

MINUTES

BOARD / COMMISSION: Architectural Review

DATE: December 7, 2016

MEETING: Regular

CALLED TO ORDER: 7:03 PM

QUORUM: Yes

ADJOURNED: 9:27 PM

MEMBER ATTENDANCE:

PRESENT: Chairman Burket, Commissioners Albrecht (arrived 7:35pm), Loftus, Strutynsky, Pulver, and Thompson

ABSENT: Commissioners Dickie, Klimala, and Wussow

ALSO PRESENT:

Village Planner Sterrett, Director of Planning and Development Hulseberg, Trustee Ladesic, Recording Secretary Johnson

I. CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Burket called the Glen Ellyn Architectural Review Commission (ARC) regular meeting to order at 7:03 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 OCTOBER 26, 2016 MEETING MINUTES

Commissioner Strutynsky made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Loftus, to approve the October 26, 2016 minutes of the Glen Ellyn Architectural Review Commission. The motion was approved unanimously.

IV. 475 Pennsylvania Avenue – BARONE’S PIZZA

Commissioner Strutynsky made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Pulver, to open the public hearing. The motion was approved unanimously.

Village Planner John Sterrett was sworn in.

Planner Sterrett stated that the property is located on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue, east of Prospect Avenue and west of Glenwood Avenue in the C5B Central Business District –

Central Service Sub-district. The Petitioner is seeking approval of a sign variation and exterior appearance review. Proposed are one wall sign and two awning signs; only one sign is permitted by Code. The exterior renovations will include removing the stucco and replacing it with a brick veneer. The mansard roof will also be removed and replaced with a limestone veneer cornice.

Ronald LaPage and Susan Lonnett, architects with LaPage Architect of 951 W. Liberty Drive in Wheaton, were sworn in as the Petitioner's representatives.

Susan Lonnett stated that Barone's has been a fixture in Glen Ellyn since 1971. They are seeking to remodel the exterior of the building while keeping with the character of Glen Ellyn. Barone's occupies what were originally 3 tenant spaces that were constructed with different materials. The stucco exterior was applied in the 1970s in an attempt to unify the look of the spaces. Ms. Lonnett reviewed the architectural stylings of nearby buildings – Glen Oak Café, Lords auto clinic, and the Legacy condos. She described the exterior renovations which will include exposing and repairing existing brick, installing new thin brick to match, installing new cast limestone, replacing existing doors, windows and existing lighting, and providing new signage and awnings.

Ms. Lonnett stated that they are proposing new signage to be clear and concise. The main sign will be facing Pennsylvania Avenue. The second sign will be on the awning on the west side of the building and a third sign will be on an awning on the east side of the building.

Chairman Burket stated that the board will discuss exterior renovation before sign request. The architects presented material boards to the commission.

Commissioner Strutynsky asked if real limestone was proposed; yes, it's made of real limestone but it is considered cast limestone. Ms. Lonnett stated that different materials are being proposed to add interest and texture to the building.

Chairman Burket asked if the doors on the corner are "real" doors. The doors will not be operable to the outside public, but will function as an "as needed" exit.

Commissioner Loftus asked about rooftop screening on the HVAC unit. The HVAC will not be replaced, but they will be providing screening.

Commissioner Loftus asked about the fencing between the subject property and Glen Oak's parking lot. Ms. Lonnett stated that currently there is a metal cyclone fence that they are not planning on replacing at this time. Commissioner Loftus asked about proposed landscaping, does it meet requirements? The landscaping will be fortified or replaced as needed. Planner Sterrett stated that as proposed, the property is in compliance with landscaping requirements. The fence in question is not on subject property; it belongs to the neighboring property.

Commissioner Loftus asked if any other type of signage was considered for the east side. Ms. Lonnett stated yes, a separate sign with exterior lighting was considered, but they believed it was a missed opportunity to continue the awning motif. The awning sign provides better contrast and is easier to read. Commissioner Loftus stated that he believes the awning is out of place since it

is not over an entry. Ms. Lonnett stated that the east awning does not need to project as far as the other awning since it is not necessarily as functional.

Mr. LaPage stated that they wanted to maintain continuity on the east side of the building with the awning. Chairman Burket stated that the awning itself is not an issue, but the signage on the awning does not meet Code.

