

**Regular Meeting – Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals
Gregory J. Bielawski Municipal Center, DuPage County, Carol Stream, Illinois**

All Matters on the Agenda may be Discussed, Amended and Acted Upon

April 11, 2011

Chairman David Michaelson called the Regular Meeting of the Combined Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals to order at 7:30 p.m. and directed Secretary Linda Damron to call the roll. The results of the roll call vote were:

Present: Chairman Dave Michaelson and Commissioners David Hennessey, Timothy McNally, Angelo Christopher, and Ralph Smoot

Absent: Commissioners Dee Spink and Frank Petella

Also Present: Don Bastian, Assistant Community Development Director, Bob Glees, Community Development Director and Linda Damron, Secretary

MINUTES:

Commissioner McNally moved and Commissioner Hennessey made the second to approve the minutes of the meeting of March 14, 2011, as amended, to reflect that Commissioner Smoot was present at the meeting. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes: 5 Commissioners Smoot, Christopher, McNally, Hennessey and Chairman Michaelson

Nays: 0

Abstain: 0

Absent: 2 Commissioners Petella and Spink

PUBLIC HEARING:

Commissioner Smoot moved and Commissioner Hennessey made the second to open the Public Hearing. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

**Case # 11082 Josh Delpierre – 542 Aztec Drive
Variation – Lot Coverage**

Chairman Michaelson swore in the witness, Josh Delpierre, Champion Windows, 549 West Lake Street, Elmhurst, IL 60126.

Josh Delpierre from Champion Windows is representing the homeowner Mr. Daoud. They are asking for a variance from lot coverage, to go from 30% to 35.2%, in order to construct a three-season room addition (16 x 16) that is going to take the place of an existing 15 x 12 deck. Also as part of this project they will be removing an existing sunroom and keeping the trench and slab to use a patio. The current sunroom is one step down level with grade, which is inaccessible via a wheelchair. The proposed three-season addition will be level with the house to make it wheelchair accessible.

Assistant Community Development Director Don Bastian stated the request is for a lot coverage variation to allow a new 16 X 16 three-season room to be built onto the rear of the

home. As noted, an existing 180 square-foot wooden deck and 172 square-foot three-season room would be demolished. To allow the three-season room to be built a variation is needed. If the variation is approved lot coverage would be 35.2%. In the R-2 district lot coverage is not allowed to exceed 30%, except that for wooden decks and swimming pools, lot coverage may increase to 35%. Mr. Delpierre has explained some of the challenges with the existing three-season room in terms of accessibility to a wheelchair and the proposed three-season room would have the same finished floor as the house itself, so the accessibility issue would go away. With respect to single family residential variations, the Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals has typically been willing to only to support these types of variations in cases in which the applicant has demonstrated a specific hardship or a practical difficulty. In contrast, the Zoning Board of Appeals usually recommends denial for cases in which no hardship or practical difficulty exists. Staff has researched previous zoning variation cases that have come before the Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals to determine situations the Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals has viewed to be hardships or practical difficulties. These have included health or medical conditions of one or more occupants of the home, flooding conditions related to existing or proposed structures, and extreme topography or grading issues. In this case the applicant has presented the situation with respect to the inaccessibility to the existing three-season room that is why they are asking for a lot coverage variation to go to 35.2%. In this case if the Plan Commission wishes to recommend approval of the variation, staff recommends it be approved with the conditions listed in the staff report.

Chairman Michaelsen asked if anyone from the audience had any questions, there were no questions from the audience. Chairman Michaelsen asked if any of his fellow Commissioners had any questions, Commissioners McNally and Smoot had no questions. Commissioner Hennessey asked if the existing three-season room would be demolished and the new three-season room would go where the deck currently is and the previous three-season room would become a patio area. Petitioner Josh Delpierre answered yes. Commissioner Christopher asked what the length of the ramp would be. Petitioner Josh Delpierre said it would be 8 to 10 feet. Commissioner Christopher asked if the ramp would meet the ADA requirements. Mr. Bastian said the ramp would be reviewed during the permit plan review. Chairman Michaelsen asked if the ramp is staying. Petitioner Josh Delpierre said the ramp would stay for the time being and Mr. Daoud is going to have someone build a new ramp. Chairman Michaelsen asked if the three-season room would have windows and doors in it. Petitioner Josh Delpierre answered yes. Chairman Michaelsen stated the staff recommendations are that the existing paver blocks immediately to the west be removed. Mr. Bastian stated yes that the paver blocks to the immediate west would be removed. The petitioner did agree to this to make the request of the variation as small as possible. Chairman Michaelsen asked if there are any issues with flooding. The Mr. Daoud answered no.

