

take action to comply with the condition. He stated the Village staff met with the petitioner to discuss the non-conformance and the petitioner decided to submit an application for revised exterior appearance approval in an attempt to have this condition removed.

Architect Douglas Lasch with Jaeger, Nickola & Associates, Ltd. apologized for appearing before the ARC again and stated the correct mullions were on the construction drawings; however, the contractor had gone back to a previous drawing and did not install the mullions. He stated the petitioner is satisfied with how the church looks and the verticality is still there, but the church does not have funds to pay for additional mullions at this point.

The ARC discussed the missing mullions and agreed it is a minor adjustment.

Commissioner Albrecht made a motion to approve the Revised Exterior Appearance of 493 Forest Avenue. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Thompson and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0. Commissioner Wilson recused himself from this application due to a personal relationship with a member on the building committee for the Church.

4. 526 N. Main Street, Career Vision – Exterior Appearance

Village Planner Stegall stated the petitioner, the Ball Foundation, is requesting Exterior Appearance approval for renovations in progress to the south façade of the existing building at 526 N. Main Street. She stated the property is located on the west side of Main Street between Anthony Street and Pennsylvania Avenue in the C5B Central Business District, Central Service Sub-district. She stated the proposed changes include the addition of six new windows and black shutters on the south elevation of the building. She stated the project is close to completion as the Planning Department accidentally issued a building permit without the petitioner going through an Exterior Appearance review. She stated once the Planning Department contacted the applicant, the applicant promptly submitted materials for the ARC's review.

Chairman Burdett asked if this was an administrative oversight to which Planner Stegall stated there was confusion in the Planning Department as the petitioner was originally planning to construct a parking lot which requires Exterior Appearance review. She stated the petitioner decided not to go forward with the parking lot; and "Exterior Appearance Review Required" was subsequently crossed off on the file. She stated there was no administrative waiver given and there was no fault on the petitioner's part.

Architect Robert Van Het Hof with Ware Malcomb Associates stated the windows were on the original construction documents; however the black shutters were not. He stated the south façade's windows were made to mimic the north façade's windows and showed a picture of the building's north façade. He stated the north façade's windows were measured and then mimicked exactly on the south façade and the windows improve the blank wall on the south façade. He apologized for not appearing at the ARC before now and stated they promptly produced all documentation when asked. Commissioner Albrecht asked about soldier coursing around the windows to which Architect Van Het Hof stated it is there, but it is hard to see in the pictures.

Chairman Burdett asked if the ARC could consider landscaping to which Planner Stegall stated landscaping is in the ARC's purview to consider.

The ARC discussed these additional windows, proposed shutters and possible landscaping and agreed the addition of the windows is appreciated, the shutters will be a nice detail and foundation planting, according to the Village's guidelines, would be good to add. The petitioner stated the entire lot will be landscaped.

Commissioner Thompson made a motion to recommend approval of the Exterior Appearance of 526 N. Main Street with the addition of the proposed shutters. Chairman Burdett stated he wanted a condition encouraging the petitioner to install foundation plantings along the southern building wall and the other Commissioners generally concurred with this suggestion. The updated motion was seconded by Commissioner Albrecht and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0. Commissioner Wilson recused himself in this matter as he is doing work for the applicant on the interior of the building.

5. Public Hearing – 650 Roosevelt Road, Pickwick Shopping Center – Exterior Appearance and Sign Variations.

Commissioner Dickie made a motion to open a Public Hearing on 650 Roosevelt Road at 7:55 p.m. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Draths and carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

Planner Stegall was sworn in and then gave background on this project as petitioner Madison Corporate Group has requested Exterior Appearance and Sign Variation approvals for the proposed renovation of that portion of the Pickwick Place shopping center, located at 650 Roosevelt Road. The property is located on the north side of Roosevelt Road between Park Boulevard and Nicoll Avenue in the C3 Service Commercial zoning district. She stated some of the changes would be to convert the two-story portion of the building to a one-story building, raise ceiling heights, increase the depths of some of the tenant spaces and add a window to the south elevation. These changes should make the building more attractive to potential tenants and allow the petitioner to attract higher quality tenants. Four sign variations are being requested as part of the project and she reviewed these variations with the Commission. Planner Stegall noted that the Staff Report explains that staff does not believe that the proposed signage and awnings comply with the Village's Appearance Review Guidelines.