Ms. Lonnett stated that one of the biggest goals of adding signage is to improve communication with vehicular traffic and identify the building/business. The main entry sign is understated and sophisticated. With the angle of approach to the building, and the nearby intersections, additional signage helps better communicate with patrons.

Commissioner Loftus asked if this property was on the corner, would these signs meet Code. Planner Sterrett replied that 2 signs would be permitted, not 3. The size of the signs would meet Code if this was a corner lot.

Commissioner Thompson stated that the petitioner has a valid argument. It is hard for vehicular traffic to see the front of the building. Additional signage would be helpful.

Commissioner Strutynsky asked the Petitioners if they were concerned that a sign on the east side of the building might confuse customers and encourage them to park in the wrong parking lot. Ms. Lonnett stated that the signage is meant to identify the building and not the parking lot. Signage on the side of the building will hopefully help patrons not pass by the building.

Chairman Burket asked if any audience members would like to comment.

Jana Sampson, 470 Pennsylvania Avenue, lives directly across the street. She stated that a very bright street light is already on the corner, and a lighted sign on the east side is not necessary. The light shines into her windows. She asked if the building was being re-roofed. Ms. Lonnett stated that the flat roof is in good condition, and will not be replaced. The new parapet may soften the view of the roof from the neighbors. The proposed down lights are designed to only shine light where it is needed, not provide any glare.

Ken Claus, 350 Ridgewood Avenue, Glen Ellyn, stated that both Barone's and Glen Oak Café are holding out and ignoring benefits to the community. Anytime a development comes in there has to be a good footprint. The developer would have been smart not to purchase the Miller Machesney property.

Commissioner Loftus asked about the photometric plan. He stated that the proposed number of lumens seemed very dim in spots. Mr. LaPage stated that the foot candle data was provided by the manufacturer, but they will look into it.

Commissioner Strutynsky asked about the location of parking lot light fixtures. Ms. Lonnett stated that it is mounted on the building.

Commissioner Pulver questioned how many people would have trouble finding the restaurant without the additional signage. He is good with the plan, but does not favor the sign on the east side of the building. Otherwise, the building plans look very nice.

Commissioner Albrecht stated that the design is a huge improvement. With regard to the east side sign, she stated she does not believe lighting on the awning will add to light pollution. She is neutral on the proposed extra signage.

Commissioner Loftus agreed the design is nice. He stated that the new remodeling outweighs the perceived detriment of the east side awning sign.

Commissioner Strutynsky stated she loves the new design. She has no problem with the three signs.

Commissioner Thompson stated she thinks the design is fantastic, especially the medallions on the side of the building and the landscaping plan. She is in favor of the extra signage.

Chairman Burket paraphrased the written comments provided by Commissioner Wussow, who could not be at the meeting. She stated she is opposed to sign on the east side. Chairman Burket stated that the east sign is unnecessary. It is a destination restaurant.

Commissioner Albrecht, seconded by Commissioner Strutynsky, made a motion to close the public hearing.

Commissioner Pulver made a motion to approve the exterior appearance. Seconded by Commissioner Loftus. Motion approved unanimously.

Commissioner Strutynsky made a motion to approve the Variations as presented. Seconded by Commissioner Thompson. The motion was approved by a vote of 4-2 (Burket, Pulver dissenting).

V. 439 Pennsylvania Avenue – HEARTS OF OAK, LLC

Commissioner Strutynsky made a motion to open the public hearing, seconded by Commissioner Pulver. The motion approved unanimously.

Village Planner John Sterrett was sworn in. He gave an overview of the request. The Petitioner is proposing a quilt store named “A Different Box of Crayons,” located at 439 Pennsylvania Avenue. The property is located on the south side of Pennsylvania between Prospect Avenue and Western Avenue in the C5B Central Business District – Central Service Sub-district. The Petitioner is proposing to remodel the interior and exterior of the property, and thus is seeking an exterior appearance review. Three signs are proposed for the building and therefore the Petitioner is requesting a sign variation. Planner Sterrett stated that a hanging sign is proposed to be located on an existing light pole, which does not meet the required setback. A “barn quilt” sign (a wall mounted, decorative, tile quilt square) is proposed for the west side of the building. A wall-mounted logo sign is proposed for the south (rear) side of the building near the entrance.