Commissioner Christopher moved and Commissioner Smoot made the second to recommend approval of the request for lot coverage variations, subject to the conditions contained in the staff report, for the Josh Delpierre, 542 Aztec Drive. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes: 5 Chairman Michaelsen and Commissioners Christopher, Smoot, McNally and Hennessey
 Nays: 0
 Absent: 2 Commissioner Spink and Petella

Mr. Bastian reminded the petitioner that the Plan Commission's recommendation would be forwarded to the Village Board at their next meeting on April 18, 2011, at which time the Board would take final action on the matter.

Commissioner Hennessey moved and Commissioner Smoot made the second to close the Public Hearing. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

PRESENTATION:

**Case # 11083: American Sale Corporation / Tim Gutraj - 320 Army Trail Road
Planned Unit Development Plan – Minor Modifications**

Chairman Michaelsen swore in the witness, Tim Gutraj, 8401 W. 185th Street, Tinley Park, IL 60487.

Tim Gutraj stated he is representing American Sale Corporation to request minor modifications to the Planned Unit Development Plan to allow them to conduct two tent sales and two truckload sales per year and to be allowed to display some merchandise on the sidewalk in front of the store.

Assistant Community Development Director Don Bastian stated that American Sale will be occupying 40,000 square feet building formerly anchored by Bassett Furniture at 310-330 Army Trail Road. The Village is very pleased that American Sale will be occupying the space. American Sale is looking for flexibility with respect to displaying merchandise outdoors on the sidewalk in front of the store, they are also looking for permission to have four special sale events during the course of the year – two, four day tent sales and two, seven day truckload sales. In total what they are asking for can be handled as minor modification to the Planned United Development for this property. The Plan Commission has the authority to grant the approval and it would not have to go the Village Board.

This will be the eighth American Sale store in Illinois. The type of merchandise that American Sale sells are pools, barbeque grills, patio furniture, indoor/outdoor recreational products and seasonal items. They wish to have merchandise outdoors on the sidewalk in front of their tenant space only. They would also like to have two tent sales a year and two truckload sales a year. Mr. Bastian went on to explain that in the Business Zoning District, all business service, storage and merchandise display must take place inside the building. If the business wants to have merchandise outside they need to request a variation from this provision or if the property was approved as part of the PUD that sort of relieve can be granted through the PUD process. The Village has granted approvals both ways. Some of you may recall when we had an Eagle Food Store on Geneva Road that had a variance for the display of plants and landscaping items and the 7-Eleven/Citgo on Geneva Road had a variance for firewood, mulch, and landscaping items. For properties approved as PUD, the aspect of outdoor merchandise display is evaluated during the review of the PUD Plan. Properties that have permission to store merchandise outdoors through the PUD process include Home Depot, Lowe's and Dominick's.

The main factors that staff considers in evaluating the types of requests for outdoor merchandise display includes the aesthetic factors of the merchandise displays, impacts on surrounding properties, and weather the display would compromise safe traffic circulation or pedestrian accessibility. American Sale wishes to display their merchandise on the sidewalk in front of their tenant space. Mr. Gutraj said it would be limited to merchandise that typically is used or kept outdoors. Mr. Bastian had one clarification he wanted to make in that the sidewalk is generally 11 feet wide, although the width decreases to 9.5 feet at the locations where the building columns project out from the face of the building. The Illinois Accessibility Code requires at least 36 inches be kept clear to be used by pedestrian traffic. Staff is

comfortable going with the 36 inches. The 36 inches is what the Illinois Accessibility Code requires and we feel we do not want be more restrictive than that. Staff is in support of the request having the merchandise outdoor subject to the conditions, plus the provision to have the clear zone for pedestrian traffic to be 3 feet wide as opposed to 4 feet wide as mentioned in the staff report.

