

**REGULAR MEETING
BUFFALO GROVE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
OCTOBER 20, 2009**

Chairman Entman called the Zoning Board of Appeals regular meeting to order at 7:32 P.M. on Tuesday, October 20, 2009 in the Council Chambers of the Village Hall, 50 Raupp Boulevard.

ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Commissioner Dunn
 Commissioner Windecker
 Commissioner Shapiro
 Commissioner Au
 Chairman Entman

Commissioners Absent: Commissioner Stein
 Commissioner Lesser

Also Present: Brian Sheehan, Deputy Building Commissioner
 William Raysa, Village Attorney

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

September 15, 2009 minutes:

Com. Windecker made a motion to approve the minutes of the Zoning Board of Appeals regular meeting held on Tuesday, September 15, 2009. Com. Dunn seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote: AYE – Dunn, Windecker, Shapiro, Entman
 NAY – None
 ABSTAIN – Au

Motion Passed 4 to 0, 1 Abstention. Minutes approved as submitted.

OLB BUSINESS

BUFFALO GROVE BUSINESS PARK, HAMILTON PARTNERS – REVIEW OF THE STATUS OF THE EXISTING LEASING SIGNS LOCATED AT 1110 LAKE COOK ROAD AND 135 ARLINGTON HEIGHTS ROAD

Ms. Valerie Loughman, Hamilton Partners, 1130 Lake Cook Road, Buffalo Grove, Illinois, was present and sworn in.

Ms. Loughman explained that they are requesting to continue to use the existing leasing signs along Lake Cook Road and Arlington Heights Road. They have provided a square footage vacancy schedule showing the expected turn over for the business park. In this economy they

anticipate their tenants to stay since a majority have been tenants in the business park for a long time. They are running into situations in which tenants are having a harder time financially, especially the smaller tenants. They would like to continue to utilize the signage for another six (6) months.

Ch. Entman advised that he is a tenant in the business park, but this will not affect his decision.

Ch. Entman does not have an issue allowing the signs to remain another six (6) months.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Commissioners. There were no questions or comments from the audience.

Com. Windecker made a motion to allow the two (2) existing temporary signs to remain located at 135 Arlington Heights Road and 1110 Lake Cook Road. Hamilton Partners shall appear at the April, 2010 Zoning Board of Appeals regular meeting to review the status of the temporary signs. Com. Dunn seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote: AYE – Dunn, Windecker, Shapiro, Au, Entman

NAY – None

ABSTAIN – None

Motion Passed 5 to 0. Item to appear on the April, 2010 Zoning Board of Appeals agenda for status review.

301 NORTH RIVERWALK DRIVE, RIVERWALK APARTMENTS – REVIEW OF THE STATUS OF THE THREE (3) EXISTING LEASING SIGNS FOR RIVERWALK PLACE APARTMENTS

Ms. Darcy Tapper, Property Manager, 301 North Riverwalk Drive, Buffalo Grove, Illinois, was present and sworn in.

Ms. Tapper advised that photographs of the three (3) existing signs were submitted.

Ch. Entman inquired about the status of the current occupancy. Ms. Tapper stated that they are under ninety (90) percent occupied. They are between eighty (80) and ninety (90) percent. The market is tough right now with all of the condominiums up for rent currently. Competition is tough. The signs directing people in are about sixty (60) percent street driven.

Ch. Entman stated that if they are at between eighty (80) and ninety (90) percent occupied, they are doing ok. The industry is happy if occupancy is over eighty (80) percent.

Com. Windecker stated that the last time they appeared before the Board current occupancy figures were provided in writing. These figures were not provided for this review. Ms. Tapper advised that she was asked by Kirk Hamilton to appear at the meeting. Com. Windecker stated that it is routine to submit current occupancy figures. Ms. Tapper stated that leasing is a month to month issue in that leases expire; people are purchasing homes or transferring. She has been up to ninety-nine (99) to one hundred (100) percent for a month, maybe forty (40) days and then it

drops again depending on what leases turn over. Right now she would say they are at eighty-eight (88) percent occupied. Com. Windecker asked to follow up with the figures. Previously the Board stated that when occupancy hits ninety (90) percent, they would re-examine the temporary signs.

