

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLAN COMMISSION HELD ON WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2009, AT THE VILLAGE HALL, 7760 QUINCY STREET, WILLOWBROOK, DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Kopp called the meeting to order at the hour of 7:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Those present at roll call were Commissioners James Baker, Robert DelSarto, Joseph Heery, Vice-Chairman Wagner and Chairman Kopp. Also present were Planner Sara Hage and Secretary Joanne Prible. ABSENT: William Remkus and James Soukup.

3. OMNIBUS VOTE AGENDA

The items on the Omnibus Vote Agenda were as follows:

- a. Waive Reading of Minutes (APPROVE)
- b. Minutes – Regular Meeting November 4, 2009 (APPROVE)
- c. Minutes – Village Board Meetings – October 26 and November 9, 2009 (RECEIVE)

MOTION: Made by Commissioner DelSarto seconded by Vice-Chairman Wagner, to approve the Omnibus Vote Agenda.

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE

MOTION DECLARED CARRIED

4. PLAN COMMISSION CONSIDERATION – Zoning Hearing Case 09-04: Dance Duo – Willowbrook Court Special Use Permit for a Recreation Use – 633-639 Executive Drive

Public Hearing

Chairman Kopp said this is Zoning Case 09-04. He said this is a public hearing of the Plan Commission of the Village of Willowbrook convened for the purpose of considering a request for a special use permit for a Recreation Use at Willowbrook Court/Dance Duo 633-639 Executive Drive. The applicant is DA Willowbrook LLC/Dance Duo. Specifically, the applicants are seeking approval of a Special Use Permit to allow a dance school at 633-639 Executive Drive. Notice of the Public Hearing on the matter to be considered was published in The Doings on November 12, 2009. A copy of the certificate of publication shall be made a part of this hearing record as Village Exhibit “A”. At this time, I would ask the Plan Commission to consider rules or procedure for this evening’s Public Hearing and the further consideration of this matter. A copy of such rules has previously been provided to each of you.

Chairman Kopp asked for a motion to adopt the rules.

MOTION: Made by Vice-Chairman Wagner, seconded by Commissioner DelSarto, to adopt the Rules of Procedure.

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE

MOTION DECLARED CARRIED

Chairman Kopp asked is the staff ready to present the case.

Planner Hage stated that the application and Public Hearing tonight is for a Special Use Permit for the Willowbrook Court Office Building, specifically unit 633-639, and the Special Use request is for a recreation use that would allow for Dance Duo (which is a dancing school) to operate within that unit. They would be taking over the tenant space that was previously occupied by ATI Physical Therapy which has since moved to the Town Center. Staff does not have any concerns with parking or the uses as the primary hours of operation are going to be opposite of what the remaining tenants use the space for, primarily in the evening and Saturday and Sunday midday. She added there is ample parking available at that time and not much traffic in the area at that time as well. She stated that the representatives from Dance Duo are here if you have any questions for them.

Chairman Kopp asked if there is enough parking for the dance school.

Planner Hage answered yes. There are over 16 spaces built in for each unit.

Commissioner Baker asked what age group will attend the dance school.

Sandra Krumhorn, a representative from the dance school answered from 5 years old and up.

Chairman Kopp asked the Plan Commissioners if they had any questions. There were no questions. Chairman Kopp stated that the Commission will discuss and consider the recommendation during the course of tonight's regular meeting. That part of the meeting is not a Public Hearing and additional statements or testimony will not be permitted once the Public Hearing is closed. Chairman Kopp asked for a motion to close the Public Hearing.

MOTION: Made by Commissioner Baker, seconded by Commissioner DelSarto, to close the public hearing.

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE

MOTION DECLARED CARRIED

Chairman Kopp said the next item on the agenda is the recommendation for Zoning Hearing Case 09-04. Chairman Kopp asked for a motion.

MOTION: Made by Commissioner Baker, seconded by Commissioner DelSarto, to recommend to the President and Village Board adoption of the findings in the staff report dated December 2, 2009 and approval of the applicant's requests for a Special Use Permit for a recreational use subject to the plans listed in staff's report dated December 2, 2009.

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE

MOTION DECLARED CARRIED

5. DISCUSSION – Willowbrook Sign Regulations

Chairman Kopp said the next item on the agenda is the discussion of the Sign Regulations.