With respect to the Special Sale Events, American Sale is requesting permission to have four special events per year, two, four day tent sales and two, seven day truckload sales. American Sale would be installing a 20 by 40 foot open sided tent in the location shown on the survey in the staff report, for up to seven days, two times a year. Merchandise placed in the tent is typically close-out furniture set, open box values of assorted items such as tables, chairs, pool filters and barbeque grills. American Sale employees would staff the tent during store hours; all sale transactions would take place within the store. Staff and the Fire District support this event as proposed. It should be noted, however, the American Sale will need to provide information to the Fire District regarding the merchandise layout within the tent to ensure that proper egress will be maintained.

With respect to the truckload sale, American Sale wishes to park an American Sale trailer in the parking lot twice a year with a banner on it saying "truckload sale event". There would be no other merchandise placed outside, the placement of the trailer would be for advertising purposes only. American Sale would still need to get permits for the different types of signage. Staff is recommending approval of all the minor PUD requests to allow outdoor merchandise display and the four annual special events, subject to the conditions in the report, with the change of the clear space on the sidewalk from 4 feet to 3 feet in width.

Chairman Michaelsen asked if any of his fellow Commissioners had any questions, Commissioners McNally had no questions.

Commissioner Christopher asked if the 3 feet span would be measured from the curb side. Mr. Bastian said it would be and there are depressed ramps to get people onto the sidewalk. Mr. Bastian also noted that the 3 foot clear zone would have to go around the ramps as well.

Commissioner Hennessey asked when American Sales has tent sale where would it be setup. Petitioner Tim Gutraj stated it would be setup in the parking lot. Commissioner Hennessey asked if they ever had problems with parking, the reason is that the parking lot at this location doesn't seem as large as your other locations. Petitioner Tim Gutraj stated that he thought there would be adequate parking at this location.

Commissioner Smoot asked how long the truck load sales would last. Petitioner Tim Gutraj stated the truck would be there for seven days and the sale would be a four day event.

Chairman Michaelsen wanted to know what types of merchandise would be on the side walk and how much space they would be taking up. Petitioner Tim Gutraj said they would be taking up about 8 feet and the types of merchandise would be tables, chairs, barbeque grills, park benches and swing sets. Chairman Michaelsen asked if it would be left outside at night. Petitioner Tim Gutraj stated that it would depend on the product, larger items would be left outside, items that could not be locked down would be brought back into the store at night. Chairman Michaelsen wanted if the item left outside at night would be prevented from being blown around by the wind. Petitioner Tim Gutraj stated it would be anchored down, any items that could not be anchored would be brought in the store at night. Chairman Michaelsen asked if the truck for the truckload sale was a 40 foot truck trailer with the American Sale sign on it. Petitioner Tim Gutraj stated it is and it would have the American Sale logo on it. Mr.

Gutraj also stated the truck would not have any merchandise in it; it is for advertising purposes only. Chairman Michaelsen asked Mr. Bastian if American Sale would be required to have outdoor facilities during these events. Mr. Bastian said outside facilities would not be required.

Commissioner Hennessey moved and Commissioner McNally made the second to recommend approval the Planned Unit Development Plan - Minor Modifications subject to staff recommendations. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes: 5 Chairman Michaelsen and Commissioners Christopher, Smoot, McNally and Hennessey
Nays: 0
Absent: 2 Commissioner Spink and Petella

PRESENTATION:

**Case # 11062: Village of Carol Stream – 500 N. Gary Avenue
Text Amendments – Sign Code**

Chairman Michaelsen swore in the witness, Community Development Director Robert Glees, 500 N. Gary Avenue, Carol Stream IL 60188.

Staff has received direction from the Plan Commission / Zoning Board of Appeals (PC/ZBA) and the Village Board to evaluate the requirements of the Sign Code with respect to certain types of variation requests, and to suggest text amendments where appropriate. Two aspects of the Sign Code which generate frequent requests for variation were cited: the number and sizes of menu board signs in drive-up window lanes, and the area and locational requirements for commercial wall signs.

