

Lueck stated the Village Sign Code Section 4-5-5(N)1 allows a maximum of 120 square feet of shopping center identification signage. He stated Ordinance 4352 previously allowed the property to have three shopping center identification signs in lieu of the one permitted with a total combined area of 279.8 square feet. He stated Ordinance 4352 was amended in 2004 by the adoption of Ordinance 5229 which allowed the shopping center to have a fourth sign with a total combined signage area of 297 square feet. The petitioner is currently requesting approval of amendments to Ordinances 4352 and 5229 to allow the total area of the shopping center identification signage to be increased above the allowable limit of 297 square feet to a total of 327 square feet.

Lueck put up an overview picture of the shopping center location and pointed out the sign variation request would be for the southeastern sign. He showed pictures of the current signage and proposed signage and then stated the current signage has an area of 60 square feet and the proposed signage would have an area of 90 square feet. He stated the increase of 30 square feet would accommodate the new tenant panel for Chicago Prime Meats.

Ken Agojci, managing partner of Chicago Prime Meats located currently at 711 Roosevelt Road in the Glen Ellyn Crossing Shopping Center, stated that Chicago Prime Meats has been at the current location for almost four years. He stated the business has grown tremendously and due to the small space of their current location, the partners looked around Glen Ellyn and the surrounding towns for a larger location. He stated they found an open place at Pickwick Place Shopping Center for which they signed a contract with the condition that Chicago Prime Meats receives approval of the requested sign variation since it is hard to see the business. He stated they have issues now with their current signage at 711 Roosevelt and know they need adequate and proper signage at the new location in Pickwick so customers know they are in the shopping center and so their business can do well.

Tom Eilers, manager of Pickwick Place Shopping Center, stated the shopping center is comprised of five buildings of which four are retail and one is a combination office and retail. He stated that if Chicago Prime Meats joins the shopping center, they would be the fourth largest tenant. Mr. Eilers stated Chicago Prime Meats would be in an awkward location as they will occupy the rear part of the eastern building which only faces west. He stated the three largest tenants comprise a total of six sign panels which face both east and west while the other 20 sign panels face only one direction, either east or west. He stated there are not enough panels if the shopping center is fully occupied.

Chairman Burdett asked if every possible tenant has a sign to which Mr. Eilers answered that there are only 20 available panels for 30 possible tenants.

Commissioner Wussow asked if the Chicago Prime Meats sign would face both east and west to which Mr. Eilers stated that it would.

Chairman Burdett asked Planner Stegall about the height of the proposed sign. Planner Stegall indicated that the sign height would go from 6 feet to 9 feet and that a maximum height of 15 feet for a sign is allowed in this area.

Chairman Burdett asked for any public comments which there were none.

Commissioner Wussow motioned for the closure of the public hearing which Commissioner Dickie seconded, and the motion passed unanimously with a vote of 6-0.

Commissioner Wilson stated there does not seem an end to the expansion and Roosevelt Road seems cluttered now. He wondered aloud how the shopping center might look in 10 to 15 years.

Commissioner Loftus stated she did not know Chicago Prime Meats was there. She stated she liked that they were only increasing the height of the sign but not the width also.

Commissioner Wussow stated Pickwick Place and Chicago Prime Meats have demonstrated the hardship of having poor visibility from Roosevelt Road and the proposed signage is tasteful.

Commissioner Dickie stated he echoed the previous Commissioners' comments. He stated the location is a tricky piece of real estate and that the proposed sign seems reasonable.

Commissioner Albrecht stated Chicago Prime Meats would be the fourth largest tenant and their signage needs to be displayed. She stated the proposed sign looks good.

Chairman Burdett stated he is inclined to agree with the commissioners that there would be a hardship for Chicago Prime Meats if another sign panel is not added. He stated the sign variation is reasonable as the shopping center is not asking for an additional sign.

Commissioner Wussow moved to recommend approval of the requested sign variation from Section 4-5-5(N)1 of the Sign Code for Pickwick Associates Limited Partnership located at 650-690 Roosevelt Road, to allow 327 square feet of shopping center identification signage on the property in lieu of the maximum area of 120 square feet permitted based on the following findings of fact for the requested sign variation:

1. The requested variation complies with the purpose of the Glen Ellyn Sign Code because the addition of the requested square footage to the shopping center identification sign will help eliminate any confusion as to where Chicago Prime Meats is located.
2. 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 existing signs in the shopping center.
3. The petitioner has demonstrated a practical difficulty in adhering to the strict regulations of the Sign Code because without an increase in square footage for Pickwick Shopping

Center, Chicago Prime Meats would not be granted a space for identification signage, and therefore would not have adequate visibility from the roadway.

