

MINUTES

BOARD/COMMISSION: Architectural Review **DATE:** 12/11/13

MEETING: Regular **CALLED TO ORDER:** 7:00 p.m.

QUORUM: Yes **ADJOURNED:** 8:25 p.m.

MEMBER ATTENDANCE: PRESENT: Chairman James Burdett and Commissioners Iain Dickie, Phillip Hartweg, Mark Senak and Sharon Wussow

ABSENT: Trustee Liaison Peter Ladesic and Commissioners Pamela Albrecht, Tom Dohrer, Jennifer Thompson and Student Madeline Howard

ALSO PRESENT: Village Planner Michele Stegall and Recording Secretary Barbara Utterback

1. Call to Order

Chairman Burdett called the Glen Ellyn Architectural Review Commission (ARC) regular meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Civic Center at 535 Duane Street, Glen Ellyn, Illinois.

2. Approval of Minutes from November 13, 2013 Meeting

Commissioner Wussow moved to approve the November 13, 2013 minutes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Senak and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0.

3. Public Hearing – Sign Code Update (continued)

Village Planner Michele Stegall stated that two major changes to the Sign Code were made between the previous ARC meeting and this meeting. She stated that the first change is that an additional allowance was created for properties in excess of 200 acres in the CR Zoning District and that this change was created for the Village Links property to allow that property to have some additional signage as the property is large and unique. She stated that the second change relates to the new Industrial Zoning District sign standards.

Ms. Stegall updated the ARC regarding box signs and electronic message boards. She stated that there had been questions regarding the proposed prohibition of internally illuminated box signs and the definition of box signs. She stated that because of the design of some current signs, the code no longer has a proposed prohibition for those types of signs. She added that a bonus is offered for individual letter signs in order to incentivize that

type of sign. Ms. Stegall also stated that regarding electronic message boards and background color, the draft code currently requires a black background and that adding a paper white background had also been discussed. She added that "paper white" does not appear to be an industry term but is becoming an industry standard for such items as Kindle. She stated that the Code as written currently still requires a black background. She stated that the ARC is now picking up with how to measure sign area and sign height in that section of the code. Ms. Stegall responded to Chairman Burdett that there is currently no proposed prohibition for box signs in any zoning district. Commissioner Wussow commented that box signs do not look like quality signs because of their shape and construction. Ms. Stegall stated that box signs currently exist in Glen Ellyn and would be grandfathered in but would not be allowed to be replaced as is. All of the Commissioners felt that square signs and rectangular box signs should not be permitted, and Ms. Stegall stated she would add that to the code. Ms. Stegall responded to Chairman Burdett that a petitioner could clip the corners of square or rectangular box signs.

Chairman Burdett asked for an example of a Light Industrial Zoning District, and Ms. Stegall displayed a map of properties on Hill Avenue which the Plan Commission will consider for Light Industrial zoning for at their meeting tomorrow evening. She added that this is the only area in the Village currently proposed to have the Light Industrial Zoning District. Ms. Stegall responded to Chairman Burdett that this area conforms to other light industrial areas in the County. Commissioner Senak asked if there are any meaningful variations between what the Village is proposing and what the County and Lombard's requirements are that the Village should be concerned about, and Ms. Stegall indicated that they are comparable. All of the Commissioners were supportive of the sign regulations for the proposed zoning district.

Regarding the sign area and height computations section, Commissioner Wussow suggested adding to No. 5 "of the tallest element" after "maximum height...". Ms. Stegall explained for Chairman Burdett that "element" refers to words or logo. Commissioner Wussow stated she would like the page with several diagrams to be clearer regarding which caption refers to which diagram (perhaps put diagram inside of a frame) and suggested numbering or lettering diagrams. Commissioner Wussow also stated that sign labeling is inconsistent regarding using either "height and length" or "A and B" and added that the location of the computation should be consistent. Chairman Burdett stated a user friendly approach would be best, and Commissioner Senak stressed the importance of consistency. Commissioner Hartweg stated that he preferred "height and length" instead of "A and B," and Commissioner Dickie agreed.

Chairman Burdett questioned the rationale for eliminating bonus provisions. Ms. Stegall provided an explanation stating that landscaping is now a requirement, similar sign colors/styles for shopping centers were discussed by the ARC and determined not to be desirable, pole signs are now prohibited and matching materials are now a requirement. Regarding setbacks, Commissioner Wussow suggested amending the setback bonus to a 1% bonus for each 10-foot setback which would allow more of an incremental bonus. She also

responded to Ms. Stegall that she would be in favor of adding a bonus for every 10 feet beyond the minimum building setback of 30 feet. The Commissioners were in favor of these setback recommendations.