This is in keeping with initiatives implemented in Community Development during recent years that have resulted in more responsive development approval processes and better customer service.

Staff has conducted a thorough review of the Sign Code, and we are recommending a number of revisions that should improve the Village's ability to approve reasonable sign permit requests without the need for special approvals via the public review process. We are also taking this opportunity to implement certain minor revisions that will provide better clarity to the Sign Code.

Each proposed text amendment is presented in this report, with a staff evaluation. In past text amendment cases which involved relatively few revisions, each proposed text amendment was discussed and presented individually; however, in this case staff has chosen to present the proposed text amendments as a comprehensive set of revisions to the Sign Code. We believe the PC/ZBA will find it easier to review the code in this manner, as the context of each section of the Sign Code will be maintained. Although certain changes may result in revisions to several sections of the Sign Code, the proposed revisions are discussed and presented individually in the staff report itself.

**PROPOSED SIGN CODE AMENDMENT #1 – GARY AVENUE AND NORTH AVENUE
CORRIDOR REQUIREMENTS**

Purpose of proposed amendment: To clarify the intent of the Gary Avenue and North Avenue Corridor regulations with respect to signage.

New text: §6-11-3(E).

Staff evaluation: Other than a passing reference to "signage" in §16-5-6(N) of the Zoning Code, the Sign Code and Zoning Code are silent on the subject of signs conforming with the Gary Avenue and North Avenue Corridor Regulations. Staff believes that signage is an element of the appearance of a property, and so it is appropriate to hold signage to the higher standards of the two corridors. We propose to add clarification to the Sign Code that would maintain the present requirements, which are that signage for new construction is subject to corridor review before the Plan Commission, but face changes are not. To be specific, signage for all **new construction** (ground signs and wall signs) and the **complete replacement of existing ground signs** require corridor review; however, wall signage for existing properties is reviewed administratively in accordance with corridor standards. Sign face changes and temporary signs are not subject to corridor standards.

After a question from Commissioner McNally as to whether this would create any undesirable precedent, the Plan Commission indicated unanimous support of this amendment.

PROPOSED SIGN CODE AMENDMENT #2 – CALCULATION OF SIGN AREA

Purpose of proposed amendment: To change the methodology of wall sign area calculation so that blank wall between separate signs is no longer included.

Amended text: §6-11-6(B)(2).

Staff evaluation: This is one of the requirements of the Sign Code specifically mentioned as needing revision. The PC/ZBA has recommended, and the Village Board approved, variations from this requirement several times in the recent past. Many communities have done away with this restriction, and staff supports its deletion from the Carol Stream Sign Code.

The Plan Commission indicated unanimous support of this amendment.

PROPOSED SIGN CODE AMENDMENT #3 – LOCATION OF WALL SIGNS

Purpose of proposed amendment: To delete the requirement that multiple wall signs cannot extend above or below the largest wall sign.

Amended text: §6-11-6(B)(2).

Staff evaluation: This is another requirement of the Sign Code specifically mentioned as needing revision. The PC/ZBA has recommended, and the Village Board approved, variations from this requirement several times in the recent past. This is not a common requirement among neighboring communities, and staff supports its deletion.

The Plan Commission indicated unanimous support of this amendment.

PROPOSED SIGN CODE AMENDMENT #4 – TERM OF TEMPORARY SIGN PERMITS

Purpose of proposed amendment: To change the term of temporary signs (except banners) from six months to 12 months, so as to be less burdensome to business and be consistent with the term of building permits in general. Permit renewals would not require approval from the Plan Commission.

Amended text: §6-11-8, §6-11-9.

Staff evaluation: Staff believes it is unnecessary to require frequent renewals of temporary signs, and that the requirement for Plan Commission approval of permit extensions is unreasonably burdensome to businesses. In addition, we would observe that the terms of the various types of temporary signs need not differ, and that much of the information contained in §6-11-9 is redundant with §6-11-8. For simplicity, the two sections have been combined. (Proposed Amendment #5 would create a new §6-11-9 to provide standards for event signage.) The proposed text amendment would change the permit duration for all temporary signs other than banners to a consistent 12 months, and would remove the requirement for Plan Commission approval of permit extensions. Also, permits would not be required for residential model signs.