4. 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 Chicago Prime Meats has no signage at the specified entrance, and signage is necessary to provide visual identification for the business.
5. The plight of the owner if due to unique circumstances because the site is located within a commercial corridor surrounded by many businesses and existing freestanding signs.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Albrecht and passed by a vote of 5-1, with Commissioner Wilson dissenting.

IV. Giordano's Restaurant & Pizzeria, 455 Roosevelt Road – Revised Exterior Appearance and Sign Variance

The next item on the agenda was a request for revised exterior appearance and sign variation approval for the recent renovation of Giordano's Restaurant and Pizzeria located at 455 Roosevelt Road. Planner Stegall stated petitioner Peter Skiouris was unable to be at the meeting due to a death in the family and that Project Architect Susan Robaczewski would be speaking on Mr. Skiouris' behalf. Planner Stegall stated that the property is located on the south side of Roosevelt between Main Street and Lambert Road in the C3 Service Commercial zoning district. She stated the ARC reviewed the original application in October 2007, but that it was not acted upon by the Village Board until January 2010 as the project area included Village right-of-way that was to be purchased by the petitioner and the Village was awaiting payment for the property. She stated the payment was received by the Village and the petitioner was granted exterior appearance approval and sign variation approval for the project by the adoption of Ordinance 5844. She stated the building and signage that ultimately were constructed on the property do not conform to the approved plans.

Planner Stegall showed a picture of the color elevation of the building that was approved by Ordinance 5844. She stated the upper section of the building was to be constructed with an EIFS material and the building was to have a number of awnings on the north, east and west sides. She stated the permit plans that were submitted did represent this building design. She stated that pictures of the constructed building and the approved plans were included in the petitioner's application packet. She stated that some of the changes from the approved plans included the extension of brick veneer to the top of the building, horizontal stone banding was added, the height of the building was reduced about two and a half feet, the columns on the eastern elevation were narrowed, windows were added to the front of the building, and the canopy over the eastern doorway was changed to a copper material. She stated the primary changes to the building were the material change of the proposed EIFS to brick and the elimination of the awnings. She noted that the Appearance Review Guidelines discourage the use of EIFS, but that the use of two different primary building materials helped to break up the appearance and mass of the building and gave it more dimension.

Planner Stegall stated four primary signs, a freestanding signs and three wall signs, were approved for the building which is more signage than has been allowed for most businesses in the past. She also showed a picture of the original building which had six signs, a freestanding sign and five awning signs.

Planner Stegall showed a picture of the western wall sign and stated there is no issue with this sign as it is the same sign referenced in the approving ordinance and the same sign that a permit was issued for. She showed a picture of the eastern wall sign and stated this sign permit was rejected due to the location of this sign which was approved to be above the eastern doorway, above the "tower" element of the building, but was placed in the east window instead. She showed a picture of the front wall sign and stated this sign permit was rejected also as the sign's script was a substantial change from the approved sign and the approved plans show the same script being used on all four primary signs. She showed a picture of the freestanding monument sign and stated the current sign is different in size and proportion than the sign approved by Ordinance 5844 and the sign for which a permit was issued. She stated this sign's height is compatible to the approved sign and the material used for the base of the sign which is compatible to the materials used on the building as encouraged by the Appearance Review Guidelines. Therefore, staff has no objection to the new freestanding sign.

Commissioner Wussow asked if the ARC's decision related to the east sign wall also to which Planner Stegall stated that it did.

Commissioner Wilson stated that it was odd that the changes which were significant occurred to the building and signage without the owner or architect coming back to the ARC for approval. Planner Stegall stated that a few years ago, the Planning Division of the Department started to review building permit plans for commercial and non-residential projects that had gone through ARC's review and have an Ordinance associated with it to verify the same plans that came in for permit were the same plans that were approved. The building permit plans submitted for the project were in substantial conformance with the plans referenced in Ordinance 5844.

Project Architect Susan Robaczewski, employed with W. Lloyd Christoph & Associates, stated the original building was Dryvit on the top. She stated in 2007 as they started going through the proceedings, there was a big difference in the economy so they proposed using Dryvit because it was a lower-cost material than brick. She stated as the project was started in 2010, the bricklayer decided to do the building in brick, instead of the Dryvit, which Mr. Skiouris thought was a good idea since the Village wanted the brick originally and thought it would not be objectionable. Therefore, this change was approved in the field.

