

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLAN COMMISSION HELD ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 3, 2010, 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 Robert DelSarto, Joseph Heery, James Baker, James Soukup Vice-Chairman Wagner and Chairman Kopp. Also present were Planner Sara Hage, Director of Municipal Services Tim Halik and Secretary Joanne Prible. ABSENT: William Remkus.

3. OMNIBUS VOTE AGENDA

The items on the Omnibus Vote Agenda were as follows:

- a. Waive Reading of Minutes (APPROVE)
- b. Minutes – Regular Meeting February 3, 2010 (APPROVE)
- c. Minutes – Village Board Meetings – January 25 and February 8, 2010 (RECEIVE)

MOTION: Made by Commissioner Soukup seconded by Commissioner DelSarto, to approve the Omnibus Vote Agenda.

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE

MOTION DECLARED CARRIED

4. PLAN COMMISSION CONSIDERATION – Zoning Hearing Case 10-01: Amendments to Title 9, Section 11: Signs (CONTINUED FROM 2/3/10)

PUBLIC HEARING

REFER TO THE ENCLOSED COURT REPORTER MINUTES.

MOTION: Made by Vice-Chairman Wagner seconded by Commissioner Soukup, to adopt the rules of procedure.

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE

MOTION DECLARED CARRIED

Chairman Kopp said we will continue this matter to the April Plan Commission Meeting.

5. VISITOR'S BUSINESS

None.

6. COMMUNICATIONS

None.

7. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Made by Commissioner DelSarto, seconded by Commissioner Soukup, to adjourn the regular meeting of the Plan Commission at the hour of 9:15 p.m.

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE

MOTION DECLARED CARRIED

PRESENTED, READ AND APPROVED,

May 5, 2010

Minutes transcribed by Joanne Prible.


Chairman

VILLAGE OF WILLOWBROOK

ORIGINAL

PUBLIC HEARING

ZONING HEARING CASE NUMBER 10-3

CONTINUED REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS at the
hearing of the above-entitled matter, taken before
KIMBERLEE A. ELLIOTT, a Certified Shorthand Reporter
and Notary Public within and for the County of Kane and
State of Illinois, at 7760 Quincy Street, Willowbrook,
Illinois, on the 3rd day of March, 2010, at the hour of
7:12 p.m.

PRESENT:

Daniel J. Kopp;

Joseph Heery;

James F. Baker;

John Wagner;

James Soukup;

Robert Del Sarto;

Sara A. Hage, Village Planner

Timothy J. Halik, Director of Municipal Services

Joanne Prible, Recording Secretary

1 CHAIRMAN KOPP: I call to order the March 3,
2 2010 meeting of the Planning Commission of Willowbrook
3 and ask the plan commission secretary to call the roll.

4 MS. PRIBLE: Commissioner Del Sarto.

5 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: Here.

6 MS. PRIBLE: Commissioner Remkus is absent.
7 Commissioner Soukup.

8 COMMISSIONER SOUKUP: Here.

9 MS. PRIBLE: Vice Chairman Wagner.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Here.

11 MS. PRIBLE: Commissioner Heery.

12 COMMISSIONER HEERY: Here.

13 MS. PRIBLE: Commissioner Baker.

14 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Here.

15 MS. PRIBLE: Chairman Kopp.

16 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Here.

17 MS. PRIBLE: Planner Sara Hage.

18 MS. HAGE: Here.

19 MS. PRIBLE: Director of Municipal Services Tim
20 Halik.

21 MR. HALIK: Here.

22

23 * * * *

24

1 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Next item is the continuation of
2 a public hearing of the zoning hearing 10-03 for
3 amendment to Title 9 Section-11. This is a
4 continuation of a public hearing of the plan commission
5 of the Village of Willowbrook convened for the purpose
6 of considering the post amendments (inaudible) section
7 (inaudible) Section 11 of the municipal code.

8 Public hearing 10-03 was originally
9 opened on February 3, 2010 and continued to tonight's
10 meeting.

11 Notice of the public hearing of the
12 matter to be considered was published in The Doings on
13 January 14th, 2010.

14 At this time I would ask the plan
15 commission to consider rules of procedure for
16 continuing this evening's public hearing in further
17 consideration of this matter. A copy of such rules has
18 previously been provided to each of you.

19 Would someone make the motion to
20 consider the rules.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: So moved.

22 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Second?

23 COMMISSIONER SOUKUP: Second.

24 CHAIRMAN KOPP: All in favor say aye.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN KOPP: Opposed say nay.

VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Nay. I'm sorry. I apologize.

CHAIRMAN KOPP: That motion carries. Is the staff ready to present the case?

MS. HAGE: Yes. Thank you very much, Chairman Kopp. So as you said, we're just going to pick up --

S A R A H A G E,

having been first duly sworn, by the Notary, was examined and testified as follows:

MS. HAGE: In any case, we're continuing our discussion from last month in which we opened the public hearing and discussed at great length signage within the village and since that time, there have been two things that I wanted to share with you.

One of which was highlighted in the packets that you sent out. Chairman Kopp had sent some minor changes to the language of the text and those were incorporated into what you received. I believe they were on pages three and four and they were incorporated into the text so minor but we can detail

1 those if you like.

2 Secondly, we've also had since that
3 time, we've had a request from one of our businesses
4 specifically Jucio (phonetic) to consider further
5 opening the illuminated window signage regulations to
6 allow a corner business to have two illuminated window
7 signs on separate facades so they could have one facing
8 the parking lot and one facing Route 83.

9 So you know, I raise that point for
10 your discussion and depending on how you wanted to go,
11 I have provided some suggested language on this sheet
12 here and it's highlighted in yellow so that is
13 something for you to consider and I'd ask that I guess
14 that you discuss this before we move on to some of
15 Woodland Park --

16 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Is that the Wings?

17 MS. HAGE: No, it's Jucio. It's the breakfast
18 and --

19 COMMISSIONER BAKER: They have this and this.

20 MS. HAGE: Yes, two facades.

21 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Yes.

22 MS. HAGE: Yes. There is an eastern facade and
23 a northern facade which goes towards the parking lot.
24 The east goes towards the drive in to Lake Hinsdale and

1 Route 83.

2 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: Is this going to open
3 up some sort of discussion with other businesses who
4 then want to hold signs on each end or whatever?

5 MS. HAGE: Well, I think it would be open to --
6 open up the discussion I think it's either is provided
7 to all corner business or it's not. You know, not just
8 Jucio with that shopping center.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: What is the definition of
10 the corner, though? Jucios isn't really a corner.
11 It's the end of a building.

12 MS. HAGE: Well, we actually define it as
13 business site frontage which is your facade faces a
14 primary pedestrian entrance, parking entrance or access
15 drive. So it's not a building rear and it's also
16 adjacent to a street so that is what qualifies them.
17 That end of the unit is facing towards a street or a
18 drive where people can park and it's the same thing
19 that, you know, would apply to Staples.

20 CHAIRMAN KOPP: There is dozens of locations
21 pretty much.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Yeah, the end of every.

23 CHAIRMAN KOPP: End of every shopping center
24 would have at least two.

1 MR. HALIK: As a caveat I believe the request
2 was that if you have store front glazing on the
3 exterior corner, then the request was to display a
4 sign. Obviously if it was a brick wall like Staples,
5 they couldn't put an open sign on that side.

6 MS. HAGE: Right. These are illuminated window
7 signs so maximum of four square feet so.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: That's the distinction
9 that it's a window with glazing.

10 MS. HAGE: Yes, that is how we decided that
11 illuminated window signs go in a window.

12 MR. HALIK: Correct.

13 MS. HAGE: And it counts toward the overall
14 window signage that we allow.

15 COMMISSIONER HEERY: It would be like Panera,
16 Starbuck's, Chipotle.

17 MS. HAGE: Yes.

18 COMMISSIONER HEERY: And on and on and on.

19 MS. HAGE: Yes.

20 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Other bank out lots.

21 MS. HAGE: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN KOPP: (Inaudible) they only have two,
23 they would have four.

24 MS. HAGE: Right. Yes. I think what I wrote in

1 as a suggestion was a maximum of the two. So if you
2 had circulation around four sides like Panera or like
3 one of the banks, you would only have two signs.

4 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Well, I don't object. I don't
5 know if anybody else here does object.

6 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Seems obvious to have two
7 signs.

8 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: I don't know if it's
9 needed but right now he is operated forever with one
10 sign or maybe no signs at all.

11 MS. HAGE: Well, he just opened, Jucio did.

12 MR. HALIK: On holidays.

13 MS. HAGE: I'm not sure if they have an
14 illuminated window sign already, probably not.

15 MR. HALIK: Not sure.

16 MS. HAGE: Given that they just opened while
17 this was all influx, it's possible that they have an
18 open sign.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: I just drove by the front
20 of that building and I don't, does the east elevation
21 facing Route 83 have the big sign on the building and
22 everything, too?

23 MS. HAGE: Yes, it does.

24 COMMISSIONER BAKER: I will be looking at signs

1 for the rest of my life.

2 MS. HAGE: Hopefully that's a long time.

3 CHAIRMAN KOPP: I guess I have no objection.

4 Does anybody object?

5 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: Well, I don't think
6 it's necessary but I'm not going to.

7 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Sounds like a consensus. The
8 consensus says that that would be okay.

9 MS. HAGE: Okay. So just as a note, I normally
10 include in the staff report recommended motion and so
11 that if you do make a vote this evening, you would
12 reference the amendment language provided in the report
13 and also as amended per your direction so.

14 Okay. Moving on to Woodland Park, I
15 provided to you this evening on the dais an
16 illustration that was provided by representatives of
17 Woodland Park sort of a second go at their signage and
18 a revision to what was included in your packets and for
19 just discussion purposes, I did calculate the area
20 total so you can have an idea what that was which as
21 shown in this drawing comes to 68 square feet a side
22 and then 136 square feet overall.

23 As a second reference, I am also
24 providing to you an elevation, a permit drawing of what

1 their current signage is.

2 Mr. McNaughton did inform me it's been
3 slightly changed although the mast head is the same.
4 So they haven't changed that. They just changed the
5 supporting structure and the overall height.

6 So I know that we went into great, a
7 very long discussion with Woodland Park before and you
8 had requested additional information from them on what
9 kind of signage they had in mind so with that, I just
10 would like to open it up for discussion.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Maybe before you do it,
12 it would be helpful to me you can you tell me what
13 pages in our code amendment apply to this and --

14 MS. HAGE: Yes. This would be Page 21 is the
15 start of the LOP LOR signs and specifically at the
16 bottom of Page 22 under Item 4 is the language for free
17 standing sign or ground sign and that continues onto
18 the next page where it specifies that this sign area
19 shall not exceed 50 square feet.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: And the height which we
21 talked and discussed increasing to 12 feet, where are
22 we measuring that from because this is essentially on a
23 berm today but I believe we allowed this to go move
24 forward toward the street more. Isn't that what we

1 allowed it to get closer to the street and now it's in
2 a flat area before the berm.

3 COMMISSIONER BAKER: It's not moved yet.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: No, no. I'm suggesting
5 if they took advantage of that, where are we measuring
6 that height from.

7 MS. HAGE: Well, first let me say and Tim can
8 correct me but from the permit drawings, the leading
9 edge of the sign so if you're looking at the left edge
10 for all intents and purposes. The street is on the
11 left. The leading edge is four feet from the property
12 line which under our amendment it would actually need
13 to be five feet from the property line but again, there
14 is a leading edge so this is projecting quite a bit.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Umm-umm.

16 MR. HALIK: Correct. With regard to height, the
17 sign ordinance clearly states that the sign height
18 shall be taken from average surrounding grade to the
19 highest point of the sign.

20 So in the case of earth and berm,
21 that's not average surrounding grade. That is
22 manipulated grade. -So the height of the sign is taken
23 at the base of that berm to the top of the sign.

24 In this case, the sign is on top of

1 the berm. So in actuality, if the full height of the
2 sign is seven feet, four foot earth and berm -- I'm
3 sorry, three foot earth and berm, four foot high sign.

4 However, in calculating the required
5 setback, we did not take into account the height of the
6 earth and berm. We merely took into account the height
7 of the sign. Therefore the setback was only four feet
8 required instead of seven.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: So in this particular
10 case, it's might be, it's similar to the elevation of
11 the sidewalk approximately.

