

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLAN COMMISSION HELD ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 5, 2010, AT THE VILLAGE HALL, 7760 QUINCY STREET, WILLOWBROOK, DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Kopp called the meeting to order at the hour of 7:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Those present at roll call were Commissioners Robert DelSarto, Joseph Heery, James Soukup Vice-Chairman Wagner and Chairman Kopp. Also present were Planner JoEllen Charlton, Director of Municipal Services Tim Halik and Secretary Joanne Prible. ABSENT: William Remkus and James Baker.

Commissioner James Baker entered at 7:05.

3. OMNIBUS VOTE AGENDA

The items on the Omnibus Vote Agenda were as follows:

- a. Waive Reading of Minutes (APPROVE)
- b. Minutes – Regular Meeting March 3, 2010 (APPROVE)
- c. Minutes – Village Board Meetings – February 22, March 1, March 8, March 15, March 22, 2010 (RECEIVE)

MOTION: Made by Commissioner DelSarto seconded by Commissioner Soukup, to approve the Omnibus Vote Agenda.

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE

MOTION DECLARED CARRIED

4. PLAN COMMISSION CONSIDERATION – Zoning Hearing Case 10-03: Amendments to Title 9, Section 11: Signs (CONTINUED FROM 2/3/10)

Chairman Kopp opened the public hearing. He said this is a continuation of the public hearing of the Plan Commission of the Village of Willowbrook convened for the purpose of considering proposed amendments to Title 9, Section 2 and Title 9, Section 11 of the Municipal Code. Public Hearing 10-03 was originally opened on February 3, 2010 and was continued to the March 3, 2010 meeting and to tonight's meeting. Notice of the public hearing on the matter to be considered was published in The Doings on January 14, 2010. Chairman Kopp asked is staff ready to present the case.

Planner Charlton said tonight's agenda is the culmination of the sign code ordinance amendment. We will review the previous documents and ensure that the commission is interpreting the revisions the same way. The focus is on the discussion regarding Bill McNaughton based on the meeting in March. Exhibit I is a memorandum that describes the conversation that staff had with Bill McNaughton. To summarize his concerns, Bill McNaughton asked the commission to consider two additional parts to the sign code and that was to allow for some additional square footage or area on a freestanding sign for addresses. In addition, to look at the possibility of

using the freestanding sign for the real estate information sign in lieu of having a separate for lease or for rent sign on the property. The Commission talked about that at the last meeting and decided that if it could be placed on the freestanding sign and the other sign removed that would be preferable to having two signs on the site. Staff asked Mr. McNaughton to put his ideas on paper and staff came back and tried to see how to word all of this. During the discussions we talked about additional square footage and as staff started to evaluate the possibility, we decided that was not a good idea. A copy of the sign from Mr. McNaughton was included in your packet. The only thing on the sign from Mr. McNaughton that was not discussed was the panel that reads "Professional and Medical Office Complex". That is something additional. When we were talking with him in terms of square footages Mr. McNaughton thought that he had additional room on the sign. This is showing at 1 in height and we drafted the language so that the overall dimension could be no more than 8 inches in height. At the bottom of the sign is the office suite for lease portion and we drafted that to say that it is no larger than 16 square ft. or 8 square ft. per side. This showing at 1.5 ft. by the dimension of 6 ft. wide is a little bit over, but Mr. McNaughton could reduce that to 1.3 ft. high and that would be in compliance with the 8 ft. per side or 16 total square ft.

Chairman Kopp asked Planner Charlton are you measuring the letters.

Planner Charlton answered not on the real estate sign just on the address sign.

Vice Chairman Wagner asked is the number to be 8 inches tall or the panel.

Planner Charlton answered the code reads that the address area be no more than 8 inches.

Vice Chairman Wagner asked what is defined as the area.

Planner Charlton answered if it is an individual letter or number on a masonry sign it would be 8 inch individual. If it was part of a panel, that would be 8 inches total.

Commissioner Baker asked what is 8 inches total on the panel.

Planner Charlton answered the panel would be 8 inches so they would need to fit the numbering and the lettering within that. They may have a sign contractor that says you need to put six inch lettering in order to have room. Staff is not going to allow them to have a panel any taller than 8 inches.

Chairman Kopp said that does not make any sense. He said staff should dictate the letter size because somebody will have it without panels. Why do we care about the size of the panel?

Planner Charlton said that is how this was set up.

Vice Chairman said we should suggest how big the numbers can be so that we can see this number at 100 ft. or more. If the number gets small it will not be visible. The numbers need to be 8 to 10 inches tall.

