

Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum called the July 12, 2004 meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Mr. Kahlke, Mr. Matejczyk, Mr. McCormick, Mr. Nicholaou, Mr. Waechtler, Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum

ABSENT: Mr. Jirik, Mrs. Reynolds, Mr. Stark

STAFF

PRESENT: Joseph Skach, Director Planning & Community Development
Lori Sommers, Strategic Planner
Beth Janicki-Clark, Village Prosecutor
Donald Scheidler, Chief Building Inspector
Alice Dornan, Recording Secretary

For the benefit of the members of the audience, Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum explained the purpose of the Plan Commission is to conduct public hearings to put together information, testimony from members of the public, technical assessment by Staff and questions and comments from Plan Commission members to provide a body of information to the Mayor and the Village Council.

Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum outlined the protocol for this evening's agenda item. First, as Chairman, he will call the public hearing to order. Second, Village Staff presents its technical review and recommendations. Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum advised this presentation assesses what is being requested relative to the Ordinances, Codes and other requirements of the Village.

The third step, the public participation portion of the hearing, is when members of the public are afforded an opportunity to speak. Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum further explained questions could be asked of Staff. As a matter of procedure, Staff gathers all the questions to be addressed sequentially upon completion of public comment.

Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum pointed out the proceedings are recorded to assist in the preparation of the minutes. He encouraged those wishing to speak to come to the podium where there is a microphone, to speak clearly and slowly and state their name and address before beginning their testimony so that detailed minutes can be provided. Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum asked anyone who testifies to remain in the Council Chambers in the event the Plan Commission members want to address specific questions to them in order to fully understand an issue or a concern.

Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum stated the final step is the Plan Commission's deliberation of the petition. When deliberation is over, a motion is presented. Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum explained the motion can be to either recommend approval based on the

information provided, it can be to recommend approval with changes or revisions or it can be to recommend denial.

The recommendation, along with the minutes, exhibits, etc., is forwarded to the Mayor and the members of the Village Council for further processing.

Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum explained there is one item on this evening's agenda. He noted the Commission would be acting in an advisory mode with regard to this petition.

PUBLIC HEARING: FILE NO. PC-11-04 ORDINANCE AMENDMENT TO CHAPTER 28 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE, ZONING ORDINANCE – Amend Section 28-1500 Signs

Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum stated the notice of Public Hearing was published in the Downers Grove Reporter June 25, 2004. He explained the Village is the petitioner and asked Staff for its presentation.

Mrs. Sommers stated the focus of this evening's meeting is to review and discuss the immediate refinements to the existing sign regulations (Attachment 1 in the Staff packet). Attachment 2 is what was discussed in the Strategic Planning Committee as the draft of the newly proposed sign Ordinance was reviewed.

Mrs. Sommers advised tonight the Plan Commission is looking at the immediate refinements that were suggested by the Joint Strategic Planning meeting along with the members of the Zoning Board of Appeals. While these refinements are going forward from the Plan Commission to the Village Council, Staff will continue work on the more complex revisions (Attachment 2).

Mrs. Sommers stated the Staff Signage Team, which is composed of Planning & Community Development, the Legal Department and Code Services along with the Strategic Planning Committee and the Zoning Board of Appeals, developed the proposed modifications to the existing sign Ordinance.

Mrs. Sommers referenced Page Two of the Staff Report, which lists the major points of the revisions. The first category is Prohibited Signs. Mrs. Sommers explained neon signs are currently allowed in covered signs and within lettering. This will continue, but the proposed changes, all exposed neon lighting, or other similar neon-like lighting, will be prohibited including the outlining of buildings and windows.

With regard to rooftop signs, it is proposed that they be prohibited, and any existing rooftop signs must be brought into compliance within one year if the prohibition is approved. Mrs. Sommers noted rooftop signs are currently allowed in Section 28.1502 General Requirements, Gooseneck Reflectors and Lights, Section 18.1519(a)(c), B-2 zoning District and Section 28.1520(a)(c), B-3 Zoning District.

With respect to advertising signs, Mrs. Sommers stated they are basically defined as off-premises signs and have been labeled as Advertising off-premises signs/advertising. The Staff Signage Team along with the Strategic Planning Committee and the Zoning Board of Appeals proposes to prohibit. Existing signs would also be given one year to be brought into compliance or removed.

With respect to the illumination and movement section, Mrs. Sommers stated it is proposed to remove searchlights as a permitted temporary sign. Currently searchlights are permitted if approved by a Director.

Inflatable signage, such as inflatable balloons, inflatable animals or objects, is proposed to be prohibited.

Mrs. Sommers advised the Staff Signage Team also looked at the existing definition of Automobile Signs. There was concurrence at the Strategic Planning meetings to add new language to address vehicles or equipment as a sign or with signs, specifying that a vehicle with signage affixed to it must be licensed, insured, operable and actually operated as part of the business. Such vehicles may not be used solely to display signage. Such a vehicle may not remain stationary, which in effect acts as a permanent sign.

Mrs. Sommers noted the definition of Temporary Signs was also modified. They proposed that the definition be "A sign designated and intended for a temporary period of posting; typically constructed from non-durable materials such as paper, cardboard, vinyl, cloth, plastic and/or wallboard and which does not constitute a structure subject to the Village's building and zoning Codes. Mrs. Sommers stated they are also proposing that inflatable type signs or objects under Section 28.1510 Temporary Signs would be prohibited along with pennants found in Section 28.1505 Developers' Temporary Signs. During the Strategic Planning meetings, Ms. Sommers stated there was additional discussion about strengthening the Site Location, specifically the vision safety triangle on corner lots, which is currently addressed in Section 28.1102, corner lots. That language states the vision triangle is formed by connecting the two points ten feet away from the lot line intersection. It is proposed to reiterate that language in Section 28-1502 of the Sign Code.

With regard to Maintenance, Mrs. Sommers advised that the Strategic Planning Committee felt a stronger maintenance section would greatly enhance the aesthetic look of the Village by cleaning up rusted, unpainted, broken, unused or abandoned signs. The Committee also felt strengthening of enforcement would come in further refinements to the Village's Signage Code.

In conclusion, Mrs. Sommers stated Staff is recommending that the Plan Commission consider forwarding a positive recommendation to the Village Council with regard to Attachment 1 of the Staff Report.

Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum advised there was an additional handout from Mr. Skach regarding a proposed amendment to the Village's Sign Moratorium regarding neon

lighting. Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum asked for an explanation of this proposed amendment. Mr. Skach explained what was provided to the Commission this evening is updated language for the Sign Moratorium Ordinance. The proposed language better defines the references to neon and carves out neon as a lighting source; that is, neon which is inside of a sign, inside letters you cannot see as opposed to an exposed neon bulb or other type of gas lighting. This refinement is consistent with the ongoing discussions at the Strategic Planning sessions.

Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum asked if there were any questions from the Plan Commission members regarding this memorandum.

Mr. Waechtler asked if the number of neon signs that can be placed in a window was implied or does that number need to be spelled out. Mr. Skach responded his understanding of this proposed amendment to the sign moratorium is that there is no contemplation of anything other than simply saying the Village was not talking about neon as a lighting source inside of a sign. All of the other requirements that govern signs would remain in place.

Mr. Nicholaou asked Mr. Skach how Staff is interpreting open and closed neon or exposed neon. Mr. Skach stated his belief would be neon that is not visible. He emphasized neon is a lighting source versus a lighting source and visual element.

Mr. Matejczyk asked if some sort of a shade over the neon bulb would be appropriate. As an example, Mr. Waechtler referred to the bank at Main Street and Burlington where Kranz Real Estate has a neon sign in the window. He asked if that was an acceptable neon sign. Mr. Skach stated his understanding was some signs that use a neon light source either as part of the sign or as backlighting to letters as opposed to neon as the sign is the distinction.

To carry the interpretation one step further, Mr. Nicholaou stated if a sign says in black letters "OPEN" but is backlit with neon that is fine. If the sign spells out the word "OPEN" in exposed neon that is what we are discussing. For the record, everyone agreed with this interpretation.

Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum stated anyone wishing to speak regarding this petition should come to the microphone and state his or her name and address.

Gary Roediger, 5421 Maplewood Place, Downers Grove stated a lot of time has been spent on neon signage this evening. He asked about the quality of signs. Mr. Roediger pointed out the Village just spent a lot of money on our downtown area and are continuing to spend a lot of money on the parking deck. He commented Main Street is the jewel of Downers Grove. Mr. Roediger stated the quality of a sign should be considered. When someone puts up something in a high traffic area that represents our Village, people are going to make a judgment about Downers Grove. Mr. Roediger commented the recommendations being considered this evening do not address signs that comply with the regulations but still reflect poorly on Downers Grove. Mr. Roediger

commented some signs went up recently in downtown Downers Grove that caused uproar within the community. People saw those signs and said a lot of money has been spent on our downtown, and those types of signs reflect badly on Downers Grove. Mr. Roediger indicated he could mention the names of the businesses, and the Plan Commission asked him to do so. Mr. Roediger stated Rose Realty's signage on the former Fannie May store is not an example of good signage for Downers Grove. Right across the street there is Kranz Realty with a neon sign. On the other end of the downtown area, there is a realtor with a candy-striped awning. Mr. Roediger noted a lot of realtors in town want to get attention, but they are not concerned about the image they portray. Mr. Roediger acknowledged there are probably other signs, but he pointed out these signs because as people enter the downtown area from both north and south, these signs do not represent a positive image of Downers Grove. Mr. Roediger stated signs like these are not seen along the River Walk in Naperville. Mr. Roediger suggested there should be more concern about how people view our community. He expressed in his opinion people were upset over the last several months because of these types of signs going up. Signage in the downtown area should represent the Village not just a business. Downers Grove needs to encourage the businesses to do something appropriate. Realtors should be demonstrating what a nice community this is, what kind of houses we have and what kinds of businesses we have. Mr. Roediger stated his belief that he speaks for a lot of people in Downers Grove. Mr. Roediger expressed appreciation for the work Staff has done, but commented that neon signs do not cut it. Naperville and Hinsdale stand out because their signage has aesthetic qualities. Mr. Roediger commented Staff should be focusing on attaining that caliber of signage rather than focusing on neon signs; however, he agreed neon signs do have to be addressed.

George Swimmer, 4905 Main Street, Downers Grove, stated he thought he was going to see all kinds of difficult tasks this evening. Mr. Swimmer commented most of the proposed changes are straightforward. The provisions are not too onerous. He indicated he could live with them, and he thought the Council could live with most of them. In response to Mr. Roediger's comments, Mr. Swimmer stated he is an accountant and has lived in Downers Grove for a number of years. He expressed the opinion that Downers Grove is an excellent community. People become accustomed to what they see. Mr. Swimmer admitted he did not know how much he would want to change the sign Ordinance. The downtown area does require some approval from some commission as to the quality of the signs. He thought there might be some signs out there that never went in front of that commission. He thought at one time there was a commission for the downtown area that had to approve the quality and general aesthetics of a sign. He acknowledged that he did not know if such a commission still exists.

Barbara Roediger, 5421 Maplewood Place, Downers Grove stated she is confused about the paper signs. They are so predominant in the downtown area; the realtors and even the Chamber of Commerce have a lot of paper signs in their windows. She asked if those types of signs would not be permitted or are these paper signs o.k. if they are advertising community events and houses for sale and change regularly.

Mrs. Sommers stated currently 50% of a window could be filled with those types of signs. Mrs. Roediger expressed amazement that it is o.k. to cover 50% of a window with paper signs. Mr. Waechtler asked if those are temporary or permanent signs. Mrs. Roediger asked if it mattered if such a sign is up for one day and changed on a daily basis or permanently in a window. Mrs. Roediger stated the Village should be concerned if 50% of a store window is covered paper affixed with scotch tape. Mrs. Roediger commented everyone in the downtown area is doing that now to attract the attention of people driving on Main Street. She recognized that business people want to advertise their sales; however, she felt there were better ways to do it.

Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum suggested that Mrs. Roediger's questions be answered now, as they are specific as to what rules currently apply and what rules need to be enforced.

Mr. Skach noted the joint discussions specifically contemplated that issue, and there was recognition that issue along with hundreds of others needs follow-up attention. Mr. Skach stated the specific provision the Commission is looking at this evening was to address businesses in town where these types of signs (cloth, plastic, etc.) that come in under a temporary basis are being displayed. At their meetings, the Strategic Planning Committee saw many examples of these types of temporary signs, which over time become permanent signs. Mr. Skach reiterated there are other issues that will need follow-up attention.