12 MR. HALIK: Correct.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: So the berm could be
14 there or not be there in relationship to the height of
15 the sign.

16 MR. HALIK: Correct. The thought being if a
17 developer put a six foot high berm --

18 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Right. Now it's 18.

19 MR. HALIK: They then put a seven foot high sign
20 on top of six foot berm.

21 MS. HAGE: And that would continue to be true.
22 It's not changed.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: We are saying it could be
24 12 feet high from essentially the height of the

1 sidewalk.

2 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Got to be able to see it
3 down to the Loop.

4 MS. HAGE: So if you're looking at the
5 illustration that was provided to you tonight, that
6 shows it as a 12 foot high sign. That does not account
7 for the berm height that you would deduct.

8 COMMISSIONER HEERY: Are you saying 16 or are
9 you saying eight?

10 MS. HAGE: Nine.

11 MR. HALIK: Nine.

12 COMMISSIONER HEERY: Okay.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: In other words, you're
14 saying the bottom three feet of the sign is obstructed
15 by the berm.

16 MR. HALIK: Correct.

17 MS. HAGE: Correct.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Or is partially
19 obstructed by the berm depending on where the berm
20 starts.

21 MS. HAGE: Correct.

22 COMMISSIONER BAKER: How about the bushes, the
23 bushes are in front of the sign.

24 MS. HAGE: They do have some --

1 MR. HALIK: They used to be.

2 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Oh, they're gone?

3 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: I think they got trimmed.

4 MR. MC NAUGHTON: My name is Bill McNaughton.

5 Do I have to be sworn in?

6

7 B I L L M C N A U G H T O N ,
8 having been first duly sworn, by the Notary, was
9 examined and testified as follows:

10

11 MR. MC NAUGHTON: We recently the end of 2008
12 removed a significant amount of shrubbery around the
13 sign because even at street level which we'll call it
14 our average grade or sidewalk level, these shrubs that
15 were installed ten years ago were higher. They got to
16 about eight foot high even though they were trimmed.
17 They were trimmed like barrels every year but tops just
18 kept growing therefore those were completely removed.

19 They were replaced with more of a
20 daylily or a lower growing shrub to keep the same bed.
21 That went up the berm basically and then it's around
22 the sign as well.

23 I guess I'll expand upon that
24 depending on what the sign ordinance change that you

1 all decide, we would probably if we go forward with
2 changing the sign itself, we would go forward in kind
3 of redesigning that front entry.

4 We still have to the south of the sign
5 a lot of leftover shrubs and trees that are
6 significantly over, you know, taller than they really
7 should be and we would probably want to do more of that
8 low growing plant material coming from the west as well
9 as coming from the east and keeping that so that we can
10 get a better view when people are driving down
11 Plainfield Road.

12 It's really wooded I guess now would
13 be a good way to put it and I think it's distracting
14 from the sign itself.

15 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: Sara, are they
16 obligated to have vegetation or plants in the front
17 with their original subdivision plat?

18 MS. HAGE: Yes.

19 MR. MC NAUGHTON: What we did when we removed
20 certain shrubbery, we also removed some island trees.
21 We worked with the village and Mr. Halik and we
22 replaced on the property basically the same type.

23 If it was a three inch tree, we
24 replaced a new three inch tree. If it was an

1 evergreen, we replaced another evergreen somewhere else
2 on the property. That was all done through the
3 village.

4 So yeah, we do have to kind of hold to
5 what was originally approved, the amount of vegetation
6 and landscape ten years ago when it was built I guess
7 you have to keep, we kind of kept that the same just in
8 a different location.

9 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: That didn't make much
10 sense to give you a bigger sign and plant some bushes
11 in front of it. That's what I was trying to, if it was
12 mandatory to do that.

13 MR. MC NAUGHTON: A lot of what was planted was
14 a ground cover type. We didn't want to lose that
15 planting area so the type of vegetation that is now in
16 front of the sign where we would kind of also grow upon
17 that with some of the other bushes and stuff that's
18 typically no more than a foot high at its full bloom
19 and it's also could be trimmed back. There is some
20 grasses that can stay very low which typically is below
21 the height of the light per se which is about a foot
22 above the ground.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Is this our drawing, your
24 drawing?

1 MS. HAGE: No, it is their drawing and I
2 annotated it with the approximate square footages on
3 the right.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: One says, the top one
5 says 20. The second one says 20 and then to the right
6 of that it says 10 and 20, 20 square feet in blue right
7 here.

8 MS. HAGE: Yes. So 20 square feet is the
9 rectangle around that component.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: The Woodland Park?

11 MS. HAGE: Correct.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: And then why does it say
13 10?

14 MS. HAGE: It says 20 below it.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: It says 20 in red and it
16 says 10 in blue.

17 MS. HAGE: Oh, you have my copy.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Oh.

19 MS. HAGE: I'm like those are my notes, I'm
20 sorry.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: I got the answer sheet.

22 MS. HAGE: Sorry.

23 COMMISSIONER BAKER: What's next?

24 MS. HAGE: The reason that I wrote that was

1 actually to note that the trees that they incorporate
2 is eating up ten square feet of signage.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Okay. This totals
4 68 square feet according to what's on this print.

5 MS. HAGE: Yes.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Didn't we limit this to
7 50?

8 MS. HAGE: Yes.

9 CHAIRMAN KOPP: And that's the concern.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: That's the crux. They
11 are allowed 50 per side.

12 MS. HAGE: 50 total 25 per side.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Oh, 25 per side.

14 CHAIRMAN KOPP: This has been going on so long I
15 can't remember the history. We doubled every number in
16 C1 there except that number we just went 45 to 50. Did
17 we discuss it? Was there a rationale.

18 MS. HAGE: Well, the allowance for the wall
19 signage really doubled from one half to one. The 45,
20 you know, before things were lumped together and it was
21 half a square foot for each one linear foot.

22 Most of our lots are for argument sake
23 are 100 feet so at a half a square foot for 100 foot
24 lot, you're never going to, you're always over

1 45 square feet. You know, you would be at 50 at a
2 minimum so it seems somewhat illogical to have that
3 threshold be 45 square feet if you're giving people
4 half a square foot for their 100 foot lot.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: I remember that part of
6 the discussion as it relates to wall signs.

7 MS. HAGE: Well, when we split the two, we made
8 that monument sign conform with the general logic of
9 half a square foot to a 100 foot lot to 50 square feet,
10 and that's where we, we were a little bit more
11 conservative. So just leaving the monument sign as is
12 but allowing the additional option for there to be a
13 wall sign.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: So today's suggested rule
15 that we've come up with so far is that you're allowed
16 50 square feet of signage in total and that is divided
17 by two because it's a two sided sign?

18 MS. HAGE: Right. That's how all of our
19 monument signage regulations, for example --

20 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: So just so I'm on the
21 right page, then we would allow on this side of the
22 sign 25 square feet as proposed and they're at 68?

23 MS. HAGE: Correct.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Okay. And do we know how

1 many square feet this one was?

2 MS. HAGE: They're at 45 from reviewing.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Well, this must meet our
4 ordinance so it's probably 45 square feet.

5 MS. HAGE: Yeah, and they have slightly revised
6 it to add some elements below.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: But then so on this one
8 surface, it would be --

9 MR. HALIK: 22.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: (Continuing) -- 22 and a
11 half square feet if they met the maximum.

12 MR. HALIK: Existing sign is 22 square feet per
13 side so it's 44.

14 MS. HAGE: And I think they may have added that
15 six square feet or you said 44, sorry, yeah.

16 CHAIRMAN KOPP: I'm sorry, being dense here, I
17 still don't recall so we said, remember we wanted
18 people to be able to have a wall sign and a monument
19 sign.

20 MS. HAGE: Right.

21 CHAIRMAN KOPP: So with C1A, we doubled all
22 those so that people could have each one of these
23 because we didn't make sense to give somebody a wall
24 sign and say then you have to pay half your monument

1 sign.

2 MS. HAGE: Well, we separated them.

3 MR. HALIK: I think initially the sign ordinance
4 gave an area for both the wall sign and a free standing
5 sign.

6 CHAIRMAN KOPP: I think it had to be either/or.

7 MR. HALIK: It's still deducted it from the
8 original allotted area. In your amendments, if you
9 noted C4, you've now added 50 square feet in addition
10 to what's permitted for a wall sign so I think that's
11 where the --

12 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Right. We thought we
13 were making great gains in giving them the ability to
14 put something on the building and then it was much
15 bigger than what they currently could do.

16 MS. HAGE: Right.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: We thought that that was
18 a large stride and then were doing it.

19 MS. HAGE: Yes.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: But what's not making
21 sense to me at the moment I was presuming that this was
22 50 feet per side.

23 MS. HAGE: Okay.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: And apparently I'm

1 already doubling something that we not put in the code
2 here or even suggested.

3 CHAIRMAN KOPP: We'll let you guys speak later
4 on.

5 MS. HAGE: We did not suggest a significant
6 increase to the monument signage just the five, adding
7 an additional five square feet to round that out at 50
8 which made a little more sense just relative to lot
9 width but then the bonus was allowing for that wall
10 sign.

11 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Maybe I'm jumping ahead, how
12 many areas in the village do we have that fit this
13 zoning classification?

14 MS. HAGE: Multiple. In addition to this, there
15 would be the office, the medical office park at 67th
16 and Kingery. There is the Chase Bank property.

17 MR. HALIK: Much of the Willowbrook Center
18 Corporate Center, Turtle Wax.

19 CHAIRMAN KOPP: These are all very commercial
20 areas. They're not --

21 MR. HALIK: Industrial.

22 CHAIRMAN KOPP: There is residential behind some
23 of these areas.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: In the case of this one,

1 there is residential across the street.

2 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Okay. Six lanes across the
3 street.

4 MS. HAGE: Between Adams and Madison actually.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Right. Wasn't part of
6 this discussion about Turtle Wax that we had?

7 MS. HAGE: Yes.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: And the fact that we were
9 talking about their sign and how small it was for their
10 corporate headquarters and so that all got into the
11 discussion of this 50 square feet on the building.

12 MS. HAGE: Having wall signage on the building.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Right, because they only
14 had the ground sign.

15 MS. HAGE: Correct, and that is where it all
16 started, that they wanted a wall sign in addition to
17 what was on the ground.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: And that's where all this
19 discussion increasing and separating the ground sign
20 from the wall sign and increasing the size of the wall
21 sign, that's where that discussion all was started
22 from.

23 MS. HAGE: Correct. Correct. So it wasn't, you
24 know, when this discussion started, it wasn't an issue

1 that there was insufficient monument signage, and I
2 believe if I recall the discussions within this room
3 were not, didn't raise the small amount of monument
4 signage as an issue from you.

5 I'm not discounting your perspective
6 or the information that you brought but when we started
7 this discussion in May of last year, it wasn't an issue
8 on the table.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: No. It seemed to me the
10 issue was, though, the square footage of the wall
11 sign --

12 MS. HAGE: Correct.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: And the fact that it was
14 combined with the monument sign total and that's why we
15 discussed separating them.

16 MS. HAGE: Correct.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: And then we looked
18 specifically at the wall sign to increase it.

19 MS. HAGE: Correct.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Were you done?

21 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Yes.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: One other question, on
23 the existing Woodland Park sign where the permit
24 drawing there is the area which is I guess I will call

1 the pedestal. It's labeled as the cedar box.

2 MS. HAGE: Umm-umm.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: That's not counted in the
4 area of the sign, is that correct?

5 MS. HAGE: Correct.

6 CHAIRMAN KOPP: So with this one oh, because you
7 didn't count this either then?

8 MS. HAGE: No, I did not.

9 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Got it.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: So what is labeled as
11 their first four feet of this example isn't counted in
12 the square footage.

13 MS. HAGE: No, it is not.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: And you're still at
15 68 square feet.

16 MS. HAGE: Correct.

17 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: On each side?

18 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Does it make sense so we say
20 that the sign can be 12 feet high. Does it make sense
21 to say a sign can be 12 feet high but then without a
22 much bigger number, it's just going to be floating, the
23 sign face is just going to be floating at the top.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Doesn't it almost force

1 them to put this, it almost forces them to take that
2 sign under our current number and put this on a post.

3 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Yes.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Sticking it up in the air
5 12 feet.

