

MINUTES

BOARD / COMMISSION: Architectural Review DATE: March 9, 2016
MEETING: Regular CALLED TO ORDER: 7:00 PM
QUORUM: Yes ADJOURNED: 8:26 PM

MEMBER ATTENDANCE: PRESENT: Chairperson Burdett, Commissioners
Dickie, Loftus, Thompson, and Wussow

ABSENT: Commissioners Albrecht, Burket, Dieter
and Klimala

ALSO PRESENT: Village Planner Stegall, Temporary Recording
Secretary Blake

AUDIENCE: None other than Petitioner

I. CALL TO ORDER:

Chairperson Burdett called the Glen Ellyn Architectural Review Commission (ARC) regular meeting to order at 7:00 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 FEBRUARY 24, 2016 MEETING MINUTES

Commissioner Wussow moved to approve the February 24, 2016 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Dickie and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING – 1100 ROOSEVELT ROAD

Commissioner Thompson moved, and Commissioner Loftus seconded opening the public hearing. The motion was passed by a vote of 5-0.

Village Planner Michele Stegall presented the project and summarized the Staff Report. The Petitioner is requesting from this Commission approval of the proposed exterior appearance and a sign variation to accommodate a new convenience store and 7-position gas station at

1100 Roosevelt Road. The Petitioner will renovate an existing vacant building, and construct a 240 sf addition for a cooler, bringing to 1,940 the total square footage of the building. There are plans to paint the building. No rooftop mechanical equipment is proposed.

The Petitioner is requesting approval of a variation from Section 4-5-4(R)3 of the Glen Ellyn Sign Code to allow a freestanding sign to be setback 3 feet from the property line instead of the minimum setback requirement of 5 feet. The proposed height and area of the sign comply with the Code. The sign will serve both the Petitioner's property and the adjacent Dunkin' Donuts, and the variation is for both properties.

Architect Eric Eriksson was sworn in and reviewed the site plan. The proposed cooler will be on the west side of the building, out of view. There will be three and one-half islands for the gas pumps, reducing one to account for the traffic pattern to the Dunkin' Donuts.

The existing building walls are concrete block painted initially red, and have a dryvit skin painted grey. The roof is wood with a canopy. The plan is to paint the outside walls to match the dryvit. The extension will be a walk-in cooler, insulated on the inside and coated on the outside. The storefront will be metal frame around windows.

There will be five LED lights in the front where most of the traffic will be, and which will not generate glare on light spilling onto neighboring properties. Behind the building will be space for a couple employee cars, and a dumpster enclosure of concrete block covered with a dryvit skin. There will be minimal lighting in the back, sufficient only for security purposes. There will be a fence, bushes and the building itself separating the pumps from the neighbors to the north.

In response to Commissioners' questions, Mr. Eriksson said that there will be a gable added to the roof, but that the air conditioning compressor will be located behind the building and not on the roof. At this point, there are no plans to put brick on the building canopy.

There was discussion concerning the use of a dryvit coating versus an EIFS coating on the building brick and concrete block. Commissioner Wussow noted that the use of EIFS is discouraged within the Village when it is within reach of vehicles or pedestrians. Although the plans call for EIFS painted onto the exterior of the cooler, Mr. Eriksson said that the Petitioner would be open to using a dryvit coating, although the EIFS has higher insulation properties and would eliminate the seams on the walls. The consensus was that dryvit coating will be best. Also, the concrete block trash enclosure will be covered with dryvit paint. There was also discussion concerning painting the gutters to match the dryvit on the building in order to not end up with a variety of colors on the building. The colors will be neutral enough to compliment the color scheme of whatever gasoline company is chosen for the site.

The discussion turned to the sign variation request. The Petitioner is requesting approval of a variation from Section 4-5-4(R)3 of the Glen Ellyn Sign Code to allow the sign to be setback 3 feet from the property line instead of the permitted minimum 5 feet. Mr. Eriksson said that the

current sign is on the southeast corner of the property, but impedes traffic circulation around the pumps and to the building, affecting safety and efficiency. The logical place for it is the southeast corner, but closer to the property line. In order to fit 3 ½ pump islands on the site, the extra space is required. Chairman Burdett clarified that the hardship would be the tight site precluding the extra one-half pump island unless the sign is moved.

Mr. Eriksson said that there is not currently a sidewalk along Roosevelt and there are no plans to install one. Village Planner Stegall said that there have been no recent discussions concerning such a sidewalk, and that IDOT would have to be involved. Chairman Burdett asked that the Village Board be informed that there is interest on this Commission to do something comprehensive on this part of Roosevelt Road.

The sidewalk on the Briar side will continue through to Roosevelt, and no changes will be made to that side other than widening the driveway. There will be a striped area for handicapped access from the mini mart to the Dunkin' Donuts as required by Code.

Commissioner Loftus asked about the addition of a right turn only lane onto Briar. Village Planner Stegall said that there may be a plan for one, but it may not be installed immediately and is recommended to be approached on a more incremental basis. Commissioner Loftus expressed support for the variation, noting that a traffic hazard could be created without good signage and visibility alerting drivers as to the upcoming location of the Dunkin' Donuts and mini mart.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Mr. Jim Sterling of 3715 Bergstrom in Joliet, who owns the apartment building to the north of the site, addressed the Commission. He noted that Mr. Eriksson has addressed many of his concerns. The post lights will be removed from this property, and Mr. Sterling said that the two lights in the back of the Dunkin Donuts building have been turned off in response to tenant's concerns. In response to his questions, Mr. Eriksson said that the compressors will be on the ground by the dumpster and not on the roof. They are efficient, but will run when necessary. The roof over the cooler will be an insulation panel with membrane roofing over it for draining. Access to the cooler is through the building only, and the public will not have access. There is landscaping planned for the area; however, extending the dumpster fence to include the cooler would impede the needed air flow around the cooler.