Architect David Kennedy with PPK Architects was sworn in and stated the petitioner is excited about the proposed improvements. He stated the building was constructed in 1963 and was used by office tenants. He stated the proposed project is to make the building more marketable to new tenants, possibly retail tenants or restaurant tenants. He stated that since the building is located in a floodplain, per FEMA regulations, the petitioner needs to keep the total costs of the building improvements to 50% of the assessed valuation of the building. Therefore, the petitioner is being pragmatic with what they are proposing.

Architect Kennedy showed pictures of the current building and parking lot and pictures of what the renovated building would look like. He stated the shrubbery around the edge of the parking

lot helps to shield the cars in the lot and this shrubbery will remain, even with the addition of a carriage walk. He stated the idea is one primary tenant in the southwest corner on the mid-level and then two or three tenants in the L-shaped building which would become one level. He stated there is an adjoining party wall with the building on the west so that does determine structure.

Architect Kennedy showed pictures of the site plan/floor plan which showed the proposed changes. He stated they will go straight up with the new roof structure so there will be 15-foot ceilings inside the building. He stated there would be a covered deck which would be a good amenity for a potential tenant, and the petitioner sees this as a possible outdoor café for a potential restaurant tenant. He stated the petitioner is planning to remove the outside outdoor elevator as it is no longer needed and would construct a new stair in its place to go from the mid-level to the lower level. The L-shaped portion of the building would house possibly three tenants with three separate entrances. He stated that the sidewalk would be extended in front of the north storefront to ensure access and would be made of permeable pavers. He stated good retail depth for a building is usually 55 to 75 feet, but this building will still only be about 29 feet in depth after the renovation.

Architect Kennedy stated the current parking lot is striped now and meets the ordinance with 19-foot deep spaces. He stated that the petitioner plans to seal-coat the lot and then restripe the lot so you can see which way the traffic will flow. He stated they will also add two spaces to the proximity parking.

Architect Kennedy stated there will be a large clear-glass window with a new aluminum sunshade above the window added to the south elevation. He stated that above the window would be stone to match the existing façade that would be raised to the upper level. He stated there would be a large metal screen on the roof to hide any mechanical equipment. He stated the central massing of the building would remain the same and the building would continue to have a two-story appearance with the upper level deck remaining as a curtain wall. He stated when you walk into the new space, you will have a ceiling of nine and a half feet directly above you and then as you walk further into the space, the ceiling will go up to 19 feet after the second level is removed. He stated the building will have a two-story look with the front being a little lower. He stated they will extend awnings over the deck to protect the lower walkway. He stated the upper level canopy will remain as it provides protection for the new stairway and allows location for a sign if there is a corner tenant. He stated they will maintain the windows on the north elevation and will do some minor window repairs and brick cleaning. He stated they will raise the elevation on the west and are proposing a cement-stucco look. He stated the upper portions of the building will be all glass of three different types: Spandrel on the upper windows, grey-tinted glass on the middle windows and clear glass on the lower windows. He stated there will be an awning on the L-shaped building to protect the walkway. Architect Kennedy showed examples of the proposed color chips, permeable pavers, awnings, glass panels, stonework and stucco.

Architect Kennedy stated they will keep and maintain any landscaping currently planted, and any landscaping that is damaged during the renovation will be replaced. He stated they do not have a specific landscape plan; however, all the landscaped areas on the site are planted now and will remain that way.

Architect Kennedy showed examples of the signage and stated they have a good solution to the signage so it can be prominent and appropriate. He stated the intent of the signage is to be classy and understated while being very visible. He stated the signage will follow the color scheme of the building so the signs will be a dark grey background with white letters and will stand between the columns so the signs will have the look of panel signing but with individual letters. He stated the signs will be centered above a tenant's entrance and project above the canopy and not the roof so the signs would meet the Village's signage guidelines.

