island. Planner Stegall stated it would be possible to move the sign back a few feet because the current signage is setback further than the proposed signage. Commissioner Albrecht stated moving the sign back a few feet could increase the visibility of the current Pickwick Place signage. Commissioner Allen questioned if the property is part of Pickwick Place. Planner Stegall stated the property is not part of the Pickwick Place Shopping Center.

Commissioner Wussow commented on the sample signage that was provided from another Advanced Auto Parts store. She stated she would like to see the monument sign shorter than ten feet to increase visibility of other signage on the street. General discussion took place regarding the types of materials that could be used for the base on the sign in lieu of the proposed concrete block to better relate the sign to the building and surrounding area.

Commissioner Albrecht stated the uniformity of signage is very nice in the adjacent shopping center and she stated she would like to see the uniformity of the signage continue. She suggested the use of a flag stone material for the base of the proposed freestanding sign.

Chairman Burdett questioned the repositioning of the sign in order to remove any conflict with the Pickwick Place sign. General discussion took place regarding alternate locations where the sign could potentially be placed on the property.

Commissioner Loftus arrived.

Commissioner Albrecht questioned where the red fascia would stop. Planner Stegall stated the red color would extend across the entire length of the front facade and that staff had debated if the background should be considered part of the total sign area.

Commissioner Allen stated that the proposed bright red color might not fit the character of the building and this area of Roosevelt Road. The Commissioners discussed if the red should be removed or reduced to just the area behind the letters of the proposed signage.

Brent Forte, with Site Enhancement Services and representative for Advanced Auto Parts, discussed details of the proposed signage. He discussed a number of alternate locations to place the sign that were looked at and why this choice was the best location. However he indicated that the petitioner would be willing to move the sign back a few feet.

Mr. Forte discussed details of the wall sign and stated that the proposed signage and red background is consistent with other Advance Auto Parts signage in the region. He stated that after reviewing the site that he agreed the red may be out of character and was willing to reduce the area to only behind the letters. He touched on the landscaping and stated that the petitioner would be willing to improve the landscape features that would be installed. He agreed that a 10 foot freestanding sign would be a more suitable height than the originally proposed 15 feet particularly given the placement of a nearby tree. He noted that lowering the sign could further block surrounding signage depending on the direction of travel. He stated moving the sign back is feasible as long as a curb cut does not need to be modified or the loss of a parking spot is not necessary.

Commissioner Wussow questioned what material would be used on the base of the monument sign. Mr. Forte stated the materials will be the same as the building and the cost of using brick may exceed the budget for this project. He also stated a preference to keep the width of the sign as proposed because of the possibility of the sight issues.

Commissioner Wussow questioned the window signage and how the code interprets this. Planner Stegall stated 50% of each window pane is permitted to be covered, but only 25% of the total window area. Commissioner Wussow stated that the amount of window signage allowed could look tacky due to the amount of glass in the front of the building and questioned if a condition could be placed on the approval if the requested variations are granted further restricting the amount of permitted window signage. Planner Stegall indicated that the Village Attorney had indicated that this could be done as a condition of approval.

Chairman Burdett questioned what the basis for the variations was. Mr. Forte stated there was a hardship due to the surrounding vegetation and the amount of traffic on the roadway and that the additional signage will give customers more ample time to identify the store and pull into the parking lot.

Commissioner Albrecht questioned how many signs should be allowed to be placed in the storefront windows if the variations are granted.

Commissioner Wussow suggested reducing the amount of permitted window signage to 15% of the total area of the bottom 2/3 of window space in order to reduce the chance of clutter. Mr. Forte stated that this could be agreeable because window signage is a main advertising technique

of auto parts stores and a percentage will allow for more flexibility for displaying signs in the windows than a set number.

Chairman Burdett expressed his concerns with using a percentage because the potential for placing 14 tiny signs is possible under this language. Planner Stegall stated using a percentage would be along the same logic as the code.

Commissioner Albrecht questioned the possibility of placing window signage on the east or west sides of the building under the current discussion. Mr. Forte stated the east and west windows would be important places of advertisement.

General discussion took place on the percentage of window signage that should be allowed in the glass façade of the building as well as the east and west windows.

Commissioner Faganel questioned if the window signs would be yellow like in the example provided. Mr. Forte stated typically the window signs will match the company logo of red and yellow.

Commissioner Wussow motioned to close the public hearing. Commissioner Albrecht seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner's Comments:

Commissioner Dickie preferred to push the monument sign as far back as possible and lower to ten feet, attempt to match the pedestal to the stone on the building and reduce the red on the building fascia to the area surrounding the letters of the sign. He stated he was in favor of using a percentage to restrict window signage to give more flexibility.

Commissioner Faganel agreed with Commissioner Dickie and stated that the petitioner had agreed to many conditions. She stated the chance for abuse of the sign code is minimal because this will be a long term store rather than temporary. She stated she had no problems with the window signage as permitted in the code.