Planner Charlton said for reference a street sign has 6 inch letters on an 8 inch sign.

Director Halik explained by definition for a free standing sign all areas excluding the supporting structure are included as sign area.

Chairman Kopp said the trees are included because it is part of the sign surface.

Director Halik added the rational was to provide area for signage including addresses and lease signs which are in addition to the area allotted for signage.

Chairman Kopp asked how you would measure the address and the real estate information.

Director Halik answered you would have to take the area of the panel.

Vice Chairman Wagner said today we draw a rectangle around the maximum length and height of the panel and add up the area. If that was a separate panel or one panel you would draw a rectangle around the whole thing and add up the square footage.

Chairman Kopp asked what section of the code is that.

Planner Charlton answered 9-11-5.

Chairman Kopp added since it is not exceeding 8 inches in height, you would multiply 8 inches by 6 ft.

Planner Charlton answered we are not looking at the total area of the sign we are looking at the height of the letter. She said the code is 9-11-6 which reads “not exceeding 8 inches in overall height” if it is in a panel, that panel is 8 inches if it is individual letters the letters are 8 inches. Planner Charlton said the panel shown is 1 ft. and the numbers are about 10 inches.

Chairman Kopp said for the patients and customers, staff thought it was more valuable to show the address than the name of the park.

Chairman Kopp said the code says “street address information not exceeding 8 inches shall be in addition to the permitted sign surface area”. That is allowing 8 inches, it is not allowing the 2 inches on top and the 2 inches on the bottom.

Planner Charlton said we are not counting that.

Chairman Kopp asked why that is not part of the exemption.

Vice Chairman Wagner said the field of the sign does not count and what we are trying to accomplish is making the numeral 8 inches tall so you can read it. The language should be clearer.

Vice Chairman Wagner said I would hope to see numbers that large in the future on signs other than this one so that people can see the signs and we resolve some of the problems that exist in other places. A standard throughout the village.

Planner Charlton said the way that I have written the address information as part of the signage can be on any free standing sign in the office districts and the commercial districts. The real estate signs are specifically written just for the office project.

Planner Charlton said that is correct. If they chose to put it on their free standing sign they are no longer eligible to have a separate real estate freestanding sign.

Vice Chairman Wagner said the shopping center at 63rd and 83 has had one there.

Director Halik responded that is in large part to the Electec vacancy. Once Goodwill takes over that space they will be under the 10% margin.

Vice Chairman Wagner said I remember someone saying something about redoing that sign because of what we were doing here. I would like to suggest that it be great to see this on all of these revised signs so that we eliminate that issue.

Director Halik said in doing so we will have to abandon our 10% vacancy rule.

Vice Chairman Wagner said that would be fine.

Planner Charlton said we will add that language to the commercial signage section. Also, with the exclusion that if you chose to put it on your freestanding sign you no longer have the ability to place it as a temporary sign.

Planner Charlton said there are a couple of other things I would like to bring up. We started out looking at other signs in other communities and decided that going from 8 ft. to 12 ft. for every office property within Willowbrook is a pretty huge jump. When looking at some of the other communities that are doing signage along Route 59 and some of these highly traveled corridors we are seeing 10 ft. She said that is pretty standard for even commercial types of signs. We rethought that a little bit and are dropping that down and recommending that you accept an increase to 10 ft. instead of 12 ft. On this particular sign that will still work with the adjustment comparatively we only need about 3 ft. of space between grade and the bottom face of the sign and if we make the changes with the real estate sign and the address sign we can achieve the 3 ft. from the grade to the bottom and not exceed 10 ft.

Vice Chairman Wagner asked where 10 ft. is measured from.

Director Halik responded average surrounding grade to the top of the sign.

Planner Charlton said the sign drawing has 3 ft. for the berm and 3 ft. for the clear space between grade and the bottom base of the sign, so that is 6 ft., 2 ½ ft. for the Woodland Park sign and that is 8 ½ ft. and then there is another 1 ½ ft. to share the address leasing information.

Director Halik clarified it is a 7 ft. sign on top of a 3 ft. berm.

Vice Chairman Wagner said the sign appears to be 8 ½ ft. tall.

Planner Charlton said we are taking out the Professional and Medical Office complex portion of it and tightening up the extra space in between. It does not work with this sign. This sign needs to be modified but it can be easily modified to achieve the 10 ft.

Chairman Kopp said this sign is higher by two ft.

Vice Chairman Wagner asked is this sign moving forward toward the street.

Director Halik said the current regulations require a setback to the property line equal to the height. The proposed setback is a flat 5 ft.

Vice Chairman Wagner said I am good with 10 ft.