Commissioner Albrecht asked about the possible sidewalk paver pattern to which Architect Kennedy stated the pattern has not been determined yet, but it would be a simple pattern.

Commissioner Thompson asked if a landscape plan is required to which Planner Stegall stated it is required if any changes are proposed to the landscaping and that Staff has encouraged the petitioner to enhance the landscaping on the site and to submit a landscape plan. Planner Stegall stated the petitioner would like to keep the landscaping as is so no plan was required.

Commissioner Thompson asked if there should be a tree-protection plan to which Planner Stegall stated it would be submitted with the building permit application to show what measures the petitioner would take to protect the trees. Commissioner Thompson asked if additional bollards or planters are required for pedestrian protection on the walkway to which Planner Stegall stated they have discussed this with the petitioner as an additional safety precaution to separate the vehicle traffic.

Commissioner Wilson asked if there is a construction plan as this is an active area during construction to which Architect Kennedy stated this is a concern so the contractor is looking at plans now, and the entrance can be blocked when construction starts as well as constructing a fence. Commissioner Wilson asked if there will be enough parking to which Architect Kennedy stated the overall site plan has enough parking. Planner Stegall stated the number of parking spaces on the property is non-conforming and because the lots are divided up with each building on a lot, the parking gets calculated separately for zoning purposes. Planner Stegall stated this is an existing non-conforming parking situation for this building, and if the building continues to be used for retail purposes, this is grandfathered and is able to continue for now. If any of the units are ultimately occupied by other uses, such as a restaurant, the parking will need to be looked at closer and it is possible, the petitioner may need to receive approval of a parking variation. Commissioner Wilson asked if it is necessary for the shopping center identification sign to remain out front to which Tom Eilers, Jr. from the Madison Corporate Group, owner of the Pickwick Place Shopping Center, stated the shopping center identification sign would remain as some of the signs are for tenants in other buildings.

Chairman Burdett stated that the petitioner should extend the sidewalk along Roosevelt Road to make it as deep as they can, six feet if possible. Architect Kennedy stated they show a five-foot walkway as of now, and if they extend the walkway to six feet, that would be the maximum depth so they can maintain the landscaping and plants. Planner Stegall stated there has been considerable discussion at the Staff level about the sidewalk/carriage walk. The Roosevelt Road streetscape plan shows a carriage walk in this area. IDOT may likely require the additional foot. Other issues to consider with the location and design of the sidewalk include an existing street

light in the area and the difficulties with maintaining a narrow strip of grass between the street and sidewalk.

Chairman Burdett asked about the possibility of installing a metal canopy on the northern portion of the building similar to the one on the southwest portion of the building to which Architect Kennedy stated there are two reasons for this as the fabric awning is believed to be a better tie-in to the rest of the center and if they tried to do all metal awnings, it would push the construction costs above the 50% FEMA threshold. Architect Kennedy stated the petitioner likes the introduction of color and that it adds character. Chairman Burdett referred to Mr. Pointner's report which recommended that the ends and backsides of the awnings be covered in fabric to which Architect Kennedy stated they respectively disagree due to wanting the view open in order to see the view of the upper level and to keep the snow and rain from collecting on these awnings.

Commissioner Dickie asked what the mechanical screen would be made out of to which Architect Kennedy stated it would be an aluminum panel with a tight louver.

Architect Kennedy stated there is various rooftop equipment that sits on the L-shaped portion of the building. He stated they will likely go from about 12 tenants to three tenants so there will be only three rooftop units which will be larger, and they are unsure where those rooftop units will go so the intent is for each tenant to have a rooftop screen to match the initial one. The existing unscreened equipment will remain until the new tenants move in at which time the rooftop equipment for these spaces will be replaced and the new equipment will be screened.

In regard to parking lot lighting, Architect Kennedy stated they will keep the upper-level canopy which already has a wired light fixture which will be replaced with the existing power source so it becomes the light level for the parking lot. He stated they are proposing one additional wall-mounted light fixture in the upper canopy, and there is already a pole light in the parking lot. The sign mounted light fixture shown on the Commission's plans will not be installed.

