

April 1, 2004

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

Subject: PC 04-08; 400- 450 E. Roosevelt Road

Dear President and Trustees:

Your Plan Commission transmits for your consideration its recommendation regarding the above-referenced petition. The petitioner requests that the Village approve a conditional use for a planned development for the subject property located within the B4 Corridor Commercial Zoning District, with deviations from the Lombard Sign Ordinance, as follows:

1. A deviation from Section 153.505 (B)(17)(b)(2) to allow for more than one wall sign for a tenant space, and.
2. A deviation from Section 153.505(B)(17)(b)(1)(a) to allow tenant wall signage not to exceed two times the lineal front footage of the tenant space where a maximum of one times the lineal front footage of the tenant space is allowed.

After due notice and as required by law, the Plan Commission conducted a public hearing for this petition on March 15, 2004.

Ed Grate, of Grate Signs, stated the request. He stated that building is setback approximately one hundred and eighteen feet (118') feet from the road. He stated the sign requirements allow one times the lineal frontage for signs and if the building were located eighteen inches further from the road two times the lineal frontage would be allowed. Mr. Grate also noted the petition included a request for multiple signs for one tenant. Mr. Grate stated that he and the property owner have met with the staff. Mr. Grate stated that the petitioner has agreed to not seek the right to additional signage and is willing to adhere to the one and a half times the lineal frontage for signage as recommended by staff. Mr. Grate stated that there are three other tenants that would like additional sign area. He stated that they would like each tenant to be treated equally. They feel that staff and the petitioner have reached a compromise that the village could live with.

Gus Danos, the property owner, stated that he would like to increase the sign area because the building is large and has a huge presence. Mr. Danos stated that they are trying to be fair to everyone and allow signage that is proportional to the image of the building.

Chairperson Ryan opened the meeting for public comment. No one spoke for or against the petition. He then requested the staff report.

William Heniff, Senior Planner, presented the staff report. He noted that the subject property was improved with a shopping center in 2003. While the center was originally intended to be occupied by Central DuPage Hospital outpatient medical office, the hospital decided not to open a facility on the property. Therefore, the developer has decided to partition the building for retail uses. Associated with this partitioning, the various tenants have been modifying the building to suit their specific needs.

Mr. Heniff noted that the existing building on the subject property is ranges from one hundred and ten feet (110') to one hundred and twenty-two feet (122') from the front property line, due to some recesses within the building. He stated that several requests for larger signage was received from different tenants. Staff felt the entire property should be looked comprehensively to determine if relief for the overall development was needed. He gave a clarification of the sign ordinance and stated that for buildings located less than one hundred and twenty feet (120') from the property line the signage is restricted to one times lineal frontage. Buildings located more than one hundred and twenty feet (120') are allowed two times the lineal frontage as the building is further from the property line.

Mr. Heniff stated that the property meets the minimum lot width and area required for planned developments, so conditional use for a planned development is being requested at this time. He noted that the planned development would give the Plan Commission greater flexibility to consider future site changes including signage. Mr. Heniff noted the table in the staff report that displays current signage and allowable signage at one and a half and two times the lineal frontage. Mr. Heniff stated that the building is unique due to its distance from the property line and the speed of traffic on Roosevelt Road. He stated that staff considered the allowance of signage at one and half times the lineal frontage as a reasonable accommodation by splitting the difference between the two visual requests. He noted that the Sprint Store suggested one and a half times the frontage as an alternative and the Wash and Glo Laundromat wanted two times the lineal frontage. He stated that two times the lineal frontage may be excessive and one and a half would be a reasonable accommodation for both.

Mr. Heniff stated that the occupant at 450 E. Roosevelt Road wanted two additional wall signs where one is permitted. Mr. Heniff stated that the existing sign is one hundred and thirty-three (133) square feet in area. He stated that additional signage would be excessive in comparison and more than double the lineal frontage if the signs were granted. Mr. Heniff stated that staff recommends allowing one and a half times the lineal frontage for each tenant with no sign

Re: PC 04-08

April 1, 2004

Page 3

exceeding one hundred and fifty (150) square feet. Referencing the pictures of some of the signage are included in the staff report, he stated that staff recommends denial for the multiple signage request.

Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for discussion among the commissioners.

Commissioner Burke asked for clarification of the one and one half times the lineal frontage suggestion.

Mr. Heniff stated that regardless of the square footage, each tenant would be allowed one and a half times the lineal frontage, but no greater than one hundred and fifty (150) square feet. He stated that the one hundred and fifty (150) square foot limitation really only applies to Insurance Plus.

Chairperson Ryan stated that if a tenant's frontage is one hundred (100) feet they would be entitled to one and a half times the lineal frontage of the space, but capped at one hundred and fifty (150) square feet. Everyone would be treated the same. Everyone would be entitled to one and a half times their frontage, but no additional signs.

Commissioner Burke asked if the petitioner understood the maximum signage allowed?

The petitioner replied that he did.

Commissioner Melarkey asked if the frontage is less than twenty- feet, what would be allowed.

Mr. Heniff stated that everyone is allowed twenty-five (25) square feet at a minimum. However if the one and one-half time lineal front footage provides for more signage, then additional sign square footage would be allowed.

Chairperson Ryan clarified Commissioner Melarkey's question and asked if a precedent was being set in granting larger signage at the subject property as opposed to other places in the Village. Chairperson Ryan stated that each property would be considered individually and in this instance it is the building's distance from the street that would allow them the larger signage.

Commissioner Melarkey stated that he was also concerned about changing of tenants in this building and the resizing of spaces. Mr. Heniff also noted that the one and one half times recommendation would apply to all tenants with more than eighteen and a half (18.5) lineal feet of store frontage could benefit from the proposed change.

Chairperson Ryan stated that the whole building would be subject to the rule.

Re: PC 04-08

April 1, 2004

Page 4

After due consideration of the petition and the testimony presented, the Plan Commission found that the proposed conditional use and variations comply with the standards of the Zoning and Sign Ordinances only in part. Therefore, the Plan Commission, by a roll call vote of 5 to 0, recommended to the Corporate Authorities, **approval** of the conditional use for a planned development and a request to allow for an increase in wall signage square footage and **denial** of all other requested relief associated with PC 04-08; with the approval subject to the following conditions:

1. No wall signage shall exceed one and one half times the lineal frontage of a tenant space or one hundred and fifty square feet, whichever is less.
2. Each tenant shall obtain building permits for its respective signage.

Respectfully,

VILLAGE OF LOMBARD

Donald Ryan, Chairperson
Lombard Plan Commission

att-

c. Petitioner
Lombard Plan Commission

H:\CD\WORDUSER\PCCASES\2004\PC 04-08\Refllet04-08.doc