

APPROVED
MINUTES OF
THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING
HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
APRIL 28, 2015

Chair Eckhardt called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Members Present: Ted Eckhardt, Chair
Alan Bombick
John Fitzgerald
Anthony Fasolo
Jonathan Kubow

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Jason Miller, Fitness 19 for *Westgate Park & Shop*
Mike Schwartz, *Owner of Westgate Park & Shop*
Jack Buttacavoli, Sign Central for *Soarus / MSI Technology*
Jim Cochran, JRC Design Build for *410 W. Wing St.*
Carole Wisniewski, JRC Design Build for *410 W. Wing St.*
Steve Campbell, *Owner of 410 W. Wing St.*
Tony VanDijk, Emerald Homes for *1013 N. Hickory Ave.*
Tom Abbatemarco, Prestigious Homes for *1130 N. Walnut Ave.*
Sean & Talicia Bashford, *Owners of 1130 N. Walnut Ave.*
Tony Divizio, MM Design for *1536 N. Ridge Ave.*
Sean Kelly, RMB LLC for *1008 N. Illinois Ave.*
Keith Neumann, Greenscape Homes for *1309 S. Evergreen Ave.*
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM APRIL 14, 2015

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 14, 2015. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 2. SIGN VARIATION REVIEW**DC#15-021 – Soarus / MSI Technology – 3930 N. Ventura Dr.**

Mr. Jack Buttacavoli, representing *Sign Central*, was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The subject property is an existing, single-story, multi-tenant office building with three tenants: Soarus/MSI Technology, Toshiba, and Thermosafe. The property currently has one code compliant ground sign at the southwest corner entry drive, as well as one code compliant directional ground sign internal to the site. The petitioner is proposing to install three additional ground signs to call attention to each of the office tenants' main building entrances which requires the following variations:

1. A variation from Chapter 30, section 30-302a, to allow four (4) ground signs where only one (1) ground sign is allowed per street frontage.
2. A variation from Chapter 30, section 30-302a, to allow ground signs with separation distances of approximately 75 feet, 291 feet, and 48 feet, where 800 feet of separation is required between ground signs.
3. A variation from Chapter 30, section 30-303a, to allow ground signs with a height of 3.5 feet, where zero (0) feet is allowed.

The petitioner submitted a letter addressing the hardship criteria, and Staff supports the proposed ground signs for the following reasons:

1. The existing building has a very uniform appearance and it is a reasonable hardship that visitors to the various office tenants could have difficulty locating the different businesses' entrances.
2. Although wall signs are allowed by code for each tenant, the proposed ground signs are small, low to the ground, nicely designed, are unlit, and will therefore not have a negative impact on adjacent properties or provide a competitive advantage.
3. The proposed signs are internal to the site, they will have very limited visibility from the road, and will face towards a retention pond to the south.

Mr. Hautzinger stated that Staff is recommending approval of the variation requests, with a requirement that landscaping be provided around the base of each ground sign a minimum of two feet out from the base of each sign, and a condition that approval of the proposed ground signs is in lieu of wall signs.

Chair Eckhardt asked if there was any public comment on the project and there was no response from the audience.

The petitioner had no comments at this time.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE VILLAGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR THE SIGN VARIATION REQUEST FOR SOARUS / MSI TECHNOLOGY LOCATED AT 3930 N VENTURA DRIVE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH PLANS RECEIVED 3/2/15, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING:

1. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 302a, TO ALLOW FOUR GROUND SIGNS WHERE ONLY ONE GROUND SIGN IS ALLOWED PER STREET FRONTAGE.
2. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-302a, TO ALLOW GROUND SIGNS WITH SEPARATION DISTANCES OF APPROXIMATELY 75 FEET, 291 FEET, AND 48 FEET, WHERE 800 FEET OF SEPARATION IS REQUIRED BETWEEN GROUND SIGNS.
3. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-303a, TO ALLOW GROUND SIGNS WITH A HEIGHT OF 3.5 FEET, WHERE ZERO FEET IS ALLOWED.
4. A REQUIREMENT THAT LANDSCAPING BE PROVIDED AROUND THE BASE OF EACH GROUND SIGN A MINIMUM OF 2 FEET OUT FROM THE BASE OF EACH SIGN.
5. A CONDITION THAT APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED GROUND SIGNS IS IN LIEU OF WALL SIGNS.
6. THIS REVIEW DEALS WITH ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, ANY OTHER ZONING AND/OR LAND USE ISSUES OR DECISIONS THAT STEM FROM ZONING, SIGN CODE OR BUILDING OR ANY OTHER REVIEWS. IN ADDITION TO THE NORMAL TECHNICAL REVIEW, PERMIT DRAWINGS WILL BE REVIEWED FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE DESIGN COMMISSION AND ANY OTHER COMMISSION OR BOARD APPROVAL CONDITIONS. IT IS THE ARCHITECT/HOMEOWNER/BUILDER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO COMPLY WITH THE DESIGN COMMISSION APPROVAL AND ENSURE THAT BUILDING PERMIT PLANS AND SIGN PERMIT PLANS COMPLY WITH ALL ZONING CODE, BUILDING CODE AND SIGN CODE REQUIREMENTS.
7. THE PETITIONER SHALL COMPLY WITH ALL FEDERAL, STATE AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES.

Commissioner Kubow clarified that the motion includes the requirement and condition listed in the Staff report. **Chair Eckhardt** did not want the motion to require the removal of any existing signage on the glass entry doors. **Mr. Hautzinger** clarified that the condition in the Staff report refers to wall signage on the building only and that window signage is allowed. **Commissioner Bombick** commented that although there have been a lot of changes in this area, these buildings appear to be more or less tech oriented tenants, and the Village should consider some overall signage or branding program for this district. Although he had no issues with the signage proposed tonight, he felt the signs were not strong enough to present an image for a hi-tech business area in the Village. **Chair Eckhardt** agreed with the idea of creating continuity of this area and suggested further discussion of the matter at the end of tonight's meeting, if time allows.

**BOMBICK, AYE; FITZGERALD, AYE; FASOLO, AYE; KUBOW, AYE; ECKHARDT, AYE.
ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.**