

earlier in the year for review of proposed changes to the façade. At that time, the store owner indicated that they would be returning at a later date with a sign variance request. Therefore, the Commission had some preliminary discussions about signage and asked that information about the size of the Jewel and Staples signs be included in the sign variance package. At least one Commissioner encouraged the petitioner to keep the size of the Ross letters a comparable size to the size of the Staples sign, including the Staples background.

Ross Gallentine, Project Manager for Ramco Gershenson located in Farmington Hills, Michigan, was sworn in and stated the sign is proportional in size to the signs for Jewel and Staples.

Nathaniel Cox with Camburas and Theodore Architects located in Des Plaines, Illinois, was sworn in and stated the lettering of the Ross sign is proposed to be about 208 square feet, compared to Staples' lettering and background which is 215 square feet and Jewel's lettering which is 297 square feet. He stated that Ross is proposing to install the sign as an inverse frame as there will be grey brick behind the lettering. He showed example boards of the sign and stated that the proposed sign would be visually comparable to the Staples' sign and would bring interest and value to the shopping center.

Chuck Zenn with North Shore Sign Company located in Libertyville, Illinois, was sworn in and stated the letters would be flush to the brick and are made of blue plastic on the face of the letters and aluminum of the sides of the letters and would have LED internal illumination.

Commissioner Wussow asked if all the letters would go out at once if there was a problem with one letter to which Mr. Zenn stated with LED lights, the power supply is usually the issue and usually only the one letter will go out.

Commissioner Senak asked if Ross Dress for Less signs vary with each location to which Mr. Zenn stated the signs do vary in size, and they do take into consideration the sign area allocated on the buildings and the store's setback from the road as well as the sign codes in the different villages. The Commissioners inquired about the letter height of the Ross sign compared to other signs in the shopping center. Ms. Stegall referred the Commission to the Staff Report which contained the heights of the proposed sign as well as the letter heights of the Staples and Jewel signs. She noted that the square footage of the sign letters was reduced by about 50 square feet from the petitioner's original submittal.

Commissioner Loftus asked about the thickness of the proposed letters to which Mr. Cox stated the letters would come out about 8 inches from the brick. Commissioner Loftus asked if the other Ross Dress for Less signs sit on the facades to which Mr. Cox stated the signs do sit on the facades; however, they want this sign to be comparable to the other signs in the center. Mr. Cox stated the grey-brick background does deviate from the Ross Dress for Less prototype as they would usually use a white brick.

Commissioner Albrecht asked if the petitioner had thought about putting the letters directly on the center's existing brick and not adding the grey brick to which Mr. Cox stated they were concerned the letters would not be seen as well or be as legible as they would with the brick there.

Commissioner Wussow moved to close the public hearing at 7:39 p.m. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Senak and carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

Commissioner Loftus stated that the sign is consistent to the other existing signs in the center. He stated he is happy to see the grey brick rather than a white brick. He stated there is a discrepancy between the drawings and the testimony at the hearing, and he would approve as long as the stipulation for the brick is added to the motion for clarification.

Commissioner Senak stated that he appreciates the petitioner's efforts in customizing the sign to match the other signs in the shopping center. He stated the overall square footage reduction was a constructive effort, and the size of the sign is comparable in square footage and letter size to the other signs in the center. He stated it is a good-looking sign and understands the size of the lettering due to the setback from Roosevelt Road.

Commissioner Wussow stated the proposed sign is very attractive. She stated the color palette is subdued and serves as a contrast. She stated the depth of the letters is fine since the letters are very tall. She stated the inverse framing of the background will be attractive. She stated she has no problem with the brick being modular size.

Commissioner Dieter stated he appreciated the petitioner taking into account the Village's and Commission's suggestions. He stated the sign fits the shopping center. He stated he would like to see the letter size fine-tuned to be more consistent to the Staples' letter size.

Commissioner Albrecht stated she appreciated the petitioner showing the differences between the board example and the renderings. She stated she would like to see the sign a bit smaller.

Chairman Burdett stated he is in favor of the variance, and the sign is appropriate as it is for an anchor store. He stated the hardship was not specifically addressed in the presentation, but it was addressed on the application.

Commissioner Wussow made a motion to approve the requested variation from Section 4-5-10(A)3 of the Sign Code to allow a wall sign with an area of 470.5 square feet in lieu of the maximum area of 115 square feet permitted based on 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 the proposed sign, with its associated brick background will be a visual asset to the community by enhancing the appearance of the shopping center.
2. The plight of the owner is based on unique circumstances due to an unusual physical limitation, such as an irregular lot shape, substantial lot depth, unusual geographic location, exceptional topographic feature or other condition 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 store is setback significantly from the street and is partially blocked by trees. The store is difficult to see in advance by eastbound traffic, because of an outbuilding.

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 sign is appropriate in size for the building and site.
4. The variations, 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. The larger retailers in the shopping center have approximately the same square footage of signage being requested if the background is not included in the sign area.
5. The variations, 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.

As well as the following supplemental findings:

6. The purpose of the variation is not based exclusively upon a desire to make more money out of the property because the goal of the signage proposed is to introduce Ross Stores into the business community with an image consistent with the developed corporate brand image of Ross Dress for Less. The large brick background being requested is consistent with their brand signage. Additionally, the request for a variation is to improve the visibility of the store from Roosevelt Road.
7. The alleged difficulty or particular hardship has not been created by any person presently having an interest in the property or by the applicant because the sign is being placed on a wall in a fifty-year old shopping center.
8. 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 larger sign is more visible to the general public, which translates to greater foot traffic. Greater foot traffic leads to a more reasonable return, and therefore a healthier store. A healthy store means greater and longer employment of local people.

subject to the following conditions:

1. The signage shall be constructed in substantial conformance with the plans as submitted and the testimony presented at the public hearing of the Architectural Review Commission, except for Brick 3 which shall be the grey modular size brick as stated in the presentation and not the white utility size brick documented on sheet P1 of the petitioner's plans.
2. The square footage of the lettering on the façade sign shall be limited to 208 square feet as per the Staff Report. This does not include the sign below the canopy.

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

5. Chairman's Report

Chairman Burdett wished everyone a Happy Thanksgiving.

6. Trustee's Report

Trustee Burket exited the meeting at 7:45 p.m for another meeting so there was no report.

7. Staff Report

Commissioner Wussow stated she was happy to see that DuPage Medical Group did take down the monument sign and does have mulch in there now.

Commissioner Wussow stated TMC² installed external light fixtures that do not have frosted glass which the Commission specifically requested and the petitioner said they would install. Ms. Stegall said this inspection was not completed yet, but the staff would do this soon.

Commissioner Wussow asked if the Reserve 22 sign would have landscaping added to the base to which Ms. Stegall stated this is a temporary sign for now, and the Village will add a permanent sign with landscaping.

8. Adjourn

As there was no other business to discuss, Chairman Burdett asked for a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Loftus moved, seconded by Commissioner Dieter to adjourn the meeting at 8:00 p.m. The motion carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

Submitted by: Debbie Solomon, Recording Secretary

Reviewed by: Michele Stegall, Village Planner