Planner Hage asked the Commissioners if they had any questions or concerns about the summary of the past discussion items.

Chairman Kopp answered that it was accurate.

Planner Hage said the garage sale sign regulations were brought up by one of the trustees and who asked the Commissioners to consider if the garage sale sign regulations are too restrictive. She said that she discussed this with Director Halik and he has no reservations about our current regulations and would not suggest changing them but if you have concerns or feel that they need to be opened up I would like to hear that direction.

Commissioner DelSarto asked what the regulations are.

Planner Hage answered a resident can have a garage sale sign on their property. There is a time limit of 3 days and the sign may not exceed 4 square feet. She asked if the Commission wanted to allow residents to put garage sale signs in the parkway noting that once you allow one person to do it then everyone gets to do it, including commercial businesses.

Commissioner Heery said that he agrees with Director Halik. All the Commissioners agreed that the garage sale regulations are not too restrictive.

Commissioner DelSarto asked if the garage sale regulations can be printed in the newsletter.

Planner Hage said that is a good idea to do in the spring during the garage sale season.

Planner Hage moved on to the signage for office and industrial areas and noted there has been some correspondence from Woodland Park office tenants and they would like the Commissioners to listen to their concerns.

Liz Hennelly, the representative from Woodland Park, said her concern is that the signage for Woodland Park is not visible from the street. Clients of Woodland Park have a difficult time finding the offices. Ms. Hennelly asked if the sign could be moved to the middle of the berm and if the sign could be raised up two or three feet so it can be seen by the traffic. Ms. Hennelly said there are a number of businesses in Woodland Park and people cannot find the offices. She said her main question and concern is how the monument sign can be made more visible.

Planner Hage stated that currently our code requires that the Woodland Park sign is set back from the property line one foot laterally for every one foot tall. So if it is five feet tall it is setback five feet. If you want to go up to a twelve foot sign or a twenty four foot sign it is setback twelve feet or twenty four feet, respectively. Planner Hage said to the Commissioners that one of the items that did not make it into your packets, but that she would like to discuss was changing the setback requirement to a flat five foot setback.

Commissioner Baker asked how far back the Woodland Park sign setback is.

Planner Hage answered that the Woodland Park sign is 5 ½ feet tall from the base.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said that he thinks this should be handled as an individual situation but also needs to look at the broader picture as to the entire zoning group. He said that it seems that the sign should be further west than it is so it is closer to the driveway, not necessarily out further, but toward the drive.

Planner Hage added that there are a few complications for that particular site.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said that it looks like there is vegetation in the right-of-way.

Liz Hennelly said that you cannot see over the traffic to see the sign.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said that there are multiple things to look at in this particular instance and some of them are landscape issues, over which the Village may have some ability and control because it appears that it is in the right-of-way. It is not on private property so therefore the Village staff will trim a tree or bush that is in the way. He added that this is for the safety of the people turning into the drive rather than the visuals of the sign. Vice-Chairman Wagner added that the Commission needs to discuss this more in general terms for the district as opposed to a specific sign.

Planner Hage said that with this specific case it illustrates the issues with the sign setback and the limitations on how we allocate signage. Currently our code allows 45 square feet of signage and it can be used as a monument sign or a building sign but not both, it has to be one or the other.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said that visually the Woodland Park sign is a big sign. He added that he would not look for the Woodland Park sign but instead would look for an address. The address is not on the sign and that is a choice of the owner not the Plan Commission.

Planner Hage said those are valid points and acknowledged that there is a design issue with the sign. She stated that it is not an efficient use of their sign area because of the lateral piece and the colors blend into the landscaping. It also shortens the height. Planner Hage added that the sign would be better served in the middle of that landscaped area because there are entrances on either end. She explained if you are coming from the east and you see the sign you are past the entrance and if you are coming from the west there are landscape issues. She added that she will discuss the landscape issue with Tim Halik. There are some clear landscape obstructions from the west side.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said that he was not sure there is a problem here. He added that there is poor design in the placement of the sign. It seems that the solution would be a smaller monument sign with just the address numbers and not the Woodland Park. It is less an issue of the height and how far back on the property [the sign sits] than how the sign was designed. If you have a small monument sign with just the address numbers at both driveways that is a simple solution.

Planner Hage said that there are multiple factors that can be changed to improve the visibility of their signage such as moving the sign to the middle between the two entrances.