6 CHAIRMAN KOPP: I certainly think we need to
7 have some relief here. I think 50 needs to be
8 increased.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: I certainly wouldn't want
10 to be give a number to the code and not think through
11 what this will force it to look like.

12 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Right, I agree.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Because the last thing I
14 want to do is have a sign like Woodland Park currently
15 has 12 feet high because --

16 CHAIRMAN KOPP: It would be this.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Sticking it on a post to
18 get it up on in the air. That's contrary to what we
19 have been doing for years in trying to lower these
20 signs and make them ground signs. I mean it reminds me
21 of the old gas station signs to think about it, the
22 single post with the big whatever.

23 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: Well, our obligation is
24 actually to come up with square footage and give them

1 latitude. It's not our obligation to design this sign
2 which sometimes we seem to be trying to do.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: No.

4 CHAIRMAN KOPP: What we are saying though is
5 does it, what I am saying, I think Commissioner Wagner
6 agrees, does it make sense to say to act like we're
7 giving them a benefit that they can raise the sign 12
8 feet but then all we are ending up doing is they are
9 not getting anymore information. They are not putting
10 anymore information on the sign. They are just making
11 the current sign more visible.

12 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: Stick out, whatever.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: And my concern was
14 because of our rules and giving them the height but not
15 giving them the square footage on the face of the sign,
16 someone could take advantage of that and I think
17 inappropriately and essentially raise the top of that
18 sign up so that it's up high in the air and supposedly
19 people will see it but yet it defeats the purpose of
20 having a ground monument sign altogether.

21 The last thing I want to do is get a
22 lot of signs high up off the ground.

23 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: How did we get to 12
24 feet high in the first place? I don't recall that.

1 MS. HAGE: 12 feet high is what's permitted but
2 anything over eight feet there is a penalty in your
3 sign area.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: You get less.

5 MS. HAGE: Correct. You deduct from your
6 permitted area. So that's the incentive to stay at
7 eight feet or under, we remove the penalty.

8 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: I guess that makes
9 sense.

10 MS. HAGE: I think Commissioner Wagner is
11 correct. It still sort of pulls you to the same
12 conclusion that you have on pylon signs.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: I would go as far as to
14 say that I don't think what we've done so far goes to
15 solve some of the issues in some of the signs that have
16 been discussed and specifically this one.

17 I would say my first reaction is that
18 this is far too big the way it's presented but in
19 relationship to what we currently have before us this
20 evening, I would say it would it -- it doesn't solve
21 any of this sign's problems today or the current sign I
22 should say.

23 Even though we said raising the height
24 of it and moving it more closer to the street or

1 allowing it to be slightly closer to the street was
2 going to help it, I don't think that's accomplished
3 what we were out to do.

4 MS. HAGE: Well, you could do two things, you
5 could change the language of the code to say one, that
6 it's a ground sign and add language to the definitions,
7 refine the definitions and we can speak that out to
8 more explicitly define ground sign and then you can
9 also raise that area.

10 We can also do additional study on it
11 to throw out different possibilities of what these all
12 might look like under different scenarios.

13 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Putting aside the size of this,
14 it does accomplish what we had talked about. It's got
15 the addresses and then it says what goes on it.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: The one thing that this
17 sign is doing which we also discussed as separate signs
18 which they currently have which also obstructs their
19 sign is the leasing issue signs but yet on this there's
20 12 square feet of essentially leasing information that
21 we're already allowing and I think it was up to
22 32 square feet which is essentially a four by eight
23 sheet of plywood or something.

24 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: That was based on

1 vacancies, wasn't it?

2 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: I think, yeah, it's based
3 on percentage of vacancy and I guess I came to the
4 conclusion that there's always a vacancy so there's
5 always going to be a leasing sign. So I don't know,
6 maybe it's more attractive to have the leasing
7 information here than a separate sign.

8 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Right now (inaudible) in the
9 letter.

10 MS. HAGE: Correct.

11 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: On this Section C
12 number seven, it says free standing or ground sign
13 shall not contain any advertisement other than the
14 business name and address, the enterprise, the building
15 name or the identity of building or a combination of
16 these. That's essentially an advertisement.

17 MR. HALIK: We'd have to amend that language to
18 allow for a lease sign on the (inaudible).

19 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Well, it seems to me -- I
20 don't know.

21 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: Again, we are trying to
22 design this one sign.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Well, no. I guess I was
24 going back to on every complex I've been by lately,

1 probably because of the economy, so forth, we're seeing
2 these large for lease signs on almost every property
3 and they never seem to go away.

4 My example at the time was the one at
5 Dominick's and 63rd and 83. That sign has been there
6 for five years plus.

7 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: Both sides of the
8 street.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Yes. But if you
10 eliminated the office suite section 12 square feet and
11 looked at what was left, you're still at 56 square feet
12 of signage on the one face which is even if we were to
13 say okay, well, allow 50 square feet on both sides,
14 we're still what would be on air.

15 I'm trying to figure out what the
16 dimensions of the pedestal would be in my mind if they
17 did 20 for Woodland Park, you'd have 30 left over and
18 if you're trying to maximize height, you choose some
19 width and get 30 square feet and the rest of it becomes
20 uncounted pedestal I guess.

21 MS. HAGE: Well, kind of going back to your
22 point of where would you count down area on this.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Umm-umm.

24 MS. HAGE: If they were to instead of make, have

1 Woodland Park extend off of the edges and eliminate the
2 trees, that would cut off 12 square feet of area
3 actually 14, no, 12 square feet.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Well, I suppose this
5 could lead to abuse but if you put a rectangle around
6 the word Woodland Park as what was counted and let's
7 say the rest of it doesn't count but it still has to
8 meet the 12 foot height, you get to say Woodland Park
9 in let's just say for the sake of discussion ten square
10 feet as opposed to the 20 that it's calculated because
11 of the trees and everything else and the larger
12 rectangle. I don't know where that would lead, though.

13 MS. HAGE: Well, that would open up a pretty
14 large can because that's how we calculate signage
15 village wide.

16 So you take I mean that's essentially
17 their logo and you take Buffalo Wild Wings and say I'm
18 not going to count the Buffalo, I'm just going to count
19 the words, that's a huge increase.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Right.

21 MS. HAGE: While it might appear minor here,
22 it's part of the overall equation.

23 Tim just mentioned there is also the
24 possibility like we did with shopping centers to exempt

1 the area given to the name of the development so in
2 this case Woodland Park, if it's under 15 percent of
3 the sign, total sign area or less, but if their
4 identity is driven as Woodland Park, is it realistic to
5 say that it would be under 15 percent or less so?

6 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Well, I guess that's my
7 question is then what's going to govern that at that
8 point because like you just said, if the Buffalo Wild
9 Wings logo didn't count, it seems to me you could have
10 a pretty huge logo and the sign is going to be very
11 large but yet it didn't count toward it.

12 It must be some, clearly the 12 feet
13 covers it but it seems to me at some point, you have to
14 limit some respect either by width or height or total
15 square footage of the area or something.

16 CHAIRMAN KOPP: I like that idea because it's
17 the same principle here as it is with the retailer.
18 The reason we did it with the retail is because we
19 wanted them to have room to put the tenant names on the
20 signs and it seems like that's the same principle here.

21 Unless any one of the commissioners
22 have any other comments, I was going to let our people
23 in the audience speak now.

24 MS. HAGE: Well, let me just kind of further get

1 into that real quick if you wouldn't mind. So if you
2 said 15 percent and it's a 50 square foot sign, that's
3 only seven and a half square feet dedicated to their
4 name for this sign and that's seven and a half square
5 feet total so both sides.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: That just doesn't work
7 because this is already at 20.

8 MS. HAGE: Right, on one side so total it's 40.
9 So you know but that changes. If you were of the mind
10 to increase the overall allowance to a hundred square
11 feet, then that's --

12 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: I guess my concern is you
13 tried now to accommodate the logo even if it has words
14 in it at 100 square feet, but then what if they chose
15 not to put that up there and went to the seven and a
16 half square feet and then maximized all this. In other
17 words, it could be abused in my opinion.

18 In other words, let's say they chose
19 to make Woodland Park really small so that they could
20 get 80 square feet in here. I mean it would seem to me
21 it defeats the purpose.

22 MS. HAGE: Well, keep in mind you're still
23 talking about two sides of the sign so it would be
24 40 square feet or 100 square feet total is 50 square

1 feet on each side.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Right.

3 MS. HAGE: So --

4 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: But in any case, 20 of it
5 was given to the logo.

6 MS. HAGE: Right.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Let's say they only went
8 with five for the logo so that they could get more over
9 here. It seems to me that we're saying on one hand,
10 let's not count it but it seems like if you just lump
11 it in with the total, it seems to me that it could get
12 abused.

13 CHAIRMAN KOPP: I'm not following you.

14 MS. HAGE: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN KOPP: If you use 15 percent as the
16 number and it was 100, they could have 15 square feet
17 for the logo and it wouldn't count towards the hundred.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Right. And I'm
19 suggesting that the 15 may need to be raised as a
20 percentage but I don't think we should combine the
21 exclusion and allowing it in the total.

22 I thought Sara was headed down the
23 road to say excluded it but yet count it in the total.

24 MS. HAGE: No, no, no, no. That's the exact

1 opposite. So if you exclude it, you get 50 square feet
2 plus seven and a half square feet and let's, I'm going
3 to assume that you're having a 100 square foot sign.
4 So you have 50 square feet of signage on one face plus
5 seven and a half square feet devoted to Woodland Park,
6 the title, and then the duplicate on the other side.
7 So the total would be 115 square feet and the 15 above
8 100 is a function of the 15 percent.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Okay. Then how could you
10 get the Woodland Park in that scenario into this sign
11 at 115 total square feet for both sides?

12 COMMISSIONER BAKER: That's not what she said.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: No, I know. I'm asking
14 the question.

15 CHAIRMAN KOPP: This one doesn't work. It would
16 have to be redesigned.

17 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: Have to redesign their
18 sign.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Where I am going with
20 this is the first seven and a half feet of this 20
21 would be excluded and the difference between the 20 and
22 the seven and a half would have to be gone to the total
23 allowed. Is that how you would deal with it?

24 MS. HAGE: We could do that. Yes. So that it's

1 really 115 if they're, I see what you're saying. Is it
2 really then 115 square feet divided by two?

3 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Right, because then --

4 MS. HAGE: Well --

5 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: You can't limit.

6 Shrinking this to seven and a half feet is not going to
7 solve the problem.

8 MS. HAGE: Sure. I understand that. Let me
9 explain when you look back to how we addressed the
10 shopping center --

11 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Umm-umm.

12 MS. HAGE: It's an exclusion. If you're under
13 15 percent, then it doesn't count. If you go above
14 15 percent, then it counts so that's their burden.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: All of it counts?

16 MS. HAGE: All of it counts. So it's their
17 burden to keep it under 15 percent or it's included.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: That sort of seems like
19 it's defeating the purpose here.

20 MR. HALIK: Can I also just clarify one point
21 that I heard Commissioner Heery make?

22 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Do you need to be sworn in, Tim?

23 MR. HALIK: Oh, thank you.

24

1 T I M H A L I K,

2 having been first duly sworn, by the Notary, was
3 examined and testified as follows:

4
5 MR. HALIK: With regard to the elevation in
6 front of you, the Woodland Park ID portion of the sign,
7 it's really near seven and a half feet if you remove
8 the green tree portion and maybe shrunk the overhang,
9 it would be eight by one so proportionality, it's
10 close. That was a good comment by Commissioner Heery.

11 COMMISSIONER HEERY: Thanks. Did you get that?

12 MS. HAGE: I mean it sounds like in one sense
13 you're moving towards, especially you Commissioner
14 Wagner, that a monument sign of 100 square feet might
15 be appropriate and while there aren't necessarily, you
16 know, this isn't permit ready, there's potential in
17 this to actually make it work. I mean they have to
18 make some changes for their own efficiency. If you
19 want them to get to 100, if it's possible that they can
20 do that.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: That's my concern. I'm
22 sort of headed in that direction. My initial reaction
23 was we'll simply double it from 50 to 100 because it's
24 now per side but when I start thinking about how big

1 this sign could potentially be, it's substantially
2 larger than what they have today because the lower
3 mounting area which isn't counted could be substantial
4 in its volume or visual log.

