

APPROVED

MINUTES OF
THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING
HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
SEPTEMBER 26, 2017

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

Members Present: John Fitzgerald, Chair
Ted Eckhardt
Aaron Coon
Kirsten Kingsley
Jonathan Kubow

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Tom Meyer, Lexington Homes for *Lexington Heritage*
Michael Bova, Top to Bottom Construction for *1805 N. Walnut Ave.*
Robert Kolososki, Prairie Tech Ltd. for *1805 N. Walnut Ave.*
Robert Flubacker, Robert Flubacker Architects for *619 N. Arlington Heights Rd.*
Mr. & Mrs. Vincent, Owners of *619 N. Arlington Heights Rd.*
Matt Peota for *Passero*
Alex Perry, Right Way Signs for *Passero*
Dr. John Kotis for *Kotis Surgical Center*
Douglas Hammen, Douglas Design & Associates for *Kotis Surgical Center*
Susan Maish, JNKA Architects for *St. Edna Church*
Mike Maloni, Building Rep for *St. Edna Church*
Chris Stair for *Aldi*
Tom Strehmann for *Aldi*
David McCallum, McCallum Associates for *Aldi*
T.J. Doyle, Doyle Signs for *Aldi*
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM SEPTEMBER 12, 2017

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 12, 2017. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 7. COMMERCIAL REVIEW & SIGN VARIATION REVIEWDC#17-104 & 17-111 – Aldi Store – 550 E. Golf Rd.

Chris Stair & Tom Strehmann, representing *Aldi*, and T. J. Doyle, representing *Doyle Signs*, and David McCallum, representing *McCallum Associates*, were present on behalf of the project.

Chair Fitzgerald asked if there was any public comment on the project and there was a response from the audience.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to expand an existing 16,079 sf Aldi grocery store with a 3,287 sf building addition for a total building area of 19,366 sf. The scope of the project also includes new signage, which requires sign variations. The existing parking lot will be modified only as needed to accommodate the new addition. The proposed addition complies with the B-2, General Business, zoning district requirements.

The existing building design is unremarkable with a simple entry design and red brick exterior walls. The proposed addition will extend across the entire front wall of the building facing Golf Road, creating an entirely new façade. The addition includes a new enhanced entry feature with a “bright silver” aluminum entrance canopy and wall cladding above a new clear anodized storefront entrance. Dark brown brick is proposed as an accent material on the vertical piers at the entry and across the front of the building.

While the new entrance is nicely designed, the rest of the building walls are flat brick walls, which lack detail and interest. Other Aldi stores include high transom windows across the front wall which adds interest to the design. It is recommended that high transom windows be added to this project, similar to the photo shown in the Staff report; however, the petitioner has indicated that this will create an issue with the interior of the store. There will be three new rooftop mechanical units that will be screened from view with equipment screens attached to the units. Trash will be stored within an existing trash enclosure located on the west side of the building.

With regards to landscaping, code requires that all landscape islands contain shade trees, and that the perimeter of the parking lot be screened with a continuous three-foot tall landscape hedge. Overall, the landscaping on the site is well maintained, but some of the landscape islands are missing shade trees, and there are some gaps in the perimeter hedge screen along Goebbert Road. The petitioner is proposing to add six shade trees where they are missing in the landscape islands, but three additional trees are required to be added in the remaining landscape islands. Also, the gaps in the perimeter hedge screen along Goebbert Road need to be filled in. Finally, it is recommended that a variety of shrubs and perennials be added around the ground sign at the southeast corner of the site to enhance the appearance.

Staff would recommend approval of the proposed architectural design for the addition, with the recommendation to add transom windows at the top of the wall along the south elevation, provide 3 additional shade trees in the remaining landscape islands, fill in the gaps in the perimeter hedge screen along Goebbert Road, and provide a variety of shrubs and perennials around the ground sign at the southeast corner of the site.

New wall signage is being proposed as part of the new façade and entry. The building currently has code compliant wall signage with one 50 sf “Aldi” wall sign facing each street frontage. New larger 75 sf “Aldi” wall signs are proposed to replace the existing signs, and new decorative halo-lit logo discs are proposed adjacent to the “Aldi” signs.