The Plan Commission indicated unanimous support of this amendment.

PROPOSED SIGN CODE AMENDMENT #5 – CREATE STANDARDS FOR SPECIAL EVENT SIGNAGE

Purpose of proposed amendment: To create signage standards for occasional events such as grand openings or promotional events, so that such signage can be approved administratively.

New text: New §6-11-9. Contains text relocated from §6-11-15(B)(7), §6-11-16(D), and §6-11-17(K).

Staff evaluation: A new §6-11-9 is proposed to provide standards for special event signage, and much of the proposed text for new §6-11-9 has been relocated from the special event sign sections for governmental agencies and not-for-profits, new residential subdivisions, and business grand openings. The significant change that staff is recommending is that items that have been approved by the Plan Commission or the Village Board for grand openings be incorporated into the new standards so they may be approved administratively, which would be much more responsive to the needs of businesses. With the proposed text amendment, inflatables, balloons, streamers, pennants and vehicle signs would be permitted as part of grand opening event signage, and all but inflatables would be permitted as part of business event signage. In addition, such events would also be allowed in the industrial zoning district. Finally, the duration of a grand opening event would be reduced from four weeks to one week, and businesses would be allowed to have up to two business events per year. We would also note that the proposed amendment would reduce the allowable duration for promotional events for residential subdivisions from four per year at 30 days each to two per year at 15 days each, to agree with the allowable duration for business events.

Commissioner Hennessey suggested that grand opening events should be allowed for 30 days. With this change, the Plan Commission indicated unanimous support of this amendment.

PROPOSED SIGN CODE AMENDMENT #6 – UPDATE THE LIST OF PROHIBITED SIGNS

Purpose of proposed amendment: To remove awning signs, canopy signs and changeable copy signs from the list of prohibited signs, because such signs are not prohibited.

Amended text: §6-11-10.

Staff evaluation: Awning signs, canopy signs and changeable copy signs are not prohibited in Carol Stream, and in fact are permitted in all zoning districts. The proposed amendment would remove them from the list of prohibited signs in §6-11-10.

The Plan Commission indicated unanimous support of this amendment.

PROPOSED SIGN CODE AMENDMENT #7 – CLARIFY THE STANDARDS FOR SIGHT OBSTRUCTIONS

Purpose of proposed amendment: To clarify the purpose and intent of the Sign Code with respect to sight obstructions. This issue is addressed in §6-11-11(C) regarding the placement of signs on lots, as well as in §6-11-15(B)(10) regarding signs that regulate on-premises traffic and parking.

Amended text: §6-11-11(C), new §6-11-15(B)(9) and §6-11-26(A).

Staff evaluation: Staff believes the current language in §6-11-11 could be clearer, and that §6-11-11(C) and §6-11-15(B)(9) should be consistent with each other. The proposed amendment would replace the existing text with clearer language, and would add a definition for "sight triangle" to §6-11-26(A).

The Plan Commission indicated unanimous support of this amendment.

PROPOSED SIGN CODE AMENDMENT #8 – UPDATE THE STANDARDS FOR CHANGEABLE COPY SIGNS

Purpose of proposed amendment: To clarify the different requirements for a changeable copy wall sign and a changeable copy ground sign.

Amended text: §6-11-12(B).

Staff evaluation: Staff believes the current language in §6-11-12(B) should more clearly address the differing requirements for changeable copy on ground signs, wall signs and window signs. With the proposed amendment, this section has been reorganized so as to be clearer to the reader. Also, a provision has been added stating that a permanent portion would not be required on a changeable copy wall sign if the name and/or logo is already provided on another sign on the same façade.

The Plan Commission indicated unanimous support of this amendment.

**PROPOSED SIGN CODE AMENDMENT #9 – ELIMINATE REDUNDANT TEXT
PERTAINING TO NAME AND ADDRESS
PLATES**

Purpose of proposed amendment: To clarify redundant text.