Director Halik said the prior proposal was 12 ft. tall by 10 ft. wide. We revised that to 10 ft., however, there is no provision in the text which would require a berm as part of the 10 ft. sign.

Vice Chairman Wagner said I would like to try to find a way to allow the 10 ft. sign and not get involved with the measuring of berms or no berms because now you are putting a factor in that someone else can take advantage of.

Director Halik said that is the intent of the average surrounding grade that you cannot build a berm to put your sign on top.

Vice Chairman Wagner asked why we don't just measure the sign whether it is on top of a 3 ft. berm or whether it is on a flat piece of ground. There is still a 7 ft. sign and it does not matter whether you have a berm or not.

Director Halik answered true but in doing so a developer or property owner could attempt to manipulate the grade. The only limit on the height of a berm is the manual slope. It is possible that an owner could try to manipulate the grade to get a 20 ft. tall sign. They could say I will build a 13 ft. berm because I have the horizontal area and I will put my 7 ft. sign on top of that and I get a 20 ft. sign.

Vice Chairman Wagner said I thought somewhere in the code we require a 3 ft. berm around parking lots.

Director Halik said in some case we do require a certain height screening requirement which is 4 ft.

Planner Charlton asked does anyone have questions before we move on.

Chairman Kopp said we should give Mr. McNaughton a chance to speak before we move on.

Bill McNaughton with Woodland Park Willowbrook said he appreciates the time that the Plan Commission has worked on this. He said in order for us to get better visibility for our tenants, the changes that the village put forth today are important, but Mr. McNaughton said I do not know if it really meets or gets us to a point where we have enough visibility. We tossed back and forth a lot of different ideas and at the last meeting I came up with my sign and the

Professional and Medical Office plaque would be a good visible way to get people to understand that it is a Professional Office Building as well as a Medical Building. He added I would hope that you would look at that as something that you would allow on the monument sign. I know the square footage at 55 square ft. is what you are working towards. I think that I can still make the sign work with 55 instead of 75 square ft. He said I would like the Commission to look at not counting the headboard sign, the air portion in the square footage. That cost me, the way that they measure signs now, roughly 22 square ft. on each side. If that change could be made I would hopefully be able to get the Professional and Medical office plaque somewhere on the monument sign. That brings up the point that in order to get that on there I would need more height.

Chairman Kopp said he really like the simplicity of how the sign is measured. He said I can envision ways to jog the system with the letters sticking up and I really do not want to make a special rule because you want to keep the tree logo. You could fit Woodland Park and Professional and Medical Office on the 2 ½ ft. by 11 ft. panel. Does anyone else feel otherwise about the measuring?

Commissioner DelSarto said that is the best way to do it. It is the standard through the village.

Vice Chairman Wagner commented that regarding the 3 ft. we are forcing the sign out of the ground by requiring the 3 ft. I think we should take the 3 ft. out and they landscape it appropriately. I would hope that we can do something to keep the sign at 10 ft. and maybe amend the 36 inches to 24 inches to accomplish this.

Chairman Kopp said we are all in agreement why do we even need 36 inches.

Director Halik said amend the 3 ft. clearance requirement to 2 ft. and that should satisfy the height issue.

Chairman Kopp said we are moving on to the next part of the meeting.

Planner Charlton said I would like some feedback and discussion from you. The LOP, talking about building mounted wall signs there seems to be some discrepancy about how the height of those signs are measured. In some cases they are measured to a maximum height or the top of the building wall and some cases they are measured one below the top of the building wall. It did not seem to make much sense as to when the various signs were chosen. I am suggesting that we make revisions so that the maximum height that is chosen be the same, but if measuring from the top of the height of the wall that it always be 1 ft. below.

Chairman Kopp said that makes sense to me.

Planner Charlton said on page 17 if we are going to chose two ft., I will change it to two ft. but I will make it consistent every time that it is referenced.

Planner Charlton said on page 19. Freestanding signs permitted in the B4 district. The businesses located in the B4 have a minimum of 200 ft. of business site frontage on a designated arterial listed as Route 83, 63rd, 75th and Plainfield so the maximum of 2 freestanding ground signs are permitted subject to the criteria. Most of the districts in the B4 are all stand alone

businesses and mostly on interior lots. Did you ever intent to have 2 freestanding signs on an interior lot?

Vice Chairman Wagner asked isn't this part of the discussion where we were talking about corner lots where they have a sign on both frontages. Does that relate to this?

Planner Charlton said that definitely relates to shopping centers greater than 10 acres but because you only have nine properties and none of them are on a corner lot.