No members of the public commented on the requested sign variations.

At 8:52 p.m., Commissioner Wilson made a motion to close the Public Hearing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Dickie and carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

Chairman Burdett stated they would discuss the proposed Exterior Appearance changes first and then the proposed Sign Variations.

Commissioner Draths stated she appreciates the canopy, but it might be better to have the same colors and same types of awnings that they have in the rest of the shopping center. She stated some additional landscaping would be good. She asked if the mechanical equipment would be changed when they have tenants to which Mr. Eilers stated it would be. Commissioner Draths stated she agreed with Public Works that to put a foot of grass by the sidewalk would be pointless as it would be labor-intensive and it may be a moot point if IDOT needs the sidewalk to be six feet wide. She definitely does want the sidewalk put in.

Commissioner Thompson stated she likes the awnings and thinks it will complement the overall building. She encouraged the petitioner to submit a landscape plan, and she appreciates that the petitioner wants to protect the landscaping that is there. She stated she would like to see bollards, planters or something similar on the north walkway under the awnings as a pedestrian safety precaution. She stated she would like to see the carriage walk on Roosevelt Road be as wide as possible. She stated she likes the thought of the permeable pavers and the color of the pavers, but would like to see more modern permeable pavers as the paver samples presented have already begun to age and the building has a modern feel.

Commissioner Wilson stated he likes the proposed building plan and the use of the big signs. He asked if there were any tenants yet to which Mr. Eilers answered there were not. Mr. Eilers stated they would like a possible restaurant in the south portion as well as a high-end retailer.

Commissioner Dickie stated he likes the awnings and the differences in the awnings as it adds color. He agrees with the additional landscaping and to having bollards as pedestrian protection. He stated he understands they will address the mechanical screening when additional tenants come in.

Commissioner Albrecht stated she likes the proposed building plan as it will keep the basic soul of the building while making great updates. She stated she likes the idea of bollards or planters as long as they are not massive. She stated the carriage walk needs to be user-friendly. She stated they should keep whatever landscaping they can. She stated she likes the canopy and awnings.

Student Commissioner Burket stated he likes the design of the building as it will be an improvement. He stated he would like to see some kind of pedestrian safety measure added to both the carriage walk and the interior sidewalk. He stated he likes the canopy and does not think it needs to match as it is a good contrast.

Chairman Burdett stated he especially likes the southwest building. He stated he would prefer the canopy to the awnings which would also be consistent with the rest of the center. He stated the carriage walk should be as wide as possible. He stated he does want the petitioner to restore any landscaping which is destroyed. He stated he does think bollards or planters are needed as a pedestrian safety measure for the interior sidewalk. He stated the Staff Report mentioned a damaged part of the walkway between the building and Roosevelt Road carriage walk which should be fixed.

Commissioner Draths stated she appreciated Staff's suggestions about the proposed signage. She stated there should be a condition on the signage for the southwest tenant not to exceed 35 square feet.

Commissioner Thompson stated she agrees with the signage as shown and that a motorist should be able to see the signage from a vehicle. She stated it is interesting that the signage is different.

Commissioner Wilson stated he is fine with the signage.

Commissioner Dickie stated he concurs with the other Commissioners and there should be no mega signs.

Commissioner Albrecht stated she likes the signs in-between the structures and the sign placements look good.

Student Commissioner Burket stated he likes the design and color of the signs. He stated there should be a size limit so there will not be just one big sign.

Chairman Burdett stated there is a hardship with the location of the building and the need for visibility and he is in favor of the proposed signage. He stated he likes the lettering above the canopy and the signs should have a size limit of 35 square feet.

