

square feet permitted. The sign is for a new business, Storm Inspired Design, located at 530 Pennsylvania Avenue on the north side of Pennsylvania between Main Street and Forest Avenue in the C5B Central Business District – Central Service Sub-district. The proposed new façade meets all other exterior appearance guidelines except for sign area.

Commissioner Strutynsky asked if the photo included in the packet was representative of the size. Planner Sterrett stated yes, the Petitioner prepared a mock-up sign and hung it on the storefront to give a better idea of what the new sign would look like.

Commissioner Klimala asked about Salon Cheveux's sign (located next to the Petitioner's storefront), which appears much larger. Director Hulseberg responded that it may have been put up prior to the current sign code. If it's replaced in the future, it would need to be brought into compliance. Commissioner Wussow asked if the Coldwell Banker sign was within Code. Staff was not sure if it met Code.

Commissioner Dickie asked about the nature of the Petitioner's business. They would sell furniture and home goods.

Commissioner Wussow asked about the construction and materials for the proposed sign.

The Petitioner, Amy Storm, an interior designer of 342 Taylor Avenue in Glen Ellyn, was sworn in. The letters on the proposed sign are made of metal, while the back plate is made to look like a wood frame. There will be two gooseneck light fixtures illuminating the sign, which were approved when the building owner went through the exterior appearance process. The sign is not made of actual wood, just made to look like wood.

Commissioner Loftus asked about the colors of the sign. Ms. Storm stated that the "Storm" letters will be painted in metallic gold. The back plate is black. The back plate is all one color. The "inspired showroom" letters will be silver.

Chairman Burket stated that the request is about twice the size that would be allowed by Code.

Commissioner Wussow questioned if Staff was able to find any wall sign variations granted in the last decade. Staff clarified that two variations were granted for projecting signs but none for the size area of a wall sign. The maximum size for a projected sign used to be 4 feet, but is now 6 feet.

Commissioner Wussow asked about store frontage and how is it measured for this space. For this request, there is a shared vestibule that was not part of the frontage calculation. Commissioner Wussow stated that this building has a large façade that's tall and has a lot of blank white space. She stated that there will be two businesses sharing the large white façade and what matters most is that the signs for the establishments are similar, so they harmonize. She thinks the sign according to code would look too small. She stated that in her opinion, the request is reasonable. Commissioner Wussow would like staff to do research on Cheveux Salon's sign. If permission was not granted for their large awning sign, Staff should contact

them and let them know if they replace the sign, it will be need to be brought into compliance with Code. Director Hulseberg stated that Staff is able to do that.

Commissioner Strutynsky stated that she likes the sign, and believes it is appropriate for the façade. Commissioner Klimala agreed that it is a unique circumstance to have the neighboring businesses having larger signs. He does not believe there would be an adverse effect on property values. There's no endangerment to the public health, safety and welfare.

Commissioner Pulver agreed. He is concerned that approving this request will set a precedent. Because of the large vertical façade on the building, this would be a one-time deal. The façade itself is large and accommodates the proposed sign.

Commissioner Dickie stated that it is tricky when the building's façade is that large because a sign in the allowable size would look very small.

Commissioner Thompson agreed. This commission is usually very strict on signs in the downtown. She stated that in this one case, an exception may be appropriate.

Commissioner Loftus asked if the mock-up photo reflects the accurate sign position. Ms. Storm responded that no, the sign was only placed as high as they could reach. Commissioner Loftus stated that the building façade has decorative terra cotta tiles on it, and he wants to make sure the proposed sign would not cover them. Ms. Storm stated that no, it will not cover the tiles.

Chairman Burket stated that when the Commission went through the sign code they considered every detail. He stated that possibly approving the request before them may be backing off what they have worked so hard to move forward. He stated that it is not realistic to consider this to be a one-time exception. He would like to see a compromise where the sign size could be decreased slightly.

Chairman Burket invited members of the audience to comment.

Audience member Tom Lamontia of 535 Pennsylvania Avenue was sworn in. He stated that he is in favor of the sign. He stated that a large sign is needed because it is easily seen by drivers. Pennsylvania is a one-way street, and it's a safety hazard when drivers are looking for a store and cannot read the signs. He stated that he understands the Commission is trying to keep a consistent look with signage, but he believes signs that are too small are a safety issue.

Commissioner Wussow stated that she believes the safety issue is a valid point. The street has an unusual traffic pattern.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Wussow made a motion to recommend approval of the requested sign variation based on the following findings of fact for the sign variation:

1. The request complies with the Statement of Purpose in Section 4-5-2 of this Chapter because the increased signage size will visually communicate to the passerby where they are located. The scale is more appropriate visually on the building than what is allowed by code.
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 portion of the storefront now bends into the building because of work the landlord did to create a recessed eating and foyer area next door. If the existing storefront had remained, the allowed signage would have been larger. The space is also next to a business with a very large awning with larger text on it. As is, the sign would be about the size of 3 letters in the word Cheveaux, so significantly smaller and the subject storefront is larger.
3. The variation, if granted, would have no adverse impact on property values in the surrounding area or be injurious to other property or improvement in the neighborhood in which the property is located because the increased signage would be significantly smaller than the adjacent neighbors. The space is a trade showroom that will draw designers and people from surrounding communities. The revenue could be affected if no one can find the property.
4. The variation, if granted, would have no adverse impact on the existing or desired character of the surrounding area because the signage will not only improve the building where but the surrounding area as well. The space has been vacant for years. The improvements will enhance downtown Glen Ellyn.
5. The variation, if granted, would not endanger, the public health, safety, or welfare because compliance with all codes will be met and use high safety standards will be used during installation. The only change will be more square footage.

As well as the following supplemental findings:

1. That the purpose of the variation is not based exclusively upon a desire to make more money out of the property because the adjacent properties not only have larger signage but awnings that block the view of the subject property when driving down the one way street.
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 because the adjacent awning have been there for years. The building is being restored and in the process, more façade has been exposed, leaving a large empty surface area for the signage.

3. That the variation is the minimum variation necessary because as a design showroom, the petitioner is not looking to be flashy, but classic, respectful, appropriate, and most of all, to be seen by people visiting Glen Ellyn who are unfamiliar with the streets and the location.
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 signage allowed is so small it would be difficult to read when driving by or even be seen with the adjacent storefront awnings.

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

VI. TRUSTEE'S REPORT

Trustee Kenwood stated that the board is still in budgeting season. They are still waiting on plans for Machesney property. There is a public hearing sign in front of Barone's for an upcoming exterior appearance review and sign variation.

VII. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

None

VIII. STAFF REPORT

The Barone's property is scheduled for the November 9th meeting. At the recommendation of the Village Board, Staff is moving towards all-electronic packets for the commissions. Discussion followed that sometimes architectural drawings are needed in hard copy format, but the rest of the packet could be handled electronically.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

VIII. ADJOURN

There being no other business, Commissioner Strutynsky moved, seconded by Commissioner Wussow, to adjourn the meeting at 7:42 PM. The motion carried unanimously by a vote of 8-0.

Submitted by C. Johnson, Recording Secretary

Approved by the Architectural Review Commission on December 14, 2016