

# MINUTES

---

BOARD / COMMISSION: Architectural Review      DATE: January 13, 2016  
MEETING: Regular      CALLED TO ORDER: 7:02 PM  
QUORUM: Yes      ADJOURNED: 8:34 PM

MEMBER ATTENDANCE:      PRESENT: Acting Chairman Loftus,  
Commissioners Albrecht, Burket, Dickie, Dieter,  
Kimala

ABSENT: Chairman Burdett, Commissioners  
Thompson and Wussow

ALSO PRESENT:      John Kenwood, Liaison Trustee, Village Planner  
Stegall, Temporary Recording Secretary Blake

AUDIENCE:      Christopher Lauriat of Intersect Studios  
Jeremy Szybowicz of Stahelin Properties

## **I. CALL TO ORDER:**

Acting Chairman Loftus called the Glen Ellyn Architectural Review Commission (ARC) regular meeting to order at 7:02 PM in the Civic Center at 535 Duane Street; Glen Ellyn, Illinois. Roll call was taken, and a quorum was present.

## **II. PUBLIC COMMENT (NON-AGENDA ITEMS)**

NONE

## **III. APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 9, 2015 MINUTES**

Commissioner Albrecht moved to approve the December 9, 2015 minutes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kimala and carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

## **IV. 530 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, CHOCOLATERIE STAM'S SIGN VARIATIONS**

Commissioner Kimala moved to open the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Dieter and carried unanimously by voice vote.

Village Planner Stegall was sworn in and presented the background on this project and the changes to the building contemplated by the Petitioner. The mansard roof will be removed, the terra cotta repaired, and the front will be recessed to accommodate outside seating. This Commission recommended in December to the Board of Trustees that these changes be approved. The Petitioner is before the Commission now for two sign variations: (1) to allow a wall sign, in the shape of a tree, with an area of 190 square feet as opposed to the 13 square feet permitted by Code; and (2) to allow two signs for the establishment, the other being a hanging sign, as opposed to the one sign permitted by Code. Staff suggests language in the variation to clarify that those portions of the tree sculpture hanging over on the other tenant's space will not be counted as part of that space's permitted signage area.

Christopher Lauriat of Intersect Studios spoke on behalf of the Petitioner. The tree sculpture is designed to be public art. The metal and glass awning across the street lent some inspiration for the tree. The shop will be serving old-world chocolate and espresso drinks. The goal is to create an old-world European flair, thus wanting to show Art-Nouveau architecture on the building and create some visual interest. The mansard roof will be demolished, the terra cotta repaired and the storefront stepped back to create outdoor seating. All other decorative elements are taken from the tree.

In response to Commissioners' questions, Mr. Lauriat said that the center of the tree is the center of the building, and identifies the entrance to the building. Both spaces can be accessed by that door. It overlaps the east storefront by approximately 3 feet. The tree trunk will be cast stone with a limestone appearance of a neutral color. Copper will be used for the branches. The overhang is a metal and glass canopy. The branches are in relief against the building. The copper branches will be shaped to cover some of the damage to the terra cotta. Other areas will be patched, with the goal to bring it back to its former luster as best as possible. There will be light sconces on each end of the building, but no work will be done on the east end to not disrupt the existing tenants.

Commissioner Dickie moved to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kimala and carried unanimously by voice vote.

Commissioner Dickie said that the changes will be a great improvement for the street. It will look nicer with the copper and the tree and be a nice outdoor environment. In short, it will be a nice addition to downtown Glen Ellyn.

Commissioner Dieter said that he is excited to see the change and it is a very creative use of the space. It will be a welcome addition to Glen Ellyn.

Commissioner Kimala expressed his pleasure in seeing that this part of downtown Glen Ellyn is being given some attention. It is a creative idea for signage, and he wants to allow the Petitioner to get underway. It will zip up that part of Glen Ellyn.

Commissioner Burket said if this is anywhere as nice as the 535 building, it will be wonderful. This is a great job and looks fantastic.

Commissioner Albrecht said that the 535 building was a home run, and that there is more to work with on this building. She likes the use of glass and the entrance. The tree is great public art and innovative. She likes everything about it, including the hanging sign.