Commissioner Pulver asked why the quilt on the side of the building is being considered a sign. Staff stated that because it is a form of advertising, the quilt design on the side of the building is considered a sign. This is consistent with how the Code has been interpreted in the past. A definition of a sign is something that attracts attention but is not architectural. It advertises quilts, which is their business. Discussion followed about what is considered a sign, and outdoor merchandise.

The Petitioner's representative was sworn in – Brian Korte, architect, 91 Gate Street, Crystal Lake. The Petitioner designs and fabricates quilt kits and offers quilt supplies. It is a historical building, appropriate for this type of business. The Petitioner wants to rehabilitate the property, and also add some square footage (250 sf) to make it more functional. They are proposing to maintain the front façade to keep it original. The siding needs to be replaced, as well as the windows. They are planning to use reclaimed brick around the bottom of the building and a vinyl railing system for the new ramp and deck. There is an existing gas coach light in the front yard, with a bracket already attached to it. They plan to use this to hang a new sign. The bracket faces north towards the sidewalk, thus does not meet the setback requirements for a sign.

Chairman Burket asked how difficult it would be to move the light pole to meet the setback. Mr. Korte did not know. The requirement is 5 feet from the property line. They're currently at 2 feet, 9 inches.

Mr. Korte stated that the project includes a new paved, curbed parking lot, as the existing lot is gravel. The parking lot will accommodate 5 vehicles. A screened trash enclosure with lattice to match the lattice skirting around the deck and ramp is included in the plan. With respect to the variations, the Petitioner wishes to use the existing light pole and bracket, thus needing relief from the setback requirement. The quilt block sign proposed for the west side of the building is a symbol of what the business is about. It is constructed of painted MDF and is 6 feet by 6 feet. The main entrance will be in the rear of the building, closest to the parking lot, hence the need for a third sign. The front entrance will still be usable for pedestrians.

The Petitioner, Lynn Schmitt-Gallagher, 1124 Webster in Wheaton, proprietor of the business, was sworn in. She stated that she is primarily a designer and conducts a portion of her business online. Delivery trucks will pull in the parking lot at this new location. Her business is a destination. Signage is important to direct drivers into the driveway and parking lot. The barn quilt is considered folk art; it helps to break up the large, plain elevation of the west side of the building. The lamp post is original (built in 1890) and she would like to keep it since the property is historic. There isn't a good place to put a sign on the building.

Commissioner Loftus asked about shrinking the size of the sign on the light pole. He said he believes it will be in the line-of-sight for drivers pulling out of the driveway.

Chairman Burket asked about hanging the sign on the interior side of the pole. It would be very close to meeting the setback then. The Petitioner was agreeable.

Commissioner Thompson asked for photo of the barn quilt, which the Petitioner provided.

Chairman Burket asked is members of the audience had any comments.

Ken Claus, 350 Ridgewood Avenue, Glen Ellyn, stated that he is happy the new owners are doing what they're doing.

Commissioner Loftus, seconded by Commissioner Strutynsky, made a motion to close the public hearing. The motion was approved unanimously.

Commissioner Pulver stated he will approve everything as proposed. In his mind, he doesn't consider the barn quilt a real sign. He supports the idea to turn the pole sign the other direction and provide more clearance from the sidewalk.

Commissioner Albrecht agreed with the previous statement.

Commissioner Loftus agreed with the previous statements and was glad to see the reuse of the building.

Commissioner Strutynsky stated she loves the quilt sign, and will approve all requests if the pole sign is flipped in the other direction.

Commissioner Thompson agreed with the previous statements. She appreciates the landscape plan as well.

Chairman Burket was in agreement.

Commissioner Strutynsky made a motion to approve the exterior appearance review, seconded by Commissioner Loftus. Motion was approved 6-0.

Commissioner Strutynsky made a motion to approve the three sign variation as requested, subject to the condition that the hanging sign on the light pole be installed on the interior side of the pole, seconded by Commissioner Pulver. The motion was approved 6-0.

VI. TRUSTEE'S REPORT

Trustee Ladesic was present. No report.

VII. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

None

VIII. STAFF REPORT

Planner Sterrett stated that there are two items on the agenda for the meeting next week, including Panera Bread on Roosevelt Road and Two Hound Red Brew Pub on Pennsylvania Avenue.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

VIII. ADJOURN

There being no other business, Commissioner Loftus moved, seconded by Commissioner Pulver, to adjourn the meeting at 9:27 PM. The motion carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

Submitted by C. Johnson, Recording Secretary