

when it is on the roof and in natural daylight that its appearance will be lighter than the displayed panel. Mr. Pryde stated that although one of the reasons this roof was selected was to have color, the roof will also be a reflection of the blue sky and the building will then not be entirely brown. Mr. Pryde added that they have kept the metal roof in the project in lieu of the shingle roof option. He also stated there is some metal soffit paneling at the main arched canopy with a perforated soffit section in the canopy for ventilation of the cavity. He added that the roof will be ventilated by using a perforated panel and he displayed samples of colors that will be used.

C. Questions and Comments from the Commission.

Mr. Pryde responded to Chairman Burdett that the proposed blue color is the exact same color as previously proposed.

Chairman Burdett read the following statement sent by Commissioner Albrecht who was unable to attend this meeting: “The roof color selection for the Village Links renovation is being discussed in my absence. I have shared my opinion and feel the building is very attractive. As previously stated, my concern is the dark blue roof color. While the building seems inspired by a prairie style architecture, I would love to see a color scheme more sympathetic with the natural site and the other well chosen building materials. I understand the architect’s prior explanation of sky reflecting off the roof, however, I disagree with a dark blue color selection. The roof is a very predominant part of this structure. I would like to see the roof color unified and more interrelated to the rest of the design.” Mr. Pryde responded that any color viewed indoors under those lighting conditions appears far darker than they will in actual daylight.

Commissioner Wussow stated that the blue color of the roof is the first thing that strikes her and that according to Village guidelines, a natural, neutral color should be chosen for the primary exterior façade material. She stated that although the façade is generally considered to be the face of the building and not the roof, she felt that the roof is acting as a façade because of its prominence. She added that she does not feel that the blue roof is in keeping with the design guidelines supported by the Village. Mr. Pryde stated he understands Commissioner Wussow’s comments but has a difference of opinion. Commissioner Wussow added that Village guidelines do not appear to specifically address roof color but building and façade colors are addressed and the large roof qualifies as a primary color in the architect’s design. Mr. Pryde stated that a contrast is sought between the roof and wall materials as there would be very little to distinguish the building one way or another if a neutral earth-tone roof was used. He added that a contrast is being sought between the roof and the wall materials and that if a cream or taupe color roof was used, there would be very little articulation between the wall and roof surface. He added that the color is one of the elements that creates the contrast and imagery and highlights the other parts of the design of the building. He added that the design guidelines are a reflection of what exists in the community and the majority of the way things look but that there are always exceptions to the guidelines that still fit within the character of the intent of the design guidelines. He added that they feel that the proposed blue roof color is an appropriate choice and is part of what creates the look and

feel of what they like about the design. Commissioner Dickie stated that the asphalt is incredibly heavy because of the color and, therefore, the building “sinks” as it is not surrounded by anything. He added that he was supportive of the roof color selection as presented. Chairman Burdett stated he liked the color of the roof as presented but felt that the color in the rendering was too bright. He stated that he preferred that the roof was grayer in color. Commissioner Mulvihill also felt that the color in the rendering was too bright and recommended taking a photograph of a building that is the same color. Commissioner Dickie felt that the color was spot on and appropriate. Commissioner Wussow felt that depending on the change in light, the change in season and the time of day, the roof will take on different colors but will be blue. She felt the blue color will not be within the guidelines of Glen Ellyn and is not the only color that would do justice to the subject building. She preferred changing the color of the roof to fit the palette of the other building materials. Commissioner Wilson stated that he would trust Mr. Pryde’s choice as the designer and asked about a second choice that he thought could also be considered. Mr. Pryde responded that he had looked at approximately a dozen colors, and Mr. Pekarek added that the darker color asphalt shingle proposed as an alternate was negatively received by the Commission members. He added that the gray/blue roof will highlight the building and blend in with the sky. Mr. Pryde displayed the colors available for the roof to the ARC members. He added that there are a limited number of choices and if the chosen color is too light, the color will disappear. Mr. Pryde responded to Commissioner Draths that deeper colors will fade over time and a light colored roof will become dirty over time and change in color. Ms. Draths stated that she appreciated that the budget allowed a metal roof on the subject building. She added that the subject building is unique in that there are no surrounding buildings. She felt that a different roof color was not possible due to budget constraints but did feel that the proposed roof color makes a statement and was, therefore, supportive. Commissioner Thompson appreciated the metal roof and was very supportive of the blue color for the roof. Commissioner Dohrer felt that the roof will blend well in its open setting and that the texture will help to break up the roof to some extent.

