



Chairman Burdett asked about the proposed material for the monument sign to which Ms. Stegall stated the proposed material for this sign is a dark bronze metal, and since there are unique materials on the existing buildings, the staff has no objection to this request.

Commissioner Wussow stated she thinks two wall signs seem excessive, and Ms. Stegall stated the permitted is based on the establishment frontage, and one wall sign is slightly bigger in area than the other. Commissioner Dieter stated the sign on the east elevation seems redundant due to the monument sign.

There were questions and a discussion around the variation due to the sight triangle for the monument sign. Ms. Stegall stated only a portion of the sign would be located within the sight triangle and a fairly wide parkway exists along both Briar Street and Roosevelt Road so vehicles stopped at the intersection should be pulled up far enough to be clear of the sign.

Eric Carlson, Project Architect with ECA Architects and Planners in Geneva, Illinois, was sworn in and stated the two wall signs are needed due to the Dunkin Donuts facing two streets. He stated they would be comfortable with removing the east elevation wall sign if need be. Commissioner Senak asked if Dunkin Donuts has sign requirements for its franchisees to which Mr. Carlson stated there are standard pre-fabricated signs that they work with and the sign proposed for the east elevation is the smallest sign offered at 31.0 square feet. Commissioner Wussow stated she could see justifying a variation for a bigger square-footage sign for one sign, but not variations in area for two signs.

Commissioner Wussow asked about the color of the frame around the window on the south elevation to which Mr. Carlson stated it will be the Dunkin Donuts bright orange. Commissioner Wussow stated in the pre-application meeting for the petitioner's other site on Roosevelt Road that the Commission asked that the orange frame be removed and it was. Mr. Carlson stated this is an orange L-shaped frame only used on the east elevation by the brown awning.

Commissioner Wussow asked about the material on the tower to which Mr. Carlson stated it is a painted hardy-board siding. Ms. Stegall stated this material is allowed by the Appearance Guidelines.

Chairman Burdett asked about the use of EIFS to which Mr. Carlson stated the EIFS will only be used to cover the existing fascia panel on the top of the building.

Commissioner Wussow asked if they would remove the orange L-shaped frame around the window to which Mr. Carlson stated they would prefer not to as the orange frame follows Dunkin Donuts' standard and adds interest and pop to the building whereas it was easier to remove on the other building due to the different architectural styles. Commissioner Wussow asked about the color for the top band on the building to which Mr. Carlson stated they would paint this the Oak Barrel color and not orange.

Commissioner Albrecht asked where the orange color is used on the building to which Mr. Carlson stated the orange color is on the L-shaped frame around the window on the south elevation and on the awning on the east elevation.

Commissioner Loftus stated the sign on the east elevation may need to stay due to traffic going east/west on Roosevelt. There was a discussion regarding the wall signs on the south and east elevations with regards to sight lines, traffic patterns and the speed of traffic along Roosevelt Road.

Jamie Dejuras, Jr., one of the owners of Shree 2<sup>nd</sup> Gen Properties in Chicago, Illinois, was sworn in and stated they would be willing to keep the two wall signs and not have the monument sign. Commissioner Wussow stated the variance would still seem excessive. Commissioner Wussow stated there are two options: one is to only have a wall sign on the south elevation which would be 31.0 square feet in area and keep the monument sign and the other option is to eliminate the monument sign and use 31.0-square feet wall signs on both the south and east elevations. Mr. Carlson stated they would prefer to keep both wall signs. Planner Stegall stated that even if the monument sign was removed from the current plans that one would still be permitted by Code and that the property owner could apply for a permit to install a monument sign in the future provided the base material matched the building and it was located completely outside of the sight triangle.

Chairman Burdett took a straw poll to see how the commissioners felt about the signage options, and the majority of the commissioners stated they would prefer to see both wall signs at 31 square-feet as well as the monument sign.

Chairman Burdett asked about the rooftop equipment to which Mr. Carlson stated the rooftop equipment will be painted to match the building.

Commissioner Senak moved to close the public hearing at 8:45 p.m. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Dickie and carried unanimously by a vote of 8-0.

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

1. A variation from Section 4-5-10(B) to allow three wall signs on the building in lieu of the maximum number of one wall sign permitted.
2. A variation from Section 4-5-10(B) to allow a total area of 65.6 square feet of nonresidential establishment wall signage in lieu of the maximum area of 29.25 square feet permitted and the 73.5 feet requested.
3. A variation from Section 4-5-4(R)7 to allow the base of the proposed freestanding sign to be made of a material that does not match the primary material of one of the buildings on the property.
4. A variation from Section 4-5-4(A) to allow the proposed freestanding sign to encroach on the required 30-foot sight triangle without the required clearance between three and eight feet in height.

The recommendation was made 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 requested variations are necessary to easily communicate the business and the drive-thru within the context of the site. The site is accessed from both the south and east and requires cross access through the adjoining parcel to the east. The proposed signs identify the building from the east access. The drive-thru sign identifies the property as having a drive-thru.
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 a right-in, right-out access forces eastbound traffic to enter from the side street, Briar Street, which also requires access through an adjacent lot. For westbound traffic the drive-thru component would not otherwise be evident as the building screens the drive-thru lane. The proposed drive-thru sign will help identify the building as having a drive-thru.
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 building is fairly isolated and will not negatively impact surrounding properties.
4. The variations, if granted, would not have an adverse impact on the existing or desired character of the surrounding area because the building is fairly isolated and will not negatively impact surrounding properties.
5. The variations, if granted, would not endanger the public health, safety of welfare because they would assist motorists in locating the business and drive-thru.

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 parcel, due to the nature of its location on the property and the nature of the obstructions on the surrounding property, makes it necessary for the establishment to have the east elevation sign in addition to the south elevation wall sign.
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 entry and access to the building currently exist and will remain.
8. The requested variations are the minimum variations necessary because the smallest version of the standard "Dunkin Brand" drive-thru sign is being requested. The front face

of the canopy has not been used to calculate the allowed square footage which does create “frontage” from the street. Furthermore, the other signs comply with the Code in relation to their “frontage.”

9. 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 making the access more easy to identify and clearly informing customers of the drive-thru location has a significant impact on the success and profitability of the business.

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.
2. The proposed wall sign on the south elevation will be the same 31.0-square feet in area and the same design as the proposed wall sign on the east elevation.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Thompson and carried by a vote of 6-2 with Commissioners Albrecht and Dieter dissenting.

Commissioner Senak made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed plan for exterior appearance as presented with the following conditions:

1. The paint color for the band at the roofline be the Oak Barrel color and not orange
2. The petitioner will work with the staff on the north-side equipment corral as the petitioner moves forward with their building permit.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Thompson and carried unanimously by a vote of 8-0.

#### **5. Chairman’s Report**

None

#### **6. Trustee’s Report**

Chairman Burdett asked if there was movement on the two possible downtown developments in the Village to which Trustee Burket stated there is no movement on the McChesney site, and the Opus development will come before the Architectural Review Commission soon. Commissioner Senak asked if there was any movement on the Dominick’s site to which Trustee Burket stated there is some interest.

## **7. Staff Report**

Ms. Stegall stated the Village just added a large annexation of 154 lots on the southeast corner of the Village.

## **8. Adjourn**

As there was no other business to discuss, Chairman Burdett asked for a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Loftus moved, seconded by Commissioner Dickie to adjourn the meeting at 9:02p.m. The motion carried unanimously by a vote of 8-0.

Submitted by: Debbie Solomon, Recording Secretary

Reviewed by: Michele Stegall, Village Planner