Com. Shapiro stated that he believes it was when they reached ninety (90) percent they would bring down the number of signs from three (3) to two (2). He asked which signs are more effective. Ms. Tapper responded that the sign at the corner of Milwaukee Avenue and Riverwalk Drive and the sign at Riverwalk Drive and North Riverwalk Drive are the signs that bring in the most street traffic. Those are two (2) key signs. The sign on the ground sign coming off Lake Cook Road could be the sign to come down. Com. Shapiro would like for the occupancy figures to be provided for the next review in order to determine which sign should come down.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Commissioners. There were no questions or comments from the audience.

Com. Dunn made a motion to allow the three (3) existing “For Rent, Sale, Lease” signs to remain located at Riverwalk Place Apartments, 301 North Riverwalk Drive. Hamilton Partners shall appear at the April, 2010 Zoning Board of Appeals regular meeting to review the status of the temporary signs. Com. Windecker seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote: AYE – Dunn, Windecker, Shapiro, Au, Entman

NAY – None

ABSTAIN – None

Motion Passed 5 to 0. Item to appear on the April, 2010 Zoning Board of Appeals agenda for status review.

NEW BUSINESS

902 HILLDALE LANE, WAYNE KRUTY – FENCE CODE, SECTION 15.20.040, TO CONSTRUCT A SIX (6) FOOT CEDAR BOARD ON BOARD FENCE SIX (6) FEET BEYOND THE BUILDING SETBACK LINE ALONG FABISH DRIVE

Mr. Wayne Kruty, 902 Hilldale Lane, was present and sworn in. The public hearing notice published in the Daily Herald on October 1, 2009 was read.

Com. Au advised that Alan Ang is her uncle, but this will not affect her decision in this matter.

Mr. Kruty explained that they would like to put up a fence. Their neighbor’s to the west of them have an existing fence that is also setback away from the house. They wanted to try and match up the location of their fence with the neighbor’s fence.

Mr. Kruty submitted photographs of the neighboring fence that was marked as Zoning Board of Appeals Exhibits “F” & “G”. The photographs were reviewed by the Commissioners. Mr. Kruty reviewed Exhibit “G” depicting the neighbor’s fence as built up on a retaining wall. He also

reviewed Exhibit “F” depicting his wife standing where the edge of the proposed fence would be located. The fence would not cause any line of sight issues.

Ch. Entman read the Village Engineer’s memorandum addressed to Brian Sheehan dated September 30, 2009 which states: “I have no comments on the proposal. There is no abutting driveway.”

Ch. Entman asked what the particular reason for the fence is. Mr. Kruty explained that they have a dog. Last week his dog was barking tied up outside and he looked around out the door and there was a dog, an Irish Wolfhound, looking in his door. It surprised him as he thought that dogs were supposed to be on a leash. It is also a privacy issue. He wants to keep his dog in the yard and keep other dogs out.

Ch. Entman confirmed that the proposed fence would be wood board on board. Mr. Kruty added that he just wants to do what the neighbor did. On the other side of the house where the garage is, they would put a five (5) foot fence.

Ch. Entman understands that the neighbor’s fence on the west is a five (5) foot fence. Mr. Sheehan stated that the permit shows it as a five (5) foot fence. Mr. Kruty believes that the fence itself is a five (5) foot fence. But when measured from his grade, it is eight (8) to nine (9) feet high. Ch. Entman stated that a question we don’t have an answer to is how that fence ended up beyond the building line. There is no reference as to the distance beyond the building line the fence was allowed. Mr. Sheehan confirmed that there was no reference found in the documents as to the distance. Ms. Kamka confirmed that there was a reference for the fence to go beyond the building line just no dimension.

Ch. Entman asked if the Petitioner is putting a fence along the west property line or are they using the neighbors. Mr. Kruty stated that he would leave it as is. Ch. Entman confirmed that a five (5) foot gate is being added on the north. Mr. Kruty stated that they are going with the same board on board fence that is on the north side so the fence would be consistent.