Mrs. Janicki-Clark, Village Prosecutor, stated temporary signs are external, and the signs being talked about are signs displayed on the inside of a window, which are considered window promotional signs and are not regulated very much under our current Code. Mrs. Sommers referenced the larger refinement, Attachment 2, which would further reduce the area of window that could be covered to 25%.

Liz Chalberg, member of the Economic Development Commission and the Chamber of Commerce, stated future discussions would focus on formation of some sort of a quality review committee. Ms. Chalberg stated she did not believe there ever was a quality review committee. She noted it would be difficult to develop objective criteria, but on the other hand, the way the current Ordinance reads, a bizarre, backlighted neon sign could go up and yet be of great quality.

Carrie Swimmer stated she owns a business and a building in the downtown area. Mrs. Swimmer indicated she had a copy of the Downers Grove Appearance Code. She asked if it was still in effect. Mrs. Swimmer recalled when you went to get a sign permit, you were given a copy of the Appearance Code. Your sign had to be in compliance with the Appearance Code. Mrs. Swimmer stated there was a Committee or a Board that reviewed sign applications and granted final approval for your sign.

Mrs. Swimmer stated she did not have a problem with any of the signs in the downtown area. Mrs. Swimmer commented the problem is that the existing Code is not being enforced. Mrs. Swimmer suggested the Village should concentrate on enforcement rather

than changing all the existing rules. As an example, she stated the setbacks are supposed to be eight feet. In the downtown area, the actual setbacks are not even six feet. If the Village is considering changing the setbacks to ten feet, everybody in the downtown area will have to take down their signs and move them.

Mrs. Swimmer stated she was concerned that the Village was going to eliminate freestanding signs. At one of the meetings she attended freestanding signs were called monument signs. Freestanding signs do not meet the definition of a monument sign. In reading the existing Code, Mrs. Swimmer stated she did not see any category for monument signs. She questioned how the monument sign was allowed at the corner of Main and Warren (Station Crossing). Mrs. Swimmer stated that sign clearly meets the proposed definition of a monument sign. Mrs. Swimmer asked about the setback for that particular sign. Mrs. Swimmer emphasized the current signs in the downtown area do not meet the existing Code.

Mrs. Swimmer expressed her opinion that for the most part the signs in the downtown area are attractive and well maintained, and they meet the business' needs. She recommended leaving those signs alone.

Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum asked if there was anyone else who wished to speak. Hearing no response, Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum closed the public participation portion of the public hearing.

Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum next asked if there were any questions or comments from the Plan Commission Members.

Mr. Nicholaou advised those members of the audience who had not attended any of the Strategic Planning meetings that the Committee has spent an enormous amount of time on the Signage Ordinance and will continue to do so in order to get the Ordinance updated. He further noted this evening the Plan Commission would be addressing the proposed amendments to the existing Ordinance step by step. The Strategic Planning Committee did not want to rush the review of the proposed Ordinance because there are so many changes yet to be discussed. Mr. Nicholaou explained everything that has been brought up this evening by members of the audience has been thoroughly discussed by the Strategic Planning Committee, and the Committee is in agreement with regard to concerns about the gateways to our community. He assured the audience that their comments were not falling on deaf ears. Mr. Nicholaou noted the Strategic Planning Committee looked at pictures of many if not all signs in Downers Grove. Mr. Nicholaou commented 20 to 30% of the problems regarding signage could be corrected through enforcement of the current Ordinance.

Mr. Nicholaou concluded the Economic Development Commission, the Plan Commission and the Zoning Board of Appeals along with Staff would continue to work together over the next few months to review and fine tune the proposed Sign Ordinance.

Mr. Matejczyk stated his understanding of the concern being expressed here this evening is quality and particularly quality in the downtown area. Mr. Matejczyk noted we are trying to somehow legislate quality by saying neon or not neon, size, in the window or not in the window.

Mr. Matejczyk commented he recently spent a half-day with the Borough Manager in Westchester, PA. Westchester is a community of about 75,000 people very similar to Downers Grove in its diversity; however, it is about 75-100 years older than Downers Grove. Their downtown is very similar to ours, and they were concerned about signs and buildings being torn down. Mr. Matejczyk advised they did not try to legislate neon signs, size of signs or monument signs. Instead, they set up a Quality Board. This Board has representatives from the business community in the central area, which is delineated on a map. They have independent architectural consultants on the Board as well as people representing the borough at large. This Board reviews sign applications and makes their decision based on quality and whether or not it fits in with the rest of the borough, which happens to be very historic. Mr. Matejczyk stressed Downers Grove is trying to legislate from the bottom up. Mr. Matejczyk emphasized that Downers Grove has a quality problem, and as Ms. Chalberg pointed out, quality is in the eyes of the beholder. Mr. Matejczyk expressed the belief that there currently are some exposed neon signs out there that are of very high quality. Legislating against neon signs may be legislating against neon signs of good quality. He pointed out the only way we can make some determination as to the quality of a proposed sign is to have representatives of the community review them based on their appropriateness for Downers Grove. The representatives should be business owners in the area that are affected by the sign, particularly in the downtown area, professional people who know about these types of things and also understand what is going on in other communities, as well as representatives of the community at large.

Mr. Waechtler commented other communities such as Hinsdale and Naperville have done this and have been very successful. Mr. Waechtler indicated in his opinion the issue is broader than just neon signs. He agreed with Mr. Nicholaou that the proposed amendments would put some teeth into the current Ordinance and would be a starting point.

Mr. Waechtler stated when he got off the train last Saturday and looked over at the Kranz Realty office he could not see anything from 50 feet away because of the 8-1/2" x 11" pieces of paper cluttered all over the window. Mr. Waechtler asked Mrs. Sommers what are the proposed changes that would make that look different than it currently does. Mrs. Sommers responded with regard to temporary signs the main difference is the word "vinyl" has been added. Paper signs in the window would be classified as window signs and have not been addressed in these immediate revisions. Mr. Waechtler recalled that this Commission has talked about gateways to the Village particularly for those people driving in their cars, and he asked what about people riding through the community on the train.