Vice-Chairman Wagner asked if we have a typical distance from the sidewalk to the right-of-way or the property line. He asked how close to the property line is the Woodland Park sign at the farthest north portion of the sign.

Commissioner Heery said that people look for an address first before the name of a square. He added if the sign could be moved to the middle with numbers that are viewable that should solve the problem.

Vice-Chairman Wagner asked do we allow an address sign only.

Planner Hage answered no.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said maybe the solution is to allow an address monument sign with the address only and the sign would be placed at each entrance.

Planner Hage said in the summer when the trees are full you will not see the sign. There are numbers on the sign and it has a design flaw but the Village does not dictate the design. There are design issues and if those were addressed it would help them a great deal. She also said that if you had an illuminated building sign of a decent size that would help to direct traffic.

Vice-Chairman Wagner asked Planner Hage what changes you are recommending.

Planner Hage said that currently in our code they only get 45 square feet of signage. It can be used for a monument sign or for a building sign.

Vice-Chairman Wagner asked how many square feet is the Woodland Park Sign.

Planner Hage said that in staff's proposal we suggest up to 100 square feet. So for this building it would be 100 square feet.

Vice-Chairman Wagner asked how many square feet is the Woodland Sign now.

Planner Hage said 45 square feet.

Vice-Chairman Wagner asked are you counting the address on the building.

Planner Hage answered no she is not counting the address on the building.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said it is actually both but you did not count it.

Planner Hage answered the 535 sign does not count.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said he does not think there is anything wrong with the 45 square feet. He added that it is badly designed. Even if you double the size and did the same thing, you still could not read the sign. The smallest thing on that sign is the address.

Planner Hage said Woodland Park is not alone; other businesses share in their concerns. One of the biggest complaints staff has had is from Turtle Wax. Their world headquarters is in

Willowbrook and they have a sign similar in shape to the Woodland Plaza sign. Turtle Wax had to make that choice and they were very vocal in sharing with the Village staff their dismay at not being able to promote the fact that they are here. Turtle Wax is proud that they are in Willowbrook and they want to share their presence. There are other businesses as well in the office park on Kingery and 69th. She further stated that they have their own design issues.

Vice-Chairman Wagner stated that if the sign allowance doubles to 90 or 100 square feet and Mr. McNaughton comes in and gives you this sign twice its size that does not solve the problem.

Planner Hage clarified that staff is not advocating that we allow for a 90 square feet sign. What we are advocating is that you can have this sign [a monument sign] and, if you chose, to allow for more square footage for a monument sign, and to also have the sign on the building at whatever area you [the Plan Commission] want, if it is 100 or 45 or 50, so that businesses can have both. They can have a monument sign and a wall sign and are not forced to chose either/or.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said with 45 square feet of signage you still cannot see the address. There are other issues such as the landscape and the placement of the sign, but we did not choose this, the builder chose this. This is not our issue. This is the builder's and the tenants' issue.

Planner Hage agreed.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said he has been by the Turtle Wax building and he is not sure that he agreed that Turtle Wax needs a sign twice the size.

Planner Hage said she is not advocating for a sign that is twice the size. Staff is advocating that Turtle Wax could put up a sign on their wall that says Turtle Wax just like National City has a sign on their wall as well as a monument sign.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said he has no objection to that. But are we saying you get two sign 45 square feet each or you get 90 square feet of sign.

Planner Hage said that is up to you. What staff is advocating is that they can have a wall sign and they can have a monument sign.

Commissioner Heery said that Turtle Wax and National City are brand names and these are addresses.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said when we talk about shopping centers, staff always talks about the name of the shopping center and he does not know the names of the shopping center.

Liz Hennelly, from Woodland Park, said that she wanted a monument sign with name plates big enough so individual businesses could be recognized. Citizens of Willowbrook need to know what is available to them in the community that is back in Woodland Park. She added that she has had numerous patients say that they never knew they were back there.

Chairman Kopp said that maybe the name should be Woodland Park Medical Center.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said we give the developer a set of rules for having a sign. For a developer utilizing his sign for Woodland Park, the most important thing is the address of the building.

