

**Regular Meeting – Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals
Carol Stream Fire Protection District Station 28, DuPage County,
Carol Stream, Illinois**

***All Matters on the Agenda may be Discussed, Amended and Acted Upon
November 27, 2017.***

Chairman Parisi called the Regular Meeting of the Combined Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals to order at 7:00 p.m. Chairman Parisi directed Jane Lentino, Community Development Secretary, to call the roll.

The results of the roll call were:

Present: Chairman Frank Parisi, Commissioners Angelo Christopher, Dave Creighton, Frank Petella, Dee Spink, Charlie Tucek, John Meneghini

Absent: None

Also Present: Tom Farace, Planning and Economic Development Manager, Jane Lentino, Secretary.

MINUTES:

Commissioner Creighton moved and Commissioner Spink seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of October 23, 2017.

The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes: 7 Commissioners Christopher, Creighton, Petella, Spink, Tucek, Meneghini, Chairman Parisi.

Nays: 0

Abstain: 0

Absent: 0

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman Parisi asked for a motion to open the Public Hearing. Commissioner Meneghini moved and Commissioner Spink seconded the motion.

**Case #17-0044 – Carol Stream Park District/Carolshire Park - 840 N. Gary Avenue
Gary Avenue Corridor Review – Park and Ground Sign
Fence Code Variation**

Chairman Parisi swore in the witnesses, Jim Reuter, Executive Director of the Carol Stream Park District, 849 West Lies Road, Carol Stream, IL, and Lori Vierow, Greenberg Farrow, 21 South Evergreen Avenue, Suite 200, Arlington Heights, IL.

Mr. Reuter referred to a .8 acre vacant site at 840 N Gary Avenue that used to have a house on it and is in a low to moderate income area. He stated that the Park District is planning to put a park on the site and introduced the consultant, Lori Vierow.

Ms. Vierow explained that she is a landscape architect and referred to a slide showing the location of the project, which is between Carolshire Condominiums to the south, Klein Creek Condominiums to the north, and Gary Avenue to the east.

Ms. Vierow stated that the Park will consist of an open play area and a multi-purpose turf field suitable for running and playing, as well as picnicking. She stated that to the west will be a creative play area consisting of two zones, one zone will have a swing set and the larger area will have play apparatus that will be for two to five year old children and five to 12 year old children. She stated that a tricycle track, complete with stop signs proposed, along with a 10 foot x 15 foot steel shelter and picnic tables and grills. Ms. Vierow stated that there would also be an area for pick-up volleyball.

Ms. Vierow stated that they are proposing a 48 inch tall ornamental fence along Gary Avenue and a portion of the north side of the park, to control children, as well as any balls may be kicked, from going onto Gary Avenue.

Ms. Vierow stated that they are proposing a 4 foot x 6.5 foot sign that would be the same as the signs at other Park District sites, which would be set off the property line per ordinance, as well as three pedestrian lights, with banner arms.

Chairman Parisi asked for questions from the audience.

Michele Stachnik, Treasurer for Klein Creek Condominiums, 244 Klein Creek Court, unit 6F, Carol Stream, IL, expressed concern about their parking lot which is to the north of the park. She stated that there is no problem with the park, but that they have an issue with parking, lighting and the possibility of additional traffic.

Mr. Reuter stated that they have proposed a handicapped accessible area to the north into the Klein Creek parking lot which takes up one stall and aligns with the existing sidewalk across the parking lot so it can be accessed from Klein Creek.

Ms. Stachnik asked if it would be a pedestrian area.

Mr. Reuter said that it would. He stated that there was another cut out to the southwest that was put in by the Carolshire Condominium Association. He stated that they have included lighting in the shelter and the pedestrian lights at the entrances to the park. Mr. Reuter stated that they are not looking at this park as a destination type of playground, and that it is to serve an underserved area of the community. He stated that there might be some bike traffic that may use the park, but they don't anticipate community traffic.