Amended text: §6-11-15(B)(1) and new §6-11-16(F)(1).

Staff evaluation: The current code addresses name and address plates in §6-11-15, Signs Permitted In All Districts, and §6-11-16, Signs In The Residential Zones. Staff believes the intent of the existing text is to address non-residential name and address plates in §6-11-15 and residential address plates in §6-11-16. However, the standards contained in the two sections are somewhat ambiguous and inconsistent. The proposed revisions would clearly give the standards for name and address plates in the different zoning districts, and would specify the allowable sizes of such signs. Staff proposes that the allowable size of one-and-two-family residential signs should be increased slightly to allow for the sizes currently available in the marketplace.

The Plan Commission indicated unanimous support of this amendment.

**PROPOSED SIGN CODE AMENDMENT #10 – ALLOW INCREASED AREA FOR WALL
SIGNS DENOTING SECTIONS OF A
BUILDING**

Purpose of proposed amendment: To recognize that such signs, when located on the walls of larger buildings, need to be larger than six square feet in order to be visible.

Amended text: New §6-11-15(B)(9).

Staff evaluation: The Plan Commission and Village Board recently approved a Sign Code variation for an employee entrance sign on a large industrial building to be 27 square feet in area, as opposed to the maximum allowable area of six feet for such signs. The standards for such signs are included in the section of the Sign Code that addresses signs permitted in all zoning districts and for which a permit is not required; however, the maximum size of such signs is only six square feet. The proposed text amendment would allow wall signs used for such purposes to have an area greater than six square feet, but a permit would be required and the sign area would need to meet the area requirements for wall signs in the particular zoning district. Such signs that are smaller than six square feet would continue to be allowed without a permit.

The Plan Commission indicated unanimous support of this amendment.

**PROPOSED SIGN CODE AMENDMENT #11 – DELETE CERTAIN RESTRICTIONS
PERTAINING TO AWNING SIGNS AND
CANOPY SIGNS, CLARIFIED
STANDARDS FOR WALL SIGNS IN
RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS**

Purpose of proposed amendment: To delete certain restrictions pertaining to signs located on awnings and canopies, and to clarify the standards for wall signs for non-residential uses in the residential districts.

Amended text: New §6-11-16(D), §6-11-16(E)(1), §6-11-17(F), §6-11-18(E), and §6-11-19(E).

Staff evaluation: The current Sign Code places a number of regulations on awning signs and canopy signs, and staff believes some of the regulations are unnecessary and overly restrictive. These include:

- Cannot extend beyond the edge of the awning or canopy
- Must be the sole wall signage on the façade
- Signage may not be located on more than two sides of an awning or canopy.

The proposed text amendment would eliminate these three restrictions. In addition, the proposed amendment adds clarification to §6-11-16(E)(1) by indicating that wall signs for non-residential uses in residential districts (i.e. churches, cemeteries, golf courses) must meet the same standards as the B-4 zoning district, including the maximum façade coverage of 8% rather than 10%.

The Plan Commission indicated unanimous support of this amendment.

PROPOSED SIGN CODE AMENDMENT #12 – REVISE THE REQUIREMENTS FOR TEMPORARY REAL ESTATE SIGNS AND CONSTRUCTION SIGNS

Purpose of proposed amendment: To revise the height and area requirements for temporary real estate signs and construction signs.

Amended text: New §6-11-16(F)(2), §6-11-17(I and J), §6-11-18(F and G), §6-11-19(G and H).

Staff evaluation: The Sign Code's text pertaining to temporary real estate signs differs among the various sections of the Code for the different zoning districts. The proposed revisions would create consistency in language, and would not change the current requirements. With respect to temporary construction signs, staff has found that the Sign Code's standards are somewhat restrictive as compared with neighboring communities. The proposed text amendment would increase the allowable height and area of such signs. A summary is as follows:

Zoning Districts	Real Estate Signs		Construction Signs	
	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed
Residential				
Area	6 sf	6 sf	6 sf	16 sf
Height	No standard	No standard	No standard	6 feet
B-1, B-2, B-3				
Area	10 sf/ acre, 200 sf max	20 sf, increasing to 10 sf/acre 200 sf max	20 sf	32 sf
Height	10 feet	10 feet	6 feet	8 feet
B-4				
Area	10 sf/ acre, 200 sf max	20 sf, increasing to 10 sf/acre 200 sf max	20 sf	32 sf
Height	10 feet	10 feet	6 feet	8 feet

Industrial					
	Area	10 sf/ acre, 200 sf max	20 sf, increasing to 10 sf/acre 200 sf max	20 sf	32 sf
	Height	10 feet	10 feet	6 feet	8 feet

The Plan Commission indicated unanimous support of this amendment.

PROPOSED SIGN CODE AMENDMENT #13 – UPDATE THE STANDARDS FOR MENU BOARD SIGNS

Purpose of proposed amendment: To update the standards for menu board signs located at drive-up window lanes, in order to reflect modern designs for such facilities.

Amended text: §6-11-17(H).

Staff evaluation: This is another section of the Sign Code specifically mentioned as needing revision. The PC/ZBA has recommended, and the Village Board approved, variations from the height and area requirements of this section several times in the recent past, which reflects the fact that the design of drive-through lanes has changed and improved over the years. The proposed text amendment would be consistent with variations approved by the Village.

The Plan Commission indicated unanimous support of this amendment.

PROPOSED SIGN CODE AMENDMENT #14 – MISCELLANEOUS REVISIONS

Purpose of proposed amendment: To revise various items in the Sign Code for purposes of consistency and clarity.

Amended text: Various sections.

Staff evaluation:

- a. Added, deleted or revised text for purpose of clarity – various locations.
- b. Deleted the minimum size requirement for flags, pennants and insignias in §6-11-15(B)(4), created a maximum size requirement consistent with §6-11-15(B)(5).
- c. Moved temporary residential model signs to new §6-11-16(F), so that such signs no longer require a permit.
- d. Added definitions for community message board and bulletin board.
- e. Deleted regulatory standards from the definitions for wall sign, awning sign and canopy sign, moved such standards to the body of the Sign Code.
- f. Deleted historic references to specific variations granted in §6-11-20(B).
- g. Changed "variance" to "variation" for consistency, and also to agree with the Zoning Code.
- h. Added cross-references where helpful.
- i. Eliminated the requirement for a 2-foot clearance beneath ground signs.
- j. Eliminated Plan Commission review of temporary residential marketing signs at PUDs or residential subdivisions (§6-11-16(C)).

The Plan Commission indicated unanimous support of this amendment.

FUTURE SIGN CODE AMENDMENTS

Staff would note that certain issues exist which have not been addressed as part of this set of text amendments, the most significant of which being the development of standards for video signs and the height and area requirements for ground signs and directory signs. These issues remain for a future amendment because the purpose of this project is to address more immediate, manageable problems. We would also note, for purpose of information, that we plan to move the Sign Code and the Fence Code into the Zoning Code as part of a future project to adopt the latest building codes.

Chairman Michaelsen and Commissioners Christopher, Smoot, McNally and Hennessey, had one change to the proposed sign code amendment #5 – Standard for Special Event Signage; the Plan Commission/Zoning Board Appeals would like the duration of the grand opening event to be 30 days instead of one week as stated in the staff report.

Commissioner Hennessey moved and Commissioner Christopher made the second to recommend approval the Sign Code - Text Amendments subject to the change in the sign code amendment #5 – Standard for Special Event Signage; the Plan Commission/Zoning Board Appeals would like the duration of the grand opening event to be 30 days instead of one week as stated in the staff report. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes: 5 Chairman Michaelsen and Commissioners Christopher, Smoot, McNally and Hennessey
 Nays: 0
 Absent: 2 Commissioner Spink and Petella

NEW BUSINESS:**ADJOURNMENT:**

At 9:00 p.m. Commissioner McNally moved and Commissioner Smoot made the second to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

FOR THE COMBINED BOARD

Recorded and transcribed by,


 Linda Damron
 Community Development Secretary

Minutes approved by Plan Commission on this 25th day of April, 2011.


 Chairman