The requested sign variations are as follows:

South Elevation:

1. A variation from Chapter 30, section 30-402 Number, to allow two wall signs on the south elevation, where only one wall sign is allowed.
2. A variation from Chapter 30, section 30-403.a Dimensions, to allow a 75 sf wall sign on the south elevation, where 50 sf maximum is allowed.

3. A variation from Chapter 30, section 30-403.a Dimensions, to allow a 81.5 sf wall sign on the south elevation, where 0 sf is allowed.

East Elevation:

4. A variation from Chapter 30, section 30-402 Number, to allow two wall signs on the east elevation, where only one wall sign is allowed.
5. A variation from Chapter 30, section 30-403.a Dimensions, to allow a 75 sf wall sign on the east elevation, where 50 sf maximum is allowed.
6. A variation from Chapter 30, section 30-403.a Dimensions, to allow a 81.5 sf wall sign on the east elevation, where 0 sf is allowed.

The petitioner has submitted a letter addressing the hardship criteria with highlights as follows:

- The building size and setbacks justify the quantity and size of the requested signs.
- The requested signs are per Aldi's national corporate standards.
- The new modern signage will enhance the character of the area.
- The proposed signage is required to properly identify the business.

Staff agrees that the proposed signage is consistent with Aldi's national brand standards, and the new signage will enhance the appearance of the building, especially at night, but the amount of signage requested is three times the current amount on the building. The proposed number and size of wall signs is similar to other previously approved grocery store sign variations, but the amount of signage is significantly larger than other grocery stores of comparable size. Staff does not object to some amount of variations, but the requested amount is excessive.

Staff recommends the Design Commission evaluate the requested wall sign variations and consider the following options:

1. Reduce the size of the signs.
2. Reduce the number of signs.
3. Omit the second wall sign on the east elevation.

Mr. Stair said that Aldi started a national remodel program in early 2016, to remodel all of their stores around the country within 3 years. Stores are either being remodeled with an expansion and new technology, or closed based on performance, or relocated to another location. This store in Arlington Heights performs well and they want to maintain their long standing relationship with the community by proposing this remodel. He presented a revised drawing showing the new corporate identity that was rolled out nationwide a few weeks ago.

Mr. Stair explained that their new ground-up stores have transom windows on the short wall; however, transom windows were not approved by corporate to roll out on the remodeled stores, and the new interior design of the store will interfere with transom windows. Accent brick is being proposed on the pilasters for contrast. They have no issue with the landscaping suggestions from Staff.

Mr. Doyle stated that Aldi's new program is a fantastic change from their old stores, both inside and outside. The remodeled south elevation of the building will be 170 lineal feet, and the east elevation will be 100 lineal feet. The two Aldi wall signs are designed to fit within the tower elements located at the southeast corner of the building. They believe the proposed new signage is reasonable, appropriate in area and location, as well as in relation to the overall size and setback of the building. It will provide an attractive improvement for this location.

Mr. Doyle also addressed the sign variation criteria. The sign ordinance limits one sign per street frontage and 25% of the signable area, and he felt that there are 3 signable areas on each elevation, with the wall signs being the most attractive part of the elevation. The variations, if granted, will not create a traffic hazard, depreciate property values, or be detrimental to the public health, safety, morals or welfare. The variation, if granted, will not provide Aldi with a

competitive advantage over similar businesses, but will provide continuity and compatibility with their national standards marketing image at all locations. The variation, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality; it will be the same store, except 100% better. If the variations are not approved, Aldi's new business and marketing image will be reduced unreasonably and destroy the public image presented by the new logo and the icons. He presented a comparison of what the new signage would look like if it were code compliant, and the signage currently proposed. He said that other major grocery stores in town have been granted variations, such as the produce store located down the street that has a large amount of awning signage. They feel their request is not unreasonable, and that the sign code does not cover every situation.

Mr. McCallum, the landscape architect for the project, addressed the landscape comments. He said that there is an existing tree in the northernmost island, and the reason trees are not shown in other islands is because there are light poles there that do not allow for sufficient room for a tree. The southernmost island does have some perennials that will remain, and additional shrubs are proposed for the northernmost island. Adding a tree to the west of the monument sign would interfere with the visibility of the monument sign when traveling west to east.