Mr. Nicholaou stated he did not disagree with what has been said, but the Plan Commission needs to keep its eye on the petition in front of us this evening which is amendments to an existing Ordinance that will be forwarded to the Village Council along with the explanation that the Strategic Planning Committee cannot complete the review of the proposed Sign Ordinance within the timeframe of the current Moratorium. Mr. Nicholaou stated most of the members of the Strategic Planning Committee have voiced their concern about the 50% window coverage. He expressed his opinion that the percentage of coverage will be lowered as a part of the Committee's continuing review of the proposed new Sign Ordinance.

Mr. Nicholaou stated Mr. Matejczyk's comments are appropriate to what the Committee tabled for future review.

Mr. Waechtler responded he is addressing a specific item, Sign, temporary that the Plan Commission will be voting on this evening. Mr. Waechtler stated the proposed language on Page 13 of Attachment One would allow temporary signs of any size to be placed all over a business' windows up and down Main Street. Mr. Nicholaou noted the proposed change was formulated to add "vinyl" because there are businesses abusing this section of the Ordinance and with the strengthening of the existing Ordinance that could be immediately corrected.

Mrs. Janicki-Clark suggested for further clarification, the words "An external" be added.

Mr. Skach stated at the Strategic Planning Committee meetings there was discussion involving which side of the building plane of the wall the sign is on. He recalled this issue had not yet been resolved. The context regarding neon is that it goes inside the business. The temporary signage amendment is a refinement to the current Ordinance by focusing down on the external nature of the sign where it ought to be versus the window advertising signs, which Mr. Skach acknowledged certainly need to be addressed.

For the purpose of moving through the proposed changes, Mr. Nicholaou suggested that the Plan Commission focus on Section 28.1204 Nonconforming signs, Page 15 and then proceed through the shaded areas or the lined-out areas page by page and discuss them as a group.

Mr. Waechtler commented the Plan Commission has to first address the proposed amendments to the Sign Moratorium. Mr. Nicholaou asked Staff for a clarification as to whether or not the amendments are a synopsis of the changes in Attachment 1.

Mr. Waechtler suggested first looking at the four proposed changes to the Moratorium Amendment and then go through the details. This is what the Plan Commission is to address this evening. He noted he was not up to going through 15 pages of changes; however, if Commission members have questions or comments regarding specific changes as shown in Attachment 1, they could be addressed this evening.

Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum agreed with Mr. Waechtler that the petition before the Plan Commission this evening is to address the Moratorium Amendments, and Plan Commission members agreed.

Mr. Nicholaou suggested as the Plan Commission discusses each of the four proposed changes outlined in the Moratorium Amendment that when we discuss Items 2 and 4 that we also refer to the sections in Attachment 1 that apply in order not to have to cover some items twice.

Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum suggested starting with Item 2, which deals with neon signs - Section 28-1502(4) Page 16 of 20. Any questions or problems regarding neon should be discussed.

Mr. Matejczyk asked if an exposed neon sign of a beer bottle in a bar window would be affected by this change. Mr. Nicholaou stated that was a good question and noted that Every Day's A Sundae just put up a Sherman Ice Cream sign and questioned if that sign would also be affected, as it is an exposed neon sign. Someone in the audience noted that Coldwell Banker has a big blue/black sign backlit with neon. Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum asked if these were examples of exposed gas tubing, and Mr. Matejczyk concurred. Mr. Nicholaou pointed out every open and closed sign in town is gas tubing. The proposed language states these types of signs are prohibited. Mr. Nicholaou asked what the timeframe would be for the removal of such signs. The proposed language with regard to advertising sign/off premises or roof sign states conformance has to occur within one year, and he suggested this language be added to the prohibition on exposed gas tubing. Mr. Matejczyk asked if the exposed gas tubing is moved back from the window but is still visible through the window, is it also prohibited.

Mr. Skach reiterated the discussions at the Strategic Planning Committee regarding which side of the building wall and how far would the language go. The presupposition is that the signs were on the exterior of the building. There was additional language added to address signs on the inside of the building. He asked Mrs. Janicki-Clark for further clarification.

Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum stated his interpretation is that if a neon sign is visible from the window it is prohibited.

Ms. Chalberg asked if it would be helpful before any decisions are made to take pictures of these types of signs in the downtown area. Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum and Mr. Nicholaou responded the Strategic Planning Committee has seen pictures of all of the signs downtown, along Ogden Avenue, 63rd and 75th Streets.

Mr. Matejczyk asked if he is walking past an establishment, and he is able to look into a window and see a neon sign, is that a prohibited sign under these proposed changes. Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum concurred. Mr. Nicholaou suggested the issues being raised with regard to neon signs are the same types of issues that were raised in the Strategic Planning meetings with regard to monument signs. Mr. Nicholaou stated he

understands the neon sign prohibition would address those businesses on Ogden Avenue with neon signs all over their buildings, which would have to be removed. Mr. Nicholaou stated an exit sign done in neon that can be seen from outside would have to come down under this proposed language. Mrs. Chalberg noted every store in town has an exit sign.

Mr. Griesbaum commented it is apparent that the Plan Commission has identified a number of issues with regard to neon signage and suggested the proposed change should not be a part of the Moratorium Amendments. Mr. Matejczyk suggested there would be unintended consequences if this proposed change were passed, and Mr. Nicholaou agreed.

Mr. Skach agreed there are two parts to this. The baseline contemplation is signage on the outside of the building, and the other part is signage on the inside. He commented the proposed changes could potentially be broken into two parts.

Mr. Nicholaou suggested passing on neon for now and addressing the other three changes, and the other Commission members agreed.

Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum asked if there were any questions or comments with regard to rooftop signs. There was no response.

Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum next addressed Section 28.1503 Advertising Off Premises Signs, Page 17 of 20. Mr. Nicholaou asked Mrs. Janicki-Clark if this change is part of the previous discussion regarding Discount Fence not being able to keep that billboard type of sign in front of their building. Mrs. Janicki-Clark stated if approval to prohibit those types of signs is granted, then Discount Fence's sign will have to come down. Mrs. Wysocki asked about sandwich board signs of which there are many in the downtown area, and Mr. Nicholaou responded currently they are illegal. Enforcement of the current Ordinance is the key.