Ms. Robaczewski stated the current eastern wall sign has greater visibility from Roosevelt Road than the proposed sign did. She stated there is a dental office building to the east of Giordano's which blocked the proposed location for the eastern wall sign. She stated they did not think it would create an issue to move it to above the east windows instead of placing it in the east "tower." Chairman Burdett stated the dental office was there when the sign application was originally submitted. Commissioner Wussow stated it does not negate the fact that the proposed

sign was to be put in the “tower” and the owner chose to move it. Commissioner Wussow questioned the difference in the awnings to which Ms. Robaczewski stated the awnings were proposed as a transition between the brick and the Dryvit so when the Dryvit was eliminated, the awnings were eliminated too. She noted that some of the awnings were only going to be attached to the brick walls with landscaping and no windows below.

Commissioner Wussow stated she was stunned these decisions were made in the field without approval from the ARC since there are procedures in place.

Ms. Robaczewski stated she understands the ARC’s process, but the field workers did not understand the importance of the approved plans being followed. She stated she understood that brick was a preferred material to Dryvit and believed they were using a better quality material than what was originally approved. She stated Mr. Skiouris and she would appreciate if the ARC would consider the materials that are chosen as the changes were not done in disregard to the approved plans, but rather were changes in the field.

Chairman Burdett questioned the height change to the building to which Ms. Robaczewski stated the building height was reduced by two feet. She stated the building has undergone many substantial renovations and the existing building did have a parapet wall which was a structural integrity concern. She stated as the builders opened the wall, they uncovered many kinds of materials which were not in good condition, and Mr. Skiouris had originally wanted to extend the wall another seven feet. She stated the builders were concerned about the structural integrity of a 10-foot parapet wall so that is why the brick height was reduced two feet. She stated the builders had asked her if the reduction would be OK to which she answered it would be OK since the height would be reduced and not increased. Chairman Burdett stated he was disappointed that the height reduction was done without the ARC’s approval to which Ms. Robaczewski stated Mr. Skiouris did it for a structural reason, not a cost reason or aesthetic reason, so Mr. Skiouris did not think it would be an issue.

Commissioner Wilson stated he felt Mr. Skiouris negated the volunteerism of the ARC to help make Glen Ellyn a more harmonious place. He stated by lowering the building two feet and leaving the awnings off, that the building actually appears higher now than it did before. He asked if the awnings might go back on the building to which Ms. Robaczewski answered that the owner did not plan on adding the awnings.

Commissioner Albrecht stated that the building design had drastically changed and the signage was completely different than what was approved. She stated the new building looks nothing like what was approved as it does not have animation on the side where the awnings were and the color combinations are completely different. She stated the new building might be OK, but it is something that has not been seen, talked about, or approved. She stated the bricklayer should not have told Mr. Skiouris or Ms. Robaczewski what he was going to do, but should have come to Mr. Skiouris and Ms. Robaczewski with recommendations.

Commissioner Wussow asked Planner Stegall if any of the changes were run by the Planning Department to which Planner Stegall stated that the petitioner did present some proposed

changes to staff including the traffic patterns on the site and the addition the electronic message board on the freestanding sign. Planner Stegall stated it is not uncommon for some field adjustments to be made. Planner Stegall stated if a change is determined to be minor it can be approved by staff. However substantial changes to the approved plans such as a change to a primary exterior building material would need to be reviewed by the ARC and Village Board.

Commissioner Dickie stated that due to the nature of the changes and how substantial those changes are, he would like to hear from Mr. Skiouris as he should make the ultimate decisions. Commissioner Dickie stated Mr. Skiouris made changes above and beyond and did approach the village with these changes. He stated he can understand that sometimes changes need to be made, but those changes should have been brought back to the ARC and the Village.

Commissioner Albrecht stated she would like Mr. Skiouris to come back. She asked Ms. Robaczewski if there are some suggestions for the building that the owner and architect could bring back to the ARC since the project was so different from the original plans.

Commissioner Dickie stated that the ARC understood the problems during construction and thinks it would be more practical to come back to the ARC with proposed solutions to get the new building closer to the previously approved rendering. Ms. Robaczewski stated she can do a rendering of the new building. She suggested that the owner could add the awnings to the front of the building above the windows but not on the brick back wall and brick side walls. She stated there were awnings on the original building, but the awning fabric looked terrible after a while and maintenance was so great that the owner got bad feelings about awnings.

Commissioner Dickie stated that the ARC does not want to reject the requests which would cost the owner more time and money. He stated the Commission would welcome options that would get the current building closer to the original plans.

Ms. Robaczewski stated she did call the Village about the northern wall sign when the owner wanted to replace the wording. She stated she was given a verbal OK as long as Mr. Skiouris maintained the original square footage. Planner Stegall stated the wording change was approved as long as the owner maintained the original square footage, but that the Planning Department did not know there would also be a script change.