Planner Stegall stated it seems the ARC is in favor of a size cap of 35 square feet on the signage as well as additional landscaping on the property and safety precautions for the pedestrian walkway and wondered if the ARC wants to see revised plans on these additional pieces. After some discussion, Chairman Burdett stated the ARC would like to see a landscape plan and pedestrian safety measures shared in an information packet in case of any concerns but that they could otherwise be reviewed and approved by staff. Chairman Burdett stated the ARC would like to add three conditions to the approval motion: a landscape plan, pedestrian safety for the interior sidewalk in the form of planters, bollards or another similar mechanism and a cap for any single sign on the southwest building to not exceed 35 square feet.

Commissioner Draths moved, seconded by Commissioner Albrecht, to recommended approval of the exterior appearance and sign variations for the proposed renovation of the front L-shaped building in the Pickwick Place shopping center located at 650 Roosevelt Road, based on the following findings of fact for the requested sign variations.

In regard to the requested variation to allow 2 primary signs on the corner unit closest to Roosevelt Road in lieu of the maximum number of one primary sign permitted the Commission found that:

1. The requested variation conforms to the Statement of Purpose in the Glen Ellyn Sign Code because it will allow the future tenant to effectively communicate its location, the additional sign will not confuse, obstruct or distract motorists or pedestrians, the proposed sign would be compatible with other signage in the area and it will not add unnecessary visual clutter to the streetscape.
2. The requested variation will not alter the essential character of the locality because similar variations have been granted for other properties in the past and the second sign will not be incompatible with the architecture of the building.
3. The petitioner has demonstrated a practical difficulty and particular hardship as a result of adhering to the strict letter of the regulations of the Sign Code because based on the design of the building and the locations of the surrounding buildings, it is not possible to place one sign on the unit that would be visible to both eastbound and westbound traffic.

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 a tenant in the southwest corner of the building would be at a marketing disadvantage if approximately 50% of the traffic volume could not see the sign.
5. The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances because the site constraints are due to existing conditions including the proximity of the adjacent building to the west and the setback and specifics of the building configuration.

In regard to the petitioner's request to allow 50 square feet of primary signage for the corner unit closest to Roosevelt Road in lieu of the maximum of one square foot per lineal foot of establishment frontage permitted, the Architectural Review Commission found that:

1. The requested variation conforms to the Statement of Purpose in the Glen Ellyn Sign Code because it will allow the future tenant to install two signs of sufficient size to effectively communicate their location and it will not be of such a size so as to add unnecessary visual clutter to the streetscape or be incompatible with the building.
2. The requested variation will not alter the essential character of the locality because the size and scale of signage would be compatible with the building.
3. The petitioner has demonstrated a practical difficulty and particular hardship as a result of adhering to the strict letter of the regulations of the Sign Code because the request is due to the hardship imposed by the existing size of the building footprint and configuration of the building. The flexibility in retail leasing demands that this space is allowed to be divided into two units and if the space is divided into two units, the permitted square footage of signage would not be practical or provide sufficient visibility for the user to attract good tenants.
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 the flexibility in retail leasing demands that this space is allowed to divide into two units and if the space is divided into two units, the permitted square footage of signage would not be practical or provide sufficient visibility for the user to attract good tenants.
5. The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances because the southwest corner unit in the building is unique in that it is very close to the street and is a small tenant space. However, it must be able to be divided to give the corner flexibility of leasing in this recessionary economy. The requested sign area is needed due to conditions that cannot be changed.

In regard to the petitioner's request to allow up to 30 square feet of primary signage for the remaining tenants in the building in lieu of the maximum of one square foot per lineal foot of establishment frontage permitted, the Architectural Review Commission found that:

1. The requested variation conforms to the Statement of Purpose in the Glen Ellyn Sign Code because the size of the signs is respectful to nearby property owners and will not have an adverse impact on the environment or public welfare.
2. The requested variation will not alter the essential character of the locality because the proposed signage is compatible with the building style and character with horizontal emphasis and will not negatively impact the neighboring aesthetics. In addition, the degree of the requested variation is minimal.
3. The petitioner has demonstrated a practical difficulty and particular hardship as a result of adhering to the strict letter of the regulations of the Sign Code because the existing structural bay width and the required sign lettering height calls for sign bands to span between columns.
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 a smaller sign would not allow for adequate visibility.
5. The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances because the additional requested sign area is due to the column bay widths and the proposed architectural solution to span the signs between columns. The design scheme being proposed gives the petitioner little area for visible signs.