Chairman Pro-Tem Griesbaum next referenced Section 18.1509 Inflatable Signs, Page 18 of 20. There was no discussion or disagreement regarding the prohibition of inflatable signs.

Chairman Pro-Tem Griesbaum next referenced Section 28.201 Definitions Sign, Vehicle, Page 13 of 20 and recalled there was quite a bit of discussion regarding this definition at the Strategic Planning Committee meetings. Mr. Waechtler explained for the benefit of the audience vehicle signs are signs displayed on an inoperable vehicle. The proposed language states such a vehicle must be used for the operation of the business. Mr. Waechtler also wanted to know if there were any loopholes and asked if Staff was comfortable with the proposed definition. Mr. Skach responded the Staff team is as comfortable as we can be after looking at it every which way in looking for that loophole. Mr. Skach commented simply stated the Village envisions vehicles are vehicles, and signs are signs.

Chairman Pro-Tem Griesbaum next referenced Section 28.201 Definitions Sign, Temporary, Page 13 of 20 and recalled temporary signs were discussed earlier this evening, and it was agreed to add “An external” at the beginning of the definition. Mr. Matejczyk asked Staff if Mylar was considered a non-durable material. He explained it is a durable material, but it is also a temporary material. Mr. Waechtler asked Mr. Nicholaou if he saw any Mylar signs when he was out in the community photographing existing signs. Mr. Nicholaou responded he had not seen any Mylar signs. Mr. Matejczyk noted Mylar is not currently in use, but it is a durable temporary material. Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum asked Mr. Matejczyk if he was recommending adding Mylar to this definition. Mr. Matejczyk indicated he was not recommending adding Mylar to the definition; he merely brought it up to show that someone will try to find loopholes. Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum asked if Mylar would be covered under plastic. Mr. Scheidler responded Mylar is a type of plastic and could be interpreted as such.

Mr. Nicholaou recommended adding Mylar to the definition so that the definition for a temporary sign would be clear to everyone on Staff.

Mr. Skach commented the materials shown in this definition are to be representative of all the different types of materials. What is missing is the concept of rigidity. He noted this could be a potential refinement. Mr. Matejczyk asked if a plastic rigid sign would be allowed. Mr. Skach responded plastic in and of itself would have to be installed in some sort of framework in order to be rigid. Mrs. Janicki-Clark noted at that point it becomes a permanent sign.

Mr. Nicholaou noted Saint Joseph Church currently has three signs on its fence, Coldwell Banker has two signs on its fence, Jewel has two huge 30 minute photo signs that just went up, the flower shop on Main Street north of Warren Avenue has a temporary sign that has been up so long it might as well be considered a permanent sign. Mr. Nicholaou asked how the proposed revisions would affect those signs; do they come down immediately or do they come down immediately if they do not have a permit for a temporary sign. Mr. Nicholaou noted the current Ordinance states one temporary sign at a time, and these locations have more than one sign.

Mr. Scheidler, Chief Code Enforcement Officer, advised the Code Enforcement Officers are currently working their way down Ogden Avenue. They are stopping at businesses whose signs are in violation of the current Ordinance. The Code Enforcement Officer presents the business owner with a Field Correction Notice in lieu of a written letter. The Field Correction Notice gives them a specific timeframe in which to come into compliance. Mr. Scheidler referred to Page 11 of 20, the definition of Sign. Mr. Scheidler stated some of the signs Mr. Nicholaou noted as illegal actually were granted a sign permit because they were temporary attention-getting devices. They were allowed to put these signs on their buildings because they had enough space to do it. Mr. Scheidler stated Staff would have to go back to see if those signs were permitted as permanent signs or as attention-getting devices. Mr. Nicholaou asked Mr. Scheidler if he was referring to the floral shop on Main Street or was he referring to the Jewel at 63rd &

Main, which just put up two 30-minute photo banners. Mr. Scheidler indicated he was referring to both of those examples. He reiterated he would have to ascertain whether or not they were issued a permit and if they were not, immediate action needs to be taken. If a permit was issued, he would have to determine if it was a permit for a permanent wall sign based on whatever material they were using, or did they get a permit for a temporary, attention-getting device in which case they are allowed a total of 60 days a year to display such an attention-getting device. Mr. Nicholaou noted Coldwell Banker on Main Street has had one vinyl sign for better than 60 days. Mr. Scheidler advised Mr. Nicholaou that he called Coldwell Banker this morning and told them the vinyl sign had to come down. Mr. Scheidler indicated he reviewed the signage rules, which state the owner must apply for a temporary sign permit, which is only good for 60 days, and such a sign cannot be on the fence.

Mr. Waechter asked for clarification that the 60 days be within a year. Mr. Scheidler stated attention-getting devices are allowed for a total of 60 days a year. Mr. Waechter asked if that 60-day period could be broken down into smaller increments. Mr. Scheidler explained at present they can apply for a permit for as few as three days or a weekend. Typically, Code Enforcement would like the permit to be for a two-week period. At the end of that two-week period, if the owner wants the sign to remain, the sign permit must be renewed.

Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum asked for clarification whether or not the Commission agreed to include Mylar in the definition of temporary signs.

Mr. Skach asked Mr. Scheidler if his Department receives a lot of sign permits for Mylar signs as opposed to plastic or other types of non-rigid plastics. Mr. Scheidler stated the intent of the Ordinance was what is important. People will try to get around any Ordinance. Mr. Matejczyk agreed intent is what is important not the specific material. Mrs. Janicki-Clark advised if such an issue became the subject of a court case, and the drafters of the Ordinance included specific types of plastic but did not exclude a specific type of plastic but included Mylar, the intent would be argued. After discussion, the Commission agreed not to specifically include Mylar but view it as a plastic.

Mr. Nicholaou expressed appreciation that members of Staff are present this evening so that they hear the Commission's intent as they deliberate.

With respect to site location, Section 28.1502 General Requirements and Section 28.1102 Corner Lots, Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum noted this is the safety triangle and recalled at the Strategic Planning Committee meeting pictures of a safety triangle were shown. Mr. Matejczyk stated he was in full support of this and indicated it is a big issue here in the Village. Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum agreed. There was general consensus on this item.