Com. Shapiro asked if the fence would end at the retaining wall. Would the fence abut the retaining wall? Mr. Kruty does not plan to connect to the fence because it is not his fence. Com. Shapiro wasn’t sure if there would be gap that the dog could get out of the yard. Mr. Kruty said that if the fence is placed close enough to the berm that should be sufficient. Com. Shapiro stated that a six (6) foot fence would still be way shorter than the other fence and it would not line up with the neighbor’s fence. Mr. Kruty stated that the reason for the six (6) foot request is because they came from a corner lot in Arlington Heights and it is a privacy issue. He has two (2) daughters. Com. Shapiro stated that he lives on a corner lot and they have a five (5) foot fence. He believes being along a road like that a five (5) foot fence would be more aesthetically pleasing. Especially since it will not abut the other fence at the back end and match. He would be more in favor of a standard five (5) foot fence.

Com. Dunn stated that he answered her question regarding the reason for the fence. Mr. Kruty added that with his two (2) teenage daughters, they used to have a pool, they don’t have one now. The girls used to sit outside and sunbathe.

Com. Windecker stated that he believes the variance granted for the neighbor's fence back in 1994 was allowed to extend one (1) section of fence from the corner of the house.

Ch. Entman does not like a six (6) foot fence in this situation. A five (5) foot fence would be more appropriate. With the size of the lot, he would not normally be amenable to placing the fence beyond the building line. But in light of the fact that the fence to the west seems to be there, he does not have an issue going beyond the building line to line up with that fence.

Mr. Sheehan stated that for clarification purposes, on the Application for Variation it is listed as the fence being installed approximately eight (8) feet from the house, while on both Exhibits "A" and "D" the dimension is shown as six (6) feet from the house. Mr. Kruty stated that it was an estimate in trying to line the fences up. He did not measure the distance, he guessed. He just wants to line up the fence.

Ch. Entman stated that for the motion, it can be referenced that the fence would extend from the corner of the house whatever distance it would take to line the fence up with the neighbor's fence, or the same distance as the house to the west, but not to exceed eight (8) feet.

Mr. Kruty amended his petition to request a five (5) foot board on board fence in the proposed location.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Commissioners. There were no questions or comments from the audience.

Com. Shapiro made the following motion:

I move we grant the amended request made by Wayne Kruty, 902 Hilldale Lane, for variance of Fence Code, Section 15.20.040, pertaining to Residential Districts, for the purpose of constructing a five (5) foot cedar board and board wood fence beginning at the southwest corner of the house and extending south beyond the building setback line along Fabish Drive a distance between six (6) and eight (8) feet, but no greater than eight (8) feet, to line up with the fence of the property to the west at 901 Hobson Drive, then turning west to the rear property line.

Subject to the Village Engineer's memorandum dated September 30, 2009. The Petitioner has demonstrated hardship and unique circumstances. The proposed fence will not be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare and will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

Com. Windecker seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote: AYE – Dunn, Windecker, Shapiro, Au, Entman

NAY – None

ABSTAIN – None

Motion Passed 5 to 0. Findings of Fact attached. Permit may be issued in fifteen (15) days – November 5, 2009.

400 W. DUNDEE ROAD, VILLAGE PLAZA – SIGN CODE, SECTIONS 14.20.030 AND 14.20.070, TO INSTALL A GROUND SIGN THAT WOULD BE LOCATED CLOSER THAN THE THIRTEEN (13) FEET TO THE PROPERTY LINE AS REQUIRED BASED UPON THE SIGN HEIGHT

Mr. Barry Millman, Horizon Realty Services, 1130 Lake Cook Road, Suite 280, Buffalo Grove, Illinois, was present and sworn in. The public hearing notice published in the Daily Herald on October 1, 2009 was read.

Mr. Millman explained that this is his third time appearing before the Board trying to reinstall the sign that was destroyed by wind damage in March last year. The property is a thirty thousand square foot shopping center located on the north side of Dundee Road near Golfview Terrace. At the time the center was built, a sign was installed. The sign was a modified pylon sign indicating Village Plaza as the name of the shopping center and 400 as the address. That sign was destroyed during a wind storm. They initially attempted to replace that sign with a multi-tenant pylon sign several times this past year. Those requests were not approved. They are asking to replace the old sign with a similar sign that was previously in place. Since the original sign was installed, the Sign Code has changed.