Commissioner Albrecht suggested that the ARC give suggestions to Ms. Robaczewski so that the petitioner can consider the Commissioners' comments in developing a revised proposal. Chairman Burdett and Commissioner Dickie agreed with this. Chairman Burdett stated the ARC should tell Ms. Robaczewski what the ARC liked about the current building and what they would like to see done to the new building.

Commissioner Wilson stated this new building and process were totally wrong and it cannot happen again. He stated he does not like Dryvit and therefore believed the owner could make the brick work. He stated that awnings would help to divide the building so it looks lower. He would like to see a new rendering as a show of good faith.

Commissioner Loftus stated the owner should have come back to the ARC with the changes. She stated the project needs more deliberation before any more changes are made.

Commissioner Wussow stated she has no problem with the brick used instead of the EIFS. She stated the cornice was an improvement too. However, she stated the current building is not as attractive as the proposed building as it has a neutral, limited color palette and the proposed building had light and dark facades and bright awnings which gave the building some pizzazz. She stated she would not be in favor of changing the brick or put anything over the brick. She stated she is in favor of installing awnings which were on the original plans. She stated the monument sign is acceptable to her as it is close to the approved sign. She stated she is not in favor of the eastern wall sign placement over the window rather than on the tower portion. She stated the north wall sign script font should connect and fit with the style of the building. She stated she is appalled this situation happened at all. She stated it caused the owner hardship and money, but the situation could have been avoided.

Commissioner Dickie stated the owner is responsible for the risks when one makes such changes. He stated he has no objection to the brick and lowering of the building. He stated the eliminated awnings detract from the original design and “dumbed down the building.” He stated from a business prospective, people want a place they can recognize. He stated the monument sign is OK and the east wall sign location is not OK.

Commissioner Albrecht stated it is the underlying and sincere feeling of the ARC to help make this plan work. She stated she is in total agreement with the previous Commissioners’ comments. She stated the building is missing the animation of the originally approved building. She stated the front of the building has potential, but the east and west walls need help. She stated the signs should be like the originally approved signs and the sign placements should reflect the original approved placements.

Chairman Burdett stated he is disappointed in the petitioner’s disregard for the originally approval granted by the Village. He stated the east wall sign should be on the tower. He stated that the awnings would be appropriate above the windows, but that he does not believe there should be awnings where there are not windows.

Planner Stegall stated there would need to be a motion to continue the public hearing due to the sign variations. Ms. Robaczewski asked Planner Stegall what the process is as the owner and she may not be able to get new packets in time for the meeting on April 27th, but could do the meeting on May 11th. Commissioner Albrecht stated there is no need for a new blue-sky rendering which would take time and money, but encouraged the petitioner to spend that time on actual ideas.

Ms. Robaczewski asked if the brick is acceptable to which Commissioner Wussow stated there seems to be agreement that there is no need to change the brick or the building height, but that the decoration and the signage should be evaluated.

Commissioner Albrecht made a motion to continue the public hearing on the revised Exterior Appearance and Sign Variation approval of Giordano's Restaurant & Pizzeria located at 455 Roosevelt Road to the May 11th Meeting. Commissioner Dickie seconded the motion which carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

V. Public Comments

Planner Stegall stated that a public comment period would appear on all ARC agendas in response to recent amendments to the Opening Meetings Act. There was no audience present for comments.

Commissioner Wilson asked if the wall by the cemetery was approved to which Planner Stegall stated it was a part of the road widening at St. Charles and Riford. She stated she would check with Public Works on this. Commissioner Albrecht stated she was happy to see the window signs for Advance Auto Parts on Roosevelt Road in compliance with the Village's Sign Code. Planner Stegall stated Advanced Auto was not happy but did bring their window signage into compliance with the approved plans. She also stated that Advanced Auto would be holding a special event called the "Grave Digger" Experience.

VI. Chairman's Report

Chairman Burdett asked if the Commissioners received Planner Stegall's email regarding 810 N. Main Street. Planner Stegall stated that staff welcomes design ideas from the Commission for the commercial building. Commissioner Wilson asked why the historic residential building would be torn down and the commercial building would be left. Planner Stegall answered that is the recommendation by the task force after a tour of the site and cost estimates for renovation.

VII. Trustee's Report

No Trustee Report.

VIII. Staff Report

Planner Stegall asked the ARC members to send her any ideas for the 810 N. Main Street property in the next two weeks. She stated Pete Pointer will be hosting a workshop at the next ARC meeting on April 27th and to let her know if a Commissioner cannot attend. She asked if information packets for the ARC's meetings can be emailed now regardless if there is a meeting or not to which everyone stated that this was fine with them.

IX. Adjourn

Commissioner Wilson moved, seconded by Commissioner Dickie, to adjourn the meeting at 9:00 p.m. The motion carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

Submitted by: Debbie Solomon, Recording Secretary