VILLAGE OF ITASCA
PLAN COMMISSION AGENDA

PLAN COMMISSION MEETING WILL BE CONDUCTED THROUGH ZOOM

Definitions: Instructions on Public Participation can be found on Pages 3 & 4 of the Agenda

Wednesday, July 15, 2020 - 7:00 p.m.
Itasca Village Hall, 550 W. Irving Park Road, Itasca, IL 60143

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

1. Call to Order

2. Roll Call

3. New Business
   a. Case PC 20-007
      Petitioner: Quadrangle Development
      Owner: 870 Arlington, LLC & Arlington Thorndale, LLC
      Location: 870 & 900 N. Arlington Heights Rd.
      Request: Petition for Preliminary & Final Plat of Subdivision Approval

4. Review and Consideration of Regular Meeting Minutes for:
   a. June 17, 2020

5. Public Comment

6. Project Updates and Announcements

7. Executive Session (if needed)

8. Adjournment
PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Case: PC 19-014 (Continuation)
   Petitioner: Haymarket DuPage LLC
   Owner: Pearl Hospitality LLC
   Location: 860 W. Irving Park Rd.
   Request: Petition for a planned development by special use with exceptions and Class I Site Plan approval all in order to permit a mixed-use residential and healthcare facility and other accessory uses in the B-2 Community Business District at 860 W. Irving Park Road.

2. Case: PC 20-010
   Petitioner: Rosaleen Ann Bradley
   Owner: Rosaleen Ann Bradley
   Location: 340 Home Ave.
   Request: Petition for a Variance to Lot Coverage Requirements in the R-2 Zoning District to allow for the construction of a patio.

3. Case: PC 20-009
   Petitioner: MRK Realty, LLC
   Owner: MRK Realty, LLC
   Location: 1133 N. Prospect Ave.
   Request: Petition for Variances to Number of Permitted Wall Signs and Wall Sign Area to allow for the construction of two wall signs.

4. Case: PC 20-006
   Petitioner: BSTP Midwest, LLC.
   Owner: Bridge Itasca, LLC
   Location: Southeast Corner of Rohlwing Rd. & Devon Ave.
   Request: Petition for Planned Development by Special Use, Petition for Subdivision, and Class I Site Plan Review for the development of a multi-tenant retail/restaurant site, hotel site, and gas station site.

5. Case: PC 20-005 (Continuation)
   Petitioner: Village of Itasca
   Owner: N/A
   Location: N/A
   Request: Petition for Text Amendments to Section 13.01-27 of the Zoning Ordinance regarding Dynamic Sign Regulations.

NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING:

- Wednesday, August 19, 2020 at Itasca Village Hall, 550 W. Irving Park Road, Itasca, IL 60143

NOTE: Any person who has a disability requiring reasonable accommodation to participate in this public hearing should contact Jody Conidi, Village Clerk, 550 W. Irving Park Road, Itasca, IL or call (630) 773-0835 within a reasonable time before the meeting. Requests for a qualified interpreter require five (5) working days advance notice.
INSTRUCTIONS FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATIONS

1. **To Listen to Audio & Participate:**
   
   Call: (312) 626-6799
   Enter Meeting ID: 959 5424 7886
   Enter Participant ID: #

2. **To view the Presentation & Exhibit(s) presented to the Plan Commission:**

   Zoom Meeting Link:
   [https://us02web.zoom.us/j/95954247886?pwd=YXZ6TFBzaVM4U0FncHJnV1VJbGdkQT09](https://us02web.zoom.us/j/95954247886?pwd=YXZ6TFBzaVM4U0FncHJnV1VJbGdkQT09)
   Password: Ruler2020

   *Note: Members of the Public will only be able to view the Presentation & Exhibit Screen. In order to listen to the audio feed and participate, you must call into the meeting.*

3. **Swearing in Witnesses:**

   All persons who desire to testify will be sworn in at the beginning of the hearing. When each person begins their individual testimony/ comment, the Chairperson or Village Staff will verbally confirm with you if you were sworn in at the beginning of the hearing.

4. **Written Questions & Comments:**

   The Public is encouraged to submit written comments and questions in advance of the public hearing in lieu of live comments and questions. Deadline to submit written comments and questions is 2 hours before the meeting. Village Staff will read submitted questions and comments into the record and either the Plan Commission, Village Staff and/or Petitioner will respond to the comments and questions.

   Comments and questions can be submitted via email to [commdev@itasca.com](mailto:commdev@itasca.com) or by mail addressed to:

   Village of Itasca
   Attn: Plan Commission Chairperson
   Case: PC# 20-XXX
   550 W. Irving Park Rd.
   Itasca, IL 60143

   *Note: Case Number can be found on the Plan Commission Agenda.*
5. **Live Comments and Questions:**

The public will have the opportunity to give live comments and/or ask live questions. The Chairperson or Village Staff will acknowledge each member of the public calling into the meeting by the last 4 digits of their phone number and ask them if they wish to provide a comment or question. If the person does not wish to provide any comments or question please remain silent and Village Staff will move onto the next caller. There will only be one pass of callers to provide comments and/or questions to allow for an efficient meeting.

6. **Questioning of Witnesses:**

Those persons who would like to cross-exam a witness are required to sign-up in advance of the hearing by emailing commdev@itasca.com, calling Mo Khan, Village Planner, at 630-228-5631, or submitting a written notice to:

Village of Itasca  
Attn: Plan Commission Chairperson  
Case: PC# 20-XXX  
550 W. Irving Park Rd.  
Itasca, IL 60143

Any documents that will be used during questioning must be provided to Village staff no later than 7 days before the Plan Commission meeting so that these documents may be made available to the Plan Commissioners, petitioner, and the testifying witness before the hearing.

7. **Submittal of Comments & Questions Post-Hearing Due to Technology Failure:**

The public is provided a 7-day period, starting the day after the vote is taken, to submit in writing to commdev@itasca.com any objections, comments or questions that were not able to be heard during the hearing due to failure to access the hearing due to a failure of technology (i.e. internet failure, inability to connect/log into the meeting).

After seven-days, if no technology objection is raised by a member of the public, the Plan Commission’s recommendation becomes final and is forwarded to the Village Board. If a written technology objection is submitted within the seven day period, the Plan Commission’s recommendation is voided and the Plan Commission shall re-open the hearing at its next regularly scheduled meeting to hear the objection and any response by the petitioner.
REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER
Chairman Kischner called the Village of Itasca Plan Commission Regular Meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. on June 17, 2020.

2. ROLL CALL
Present: Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray, Chairman Kischner

Others Present: Shannon Malik Jarmusz (Director of Community Development), Mo Khan (Village Planner), Yourdina Wysocki (Village Attorney), Peggy Michet (Recording Secretary)

3. ADOPTION OF PLAN COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARINGS PROTOCOLS DURING COVID-19
Chairman Kischner asked if all the Commissioners had an opportunity to review the protocols presented for adoption and asked if they had any questions. Each Commissioner and staff confirmed that they understood the protocols and had no questions.

Call for Motion:
Chairman Kischner asked for a roll call vote to approve the adoption of Plan Commission Public Hearings Protocols during COVID-19.

Motion to approve the adoption of Plan Commission Public Hearings Protocols during COVID-19:
Commissioner Swets
Second to Continue: Commissioner Carello

Roll Call Vote:
Yes: Commissioners Daly; Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray
Nay - None
Motion Carried

Call for Motion:
In consideration of petitioner’s time, Chairman Kischner asked for a motion to continue the regular meeting business to after the completion of the Public Hearings.

Motion to continue the regular meeting business to after the completion of the Public Hearings:
Commissioner Swets
Seconded: Commissioner Carello

Roll Call Vote:
Yes - Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray
Nay - None
Motion Carried
PUBLIC HEARINGS

CALL TO ORDER
Chairman Kischner called the Village of Itasca Plan Commission Public Hearings to order at 7:03 p.m.