Commissioner Kubow liked the simple and utilitarian architecture of the building, which is cost effective and similar to the shopping experience at Aldi, which he respects. He felt that an Aldi store has a very distinct look to it, especially the logo, which is a classic 60's or 70's design. **Mr. Stair** clarified that the logo was revised on the drawing he presented tonight, and **Commissioner Kubow** felt it still had a classic color scheme. In terms of signage, **Commissioner Kubow** was in support of what is being proposed as well as the code compliant option that was presented tonight by the petitioner. He had no issue accepting the sign variations because he felt the logo discs were more of an icon graphic and not necessarily signage. For that reason alone, he was okay with what is being proposed, although he liked both comparisons.

Commissioner Kingsley felt it was a great addition and had no issue with the new building design being rolled out nationwide by Aldi; she also liked the materials. She did not mind the wall sign, although she asked if the revised Aldi sign presented tonight was the same size as the previous new wall sign, and if the background panel of the tower was the same size. **Mr. Stair** replied that the size of the Aldi sign and the size of the background panel did not change. **Commissioner Kingsley** also asked about the material of the 3 logos discs, and the color of the coping at the top of the building. **Mr. Stair** replied that the logos would be brushed aluminum mounted on a fiber cement board wall cladding, the coping would be 'Slate' grey aluminum, and the doors would be "Keystone" gray.

Mr. Hautzinger asked for clarification of the style of wall sconce light fixtures being proposed, which were inconsistent between the drawings submitted and the reference photos of an Aldi store at another location. The petitioner stated that the reference photo accurately reflected the location and type of the light fixtures being proposed for the building. **Commissioner Kingsley** liked the fixtures being proposed, but was concerned that some of them were not dark sky compliant. She also asked about the rooftop screening, and the petitioner said it would be a horizontal composite wall screen. **Commissioner Kingsley** had no objections to the changes being made to the existing building, which were a really nice upgrade; she felt the colors were great, although she preferred the pilasters to be in the same color. Her only issues were with the exterior lights shining out, and that 3 trees be added either in the parking lot islands that are missing trees or elsewhere on the site.

Commissioner Eckhardt felt the proposed design was a great upgrade to the existing building; he liked the color palette and the 3-tiered arrival at the entrance. He supported the simple sign and the new logo discs being proposed, as well as the backlighting, and felt it was important to replicate the sign at the entrance on both sides of the building. He also supported the sign variance and felt the size of the signs were proportionately equivalent. He cautioned the petitioner about the light fixtures and uplighting, and he was interested with the concerns about dark sky compliance. Otherwise, he is in full support of the project.

Commissioner Coon asked about the clerestory windows located further down the elevation shown in the photograph of another Aldi store. The petitioner replied that clerestory windows are only used on ground-up stores, not on remodeled stores like this one, and the windows would interfere with the first aisle of the store that is located on the

south elevation. **Commissioner Coon** said he was struggling with the long expanse of brick on the south elevation, and pointed out that both the Valli produce store and the strip center to the west have a 'front' elevation, and Aldi does not. If the petitioner had come in with the proposed corner design on the existing building without the expansion, he would love it; it was a great improvement for that corner feature; however, he felt there was a missed opportunity to have an actual front elevation for the building. He understood the petitioner's concerns about windows interfering with product inside the building; however, there are details other than windows that can be added on the long south elevation. He pointed out that the loading already exists on the front of the building, although he liked that the new south wall projects forward and obscures some of that; however, he wanted to see more landscaping added to the west of the loading dock area to help obscure it more. With regards to signage, **Commissioner Coon** was not opposed to the scale of the signage if another bay of the tall wood feature wall was added and the logos were moved over; it seems too crowded as proposed. He preferred signs that are 75% of the size being proposed. He felt a lot of effort was put into the corner element of the building, and he wanted to see more of that effort put into the south elevation, given its prominence on Golf Road, whether it be through additional landscaping or an extension of the corner element.

Chair Fitzgerald was okay with the signage as proposed and felt it looked appropriate with the building. He was very much intrigued with the 3 logo discs, especially at night, and felt the material is a great contrast and interesting. He liked everything being proposed with the exception of the south elevation west of the 3 logo discs; he could not remember a project where the commissioners did not require landscaping or some details on a long expanse of wall like this. He asked the petitioner why there was no landscaping on the south elevation, from the area where the push carts are stored over to the garage door bay that is now set back. The petitioner referred to the sidewalk along the south elevation that is adjacent to the drive aisle and stated that bumping the area out for landscaping would result in the drive aisle becoming too small for trucks. **Chair Fitzgerald** questioned the need for a sidewalk on the south elevation, and the petitioner explained that this sidewalk would be used by customers parking at the west end of the parking lot, versus having to walk through the drive aisle to get to the front entrance.

