



elevation instead of spandrel glass and the restrooms and storage rooms would be put on the side walls instead of the Roosevelt Road frontage. Ms. Stegall also reviewed the requested sign variations. She noted that the plans show signage with letters potentially as tall as 4'7½" but that the petitioner has indicated that they would be amenable to a condition restricting the maximum letter height to 30" in accordance with one of the tenant's leases. She also noted that wall signage is requested on all four sides of the building and is only permitted by Code on the front and corner sides. She suggested that if a variation is granted to also allow signage on the south elevation that it be in lieu of permitting signage on the corner side elevations.

Chairman Burdett asked about a rendering of the building that includes landscaping to which Ms. Stegall stated the petitioner brought along a new rendering to the meeting and that a picture of the petitioner's building in Streamwood that is similar to the proposed building was included in the packet.

Edwin Reitan, Principal at Reitan Architects at 1325 Wiley Road in Schaumburg, Illinois, was sworn in and stated the newly-completed rendering is showing the building from Roosevelt Road. He stated the proposed building would be a two-tenant structure with one tenant possibly being a retail space and the other tenant being a restaurant space. He stated the proposed building would be done in chiseled concrete block with stone brick in the middle and accents of soldier brick on the sides and top of the building. He stated there would be a stone band at the top of the building on the north and south elevations. He stated they are proposing to use EIFS on the cornice at the top of the building.

Mr. Reitan stated the front of the building would be 28 feet tall with the other elevations being 24 feet tall, and the parapet walls on the roof would screen all roof-top mechanicals. He stated the trash enclosure would be at the rear of the property and would be constructed of the same brick as the building. He stated the elevations on Roosevelt Road and Taft Avenue would both be fronts to the building; however, the actual entrances to the building would be on Taft Avenue. He stated the utilities will come into the building on the east side with the restrooms and storage rooms being located along the side walls.

There was a discussion on what types of retailers or restaurants could go into this building as there were concerns about the size of the trash enclosures.

Chris Soto, with KDP Roosevelt 369 LLC at 515 N. State Street in Chicago, Illinois, was sworn in and stated they could have a national-chain fast-casual restaurant in the space.

Mr. Reitan stated IDOT gave them restrictions on the property so this is why the petitioner is proposing to put the parking and entrances on the Taft Avenue side of the property. Mr. Soto stated the site is also limited by the building to the west.

Commissioner Thompson asked if they had explored the possibility of outdoor seating to which Mr. Reitan stated they have the space, but they will not be sure of the restrictions on the parking until they know who the tenants are. Ms. Stegall stated they can put in seasonal outdoor seating without coming back to the commission for approval.

Commissioner Albrecht stated she understands the constraints of the parking, and she likes the two fronts with different treatments.

Chairman Burdett asked if there would be a sidewalk around the building to which Mr. Reitan stated there would be a 4-foot wide sidewalk for pedestrians. Commissioner Thompson asked if there would be a sidewalk along Roosevelt Road to which Mr. Reitan stated there will be; however, they may replace what is currently there.

Commissioner Thompson asked about what types of equipment would be on the roof to which Mr. Reitan stated there would be HVAC equipment as well as exhaust fans for a restaurant. Mr. Reitan stated the parapet towers will screen these mechanicals.

Chairman Burdett asked about the hardship reasoning for why the petitioner is seeking the sign variations. Mr. Reitan stated the hardship is due to the lack of visibility coming from the west and the adjacent building as well as the front being on the south side of the building. There was a lengthy discussion about the sign variances with regards to letter height, placements of the different signs, which signs were really needed and sight lines. The consensus was that 36-inch letters could be used on the signs on the north and south elevations and the signs on the east and west elevations were not needed. Commissioner Thompson stated it is a challenge to discuss the sign variations without knowing who the tenants would be and having sign elevations to review. Commissioner Albrecht stated the building is not fussy so 36-inch letters on the signs would be fine.

Commissioner Loftus noted that all of the signs being proposed required a variation and that a total 5 signs were being requested for each business, including 3 wall signs and 2 freestanding signs.

Commissioner Albrecht moved to close the public hearing at 8:22 p.m. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Burket and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

Commissioner Loftus stated it is a nice building. He stated he supports the lettering being 36 inches in height and the proposed change to the monument signs. He stated the property is a unique space. He stated there is more flexibility with this building as it is on Roosevelt Road and not in the downtown. He stated he likes the clean lines and is fine with the minimal use of EIFS on the top of the building.

Commissioner Thompson stated it is a handsome building design and likes that the building has four distinct sides. She is hesitant about the sign approvals, but thinks the petitioner is putting in a nice building so the signs should go along with the appearance of the building.

Commissioner Burket stated he has no problem with the building. He stated he understands the need to fill the space with signs, but he does not want there to be signs on all the sides of the building. He stated he knows the tenants will want nice signs on the building.