Ch. Entman read the Village Engineer's memorandum addressed to Brian Sheehan dated October 1, 2009 which states: "The sign location should be determined so that any portion of the sign does not overhang the right of way and the sign edge is setback at least two feet from the edge of the public sidewalk." Mr. Millman acknowledged that he has seen the report and stated that they can meet that criteria.

Ch. Entman referenced the ART Minutes of October 1, 2009. He confirmed that the proposed sign is the same sign that was blown down and will be in the same location.

Com. Windecker stated that as he discussed at the ART meeting, the base of the sign should be reinforced. Mr. Millman stated that he has asked the sign contractor to do that. Com. Windecker stated that as he mentioned at the ART meeting, he is concerned with the size of the sign. If it blew down from the wind at that size, what is to prevent the sign from blowing down again? He would suggest lowering the sign approximately two (2) to three (3) feet. He also believes that the width of the sign should be reduced to eight (8) feet instead of ten (10) feet so that the wind resistance is less so the same problem doesn't happen again.

Com. Dunn asked if the previously proposed signs that were not approved were the same size as this proposed sign. Mr. Millman said it is the same size. Com. Dunn also believes that the sign could be smaller. There is not a lot of lettering on it and there is not a lot to read. If the last sign blew over, what is to prevent the new sign from blowing over? If the sign blows over, it could blow into the street and hit a car that is driving by. She would like to see the size reduced.

Com. Windecker added that at the ART meeting he stated that the sign was too large. The ART is to look at the design, color and style of the sign as opposed to what is handled by the Zoning Board. The Zoning Board decides on size criteria.

Ch. Entman believes that the proposed sign is a fair sign as far as not asking for too much verbiage. It is the same sign that was there before. He does not see the need to have that type of sign so large. He can see that property fairly well from either direction. He uses one of the professionals in the plaza. He would really like to see the size brought down and made smaller. It does not need to be ten (10) feet by eight (8) feet. If the total height of the sign were to be five (5) feet or so, that would be more than sufficient to identify the address of the plaza. The sign will not be setback to take up parking spaces. Mr. Millman stated that they originally had another idea to put the sign in another location, but they would lose a parking space. Ch. Entman said that since the sign has to be so close to the sidewalk it needs to be a smaller sign. The proposed sign is thirteen (13) feet off the ground and even if it were reduced two (2) or three (3) feet, the sign would still need to be scaled down. The signs across the street are lower and smaller in size, close to the ground. Dengeo's sign is only eight (8) feet in height and that sign contains the name of the business and so forth. A smaller sign will address the concerns of the Commissioner's concerning the sign being a hazard. Keeping the sign closer to the ground and small will allow the sign to identify the plaza and not present a safety issue. He asked for suggestions from the Commissioner's on how big the sign should be. He does not believe this proposed sign needs to be eight (8) feet in height. There are other signs that are the height of an average human being, five (5) to six (6) feet in height. Plus if it is low in the ground as a monument type without a large post, you would not need to worry about the sign blowing down. If the sign ever blew down again, it would blow onto the ground and not across the street or something. He would prefer to see the sign as a monument type sign and then scale it down in half. That would be a four (4) foot high by five (5) feet in width. Mr. Millman had attempted a monument sign in the past. And because they have such a narrow front yard to the property, a typical monument sign with it being on a pole doesn't really provide any benefit to the shopping center. They do not have enough room for a monument style sign. They only have approximately twelve (12) feet available for a sign. That is why they went with a single pole sign. They want to get as much signage as they can. He doesn't have a problem making the width eight (8) feet if the sign contractor can achieve that and still duplicate the old sign.

Ch. Entman understands and acknowledges the attempt to compromise. If the Board does not have a problem with an eight (8) foot wide sign, then the height should come down as well. He still believes that six (6) feet in total height from the ground is sufficient. He thinks it would look better if kept close to the ground if not in the ground.

