

APPROVED

MINUTES OF
THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING
HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
NOVEMBER 28, 2017

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

Members Present: John Fitzgerald, Chair
Aaron Coon
Ted Eckhardt

Members Absent: Kirsten Kingsley
Jonathan Kubow

Also Present: Joshua Spinks, Morgan Harbour Construction for 703-723 W. Algonquin Rd.
Mike Wauterlek, Hamilton Partners for 703-723 W. Algonquin Rd.
Grant Brandenburg & Julie Dalga, Ware Malcomb for 703-723 W. Algonquin Rd.
Jay Zumbahlen, Wingren Landscape for 703-723 W. Algonquin Rd.
Joe Favia for *Favia Dental*
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM NOVEMBER 14, 2017

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER COON, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 14, 2017. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 2. SIGN VARIATION REVIEW

DC#17-143 – Favia Dental – 300 E. Northwest Highway

Joe Favia, representing *Favia Dental*, was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner has an existing pole-mounted ground sign facing Northwest Highway. The existing sign is located in a narrow landscape island, and it overhangs above the parking lot driveway in front of the building. Code requires a minimum twelve feet of clearance to the underside of the sign to allow vehicles to safely pass beneath the sign. The existing sign is non-compliant with only ten feet of clearance. The sign is also non-compliant with a zero foot setback, where three feet minimum is required. The petitioner is proposing to replace the existing sign cabinet assembly in its entirety to match the existing sign. Per Chapter 30, Section 30-121 regarding non-conforming signs, the sign is not allowed to be replaced unless it is made to conform with the sign code regulations. Therefore, sign variations are required. The existing pole and Lexan sign panels are proposed to be reused.

The existing sign has been at this location for many years. Staff feels that the need to replace the sign represents an opportunity to upgrade the dated sign to eliminate the vehicle clearance issue and to improve the corridor aesthetics at key locations along Northwest Highway. Some of the goals of the current Northwest Highway corridor beautification plan include, *to beautify the corridor as an asset to the community*, and *to promote participation by adjacent property owners and businesses to develop and maintain corridor beautification*.

Staff previously provided the petitioner with the following 4 options, and Mr. Hautzinger presented sketches of each option from the Staff report:

Option 1

A vertically designed code-compliant sign with a 3-foot setback to fit within the existing landscape island in the same location as the existing sign.

Option 2

A code-compliant monument style sign to fit within the existing landscape island. Monument style signs (6-feet tall maximum) have no setback requirement.

Option 3

If a larger sign is desired, a 60 sf sign does fit in the existing landscape bed to avoid overhanging the driveway, but a variation would be required for setback. This is the same size as the existing sign, but in a vertical orientation instead of a horizontal orientation.

Option 4

Pursue sign variations to rebuild the existing sign as is. This option is not recommended due to the hazard of the sign overhanging the vehicular drive.

Staff recommends the Design Commission evaluate the sign options and encourage the petitioner to pursue Options 1, 2, or 3.

Chair Fitzgerald stated that a unanimous vote was needed from all 3 commissioners tonight for a recommendation for approval.

Mr. Favia said that he was not opposed to improving the existing sign; however, he did not like Option 1 or 2 because he has renters, who basically pay his \$40,000 taxes to the Village, and he felt that signage was important for those tenants who rent from him. The reason he bought the building was to have his name on Northwest Highway; it is important to him to have a larger sign. He received a quote from a sign contractor for a new, larger sign similar to Option 2, and the quote was less than the cost of the damage to the existing sign. He explained that the existing sign

was damaged from two microbursts in the last three years; one that destroyed the panels, which he replaced, and the second one that did major damage to the actual structure, which he attempted to have repaired but the sign cabinet is no longer straight. He wants to replace the existing sign with a straight sign, although he is not opposed to improving the existing sign either. He would consider Option 3, which will allow him to space for his own signage on the sign, along with signage for the tenants, and he also preferred Option 4, to just replace what the Act of God damaged.

Commissioner Coon was happy to see the petitioner receptive to the options presented by Staff, and he was in favor of Option 3. He felt that replacing the existing sign due to nature should fundamentally be the petitioner's right; however, he was in support of Option 3, if the petitioner did not object.

Commissioner Eckhardt agreed with Commissioner Coon, and was also in support of allowing the petitioner to repair the existing sign; however, he was concerned about the safety hazard of the existing sign overhanging the vehicular drive, as pointed out by Staff. **Commissioner Eckhardt** felt the existing sign was not very attractive, and he supported Option 3, which would provide a large, attractive sign for the dental office, as well as space for tenant signage.

Mr. Favia said that although the sign company indicated they could replace the existing sign, he felt the options presented by Staff were nicer than his existing sign, and if he is given approval for a variation, he would go with Option 3.

Chair Fitzgerald was okay with all 3 of the options presented by Staff. He felt that a new sign would add a lot to the business, and he encouraged the petitioner to consider Option 1 as well, because the unique design might draw more attention being tall and narrow, and there is nothing like it along this corridor.

Mr. Hautzinger added that the options presented by Staff are conceptual designs that should be further developed by studying different sizes and designs, and he agreed with Chair Fitzgerald's comments about the uniqueness of the sign in Option 1. A design that is somewhere between Option 1 and Option 3 could be studied.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER COON, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE VILLAGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, OF THE FOLLOWING SIGN VARIATION REQUEST FOR *FAVIA DENTAL* LOCATED AT 300 E. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY:

1. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-301b LOCATION, TO ALLOW A ZERO FOOT SETBACK FOR A GROUND SIGN IN THE B-2 ZONING DISTRICT, WHERE 3-FEET MINIMUM IS REQUIRED.

THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON THE PLANS DATED AND RECEIVED 11/16/17, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING:

2. THE DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDS APPROVAL OF OPTION 1 OR OPTION 3 AS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF REPORT, TO BE REVIEWED BY STAFF.
3. 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.

ECKHARDT, AYE; COON, AYE; FITZGERALD, AYE.

ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

Mr. Hautzinger pointed out that sign variations require final approval by the Village Board, and the final sign design should be submitted and reviewed by Staff prior to moving forward to the Village Board. **Mr. Favia** stated that his sign contractor will provide a final sign design to Staff as soon as possible, and he reiterated his appreciation to Staff for the options presented.