

January 18, 1999

Mr. William J. Mueller,
Village President, and
Board of Trustees
Village of Lombard

Subject: PC 99-02: 450 East 22nd Street

Dear President and Trustees:

Your Plan Commission transmits for your consideration its recommendation regarding the above-referenced petition. This petition requests an amendment to the Anvan Planned Development (Ordinance 2249; previously amended by Ordinance 4409) in order to allow changes to the standards for freestanding and wall signs.

After due notice and as required by law, the Plan Commission conducted a public hearing for this petition on January 18, 1999.

Guy Dragisic, on behalf of Travel Group, presented their request for new signs. He gave proposed dimensions of 50 square feet with a setback of one and one-half feet (1.5'). The petitioner referred to and apologized for the packet he submitted. Ed Pyter, the petitioner of Olympic Signs, and Mr. Dragisic did a cardboard mockup showing where they want the sign vs. staff's recommendation. Their client stated a sense of urgency, as the proposed size and location, by staff, of the freestanding sign would not accomplish what he wants. Mr. Dragisic referred to tiny panels on the freestanding sign if it were 40 square feet. He stated that the copy will be smaller and hard to read at a distance. Staff's proposal is approximately 35' feet back. Because of the retaining wall, they want the sign to be located one and one-half feet from property line. He noticed that Greek Islands and Studio Plus both have signs that are approximately 15 feet back from the property line, and are located in the 30-foot sight triangle. He also noticed these are individual businesses as compared to their sign, which is for multiple tenants. The location also has a traffic signal box that poses a site obstruction more than their sign would. He then referred to photographs he took that day and showed the height differential. Mr. Dragisic did note that he has taken into consideration the engineering report and will move the sign further to the west, while keeping it parallel to 22nd street and set back to retaining wall.

No one was present to speak in favor or against petition.

January 18, 1999

Re: PC 99-02

Page 2

Amy Willson presented the staff report. She referred to the Planned Development and stated no other freestanding signs are allowed. It was explained how the underlying zoning for this Planned Development is B3 Community Shopping District with signage following the O Office District Standards. She explained the petitioner's request to remove the old sign and add a new freestanding sign as well as a wall sign. In clarifying the 30-foot sight triangle, Ms. Willson stated that even though the sight triangle pertains to fences and hedges, it should also apply in this case to the signs. The standards for the B3 and the Office districts were discussed. The Office District requires a setback 10' from property line. Staff wants the signage to be consistent with the signage of other properties along 22nd Street. Therefore, if the sign were perpendicular, it would be best.

Ms. Willson discussed the proposed wall sign and stated that the requirements would be met if following the B3 standards.

Ms. Willson went over dimensions of the Studio Plus, Greek Islands, and Danka signs, which are all over forty (40) square feet or less in area. Staff would like the proposed freestanding sign scaled down to forty (40) square feet instead of fifty (50).

Chairperson Ryan opened the public hearing for discussion and questions by the Plan Commission.

Commissioner Olbrysh posed a question to staff regarding the petitioner's request to have the freestanding sign located within the sight triangle. He wanted an explanation why the Studio Plus and Greek Island signs are within the 30-foot sight triangle. Ms. Willson stated that Studio Plus and Greek Islands are on private streets, whereas the petitioner's site is located near two public streets.

Commissioner Sweetser asked if the location that staff proposes is as close as possible to 22nd Street. Ms. Willson stated it was just an estimate. Commissioner Sweetser asked if anything can be done with the berm such as recommend a lowering of it. David Sundland stated that it could be a recommendation of an amendment to the Planned Development. He also stated that the berm does not have as much of an effect on the sign location as does the retaining wall. Mr. Sundland continued if the standards of the Office District were to be maintained, an amendment for the sign to be located closer to 22nd Street would have to be made. Commissioner Sweetser stated that she is not arguing about the best location, but she wants to know where is the closest the sign can go. Can it be moved further south?, she asked. Mr. Sundland answered yes.

Mr. Dragisic made a statement regarding the berm and moving the sign closer to property line. He said, in order to put the sign on the berm, you would have to reconfigure the berm, or remove the berm. Mr. Dragisic stated it would be very

January 18, 1999

Re: PC 99-02

Page 3

difficult to remove the berm, and would incur a tremendous expense. That is why they are proposing the sign placement parallel to 22nd. He feels it is a unique situation.

Commissioner Sweetser asked the other commissioners about their thoughts on the sight triangle. She asked if it would be a possible impediment. Mr. Sundland stated that in regards to the sight triangle, it is in the best interest of the public to apply the rules to signs as it is applied to fences.

Commissioner Olbrysh stated the line of sight is not blocked or obstructed, and that the drawings submitted would meet requirements.

Mr. Dragisic reminded the Plan Commission that the sign would remain 50 square feet.

Commissioner Flint stated that the sign needed to stay out of the sight triangle and there was a consensus of the commissioners.

Commissioner Sweetser asked what the purpose of a smaller sign is. Ms. Willson referred to the Office standards as well as being consistent with signage on nearby properties.

Mr. Dragisic stated that the Fairfield plaza sign across Fairfield Avenue is a multi-panel sign containing 10 panels similar to theirs, and that is why the petitioner wants 50 square feet. The sign is not for just one business.

Mr. Sundland stated that particular sign is out of this Planned Development. Signs within this Planned Development are less than 40 feet. And there is an additional freestanding, multi-tenant sign that was approved without going through the Planning Commission process. This sign is 29 square feet.

After due consideration of the petition and the testimony presented, the Plan Commission found that the requested conditional use complied with the standards of the Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, the Plan Commission, by a roll call vote of 5 to 0, recommended approval of PC 99-02, subject to the following conditions:

1. The proposed freestanding sign shall be a maximum of six feet (6') in height, not to exceed forty (40) in sign surface area, and meet all other requirements of the Lombard Sign Ordinance.
2. The sign shall be located outside of the 30-foot sight triangle.
3. The sign shall be located perpendicular to 22nd Street.

January 18, 1999

Re: PC 99-02

Page 4

Respectfully,

VILLAGE OF LOMBARD

Donald F. Ryan, Chairperson
Lombard Plan Commission

DAH:ACW:jd

att-

c. Petitioner

M:\WORDUSER\PCCASES\99\99-02\REFLET.DOC