ROLL CALL
Present: Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray; Chairman Kischner

Others Present: Shannon Malik Jarmusz (Director of Community Development), Mo Khan (Village Planner), Yourdina Wysocki (Village Attorney), Peggy Michet (Recording Secretary)

1. Case #: PC 19-014 (Continuation)
   Petitioner: Haymarket DuPage LLC
   Owner: Pearl Hospitality LLC
   Location: 860 W. Irving Park Rd.
   Request: Petition for a planned development by special use with exceptions and Class I Site Plan approval all in order to permit a mixed-use residential and healthcare facility and other accessory uses in the B-2 Community Business District at 860 W. Irving Park Road.

   Call for Motion:
   Chairman Kischner asked for a roll call vote to continue Case #PC 19-014 to the Wednesday, July 15, 2020 Plan Commission meeting.

   Motion to Continue Case # PC 19-014: Commissioner Carello
   Second to Continue: Commissioner Daly

   Roll Call Vote:
   Yes - Commissioners Daly, Carello, Holmes, Drummond, Ray
   Nay - None
   Recused – Commissioner Swets
   Motion Carried

2. Case #: PC-002 (Continuation)
   Petitioner: Doyle Signs, Inc. on behalf of Keyence
   Owner: BPRE Itasca Holdings, Ltd.
   Location: 500 Park Blvd.
   Request: Petition for Variances to Number of Permitted Wall Signs and Total Wall Sign Area in order to accommodate a second wall sign.

   Roll Call to Open Case # PC 20-002:
   Present: Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray; Chairman Kischner

   Others Present: Shannon Malik Jarmusz (Director of Community Development), Mo Khan (Village Planner), Yourdina Wysocki (Village Attorney), Peggy Michet (Recording Secretary)

   Petitioner and Public Sworn In

   Petitioner Presentation: Mr. Mike Schatz made a presentation on behalf of the petitioner, Keyence. He noted that they currently have a sign on the southwest corner of the building (313 sq. ft.) and they are requesting a variance to install a duplicate sign on the northeast corner. He noted the western exposure provides great exposure to both I290 and I390 and the additional sign would give exposure to traffic
traveling eastbound. He stated that the requested signage is similar to others in the immediate area, including the Westin.

**Commission Discussion:** Commissioner Carello asked for confirmation that the requested additional signage would be an exact duplication of the current one on the building and Mr. Schatz stated it would be identical. Commissioner Drummond asked for the combined signage square footage of the Westin and Mr. Mo Khan stated he did not have that information. Commissioner Swets noted while the current sign is a conventional size and comparable to others in the area but due to the length of the company name, it needed to be a bit larger. He added that based upon the size of the building and the fact that both signs would not be visible at the same time, he would be in favor of approving the request. Mr. Schatz added that Keyence currently occupied approximately 94% of the 500 Park building and added that whenever space becomes available they request it to expand. Commissioner Drummond asked for confirmation of the proposed sign location and Mr. Schatz confirmed that the sign would be on the east wall of the north side of the building.

**Staff Report:** Mr. Khan stated the following:
- The requested second sign would be on the opposite facade of the building (not visible at the same time)
- It would be proportional to the building
- Is a unique circumstance that would not be applicable to others in the area
- Would be aesthetically appealing
- A variance had been granted for the original/current sign

Chairman Kischner agreed with the staff report and stated that he also supported the request however; he raised a question regarding Conditions of Approval # 4, item 4 – allowing additional signs in the future. Mo Khan stated that if additional signs were requested in the future, they would have to go through the variance process. Attorney Wysocki stated that this variance could be written specific to this petitioner only and not as a per tenant ordinance if desired and the Commissioners noted that would be their preference. She reiterated that all future variance requests would be required to be brought before the Plan Commission for individual review and would be approved for specific square footage.

**Public Comment:** Commissioner Kischner asked if there were any public comments or concerns and with none were raised, closed the public comment portion of the hearing.

**Legal Findings of Fact:** Attorney Wysocki noted that the findings of fact required for a variance was available in the staff memorandum included in the meeting packet. She noted that the circumstances of this request were unique (location and size of building) and it would not alter the essential character of the locality.

**Call for Roll Call Vote:**
Chairman Kischner asked for a roll call vote to confirm agreement of Commissioners with Attorney Wysocki’s findings.

**Roll Call Vote:**
Yes - Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray; Chairman Kischner
Nay - None
Motion Carried

**Call for Motion:**
Chairman Kischner asked for a motion to approve the petition for variances.
Motion to Approve Case # PC 20-002, petition for variances to Section 13.03-4b and 13.03-4c to allow for two (2) wall signs with a total wall sign area of 626 square feet as described in the petition and attached documents and subject to staff recommended Conditions #1-4: Commissioner Drummond
Seconded: Commissioner Daly

Roll Call Vote:
Yes - Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray
Nay - None
Motion Carried

Chairman Kischner advised the petitioner that the motion passed and to discuss with staff when they would appear before the Village Board. Mr. Khan advised that he would be in contact with them.

Call for Motion:
Chairman Kischner asked for a motion to close Public Hearing #PC 20-002.

Motion to close Public Hearing #PC 20-002: Commissioner Swets
Seconded: Commissioner Daly

Roll Call Vote:
Yes - Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray
Nay - None
Motion Carried

3. Case #: PC 20-003 (Continuation)
Petitioner: Michael Gasior
Owner: Zain Investments, LLC
Location: 1431 Harmony Ct.
Request: Petition for Special Use & Class I Site Plan Review to permit Outdoor Storage at the address commonly known as 1431 Harmony Ct., Itasca, IL 60143 in order to accommodate an online car sales business.

Roll Call to Open:
Present: Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray, Chairman Kischner

Others Present: Shannon Malik Jarmusz (Director of Community Development), Mo Khan (Village Planner), Yourdina Wysocki (Village Attorney), Peggy Michet (Recording Secretary)

Petitioner and Public Sworn In

Petitioner Presentation: Mr. Michael Gasior began his presentation on behalf of the owner of Zain Investments. He stated that the purchased property is located in a limited manufacturing zoned district. They seek to lease it to a tenant that is currently running a successful car sales business in Mount Prospect that would like to open a location in Itasca. He noted that the primary sales are online and the desire is to be able to store vehicles both inside and outside the facility. He provided a letter from the Village of Mount Prospect that stated that they are good tenants and in good standing with the Village.

Commission Discussion: Commissioner Drummond asked if there would be security implemented and Mr. Gasior stated that lighting had recently been updated but fencing would not be installed. He added that the majority of vehicles would be parked inside the facility with up to fifteen additional vehicles parked outside. Mr. Khan stated that the outside parking would serve as overflow parking, for inventory rotation during business hours and staff parking. Commissioner Drummond asked for confirmation of the number of
outdoor parking spaces and asked if there were mandates concerning the indoor parking capacity. Mr. Khan confirmed the number of outdoor parking spaces and stated the only indoor parking requirement was their adherence to building code requirements. Commissioner Daly asked if any physical improvements were anticipated and Mr. Khan replied that there might be seal coating and painting but nothing additional. Commissioner Daly asked about the dumpsters that currently existed and Mr. Gasior stated they would be stored in the rear of the building. Additional concerns raised by Commissioner Daly included the access and egress of emergency vehicles and refuse disposal vehicles; Mr. Khan stated that both access and egress would be secured. Commissioner Swets asked if outdoor storage would be limited to cars only and would vehicles need to be licensed, in good condition and parked on paved surfaces. Mr. Khan stated that the Conditions of Approval addressed those concerns. Commissioner Holmes asked if all adjacent properties had been notified and Mr. Khan confirmed they had - the only response was the letter from the Forest Preserve District that he read into the record. The letter, addressed to Chairman Kischner from Mr. Kevin Stowe of the Forest Preserve District of DuPage County, thanked the Plan Commission for the opportunity to comment and voiced concern of potential gasoline and oil environmental hazards. Regarding a question raised about tax revenues to Itasca, Mr. Khan noted that Platinum would need to list this address, update their license and noted that the sales tax revenue percentage is less than that of new vehicle sales. Chairman Kischner asked if a safety inspection of the indoor storage area had been conducted and Mr. Khan confirmed that safety inspections were routinely conducted in conjunction with the business license application process. The Chairman also asked if fencing is required and Mr. Khan responded that fencing is only required when adjacent or visible to residential properties. Commissioner Daly stated that cars parked in a parking lot falls beyond that requirement as it is not unusual. Commissioner Daly also asked if the Police and Fire Departments had looked at the exterior not from the perspective of risk/theft (up to the tenant’s discretion) but from a personal safety standpoint; Mr. Khan stated he would forward the Commission’s request for review. Chairman Kischner stated that he would be supportive of approval based on the Police and Fire Department’s recommendation. Chairman Kischner asked the petitioner if he agreed with the recommendations in Exhibit C and he confirmed that they did. Commissioner Daly added that ADA rules should also be followed and Mr. Khan shared where the designated ADA spaces were located on the property adding that no storage would be allowed in those spaces.