5 CHAIRMAN KOPP: We don't necessarily have to, we
6 can revisit the 12 feet issue. I mean if we're going
7 to double the size of the sign, then we can perhaps go
8 back to ten or eight or some other number.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Well, yeah, because then
10 we simply take, we have this the Woodland Park today.

11 MS. HAGE: Right.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: And then we in a
13 suggestion, we're allowing them additional square
14 footage so they could accomplish this.

15 MS. HAGE: Umm-umm.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: And bring it to 12 feet.
17 It seems to me that it is much larger than the
18 original.

19 MS. HAGE: Well, what you are looking at is 12
20 feet.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: No. I meant compared to
22 what exists today.

23 MS. HAGE: It would get them approximately I
24 think that shows it as seven feet.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Uh-huh.

2 MS. HAGE: I think it might actually be eight
3 feet if you added a foot.

4 MR. MC NAUGHTON: The top of the sign is six, is
5 five feet from the top of the trees down to the bottom
6 of the call it the bottom of my --

7 MS. HAGE: Your foundation.

8 MR. MC NAUGHTON: Foundation, my ground level at
9 the berm height five feet.

10 MS. HAGE: It's eight feet so you're only
11 talking about adding four feet on to which is really
12 this base that they're showing.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: The sign today from the
14 sidewalk approximately or whatever the elevation is to
15 the top of the green trees of the top of the logo
16 you're saying is how tall?

17 MS. HAGE: Eight feet.

18 COMMISSIONER HEERY: So you're adding four to
19 it?

20 MS. HAGE: Correct. Yes, if that's what --

21 COMMISSIONER HEERY: How about width wise?

22 MR. MC NAUGHTON: Well, width wise at the
23 Woodland Park side is 11 feet from the round to the
24 round but the actual body of the sign is only six feet

1 wide.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Well, what could the --
3 what's the limit today on the width of this?

4 MS. HAGE: We don't have one.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: So in other words, if
6 they chose to, on this permit application, they're
7 saying their logo is two feet tall and 11 feet wide.

8 MS. HAGE: Correct.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: So potentially this could
10 be 15 feet wide and whatever the height works out.

11 MS. HAGE: Right.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: And we could go to 12
13 feet and none of this supporting structure below it
14 counts. So we could say like the shopping center where
15 many of them build the bases out of natural stone and
16 so forth, we could potentially have a huge sign there
17 that has a fairly small print size but huge width and
18 huge height because they would choose to squeeze this
19 and make it longer and there is no limit on it.

20 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Yeah, but I mean we are talking
21 about signs. You are talking about like an
22 architectural feature. With signage, people are
23 worried about visual. I think with visual clutter and
24 if somebody, I understand exactly what you're saying.

1 It could be a mile. It could be half an inch letters
2 and they could be a mile long but I'm not sure that I
3 -- do we care about that because --

4 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: I do because at some
5 point if this white piece of paper is some all natural
6 stone background that's not counting it's 12 feet tall
7 and let's say it's 12 feet wide and we allow them
8 50 square feet to write on that sign, seems to me
9 you've just built a huge thing which becomes a sign in
10 my book and the smallest part of the sign is the
11 written part.

12 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Yeah, I look at it just like we
13 can't stop somebody from painting their building pink.
14 I mean we're then getting into the esthetics that I
15 don't think are any of our business.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: No, it's hugely out of
17 proportion at that point.

18 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: I don't think they'll
19 do that.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: If mean if they have a
21 sign today that's 11 feet wide and they want to put,
22 let's just say they stay with the same dimensions, it's
23 two feet tall and 11 feet wide.

24 CHAIRMAN KOPP: They had all sorts of decorative

1 stuff here that wasn't natural. They could do all
2 sorts of things.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Well, I guess in my mind,
4 I thought that the 100 square foot that we were
5 originally talking about was defining this whole thing
6 and it seems to me that at some point, this is out of
7 control or could be.

8 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: Is there any way we
9 could just compromise on all this and give a 50 square
10 feet on each side and height of the sign be ten feet
11 and get a little relief. We bring the sign down. It's
12 a compromise.

13 CHAIRMAN KOPP: You will get a chance. I
14 promise.

15 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: Let them design the
16 sign.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: My concern here is we
18 haven't defined the box. I don't want the sign to
19 define or design their sign but it seems to me that we,
20 we're trying to limit the square footage of the written
21 area or what we've traditionally calculated to be the
22 sign but yet we have not limited the body of the sign.

23 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Limited the height.

24 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: We limited the height.

1 They have a restriction from the property line.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Right.

3 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: They can, as you point
4 out, they can make it as wide as they want. If they
5 make it wider of course they lost whatever.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: No. They don't lose any
7 of that.

8 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: It gets narrower or
9 longer. I don't know if they want a sign going into
10 the bushes in this particular case.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: I just see the ability to
12 abuse it at some point, but I would tend to agree with
13 the 50 feet.

14 MR. HALIK: You know, Chairman Wagner, towards
15 your point, I understand what you're saying and I
16 believe we have some similar language in our ordinance
17 currently with regard to residential signs, that is
18 multi family complexes.

19 If you look on Page 11, there's some
20 language in both A and B that references how much
21 maximum sign surface area you can display as far as an
22 identification sign but yet it also limits the overall
23 size of the structure upon which that signage copy per
24 se can be placed. I think that's your, that's what

1 what you are referring to.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Right.

3 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Timothy, can't we tell them
4 don't make it distorted wide?

5 MR. HALIK: Well, I think that's what that
6 language speaks to.

7 COMMISSIONER BAKER: That's all you got to do.
8 They are not going to distort that if you tell them not
9 to.

10 MR. HALIK: That may be a valid point. My
11 concern with just increasing the sign surface area for
12 this zoning district is it would be the same area that
13 we give some of our retailers. I guess that would be
14 something the commission would want to measure.

15 COMMISSIONER BAKER: You just don't approve the
16 sign unless it fits what we think is accessible.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: No, you can't do it that
18 way.

19 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Why not?

20 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: You have to give them
21 definite numbers of what --

22 CHAIRMAN KOPP: They can't have discretion to
23 approve a sign.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: No.

1 CHAIRMAN KOPP: We need to tell them.

2 COMMISSIONER BAKER: How wide it can be?

3 CHAIRMAN KOPP: We can do that.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: We can tell them how tall
5 it can be, how wide it can be and how much square
6 footage of words can be on it. We can't tell them what
7 it can look like.

8 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Well, what can it look
9 like?

10 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Well, that's up to them.

11 CHAIRMAN KOPP: It has to be of the same type of
12 materials as the --

13 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: As the building.

14 MR. HALIK: Correct.

15 MS. HAGE: Correct.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: I guess I would like to
17 hear --

18 CHAIRMAN KOPP: I mean your concern isn't the
19 Town Center sign. That's a huge --

20 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Exactly. That's what I
21 don't want it to be. That's my concern. I think these
22 are all going to end up looking like retail signage at
23 this type of size and clearly that's not what these
24 buildings are.

1 MS. HAGE: Well, as Tim said, you can limit the
2 overall sign signage so that the entire surface of the
3 sign, the bulk of the sign is no more than 50 square
4 feet and keep in mind, our discussion that we had last
5 time with Regency just as a point of order asking them
6 how much does it cost to build a sign.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Umm-umm.

8 MS. HAGE: \$50,000, 25 to \$75,000, I mean like
9 are they going to build a \$75,000 structure just to
10 get, you know, I'm being the devil's advocate.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: The problem we are doing
12 is we're applying common sense to something. That's
13 not always done. That's my concern.

14 MS. HAGE: I'm saying give some common sense to
15 it. Are they going to spend \$75,000 to get 25 square
16 feet of signage?

17 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: I don't know.

18 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Their goal is usually to have an
19 attractive sign to have an attractive project.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: I would agree.

21 MS. HAGE: With some exceptions.

22 COMMISSIONER HEERY: Yes, attractive is again is
23 reasonable in the mind of the beholder.

24 MS. HAGE: Right.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: I guess I would be
2 interested in hearing from --

3 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Right. Do the commissioners or
4 staff have any further comments at this point?

5 MS. HAGE: I would be very cautious about
6 lowering the height from 12 feet I mean only because,
7 you know, the code allows for it now and you did have
8 some discussion about okay taking away that penalty.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: The code allows for 12
10 feet today?

11 MS. HAGE: It allows for 12 feet.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Okay.

13 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: Did we change that or
14 was it --

15 MS. HAGE: The code allows for 12 feet but if
16 you go above eight feet, then you have a penalty
17 assessed against your permitted area so that's why you
18 see that their sign is only eight feet.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: What was the penalty?

20 MS. HAGE: Three quarters of a square foot for
21 each height above.

22 MR. HALIK: Three and three quarters I can tell.

23 MS. HAGE: Three and three quarters.

24 MR. HALIK: I can tell you in 15 years, no one

1 has ever taken the penalty to go to a higher sign.

2 MS. HAGE: It means that's cutting their
3 signage.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: So could you say then
5 that it worked because no one ever took the penalty?

6 MR. HALIK: It worked in keeping them to eight,
7 right.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Okay.

9 CHAIRMAN KOPP: All right. You folks have been
10 very patient. You have had your hand up pretty much
11 constantly. You need to be sworn. You need to be
12 sworn in.

13

14 E L I Z A B E T H H E N L E Y,
15 having been first duly sworn, by the Notary, was
16 examined and testified as follows:

17

18 MS. HENLEY: Elizabeth Henley. Just in
19 reference to the height, one of the main points that we
20 had when we first started this discussion is on the
21 westbound Plainfield when you are driving westbound,
22 you cannot see a sign above the traffic.

23 So at the current height, there is
24 photographs to prove it, you cannot see the Woodland

1 Park sign because of the eastbound traffic, (inaudible)
2 if there was a truck, if there is another car, you
3 cannot see the top of the sign just because of the
4 angulation of how they (inaudible) with the cars in
5 front you can't see it.

6 If you're going to keep the sign at
7 the current eight feet, we can't be seen. I don't care
8 how big it is, you still can't see it. We need the 12
9 foot to elevate which is the first fact that we had
10 with raising the sign height.

11 Now then if we look at the 12 foot,
12 even if we raise that sign to 12 feet, with the current
13 ordinance of 50 square feet, we can only make a sign if
14 we keep it without a pier to limit it to the 50 square
15 feet on either side.

16 We have a sign at 12 feet about two
17 and a half foot wide, you know, at the top elevation
18 for all the information we wanted to get to that height
19 which makes it a logical sign.

20 So when you have these parameters
21 which we're discussing perhaps to solve our problems at
22 getting this 12 foot height so we can actually be seen
23 above the traffic what do we do? We have to do piers
24 or something to anchor it which in my mind was really

1 unattractive and would not look good on Plainfield Road
2 which to your discussion stating we go crazy with this.

3 No. We want to go and find something
4 that is attractive to the environment around us by the
5 same time, it's readdressing the issues we have which
6 is we need a taller sign.

7 So the first factor I added with
8 adding the lower part of the sign just as a solid state
9 was really just to give us the height without truly
10 changing too much of the sign but to add a little bit
11 there, you know, with more clarification for the
12 identifier which of course we want Woodland Park to
13 stay. We want the street sign.

14 So I think when we looked at this
15 logically when we come back after that last meeting to
16 give us 50 square feet really doesn't do anything for
17 us. It gives us two and a half square feet additional
18 side and to elevate it up on piers will give us a
19 really ugly sign.

20 So somewhere along the line, we are
21 trying to find a solution where we can have perhaps a
22 solid status of sign that is elevated maybe to 10 feet,
23 maybe to 11 feet, something that can be seen above the
24 traffic.

1 I don't want it to be on these big
2 pier signs. I don't want that. I wanted something
3 that was attractive that was still in keeping with what
4 we've got on Plainfield Road.

5 So that was kind of where I was going
6 with the height of this and subsequently we understand
7 all those other issues involving with the illumination
8 and with the vegetation and so on.

9 They will be addressed so we can have
10 this but ultimately, we can't change the height
11 (inaudible) around Woodland Park and on Plainfield
12 Road. I understand that, you know, there is all the
13 other buildings there. We can't change what's there
14 already.

15 The only identifier that we have is a
16 road side sign. So you know an exemption or some other
17 way of identifying ourselves. Understand we have 20
18 businesses back there.