Planner Hage said that it is fair that a sign be visible from within a reasonable approach [distance]. She said if you go down Route 83, she could not tell you the address of the Papadoux Restaurant or the Urology Center or the KPMC Medical Center but she knows where they are because of their sign identity. Planner Hage added if someone told her that to look for KPMC, she knows where that building is and that she does not care what the addresses are. She stated that businesses, including Woodland Park developer McNaughton Builders, have developed a brand and we need to give them the opportunity to execute their brand. There are other businesses in town that will also benefit from this. The Village is subject to the same sign regulations; however, we by-passed the regulations for the Village Hall which has two monument signs and a wall sign. The monument signs are overgrown with landscaping, but we also have a wall sign, so the Village is fortunate. Other businesses around the Village Hall have one or the other. Not all of them would qualify for a wall sign and a monument sign, but there are many that would and would benefit from both.

Chairman Kopp said he thinks the Commissioners are in agreement that the businesses can have both a wall sign and monument sign.

Planner Hage said that she did not think that all are in agreement.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said he had no trouble with the signage to which Chairman Kopp referred.

Commissioner DelSarto asked if we are talking about two different signs, would they have the same square footage.

Chairman Kopp said the Commissioners will have to talk about that.

Commissioner Heery said it comes down to identification. The problem is the number of tenants you have and how do you identify the building except by address.

Planner Hage said that is not the only means. These medical offices communicate with their clients and regular user, directing them to look for specific identifiers. Whether the identifier is an address or a particular brand [name], we cannot control that.

Chairman Kopp said that with whatever number [of sign surface area] we come up with, if they want a lighted wall sign that says Woodland Business Center or if they want to list have specific tenants listed, then they can do that.

Vice-Chairman Wagner asked if for the moment we could forget about Woodland Park to get through this issue. He said he does not have a problem with a company having a monument sign and a wall sign, but he does not think that they should be allowed to put all their allowed square footage out on the street [on a monument sign].

Planner Hage said if the Commissioners wanted to allow for more than 45 square feet for the monument sign that is one of the questions to debate. Currently the allowance is 45 square feet and staff had not suggested changing that number so that even with the addition of the wall sign the monument sign could only be a maximum of 45 square feet. As a point of reference, she noted that the outlot sign for National City at the town center is 50 square feet.

Vice-Chairman Wagner asked how far back from the property line is the monument sign and noted that it seems to be an issue.

Planner Hage said she thinks they are similar and could possibly be ten feet.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said the berming and landscaping we require seems to be at odds with the sign. He stated that it would seem that if you took away the one for one ratio and, instead, gave them a maximum height and allowed them to put it "x" amount of lineal feet back from the property line, the sign would be a bit more forward on the berm so that you can actually see it. He said he did not know what those numbers should be at the moment, but it would seem to him that we are allowing ten feet somewhere else in a similar one story building scenario. At ten feet it would seem to solve the problem noting that he does not know how far back from the property line this [sign] is.

Planner Hage answered that it is close to five feet or eight feet at a maximum.

Vice-Chairman Wagner asked if it could move forward.

Planner Hage said it could move forward.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said it could move forward if you took it to zero.

Planner Hage said no.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said you are saying it is set five feet back now.

Planner Hage said we do not have enough information to answer that specifically, but given the design and what it appears that their setback is, she believe it is somewhere around eight feet.

Vice-Chairman Wagner asked is that to the base or to the tip of the sign.

Planner Hage answered she thought it was the base.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said the tip is at the property line. It should be measured at the tip not the base because we are drawing the rectangle around the box of the sign.

Planner Hage said that is why it is eight feet because the sign itself is five feet in height.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said that it is sitting on top of a four or five foot berm so the top of the sign is at least nine to ten feet above the surface of Plainfield Road.

Chairman Kopp said that he thinks it is preferable that signs are setback five feet or eight feet rather than having your vision going back and forth and up and down. He stated that he does not have a problem with a uniform setback.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said he thought that was a good idea.

Planner Hage said that helps to underscore the signage we are giving them. For example with Willowbrook Ford, the Plan Commission proposed that we allow [Willowbrook Ford] to have as much signage as the Town Center, which is a 24 foot high sign. According to our current regulations, that would have to be set back 24 feet. [Setting it back that far] starts to erode the purpose of having the sign along the street. We want to attract people and traffic. That is why those signs are there. She said she thought we would be better served with a setback of a specific distance and suggested five feet and noted that our commercial right-of-ways are wide.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said his only concern is that most every development has some type of berming. We usually require berming and landscaping. If we took the sign and moved it within five feet of the property line, I do not know if that would solve the problem, but I think it is a good idea because then the sign is the most forward thing. The question is if the sign is moved forward, it also becomes lower because it is not sitting on the top of the berm. I think that the top of the sign should not be more than 10 feet above the ground at or near the sidewalk, not on top of the berm. So if our course here is to push the sign forward in front of the berm to make it readable, it just lowered it because it is not on the top of the berm. He added that he thinks you need to add five feet or something so that you can get it up off the ground. The top of a car is about five feet high.