**Staff Report:** Mr. Khan presented the staff report noting that Platinum Auto Exchange, an online car dealership business received their Zoning Certificate approval from the Village Board to use the subject property as an indoor storage facility in February 2020. They have indicated that they would like to move the business’s main operations to this location in Itasca pending the ability to use the outdoor pavement area for additional storage of their vehicles. Staff looked at parking and zoning ordinances and there were no separate requirements designated for online sales. He provided an overview of the Planning & Zoning Analysis prepared and in summary stated that the proposed use of a motor vehicle sales business with accompanying outdoor storage at the subject property raised concerns regarding safe and adequate off-street parking and circulation and the potential for inadequate access by emergency vehicles to the site. He then shared the Recommendation Conditions of Approval prepared by Village staff that sited five recommendations for approval.

**Public Comment:** Chairman asked if there were any additional questions or comments from the public and with none raised, he closed the Public Comment portion of the hearing.

**Legal Findings of Fact:** Attorney Wysocki stated that the Standards of Approval for Special Use and Required Findings of Fact for Special Use were included in the staff memorandum. She noted that the proposed use would assist the petitioner to move a well-established business to the Village of Itasca. The property is located in a cul-de-sac, which allows for minimal traffic to the surrounding businesses. The special use allowing outdoor vehicle parking will not be detrimental to the health, safety, orals or general welfare of person residing or working in the vicinity. The petitioner agrees to abide by the Zoning Ordinance and any Conditions made part of the authorization by the Board.
Call for Roll Call Vote:
Chairman Kischner asked for a roll call vote to confirm agreement of Commissioners with Attorney Wysocki’s findings.

Roll Call Vote:
Yes - Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray
Nay - None
Motion Carried

Call for Motion:
Chairman Kischner asked for to approve Case #PC 20-003.

Motion to Approve Case # PC 20-003, petition for Special Use and Class 1 Site Plan Review to permit outdoor storage as described in the petition and attached documents, and subject to staff recommended Conditions #1-5: Commissioner Drummond
Seconded: Commissioner Daly

Roll Call Vote:
Yes - Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray
Nay - None
Motion Carried

Chairman Kischner advised the petitioner that the motion passed and to discuss with staff when they would appear before the Village Board. Mr. Khan advised that he would be in contact with them.

Call for Motion:
Chairman Kischner asked for a motion to close Public Hearing #PC 20-003.

Motion to close Public Hearing #PC 20-003: Commissioner Swets
Seconded: Commissioner Daly

Roll Call Vote:
Yes - Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray
Nay - None
Motion Carried

Petitioner and Public Sworn In

Petitioner Presentation: Mr. Jim Mensching, President of Itasca Bank and Trust Company stated that he came before the Board in January for sign approval and noted that they are currently under construction. He
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was now coming before the Plan Commission with a petition regarding the Dynamic Sign Regulation in reference to shut-off time. He noted that the smaller sign on west side is for the Drive-up Teller and ATM usage - available to customers and non-customers. The Drive-up hours are 7:00 a.m. - 7:00 p.m. but are currently shortened due to COVID-19 pandemic. Mr. Mensching shared that the Drive-up sign is helpful to customers and would be changed twice a day – at the start and end of each day. With the main entrance moved to the east side of the building, the main (larger) sign has been moved to the east side of the property. The main sign advertises product and service offerings and provides event information/community announcements.

**Commission Discussion:** Commissioner Swets asked Mr. Khan why the Bank had to come back before the Commission and he replied that the variance hadn’t been publically announced for the last meeting. He added that Illuminated signs can be on 24 hours but dynamic (electronically changing signs) have time limitations. He confirmed that the petitioner is seeking a variance to allow approved dynamic signs to remain operational 24 hours a day, 7 days a week due to safety concerns for motorists approaching the Bank on Irving Park Road and to let their customers know if the Drive-up is open or closed for efficient traffic flow. He added that the Drive-up teller window is open at 6:50 a.m., earlier than when the bank opens. Commissioners Ray and Drummond did not understand that this request would be applicable to both signs. Mr. Khan stated the Bank would have usual banking hours on the main (large) sign from 10:00 a.m. – 7:00 p.m. that advertises services, product offerings and event/community information. The smaller sign would address the business operations for the ATM (24 hours) and specific hours for the Drive-up Teller. He noted that the Village staff recommends that the ATM/Drive-up sign for 24 hours per day and the main sign be operational from 6:30 a.m. - 8:00 p.m. The differences between a dynamic (moving) sign and a static (digital) sign were discussed and it was confirmed that the black screens on both signs were dynamic. It was also noted that the lumens of the LED lighting at night would need to be monitored as well. Mr. Steve Gruber (sign company) noted that the LEDs are programmable and stated that the ATM 24 HRS sign is dynamic but would remain static. Chairman Kischner noted Condition #3 – could operate 24 hours per day and allow two changes a day. Chairman Kischner polled the Commissioners asking for consensus of adding a Condition changing the Drive-up sign twice a day and the responses were as follows:

**Yes:** Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Holmes, Ray  
**No:** Commissioner Drummond

**Staff Report:** Mr. Khan provided an overview of the prepared Planning & Zoning Analysis and in summary noted that the petitioner was requesting a variance to the Zoning Ordinance to permit 24 hours of operation of their dynamic signs. The petitioner stated that the signage would allow for better visibility, and help to control and contribute to traffic safety. The variance would also allow for the Bank to alert customers that their drive-up window was open before the Bank opens. He then outlined the four Staff Recommended Conditions of Approval.

**Public Comment:** Mr. Khan read a letter submitted in advance by residents Mr. Dave and Mrs. Paula Pattelli of 309 West Grove Street, Itasca regarding the elevated lit architectural sign on the east side of the Itasca Bank & Trust building. They stated that the glaring light is an eyesore that “changes the environment of that nature area”. They asked for consideration of adjustments such as shielding the light from the south side or changing the color from neon blue to a soft white. Two photographs taken from their yard on May 21 were presented to the Plan Commission. She stated that she understands she cannot force a change but hopes that consideration to the homes on Grove, the river walk and nature walk path would be considered. Mr. Mensching stated that these were old photos - in the last two weeks the entire area had been landscaped that he believed would soften the lighting but Ms. Patelli responded that the issue was the light on the roof. He understood their concerns and responded that he would go back to see what might be done to make it better.
Legal Findings of Fact: Attorney Wysocki clarified Condition #5 ATM-24 Hours sign (smaller sign on west side of building) stating it may be changed no more than twice a day. She noted that this is a request for a variance to Section 13.01-27 requiring certain Findings of Facts that were included in the staff memorandum. The proposed Finding of Facts stated that the west entrance sign helps motorists to ensure safe traffic flow on Irving Park Road; the east entrance sign provides information on products, service offerings and community events. She also noted that the new signage compliments the Bank’s newly remodeled building, it has a unique circumstance in that different components of the Bank’s business has differing operating hours and the Bank operates different hours from other businesses in the downtown district. In order to fully serve its customers, the petitioner must keep the public informed of operating hours and traffic patterns. It would not have negative effects on the character of the neighborhood or property values and not alter the essential character of the locality.