Com. Windecker suggested reducing the post by three (3) feet to two (2) feet and then reducing the size of the sign to get the verbiage on it. Possibly twenty-four (24) inch letters. Consolidate the sign to eight (8) feet across and five and one half (5-1/2) feet in height added on to the two (2) foot base. That would be more appealing than the gigantic sign that is eighty (80) square feet. It would look more professional if it is identified with the plain verbiage at the suggested dimensions. Mr. Millman replied that his contractor stated that the sign has to be three (3) feet off the ground.

Ch. Entman stated that he wants to make sure that the sign is low to ground and if there is a structural issue that it has to be a certain height, then the issue of the sign blowing over is raised again. The total height still should not exceed the suggested total height. That is why he was

thinking more of a monument-type sign. The sign is all based on dimension. If you have an eight (8) by ten (10) sign, he is going to need a certain amount of post to support it. If it is a smaller sign, you need less of a post. Based on what the Board is suggesting, a five and one half (5-1/2) by eight (8) foot sign, he is not sure what base would be needed to support that. If this is something the Petitioner thinks he needs to ask the sign company about, see what they can provide. Then the Board will take a look at that.

Mr. Millman asked why this was not told to him before so he didn't have to waste time. Ch. Entman asked Mr. Millman what he wasn't told. Mr. Millman stated that he has had the proposal in since the beginning of September. So now this is almost the end of October. The ART committee never mentioned the issue of the height. Ch. Entman stated that the ART committee is not the Zoning Board of Appeals. Mr. Millman stated that he is willing to reduce the size of the sign if he could get the Board's approval so he can proceed. Otherwise he will run into a winter condition, it will be difficult to install the sign the ground. He is losing tenants by the day. He has three (3) tenants who have left and three (3) tenants who are not paying rent. Ch. Entman asked when the three (3) tenants left. Mr. Millman stated they left before the sign blew down, but he cannot get new tenants. Ch. Entman asked if the tenants have told him specifically that they will not sign a lease because there is no sign. Mr. Millman stated yes. Ch. Entman asked who those tenants are. Mr. Millman said he lost Explore, the resale shop. She is already gone. The camera shop left. He had one (1) tenant that wanted to come into the Center but wanted more exposure to the street. He also had a children's hair salon, but they decided to go elsewhere. Across the street, actually. And they lost Chase Staffing because they got a sign right on Dundee Road. They are really in a negative situation. It has gone on for over a year.

Ch. Entman stated that the two (2) prior proposals were reviewed individually and rejected. This is the first time they are seeing this proposal. The sign being proposed has nothing to do with tenant identification. He is not convinced that the reason tenants either left or didn't move in is because of a sign. The Board is willing to do what they suggested by reducing the sign. If the Petitioner is saying that the contractor won't be able to build the sign at those dimensions, then that is something that the Petitioner will have to deal with. The Board has an idea of what they would like the sign to be as far as size and height. Mr. Millman asked for the size that the Board would agree to and he will go back to his contractor and say this is what I need, and then he will let the owners make that decision on whether they want to pursue it. Ch. Entman stated that Com. Windecker suggested that the sign be five and one half (5-1/2) feet in height and eight (8) feet wide and mounted on a two (2) foot post. Mr. Millman stated that those dimensions might inhibit their landscaping requirements. Com. Windecker stated that they might have to cut the grass. Ch. Entman stated that if the landscaping impedes that 400 number then the Petitioner could come up with different landscaping or keep it trimmed. Com. Windecker stated that at the ART meeting the Petitioner stated that the sign broke off the foundation. The previous meetings at the Zoning Board it was stated that the sign fell over. It broke off from the foundation. He asked how the foundation could be used again and Mr. Millman replied that the post was sleeved with metal piping. Then the Petitioner agreed to reinforce the base and pour a new base. Mr. Millman agreed that is what he said. Com. Windecker stated that the reason the sign broke off at the base was probably because the surface of the sign was so large that it broke off of an insufficient mounting for that pole that held the sign up. He also stated that it is a huge sign for that location and

suggested that the size be reduced. However, being an ART review he did not think that it was his place to say to reduce the size of the sign.

Mr. Millman stated that the sign was up for twenty (20) years. He would like to know what would be approved and would meet the criteria and still satisfy the ordinance so they can have a sign installed before this coming spring.