19 Even though we are not retail and we
20 are not providing the same revenue to the village, we
21 understand it but we do support a large chunk of
22 economy in that little parkway which is about two acres
23 in the back but our primary concern our clients cannot
24 find us which is what we started this whole discussion

1 before.

2 So it appeals to me that you are
3 looking at doing 50 feet each side. I think that would
4 truly help us because we can elevate, get messaging out
5 there. I don't know what way we can go with this.

6 I wish we can have some solution
7 tonight so I can stop bothering myself with this sign
8 stuff. Honestly this is not what I want to do. I
9 would really not wish not to be here and bothering you
10 guys but by the same token, I really want a solution to
11 this.

12 I think there is enough physicians
13 behind us and there is enough support that we have with
14 the public that there really is a problem and it's not
15 something that can just, you know, I agree that you're
16 all trying to help us.

17 I really think we need to look at it
18 from a logical standpoint that the 50 square feet each
19 side would be something that we would be, you know,
20 quite happy with as well as the allowable height even
21 if we can go 10 or 11 feet so it's another two, maybe
22 three feet up from where we were at.

23 That's what we were looking at, not to
24 create some monster illusion on Plainfield Road.

1 That's really the problems that we have.

2

3 P O L L Y W A L G R E N,

4 having been first duly sworn, by the Notary, was

5 examined and testified as follows:

6

7 MS. WALGREN: Polly Walgren. The signage that
8 the picture of the sign that you have there that has
9 the area on it for lease space putting all of the
10 information in identifying the businesses or the park
11 and businesses therein and the lease information all on
12 one to me seems to be more esthetically pleasing
13 irregardless of what you can see than the current sign
14 we have out there and that other, excuse me, ugly sign
15 stuck up there to identify the fact that we have lease
16 space.

17 It would seem to make sense to put it
18 altogether in a nice looking sign as compared to have
19 two.

20 MR. MC NAUGHTON: I think I can expand upon
21 that. I gave a what you guys asked me for last time we
22 were in session and I know this goes to the Village of
23 Burr Ridge, but it was a big concern of theirs.

24 There is a sign that is on 83rd

1 Street. What the Village of Burr Ridge wanted to do is
2 they had the same concerns that you do where we can go
3 up 12 feet with a basically that call it a box board
4 and then have a head board on top and that would look
5 bad and I guess it would look better than piers going
6 up 12 feet.

7 What the Village of Burr Ridge kind of
8 concluded was if we could get rid of these other for
9 lease signs which everyone hates and put it on that
10 space, okay, that is taken up from all that height and
11 width of just blank wood or painted wood, it kind of
12 cleaned it up not only the sign from looking like just
13 a tall pillar, it also cleaned up the rest of the
14 frontage. We have a little over 200 feet.

15 It cleaned up the frontage a little
16 bit more because you don't have another sign sticking
17 out there. So it's not an exact additional square
18 footage that we're asking for.

19 It's just another way to clean up this
20 tall sign that you guys I guess trying to get us to 12
21 feet and make it a little more, a little nicer and more
22 esthetic at least.

23 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Sara, what are the leasing
24 signs, how big can they be?

1 MS. HAGE: 32.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: 32 square feet.

3 MS. HAGE: To be honest, I need to check. I
4 think 32 is the construction and --

5 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: It's 64 feet two sided
6 32. It's a four by eight sheet of plywood.

7 MS. HAGE: That's construction.

8 MR. HALIK: That's new development.

9 MS. HAGE: So before your --

10 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: That's what Dominick's
11 has had out for five years it's two sided. It's a four
12 by eight sheet of plywood.

13 CHAIRMAN KOPP: These numbers we can discuss but
14 sort of going with Commissioner Delante's (phonetic)
15 idea 50 feet on each side, 10 feet high would allow us
16 to go up to 12 feet if they put the leasing sign on the
17 body or on this structure.

18 MR. MC NAUGHTON: That's a great idea.

19 MS. WALGREN: Exactly.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: I think it's a great
21 idea. The problem I see is what do you do with all the
22 people, the properties today that don't have the
23 ability to put a leasing sign on their sign and are
24 going to still stick the plywood sign out on the

1 property or are we eliminating that altogether?

2 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Well, I wouldn't eliminate it
3 but this is going to encourage them to consolidate
4 those two signs into one and you reward them by giving
5 them two extra feet.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Then how do you police
7 let's say we allowed that and all of sudden there is a
8 bunch of vacancies in their properties and they put up
9 the --

10 CHAIRMAN KOPP: That's what Tim does or whoever
11 our code enforcement officer does. I mean how, what if
12 they were just, Mr. McNaughton was to stick two out
13 tomorrow. Somebody is going to drive by and notice it.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: That's my question. I
15 mean it would seem to me, I think it's a great idea but
16 it seems to me if we are going to go that route, let's
17 eliminate the other one altogether like he suggested
18 that Burr Ridge either did or wanted to do and now you
19 don't have these big leasing signs all the time. You
20 have them almost on here not being counted or
21 something.

22 CHAIRMAN KOPP: I don't think we can make an
23 existing business not use those signs anymore if they
24 don't have, you are then making them put up a new

1 monument sign because they're going to think it's
2 important to have a for leasing sign.

3 If you say you cannot have a for
4 leasing sign, you are telling them they got to build a
5 \$50,000 monument sign to put their leasing information
6 on.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: I just think it's going
8 to be a nightmare where you give them the benefit of
9 making a better looking sign that at some point how
10 does this get policed?

11 CHAIRMAN KOPP: You are out there --

12 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Am I making --

13 MR. HALIK: Our building inspector, our code
14 enforcement officer.

15 COMMISSIONER BAKER: I'll go.

16 MS. HENLEY: I will, too.

17 MS. HAGE: If you look at it in terms of having
18 the height of ten feet but you are limited to height of
19 ten feet, but if you incorporate the leasing sign, then
20 get to go up to 12 feet.

21 MS. WALGREN: Perfect.

22 MS. HAGE: Well, you're somewhat making that
23 permanent and I think that's where you get into the
24 policing like you're talking about and --

1 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Right. We can't have the ten
2 percent rule because (inaudible) monument sign pull a
3 panel on and off.

4 MR. MC NAUGHTON: I can tell you the Village of
5 Burr Ridge does police this. We have been up for a
6 little over two years. One of the stipulations with
7 this sign change was if we didn't have vacancies, that
8 plaque, it's basically a laminate plaque had to come
9 down, and they in two years, they've probably called
10 three times requesting tenant lists which A, to make
11 sure all of these tenants are registered with the
12 village, but they do ask us to basically prove to them
13 that we still have vacancies and I'll be honest, our
14 Woodland Park Commerce Center is 100 percent vacant and
15 the sign had to come down.

16 CHAIRMAN KOPP: 100 percent occupied.

17 MR. MC NAUGHTON: I'm sorry.

18 COMMISSIONER BAKER: That was ass backwards.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: So you literally take
20 this down when --

21 MR. MC NAUGHTON: It's a removable plaque. If
22 you are 100 percent occupied, you have to remove the
23 sign.

24 CHAIRMAN KOPP: I personally wouldn't care about

1 that because you are going to be looking to replace
2 turn all the time. Your going to be looking to
3 replace --

4 MR. MC NAUGHTON: You did make a mention the
5 odds of us being 100 percent occupied at any one given
6 time is very slim. What it does is it allows us to
7 take a sign which nine out of ten people that call in
8 for leasing space, they call from our signage off the
9 street.

10 Willowbrook is the same and most
11 people driving down where they go to look for a sign,
12 they look for the monument sign and say okay, where is
13 the leasing information.

14 Obviously in Willowbrook in our case
15 on Plainfield, they have to find that sign that's on
16 the separate post.

17 What we have found in Burr Ridge is we
18 are able to capture more business because people
19 actually, their first eye goes to the monument sign.
20 They take the leasing information down and they get
21 obviously called from there.

22 Where in Willowbrook, they have to
23 really hunt and peck to find it. It just cleans up the
24 sign for the most part.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: I think it's a great
2 idea. I just think it's a policing issue but if that's
3 what we are doing already.

4 CHAIRMAN KOPP: I wouldn't care, as I said, I
5 wouldn't care if they leave a panel if it's not a
6 separate -- I think the reason you have the ten percent
7 rule for the signs is because they tend to be ugly,
8 then they wear. This isn't going to wear.

9 MS. HAGE: Just to clarify, there is no ten
10 percent threshold. That only applies to shopping
11 centers.

12 CHAIRMAN KOPP: I'm sorry. So they can have it
13 out --

14 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: 24 hours a day.

15 MS. HAGE: The caveat is that when the lease is
16 signed, that it comes down so lease or sale, it comes
17 down within seven days. So that's their threshold. So
18 if they have a vacancy, they can have a sign up.

19 CHAIRMAN KOPP: You are going to have a vacancy
20 100 percent of the time. It's not the same unit. It
21 doesn't have to take, if he leases a unit, he doesn't
22 have to take the sign down and put it up the next day
23 for the next unit that is then vacant.

24 MS. HAGE: I wouldn't.

1 MR. MC NAUGHTON: No, it stays up. The way,
2 again I was talking from Burr Ridge, the way they
3 stipulate it, this was a big change for them because we
4 have a good portion of 83rd Street and they allowed so
5 many of these four lease signs. That's what they were
6 trying to get away from because they were so ugly.

7 If you have a vacancy, you are allowed
8 to have a certain square footage of for lease with the
9 information to call someone on. Again, the odds of
10 having no vacancies is pretty slim.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: So the sign is up all the
12 time.

13 MR. MC NAUGHTON: But there was a case that we
14 did have to take it down and there could be a case very
15 soon here in Willowbrook that it could happen as well.
16 We're pretty close to hopefully getting the remaining
17 building leased out so it does happen. It's not often
18 in this economy.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Well, I would agree with
20 you. If it's on here and it's nice looking and it's
21 part of the sign. It's being maintained. I really
22 don't care if it ever comes down. It just gives the
23 public a contact to get to Mr. McNaughton or whoever
24 the owner is.

1 CHAIRMAN KOPP: You can probably design a better
2 looking sign if it could be more permanent than
3 something that had to slide in and out.

4 MR. MC NAUGHTON: Correct.

5 MS. HAGE: Just for argument sake, could I throw
6 out, so their leasing area is 12 square feet so it gets
7 backs to what we were talking about earlier. If you
8 discount that, that brings them down to 56 square feet
9 for one sign.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Right.

11 MS. HAGE: Again, that's getting very close to
12 100 square feet and going back to Commissioner's
13 Wagner's point about being concerned about the mass,
14 perhaps the easiest way to did that is to just restrict
15 how wide the base of the sign can be so no more than
16 eight feet wide.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: It seems to me that if
18 the width never exceeded the width of the maximum of
19 the sign, I think that would curb it right there. So
20 this is at 11 feet today so the base of the sign can't
21 be any wider than 11 feet. Is that reasonable?

22 MS. HAGE: Very, I think.

23 CHAIRMAN KOPP: It can't be wider than it is
24 tall?

1 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: No. I'm saying today
2 they chose to make the Woodland 11 feet wide and I'm
3 suggesting that the base of the sign then couldn't be
4 larger than that.

5 MS. HAGE: Well, let me actually throw in --

6 CHAIRMAN KOPP: You have to give them a little
7 bit I mean if it's inset in stone or something.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Well, I don't know how to
9 control it then. Maybe it doesn't need --

10 MS. HAGE: You might be better off setting a
11 specific number and the reason being the Town Center,
12 that base is wider than the sign itself.

13 COMMISSIONER HEERY: Yes.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Is 10 feet workable? It
15 seems reasonable to me if it's 12 feet high ten feet
16 wide. It seems to me to be somewhat in proportion.

17 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: That's a big sign.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: It is a very big sign.

19 COMMISSIONER HEERY: And how many others would
20 this impact? We're dealing with one sign here but
21 there are a number of other businesses impacted, right?

22 MS. HAGE: Yes. You may want to think less than
23 ten to be, I mean ten is generous.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: I'd like to ask one other

1 question. Someone mentioned lighting on this sign.
2 Someone mentioned I think illumination from within. Is
3 that allowed today?

4 MS. HAGE: Yes.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: It is?

6 MS. HAGE: Yes. Before you get into that, I
7 think I mean I understand it's all part of the grand
8 picture but to think more about the sign surface area
9 just as a point of comparison. Our shopping centers
10 that are less than ten acres only get 100 square feet
11 of signage.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Less than ten acres?