Roll Call Vote:
Chairman Kischner asked for a roll call vote to confirm agreement of Commissioners with Attorney Wysocki’s findings.

Call for Roll Call Vote:
Yes - Commissioners Daly, Carello, Holmes, Drummond, Ray
No - Commissioner Swets
Motion Carried

Call for Motion:
Chairman Kischner asked for a motion to approve Case #PC 20-004.

Motion to approve Case # PC 20-004, petition for variance to Section 13.01-27.i to allow for ATM Dynamic Signs in the B-6 Zoning District to remain operational 24-hours a day, 7 days a week and changed no more than twice a day and, the Main Dynamic sign to be operational from 6:30 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. as described in the petition and attached documents and subject to the staff Recommended Conditions #1-5: Commissioner Carello
Seconded: Commissioner Daly

Roll Call Vote:
Yes - Commissioners Daly, Carello, Holmes, Drummond, Ray
No - Commissioner Swets
Motion Carried

Chairman Kischner advised the petitioner that the motion passed and to discuss with staff when they would appear before the Village Board. Mr. Khan advised that he would be in contact with them.

Call for Motion:
Chairman Kischner asked for a motion to close Public Hearing #PC 20-004.

Motion to close Public Hearing #PC 20-004: Commissioner Swets
Seconded: Commissioner Daly

Roll Call Vote:
Yes - Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray
Nay - None
Motion Carried

5. Case #: PC 20-005
Petitioner: Village of Itasca
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Owner: N/A
Location: N/A
Request: Petition for Text Amendments to Section 13.01-27 of the Zoning Ordinance regarding Dynamic Sign Regulations.

Roll Call to Open:
Present: Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray, Chairman Kischner

Others Present: Shannon Malik Jarmusz (Director of Community Development), Mo Khan (Village Planner), Yourdina Wysocki (Village Attorney), Peggy Michet (Recording Secretary)

Petitioner and Public Sworn In

Petitioner Presentation/Staff Report: Mr. Khan noted a concern among members of the Village Board and Plan Commission regarding the use of dynamic signs in residential areas. The Dynamic Sign ordinance was reviewing every 60 seconds to every 15 seconds. In addition, the operational hours in or adjacent to residential areas be modified from shutting off from 10:00 p.m. to 7 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. If approved by the Village Board, the current signs would be grandfathered but would also be asked to comply but not mandated.

Commission Discussion: Commissioner Swets stated the timing of the signs changing should be different for residential vs. non-residential areas – signs changing every 15 seconds in a residential area could be annoying. He the current setting for one minute was fine or suggested designating residential and non-residential parameters. Mr. Khan noted that the text amendment could be adjusted to address both areas in a different fashion. Commissioner Holmes was in favor of the proposed shut-off time of 8:00 p.m. but not in favor of a 15-second sign change. Commissioner Daly wanted the one-minute timing to remain and would like the shut-off time modified to 8:00 p.m. Commissioner Ray agreed with Commissioner Holmes. Commissioner Carello asked why the change was being recommended and Mr. Khan stated one minute doesn’t allow viewing more than one message in traffic. Ms. Malik Jamusz noted the allowance of the car wash’s sign at Arlington Heights Road and Irving Park Road hadn’t had any issues and that is why it is was being brought forward. Commissioner Holmes stated the car wash is between a stop light and stop sign – a different scenario. Commissioner Drummond was concerned that our own Village sign changes more often than every minute so it would be difficult to enforce- we need to lead by example. Ms. Malik Jamusz reminded the Commissioners that all signage currently in place before the new regulations would be grandfathered in. Chairman Kischner believed 15 seconds would be too aggressive despite the various studies noted; different roads would have different recommendations. Mr. Khan stated that the study provided an average and the proposed amendment would adopt the more stringent number of 15 seconds and Ms. Shannon Malik Jarmusz added that we always look at how it fits into our community. Commissioner Holmes stated safety must be the most important consideration. Commissioner Swets stated that he would be open to adopting the 30-second recommendation but suggested that perhaps more discussion was needed. Mr. Khan stated the Commission could continue this discussion until the next meeting. Ms. Malik Jarmusz stated that she would provide requested additional data on safety, timing and information on what other communities are doing per their request. Commissioner Swets stated perhaps just leave as is and if a petitioner wants a change, we can have that discussion on an individual basis. It was noted that it is worth looking at to be business friendly but we need to look at all aspects. Commissioner Daly stated that a sign changing every 15 seconds sounds fast but the distance you travel in that time is not that significant. It was also called out that signs changing looking down the road can be distracting and unattractive. It was recommended that the cycle times of residential versus business be addressed.

Call for Motion:
Chairman Kischner asked for a roll call vote to continue Case #PC 20-005 to the Wednesday, July 15, 2020 Plan Commission meeting.
Motion to Continue Case # PC 20-005 to July 15, 2020: Commissioner Swets
Second to Continue: Commissioner Daly

Roll Call Vote:
Yes: Commissioners Daly; Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray
Nay - None
Motion Carried

Return to the Regular Meeting with the completion of the Public Hearing portion of the meeting

4. REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

a. December 4, 2019 (Continuation)
   Call for Motion:
   Chairman Kischner asked for a motion to approve the December 4, 2019 meeting minutes

   Motion to approve the December 4, 2019 meeting minutes: Commissioner Swets
   Seconded: Commissioner Carello

   Roll Call Vote:
   Yes: Commissioners Daly; Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray
   Nay - None
   Motion Carried

b. December 18, 2019 (Continuation)
   Call for Motion:
   Chairman Kischner asked for a motion to approve the December 18, 2019 meeting minutes

   Motion to approve the December 18, 2019 meeting minutes: Commissioner Holmes
   Seconded: Commissioner Daly

   Roll Call Vote:
   Yes: Commissioners Daly; Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray
   Nay - None
   Motion Carried

c. January 22, 2020 (Continuation)
   Call for Motion:
   Chairman Kischner asked for a motion to approve the January 22, 2020 meeting minutes

   Motion to approve the January 22, 2020 meeting minutes: Commissioner Holmes
   Seconded: Commissioner Daly

   Roll Call Vote:
   Yes: Commissioners Daly; Carello, Holmes, Drummond, Ray
   Nay - None
   Abstain: Commissioner Swets
Motion Carried

d. February 19, 2020 (Continuation)

Call for Motion:
Chairman Kischner asked for a motion to approve the February 19, 2020 meeting minutes

Motion to approve the February 19, 2020 meeting minutes: Commissioner Holmes
Seconded: Commissioner Carello

Roll Call Vote:
Yes: Commissioners Carello, Holmes, Drummond, Ray; Chairman Kischner
Abstain: Commissioners Daly, Swets
Nay - None
Motion Carried

e. March 18, 2020

Call for Motion:
Chairman Kischner asked for a motion to approve the March 18, 2020 meeting minutes

Motion to approve the March 18, 2020 meeting minutes: Commissioner Daly
Seconded: Commissioner Swets

Roll Call Vote:
Yes: Commissioners Daly, Drummond, Ray; Chairman Kischner
Nay - None
Abstain: Commissioners Carello, Swets, Holmes
Motion Carried

f. April 15, 2020

Call for Motion:
Chairman Kischner asked for a motion to approve the April 15, 2020 meeting minutes

Motion to approve the April 15, 2020 meeting minutes: Commissioner Holmes
Seconded: Commissioner Daly

Roll Call Vote:
Yes: Commissioners Daly; Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray
Nay - None
Motion Carried

g. May 20, 2020

Call for Motion:
Chairman Kischner asked for a motion to approve the May 20, 2020 meeting minutes

Motion to approve the May 20, 2020 meeting minutes: Commissioner Holmes
Seconded: Commissioner Daly

Roll Call Vote:
Yes: Commissioners Daly; Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray
Nay - None
Motion Carried

5. PUBLIC COMMENT: NONE

6. NEW BUSINESS: NONE

7. PROJECT UPDATES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS: Ms. Malik Jarmusz shared that the Itasca Park District was close to having a new bathhouse approved. She also noted that the Wings and Talons improvements at the Nature Center that included lighting, outlets and switches for the buildings housing the birds of prey should be finished by next week.