Com. Shapiro asked what the most identifying part of the sign is. Is it Village Plaza, or is it the address. Mr. Millman stated the address 400. Com. Shapiro said if they reduce the size of the sign and Village Plaza turns out to be a slightly smaller lettering and they make the 400 larger, they will still get the recognition along the street that they want. Reducing the overall size of the sign should not be a hardship. The Board has seen some really nice looking monument signs that are probably the size the Board is suggesting that would identify the property and not have the issues with the wind. The pole doesn't even have to be there if it were a monument sign. You would have a base and the sign would be on top of the base. It doesn't have to be a two (2) foot pole; it can be a concrete base that the six (6) foot by eight (8) foot sign would sit on. Mr. Millman stated now that creates a cost issue. The monument sign will be significantly more expensive than the proposed sign. Com. Shapiro does not know the cost factor between a pole versus a base. It sounds like the pole would have to be set into a base anyway. If the Petitioner is identifying the address, they don't need a ten (10) foot sign to do that. Mr. Millman agrees. They are willing to reduce the size of the sign.

Com. Au asked why the Petitioner is so insistent on a pole with the lollipop look. That was a safety concern with the sign blowing down. It seems that based on the examples of other signs given to the Board all of them are lower to the ground and more streamline as opposed to a pole with a huge sign at the top. She asked if they are trying to get that look for a reason. The previous proposals were the same style. Mr. Millman stated that it is strictly a cost issue. Com. Au asked what kind of cost he is talking about so the Board has an idea of what the hardship would be. Mr. Millman stated that the proposed sign is \$11,000.00. A monument sign would be closer to \$20,000.00. With a monument sign, the contractor would have to start over. With the proposed sign, the contractor can use some of the infrastructure that might be in the ground.

Ch. Entman stated that if the hardship of the \$9,000.00 cost difference to put a monument sign in, then the Board would want to see the sign no larger than five and one half (5-1/2) feet in height and no wider than eight (8) feet in width and elevated off the ground no more than two (2) feet. So the absolute top of the sign would be seven and one half (7-1/2) feet.

Mr. Millman amended his Petition to reduce the sign to five and one half (5-1/2) feet in height and no wider than eight (8) feet in width and elevated off the ground no more than two (2) feet. So the absolute top of the sign would be seven and one half (7-1/2) feet. If his contractor cannot build the sign to those specifications, he will come back before the Board.

Ch. Entman stated that if the sign cannot be built at those dimensions then the Petitioner would have to come back on a brand new Petition. If the sign contractor cannot build the sign, the Petitioner would have until the following Thursday, October 29, 2009 to file a new Petition to get on the November agenda.

Mr. Sheehan stated that there is no reference to color on the sign rendering. There is also no reference to illumination.

Ch. Entman confirmed with the Petitioner that sign would be a bronze cabinet with white lettering internally illuminated. Mr. Millman stated that the sign rendering is remotely close. They tried to make it as similar as possible to what was up before. Ch. Entman asked Mr. Raysa if the Board can use Exhibit "F", the photograph of the sign that blew down, to define the proposed sign colors. Mr. Raysa stated they could use Exhibit "F".

There were no additional questions or comments from the Commissioners. There were no questions or comments from the audience.

Com. Dunn made the following motion:

I move we recommend to the Village Board to grant the amended request made by Horizon Management, 1130 Lake Cook Road, Suite 280, Buffalo Grove, Illinois, for variance of Sign Code, Section 14.20.030, pertaining to Business Districts; and Section 14.20.070, pertaining to Ground Signs, for the purpose of installing a ground sign that would be located closer to the property line as required based upon the height for the property located at 400 W. Dundee Road.

Subject to the Village Engineer's memorandum dated October 1, 2009. The sign dimensions shall not exceed five and one half (5-1/2) feet in height and no wider than eight (8) feet in width and elevated off the ground no more than two (2) feet. So the absolute top of the sign would be seven and one half (7-1/2) feet. The sign content, color and font to match as closely as possibly to Exhibit "F" submitted to the Zoning Board of Appeals. The location of the sign to remain consistent with Exhibit "A". The hours of illumination of the sign to be 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., seven days a week.

Pursuant to Sign Code, Section 14.44.010, Sub-section B.