Ms. Stachnik stated that there is already a parking issue with the row of parking directly to the north of the park, and that it is designated as resident only parking. She stated that the perimeter parking is normally visitor parking, but that there are eight spots that are resident only due to the problem of people using the lot prior to the proposal of the park.

Mr. Reuter stated that they could post signs stating that those eight spaces are non-park parking, and that they are not anticipating that most of the play at this park will be during the daytime.

Ms. Stachnik stated that parking was a main concern and that the other concern is the fencing and asked if there would be landscaping between the park and Klein Creek property.

Ms. Vierow stated that the fence would not encompass the entire park, and that they are showing some plant material by the proposed park district sign, and adding a few trees, but that it will remain turf to the south.

Ms. Stachnik asked for Mr. Reuter's card to discuss further concerns.

Mr. Reuter gave Ms. Stachnik his card and stated that they are calling the park Carolshire Park at this time, but that this park is not only for the Carolshire Condominium community and that it also serves the Klein Creek Condominium community. He stated that everyone is welcome to use the park. He also stated that they don't like boundaries around the park because it's harder for the police to see within the park, and it would be costly to maintain.

Ms. Stachnik stated that they are very happy with the landscaping on the other side of Klein Creek where the rec center is located.

Chairman Parisi asked for any other comments or questions.

Joanne Mamo, Property Manager, Klein Creek Condominiums, asked if the hours of operation would be stated on a sign.

Mr. Reuter stated that all hours are posted on all of the park district playgrounds and the police know what they are.

Chairman Parisi asked for the Staff Report.

Mr. Farace stated that the Park District is seeking Gary Avenue Corridor review for the proposed park and the associated ground sign, along with approval of a fence code variation.

Mr. Farace stated that the park would be situated between the Klein Creek and Carolshire Condominium developments on the west side of Gary Avenue with a combination of open play area, playground equipment, landscaping, a shelter with picnic tables, grills, volleyball court and a walking path with pedestrian scale lighting and with connections with the condominium developments to the north and the south. Mr. Farace stated that Staff is requesting that if the connections take place, there be written approval provided by both developments prior to the connections being installed.

Mr. Farace stated that landscaping being proposed will meet the point system for the Gary Avenue Corridor.

Mr. Farace stated that the proposed sign is the standard sandblasted wood park district sign and is the same as the ones at the other parks in town. He stated that is approximately four feet high, 15 square feet in area and is on wooden posts. Mr. Farace stated that Staff supports the sign as it is appropriate for this area.

Mr. Farace cited the fence code that stated that fences are not allowed in front yards and that the fence will be along Gary Avenue, which is the front yard for this parcel, but that from a safety perspective, it makes sense to have the fence at this location. He stated that the fence would be a four foot tall aluminum fence.

Mr. Farace stated that Staff is supportive of the fence code variation and the project as a whole.

Chairman Parisi asked for questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Tucek asked Mr. Farace about the agreement between the two properties.

Mr. Farace stated that Staff requests that, prior to any permitted work for the sidewalk connections, there would be written approval provided by both condominium developments.

Commissioner Tucek stated that the park is a great use for the property and is needed. He stated that the area is heavily patrolled by the police and asked if the plans were given to the Police Department for review.

Mr. Farace stated that the plans are provided to the Police Department.

Commissioner Tucek asked if there would be any type of emergency light that could alert the police in case there was any trouble at the park.

Mr. Reuter said there would not because this type of system is not in place in the other parks, and that he would hesitate putting one in this location because it might not look the best.

Commissioner Petella asked if the lights in the gazebo would be left on.

Mr. Reuter indicated that the lights would be left on.

Commissioner Spink stated that she is against the park because she doesn't like the name, that there is no landscaping along Gary Avenue, and that the equipment will be too hot for children to play on. Commissioner Spink stated that a four foot fence will not prevent soccer balls from going into Gary Avenue. She stated that she doesn't like the open field along Gary Avenue and that it should be in the back of the property.