8. OLD BUSINESS:

Hamilton Signage: Ms. Malik Jarmusz provided an update on the Hamilton signage. The permits are in and movement is anticipated in late spring/early summer.

Keyence/The Bridge: As soon as the end of this month/next month, Keyence may be moving into the middle section of the Bridge as one of the first tenants.

Haymarket: Ms. Bridget O’Keefe, legal representative of Haymarket was present on the call. Ms. Malik Jamusz noted this is our first remote meeting and the Village was working to catch up on the backlog and new applications that had occurred during pandemic. She stated that the hope was for this meeting and next would allow them to gain wisdom on how to apply the online meeting format for bigger hearings. She noted that the Commissioners would receive a survey from Mr. Khan either tomorrow or by the end of next week to look at meeting dates to ensure a quorum. Based on caseload and availability, the meetings would be scheduled. Attorney Wysocki noted that other technologies are also being looked at to make sure the petitioners, objectors and public have an opportunity to be heard. Rules will be adjusted, known in advance and staff would work with their legal representatives. Attorney Wysocki stated that the COVID-19 Phase 4 guidelines as currently stated would allow the Commission, petitioners, Village staff to be together for meetings but noted that we are at the mercy of the pandemic. Ms. O’Keefe was asked if she had anything to add and she did not at this time.

Pulte Home: Commissioner Daly asked it would be coming back to any development on Irving Park Road

Gullo Property (Rohlwing Road): Ms. Malik Jamusz stated that they are still interested in doing something in the Village.

Comprehensive Plan Review: Commissioner Daly mentioned that grant money was approved and public input to be sought. The RTA staff and Ms. Malik Jamusz would review the materials obtained through an RFP (aka, Downtown Strategic Plan Update) to gain a consensus on a consultant for the project. She noted that the plan had slowed due to pandemic but was still moving forward; a timeframe should be available in the next month or so.

IDOT Road Work: Commissioner Daly stated that IDOT had come to review the possible widening of Irving Park Road from Walnut to the western edge of the Village in the past and asked if this consideration might re-emerge and Ms. Malik Jamusz responded that it had not been brought back up but could in the future. Commissioner Holms noted the traffic has increased on Irving Park Road due to I355 and called out potential implications moving forward resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic.

9. ADJOURNMENT
Chairman Kischner asked for a motion to adjourn the Village of Itasca Plan Commission Regular Meeting at 9:53 p.m.

**Motion to adjourn the Plan Commission meeting of June 17, 2020:** Commissioner Holmes

**Second to Continue:** Commissioner Swets

**Roll Call Vote:**

**Yes:** Commissioners Daly; Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond

**Nay:** None

(Commissioner Ray left the meeting prior to adjournment.)

**Motion Carried**
Motion to Adjourn: Commissioner Swets  
Second to Adjourn: Commissioner Carello

Roll Call Vote:  
Yes: Commissioners Daly; Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray, Chairman Kischner  
Motion Carried

NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING: Wednesday, July 15, 2020 at Itasca Village Hall, 550 W. Irving Park Road, Itasca, IL 60143 (Location subject to change.)

Respectfully submitted by Recording Secretary, Peggy Michet

____________________
Peggy Micher, Recording Secretary

Approved: July 10, 2020
TITLE: Option Care Subdivision
ADDRESS: 870 & 900 N. Arlington Heights Rd.
PIN: 03-05-403-007; -010, 03-05-302-072

PROPOSAL: Tim Sweeney, as representative of Quadrangle Development and the property owners 870 Arlington LLC and Arlington Thorndale LLC, is requesting the following:

1. Preliminary and Final Plat of Subdivision – Options Care Subdivision Approval for 870 & 900 N Arlington Heights Rd.
BACKGROUND

The Village Board approved Ordinance 1921-19 in September 2019, which granted approval of a Planned Development and Class I Site Plan review to Quadrangle Development for the construction of a single-story manufacturing, warehouse, and office building for Option Care. The Plan Commission heard the Petition for Planned Development and Class I Site Plan Review under Case # PC 19-014.

The plans submitted as part of PC 19-014 indicated that there would be a need for a Plat of Subdivision to reflect a lot area change to accommodate the construction of parking stalls for 870 N. Arlington Heights Rd. However, a Petition for Subdivision and Plat of Subdivision was not prepared at that time. The lot line will shift approximately 83 ft. to the west.

PLANNING & ZONING ANALYSIS

The subject properties are located at the southwest corner of Arlington Heights Rd. and South Thorndale Ave. 900 N. Arlington Heights Rd. is currently improved with a three-story office building that is approximately 103,00 square feet with surface parking and a retention pond. 870 N. Arlington Heights Rd. is currently under construction for a single-story manufacturing, warehouse and office building that will be approximately 50,000 square feet with surface parking and a retention pond. The subject properties are both zoned B-2, Community Business District.

Section 8.04-5 of the Zoning Ordinance states that in the B-2 District there are no minimum lot standard requirements for lots with the proposed use at 870 N. Arlington Heights Rd. and the existing use at 900 N. Arlington Heights Rd.

The various provisions of the Subdivision Ordinance related to School & Park District Land Donation, Payment or Fee-in-lieu are not applicable as the proposed subdivision does not include any new residential units.

Provisions related to public street design as stated in the Subdivision Ordinance are not applicable as there are no new public streets proposed.

Provisions related to stormwater management have been addressed as part of the previous Planned Development and Class I Site Plan Approval.

Provisions related to Final Plat requirements will be addressed during the final review by Village’s Community Development and Engineering staff after approval, which is consistent with past practice of Plat approvals.

SUMMARY

The proposed Plat of Subdivision will clear up the property line and include the required parking needed for the Options Care business on its own property (870 N Arlington Heights Rd.). The proposed Plat of Subdivision will not alter the characteristic of the area.
PUBLIC COMMENTS

As of July 8, 2020, Village Staff has received no public comments regarding this petition.

STAFF RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Staff recommends the following conditions be included if a favorable recommendation is made by the Plan Commission:

1. Final Plat of Subdivision must be in substantial compliance with the Plan Commission and Village Board Submittals.
2. Final Plat of Subdivision shall be reviewed and approved by Village’s Community Development and Engineering Staff prior to recording the Plat with DuPage County’s Recorder’s Office.

REQUIRED STANDARDS OF REVIEW FOR SUBDIVISIONS

Section 2.00 of the Subdivision Ordinance sets the following standards for review when considering a Subdivision Request.

1. To ensure sound, harmonious subdivision development including Planned Developments and community growth, and to safeguard the interest of the homeowner, the subdivider, the investor, and the Village.

   To assure that no subdivisions shall be approved that is not energy efficient as practicable in terms of density, mixture of use, site selections, building layout and orientation and landscaping.