Chair Fitzgerald wanted some kind of detail added in each of the bays on the south elevation because the majority of the building that faces Golf Road looks like it is the back or side of the building. He suggested adding a square lattice made of wood, or a round light fixture that spreads light in a circle. The petitioner replied that they were given strict instructions to not vary the design of the remodeled stores to achieve uniformity across the country. **Commissioner Eckhardt** pointed out that 31' is shown from the parking stall to the 5' sidewalk, which is substantially wider than a standard drive aisle, and he questioned why this would not allow for the addition of 2' for plantings. The petitioner replied that he would need to reconfirm the truck movements.

Chair Fitzgerald reiterated that he liked the building, he liked the materials, and he was okay with the signs; his only comment is about the south elevation.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Lynn Guercio, 588 E. Windgate Court. She is an advocate for the homeowners that live near the Aldi store and is here tonight from the perspective of a homeowner. This is a blended area, and the store is right on top of their property, and they have all kinds of issues as a result of that. When the store first moved in, it was more demure and more neighborly, and it fit in because it was less commercial and more of that blended type of community, given the fact that they are right on top of us. However, since the store first opened, the store hours have been extended, bringing trucks at all hours, some of which park on the property and idle, contributing to extra noise on their property. She said that Goebbert Road is the only road going in and out of the Wingate properties, the nursing center, the low income housing, and the Goebbert Plaza. This results in traffic light issues and difficulty exiting their property in a timely manner, with the entrance onto Goebbert Road being very steep as well. She asked if the trash area would be redesigned because it is completely unmanaged, with the Health Department out there countless times and the homeless living behind the store, there are dead trees back there, and part of the fence is falling down. She was also concerned about noise impacts from the rooftop equipment. She felt the Aldi store at this location when they first moved in was wonderful, but it has really gone downhill. **Chair Fitzgerald** stated that most of these concerns are not under the purview of the Commission and Staff can direct the resident to the appropriate Village contact.

The petitioner stated that screening for the rooftop equipment will be a heavy duty material that will reduce some noise, compared to having no screening, and the number of existing rooftop units will be reduced to one condenser and 2 rooftop units. They can address any truck concerns with store management. The trash enclosure will be contained by a wood fence. **Commissioner Kingsley** asked if the fence along the rear (north) of the property will be replaced and the petitioner replied that the existing fence will be evaluated and repaired where necessary. **Commissioner Kingsley** suggested a fence around the entire detention area, and a different type of material for the trash enclosure to better match the aesthetics of the building.

Commissioner Eckhardt encouraged the resident to talk with the petitioner tonight about her concerns, and contact Staff for direction on the issues not under the purview of this commission. He added that the motion will include a requirement to add landscaping along the loading dock area. He felt the changes being proposed were a great improvement to the existing store, which looks old and tired, and the changes will help everyone in the neighborhood.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE ADDITION TO ALDI LOCATED AT 550 E. GOLF ROAD. THIS APPROVAL IS BASED ON THE PLANS RECEIVED ON 8/16/17, THE REVISED DRAWING (EXHIBIT A) RECEIVED TONIGHT, 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 REQUIREMENT TO ADD A MINIMUM OF 60 LINEAL FEET OF LANDSCAPING AT THE LOADING DOCK, TO BE REVIEWED BY STAFF.
2. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE SOUTH ELEVATION OF THE ADDITION BE ENHANCED WITH 2 DIFFERENT BRICK TYPES AS PROPOSED, AND EITHER REMOVE THE SIDEWALK TO ALLOW FOR A 2-FOOT PLANTING BED, OR REMOVE THE SIDEWALK TO ALLOW FOR PLANT MATERIAL IN PLANTERS ON THE SIDEWALK, TO BE REVIEWED BY STAFF.
3. A REQUIREMENT TO ENHANCE THE LANDSCAPING AROUND THE 2 ISLANDS THAT HAVE LIGHT POLES, IN LIEU OF TREES.
4. THIS REVIEW DEALS WITH ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, NOR REPRESENT ANY TACIT APPROVAL OR SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED LAND USE OR ANY OTHER ZONING AND/OR LAND USE ISSUES OR DECISIONS THAT STEM FROM ZONING, BUILDING, SIGNAGE 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 PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO INCORPORATE ALL REQUIREMENTS LISTED ON THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS INTO THE PERMIT DRAWINGS, AND TO ENSURE THAT BUILDING PERMIT PLANS AND SIGN PERMIT PLANS COMPLY WITH ALL ZONING CODE, BUILDING CODE AND SIGN CODE REQUIREMENTS.
5. ALL SIGNAGE MUST MEET CODE, PER CHAPTER 30.