Commissioner Spink asked if there would be security cameras or bathrooms on the site, and if this park was going to be a day care center for a child, but her biggest concern is the landscaping.

Commissioner Meneghini stated that he liked the idea of a park and asked if, from a life safety perspective, the plan could be switched around to put the open area in the back, away from Gary Avenue.

Commissioner Creighton asked Mr. Reuter if the Park District planned to use this park for soccer programs and if goals would be provided.

Mr. Reuter said no and stated that kids are already using the field and there is no barrier along Gary Avenue at this time.

Commissioner Creighton stated that he feels that the parking at Klein Creek would not be affected.

Ms. Stachnik stated that if the soccer field were switched that it would be closer to a heavy traffic area in Klein Creek.

Commissioner Creighton stated that he supports the park at this location.

Commissioner Christopher stated that the design is fine and asked what is going to protect the patrons from the cars going over the curbs at a one foot elevation on the north, east, and some of the west sides. He said that the kids have to be protected.

Chairman Parisi stated that the positioning of the park, in relation to Gary Avenue is the better choice, and recommended looking for an opportunity to put berms along Gary Avenue, which would provide safety and still look like a park, but that he doesn't agree with the parking lot area being a concern, and that a car could jump a curb at 25 mph at any of the parks.

Commissioner Petella asked if the exhibit was showing bollards on the north side of the lot.

Ms. Stanchik said that those were visitor parking only signs.

Commissioner Petella stated that calling the field a soccer field was causing unnecessary problems. He stated that he liked the idea of the berms.

Chairman Parisi asked to clarify what the target age range of the play features was.

Ms. Vierow stated that the swings were to include a toddler belt, a standard belt and possibly a molded seat for those with disabilities. She stated that the play features would consist of two different composite structures, one for two to five year old children, and one for five to twelve year old children.

Chairman Parisi asked for a motion to approve the Gary Avenue Corridor Review for Carol Stream Park/District/Carolshire Park. Commissioner Meneghini moved and Commissioner Tucek seconded the motion to approve the request with Staff recommendations, including the three items on page five.

The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes: 5 Commissioners Creighton, Petella, Meneghini, Tucek, and Chairman Parisi.

Nays: 2 Commissioners Christopher and Spink

Abstain: 0

Absent: 0

The motion was approved.

Case #17-0044 - Wayne Township – 27W031 North Avenue

North Avenue Corridor Review – Monument Sign
Sign Code Variation

Chairman Parisi swore in the witness, Randy Ramey, Wayne Township Supervisor, 27W031 North Avenue, West Chicago, IL.

Mr. Ramey stated that they are requesting to install an electronic sign in front of their facility. He stated that when he was elected in April, 2017, he asked his directors what their needs were for the facility and its programs, and they desired to have an electronic sign that would advertise the variety of programs offered and help people find where they are located.

Mr. Ramey stated that the bid was won by Signarama, a design proposal was made and presented to Staff. He stated that he would like to respond to Staff requests.

Mr. Ramey reviewed the criteria in the ordinances and it seemed to apply to new businesses, and not pre-existing businesses. He explained that they are a governmental agency and, as such, has minimal funds. He stated that their only revenue stream is property tax.

Mr. Ramey referred to a slide representation of the proposed sign and pointed out that the bottom of the sign reads, "Provided by West Suburban Bank". He stated that that is the bank where the township holds their funds, and that they approached the bank and asked if they would help pay for the sign. They agreed and asked if they could get a designation.

Mr. Ramey stated that the Staff analysis said that it hasn't happened before, but that it doesn't mean that it can't happen, and that he would be happy to use other language if necessary.

Mr. Ramey stated that the code also mentions "off premise business", and that the bank comes to their facility every other month to speak to seniors about banking and financial issues. He stated that the bank does not have regular hours, but that they provide a regular service at the facility.