Commissioner Wussow stated that Section 4-5-14 in the copies forwarded to the ARC showed an inconsistency with the word "sign" related to Message Boards. Commissioner Wussow also stated that the black line and white copies of Section 4-5-14(B) were also very different, and Ms. Stegall responded that the black line copy was the correct document. Ms. Stegall to Commissioner Wussow that an electronic message board is still proposed to be limited to 18 square feet and would likely not be the entire sign for a business. She added that electronic message boards for the Village, Park District and schools which are typically used more as community message boards would not be limited to 18 square feet. Commissioner Wussow stated she was uncomfortable with no required sign limit for a governmental body, and Ms. Stegall responded that the total sign area would need to be within the maximum permitted sign area for the zoning district it is in and that it was only the limitation of the electronic message portion that did not apply.

Commissioner Wussow stated that a memo sent to the ARC states that the Sign Code will be reevaluated in approximately one year to address any unforeseen issues that may arise as the Code is implemented. Regarding Section 4-5-14(E), she therefore suggested that since terminology may be invented for a paper white background, could a black or Kindle-like "paper white" background term be used. Commissioner Senak was supportive of the term "paper white" as he felt it would be understood by those reading the Code, and Chairman Burdett agreed. Commissioner Wussow stated that "Message Sign" in lieu of "Message Board" is included in Section 4-5-14(F), and Ms. Stegall responded that that terminology can be changed to "Message Board". Commissioner Wussow also suggested changing "message shall appear in intervals of no less than five (5) seconds" to read "message shall *update* in intervals of not less than five (5) seconds". Chairman Burdett also recommended changing message "signs" to message "boards" in (D) also and recommended a universal search to change the term "message sign" to "message board" throughout the document. Commissioner Wussow asked if it is commonplace in the industry to have signs that are sensitive to the amount of ambient light, and Ms. Stegall replied yes. Regarding (G)2, Ms. Stegall responded to Commissioner Wussow that signs would be turned off during non-operational hours.

Ms. Wussow also stated that she would like (G)6 to be changed to read "two *or more screens*." Commissioner Wussow stated she likes the idea of Section (G)8 in concept but wondered how the Village utilizing any electronically variable message sign for emergency situations would be implemented, and Ms. Stegall responded that the Police Department would need to work on this item with individual business owners.

Ms. Stegall responded to Commissioner Wussow that the Community College Special Sign District is available in the event the College of DuPage comes back under the jurisdiction of the Village of Glen Ellyn in the future.

Ms. Stegall responded to Chairman Burdett that Section 4-5-16(F)1.c. regarding a geographic area larger than 25 acres would apply to properties such as the Village Links. Regarding Section 4-5-16(F)3 regarding a sign variation, Commissioner Wussow asked if a petitioner is required to fulfill all of the items on the evidence list, both primary and supplemental. Ms. Stegall responded that items A through G (primary) would be required to be met and A through C (supplementary) can also be taken into consideration. Ms. Stegall responded to Commissioner Senak that the existing criteria were paragraphs A, B (existing but expanded upon), C (previously supplemental), D (rewording of character criteria) and G. Item G was moved to the supplemental list as Chairman Burdett felt there was rarely a reasonable return issue with a property. The Commissioners responded to Ms. Stegall that they were comfortable with the proposed standards list.

Regarding Section 4-5-16(I), Commissioner Senak asked to make clear that the penalties provided in the Village Code are incorporated by reference and Ms. Stegall agreed that it would be included. Chairman Burdett recommended adding “any” as follows: “Any person who violates “any” of the provisions...”. Regarding (H)3.c., Commissioner Wussow questioned the determination of the original value of a sign that has been damaged as there are signs in town that have been in place for many years. She did not feel that was fair and felt the sign’s original value adjusted by inflation would be better. Ms. Stegall responded that one of the goals of the Code is to bring nonconforming signs into conformance and noted that a variation for a sign, such as Malloy’s that had been used as an example, could be requested.

The ARC members requested seeing a final clean copy of the Sign Code prior to it being forwarded to the Village Board for approval.

Commissioner Senak complimented Ms. Stegall and staff for their efforts regarding the update of the Sign Code.

4. Public Comments

None.

5. Chairman’s Report

None.

6. Trustee's Report

None.

7. Staff Report

Ms. Stegall wished everyone Happy Holidays.

8. Adjourn

Commissioner Wussow moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:25 p.m. The motion carried unanimously with five (5) yes votes and zero (0) no votes.

Submitted by: Barbara Utterback, Recording Secretary

Reviewed by: Michele Stegall, Village Planner

X:\Plandev\PLANNING\ARC\MINUTES\2013\121113.doc