Planner Hage said currently our regulations allow for anywhere from eight to twelve feet in height.

Vice-Chairman Wagner asked from where it was measured.

Planner Hage said it is from the average surrounding grade.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said so it is half the berm.

Planner Hage also noted that signs over eight feet tall have a reduced area. Specifically, for every foot over eight feet, the allowed sign area of 45 square feet is reduced by $3\frac{3}{4}$ square feet.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said if you are going to allow them to go twelve foot sign then allow them to go twelve feet, setback five feet from the road. He said he would suggest that every one of these projects that comes to the Village, the Plan Commission see the sign and make some type of a judgement to the owner.

Chairman Kopp said that he agreed with him until his last point.

Planner Hage said we that we have talked about variations and whether we want to entertain [sign] variations. The consensus was that, no, we do not want to entertain sign variations and part of not doing that is making sure that we allow enough latitude for signage.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said he would propose that it be five feet back from the property line. It would be 50 square feet for the monument sign and the wall sign, allowing both but at an area not greater than those numbers for each, and a maximum of twelve feet high.

Planner Hage asked if the Commissioners had other thoughts.

Chairman Kopp said that it worked for him.

Commissioner DeSarto said there is a lot of latitude.

Planner Hage agreed and said that is what we want to give them. We do not want to dictate [signage], we want to give [business owners] the ability and tools to have good signage and let them fight it out with the landlord [as to how much signage tenants get]. Willowbrook Square tenants have had similar complaints. Their landlord inadequately uses their signage. We need to give them the tools and let them work it out with the landlord, so they can go back to their landlord and say here is what we can get for signage.

Commissioner Baker asked what they get.

Vice-Chairman Wagner answered they would get 50 square feet and 50 square feet more on the building.

Chairman Kopp said to Planner Hage that in her notes she mentioned that the wall sign could have a maximum of 100 square feet and we are splitting that in half, but there could be people that would want a 100 square foot sign.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said that is a ten by ten sign if you make it square.

Chairman Kopp clarified that staff is saying that they cannot have that, they can only have 50.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said that he suggested 50 or 45. Sara suggested 100.

Planner Hage asked for clarification that Vice-Chairman Wagner suggested 50 and now Chairman Kopp is suggesting that maybe we want to go more than 50.

Chairman Kopp asked how this relates to the retail signage that we are giving people.

Planner Hage said keep in mind that retail signage up to this point has been limited to 120 square feet [of signage] for most businesses. They have been allocated at a rate of one square foot per foot of lot width. Business park uses, including our light industrial uses, get half of square foot, so if they have 100 feet of lot width, they would only get a 50 foot wall sign under the current rate. We advocated changing that to one square foot at a rate similar to our current [retail] wall sign allowance. We said up to a max of 100 square feet for the wall sign. The Buffalo Wild Wings sign that you just approved, which is being installed today, that sign that is over the canopy area was 80 square feet.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said let me ask for a specific example and I have one in my mind. 75th Street, just east of Route 83, on the south side of the street there is a commercial strip building

that appears to have been divided into twenty or twenty-five foot fronts that look like it was an office warehouse and it seems like it is turning into retail. There is a golf store there that has 25 lineal feet of building frontage. What would this do for them?

Planner Hage said let's say they have a 30 foot wide unit, they get ½ a square foot for each foot of width. Planner Hage said they could have up to a max of 15 square feet of signage.

Vice-Chairman Wagner asked what would happen if we changed it to 100 square feet. Now is that divided by all the tenants?