In regard to the petitioner's request to allow two address signs with areas of 8 square feet each in lieu of the maximum area of 2 square feet permitted for each address sign, the Architectural Review Commission found that:

1. The requested variation conforms to the Statement of Purpose in the Glen Ellyn Sign Code because the size of the address signs is needed for legibility. This is a clear and efficient use of signage to identify the building. In addition, these signs are a public convenience and not for the benefit of an individual person.
2. The requested variation will not alter the essential character of the locality because the signs fit in with the building style and would not alter the character of the neighborhood. Since the building is not large enough for a national tenant, it is identified by the address, not by anchor tenants.
3. The petitioner has demonstrated a practical difficulty and particular hardship as a result of adhering to the strict letter of the regulations of the Sign Code because the unique hardship is due to the shape of the building, location of the building on the site, the speed and direction of traffic and the need for the address signage to be visible to both eastbound and westbound traffic.
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 due to the shape of the building, location of the building on the site and the speed and direction of traffic, the address signage needs to be visible to both eastbound and westbound traffic.

5. The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances because the two 8 square foot address signs are needed due to the unique location of the building on the site and the need to have address signage that is visible to both eastbound and westbound traffic.

And subject to the following conditions:

- A. The project shall be constructed and maintained in substantial conformance with the plans as submitted and the testimony presented at tonight's meeting.
- B. The petitioner shall replace the existing shrubs along Roosevelt Road with similar shrubs that will continue to shield the view of the parking lot. The species and location shrubs shall be reviewed and approved by Village staff prior to the issuance of a building permit.
- C. The width of the planned carriage walk along Roosevelt Road shall be increased from 5-feet to 6-feet or otherwise designed as may be required by the Public Works Department.
- D. The damaged private walkway located in between the building and the Roosevelt Road sidewalk shall be repaired or replaced.
- E. A revised landscape plan shall be submitted for review and approval by Village staff and shall be shared with the ARC via an informational packet.
- F. A plan for pedestrian safety measures such as bollards or planters for the interior sidewalk in front of the northern wing of the building shall be submitted to and reviewed and approved by Village staff and shared with the ARC via an informational packet.
- G. There shall be a size cap of 35 square feet for the signage on the southwest building.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Albrecht and carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

6. Public Comments

There were no Public Comments.

7. Chairman's Report

None.

8. Trustee's Report

Trustee Liaison Ladesic thanked the staff for allowing flexibility for Pickwick Place in the Sign Code depending on what tenants they might have. He asked if current ordinances allow the flexibility of an administrative variation to which Planner Stegall stated the staff is not currently allowed to administratively approve any variances. He stated the TIF was approved for downtown Glen Ellyn and any proposed building changes would come before the ARC. Commissioner Wilson asked who is paying for the TIF as village residents are concerned about higher taxes to which Trustee Liaison stated the best information is on the website. Trustee Ladesic stated the golf course improvements plans are underway.

9. Staff Report

Village Planner Stegall stated there is a possibility of a meeting on either March 28, 2012, or April 11, 2012. Commissioner Wilson asked if the packet will still be delivered to the home to which Planner Stegall stated a packet will be delivered if there is going to be a meeting; however, if the meeting is cancelled, any informational material would come via email. Commissioner Thompson asked who is overseeing the master plan for Lake Ellyn to which Planner Stegall stated the Glen Ellyn Park District is, and the Park District is separate from the Village. Planner Stegall stated an RFP was issued for the Downtown Streetscape Plan and Parking Study, and the ARC will be involved in the review of the streetscape portion of the study as described in the RFP.

10. Adjourn

As there was no other business to discuss, Chairman Burdett asked for a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Wilson moved, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, to adjourn the meeting at 9:45 p.m. The motion carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

Submitted by: Debbie Solomon, Recording Secretary

Reviewed by: Michele Stegall, Village Planner