2. To provide permanent assets to the locality and to the Village.
3. To prevent scattered development beyond existing public utilities and prevent excessive development costs.
4. To assure development of land for optimum use with necessary protection against deterioration and obsolescence.
5. To limit and control the pollution of the environment that can be caused by inadequate or incomplete urban development.
6. To provide common grounds of understanding and a sound working relationship between the Village and Subdivider.
7. To lessen congestion in the streets and highways.
8. To provide for adequate light and air.
9. To facilitate adequate provision for transportation, water, sewerage, schools, and other public necessities.
10. To ensure proper legal description and proper monumenting of subdivided land.
DOCUMENTS ATTACHED

1. Petition for Subdivision, dated March 5, 2020
2. Plat of Survey (870 N. Arlington Heights Rd.), dated July 3, 2019
3. Plat of Survey (900 N. Arlington Heights Rd.), dated July 25, 2018
4. Plat of Subdivision (Options Care Subdivision), dated October 31, 2019
5. Site Plan, dated August 7, 2019
PETITION FOR SUBDIVISION

VILLAGE OF ITASCA PLAN COMMISSION
Community Development Department
111 Line Street
Itasca, IL 60143
(630) 773-5568
Fax: (630) 773-0862

DATE 3/5/2020

ALL ITEMS MUST BE COMPLETE TO PROCESS APPLICATION

Address(es) of Property 810 N. Arlington Hts Rd Itasca 60143
Proposed Use General Office/Parking Subdivision Name Arlington Thordale
Existing Use General Office/Parking Existing Zoning B-2 PUD
All P.I.N. #s 03-05-403-007 Number of Acres 7.36 Lot Size 7.36 acres

 Attach preliminary plat of subdivision with legal description

THE LEGAL TITLEHOLDER MUST SIGN THIS PETITION. Where the property is held in trust, the trust officer must sign the petition and include a letter naming all beneficiaries of the trust and authorizing the beneficiaries to act on the matters related to this petition request. The undersigned acknowledges and agrees that this application and all documentation submitted becomes public record and may be viewed by the public.

Owner’s Name(s) 810 Arlington LLC
Address(es) 40 Quadrangle Development Phone 847-940-9667
 see below Fax 847-940-7895

Petitioner(s) Quadrangle Development Company, As Agent
Address(es) 1450 Lake Cook Rd, Ste 150 Phone 847-940-9667
 Deerfield IL 60015 Fax 847-940-7895

Agent or Attorney Information
Name N/A
Firm
Address
Phone

Site Planner or Engineer
Name Chris Bartosz
Firm V3 Companies
Address
Phone 630-729-6124

I WE, Timothy E. Sweeney, DO HEREBY CERTIFY OR AFFIRM THAT I WE ARE THE OWNER(S) OF RECORD OF THE AFORESAID DESCRIBED PROPERTY AND HEREBY MADE APPLICATION AS SUCH

Signature Date 3/5/20

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO

BEFORE ME THIS 5th DAY OF March, 2020

Cathleen M. Carrell
NOTARY PUBLIC

"OFFICIAL SEAL"
CATHLEEN M. CARRELL
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF ILLINOIS
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: 10-16-21

MAR 0 R 2020
THORNDALE AVENUE (ILLINOIS RTE 390)

5. UNDERGROUND UTILITY LINES SHOWN HEREON ARE BASED ON FIELD LOCATED 1375-07 PLAT RECORDED JULY 24, 2007 AS DOCUMENT R2007-137241, IN EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT OF MEASURED AT RIGHT ANGLES TO THE NORTH LINE THEREOF OF SAID OUTLOT A, AS DEDICATED TO THE VILLAGE OF ITASCA IN ORDINANCE NO. QUARTER AND THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 5, TOWNSHIP 40 AS DOCUMENT R2007-137242, IN DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

E TERMS & PROVISIONS, AGREEMENT, ENCHROACHMENT (b) PRIOR TO ANY DIGGING OR CONSTRUCTION.

EXISTENCE OF UNDERGROUND UTILITIES. (SANITARY, WATER, ETC.) IS BASED SOLELY ON THE "STAMPED" MARKINGS OF THE SURVEYORS USE AT THE TIME OF PREPARATION OF THIS SURVEY. SEE NOTES FROM CCHI1902889LD, EFFECTIVE DATE MAY 31, 2019, PRINTED 06-13-19, AS PROVIDED FOR STATEMENT REGARDING THE ACTUAL PRESENCE OR ABSENCE OF ANY SERVICE.

OWNERSHIP, CONSULT YOUR TITLE COMPANY.

TOGETHER WITH THE TITLE COMMITMENT. THE PARCEL WHICH IS DEFINED MAY NOT WHICH ARE VISIBLE FROM ABOVE GROUND AT TIME OF SURVEY, THROUGH A NORMAL EASEMENT AGREEMENT, DOC. R86-02967

b. enchroachement shown hereon

c. it is not on the surveyed property;

YES YES YES

EAST LINE OF OUTLOT "A"

1.15' W

2 STORY BRICK & FRAME

CONC. WALK

3.97' E

135.69'

CB=(N45°39'38"W)

0.50'

S00°17'43"W

(N88°14'18"E)

66.05'

(N00°22'43"E 405.20')

CB=N45°42'25"W S88°17'27"W769.78'

3.97' E

66.00'

66.54'

TOTAL PARKING STALLS=84

DOC. R73-72733

Ditch

88°04'13"W

10'

CONC. WALL

10' M.U.E. PER DOC. R2007-137242

PRC  POINT OF REVERSE CURVATURE

PCC  POINT OF COMPOUND CURVATURE

RCP  REINFORCED CONCRETE PIPE

VCP  VITRIFIED CLAY PIPE

P.U.E. PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT

I.E. INGRESS & EGRESS EASEMENT

PC  POINT OF CURVATURE

EP  EDGE OF PAVEMENT

A  ARC LENGTH

W  WEST

B-BOX

W  WEST

DEPRESSED CURB

Fence

R  RAIL

CURB

OVERHEAD WIRES

UNDERGROUND TELEPHONE(ATLAS INFO.)

UNDERGROUND ELECTRIC(ATLAS INFO.)

UNDERGROUND ELECTRIC

UNDERGROUND FIBER OPTIC CABLE(ATLAS)

RIP-RAP

LANDSCAPE

SIGN EASEMENT

15'X15'

BIT. PAVEMENT

SBM #1

WATER

BIT. PAVEMENT

SBM #2

WATER

SIGN

LANDSCAPE

PER DOC. R2007-193200 & R2008-119377

PER DOC. R2007-193199

PER DOC. R2007-193200 & R2008-119377

PER DOC. R80-75245

PER DOC. R73-72733

105

15'

907

100' PUBLIC R.O.W.

CDB

101

847-940-7333

847-940-7333

1650 Lake Cook Road, Suite 450

Quadrangle Development Company

630.724.9200 voice

T \fice hours MON - FRI

Surveys & Plans

Copyright © 2008 Quadrangle Development Company

SURVEYORS CERTIFICATE

NATURA SURVEYORS, LLC

CONTRIBUTED TO THE NATIONAL LAND SURVEY

CHICAGO TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY; NO. 35-3189

MADE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE 2016 MINIMUM STANDARD DETAIL REQUIREMENTS FOR TO: 870 ARLINGTON LLC, C/O JANKO ASSET MGNT.; V3 COMPANIES, LTD. PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM NO. 184000902 AND INCLUDES ITEMS 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9 AND 11 OF TABLE A THEREOF.

ALTA/NSPS LAND TITLE AND TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY


I. FIELD HAZARDS NOTE

2. THE SURVEY MAY NOT DEPICT ALL HAZARDS THAT MAY BE PRESENT. THE SURVEY MAY NOT DEPICT ALL STRUCTURES OR OBJECTS THAT MAY BE PRESENT.