Planner Hage said our provisions break it down into if it is a single-story, multi-tenant building, like Woodland Park, then you can have that brand name on the building. Each individual tenant gets an allocation for their individual spaces. For the Darco building, they could, if they wanted to, brand themselves as "The Darco Building", and put that on 50 square feet of signage or 100 square feet of signage based on their lot area and lot width. They could have that wall sign that says The Darco Building and then their individual tenants could also have their signs. Currently it is 15 square feet max, we are advocating that be increased to 30 square feet going for one square foot per one lineal foot and lifting the max to 30.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said that seems to be a separate question but it is an important part of the question. What is the point of giving them the ability to put up 100 square feet of sign on the building that says The Darco Building? What is the purpose there? I do not see one and that is why I have trouble going to 100 square feet.

Chairman Kopp said he would not give them better treatment. The Town Center logo on the monument sign, does that count against their sign area? If they were to put that logo on the building, would that count against the signage or could they even do it?

Planner Hage said we have not run into it because generally they are associated with a business name. So in the retail world we have not seen that issue.

Chairman Kopp said he agrees with Vice-Chairman Wagner there is no reason to double the wall signage for multi-tenant buildings. I think it should all count together.

Planner Hage said Woodland Park or the Donnelly building are known by their building names. The Donnelly building could have an identifying sign if the property owner wanted.

Chairman Kopp asked is that a multi-tenant building.

Planner Hage answered yes it is and those tenant units are not visible from the street. The Darco building, by all accounts, is so out of wack with our zoning, it is not the best example, it is not conforming in so many ways, but we have businesses like Willowbrook Court, there are three buildings there. We have the Donnelly building, we have Woodland Park, we have the office park on Route 83. Those are all places that could benefit from both individual tenant signs indicating where a business is once you are in there and then a larger brand sign.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said he agreed with what she said and understood why she said that but the reason he brought up that other building was this sign ordinance will affect them and allow

them to do a great deal more than what they have today. He doesn't see it resolving a tenant issue. There is no benefit to the tenants.

Chairman Kopp said you are talking about expanding each individual tenant sign, the sign above the tenant spaces.

Vice-Chairman Wagner that is one of the things we are talking about, but we were also saying that you have "x" amount of square feet of monument sign for the multi-tenant building and you have the choice to either put it here or there. Now we are saying you get both and it is "x" square feet here and it is "x" square feet here and that has nothing to do with the tenants.

Chairman Kopp said that whoever owns that building could give their big wall sign to Donnelly if they wanted to.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said there are two rules here. There is the rule that says I can put up ½ square foot for every foot of my frontage and on top of the Darco building he could put up 100 square feet as an additional sign that had never been allowed before to identify the building.

Chairman Kopp said just as we do not want to make the rules too loose based on one particular case we do not want to make them too restrictive based on one building.

Vice-Chairman Wagner answered that he is just trying to pick an example in his own mind to see what effect it has on a building that does not have a sign today. In other words, Turtle Wax can put 45 square feet out on the street and we are suggesting now that they could put somewhere between 45 and 100 additional square feet on the building that says Turtle Wax or maybe it is just a big picture of a turtle. They are not even allowed to do that today, but in the case of Turtle Wax they are the only people in that building. So what is the point of giving a multi-tenant building the ability to put up 100 square feet on top of the building that really does not benefit anybody but the developer?

Planner Hage answered that is exactly the point. For example, Woodland Park could be identified by their brand. Does that mean that every building that can do that will? Willowbrook Town Center could pick some area and put up a [shopping center name or logo] sign, but they are taking away from their other tenants. I do see your point, that we are creating too much sign opportunity for the businesses.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said he does not see any benefit to anybody to have another 50 to 100 square feet of signage on the building that is not visible from the street in many cases.

Chairman Kopp said keep in mind what neighborhoods these are in. Turtle Wax and Darco are not next to houses, they are not at all residential.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said he disagreed.

Chairman Kopp said he does not have a problem with giving Darco the ability to have extra signage if he wants it.

Commissioner Heery said he doesn't think that it has to be blaring. Whether it is residential or industrial, it is still Willowbrook.

Chairman Kopp said we cannot dictate taste.

Commissioner DelSarto said our focus is trying to get additional signage for each individual tenant.

Chairman Kopp said he thinks the focus is to help the community. So you are saying that helping a landlord promote Woodland Park is not helping the community. They all seem to think it is very important.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said in some examples that is important because the development has become recognized by that name. But in so many of the examples that come to us, even in the community I live in, I did not recognize Woodland Plaza as being this location. So clearly the name to me has not become important because I am not related to it in some manner. When you have branded things like Turtle Wax, for example, most of us know what that is and recognize the logo first and the name second. In a multi-tenant building, I do not think that we help it. I do not have any problem with the one for one increase for the tenant sign, but I would recommend that we only go 50 feet for the wall sign and 50 feet for the ground sign since that seems to have been a number that was used elsewhere in the village.