Commissioner Albrecht stated the building will serve well on Roosevelt Road and Taft Avenue. She stated the brick will look good compared with the current surrounding buildings. She stated she likes the letters on the signs being 36 inches.

Chairman Burdett stated he is in favor of the exterior appearance as it is within the Appearance Guidelines. He stated he recommends the bronze-color window system. He stated the petitioner has demonstrated a hardship with the two front exposures on Roosevelt Road and Taft Avenue. He stated he is in favor of the signs on the north and south sides of the building having lettering that is 36 inches in height, but he is not in favor of signs on the east and west sides of the building.

Commissioner Loftus made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed exterior appearance and following reduced sign variations:

1. A variation from Section 4-5-10(B) of the Sign Code to allow wall signs on the south building elevation with areas of 84.99 square feet and 60 square feet where signage would not otherwise be permitted. *(Areas of 131 square feet and 93 square feet had been requested)*
2. Variations from Section 4-5-10(B) of the Sign Code to allow wall signs on the north building elevation with areas of 84.99 square feet and 60 square feet in lieu of the maximum areas of 44.17 and 39.17 square feet permitted. *(Areas of 131 square feet and 93 square feet had been requested along with variations to allow corner wall signage of 71 square feet and 55 square feet in lieu of the maximum areas of 44.17 and 39.17 square feet permitted).*
3. Variations from Section 4-5-10( C) and 4-5-4( R) of the Sign Code to allow a second freestanding multi-tenant establishment sign on the property with a height of 4 feet and an area of 3.4 square feet where only one freestanding multi-tenant establishment sign would otherwise be permitted; and
4. A variation from Section 4-5-10(C) of the Sign Code to allow a freestanding multi-tenant sign along Roosevelt Road with an area of 77 square feet in lieu of the maximum area of 65 square feet permitted.

*(A variation to allow the absence of the required landscaping around the base of the freestanding signs was also requested and not recommended for approval.)*

The recommendation for approval was based on the following findings of fact for the requested sign variations:

1. The request complies with the Statement of Purpose found in Section 4-5-2 of the Glen Ellyn Sign Code because the primary purpose of the proposed signage is to assist people find what they need without difficulty or confusion.
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 subject property is a through lot, the main entrances to the establishments are on the back side of the building and the adjacent building to the west obstructs motorists' vision of the site.

3. The variations, 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 adjacent property to the east has a nonconforming sign larger than permitted by Code and the property is located along a main commercial corridor with a variety of sizes and types of signage.
4. The variations, if granted, would not have an adverse impact on the existing or desired character of the surrounding area because the adjacent property to the east has a nonconforming sign larger than permitted by Code and the property is located along a main commercial corridor with a variety of commercial signage.

The recommendation for approval was made subject to the following conditions:

1. The project 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. That the proposed wall signs shall be comprised of individual letters.
3. That the maximum letter height permitted for any wall sign on the property shall be limited to 36 inches.
4. That no utility meters, service doors, gutters or other similar utilitarian elements shall be placed on the north building elevation facing Roosevelt Road.
5. That the storage rooms shall not be located behind the window on the north building wall.
6. That bronze-colored window systems be used to compliment the color scheme of the building.
7. That landscaping is installed around the base of the freestanding signs as required by Code.
8. That the petitioner explore the possibility of widening the sidewalk along Roosevelt Road.
9. That signage is not allowed on the east and west sides of the building in lieu of allowing signs on the south side of the building.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Burket and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

## **5. ARC Annual Traveling Architecture and Landscape Awards**

Village Planner Stegall stated the Appearance Review Guidelines authorize the ARC to present a "Traveling Trophy Design Award" each year which is "intended to acknowledge excellence in building design." She stated the Vivian Ball Landscape Award "is intended to acknowledge excellence in achieving the aesthetic landscape objective of the Village."

There was a discussion about the nine projects that have been completed since the ARC last reviewed the awards in July 2014.

It was agreed to award the 2015 Traveling Trophy Design Award to the Courtyards of Glen Ellyn and an Honorable Mention to TMC<sup>2</sup> and award the 2015 Vivian Ball Landscape Award to the Willowbrook Wildlife Center.

## **6. Chairman's Report**

None

## **7. Trustee's Report**

Trustee Kenwood stated the Board has approved all recent projects that came through the ARC. He stated there was a long discussion about the row housing due to the density and materials on the building, but this was approved too.

## **8. Staff Report**

Ms. Stegall stated there are two projects that will come before the ARC soon: the Lake Ellyn Boat House and 320 Briar apartment building.

## **9. Adjourn**

As there was no other business to discuss, Chairman Burdett asked for a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Burket moved, seconded by Commissioner Loftus to adjourn the meeting at 9:10 p.m. The motion carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

Submitted by: Debbie Solomon, Recording Secretary

Reviewed by: Michele Stegall, Village Planner