Mr. Ramey stated that, when the original design was presented, there was a stone/brick outlay around the sign, and that Wayne Township didn't want it because it doesn't match the building or anything else on the property, but it is part of the ordinance and he didn't understand why. He stated that there is an

extra cost to build and maintain the stone structure, and as a government facility, they don't have multiple strains of revenue and they are trying to be efficient. He suggested that the stone structure is unnecessary, but would work on foliage provided that it be done by the end of September, 2018, when the parking lot is being done.

Mr. Ramey stated that the size of the sign falls within the basic requirements of the Village. He stated that they prefer the larger part to be the changeable, electronic portion of the sign because of their location on North Avenue, and there are a lot of fast moving vehicles. He stated that making the non-changeable portion of the sign larger would add to the cost, and asked for deference to the size that they've chosen.

Mr. Ramey stated that Staff recommended that, if this does pass, the sign be five feet off of the property line, which would be in the middle of their parking lot. He asked that the sign be allowed to be placed six inches off the property line.

Mr. Ramey stated that another Staff recommendation was that temporary signage no longer be used. He asked for approval to some of his changes and requests, and would review any recommendations.

Chairman Parisi asked for questions from the audience. There were none.

Chairman Parisi asked Mr. Farace for the Staff report.

Mr. Farace stated that Wayne Township was seeking North Avenue Corridor Review approval for the proposed ground sign, along with a couple sign code variations for the sign. He stated that the Township property was annexed into the Village in early 2016, and it was rezoned and granted Special Use permit, few Zoning Code variations, and a sign code variation for the described temporary banners for special events and activities that take place on the property, and when a permanent sign with an electronic message board was installed, the temporary banners would no longer be used.

Mr. Farace referred to a slide showing the proposed sign, and that it meets the requirements in terms of size, height, and material, and is actually smaller than is allowed per code.

Mr. Farace stated that Staff has some concerns with the variations that are being requested, along with some of the criteria for signage along the North Avenue Corridor. He stated that the Staff report listed some of the provisions and the purpose of the Gary/North Avenue Corridor regulations in terms of creating a unified, harmonious, high quality visual environment for the community, and fostering a distinctive and positive image for the Village and the corridors that function as gateways into the Village.

Mr. Farace stated that Staff understands that there are budgetary constraints, but that there are some things that could be done to dress up the sign and not be overly expensive, and referred to page 4 of the Staff report of other signs along North Avenue that have a simple masonry base with landscaping. He stated that, based on the simple design of the sign, that it doesn't meet the intent of the code. He stated that Staff feels that something else should be done to create visual interest and design quality.

Mr. Farace stated that the off premise advertising, "Provided by West Suburban Bank", could set a precedence for any commercial or non-commercial business to make similar requests that would be difficult for Staff, Plan Commission, and Village Board to deny. He presented the example that a new grocery store would come into a vacant space and have the sign sponsored by Budweiser, for instance, but that is not technically a business on the property. He stated that Staff feels that it could be a slippery slope to have that type of promotion or advertising on the sign, and recommends denial of that request.

Mr. Farace stated that there is a provision in the code that looks at the percentage of permanent copy versus changeable copy where 2/3 of the sign can be changeable copy and 1/3 of the sign needs to be permanent copy, usually on the top of the sign. He stated that this the permanent copy of the sign is less

than 1/3 of the sign. He stated that Staff does not see this as a hardship because the sign is smaller than what is allowed in the code and could be larger.

Mr. Farace stated that Staff is recommending denial of the sign and the associated variations, and that there are conditions of approval listed if the Commission feels it is appropriate to approve the request or portions of the request. He stated that Staff will be willing to work with Wayne Township on a phasing plan since there are other projects that are proposed for the Township property, such as the masonry around the landscape bed of the sign being done once the parking lot work is completed.

Chairman Parisi asked Mr. Farace to reiterate the authority of the Commission, and asked if the case would have to go to Village Board based on the motion carried.

Mr. Farace stated that the Commission is the final stop for the Corridor review and sign code variations, but that there is a provision in the sign code that indicates that the Village Board can go affirm the Plan Commission's recommendation or turn it over.