Commissioner Kingsley asked that consideration be given to the exterior lighting and the 3 icon discs, that these be dark sky compliant. Also, clarification should be made that this approval is for the drawing submitted tonight (Exhibit A) that shows the wood behind the 3 logo discs, not the aluminum composite on the original proposal, as well as the different color brick on the pilasters. She also asked that the motion include a recommendation to look at the fence at the loading dock.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO AMEND THE MOTION AS FOLLOWS:

6. THAT EXTERIOR LIGHT FIXTURES BE DARK SKY COMPLIANT.
7. THAT THE PETITIONER WILL EVALUATE THE EXISTING FENCE AND REPAIR WHERE NECESSARY.

8. THAT THE PETITIONER WORK WITH STAFF TO CONSIDER A MATERIAL MORE IN CHARACTER WITH THE BUILDING (NOT WOOD) THAT IS SYMPATHETIC TO THE ADJACENT HOMES, FOR THE FENCE AROUND THE TRASH ENCLOSURE.
9. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PETITIONER PROVIDE A VARIETY OF SHRUBS AND PERENNIALS AROUND THE GROUND SIGN AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF THE SITE.

Mr. Hautzinger stated that code requires all parking islands to have a tree; therefore, the requirement to enhance the landscaping around the 2 islands that have light poles, in lieu of trees, should be a recommendation. Staff can work with the petitioner on this item.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO AMEND THE MOTION AS FOLLOWS:

3. A RECOMMENDATION TO ENHANCE THE LANDSCAPING AROUND THE 2 ISLANDS THAT HAVE LIGHT POLES, IN LIEU OF TREES.

KUBOW, AYE; COON, AYE; KINGSLEY, AYE; ECKHARDT, AYE; FITZGERALD, AYE.
ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO RECOMMEND TO THE VILLAGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING SIGN VARIATION REQUESTS FOR THE *ALDI STORE* LOCATED AT 550 E. GOLF ROAD:

SOUTH ELEVATION:

1. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-402 NUMBER, TO ALLOW TWO WALL SIGNS ON THE SOUTH ELEVATION, WHERE ONLY ONE WALL SIGN IS ALLOWED.
2. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-403.A DIMENSIONS, TO ALLOW A 75 SF WALL SIGN ON THE SOUTH ELEVATION, WHERE 50 SF MAXIMUM IS ALLOWED.
3. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-403.A DIMENSIONS, TO ALLOW A 81.5 SF WALL SIGN ON THE SOUTH ELEVATION, WHERE 0 SF IS ALLOWED.

EAST ELEVATION:

4. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-402 NUMBER, TO ALLOW TWO WALL SIGNS ON THE EAST ELEVATION, WHERE ONLY ONE WALL SIGN IS ALLOWED.
5. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-403.A DIMENSIONS, TO ALLOW A 75 SF WALL SIGN ON THE EAST ELEVATION, WHERE 50 SF MAXIMUM IS ALLOWED.
6. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-403.A DIMENSIONS, TO ALLOW A 81.5 SF WALL SIGN ON THE EAST ELEVATION, WHERE 0 SF IS ALLOWED.

THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE REVISED ELEVATION 'EXHIBIT A' RECEIVED ON 9/26/17, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING:

7. THIS REVIEW DEALS WITH ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, NOR REPRESENT ANY TACIT APPROVAL OR SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED LAND USE OR ANY OTHER ZONING AND/OR LAND USE ISSUES OR DECISIONS THAT STEM FROM ZONING, BUILDING, SIGNAGE 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 PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO INCORPORATE ALL REQUIREMENTS LISTED ON THE

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS INTO THE PERMIT DRAWINGS, AND TO ENSURE THAT BUILDING PERMIT PLANS AND SIGN PERMIT PLANS COMPLY WITH ALL ZONING CODE, BUILDING CODE AND SIGN CODE REQUIREMENTS.