Acting Chairman Loftus likes that the terra cotta will be exposed, and is a great design feature. The tree and awning over the door are different for Glen Ellyn, but it is time to take some bolder steps. It is creative, and a great job with a good design.

Commissioner Dieter moved, seconded by Commissioner Burket to recommend approval of the following variations from the Glen Ellyn Sign Code:

1. A variation from Section 4-5-11(B)4 to allow a wall sign of 190 square feet in lieu of the 13 square feet permitted.
2. A variation from Section 4-5-11(B) to allow two signs on the establishment in lieu of the one sign permitted.

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. That portion of the tree sign that extends onto the store frontage of the Tenant B space shall not be counted against the sign area permitted for Tenant B and Tenant B shall continue to be allowed a separate establishment sign with an area equal to the area permitted by Code which is currently .5 square feet per lineal foot of frontage.

The recommendation was based on the following findings of fact:

1. The request complies with the Statement of Purpose in the Glen Ellyn Sign Code because the wall sign encourages a sense of aesthetic appreciation for the Village's visual environment, ensures the integrity of the architectural elements and character of the building, and promotes economic development by creating public art that provides a more attractive economic business climate within commercial areas of the Village.
2. The plight of the owner is based on unique circumstances due to an unusual physical limitation 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 wall sign is also a piece of art that is a part of the façade. Other property owners in the area do not have the same issue because they do not have features that are not part of the façades. The subject

property is one of the few buildings in the Village with this style of architecture, Art Deco or Art Nouveau, and this type of feature enhances that style architecture. This feature may not work so well with another type of building in the Village.

3. The variation, if granted, would have no 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 tree sculpture will be constructed of high quality materials and is a unique and creative work that should be attractive to visitors to the downtown.
4. The variation, if granted, would have no adverse impact on the existing or desired character of the surrounding area because the subject section of Pennsylvania Avenue has a collection of various architectural styles from many different time periods and the proposed tree follows after Art Nouveau, a highly decorative, early Modern style and therefore should not conflict with the diversity in architectural style or character of surrounding buildings.
5. The variation, if granted, would not endanger the public health, safety, or welfare because it helps delineate the outdoor eating area and provides a canopy over the sidewalk and retail entrances at 530 Pennsylvania Avenue.

The motion carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

**V. PUBLIC HEARING – 800 ROOSEVELT ROAD, STAHELIN PROPERTIES, SIGN VARIATIONS**

Commissioner Burket moved to open the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Deiter and carried unanimously by voice vote.

Glen Ellyn Village Planner Michele Stegall was sworn in and presented the staff report. The petitioner, Stahelin Properties, owner of the property, is requesting approval of variations to allow installation of three new traffic directions signs with a greater area and height than permitted by Code. The three traffic directions signs would be 9 feet in height and have a sign area of 40.5 square feet in lieu of the maximum height of 4 feet and sign area of 4 square feet permitted by Code for each sign.

Because of the size of the property, staff feels that some additional directional signage is warranted. However, staff is asking for consideration of removing the address at the bottom and/or the property identification at the top, thus reducing the size to approximately 25 square feet.

Jeremy Szybowicz, representing Stahelin Properties, spoke on behalf of the Petitioner. They have experienced patrons having problems locating specific buildings once they are inside the

property. They want this size of sign so that the map is clear. The existing perimeter signs are not included in this variation request. Ms. Stegall noted that the existing perimeter identification signs are within the 40 square foot range with the sign on Roosevelt Road, being 42.5 square feet. In response to Commissioner questions, it was noted that all the signs in question are on private property.

Commissioners discussed with Mr. Szybowicz various ways of keeping the map information, but eliminating the address and/or the "Glen Hill North" identifier to reduce the size of the signs. The advantages of branding and consistency were acknowledged, and the need for the address as drivers often end up on the property by mistake. If the "Glen Hill North" lettering is removed, the signs would be reduced to 7.5 feet tall while retaining the size of the map.

In response to questions, Mr. Szybowicz stated that some trees would be trimmed to accommodate the new signs, but none removed. The signs will be black and white, with the map itself back-lit. There were no other questions.

