



Following Intern Dickerson's introduction, the petitioner, Lisa Demos, stood up to answer questions from the Commission. Commissioners asked about the cornice material, and the petitioner answered several questions concerning the material and installation. The petitioner stated that the cornice material had been changed to a polyurethane molding. The polyurethane is rated for hurricane force winds and would receive an external paint coating prior to installation to make it look like natural limestone. A sample of the cornice molding was passed around for the Commissioners to inspect.

Commissioners also had several questions about the proposed awning, and sight lines to the doorway. Staff confirmed that an 8 foot height above the sidewalk is permitted for awning installations. Commissioners expressed concern over the illumination of the sign, in that the Guidelines state that external lighting is preferred in the downtown area and external illumination is also recommended by the downtown plan. Concerns were expressed that the sign might shine too brightly at night and detract from the downtown's historic quality. Upon being asked, Village Planner Stegall indicated that off hand she could not think of another sign in the Village that is both backlit and internally illuminated. The petitioner stated that she believed that due to proximity of the site to the theater with its brightly-lit protruding marquee that an externally lit sign would be washed out. The petitioner's sign designer explained more about the sign structure and how the lighting within and around the sign would work. He stated that the sign would have internally illuminated channel letters and would also be illuminated from behind to create a halo effect around the sign. A Commissioner asked about any planned outdoor features and the petitioner indicated that there would probably be outdoor seating and planters.

Commissioners' comments focused on concerns about the proposed sign while expressing support for the proposed façade renovation and materials. The Commissioners were in agreement that the proposed improvements were a significant upgrade. Some Commissioners expressed concern about how the sign would affect the look of the downtown and some Commissioners indicated that they agreed with the reasoning given by the petitioner for allowing the proposed sign illumination. Some Commissioners felt that to deny the proposed signage would be unfair due to the presence of the internally illuminated Starbucks sign down the street as well as at Subway and Einstein Bagels elsewhere in the downtown. One Commissioner thought that the sign would fit well on the red brick. All comments made ultimately expressed support for the proposed improvements.

Commissioner Wussow moved to approve the application for exterior appearance approval with no conditions. Commissioner Wilson seconded the motion. The motion was approved on a roll call vote with 9 ayes and 0 nays.

### III. PUBLIC HEARING – CAREER VISION, 526 N. MAIN STREET, SIGN VARIATIONS

Due to a conflict of interest, Commissioner Wilson recused himself from the hearing and left the room.

Commissioner Draths moved to open the public hearing. Several seconds were heard. The motion to open the public hearing was approved by voice vote.

Village Planner Michele Stegall was sworn in and presented the staff report. The petitioner, The Ball Foundation, owner of the property, is requesting approval of variations to allow a sign projecting further from the building wall than permitted and exceeding the maximum allowable sign area on the front of the building.

Paula Cousin, Marketing Manager for My Career Vision at 526 N. Main, Glen Ellyn was sworn in to represent the petitioner. Commissioners asked about the sign material, which she said would be a high density polyethylene that is weather resistant with vinyl color. In response to questions from Chairman Burdett, Village Planner Stegall noted that the size of projecting signs is limited to 4 square feet because most projecting signs are designed for pedestrian view. The proposed sign is intended for view by both motorists and pedestrians, and would be located off the second floor of the building. Since the property is located on a corner lot and is permitted to have two primary signs, if the variation is approved, it is possible that the petitioner could still obtain a permit for a second sign facing Anthony Street as 46 square feet of additional primary signage would still be allowed for the property. Ms. Cousin stated that there are no plans for additional signage on Anthony Street.

When questioned about the required hardship for a variation, Ms. Cousin noted that, because of the two large trees in front of the building on Main Street, there are visibility and safety issues erecting a sign that complies with the Code.

With no more questions being heard, Commissioner Wussow made a motion to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Draths and unanimously approved by voice vote.

Commissioners' comments noted the problem created by the trees in front of the building and the design of the building with large first floor bay windows and the sign being proposed on the second floor. There was the expressed hope that the petitioner would not apply for a sign permit in the future to allow a second sign on the property.

Commissioner Thompson moved, seconded by Commissioner Draths, to recommend approval of the following sign variations with no conditions

- A. A variation from Section 4-5-5(L)1 of the Glen Ellyn Sign Code to allow a projecting sign with an area of 8.2 square feet in lieu of the maximum area of 4 square feet permitted.
- B. A variation from Section 4-5-5(L)4 of the Glen Ellyn Sign Code to allow a sign to project 2 feet 10 inches from the building wall in lieu of the 2 feet 8 inch maximum.

Based on the following findings of facts:

- A. The requested variations comply with the purpose of the Glen Ellyn Sign Code because the additional size is needed to allow the sign to be legible at 18 feet in height from both street traffic and sidewalk traffic.
- B. If granted, the requested variations will not alter the essential character of the locality because the building to the south has a 14 square foot projecting sign and the additional requested projection of 2 inches from the building wall should have a nominal impact on the character of the area:
- C. The petitioner has demonstrated a practical difficulty in adhering to the strict regulations of the Sign Code because due to the first floor bay windows, the sign would not be as visible if it was attached to the first floor building wall and the additional square footage and projection are needed to allow the sign to be visible to pedestrians and motorists and blend in the architecture of the building.
- D. The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances because of the large first floor bay windows that give the building the appearance of having a second floor that is set back from the front façade.

Upon a roll call vote, the motion passed with 8 ayes and 0 nays.

#### IV. **CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**

Chairman Burdett asked Commissioners to please complete the visual preference survey on the Village website, if not already done so.

#### V. **TRUSTEE'S REPORT**

Trustee Ladesic said the Village Links project is up and running. The Oberweis renovation is starting, and the Fresh Market is moving along. There are several projects in the concept stage for Roosevelt Road, the downtown area and Stacy's Corner. The downtown streetscape project should be on the Village website. The Village is looking for input from Commissioners and from residents.

#### VI. **STAFF REPORT**

Village Planner Stegall echoed the request for Commissioners to complete the visual preference survey, and urged everyone to get the word out about the questionnaires also available on the website.

VII. **ADJOURN**

There being no other business, Commissioner Albrecht moved, seconded by Commissioner Wussow, to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 PM. The motion carried unanimously by a vote of 9-0.

Submitted by Karen Blake, Acting Recording Secretary

Reviewed by Michele Stegall, Village Planner