

faces south. Chairman Burdett asked if the petitioner would still need a variance if the freestanding sign was not there to which Ms. Stegall stated yes.

Kimberly Hess, Vice President of Key Investment and Management at 1263 S. Highland Avenue, Suite 2W, Lombard, Illinois, was sworn in and stated their company has managed the property for 13 years. She stated there has been a lack of sign visibility on the property for many years due to the property's proximity to the trees on the Prairie Path. She stated they have received many requests from the tenants over the years to add additional signage. She stated each tenant does have illuminated signs on the north side of the building which faces the railroad tracks, but if you are driving south on Park Boulevard over the tracks, you cannot see the newly-installed freestanding sign. She stated they would like to put this multi-tenant sign on the north-facing wall at the northeast corner of the building, higher on the wall so it is not blocked by the tree. She stated they are a fully-leased building right now.

Chairman Burdett asked if the sign would be illuminated to which Ms. Hess stated it would not. Commissioner Wussow asked if customers were not able to find the building to which Ms. Hess stated if you are driving south on Park, there is a slight incline up over the railroad tracks as well as trees that block this. Commissioner Wussow stated she walked the property, and the 462 building number is not very visible. Commissioner Wussow stated she is not sure if the proposed sign needs suite numbers, and there is too much unused space on the sign. Commissioner Wussow stated she did not think the sign would achieve what the petitioner is trying to achieve, and the tenants could be doing more to promote themselves on the south side of the building. Ms. Hess stated there are no illuminated signs on the south side of the building out of respect for the residential properties that are near. Village Planner Stegall stated before the new Sign Code was adopted, each business was only allowed one primary sign on the primary façade which is the north side of the building.

Lee Gottfried from Olympic Sign, 1130 N. Garfield, Lombard, Illinois, was sworn in and stated he drove back and forth on Park Boulevard so he could figure out the best placement for this sign. He stated the proposed sign in the biggest sign could be seen from a car and still fit the corner of the building. Commissioner Wussow stated the 462 needs to be more prominent, and Ms. Hess agreed with this. Commissioner Albrecht stated she would like to see the wall-mounted sign mirror the design template of the new free-standing sign so the 462 and arch could be added. Commissioner Wussow asked if they had considered another freestanding sign to which Ms. Hess stated this is not an option as the Prairie Path's property starts about six inches from the end of the steps.

Commissioner Wussow asked if non-illuminated signs could be added to the south side of the building to which Village Planner Stegall stated lettering would need to be removed from the awnings and then signs could be added between the awnings and the standing rib.

Commissioner Dickie made a motion to close the Public Hearing at 8:00 p.m. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wussow and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0.

Commissioner Albrecht stated she understands the challenges with the landscaping and such. She stated she does not like the look of the proposed sign but would like it if it looked like the

freestanding sign as this would be in alignment with what is already there. She stated this would be recognition via repetition.

Commissioner Dickie stated it would add more punch to branding if the wall-mounted sign mirrored the freestanding sign. He stated adding the address would make the wall-mounted sign more impactful.

Commissioner Wussow stated adding the 462 and the arch to the wall-mounted sign would help it go with the freestanding sign. She stated the business names need to be more readable and suggested eliminating the suite numbers and enlarging the business names. She thanked the petitioner for the clarification on why they cannot do another freestanding sign.

Chairman Burdett stated the hardship standards have been met for sign variances. He stated the shopping center does not have much street frontage. He stated he would like to see the wall-mounted sign model the freestanding sign.

Commissioner Wussow stated she would prefer not to vote on this, but to see a new proposal for this sign. The other commissioners agreed.

Commissioner Dickie moved to continue the public hearing to the June 25, 2014 meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wussow and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0.

5. Public Hearing – Pet Supplies Plus, 299 Roosevelt Road – Sign Variations and Exterior Appearance

Commissioner Wussow made a motion to open a Public Hearing on 299 Roosevelt Road at 8:10 p.m. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Dickie and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0.

Village Planner Stegall was sworn in and stated petitioner Virginal Puroll, owner of Pet Supplies Plus, is requesting four sign variations from the Glen Ellyn Sign Code as well as exterior appearance approval for a proposed 10,859 square foot Pet Supplies Plus store proposed at 299 Roosevelt Road. She stated the property is located on the south side of Roosevelt Road between Lambert Road and Lorraine Street and is zoned C3 Service Commercial. She stated the petitioner came before the commission in August 2013 for a pre-application meeting on the redevelopment of the Grandma Sally's site which then fell through; however, the petitioner did take the commission's and staff's suggestions as they planned the redevelopment of the Control'd property at 299 Roosevelt Road. She stated the petitioner will appear before the Plan Commission on June 12, 2014 for a public hearing on the requested zoning variations.

Virginia Puroll, owner of Pet Supplies Plus at 915 E. Roosevelt Road, Wheaton, Illinois, was sworn in and stated they really wanted to move forward with this project and thanked the staff for their help with this.

Allen Morris, Senior Vice President with Lagestee-Mulder, Inc., 17005 Westview Avenue; South Holland, Illinois was sworn in also.

David Ports, principal with David Ports Architect Inc., 3554 Brecksville Road, Richfield, Ohio, was sworn in and stated they have taken every effort to address the commission's comments from the fall meeting. He stated there will be a glass entrance, a green branding identifier and custom light fixtures on the exterior columns. Chairman Burdett asked about the light fixtures to which Mr. Ports stated the lights are halo channels with a solid metal face that is opaque in color. Mr. Ports stated there are LED strips down the side which makes reverse illumination.