3. THE SURVEY MAY NOT DEPICT ALL ELEVATION DEPARTMENTS IF ALL ELEVATION DEPARTMENTS ARE BOTH HIDDEN AND VISIBLE FROM ABOVE GROUND.

4. THE SURVEY MAY NOT DEPICT ALL EQUIPMENT THAT MAY BE PRESENT.

5. THE SURVEY MAY NOT DEPICT ALL UTILITIES THAT MAY BE PRESENT.

6. THE SURVEY MAY NOT DEPICT ALL GROUND CONDITION THAT MAY BE PRESENT.

7. THE SURVEY MAY NOT DEPICT ALL GROUND CONDITIONS THAT MAY BE PRESENT.

8. THE SURVEY MAY NOT DEPICT ALL GROUND CONDITIONS THAT MAY BE PRESENT.

9. THE SURVEY MAY NOT DEPICT ALL GROUND CONDITIONS THAT MAY BE PRESENT.
1. DIMENSIONS ALONG CURVED LINES ARE ARC LENGTHS.

2. SUBDIVIDED LOTS AND EXTERIOR BOUNDARY CORNERS SHALL BE MONUMENTED WITH 3/4'' IRON PIPES, UNLESS SHOWN OTHERWISE.


4. DEEDS TO LOT 1 & 2 IN ARLINGTON THORNDALE RESUBDIVISION, IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER AND THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 5, TOWNSHIP 40, RANGE 1, ILLINOIS, ARE SHOWN IN FEET AND DECIMALS THEREOF. PERMANENT MONUMENTS MONUMENTED WITH 3/4'' IRON PIPES, UNLESS SHOWN OTHERWISE.

5. THERE SHALL BE NO VEHICULAR ACCESS FROM TALL OAKS LANE INTO SUBDIVISION.

FURTHER CERTIFY THAT THE ANNEXED PLAT IS A CORRECT HERETOFORE DEDICATED AS SHOWN.

I, CHRISTOPHER D. BARTOSZ, A PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR IN THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, HEREBY DESIGNATE ____________________________________ __ TO RECORD THIS DESIGNATION IS GRANTED UNDER 105 ILCS 5/11-1705.


TO DESIGNATE SUCH RECORDING UNDER CHAPTER 109, SECTION 2 OF THE ILLINOIS REVISED STATUTES.

M. U. E. PER DOC. R2013-093139

S00°35'08"E

SURVEYOR CERTIFICATE

1. DIMENSIONS ALONG CURVED LINES ARE ARC LENGTHS.

2. SUBDIVIDED LOTS AND EXTERIOR BOUNDARY CORNERS SHALL BE MONUMENTED WITH 3/4'' IRON PIPES, UNLESS SHOWN OTHERWISE.


4. DEEDS TO LOT 1 & 2 IN ARLINGTON THORNDALE RESUBDIVISION, IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER AND THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 5, TOWNSHIP 40, RANGE 1, ILLINOIS, ARE SHOWN IN FEET AND DECIMALS THEREOF. PERMANENT MONUMENTS MONUMENTED WITH 3/4'' IRON PIPES, UNLESS SHOWN OTHERWISE.

5. THERE SHALL BE NO VEHICULAR ACCESS FROM TALL OAKS LANE INTO SUBDIVISION.

FURTHER CERTIFY THAT THE ANNEXED PLAT IS A CORRECT HERETOFORE DEDICATED AS SHOWN.

I, CHRISTOPHER D. BARTOSZ, A PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR IN THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, HEREBY DESIGNATE ____________________________________ __ TO RECORD THIS DESIGNATION IS GRANTED UNDER 105 ILCS 5/11-1705.


TO DESIGNATE SUCH RECORDING UNDER CHAPTER 109, SECTION 2 OF THE ILLINOIS REVISED STATUTES.
I, __________________________________________, A NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR THE RESIDING IN THE COUNTY

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: __________________________________________

NOTARY PUBLIC

DESCRIBED IN THE ANNEXED PLAT, AND HAS CAUSED THE SAME TO BE SURVEYED AND SUBDIVIDED AS INDICATED

PURPOSES THEREIN SET FORTH AS THE FREE AND VOLUNTARY ACT AND DEED OF SAID CORPORATION.

GIVEN UNDER MY HAND AND NOTARIAL SEAL THIS _____ DAY OF ___________________, A.D., 20____.

STATE OF ILLINOIS  )

OWNER'S CERTIFICATE

TITLE: _________________________ TITLE: _______________________ __

WHO IS SUBSCRIBED TO THE FOREGOING CERTIFICATE OF OWNERSHIP APPENDED BEFORE ME THIS DAY IN

DELIVERED THE SAID INSTRUMENT AT THEIR OWN FREE AND VOLUNTARY ACT OF SAID CORPORATION AS OWNER, FOR

THE USES AND PURPOSES THEREIN SET FORTH, AND THE SAID MORTGAGEE DID ALSO THEN AND THERE

AFFIX CORPORATE SEAL IF APPROPRIATE

ACKNOWLEDGE THAT HE OR SHE AS CUSTODIAN OF THE CORPORATE SEAL OF SAID CORPORATION DID AFFIX SAID

SIGNATURE

OF SAID CORPORATION TO SAID INSTRUMENT AS HIS OR HER OWN FREE AND VOLUNTARY ACT AND AS THE FREE

AND VOLUNTARY ACT OF SAID CORPORATION, AS OWNER, AS AFORESAID, FOR THE USES AND PURPOSES THEREIN SET

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I HAVE HERETO SET MY HAND AND SEAL OF THE VILLAGE ITASCA, ILLINOIS,

GIVEN UNDER MY HAND AND SEAL OF THE COUNTY CLERK AT WHEATON, ILLINOIS, THIS ______   DAY OF

STATE OF ________________ )

STATE OF ________________ )

THE TERM COMMON AREA OR AREAS IS DEFINED AS A LOT, PARCEL OR AREA OF REAL PROPERTY, THE

REAL PROPERTY PHYSICALLY OCCUPIED BY A BUILDING. SERVICE BUSINESS DISTRICT OR STRUCTURES SUCH AS

BUILDINGS SHALL BE PLACED ON SAID EASEMENT BUT THE SAME MAY BE USED FOR OTHER PURPOSES THAT DO

OTHERWISE DESIGNATED ON THE PLAT BY TERMS SUCH AS, OUTLOTS, COMMON ELEMENTS, OPEN SPACE, OPEN

AREA, COMMON GROUND, PARKING, AND COMMON AREA. THE TERMS COMMON AREA OR AREAS, AND COMMON

APPURTENANCES AS MAY BE DEEMED NECESSARY BY SAID VILLAGE OVER, UPON, ALONG, UNDER, AND THROUGH,

REVISIONS

Other easements, title and other information

OPTION CARE SUBDIVISION - ITASCA, IL

* EASEMENT PROVISIONS

An easement for serving the subdivision and other property with electric and communications service is hereby reserved for and

granted to Commonwealth Edison Company

of1" =SCALE:

&: 2250'
**PUBLIC HEARING DATE: JULY 15, 2020**

**TITLE:** Bradley Variance  
**ADDRESS:** 340 Home Ave.  
**PIN:** 03-08-411-023  

**PROPOSAL:** Rosaleen Bradley as representative of Oxford Bank & Trust #1217, property owner, of 340 Home Ave. is requesting the following:

1. Variance to Section 7.05-7-b of the Zoning Ordinance to allow for a lot coverage of 51.5%, or 3,886 square feet, whereas the maximum allowed is 40% or 3,330 square feet.

**BACKGROUND**

The owner applied for a patio permit in May 2020 as part of the permit review it was found that the property exceeds the maximum 40% lot coverage allowed for non-conforming lots within the R-2, Single-Family Residence District and new impervious area would not be permitted.