D. Motion.

Commissioner Draths moved, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, to approve the blue metal roof for the Village Links building at 485 Winchell Way. The motion carried with six “yes” votes and two “no” votes as follows: Commissioner Draths, Thompson, Dickie, Dohrer, Wilson and Chairman Burdett voted yes; Commissioners Mulvihill and Wussow voted no.

IV. 285 Roosevelt Road – Glen Ellyn Market.

A. Staff Presentation.

Commissioner Wussow moved, seconded by Commissioner Dickie, to open the public hearing.

Village Planner Michele Stegall stated that at a previous ARC meeting, the exterior appearance for the Glen Ellyn Market was reviewed and approved by a vote of 6-1 with some conditions. She added that the petitioner has returned to the ARC to further discuss two of the conditions regarding the light fixtures and awning colors. Ms. Stegall also stated that the petitioner will need some sign variations in order to move forward. The sign variations are for a Fresh Market wall sign that will be mounted on the building at a height of 27-1/2 feet in lieu of the Code maximum of 25 feet and a drive-thru valet sign on the drive-thru canopy to allow 13 square feet in area in lieu of the maximum area of 4.5 square feet permitted and to allow that sign to be mounted at a height of 13 feet 9 inches in lieu of the maximum allowed height of 10 feet for an incidental sign.

B. Petitioner's Presentation.

John Gelderman of Opus Corporation, 1812 Valley Curve, St. Paul, Minnesota, Jim O'Malley of OKW Architects, 5430 W. Agatite, Chicago, Illinois, and Ryan Murphy, 468 Hill Avenue, Glen Ellyn, Illinois were present.

Mr. O'Malley stated he would like to address changes brought forward at the previous ARC meeting. He stated that one recommendation was to extend the screening wall behind Fresh Market all the way to the building and they were able to do so. He also stated that the material was changed from brick to the pan liner brick material painted like the rest of the building which made the rear of the building flow better. He added that with the extended material, the back side of the building would be more vulnerable to damage with storage of various items. He added that the concrete panel that would match the rear of the building is an upgrade material for durability reasons. Mr. O'Malley also stated that in keeping with a consistent theme and look across the rear, there is a detached trash enclosure behind the Tide area. He stated that was changed to the concrete panel that would be the form liner with the brick stamp painted to match the building. He also stated that downspouts will be painted and tied in to the underground storm sewer.

Mr. O'Malley stated that the height of the Fresh Market sign needed to be raised due to the height of the building. He stated that the height of the building is dictated due to the clear area required inside by Fresh Market as well as hiding and screening any additional rooftop units and equipment. He added that the high parapet does serve this purpose. He stated that if the sign was lowered 2-1/2 feet, inset pieces above the awnings that create the overall architectural feel of the building would be lost. Mr. O'Malley stated that the height of the drive-thru/porte-cochere needs to be greater than the Zoning Code allows so a minimum of 10 feet just to the bottom of the canopy is required for cars to go underneath; therefore, the height of the sign would need to be at 13'9". He added that regarding the issue of readability as a car would approach; the signs need to increase over the maximum of 4.5 square feet.