There was no second to the motion.

Mr. Hautzinger said that there needed to be clarification of the variations in light of the revised drawing (Exhibit A) that was presented tonight. The size of the Aldi wall sign was slightly increased in size from 75 sf to 76 sf, and the space between the 3 logo discs was increased from 11" to 2'-1 ¾", which adds approximately 12 sf to the overall sign area. Originally proposed, the 3 logo discs were considered to be one sign; however, increasing the space between each logo disc now made the logo discs appear like 3 separate signs, for a total of 4 signs on each elevation. He suggested two options to consider: revise the variations to show a total of 4 signs being proposed on each elevation, with the new sizes shown on Exhibit A; or continue to treat the 3 logo discs as one sign at 93.6 sf instead of 81.5 sf that was originally proposed. The Design Commission should consider that, if approved as one sign, the 3 logo discs could potentially be replaced in the future with one 93.6 sf wall sign.

Commissioner Kingsley suggested amending the motion to approve the revised Aldi wall sign at 76 sf on each elevation, and 3 individual logo disc signs at the revised size on each elevation, for a total of 8 signs. **Mr. Hautzinger** replied that this would change the variations to allow a total of 4 wall signs on the south and east elevation, where only 1 wall sign is allowed; allow 76 sf of wall sign on the south and east elevation, where 50 sf is allowed; allow three 24.2 sf wall signs on the south and east elevation, where 0 sf is allowed.

Commissioner Kingsley wanted to approve as 4 separate wall signs on each facade. **Commissioner Eckhardt** pointed out that approving them as 4 separate signs would then need to include a requirement for the spacing between the 3 logo discs, as opposed to approving them as one wall sign. He felt the logo discs looked better spaced farther apart, as shown in the revised design presented tonight, and he was more comfortable approving the variations as 2 wall signs on each elevation.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO RECOMMEND TO THE VILLAGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING SIGN VARIATION REQUESTS FOR THE ALDI STORE LOCATED AT 550 E. GOLF ROAD:

SOUTH ELEVATION:

1. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-402 NUMBER, TO ALLOW TWO WALL SIGNS ON THE SOUTH ELEVATION, WHERE ONLY ONE WALL SIGN IS ALLOWED.
2. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-403.A DIMENSIONS, TO ALLOW A 76 SF WALL SIGN ON THE SOUTH ELEVATION, WHERE 50 SF MAXIMUM IS ALLOWED.
3. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-403.A DIMENSIONS, TO ALLOW A 93.6 SF WALL SIGN ON THE SOUTH ELEVATION, WHERE 0 SF IS ALLOWED.

EAST ELEVATION:

4. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-402 NUMBER, TO ALLOW TWO WALL SIGNS ON THE EAST ELEVATION, WHERE ONLY ONE WALL SIGN IS ALLOWED.
5. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-403.A DIMENSIONS, TO ALLOW A 76 SF WALL SIGN ON THE EAST ELEVATION, WHERE 50 SF MAXIMUM IS ALLOWED.
6. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-403.A DIMENSIONS, TO ALLOW A 93.6 SF WALL SIGN ON THE EAST ELEVATION, WHERE 0 SF IS ALLOWED.

THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE REVISED ELEVATION 'EXHIBIT A' RECEIVED ON 9/26/17, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING:

7. THIS REVIEW DEALS WITH ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, NOR REPRESENT ANY TACIT APPROVAL OR SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED LAND USE OR ANY OTHER ZONING AND/OR LAND USE ISSUES OR DECISIONS THAT STEM FROM ZONING, BUILDING, SIGNAGE 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 PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO INCORPORATE ALL REQUIREMENTS LISTED ON THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS INTO THE PERMIT DRAWINGS, AND TO ENSURE THAT BUILDING PERMIT PLANS AND SIGN PERMIT PLANS COMPLY WITH ALL ZONING CODE, BUILDING CODE AND SIGN CODE REQUIREMENTS.

KUBOW, AYE; KINGSLEY, AYE; ECKHARDT, AYE; FITZGERALD, AYE.
ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.