Chairman Parisi asked for questions from the Commission.

Commissioners Christopher and Meneghini had none.

Commissioner Creighton agreed with Staff that the sign does not meet North Avenue Corridor standards. He stated it's important that the sign match the building and the rest of North Avenue. He stated that he also agrees with Staff regarding no off premise advertising and that Wayne Township has plenty of opportunities to point out the bank's generosity.

Commissioner Creighton stated that he might be able to support the changeable percentage copy because, as technology moved forward, they will see more requests for larger changeable copy signs, and doesn't feel that the sign code addresses that.

Commissioner Creighton asked Mr. Ramey if there were other sign designs presented to him, what the different estimates were, and what West Suburban Bank was willing to donate.

Mr. Ramey stated that there was another design that was a V-shape that was denied when presented to Staff because there had never been one like that before, and that there was also a cost factor involved. He stated that there was a \$30,000 estimate, a \$26,000 estimate, and \$15,000 for the Signarama sign. He stated that West Suburban Bank donated \$15,000.

Commissioner Creighton stated that a couple of years ago, there were many changes approved to the building and asked how many changes actually took place.

Mr. Ramey stated that he was aware of a \$3,000,000 proposed project, but were unable to get a loan in that amount. He stated that a \$400,000 loan was procured which brought water in for a future sprinkler system, a pipe room, a dumpster enclosure, and an employee break room.

Commissioner Creighton asked if a cost benefit analysis was done with and without the sign.

Mr. Ramey stated that this is not available because you don't know until it happens. He stated that when any governmental entity has a sign out in front, they are advertising the programs that are going on in the facility, and used the Simkus Center and Hanover Township signs as an example. He stated that the sign would give the help they need showing programs and the facility.

Commissioner Creighton asked if Mr. Ramey could quantify how much help the sign would offer.

Mr. Ramey stated that there are about 40,000 cars that go by each day and they have enhanced their visibility on social media, and they will be putting out two newsletters instead of one, and that it depends on the costs and the budgets. He stated that they are not requesting any increase to their budget.

Commissioner Creighton stated that he has no problem with a sign, but that it doesn't meet standards.

Commissioner Spink stated that she is not against the sign, but she is against the sponsorship advertising.

Commissioner Petella asked how long the messages would be, if they would be up all day, and if they would be rotating.

Mr. Ramey stated that a rotating message that can be set for various times.

Commissioner Petella asked what the optimal time for a message to be read.

Mr. Grochowski, Signarama-Bloomingtondale, stated that there is an equation encompassing the speed of traffic and size of the sign that comes out to about four to five seconds per message.

Mr. Ramey stated that they are close to a signal, which is good.

Commissioner Petella stated that he is not opposed to a sign, but he is opposed to sponsor advertising.

Commissioner Tucek stated that he agreed with Staff regarding the off premise advertising as it is against the code and could be addressed at a later time, but as it is at this time, would be hard to support. He stated that he is agreeable to the smaller permanent sign space allocation.

Commissioner Tucek asked for clarification as to the location of the sign.

Mr. Ramey stated that the planned property line is at the edge of the parking lot, and that five feet from the property line would place the sign in the parking lot.

Mr. Farace referred to the Plat of Survey (Exhibit C) and stated that the proposed location would be ok, and not locate the sign in the parking lot.

Commissioner Creighton asked for the location of the property line.

Mr. Ramey showed that the property line was where the ditch was located.

Commissioner Tucek stated that he agrees with Staff that the sign is a step backward, could do better and proposed a ground sign with a base.

Mr. Ramey stated that there is traffic going both east and west at about 45mph and that there is a hill in the middle of North Avenue that will block a ground sign from one direction and a tree that will block it from the other direction.

Mr. Ramey referred back to off premise advertising and pointed out that the Caputo's sign has two large stone poles, and that their sign advertises what is for sale in the store.