Chairman Kopp said if it is in addition, we do not need it.

Planner Charlton said we are going to have one freestanding sign for interior lot. The other thing to know is there are 9 parcels that are in this district and 4 of them qualify for this freestanding sign, Willowbrook Ford, Holiday Inn, LaQuinta and Red Roof Inn. There are 5 other parcels that are not eligible for this because they do not have 200 ft. of frontage.

Chairman Kopp asked can they have signs.

Planner Charlton answered they cannot have any. Right now you have to have 200 ft. of frontage and on 83, 63rd, 75 or Plainfield Road.

Chairman Kopp clarified before we took on the sign code review none of the B4 districts had free standing except those grandfathered from the county. The Commission said to give them signage rights similar to retail owners but for some reason it was limited to parcels 200 ft. and on arterial and I suspect we were thinking of them with regard to two signs not having a sign at all.

Planner Charlton said this language is almost exactly taken from the shopping center greater than 10 acres.

Vice Chairman Wagner said I am not sure whether or not I understand the issue but if we are talking about the 9 parcels and we have excluded one or two of them because of the definition, I think that this discussion should apply to all B4 parcels and forget this 200 ft. or Route 83.

Director Halik said Willowbrook Ford has numerous freestanding signs as does Holiday Inn. Perhaps the commission did want to allow these parcels to have 2 signs.

Chairman Kopp said we were not looking to make them all equal to Willowbrook Ford because most of us think that they are oversized.

Commissioner Heery said the Commission never thought of some properties not being on Rt. 83.

Vice Chairman Wagner said what are we allowing them to do that they cannot do today. Today they can have one sign on the ground and one sign on the building and this allows them to do what.

Director Halik said it appears to allow them to have 2 freestanding sign.

Chairman Kopp said we do not need the two and if they already have the one we should leave it the way it is.

Vice Chairman Wagner said I would only change the district to B4 district property rather than having frontage.

Director Halik clarified keep the 200 ft. requirement and eliminate the arterial wordage.

Planner Charlton said the current code does not separate B4 out so the assumption is that you wanted to look at B4 differently than you had in the past because of the specific parcels.

Chairman Kopp said it should to be modified so anyone in the B4 can have a freestanding sign.

Planner Charlton said as long as they have 200 ft. of frontage.

All Commissioners agreed to leave in the 200 ft. and take out the reference to the streets.

Planner Charlton said the shopping center freestanding identification signs shall be erected to a height of 15.

Chairman Kopp said it should be a height of 16.

Planner Charlton said in addition to the shopping center identification sign, outparcel ground sign, this is allowing a 5 ft. tall 64 square ft. sign. In looking at the language, it was not specified 5 ft. tall above the average surrounding grade, as we measure every other sign within the community so I added that in. These are out parcels; they are allowed separate ground signs in addition to the tall freestanding signs.

Chairman Kopp added we are giving the other shopping centers the ground signs. We wanted to extend that to the other shopping centers.

Planner Charlton said she added the words “with direct ingress/egress to the outside”. This is intended to clarify that we only want to have those additional wall signs for individual tenants if they have a door to the outside. Without that language you could have one building with a common entrance and lots of signs wherever.

Planner Charlton asked if anyone had questions. She added staff recommendation is that the Commission adopt it as written and make the changes that were referenced during the meeting tonight and include that reference in the motion.

MOTION: Made by Vice-Chairman Wagner seconded by Commissioner DelSarto, that the Plan Commission recommend to the President and Village Board approval of the proposed Text Amendments for Title 9, Section 2: Definitions and Title 9, Section 11: Signs, as attached to Staff’s Report to the Plan Commission dated March 3, 2010 with revisions presented to the Plan Commission dated April 7, 2010 and with the modifications discussed and agreed to by consensus by the Plan Commission today May 5, 2010.

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE

MOTION DECLARED CARRIED

5. VISITOR'S BUSINESS

None.

6. COMMUNICATIONS

Director Halik thanks the Plan Commission for their work on the sign ordinance.

Director Halik said there was a ground breaking for an out lot building. It is a two tenant building that will match the architecture of the current center. The tenants are Pei Wei Asian diner which is a company that owns PF Chang. It is marketed as PF Chang quality under a cafeteria style business. The other candidate is Meatheads Burgers.

7. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Made by Commissioner DelSarto, seconded by Commissioner Heery, to adjourn the regular meeting of the Plan Commission at the hour of 8:25 p.m.

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE

MOTION DECLARED CARRIED

PRESENTED, READ AND APPROVED,

_____, 2010

Minutes transcribed by Joanne Prible.

Chairman