Planner Hage said you could, if you want to split hairs a little bit more. Do as you suggested but if it is a single tenant you can go to 100.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said it seems to be that is exactly opposite of what we should be doing. If it is a single tenant operator he has two signs, one on the ground and one on the building that says Turtle Wax. Everybody knows it is Turtle Wax. Now we have a multi-tenant building with numerous tenants and there are three buildings, none of which are hardly visible from the street and they are looking for identity. It is exactly opposite and it goes along with the shopping center that the biggest guy gets the top of the sign. The little guy needs to have more information.

Chairman Kopp said to Vice-Chairman Wagner that he just did not agree with him. He did not see, with a facility as big as Turtle Wax, limiting them to a 50 foot sign.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said he does not necessarily want to limit Turtle Wax, but does not want that building to have 100 square feet it is completely unnecessary.

Chairman Kopp said he liked Sara's solution.

Vice-Chairman Wagner asked how it is defined that it is a single tenant.

Planner Hage said we have single-tenant and multi-tenant.

Vice-Chairman Wagner asked if the Turtle Wax building could be split.

Chairman Kopp said if it was then Turtle Wax would have to change the sign.

Planner Hage said it is somewhat based on use.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said it is based on use not zoning.

Planner Hage said Turtle Wax can say they are splitting up the building and lease half of it to someone else and that other business comes in and says we want a sign. Well then, they each get half.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said so you are going to say to Turtle Wax take your sign down and cut it in half and allow your other tenant to put up the other half of your sign. And you would enforce that?

Planner Hage said that the business wouldn't get the permit until the other is down.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said he had no problem with that.

Chairman Kopp said could you state it again.

Planner Hage said in a multi-tenant building they can have 50 square feet dedicated to a center's identity and one to one up to 30 square feet for the individual tenant (whatever that number is 15 or 30 at a 1 to 1) and if it is a single-tenant they get 100 square feet plus their monument sign.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said he does not have any objection to that at all and thinks we should vote on it and do it. What he doesn't think it does is resolve much of Woodland Park but it is the developer that is not taking advantage of the sign. Not us.

Planner Hage said what she heard was for the individual signs.

Chairman Kopp said if we are doubling the ratio we should double the maximum sign size.

Planner Hage said the maximum is 15 square feet right now.

Chairman Kopp said 30.

The Commissioners agreed.

Vice-Chairman Wagner said there are so many extra clauses in this. Give them the 30 square feet and give them the square footage and say here is the box you can put your sign in.

Planner Hage stated that was the last of the sign discussion items.

6. VISITOR'S BUSINESS

None.

7. COMMUNICATIONS

Planner Hage said we are publishing the schedule for the 2010 meetings and the last several meetings we have met at 7:00. Do you want to keep the 7:00 meeting time or would you rather meet at 7:30. The Commissioners all agreed on 7:00 for the 2010 meetings.

Planner Hage reported we have a new village logo. You will start to see that on letterhead coming out of the village.

Planner Hage said there are banners commemorating the 50th Anniversary. The banners are on the light poles throughout town. They were paid for by the anniversary committee. January 17th there will be a birthday bash and open house here in the Village Hall. You will receive notices in the mail.

Planner Hage said that concludes all of our sign discussions. What we will aim for in January is to bring back the whole sign package to the Commissioners with some highlights and then in February we will have a public hearing. In between that time, we will share it with the Chamber and get some feedback. After we get through the sign ordinance, we are going to continue going through the rest of the zoning ordinance. One of the things that we talked about is the alternative setback that states a specific setback for a building, whether it is 50 feet or 70 feet, but if your neighborhood is already built, you can use the average of all the homes on your block .

Lastly, Planner Hage reported that the new website is up and is hopefully easier to use and find things.

8. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Made by Commissioner Heery, seconded by Commissioner DeSarto, to adjourn the regular meeting of the Plan Commission at the hour of 9:00 p.m.

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE

MOTION DECLARED CARRIED

PRESENTED, READ AND APPROVED,

_____, 2009

Minutes transcribed by Joanne Prible.

Chairman