Mr. O'Malley displayed a cut sheet of the proposed light fixture and stated that the canister would be larger if the up and down light can be done. He stated that the light fixtures are located at each of the piers as well as the quoins and each of the brick elements along the building. He added that the fixtures are low enough wattage that light

will be thrown up the building but will not project above the top of the building. He also stated that there are cut-off shields involved, and a cornice will be located across the building which will keep that light from projecting into the night sky. Mr. O'Malley added that the ones with the ups and downs would be the major corners with the quoins and the downlights with sign band directly above, and he displayed areas of downlights. Mr. Gelderman commented that up and down lighting adds a lot to a building at night and asked that the ARC consider that lighting. Ms. Stegall stated that the Zoning Code prohibits up lighting. Mr. O'Malley stated that they looked at adding some poles out near the parking standards with high-mounted lights, however, those lights tend to be bright with much light spillage which would do more harm than the selected lights.

Mr. O'Malley stated that Fresh Market has forest green and white striped awnings in the center and would like to use colors at the edges for balance and to draw the eye towards the Fresh Market and smaller tenants. He stated that the intermediate retail colors of the awnings have been changed to forest green to match the forest green stripe in Fresh Market. Mr. Gelderman added that they are looking at bookending each one with a color as requested by the tenants. Commissioner Burdett stated that the orange color appears to be a burnt orange as opposed to a neon orange, and Mr. Murphy responded that the orange color isn't quite as bright as seen with other retailers. He added that he believes the building will flow very nicely and part of the look is the awnings. Mr. Gelderman added that the chosen color is more representative of the orange Tide color than last time. Mr. O'Malley stated that the awning material will be canvas and in a muted color. He stated that the awnings would be made with a high quality material in solid colors with no graphics. Mr. Murphy added that the awnings will break up the mass of the large expanse of the building. Mr. Murphy stated there are some unique characteristics to the subject site as it is a new development, it is set back from the road and the different color awnings are being limited to the end caps.

C. Questions and Comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Wussow was concerned that voting for this project would set a precedent that has not been previously done in Glen Ellyn regarding adding various colors at a site. She also expressed a concern that this project could greatly change the character of the Roosevelt Road business district as other businesses would also want this type of project if it was approved for the petitioner. She felt that introducing multi-colored awnings could jeopardize the current Roosevelt Road level of attractiveness and was concerned with allowing various colors for small businesses is treading on dangerous ground because there are so many small businesses along Roosevelt Road. She stated this type of look would eliminate the unified appearance along Roosevelt Road.

Regarding findings for a variation, Mr. O'Malley responded to Chairman Burdett that they would like people to have a clear way to get to the porte-cochere area and if signage wording is too small, drivers will find it difficult to navigate in that area. He added that safety is therefore a major factor. Mr. O'Malley agreed with Chairman Burdett that this request is based on a hardship rationale in terms of the setbacks.

Commissioner Wussow also asked the petitioner why they should be granted a variance for up lighting when the Sign Code prohibits that type of lighting. Mr. O'Malley responded regarding the down lighting the lot lighting will be lost as one steps back to the building and away from the parking lot, however, it will help to illuminate the walkway in front of building. He also stated that the uplighting will be minimal and kept down so that it is a small throw off of the top of the fixture. He added that the lighting is more of an accent than a beacon and will be a soft glow spreading upward. He added that there should be no light spillage into the night sky. Mr. Gelderman added that uplighting would be important to enhance the visibility of the property as it is retail and is surrounded by other properties. Mr. Gelderman responded to Commissioner Mulvihill that the signs are internally lit which is traditional signage on Roosevelt Road. Chairman Burdett asked for the rationale behind the zoning code regulations about uplighting. Ms. Stegall responded the rationale is not wanting to shoot lighting up into the sky and added that staff feels that the lighting standards in the Zoning Code are out of date. She added that since this would be a variation to the Zoning Code that it would be reviewed by the Plan Commission and that some uplighting variations have been approved by the Village in the past. Chairman Burdett asked if uplighting could be allowed with limited wattage, and Ms. Stegall replied yes. Ms. Stegall also responded to Commissioner Draths that staff feels that uplighting is accent lighting. Commissioner Wilson commented that there is uplighting on many residential homes, and Ms. Stegall responded that the zoning lighting standards do not apply to single family residential properties. Mr. O'Malley responded to Commissioner Draths that a maximum of three colors of awnings are being requested for the site. Mr. Murphy responded to Commissioner Draths that, per their lease, they have the right to approve signage, awnings and awning colors and could limit the different color awnings to the end cap spaces. He verified for Commissioner Draths that the only restriction on the end cap awning colors would be that they be a solid color. Mr. Gelderman stated that they control final approvals on the colors.