Mr. Ports showed the sample material board and discussed the materials proposed for the exterior which includes two primary colors of light concrete block. Commissioner Wussow asked if this was a glazed concrete brick to which Mr. Ports stated it is.

Commissioner Wussow asked if the petitioner could pare down the two wall signs to the 71.3 square feet that is permitted in the code to which Mr. Ports stated the letters are proposed to be 24 inches, and due to the 15-letter name, they need to keep this bigger. Mr. Ports stated the Fresh Market is on the other side, and the petitioner wants visibility to the sign by the cars driving by. Ms. Puroll stated they will be one block from a major competitor, and if the letters are shorter, there would be less visibility of the sign.

Commissioner Wussow asked if it is necessary to have the monument sign to which Mr. Ports stated a monument sign is necessary so the building can be seen by drivers going westbound on Roosevelt Road. Commissioner Wussow asked if the monument sign materials would match the building to which Mr. Ports stated the materials will match the base of the building, and the sign will be internally illuminated.

Commissioner Wussow stated the landscape plan has a lot of plants to which Mr. Ports stated they followed the Village's guidelines. Mr. Morris stated the plan has been reviewed by the Village's landscape consultant, and the petitioner did make one change after this.

Commissioner Wussow asked if the Village had heard from Wendy's on the setback to which Ms. Stegall stated the business was sent a letter about this being discussed at the Plan Commission meeting, but she had not heard from Wendy's.

Ms. Stegall stated the second wall sign adds additional square footage, and this is where most of the variation square footage is coming from.

Chairman Burdett asked if the petitioner was willing to maintain the landscape on Taft Avenue to which Mr. Morris stated they can do this. Chairman Burdett asked if the utilitarian elements on the building would be painted to match which Mr. Ports stated they would be.

Commissioner Albrecht made a motion to close the Public Hearing at 8:50 p.m. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wussow and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0.

Commissioner Wussow stated the proposal is effective and likes the colors and materials. She stated she was concerned about the size of the signs, but the signs do now seem appropriate to her. She stated she also likes the glass entry and landscaping plan.

Commissioner Dickie stated it will be a handsome building which will work well in the neighborhood. He stated the western wall does make sense.

Commissioner Albrecht stated the design is good and complimented the shape of the building. She stated she understands the variations, and the project looks good.

Chairman Burdett stated the westbound traffic is the hardship for the variance and the size of the name. He stated he likes the design and entrance.

Commissioner Albrecht made a motion to recommend approval of the variations from the Glen Ellyn Sign Code and recommends approval of the following:

1. A variation from Section 4-5-10(A) to allow 3 establishment signs on the property in lieu of the maximum number of 2 establishment signs permitted.
2. A variation from Section 4-5-10(A)3 to allow each of the two proposed wall signs to have areas of 82.13 square feet in lieu of the maximum area of 71.3 square feet permitted.
3. A variation from Section 4-5-10(A) to allow a total of 214.26 square feet of establishment signage on the property in lieu of the maximum area of 120 square feet permitted.
4. A variation from Section 4-5-6(II) to allow more than 25% of the area of the proposed traffic directional sign to be used to advertise the business.

The recommendation is made based of the following findings of fact:

1. The request complies with the Statement of Purpose found in Section 4-5-2 of the Glen Ellyn Sign Code because it would help people locate the business without difficulty or confusion.
2. The plight of the owner is based on unique circumstances due to an unusual physical limitation that is peculiar to the subject property or establishment and the conditions upon which the request is based are not generally applicable to other property within the same zoning district because the property is located on a through lot with frontage on two roads and the west building wall acts like a corner wall.
3. The variation, if granted, would not have an adverse impact on property values in the surrounding area or be injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located because the proposed signs are appropriate in size for the building and size.
4. The variation, if granted, would not have an adverse impact on the existing or desired character of the surrounding area because the area is a business district with many retail stores that rely on signage for wayfinding and marketing.

5. The variation, if granted, would not endanger the public health, safety of welfare because it would assist motorists in locating the business and would not be distracting to drivers.

In addition, the Commission hereby adopts the supplemental findings of fact identified in the petitioner's application packet.

The motion was made subject to the following conditions:

1. The signs shall be constructed in substantial conformance with the plans as submitted and the testimony presented at the public hearing of the Architectural Review Commission.

Commissioner Albrecht also moved to approve the proposed plans for exterior appearance as presented with the conditions that the utilitarian elements on the building will be painted to match the building and the owner will maintain the exterior landscaping on Taft Avenue. The motions were seconded by Commissioner Wussow and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0.

6. Chairman's Report

None

7. Trustee's Report

Commissioner Wussow asked if there had been discussion about sending the meeting materials electronically to which Village Planner Stegall stated there had been discussion but no conclusion yet. Trustee Burket stated they are trying to get the commissions off paper, but it might be hard for architect plans to be seen electronically.

8. Staff Report

Village Planner Stegall stated there will be a meeting on June 25, 2014, and there are more items coming. Commissioner Wussow asked about more commissioner candidates for the ARC to which Trustee Burket stated he had not heard anything from President Demos on this yet. Village Planner Stegall stated there are two commissioner and one student commissioner openings, and residents can apply online or by contacting Patti Underhill at the Village.

9. Adjourn

As there was no other business to discuss, Chairman Burdett asked for a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Wussow moved, seconded by Commissioner Dickie to adjourn the meeting at 9:07 p.m. The motion carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0.

Submitted by: Debbie Solomon, Recording Secretary