With respect to Maintenance, everyone was in agreement with the comments contained in the Staff Report. For the record, Mr. Nicholaou stated he felt very strongly that Staff needs to be increased in order to handle the load. Mr. Nicholaou indicated he was

pleased to see several Council members in attendance this evening and expressed the hope that they would support an increase in Staff.

Mr. Waechtler asked Mr. Scheidler to walk him through the process of what currently occurs with regard to poorly maintained signs. He asked when the property owner is made aware of the poor maintenance; do they have a certain amount of time to make the necessary repairs, etc? He also wanted to know if nothing is done, does the Village fine the business owner?

Mr. Scheidler stated the Code Enforcement Officers have been meeting with the business owner on a one-to-one basis at which time the owner is given a Field Correction Notice rather than receiving a letter in the mail citing the violation. The Notice indicates the timeframe in which they have to come into compliance, usually 15-20 days. The Code Services Department will work with a business owner if he requests more time in order to obtain bids, finalize contracts, etc. If a business owner ignores the Field Correction Notice, the Code Enforcement Officer issues a ticket, and the business owner would have to appear before a judge. Mr. Scheidler indicated fines start at \$75 and go as high as \$750.

Mrs. Janicki-Clerk stated the existing enforcement provision provides that the sign be altered or removed within ten days of receiving notice. If a sign causes an immediate threat to persons or property, there is also a provision for immediate removal with the Director's approval. She also pointed out the current language allows the Village to put a lien on the property if necessary.

Mr. Matejczyk stated his impression after looking at pictures of examples of poorly maintained signs is that the current provisions of the Ordinance have not been enforced in the past. He asked if that was because of lack of manpower. Mr. Scheidler responded it is difficult to focus on poorly maintained signs and keep up with everything else. Mr. Matejczyk commented some of the signs on Ogden Avenue are very poorly maintained, if maintained at all. Mr. Scheidler stated he met with the Code Enforcement Officers prior to the sign issue but did not give them instructions to actively enforce this section of the Code because he did not know the direction the moratorium was going to take. Mr. Scheidler indicated after the last Strategic Planning Committee meeting this issue came up and he then directed the Code Enforcement Officers to start blitzing Ogden Avenue. Mr. Scheidler indicated he would be accompanying the Code Enforcement Officers this week to see where they are at and what they have accomplished.

Mr. Nicholaou stated that was a secondary purpose of all the photographs he provided to the Strategic Planning Committee.

Mr. Nicholaou suggested to the Chairman that the Commission should start looking at the shaded items in on pages 11-20 in Attachment 1 to make sure everyone is in agreement. With regard to page 13, he asked if the Commission had reached agreement to add the words "An External" at the beginning of the definition of Sign, Temporary. Everyone agreed.

Mr. Nicholaou next referred to Page 15 Section 28.1204 Nonconforming Signs. Mr. Nicholaou asked Staff how this language would apply to the former Coldwell Banker office on Ogden Avenue as that building has been sold and the Firestone Sign, which became Bridgestone, a 50% ownership change. Mr. Scheidler advised Code Enforcement is in the process of bringing those types of signs into compliance. He noted the Coldwell Banker sign may well be in compliance. It is not too high, and it may be set back 50 feet from the centerline of Ogden Avenue. Mr. Scheidler expressed the hope that the new owners will not like the sign and will have it removed.

Mr. Nicholaou asked if a sign that has a verbalization panel at the bottom of the sign is a conforming sign. Mr. Scheidler stated it is a sign that does not move. The letters on the sign have to be manually changed. The street frontage of the building determines the square footage of signage. As an example, Walgreens or CVS are on corner lots and have two frontages so they can have a significant amount of signage.

Mr. Nicholaou stated in his last visit to CVS, he lost count at 21 signs on their building. He asked Staff if the ability to have that much signage is in the existing Code somewhere. Mr. Nicholaou stated he could not find it. Mr. Scheidler indicated now that the Code Enforcement Officers are blitzing Ogden Avenue, he would first want to determine how many of those signs were attention-getting devices, which ones do they have permits for or do not have permits for and then they can address those signs. Mr. Scheidler reiterated for every foot of frontage they are allowed to have two square feet of sign. Mr. Nicholaou indicated he brought this up to get the issue into the minutes so that when the Committee starts to talk about the new proposed Ordinance we know which animals we need to attack.

Mr. Scheidler indicated in Staff discussions they have been talking about building front as opposed to property front, which would make a significant difference.

Mr. Waechtler recalled Mr. Nicholaou previously raised the issue about the BP location at Main and Ogden. The property has street frontage on all four sides of the parcel. Mr. Waechtler stated under the current Ordinance the amount of signage they are allowed is based on the total street frontage. This is the type of issue that will have to be addressed within the review of the proposed new Ordinance.

Mr. Waechtler noted CVS in other communities does not have nearly as much signage as they are allowed to have here in Downers Grove. He specifically referred to the CVS store at Roosevelt and Meyers Roads.

Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum asked if there were any questions regarding the proposed changes on Page 18. Mr. Nicholaou next referenced "No pennants shall be permitted" and commented the Shell gas station on the northeast corner of Ogden and Fairview Avenues has pennants, banners and the shiny, shimmery stuff all over their property. Mr. Nicholaou asked Staff for confirmation that under the current Ordinance they can do all of those types of signage on their property at the same time. Mr. Waechtler asked if under the current Ordinance are pennants only allowed for a temporary period of time.

He noted Brown's Chicken on Ogden Avenue has been displaying pennants for quite some time. Mr. Scheidler responded those types of pennants are considered temporary attention-getting devices, and Brown's is probably at or near the end of their 60 day permit.

Mr. Nicholaou stated he thought there was something in the current Ordinance with regard to American flags, but he was not able to find anything. Mr. Nicholaou indicated he is bringing this matter to the Commission's attention because it is against U.S. Code to use the flag of the United States of America to advertise anything. He further noted out of respect to our flag, torn, tattered or dirty flags should be replaced. Mr. Nicholaou suggested adding some language regarding this issue to the current Ordinance. He recommended the language state that each property would be limited to three flags and maintained properly. Mr. Nicholaou noted there are a number of businesses around town whose flags are in sad shape. He commented that does not given a good impression of Downers Grove.