13 MS. HAGE: Yes. So anything that isn't the Town
14 Center or the Dominick's shopping center or K-Mart,
15 they get 100 square feet of signage.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Well, then.

17 MS. HAGE: Plus their 15 percent for their
18 shopping center name.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Rather than saying it
20 that way, what's a comparison in a retail district that
21 would be like this? Is there one? For instance, I
22 think there is a big sign on the Patio. There is a
23 fairly big monument sign.

24 MS. HAGE: Yes.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Do our suggestions lead
2 to much bigger signs on what is something like that?
3 That's on its own property. It's a single standing
4 business instead of a retail strip center.

5 MS. HAGE: Are you talking about the Patio
6 Restaurant?

7 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Umm-umm.

8 MS. HAGE: It's in Darien. We don't know what
9 the signage area is but the Patio shopping center I
10 think that's a 12, that's a 12 foot sign with 90 square
11 feet or surface area.

12 MR. HALIK: Some of our shopping centers will
13 get 90 square feet of free standing sign and the
14 commission appears to be considering giving LOR LOP
15 districts 100.

16 MS. HAGE: So where Senior Tequila with Wingren
17 (phonetic) Plaza, they put in a new sign. They are at
18 100 square feet and that was based on --

19 MR. HALIK: 15 percent.

20 MS. HAGE: Right.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: So the current Wingren
22 sign is 100.

23 MS. HAGE: Square feet.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Square feet 50 per side.

1 MS. HAGE: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN KOPP: That's pretty big.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: That's a big sign. I
4 don't think it was ever the intent to have a sign that
5 big.

6 MS. HAGE: Right. That doesn't include any
7 leasing areas. I mean, you know, it's splitting hairs
8 to some extent in this discussion. That's up to you
9 guys to think about do you want to have that line drawn
10 between a retail district and --

11 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: I think office districts
12 were always meant to be some type of a (inaudible) as
13 opposed to a full fledged retail district. It seems
14 like some of our office districts are turning into
15 retail districts.

16 MS. HAGE: I think that's the exception, but I
17 mean there are complimentary retail uses for some of
18 our office.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: I guess I always thought
20 of an office complex as a destination where there was a
21 monument sign of some kind like the Wingren or I should
22 say the Woodland Park sign with an address and then
23 there were numbers on the buildings so on, so forth.

24 It seems like they have gotten divided

1 up more and more and more to individual businesses and
2 they're all looking for identification and look and
3 being found and I think that's leading us to these huge
4 signs. I don't think, I'm not sure it's appropriate.
5 It wasn't the intent originally.

6 CHAIRMAN KOPP: I'm not sure what to do. I
7 agree with you putting it in that context it's too big.
8 I think we have developed some good ideas here.

9 I think we just need to perhaps work
10 on the numbers so the numbers at issue would be height,
11 width and sign area and we went to 12 because that's
12 what the (inaudible) are able to get.

13 MS. HAGE: Well, because 12 was what was already
14 permitted. We just removed the penalty.

15 CHAIRMAN KOPP: I'm sorry. And nobody went over
16 eight.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: So really the limit was
18 eight. There was a set of circumstances that would
19 allow you to go to 12 but no one ever did. So
20 essentially it was such a stringent thing that really
21 the outcome was let's build an eight foot sign.

22 MR. HALIK: Correct.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: So going to 12 feet is a
24 huge jump in itself.

1 CHAIRMAN KOPP: 50 percent.

2 MS. HAGE: Right. If you did nothing else, they
3 could add four feet of height to the sign that they
4 have.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Right. And I think my
6 original discussion on this was that it was more
7 important to have an address that was legible and I
8 think originally when these people came in and talked
9 about it, no one could find it because you couldn't see
10 the number and it was too low.

11 Then it was said to me by a lot of
12 people that a lot of people would identify the area by
13 a name not just an address but by a name. So if you
14 could have a bigger Woodland Park with a legible
15 address number that you could see further away and it
16 was higher up, that seemed to solve a lot of problems
17 and then all of sudden we see professional medical
18 office complex in here 16 square feet and the leasing
19 below it.

20 So if you took that, that solved a lot
21 of the problem I think because one, it raised it. Now
22 it can be seen over traffic and I don't think you have
23 this huge sign that looks like it's part of a retail
24 center. That's my concern.

1 MS. HAGE: Maybe the compromise between this and
2 a retail center is somewhere in between. Maybe it's
3 75 square feet.

4 MR. HALIK: I would agree. I did some doodling
5 here in line with what Vice Chairman Wagner just
6 mentioned and it seemed to be in the realm of 70,
7 75 feet would be a workable number. That presumes the
8 exception of the identity of the complex at 15 percent
9 rule that we just discussed.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: So with what you just
11 said, would this whole sign be there?

12 MR. HALIK: If the commission wanted to
13 recommend an amendment to the leasing language, perhaps
14 it could.

15 MS. HAGE: And with the understanding that they
16 would need to make some modification to the Woodland
17 Park so that it comes in at a lower area.

18 MR. HALIK: Correct unfortunately given its
19 current design, there is a lot of wasted SSA.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Would you allow them to
21 do this where you took off the seven and a half square
22 feet on the one side or 15 for the total, would you
23 then if it was still at 20, would you then add
24 25 square feet of the rest of the sign or of the

1 75 square feet? Are they using part of that then
2 because of their Woodland Park being exempt up to
3 15 percent? How would you allow that to happen?

4 MS. HAGE: Well --

5 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Or they just would, in
6 today's rule, the 15 percent wouldn't apply and it's
7 just part of the sign?

8 MR. HALIK: Correct.

9 MS. HAGE: Correct, and 15 percent if they were
10 permitted a 75 square foot sign, 15 percent would equal
11 11 square feet total. So I mean that really comes out
12 to five and a half square feet each side. It's not
13 really, so I mean it gets them something but --

14 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: But it's kind of an all
15 or nothing situation. Either be contained within the
16 15 percent or you don't get it.

17 MS. HAGE: Yes.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: It seems to me it would
19 be simpler for everyone if we just allowed that square
20 footage to be within the total rather than having this
21 rule.

22 CHAIRMAN KOPP: All right. You folks wanted to
23 say something.

24 MS. HENLEY: All I was saying just with the

1 discussion regarding the height allocation and, you
 2 know, going back to that, truly we need the height with
 3 that sign where it's located just because of its
 4 location I would say that when I looked through the
 5 other districts that were in the LOR districts, all the
 6 other buildings can be seen by the road but with their
 7 particular landscape, it can't be.

8 You're looking at what we got and with
 9 the situation we are looking at, if we don't get
 10 additional signage space to create a more effective
 11 sign, we'll be forced to just pop it up in the air
 12 which is not what we want to do. So it's kind of like
 13 we are stuck between a rock and a hard space. We want
 14 the height. That's what we are going after.

15 If you are forcing us to really reduce
 16 that signage space, the writing space, then we'll just
 17 have to put it up on piers to get the height we need
 18 from it because it's truly coming down to that issue.

19 I think at 75 square feet will give us
 20 an adequate amount to give everything we are talking
 21 about with the change for leasing signs.

22 Ultimately, though, you are discussing
 23 between retail and our complaints, I would deduce we
 24 have 20 independent businesses in here and the reason

1 we want the professional medical complex is that the
2 majority of people that I represent are physicians and
3 they felt strongly that this was a patient compliance
4 issue that they couldn't find us in an emergency.

5 So just (inaudible) lettering for us
6 on that signage and allowing a little more space
7 actually allows people looking first time for a
8 building to know the professional medical complex. Oh,
9 it must be in here.

10 I know there is some issue with the
11 landscaping and so on. I really think for our
12 particular area, it's quite unique. I don't think that
13 a lot of the other districts in the LOR have that same
14 issue otherwise they should be sitting beside me making
15 AM issue about it and they are not. Obviously that's
16 not their priority but to us, it is.

17 So from the medical perspective, the
18 additional writing on that sign is very important for
19 us so that our clients can see it. In our practice
20 alone which is probably we employ 40 women and me and
21 our practice we would see on average 80 people to 100
22 people a day coming to that practice. That's 100
23 people just in our entity driving into that business
24 and we deal a lot of somewhat emergency situations but

1 people need to find us from there.

2 It's just one of the 20 businesses
3 that are in there. So it's quite a lot larger. I know
4 some of them are smaller, but we do represent a large
5 portion in this village also for the residents here. I
6 just really think when you're thinking about it in
7 relation thereto a retail area, times are changing.

8 We are creating a different type of
9 idea with an office complex. It's not just people
10 walking into a building and just sifting away. We got
11 a real turnover of people coming in here and it's just
12 going to get busier.

13 CHAIRMAN KOPP: You got to keep in mind --

14 MS. HENLEY: (Inaudible) for sure.

15 CHAIRMAN KOPP: (Continuing) -- there are
16 14,000, 16,000 people that live in Willowbrook and
17 especially the ones that live near this office park.

18 They bought their houses they thought
19 they were next to an office park and they probably
20 aren't going to be happy if there's a huge monument
21 sign that they have to pass everyday and all of a
22 sudden it looks like their house is next to a shopping
23 mall as opposed to a lower intensity office park.

24 So that's what we're struggling with

1 here. We want your patients to find you --

2 MS. HENLEY: What about (inaudible) big
3 four-story building that is there. We are kind of
4 comparing a four-story office park right next to the
5 post. It's right next to a large illuminated sign.

6 We have at the moment a tiny little
7 innocuous sign on a berm that can't be seen so I'm
8 thinking from creating this innocuous largely
9 illustrated sign and worrying about what the residents
10 are going to think, they're already obstructed from all
11 these huge visuals when they drive past there that
12 we're actually competing against to (inaudible).

13 Honestly the Walgreens is much better
14 illuminated than what we are at that point which is on
15 the corner of Madison and Plainfield from a visual
16 standpoint.

17 We don't really have much evening
18 illumination which we would like to change, but by the
19 same token we're not looking at creating a Christmas
20 tree on that berm.

21 I'm just creating an identifier so
22 people driving at 40, 50, 60 miles an hour down
23 Plainfield Road, they can see us and safely turn in
24 like all my pregnant women that complain to me everyday

1 that someone nearly rear ended them because they had to
2 slam on the brakes to turn in. So that's where I am
3 coming from that we need something.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Maybe they should slow
5 down.

6 MS. HENLEY: Well, maybe that's what I'm saying,
7 you know. That's a dangerous road to have to have poor
8 visibility to turn in. I get the residents, we are
9 talking three or four residents versus hundreds of
10 people --

11 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: No, no, no, no.

12 CHAIRMAN KOPP: There is 14,000 residents. The
13 people buy their house in this community thinking that
14 the community is going to at least stay the same and
15 hopefully improve they don't -- so yes, we give people,
16 retailers, we gave them additional signage.

17 We are going to give you guys
18 additional signage but there is a lot of people that
19 would be very upset like I said if they're behind your
20 project and everyday when they go home, they see a much
21 bigger, much more (inaudible) sign than was there when
22 they bought their house ten years ago.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Sara, did we distinguish
24 between medical office and office?

1 MS. HAGE: No.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: I think that's what has
3 probably caused this is because typically an office
4 complex isn't as highly trafficked as medical office
5 buildings and the people who are turning this traffic
6 over are almost more or could almost be more intense
7 than a retail use.

8 MS. HAGE: Let me I guess revise that answer.
9 In terms of signage, no, we don't differentiate. In
10 terms of our zoning ordinance, yes, we do, and when
11 people are developing their site plan and allocating
12 their parking --

13 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Right.

14 MS. HAGE: (Continuing) -- we do differentiate
15 based on the type of office.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: On use.

17 MS. HAGE: If it's a medical office versus
18 regular office, we calculate it based on the number of
19 exam rooms and doctors' offices and waiting rooms. So
20 we do have other LOP, OR, LOR districts with buildings
21 where doctors' offices are in fact located in some form
22 or another and quite frankly, we also get inquiries
23 from people saying I want to open my doctor's office in
24 this building and is that permitted. Well, technically

1 it's a permitted use but you don't have enough parking.
2 It was not developed to support --

3 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Medical.

4 MS. HAGE: (Continuing) -- the traffic you're
5 going to create. So this was, you know, a more intense
6 office and we permit doctors' offices in retail centers
7 as well.