Mr. Millman stated that he has an issue with the hours of illumination. The sign system is connected to the parking lot lighting system of the Center. The parking lot lights go on approximately 5:00 p.m. and go off at 7:00 a.m. He asked if there was a reason that the Board would want an address or identifying sign turned off on the street. Com. Dunn stated that the businesses are closed and there are residential neighbors on each side of the Center. Mr. Millman stated that the business signs are still illuminated all night long. Com. Dunn stated that if the businesses are closed then there is no purpose served to have the address lit up at night. Mr. Millman asked if the hours could be extended to midnight.

Com. Au stated that she doesn't see any issue if the parking lot lights are on all night.

Ch. Entman understands. Com. Dunn stated that the parking lot lights are on for safety. This sign is not for safety. This sign is just for identification.

Com. Windecker stated that the parking lot lights shine down whereas this sign will be shining from side to side. Mr. Millman stated that the sign would be shining into to the street back and forth. It is a dimly lit sign. It is not a bright light, it is a dull light. Residential wise, he really doesn't have residents. The sign would be facing east and west. Not facing north and south. There are residents to the east and there are condominiums to the west, but they are about a block away. Com. Windecker asked if the previous sign that blew down was on all night. Mr. Millman stated that it was on all night.

Ch. Entman does not have an issue with having the sign on until midnight. Mr. Millman stated that he will have to make some changes in the system because the sign is tied into the parking lot lights. He will have to figure out a way to turn them off separate from the lights. This is just adding to the expense. Ch. Entman understands the concerns. He asked if the Petitioner would compromise and turn the sign off at 11:00 p.m. Mr. Millman agreed to 11:00 p.m.

Com. Dunn amended the motion that the hours of illumination of the sign to be 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., seven days a week.

Com. Windecker seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote: AYE – Dunn, Windecker, Shapiro, Au, Entman

NAY – None

ABSTAIN – None

Motion Passed 5 to 0. Item to appear on the November 16, 2009 Village Board agenda.

175 MCHENRY ROAD, CHASE BANK – DEVIATION TO THE GROVE POINT PLAZA SHOPPING CENTER SIGN CRITERIA TO ALLOW A MAXIMUM LETTER HEIGHT OF 30 INCHES AND TO ALLOW THE MAXIMUM SIGN DEPTH TO BE 8-5/16" FOR THE LOGO

Jessica Health-Bolden, Icon Identity Solutions, 1418 Elmhurst Road, Elk Grove Village, Illinois 60007 was present and sworn in.

Ms. Bolden explained that Icon has been charged with the sign conversion from WaMu to Chase Bank. The sign dimensions were reviewed. They are requesting the height of the sign letters to be thirty (30) inches versus the twenty-four (24) inches. They are also requesting the depth of the logo to be eight and five-sixteenths (8-5/16) inches versus six (6) inches. The area of the wall is four hundred twenty (420) square feet. They will be centering the sign. They will be making any wall repairs and patches as necessary. The sign will be black during the day and white at night. One of the more important issues is the depth of the logo. Their engineers have told them that without the depth of logo as proposed the sign would be illuminated unevenly. The illumination is LED.

Ch. Entman noted the landlord approval letter and the ART minutes of October 1, 2009.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Commissioners. There were no questions or comments from the audience.

Com. Windecker made the following motion:

I move we grant the request made by Icon Identity Solutions on behalf of Chase Bank, 175 McHenry Road, for Deviation to the Grove Point Plaza Shopping Center Sign Criteria to allow a maximum letter height of thirty (30) inches and to allow a maximum sign depth of eight and five-sixteenths (8-5/16) inches for the logo. The sign will be black during the day and white at night. The sign will be centered in the sign area. Pursuant to the sign drawing dated January 30, 2009 and revised May 28, 2009.

Com. Dunn seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote: AYE – Dunn, Windecker, Shapiro, Au, Entman

NAY – None

ABSTAIN – None

Motion Passed 5 to 0.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Com. Dunn and seconded by Com. Windecker. Voice Vote – AYE was unanimous.

Ch. Entman adjourned the meeting at 8:50 P.M.

Submitted by,

Julie Kamka
Recording Secretary