Mr. McCormick pointed out some gas stations display gigantic Americans flags as an attention getting device. Mrs. Janicki-Clark referred the Commission members to Page 2 of 20 Attention Getting Device, which states a flag or similar device used to draw someone's attention to a particular place. Mr. Nicholaou and Mr. McCormick asked if that language could be modified to include the United States flag. Mrs. Sommers referenced the proposed Sign Code Amendments, Page 9 of 19, No. 7 which states "Flags of any country, state, or unit of local government. No more than three (3) flags, displayed properly per Federal guidelines". Mr. Nicholaou asked Staff if "displayed properly" covers maintenance, and Staff agreed. Mr. Nicholaou stated with the permission of the other Plan Commission members, he would like that language inserted into the old Ordinance. Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum asked where this language should be inserted in the current Ordinance. Mr. Nicholaou asked Mrs. Janicki-Clark if it would be appropriate to place that language under the definition of a sign or is there some other section that would be appropriate. Mrs. Janicki-Clark responded she was not sure that it should be included under the definition provision. Staff will have to determine the appropriate section. Mr. Nicholaou asked when the Commission makes a motion this evening regarding these changes, should the motion state that the location of this language should be at Staff's discretion. Mr. Kahlke asked Mr. Nicholaou if he wanted size added. Several other Commission members stated size would have to be defined, and it was agreed to address this in the review of the Proposed Sign Code Amendments. Mr. Nicholaou addressed the audience and explained the Plan Commission is trying to clean up as much of the current Ordinance as possible as it will take considerable time to work on the new Ordinance.

Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum advised the Plan Commission members that all of this discussion regarding flags reverts back to Page 18 of 20.

Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum asked if there were any other comments or questions regarding the other changes on Page 18. There was no response.

Referring back to neon, Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum recalled the Commission had been wrestling with interpretation. Mr. Nicholaou stated Mr. Skach had suggested breaking the issue of signage on the outside of the building and signage on the inside of the building into two parts. Mr. Nicholaou commented his interpretation of this suggestion was that we talked about getting it out of the window and would address the issue of being able to view a neon sign hung on the wall from the street in future discussions. Mr. Skach responded the comment was made in the context of previous discussions with the Strategic Planning Committee in that there was clearly some hesitancy as to how far does the Code go inside of the building plane. The language that is currently proposed in this Draft is a result of that discussion. The presupposition is that the signs being discussed are exterior. The reason for the further refinement of going to the inside is in the Draft because of those discussions. That allows those two parts, outside and inside, to be discussed and allows the Commission to talk about that language in terms of the outside and potentially break off the inside and still allow this to move forward.

Mr. Waechtler stated he knew Staff had surveyed other communities with regard to neon. He asked Mr. Skach how other communities have addressed neon. Mr. Skach asked Mrs. Sommers to address that question as she had surveyed other communities. Mrs. Sommers responded in the initial review some communities did not even mention it in their Code at all. She suggested perhaps neon signage is addressed during their review process. Mrs. Sommers noted it was a very vague area in some of the other communities' Codes.

Mr. Waechtler noted he did not see many neon signs in other communities. He noted when you travel via train through the suburbs to Chicago and back, most of the neon signs you see are in the city advertising "Joe's Bar & Grill", etc. As you ride from LaGrange through Western Springs, Clarendon Hills and Hinsdale, the whole scene along the railroad tracks changes. Mr. Waechtler stated he would hate to see any proliferation of neon signs in the downtown area or along Ogden Avenue.

Mr. Skach stated the common theme despite the specifics of different communities is consistency of the difficulty in dealing with the issue. People find it much easier to make definitive statements about large neon signs. Sports team signs that appear in a window have become so much a part of our visual landscape and our culture as well as the business culture that in some instances there has been a hesitancy to address those types of signs. Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum agreed those types of signs seem to blend in with the overall streetscape.

After much discussion, the following change to Item (4) on Page 16 of 20 was agreed to: "Exterior signs containing exposed gas tubing including but not limited to Argon and Neon, are prohibited."

Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum asked if there were any further questions or comments. Hearing none, he called for a motion noting that the Plan Commission is in a recommendation mode with regard to this petition.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE NO. PC-11-04, MR. NICHOLAOU MOVED THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL NOTING THE FOLLOWING CHANGES: ON PAGE 13 OF 20, UNDER SIGN, TEMPORARY THAT THE WORDS “AN EXTERNAL” BE ADDED; ON PAGE 16 OF 20, “EXTERIOR SIGNS CONTAINING EXPOSED GAS TUBING INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ARGON AND NEON ARE PROHIBITED”; ON PAGE 9 OF 19, THAT THE VERBAGE REGARDING THE AMERICAN FLAG “FLAGS OF ANY COUNTRY, STATE OR UNIT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT. NO MORE THAN THREE (3) FLAGS, DISPLAYED PROPERLY PER FEDERAL GUIDELINES” BE INCLUDED IN THE CURRENT ORDINANCE. MR. MATEJCZYK SECONDED THE MOTION.

Mrs. Janicki-Clark suggested under Section 28.1204 Non-Conforming Signs, Subsection (d) Page 16 of 20 where the three (3) year period was changed to one a (1) year period for bringing signs into compliance, the language should be changed to read “Any advertising sign/off premises or roof sign and any exterior sign containing exposed gas tubing including but not limited to argon and neon are prohibited”. The Plan Commission agreed to amend the motion so that the corrected motion reads as follows:

WITH RESPECT TO FILE NO. PC-11-04, MR. NICHOLAOU MOVED THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE NOTHING THE FOLLOWING CHANGES: ON PAGE 13 OF 20, UNDER SIGN, TEMPORARY, THAT THE WORDS “AN EXTERNAL” BE ADDED; ON PAGE 16 OF 20, “EXTERIOR SIGNS CONTAINING EXPOSED GAS TUBING INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ARGON AND NEON ARE PROHIBITED”; ON PAGE 9 OF 19, THAT THE VERBAGE REGARDING THE AMERICAN FLAG “FLAGS OF ANY COUNTRY, STATE OR UNIT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT. NO MORE THAN THREE (3) FLAGS, DISPLAYED PROPERLY PER FEDERAL GUIDELINES” BE INCLUDED IN THE CURRENT ORDINANCE AND SECTION 28.1204 NON-CONFORMING SIGNS, SUBSECTION (d) BE CHANGED TO READ “ANY ADVERTISING SIGN, OFF PREMISES OR ROOF SIGN AND ANY EXTERIOR SIGN CONTAINING EXPOSED GAS TUBING INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ARGON AND NEON ARE PROHIBITED”. MR. MATEJCZYK SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum asked if there were any further questions regarding motion. Hearing no further questions, Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum asked for a roll call:

ROLL CALL:

AYE: Mr. Nicholaou, Mr. Matejczyk, Mr. Kahlke, Mr. McCormick, Mr. Waechtler, Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum

NAY: None

Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Waechtler stated it was very helpful to have Don Scheidler and Beth Janicki-Clark here in addition to Mrs. Sommers and Mr. Skach to answer questions and to assist us through this with the goal of passing on a very good recommendation to the Village Council.