Commissioner Dickie asked what say the ARC would have in the future regarding this project, and Ms. Stegall responded that as proposed a future owner would be able to choose the color of the awnings for the end caps.

Commissioner Wussow felt that a problem is that the Village is not making the decision on what an awning color will be at this project. Ms. Stegall responded to Mr. Gelderman that the Village typically does not dictate particular colors for projects but that the Appearance Review Guidelines talk about colors blending and being compatible with the building rather than dominating the façade and preventing the appearance from becoming too busy. Commissioner Wilson stated he was supportive of the chosen colors. Commissioner Draths stated she appreciated Commissioner Wussow's comments regarding precedent setting and decision making by the tenants. She added that it is the responsibility of the ARC to be sure that over the long term that the building continues to remain as originally intended. She added that she appreciates retaining just 3 colors of awning at the site and feels the building is lovely.

Commissioner Draths moved, seconded by Commissioner Dickie, to close the public hearing. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

D. Public Participation.

No persons spoke in favor of or against the subject property.

E. Commission Deliberation.

Chairman Burdett asked for comments from the Commissioners regarding signage, uplighting and the awning issue.

Commissioner Mulvihill was in favor of granting the sign variation. She also felt that the uplighting worked well with the design of the building but felt that the lighting should not be too bright. She felt that the design of the building is well done and stated that awnings can be easily changed. She stated that everything should be uniform and that she liked the proposed colors.

Commissioner Dickie was supportive of the sign variation given the proportions of the building and the setback. He also was supportive of the proposed light fixtures and uplighting subtly accenting the corners of the building. He also stated that he was in favor of the awnings and stated that the size and material of the awnings are important as well as that they are a solid color.

Commissioner Wussow felt that the sign variation requests were appropriate given the size of the building and the setback of the development. She felt that the lighting was well selected. She stated she was initially opposed to the uplighting until she learned that the staff hopes to update the Zoning Code and that soft uplighting has been granted in other cases. She stated that uplighting should end where the building ends. Commissioner Wussow stated she is opposed to tenant selected awnings and did not feel the developer's case warrants setting a precedent of this magnitude in Glen Ellyn's business district.

Commissioner Wilson was supportive of the proposed signage, uplighting and awnings and felt that the building will be great. He added that the parking lot will have many trees which will soften the building with a natural look.

Commissioner Draths stated she agrees with the other Commissioners regarding the signs and lighting. Regarding the awnings, she reiterated that she appreciated the fact that there are fewer colors on only the end caps, that they are canvas and will not be bright or shiny. She stated she is concerned regarding the tenant making decisions regarding color.

Commissioner Thompson was supportive of the signage variances and uplighting per comments by the other Commissioners. She stated that she felt that the petitioner should be able to choose and design the awnings of their choice to help people locate the site.

Commissioner Dohrer felt the building was lovely and was supportive of both the signs and the lighting. He felt that the building would be nicer if it was more uniform and was opposed to the awnings with the tenants being allowed to choose the colors.

Chairman Burdett was supportive of the signage variation because the building is set back from the road and the difference in height is minor. He also was supportive of the uplighting with perhaps a cap on the wattage. He stated that the Appearance Review Guidelines state similarity in color in projects is appropriate, and one of the problems with Roosevelt Road is the different types of enterprises, signage and colors. He stated that the subject building could be elegant and he did not want to see massive colors on the building. He added he would be in favor of uniform solid color awnings across the entire façade.