Mr. Eriksson said that there will be a fence and shrubs erected along the north property line, which will help greatly to absorb sound from the site. Mr. Sterling expressed support for this plan.

Mr. Sterling expressed concern about the traffic, and that his tenants have already complained about the traffic around the Dunkin' Donuts. Village Planner Stegall noted that the Village's traffic consultant looked at the plan. Traffic issues will be discussed at the Plan Commission meeting.

Commissioner Wussow asked about the size of the storefront windows. Village Planner Stegall noted that the Village guidelines discourage windows that extend all the way to the ground. The plans for this building call for windows outside these guidelines. However, Village Planner Stegall noted that it was not raised in the staff report as this has been approved along Roosevelt Road for other projects.

Village Planner Stegall clarified for the Commissioners that the vote at this meeting would be on the monument sign variation only and the exterior appearance of the building. It is possible there will be additional sign variance requests once a gas company is selected, but if the additional signage is within Code, it would be approved without Commission review.

There being no other questions, Commissioner Thompson moved, and Commissioner Dickie seconded closing the public hearing. The motion was passed by a vote of 5-0.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

Commissioner Dickie said that it is a simple building. He has no problem with the proposed location of the monument sign and is in favor of the variation.

Commissioner Loftus felt that the sign variation is not an issue for him. He would prefer to see EIFS coating not used on the walk-in cooler, but is fine with it used on the facade. He was glad the Petitioner is using an existing building rather than tearing something down. The storefront windows at this location are appropriate, although he noted that he would not approve if placed on a downtown building. He felt the colors are fine, and the use of dryvit is appropriate on the blocks.

Commissioner Thompson was pleased that the existing building is being reused. Although there was little discussion concerning landscaping, what was shown on the plans is good. She is pleased that the seams on the cooler will be masked. She is in favor of the sign variation, and thanked Mr. Sterling for addressing the Commission.

Commissioner Wussow thought a gas station use for the site is ideal, and was pleased about the cooperation to eliminate the EIFS on the cooler. The color palette is an excellent neutral.

Chairman Burdett said that he favors the sign variance, noting that it is a tight site. He is also in favor of approving the exterior appearance with no EIFS on the cooler, and the base of the sign be painted in the same neutral color.

Commissioner Wussow made a motion to approve the proposed exterior appearance and requested sign variation. Based on the following findings of fact for the requested sign variation:

1. The request complies with the Statement of Purpose found in Section 4-5-2 of the Glen Ellyn Sign Code because the requested variation is needed in order to locate the sign on the property in such a manner that allows for the identification of both businesses on the property and eliminates confusion, in particular for westbound traffic who might otherwise

pass by the Roosevelt Road access drive if the sign were placed in a conforming location on the west side of the site.

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 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 site is developed as a PUD and the sign needs to identify both businesses on the property. With the location of the existing building and need to allow for adequate vehicular turning movements around the gas pumps, limited space is available in which to place the sign.
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 sign is located along a commercial corridor. The height and area of the sign comply with the Code and the proposed style is typical for the area.
4. The variation, if granted, would not have an adverse impact on the existing or desired character of the surrounding area because the sign would be located along a commercial corridor and the height and area would comply with the Code.
5. The variation, if granted, would not endanger the public health, safety or welfare because given the unusually wide parkways in the area, sight lines should not be impeded by the proposed location of the sign and placing the sign in the proposed location will help minimize driver confusion.

For the purpose of supplementing the above standards, the Architectural Review Commission, in making its findings and recommendations has also taken into consideration the extent to which the evidence establishes the following facts favorably to the Applicant:

1. That the purpose of the variation is not based exclusively upon a desire to make more money out of the property.
2. That the alleged difficulty or particular hardship has not been created by any person presently having an interest in the property or by the Applicant.
3. That the variation is the minimum variation necessary.
4. That 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.

The motion was made subject to the following conditions:

- A. The monument sign shall be located and constructed in substantial conformance with the

plans as submitted and the testimony presented at the public hearing of the Architectural Review Commission. The base of the monument sign shall be painted to match the building. This sign variation applies only to the monument sign.

- B. That the proposed EIFS product to be used on the cooler is eliminated and in its place, a dryvit coating be used that matches the building. Additionally, the waste enclosure dryvit coating shall also match the building.

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

V. TRUSTEE'S REPORT

None

VI. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

None.

VII. STAFF REPORT

Village Planner Stegall said that Applicant for the gas station at Stacy's Corner has met with Chairman Marks of the Historic Preservation Commission and is in the process of reevaluation the design. The Applicant will come back before this Commission for an additional pre-application meeting in April.

VIII. ADJOURN

There being no other business, Commissioner Loftus moved, seconded by Commissioner Wussow, to adjourn the meeting at 8:26 PM. The motion carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

Submitted by Karen Blake, Acting Recording Secretary
Reviewed by Michele Stegall, Village Planner