8 COMMISSIONER HEERY: Can I ask a question? Do
9 you think the larger sign coming down Plainfield that
10 people will see that? As I'm going along, I look to
11 the side to see it and I'm going to be able to turn in
12 sooner?

13 It almost seems like where it is
14 parallel to the office building you don't see and if
15 you've got patients that aren't as aware, sometimes I
16 wonder if a bigger monument would make a difference.

17 You are going 40 miles an hour down
18 Plainfield. That's the speed limit. So you got two
19 entrances. You're going along. All of a sudden you
20 see it. If it's larger, I would think you would have
21 the same reaction. You are going to have to turn in
22 pretty soon.

23 MS. HENLEY: The problem is in the intersection
24 of Madison and Plainfield when you're actually stopping

1 there, all that traffic backs up all the way past our
2 office complex and actually occludes the view of our
3 sign so you really actually can't see it which is one
4 of the reasons why we started this process.

5 On top of that, most people hitting
6 the intersection there right on the corner as they're
7 coming through, they're just accelerating or
8 accelerating to get through the light. So most people
9 aren't coming that way going that fast but if they can
10 see it on the other side of the light, they could see
11 it and know to turn in. What happens is they are
12 sitting there looking and they can't even find it.

13 This is just comments from literally
14 hundreds of our clients because we did do a survey and
15 they're all saying we wish that we could see the
16 numbers or the sign more clearly because as we're
17 driving east or west, they go up and down to the
18 Walgreens and as you remember, part of my initial
19 concern was that I felt that in this district of
20 Willowbrook, I should be able to give one address 545
21 Plainfield Road and that would be the only identifier
22 needed for my clients to find me.

23 Instead, I have to give them three or
24 four locators in between this, Walgreens is on the

1 corner. It will be here, look for that. You know,
2 it's really it's the (inaudible) from Walgreens. I
3 have to reference for them to be even find us. Our
4 sign is really not adequate.

5 So truthfully for us we need the
6 height and we need it more illuminated and of course we
7 need a larger size because we do have as you pointed
8 before with the reading with the closeness. A lot of
9 our clients are elderly as well. We deal with women of
10 all ages and they can't really see from that far.

11 So again we are looking for visually,
12 you know, more appealing for all our client base and
13 for obviously for the traffic on both sides of Madison
14 to help find us.

15 COMMISSIONER HEERY: Seems like you need signs
16 farther down the road to tell them to get ready to turn
17 in.

18 MS. HENLEY: We can do billboards (inaudible) is
19 going to go out there with sandwich boards and a
20 (inaudible).

21 MS. HAGE: To be fair to Commissioner Heery, we
22 have talked about this and I think his point is that
23 the sign is located very close to your entrance so, you
24 know, on one direction once you see it, you are past it

1 because it's not in the middle of your property,
2 correct?

3 COMMISSIONER HEERY: Yes.

4 MS. HAGE: Along the lines of Plainfield Road.
5 I think we've talked about this for numerous meetings
6 and it's not just one issue. It's not just the height.
7 It's not just the area. It's not just the
8 illumination. It's not just the location. It's all of
9 them and all of it could improve your signage and there
10 are things that are within their control and the rest
11 is on you.

12 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Are we tonight prepared to make
13 a recommendation or do we want to continue this?

14 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: I'm trouble by it because
15 I think this sign is too big. I mean I want to try to
16 resolve some of the issues that are discussed.

17 There is no point in revising the sign
18 ordinance if it doesn't resolve problems but again,
19 this is an office complex in an office district that
20 was supposed to be and I think clearly intended to be a
21 lesser intensity use than retail and it's abutted by
22 residential in many cases not only this site but many
23 of the cases where these office products have been put
24 in and I think there is some things that have been said

1 that are good to incorporate part of this leasing sign
2 to get rid of the other leasing sign. I think that's a
3 good idea. I think that could be accommodated in the
4 sign.

5 I'm not sure that it needs to be as
6 big as it is on this one. I have trouble going and
7 doubling to a hundred feet and then also exempting all
8 these other things where you are ending up with a sign
9 that ultimately due to some rules is, you know, 115 or
10 120 or 30. If we start exempting the leasing area, I
11 think it's just a huge sign.

12 MS. HAGE: Well, I mean we did mention 75 square
13 feet. If you took this sign and (inaudible)
14 modifications if they reduce the Woodland Park area to
15 fall within the same vertical parameters so it's eight
16 feet wide and a foot tall, that's eight square feet.

17 Professional medical office complex is
18 16 square feet. That's 24. I think you could
19 incorporate immediately under that and still within
20 that sign area the address of 535 to 555 Plainfield
21 Road and you would still be within the 24 square feet
22 making some modification and adding on 12 square feet
23 for the office suites that would get them to a total of
24 72 square feet which is under 75.

1 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: That's both sides.

2 MS. HAGE: That's both sides. So really I mean
3 what you're talking about is removing or reducing their
4 overall mast head and removing that area that says 535,
5 545, 555 and incorporating it into another component of
6 the sign and making it smaller and I think just by
7 virtue of adding Plainfield Road, you also indicate
8 that one, it's not a phone number and two, that it's a
9 range. I mean I don't want to design the sign but I'm
10 merely trying to express that there are options.

11 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Well, actually, there is some
12 logic to it as well if we are allowing the sign height
13 to increase by 50 percent. We are allowing the surface
14 area to increase by 50 percent from 50 to 75.

15 MS. HAGE: Right, yes, from 8 feet to 12 feet.

16 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Right.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Then I would only hope
18 that the owners would design a sign that was legible
19 and solve their client's concerns and possibly locate
20 it differently. It sounds like it's located more
21 towards the one end of the property than the other.

22 MR. MC NAUGHTON: We do only have one entrance I
23 mean so it is.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: You have two entrances.

1 MR. MC NAUGHTON: No, sir. It's part of
2 Walgreens.

3 MR. HALIK: A cross access.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: That's cross access. I
5 remember when that was approved.

6 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: Sara, yours was
7 72 feet?

8 MS. HAGE: Yes.

9 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: Half of that is 36.

10 MS. HAGE: Yes.

11 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: Existing sign now is
12 about 30.

13 MS. HAGE: Existing sign now is 22 square feet
14 per sign.

15 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: Blueprints that you
16 gave us does not show the addresses of the sign. There
17 is addresses of the sign that adds more square footage.

18 MR. HALIK: Currently there is addresses on it
19 you're saying?

20 MR. MC NAUGHTON: There is a plaque that says
21 building. It used to just have where it looked like a
22 phone number and then a couple years ago changed try to
23 get where it says building 535 building. It's way too
24 small really unlegible.

1 MR. HALIK: Was that at the request of
2 Tri-State?

3 MR. MC NAUGHTON: Yes.

4 MR. HALIK: Our fire district asked for some
5 leniency to put the address on the sign so they could
6 find it.

7 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: 22 plus whatever is
8 under there has got to be at least eight.

9 MR. HALIK: I think we worked with the fire
10 district just to improve the --

11 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: You got 30. You are
12 asking for 32. It's not a big change. It's doable.

13 MS. HAGE: That's a good point.

14 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: I agree with
15 Commissioner Wagner someone will have to redesign this
16 sign and take advantage of square footage that's
17 available.

18 MR. HALIK: I believe based on our discussion
19 tonight and Bill, jump in if you disagree, I feel
20 confident we can come to an agreement on a sign design
21 if the commission would recommend an SSA and a height
22 in the realm of our discussion tonight.

23 MR. MC NAUGHTON: Yeah, two last things. I
24 appreciate you spending the amount of time you have

1 especially on my part.

2 Second, I would say that looking at
3 some sort of benefit to having the for lease sign added
4 to the monument sign I think is a plus from a visual
5 standpoint of the sign and I think it maybe could be
6 added as a bonus and it's obviously what we are
7 requesting I think I need 18 inches by the width of 16.

8 That would be significantly less than
9 what you would allow us on a post separate so I think
10 that would be the only thing it does visually help out
11 the street to kind of clean up the signage.

12 MR. HALIK: That was within the area Sara
13 mentioned in the calculation.

14 MS. HAGE: Yes.

15 MR. HALIK: So it's in.

16 MR. MC NAUGHTON: It is in there, okay.

17 MS. HAGE: Did what I explain in terms of
18 modifications make sense to you?

19 MR. MC NAUGHTON: It did.

20 MS. HAGE: Do you follow it?

21 MR. MC NAUGHTON: Yes, I follow it.

22 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Can you summarize it again, the
23 whole package.

24 MS. HAGE: Sure. If you were to take the

1 Woodland Park mast head --

2 CHAIRMAN KOPP: No, I'm sorry. I'm thinking
3 summarize what we're --

4 MS. HAGE: Advocating?

5 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Yes, exactly.

6 MS. HAGE: Increasing the permitted sign surface
7 area to 75 square feet and that includes both sides
8 allowing for the height of 12 feet which is already
9 included and then if you wanted to pursue it, setting a
10 maximum width for the base.

11 CHAIRMAN KOPP: What about the idea of the
12 height being ten feet but they get the extra two feet
13 if they put in up to 12 square feet of per side of
14 leasing information.

15 MS. HAGE: Well --

16 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Because people that are going to
17 be putting in new signs like this project, it sounds
18 like Mr. McNaughton is going to do it immediately
19 because he has got some tenants that are going to
20 insist on it so then they can take advantage of it. It
21 I don't want to make any existing person have to do it.

22 MS. HAGE: Tim, jump in, but I think that kind
23 of creates a policing nightmare. See suddenly we
24 have --

1 CHAIRMAN KOPP: No. We were saying we don't,
2 they can have this leasing information whether they
3 have vacancies or not.

4 MS. HAGE: What I was going to see is that let's
5 say, you know, every business builds a new sign and
6 they make the choice at that point, okay, I'm going to
7 go to 12 feet and I'm not going to have, I'm going to
8 incorporate the leasing sign into the monument sign or
9 ultimately they make a choice to stay at ten feet and
10 keep to the other provisions that allow them to put up
11 a separate for leasing sign.

12 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Right.

13 MS. HAGE: So then the village has to go out and
14 do more spot checks like oh, wait. You can have a
15 leasing sign but you can't because you're sign monument
16 sign is taller and which businesses are those and it
17 then becomes splitting hairs or it can become splitting
18 hairs. They sell the office park. The next owner
19 comes in and says well, why can't I have a leasing sign
20 and the office park next to me has this. We are
21 creating more nuances I guess.

22 CHAIRMAN KOPP: I mean isn't that so that's what
23 you are doing in the retail areas. You may be not
24 doing it. That's theoretically what you're doing. You

1 are checking with the shopping centers to see if they
2 have tenants or vacancies or not. You are looking at
3 signs.

4 There is rules about what can be on
5 the signs. You are looking at that. So the only
6 difference is I guess measuring the sign keeping track
7 of whether a sign is 10 feet or 12 feet. Maybe we
8 don't need the reward. Maybe we just don't count.

9 If we tell them they can put it on
10 their monument sign and don't give them a bonus for
11 putting it on a monument sign, will they all put it on
12 the monument sign or will they say no, I'd rather have
13 this big sheet of plywood out there because it's bigger
14 because what we are trying to do is encourage them all
15 to put it on the monument.

16 MR. HALIK: I think if you defer to your first
17 suggestion all the signs would become 12 feet tall and
18 you would get them all on monument signs, no one would
19 default to a 10 foot sign.

20 CHAIRMAN KOPP: It's like (inaudible) the 12
21 foot.

22 MR. HALIK: Correct.

23 CHAIRMAN KOPP: In fact, you guys I guess you
24 only have to police it once. That's Sara's part, you

1 only have to police it once. Actually how is it
2 different than somebody changing their sign? You have
3 to police that or Mr. McNaughton changed his sign. He
4 did the right thing and apparently went to you because
5 the fire district wanted him to. You police that stuff
6 all the time.

7 MR. MC NAUGHTON: The village checks. They keep
8 pretty close tabs on I would say --

9 CHAIRMAN KOPP: I don't want to give them 12
10 feet and have them have a piece of plywood out there.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: I would agree with that
12 because now you defeated the monument sign aspect of
13 this huge sign at 12 feet.