F. Motion.

Commissioner Thompson moved, seconded by Commissioner Dickie, to recommend approval for Vequity, LLC of variations from the Glen Ellyn Sign Code for property located at 285 Roosevelt Road based on the following findings of fact: A. The requested variations comply with the purpose of the Glen Ellyn Sign Code because the proposed signs will serve the primary purpose of helping people find what they need without difficulty or confusion. Furthermore, the variations are needed in order to satisfy the purpose that the signs be considered accessory components of an overall composition of architectural elements, not as freestanding or dominant elements by themselves. B. If granted, the requested variations will not alter the essential character of the locality because the signs have been designed to be accessory components of the overall architectural design of the proposed building. C. The petitioner has demonstrated a practical difficulty in adhering to the strict regulations of the Sign Code because the proposed building architectural elements insist on variations in order to have the signs serve as accessory components and part of an overall design. A second difficulty is the distance of the building from the primary access road. This distance creates the need for sign variations in order to meet the purpose of making signage visible enough to help people find what they need without difficulty or confusion. D. The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances because the building is located approximately 140 feet away from the primary access road and E. the additional supplemental findings of fact in the petitioner's application packet dated November 5, 2012.

Four (4) motions were made as follows:

Motion 1

Based on the findings of fact, the Architectural Review Commission recommended that the Village Board approve the following: A. A variation from Section 4-5-12(B) of the Sign Code to allow a primary wall sign with a height of 27 feet 6 inches in lieu of the maximum height of 25 feet permitted. B. Variations from Section 4-5-5(G) of the Sign Code to allow an incidental sign height of 13 feet 9 inches in lieu of the maximum height

of 10 feet permitted and an incidental sign area of 13 square feet in lieu of the maximum area of 4.5 square feet permitted.

The motion carried unanimously with eight “yes” and zero “no” votes.

Motion 2

Commissioner Draths moved, seconded by Commissioner Dickie, to amend the previous recommendation to approve the exterior appearance by eliminating Conditions 4 and 6 that the wall behind the loading dock shall be extended to connect with the building and completely screen the loading area and that the proposed style and location of the exterior light fixtures to be placed on the front elevation be presented to the Architectural Review Commission who agree with what has been presented.

The motion carried unanimously with eight “yes” and zero “no” votes.

Motion 3

Commissioner Mulvihill moved, seconded by Commissioner Dohrer that previously recommended Condition 5 regarding the proposed awning colors remains as written.

The motion did not carry with three (3) “yes” votes and five (5) “no” votes as follows: Commissioners Wussow, Dohrer and Chairman Burdett voted yes; Commissioners Dickie, Draths, Mulvihill, Thompson and Wilson voted no.

Motion 4

Commissioner Draths moved, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, to amend previously recommended Condition 5 to limit the awnings to 3 colors for the entire development, in particular the green and white striped and solid green awnings in keeping with the Village’s Appearance Review Guidelines and to allow the end caps to have a different color awning provided that all of the awnings would be a solid color and the awnings would all be canvas in material.

The motion carried with five (5) “yes” votes and three (3) “no” votes as follows: Commissioner Draths, Thompson, Dickie, Mulvihill and Wilson voted yes; Commissioners Dohrer, Wussow and Chairman Burdett voted no.

V. Chairman’s Report.

Chairman Burdett welcomed new ARC Member Tom Dohrer. He also encouraged everyone to view the Village Preference Survey on the Village website.

VI. Trustee Report.

Trustee Henninger thanked the ARC members for their service to the Village. He updated the ARC members on the budget process and added that the final levy hearing will be in December. He also stated that the Village's capital plan has been expanded to include all of the Village's facilities and properties. He added that a police department expansion is currently being considered by the Capital Improvements committee and that the Village is currently in negotiations regarding the police officers' union contract. He also added that the Oberweis project has been approved. He stated that Trustee Ladesic is currently on the East Coast doing hurricane relief work.

VII. Staff Report.

None.

VIII. Adjournment.

Commissioner Wilson moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:20 p.m. and Commissioner Draths seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Submitted by:

Barbara Utterback, Recording Secretary

Reviewed by:

Michele Stegall, Village Planner