Commissioner Albrecht found the sign size to be overwhelming. She felt that the letter designation of the buildings and the "800 Roosevelt Road" address to be the most important information.

Commissioner Burket noted that these directional signs would not be very visible from the street. He understands the concept of branding for the property in that it is on 12 acres and contains five buildings. He has no problem with the signs as proposed.

Commissioner Kimala felt that these signs would be a great improvement to the existing directional signs, and appreciated the need for them. None of these signs will be immediately on Roosevelt Road or Nicoll Way, and the intent is to direct traffic once inside the property.

Commissioner Dieter acknowledged the need for directional signage, but felt that there was too much information on these as proposed. He supports keeping the "800 Roosevelt Road" lettering, but eliminating the "Glen Hill North" portion, and reducing the overall sign size.

Commissioner Dickie agreed that the "Glen Hill North" information is too much for the map sign. Instead, perhaps make the map larger. He likes the idea of the signs, but feels there is too much on them.

Chairman Pro Tem Loftus saw the need for the maps, the designation of "you are here" and the leasing information, but not the "Glen Hill North" nor the "800 Roosevelt Road" for branding purposes.

Mr. Szybowicz response to the comments was that he understood the idea of removing the "Glen Hill North", but felt that the "800 Roosevelt Road" is a necessity. Also, the "800

Roosevelt Road” portion could be back-lit along with the map. The petitioner would have to consider removing the information of “Glen Hill North” from the sign.

Commissioners noted that “Glen Hill North” could go somewhere else on the sign, and remove the top to reduce the overall sign size. All the perimeter signs tell a visitor that they are at Glen Hill North. A nine foot sign once already inside the complex is very large.

A discussion followed on how to proceed depending on whether or not the petitioner would be willing to revise the sign by removing the “Glen Hill North” lettering at the top and reducing its size by that amount, or if he would prefer to come back to the Commission with a revised elevation. Commission Dieter ultimately made a motion, which was seconded by Acting Chairman Loftus, to continue the matter to the January 27 Commission meeting unless the petitioner was willing to take off the top of the sign containing the lettering “Glen Hill North”, in which case the Commission would recommend approval of the requested variations from Section 4-6-6(JJ) to allow 3 traffic directional signs that are 7.2 feet in height and have a sign area of 33 square feet each in lieu of the maximum height and maximum sign area of 4 square feet permitted for each sign.

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.
2. That the petitioner may come before the Commission in two weeks unless the petitioner accepts the removal of the top 1’ 8” containing the words “Glen Hill North”, in which case the recommendation will be forwarded to the Board of Trustees for consideration.

The recommendation was 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 signs would help visitors navigate around the complex and will not be a dominant architectural feature.
2. The plight of the owners is based on unique circumstances particular 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 different from other properties in that it contains 5 freestanding buildings, similar in design, structure, and exterior finishes. The petitioner has indicated that visitors often end up at the wrong building or wrong address. The new signage will help eliminate the potential hazard of having to stop in driveway areas and direct visitors to the correct buildings.

3. The variations, if granted, would have no 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 as the signs would be within the 800 Roosevelt complex and are intended for visitors of the complex.
4. The variations, if granted, would have no adverse impact on the existing or desired character of the surrounding area because the signs are aesthetically pleasing and professional landscaping beds will be installed around the signs.
5. The variations, if granted, would not endanger the public health, safety or welfare because they would improve safety within the complex by better directing visitors to the appropriate building without needing to make frequent stops or unexpected turns.

The motion carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

**VI. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**

None

**VII. TRUSTEE'S REPORT**

Trustee Kenwood said that the most recent Board of Trustees meeting was mostly for house cleaning items. Residents can now sign up their smart phone for 911 notifications pertaining to their address.

**VI. STAFF REPORT**

Village Planner Stegall said that the Commission will review the proposed new police station building in the near future for exterior appearance. There will also be a new retailer in the 478 Main Street building that will have a request for exterior renovations.

**VII. ADJOURN**

There being no other business, Commissioner Burkett moved, seconded by Commissioner Kimala, to adjourn the meeting at 8:34 PM. The motion carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

Submitted by Karen Blake, Acting Recording Secretary

Reviewed by Michele Stegall, Village Planner