Chairman Parisi asked Mr. Ramey for a final statement.

Mr. Ramey stated that government is under a lot of constraint and that they are trying to do things to enhance their visibility, and try to get grants and donations. He stated that the bank helps facilitate programs at the township and that he felt that the off premise advertising was a way to fill their need.

Chairman Parisi had no comments or questions.

Chairman Parisi asked for a motion. There was none.

Mr. Farace suggested that the motions be split since there are three items.

Commissioner Tucek asked if the case could be postponed to a different date.

Chairman Parisi stated that a motion would have to be made on the proposal that is to date, and that Mr. Ramey can come back with a new proposal, if he chooses.

Mr. Farace stated that the Commission could ask the applicant if he wanted to come back with a different proposal if the consensus was going in a certain direction.

Commissioner Tucek asked Mr. Ramey if he felt more time would allow him to comply with Staff recommendations.

Mr. Ramey stated that he agrees with the previous comment about a future structural enhancement at the base of the sign but, if granted, after the parking lot program, which is planned to start at the beginning of September, 2018, is finished. He stated that the building project is scheduled for May, 2018 to September, 2018. He also stated that it would depend on if there were any funds left over from the building project should it come under budget.

Chairman Parisi clarified that Mr. Ramey is receptive to providing a landscaped stone base to be phased in when the parking lot goes into effect, which would be by the beginning of September, which would be a recommendation made in the motion.

Chairman Parisi stated that the first motion would be to approve the North Avenue Corridor version of the petition that would include the Petitioner's recommendation to include some form of stone base which would be approved by Staff in accordance with the aesthetic requirements for the North Avenue Corridor.

Chairman Parisi stated that the second and third items are approval or denial of the requested sign code variations, which is the purview of the Plan Commission with regards to the off premise advertising and the font on the top.

Commissioner Petella stated that the Petitioner has presented some unusual ideas on the sponsorship that deserves some thought, but that it is not up to the Commission, and asked if part could be approved and the rest go to Village Board.

Mr. Farace explained that the Plan Commission will approve or deny both the Corridor review and the variation, but the variation requests goes to Village Board.

Mr. Farace stated that one of the conditions at the end of the report was that the landscape material would be installed no later than May 31, 2018, but it might make more sense to wait until the parking lot is done, at the end of September, 2018.

Commissioner Petella made a motion to approve the North Avenue Corridor Review with landscaping and stone and/or masonry wall around landscaping to be added at a future date, being no later than September 30, 2018, to be approved at Staff's discretion. Commissioner Tucek seconded the motion.

The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes: 5 Commissioners Christopher, Petella, Spink, Tucek, and Chairman Parisi.

Nays: 1 Commissioners Creighton.
Abstain: 1 Commissioner Meneghini.
Absent: 0

The motion was approved.

Commissioner Petella motioned to deny the Petitioner's request for both Sign Code Variations. Commissioner Creighton seconded.

The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes: 5 Commissioners Christopher, Creighton, Meneghini, Petella, Spink, Tucek, and Chairman Parisi.
Nays: 0
Abstain: 0
Absent: 0

The motion was approved.

This case will go before the Village Board of Trustees on Monday, December 4, 2017, at 7:30 PM for formal approval.

Chairman Parisi asked for a motion to close Public Hearing. Commissioner Creighton moved and Commissioner Tucek seconded the motion.

The motion was passed by unanimous vote.

PRESENTATION:

Chairman Parisi received a request from Tom Farace and asked for a motion to postpone the case to the January 22, 2017, Plan Commission meeting.

OLD BUSINESS:

NEW BUSINESS:

ADJOURNMENT:

At 8:15pm Commissioner Creighton moved and Commissioner Petella seconded the motion to adjourn the meeting.

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

FOR THE COMBINED BOARD

Recorded and transcribed by,

Jane Lentino
Community Development Secretary

Minutes approved by Plan Commission on this ____ day of _____, 20____.

Chairman