Mr. McCormick asked about the memo regarding the proposed amendment to the Village's Sign Moratorium and asked if the Plan Commission has to forward a recommendation that Item No. 2 of the amendment be modified in light of our discussions with regard to neon. Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum agreed and asked for a motion.

WITH RESPECT TO THE ORDINANCE AMENDING A MORATORIUM REGARDING THE SIGN ORDINANCE IN THE VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE, MR. MCCORMICK MOVED THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL BE MODIFIED AS PERTAINS TO ITEM 2 UNDER SECTION 1 SO THAT IT READS "NO PERMIT SHALL BE GRANTED FOR EXTERIOR SIGNS CONTAINING EXPOSED GAS TUBING INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ARGON AND NEON SIGNS". MR. NICHOLAOU SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum asked for a roll call:

ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. MCCORMICK, MR. NICHOLAOU, MR. KAHLKE, MR. MATEJCZK, MR. WAECHTLER, CHAIRMAN PRO TEM GRIESBAUM

NAY: None

The motion passed unanimously.

For the record, Mr. Nicholaou stated the Plan Commission needs to state one more time even though no motion was made, that Staff in the Code Enforcement Department be increased to monitor these issues. Between teardowns, new construction and the everyday things this Village has to address in terms of Code Enforcement and now the re-invigoration of the current Sign Ordinance, Mr. Nicholaou expressed his strong belief that more people are needed. Mr. Nicholaou noted, since the Code Enforcement Department is a viable financial center, its Staff should be increased. As a result of the numerous meetings on this subject, a number of Plan Commission members feel very strongly that should occur.

Mr. Waechtler added regardless of how we do it, once the word gets out on the street that the Ordinance is going to be enforced, a message is sent to all those businesses that are

currently in violation or might be thinking of skirting the Ordinance, and we might see some businesses voluntarily bring their signs into compliance.

Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum expressed the hope that the public here this evening really understands that the Plan Commission takes this very seriously, and we care a lot about how the Village looks, how it is portrayed and the Village's image. This group, along with many others, has spent a lot of time talking through the nits and gnats of what this is all about.

Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum asked Mr. Skach if he had any final comments.

Mr. Skach stated this petition will go before the Village Council at the July 27, 2004 Workshop meeting. The moratorium issue will be modified based on what was discussed this evening. Mr. Skach recalled there was discussion at the second joint meeting about the need to form a smaller subcommittee to work with the Staff signage team on the outstanding issues. Mr. Skach stated Staff would be in touch with Plan Commission members with regard to moving forward on that.

Mr. McCormick commented the Economic Development and Plan Commissions have been discussing the Future Land Use Plan over the past year. For clarification purposes, Mr. McCormick asked if Future Land Use now takes a back seat to the Sign Ordinance. Mr. Skach stated Staff is trying to respond to the issues as they come. Certainly the Future Land Use Plan discussions are not meant to take a back seat, but as some of these issues that have a high priority come forward they will be addressed as best as possible. Mr. McCormick indicated he wanted the two Council members present to recognize the Plan Commission has a lot of work to do, and the proposed new Sign Ordinance is not going to be done in one or two months. It will probably take six months. Mr. Skach pointed out the Future Land Use discussions got to a definitive recommendation point and can be sustained for a certain amount of time.

Mr. Nicholaou pointed out the Future Land Use discussions regarding gateways will help the Plan Commission as it addresses the Sign Ordinance.

Recording Secretary Dornan advised the Plan Commission that a second Commission meeting has been confirmed for August 2, 2004 at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers.

Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum acknowledged two Council members were present this evening and asked if they wanted to make any comments.

Commissioner Sandack stated, in his opinion, the Plan Commission has diligently looked at this, and he recognized that it would be a continuing process. Commissioner Sandack stated from the enforcement of the current Ordinance to moving forward to an updated Ordinance, the sign issue is a little more daunting than anyone thought it would be. What has been recommended this evening will be a great stop gap measure which will enable Code Enforcement to do its job so that the Village can put together a Sign Ordinance that is workable for all. Commissioner Sandack stated he took very seriously the

Commissioner's comments with regard to coming up with an Ordinance that is doable, enforceable and works for the community. He acknowledged the quality issue would be a difficult one to work through. He expressed his opinion that the finished product will be far better and easier to enforce than the current Ordinance.

Commissioner Tully expressed appreciation for the additional load the Plan Commission is currently carrying, as there are a lot of important issues that the Commission and other people who volunteer to serve on Commissions are addressing. Commissioner Tully stated this is a very important issue and something that for decades people, both in the business and residential community, have been saying something has to be done about the Sign Ordinance. He noted doing something is easier said than done and what he has seen this evening is demonstrative of that. While we are not reinventing the wheel, Commissioner Tully noted no one has gotten it exactly right yet. Commissioner Tully stated having these kinds of discussions in an open forum is very important. Getting a vision down to words on a page is a difficult process from an aesthetic and a legal standpoint. Commissioner Tully concluded by stating he was thrilled that the process is underway, and he agreed that it might take a lot more than three months to accomplish. He thanked the Plan Commission members.

As there was no further business, Chairman Pro Tem Griesbaum called for a motion to adjourn. **MR. WAECHTLER MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING, AND MR. MATEJCZYK SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

C: Enza Petrarca, Village Attorney
Beth Janicki-Clark, Village Prosecutor
Donald Rosenthal, Director Code Services
Donald Scheidler, Chief Building Inspector
Lori Sommers, Strategic Planner
File