Commissioner Albrecht stated she was in favor of limiting the height of the ground sign to 10 feet, she is in favor of stone around the base, that either matches the stone material on the building or the adjacent Pickwick Place Shopping Center as close as possible. She also agreed that the red fascia should be reduced to be just around the letters on the wall sign, that the monument sign should be moved north as far as possible, that the proposed landscaping should be enhanced as suggested by staff, that no neon window signage should be permitted and that the percentage of permitted window signage should be 10% of the lower pane of windows, excluding the doors.

Commissioner Allen concurred and stated the higher the sign is the more pleasing it will be if the pedestal is narrower.

Commissioner Wussow believed the pedestal of the ground sign should match the building as recommended in the Appearance Review Guidelines, that the width of the pedestal was appropriate and that the height of the ground sign should be lowered. She stated she was also in favor of allowing 10% of the bottom window panes to be covered with signage, and that the red on the fascia should be just around the sign lettering. She was also in favor of moving the ground sign north as much as possible within the existing island.

Commissioner Loftus concurred and stated that the red background should be minimized, that the base of the ground sign should match the building, and agreed with minimizing window signage by a percentage but not limiting the number of window signs.

Chairman Burdett stated in his opinion the criteria for a sign variation was met, he stated he was in favor of the 10% formula for window storage, the base of the sign is okay as proposed, the material of the base should match the building or Pickwick, the red fascia should only be behind the letters, landscaping should fully cover the island around the sign, and the sign should be moved 5 feet to the north without cutting into the curb.

The Architectural Review Commission made the following findings of fact in regard to the requested variations:

- A. The requested variations comply with the purpose of the Glen Ellyn Sign Code because the proposed signage will “help people find what they need without difficulty or confusion” which is a stated purpose of the Sign Code;
- B. The requested variations will not alter the essential character of the locality because the property is located in a commercial district and surrounded by a large variety and types of freestanding signs and variations for the number of primary signs have been granted for other businesses in the area;
- C. The petitioner has demonstrated a practical difficulty in adhering to the strict regulations of the Sign Code because due to the surrounding vegetation, amount of traffic lanes and other surrounding obstructions, a freestanding monument sign is required to provide motorists with advance notification to safely locate and navigate into the site; and
- 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 which it is located because due to surrounding conditions a freestanding sign is needed to provide advance identification of the site and identification of the entrance.

Based on the above findings of fact, Commissioner Wussow motioned, seconded by Commissioner Albrecht to recommend approval of the following variations for Advanced Auto Parts to be located at 696 Roosevelt:

- A. A variation from Section 4-5-12(E)1 of the Sign Code to allow two primary signs on the property in lieu of the maximum number of one primary sign permitted; and

- B. A variation from Section 4-5-12(D) to allow a sign to be located 40 feet from the centerline of Roosevelt Road in lieu of the minimum setback of 55 feet required

Subject to the following conditions:

- A. The signage shall be installed in substantial conformance with the plans and testimony presented at tonight's meeting;
- B. That the dimensions of the ground sign be amended so that the sign height is lowered to 10 feet and that the sign be moved north as far as possible within the island without obstruction of the light pole;
- C. That the material for the sign base match the stone on the building;
- D. That the red fascia around the wall sign be reduced to be only behind the letters and logo on the wall sign and the remainder of the fascia remain a neutral color;
- E. That the window signage be limited to 10% of the total glass area of the lower panes of glass and no more than 50% of an individual pane. In addition, no neon signs shall be permitted;
- F. That the landscape plan be amended so that the proposed landscaping more fully covers the island around the proposed sign and that a revised landscape plan be submitted prior to the request being forwarded to the Village Board.

The motion passed unanimously. The Commission requested to see the changes to the plans once they were revised. Planner Stegall indicated that staff would copy the Commission on the revised plans that will be forwarded to the Village Board.

IV. Chairman's Report

Chairman Burdett stated that Commissioner Gorz has resigned from the Commission.

V. Trustee's Report

Trustee Comerford stated officials from COD and Glen Ellyn recently met and reached an interim agreement and attorneys are meeting to attempt to come to terms on a new intergovernmental agreement.

Chairman Burdett questioned if building designs will come through the ARC for future COD buildings. Planner Stegall stated that COD had previously received approval of design guidelines for the campus, but that the terms of any new agreement are unknown.

VI. Staff Report

Planner Stegall stated the trophy award and landscape plaque will be presented at the September 27 Board meeting. She stated a staff representative will be presenting information at a future

meeting about EIFS. She also stated the CDH painting will start next week and should take roughly 5 weeks at a cost of \$40,000.

VII. Adjourn

Commissioner Allen moved, seconded by Commissioner Dickie, to adjourn the meeting at 9:02 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Submitted by: Chris Ragona, Recording Secretary

Reviewed by: Michele Stegall, Village Planner

X:\Plandev\PLANNING\ARC\MINUTES\2010\arc090810mins.doc