14 CHAIRMAN KOPP: And not only that, they have
15 the --

16 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Right or (inaudible)
17 plywood out there all painted up. I would say give
18 them some square footage that's not counted or counted
19 and you get a bonus or something, however you want to
20 handle it the written form but I think 24 square feet
21 of leasing area on a sign is fairly large.

22 CHAIRMAN KOPP: (Inaudible) those are people
23 that are driving by the project, they are going to pull
24 in, right. They are not -- because nobody is driving

1 by the project like writing phone numbers down.

2 MR. MC NAUGHTON: On Plainfield, yes, they pull
3 in.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: My suggestion was going
5 to be give them and I'm going to throw out a number 10
6 square feet free to put their leasing information on
7 the monument sign and then it can go to 12 feet.

8 MS. HAGE: Ten square feet free wouldn't, it
9 wouldn't cover this.

10 MR. HALIK: This is 12.

11 MS. HAGE: This is 12 on one side.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: I'm aware of that.

13 CHAIRMAN KOPP: He meant 10 per side. I assume
14 you meant 10 per side. We are saying it doesn't need
15 to be this big because the people, it's not nearly the
16 same number of people looking and they are going to
17 pull into the project when they see.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: We are listening to the
19 tenants and they are going this is really important to
20 us that it says professional office but the leasing
21 information is almost as big. I just don't think that
22 you need to have that much area to say this is who owns
23 it, it's for lease, here's our phone number but I'm
24 just trying to get away from the 12 feet unless they

1 incorporate this. 12 feet is really tall. It's a huge
2 sign.

3 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Sara, you almost had an
4 agreement with Mr. McNaughton by almost when you cut
5 the size of the numerals on each side. Yes?

6 MR. MC NAUGHTON: I'm not following you, sir.

7 CHAIRMAN KOPP: You are not alone.

8 COMMISSIONER BAKER: What did you do, what did
9 you say about the Woodland Park sign? How did you
10 reduce it?

11 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Her suggestion was to
12 reduce it in area.

13 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Right. How much?

14 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Well, that's not up to
15 us. That's up to them.

16 COMMISSIONER BAKER: No. That brings the whole
17 size of the sign down if you do it to each piece of the
18 sign.

19 MR. MC NAUGHTON: My personal opinion on the
20 lettering that's there currently, we might be able to
21 shrink it a little bit on the, take off some of the
22 oval portion. I would not change the height of those
23 letters.

24 COMMISSIONER BAKER: I'm not talking about the

1 height. Oh, the height of the letters?

2 MR. MC NAUGHTON: By changing the height --

3 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Well, but you can squeeze
4 the space around the numerals.

5 MR. MC NAUGHTON: You're not going to get much.
6 You might get three inches on each side. I would not
7 make the letters smaller which would then obviously do
8 what you are saying and make my Woodland Park small.

9 COMMISSIONER BAKER: I think Sara had it right,
10 but I can't get her to bring it up.

11 COMMISSIONER HEERY: We were talking square
12 footage whereas you're trying to design the sign.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Right.

14 MS. HAGE: I mean even --

15 COMMISSIONER HEERY: We were trying to give the
16 parameters as opposed to telling them how to design
17 their sign.

18 COMMISSIONER BAKER: That's what I want to do.

19 MS. HAGE: To reiterate for one what I said is
20 if you remove the trees that project above the sign,
21 that gets, that reduces that area to ten square feet.

22 If they cut the end caps off, that
23 reduces that area to eight square feet. Mr. McNaughton
24 is saying that would be difficult to do to cut the end

1 caps off.

2 So even if they stayed at ten square
3 feet and then used the professional medical office
4 complex and the leasing area, they're still only at
5 38 square feet for that site assuming that they remove
6 those numerals in the large format that they're at and
7 incorporate them elsewhere.

8 CHAIRMAN KOPP: The 12 feet bothers me because
9 it seems really high if you don't have a berm. So the
10 medical project on Kingery, is that going to seem like
11 an enormous sign if they put a new one there? I don't
12 know the names of any of these projects.

13 COMMISSIONER HEERY: Around 68th?

14 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Yes, exactly.

15 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: 67th.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: My concern is this seems
17 Woodland Park is a wonderful office complex, but I feel
18 as though I'm sitting here designing numbers and
19 massaging numbers to solve their problem and that's
20 fine. Maybe that's solves their problem.

21 My next question is what is this doing
22 to how many sites in the village and I don't know where
23 they are at the moment and I'm reluctant to go forward
24 with this tonight because I don't know the effect on,

1 for instance, the office complex at 83 between K-Mart
2 and 67th.

3 MS. HAGE: Right.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: What is that going to do
5 to them or what can of worms does this open? I'm
6 concerned about what the effect is on Turtle Wax. What
7 is this doing over there or what is this doing to
8 Turtle Wax's neighbor who I don't even know who it is?
9 So do I get 12 foot signs all the way down that street
10 now?

11 COMMISSIONER HEERY: I agree with you. We are
12 taking one example and applying it to us. I mean I
13 think we have to work it out. I feel uncomfortable not
14 knowing the impact.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: I'm uncomfortable moving
16 forward with these numbers not knowing where else this
17 is going to be applied in the village and what it's
18 going to do.

19 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Sara, could you do what you did
20 with their retail size with the Photo Shop?

21 MS. HAGE: Yes, it might be a little tricky but
22 it's a lot easier to do to a wall sign.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: You know what else would
24 be helpful if Mr. McNaughton could submit a sketch of

1 this sign based on the numbers that have been talked
2 about tonight that's in scale.

3 This is so out of scale that you can't
4 tell what it's really going to look like and I'm not
5 looking for a blueprint. I'm just looking for a
6 reasonably in scale sketch that would be what 12 feet
7 75 square feet of area --

8 MS. HENLEY: The sign is going to be nine feet
9 tall because it's on a berm.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Excuse me?

11 MS. HENLEY: The sign would actually only be
12 nine feet tall.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: No, no, no, no. That's
14 not true. The sign is 12 feet measured from where we
15 measure. Whether you have a berm or not isn't the
16 issue because some people don't have berms.

17 MS. HENLEY: Yes.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: We can't look at it like
19 because this is only nine feet from the berm. We have
20 to look at it from our regulation.

21 MS. HENLEY: Visually occluding it, though.

22 MS. HAGE: You're correct. It would be shown as
23 from our regulations, it would be shown as nine feet
24 plus the berm which is three feet so basically you

1 would be taking the base of that sign and putting a
2 three foot arc at the bottom.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: If they want to show the
4 berm across the sign, that's fine. We still need to
5 know what the structure looks like and how it's
6 affected on their property.

7 We also need to look at I don't know
8 how many other sites there are in the village that this
9 could be applied to.

10 MS. HAGE: Well, I can create a map for you and
11 identify those locations and just like we do for some
12 other signs, you may want to then consider steps based
13 on the profile of those other properties so different
14 site profiles have different --

15 CHAIRMAN KOPP: So many acres.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Right. There is a
17 multiple building.

18 MS. HAGE: Right.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: At 72nd and Madison.
20 Isn't that where all the frontages are on? Isn't that
21 where Executive Windows --

22 MR. MC NAUGHTON: Exclusive Windows.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Exclusive Windows is at.
24 I mean now that's a similar complex. You got all these

1 individual companies in there.

2 MS. HAGE: Yes.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: And it's on two frontages
4 I think, you know, where do we go with all that and
5 what happens there?

6 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: Don't you have the same
7 example right here at the village town a little bit
8 east of (inaudible)?

9 MS. HAGE: Yes.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Right.

11 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: On both sides you have
12 monuments.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: That's my concern. I
14 just think this is ending up looking like a whole bunch
15 of retail signs in an LR district that was never
16 intended to be that way. That one business over on
17 75th which was all office warehouse across from
18 Wingren's is starting to look like retail stores lined
19 up.

20 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Is this the only project that
21 has a big berm like that?

22 MS. HAGE: The newer buildings have those berms,
23 train, Exclusive Windows, the office.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: We require them, don't we

1 and landscaping on top of the berm?

2 MS. HAGE: Yes. So in Executive Plaza, the
3 majority of these as you know there is no landscaping.
4 It's flat and those are older developments.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Well, if there is a sign
6 change, can some of that be required because these
7 buildings were developed a long time ago before berms
8 and bushes were required.

9 If they're looking for that change, is
10 that something that's going to be brought up to code.

11 MR. HALIK: It's the whole legal nonconforming
12 issue. So there is a chapter in our zoning that deals
13 with when they have to comply.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER:

15 CHAIRMAN KOPP: I think Commissioner Wagner is
16 saying if you want to take advantage of a change in the
17 code and put in a bigger sign, can we then say okay but
18 now you got to --

19 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Now you got to berm it.
20 I mean I understand the argument the sign is only nine
21 feet high because the berm is in front of it. I
22 understand that. It minimizes it here. I have less
23 concern of it here.

24 Those places that don't have berms or

1 the elevation the ground is exactly opposite where the
2 ground height is higher in the front, now you allow a
3 12 foot sign there. That's going to stick out like a
4 sore thumb and I think my concern is I want to try to
5 solve their problem, but how is this affecting the
6 whole rest of the village or all the other districts
7 involved?

8 COMMISSIONER DEL ARTO: Is there a possibility
9 to check with Downers Grove or other municipalities
10 that may have this same problem to see how they solve
11 it?

12 MS. HAGE: Well, we have done that in the past
13 in the beginning of this process.

14 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Did we do it for these
15 districts?

16 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: I don't think we did it
17 for LOR. We did it for other retail districts when we
18 started this process, didn't we?

19 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: Retail mostly.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Right, retail.

21 MS. HAGE: Yes.

22 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: Just a thought. They
23 have got to have the same problems as far as signage.

24 MR. MC NAUGHTON: I have at Burr Ridge off of

1 83rd Street which is a single story office as well, we
2 got eight foot tall, the same looking sign show it to
3 you. These were all were approved. They are up and
4 down 83rd.

5 Again, it's a little different because
6 it's slower traffic. We did get tenant panels. This
7 is eight foot tall, eight foot wide. This is nine foot
8 six wide so that's what size? If you get eight by
9 eight, you are 64 a side and there is no, I mean it's
10 pretty flat (inaudible). That's pretty much street
11 level. The first 16 inches by the way you really
12 couldn't do anything with because of some snow and
13 stuff.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Bushes and everything,
15 landscaping you are not going to see it all.

16 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Mr. McNaughton, did you do this
17 one inhouse? I didn't want Commissioner Wagner to have
18 you hire a sign person. I just want to make sure.

19 MR. MC NAUGHTON: No, it's not done inhouse. I
20 have no problem going and having sign work done.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: I didn't mean to go spend
22 a bunch of money or anything.

23 MR. MC NAUGHTON: I didn't take it that way.

24 CHAIRMAN KOPP: I don't want you to spend money.

1 MR. MC NAUGHTON: No, I didn't take it that way.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Something that was a
3 little more to scale.

4 CHAIRMAN KOPP: I think what we need to do
5 ironic with this whole process we spent most of the
6 time on sandwich boards than LOR is continue this
7 hearing yet again and Sara if you can help us with some
8 graphic examples of what this would look like.

9 MS. HAGE: I'd be happy to.

10 CHAIRMAN KOPP: It's hard to visualize.

11 COMMISSIONER DEL SARTO: Visualize this room is
12 got a ten foot ceiling so it gives you an idea how high
13 a ten foot sign is. It's pretty high.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: It's big.

15 CHAIRMAN KOPP: All right. Any commissioners
16 have anything further to say? Did you folks have
17 anything further? Afraid this is still going to go on.

18 All right. Will someone make a
19 motion? Do I have to have a motion to continue, Sara?
20 No? We are going to continue this public hearing to
21 the public meeting on April meeting.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN WAGNER: Regularly scheduled.

23 (Hearing continued sine die.)

24

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS)
2) SS.
3 COUNTY OF K A N E)

4 I, KIMBERLEE A. ELLIOTT, being first duly
5 sworn on oath says that she is a court reporter doing
6 business in the County of Kane and State of Illinois;
7 that she reported in shorthand the testimony given at
8 said hearing aforesaid; that the foregoing is a true
9 and correct transcript of her shorthand notes so taken
10 as aforesaid, and contains all the testimony so given
11 at said hearing.

12
13
14 
15 Notary Public, Kane County, IL
16 CSR # 084-003093

17 SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to
18 before me this _____ day
19 of _____, 2010.

20 _____
21 Notary Public