The owner is seeking a variance to the lot coverage requirement to construct an approximately 210 ft.\(^2\) patio at the rear of the home.
PLANNING & ZONING ANALYSIS

The subject property is located on the west side of the 300 Block of Home Ave. and is Zoned R-2, Single-Family Residence District. The subject property is considered legal non-conforming as it does not meet the minimum lot width of 65 ft. and lot size of 9,100 ft.² for R-2 zoned properties as required by Section 7.05-4 of the Zoning Ordinance. The subject property has a lot width of 55 ft. and lot area of 7,507.5 ft.².

The subject property was built in 2003 and is currently developed with a two-story single-family structure with a basement that is approximately 4,609 ft.², a detached garage that is approximately 588 ft.² and a driveway.

Section 7.05, which regulates the R-2, Single-Family Residence District provides two sets of lot coverage regulations for lots within the zoning district. Lots that meet the minimum lot width and lot size requirements are allowed a lot coverage of 50%, whereas lots that are non-conforming are allowed a lot coverage of 40%.

There are multiple purposes for why municipalities have lot coverage requirements, including but not limited to:

1. Ensuring development is consistent within a neighborhood/zoning district.
2. Ensuring that greenspace is provided for stormwater saturation.

Typically, lot coverage requirements are provided as a percentage of the lot size since this allows the regulation to be applied equally to all properties in terms of the ratio of impervious to pervious surface.

The Village of Itasca Zoning Ordinance is unique in that it provides a stricter requirement for those lots which do not meet the minimum lot width and size requirements, which specifically only applies to those lots in the R-2, Single-Family Residence District. The Zoning Ordinance does not provide for a stricter lot coverage requirement for those lots which do not meet the minimum lot standard in either the R-1 nor R-3 Zoning Districts.

Staff is recommending that a variance to allow for a lot coverage of 50% or 3753 ft.² be recommended for approval for consistent application of the Zoning Ordinance since this property presents requires additional impervious surface to reach the detached garage in the rear-yard.

SUMMARY

The subject property at 340 Home Ave. is a smaller lot and thus is required to have a smaller portion of their lot be improved with impervious surface. The location of the detached garage being located further to the rear of the property requires more pavement from the street to reach the detached garage resulting in less impervious area to be used for improvements such as patios.

PUBLIC COMMENTS
As of July 8, 2020, Village Staff has received no public comments regarding this petition.

**STAFF RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

Staff recommends the following conditions be included if a favorable recommendation is made by the Plan Commission:

1. Permit Documents must be in substantial compliance with the Plan Commission and Village Board Submittals.
2. The proposed patio was must comply with all Village Ordinance and Building Codes in place at time of permit application.
3. The proposed patio shall be completed within one (1) year from the date of Ordinance approval.

**REQUIRED FINDINGS OF FACT FOR VARIANCES**

Section 14.09-3 sets forth the following standards for variances:

*(Staff’s Response are in Italics)*

No Variance shall be granted by the President and Board of Trustees unless the specific findings are made based on the evidence presented to the Plan Commission:

1. The property in question cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used only under the conditions allowed by the regulations governing the district in which it is located;
2. The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances, and
3. The variation, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality.

In making this determination, the Plan Commission shall consider whether there are particular difficulties or particular hardships, and take into consideration whether the following facts have been established by evidence:

1. The particular physical surroundings, shape or topographical conditions of the specific property involved would bring a particular hardship upon the owner, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience if the strict letter of the regulations were to be carried out;
2. The conditions upon which the petition for variation is based would not be applicable generally to other property within the same zoning classification;
3. The purpose of the variation is not based exclusively upon a desire to make more money from the property, or merely for the convenience of the owner;
4. The alleged difficulty or hardship has not been created by any person presently having an interest in the property;
5. The granting of the variation will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located; or
6. That the proposed variation will not impair an adequate supply of light on adjacent property or substantially increase the danger of fire or otherwise endanger the public safety or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood.

DOCUMENTS ATTACHED

1. Petition for Variance, dated June 16, 2020
2. Plat of Survey, dated March 10, 2004
3. Site Plan, dated June 16, 2020
PETITION FOR VARIANCE

Village of Itasca Plan Commission
c/o Community Development Department
550 W. Irving Park Rd.
Itasca, IL 60143
(Ph): 630-773-5568    (F): 630-773-0852
comdev@itasca.com

Date Submitted: 6-16-2020

ALL ITEMS MUST BE COMPLETE TO PROCESS APPLICATION

Address(es) of Property: 340 HOME AVE ITASCA IL 60143
Owner(s) of Property: Rosaleen Ann Bradley

Petitioner(s) (if other than owners):

Existing Use: Residential Family Home Zoning: R-2
P.I.N. #: 03-08-411-023 Lot Size (sq. ft.): 7507 sqft.

Please answer the following questions (you may attached additional sheets if needed):

1.) Specifically state the variance(s) which is sought including the relevant section(s) of the Zoning Ordinance and how and/or the amount(s) by which the ordinance is sought to be varied.
   The required lot coverage in R-2 zoned district is 40% land coverage.
   We are seeking a variance to Section 7.05-7-B to allow for lot coverage of 51.5% or 3,866 sq. ft. whereas the current maximum allowed is 40% or 3,300 sq. ft.

2.) Generally state the purpose and reasons for which the variance(s) is/are sought.
   The property is a single family home with no outdoor living space. The proposed brick patio will allow for a brick paver seating area approximately 14 ft. X 15 ft.

3.) Explain how the property in question cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used only under the conditions allowed by the Zoning Ordinance.
   This property has no outside seating area for relaxing. It would be nice to entertain family and friends during the year. A new patio would help increase the value of said home and help make our backyard area more inviting.
4.) State and explain the particular factors of the property (e.g., physical surroundings, shape or topographical conditions, etc.) that bring a hardship to the owner under the strict letter of the Zoning Ordinance. The said property is an inside lot with neighbors to the North and South. The average lot size in a R-2 district is approximately 9,100 sq. ft. Our lot is approximately 7,500 sq. ft. Our ground coverage is used up by our side driveway which is on the opposite side of the lot from the proposed patio.

5.) Explain how the plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances and not generally applicable to other properties in the neighborhood. The lot size is unique and different. We are located in an R-2 zone which only allows us 40% ground coverage. R-1 zone lots can have a 50% ground coverage. If R-2 zone had 50% coverage we would not need a variance.

6.) State the effects of the proposed variation(s) upon the character of the neighborhood, the property values, traffic conditions, public utilities, storm water detention, and other matters pertaining to the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the community. Explain how the variation will not alter the essential character of the locality. The proposed patio will have no impact on the neighborhood, the property values, traffic, utilities, storm water detention and any other matters. The patio will be located at the rear of the home and be at ground level.

Owner’s Name(s): Rosaleen Ann Bradley
Address: 340 Home Ave itasca IL 60143
Phone: 630-205-5406.
Email: Colmbradley@yahoo.com.

Petitioner’s Name(s): Colm & Rosaleen A Bradley
Address(es): 340 Home Ave itasca IL 60143
Phone: 630-205-5406
Email: Colmbradley@yahoo.com.

Agent or Attorney (if applicable) Name: N/A
Firm: 
Address: 
Phone: 
Email: 

Site Planner or Engineer (if applicable) Name: 
Firm: 
Address: 
Phone: 
Email: 
LOT 17 IN BLOCK 9 IN H.O. STONE AND COMPANY’S ADDITION TO ITASCA, BEING A SUBDIVISION OF THAT PART OF THE SOUTHEAST 1/4 OF SECTION 8, TOWNSHIP 40 NORTH, RANGE 11 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, LYING EAST OF THE WEST 20 RODS THEREOF AND SOUTH OF THE LANDS OF THE CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE AND ST. PAUL RAILROAD, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED DECEMBER 2, 1926 AS DOCUMENT NO. 225893, IN DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS.
340 Home Ave Itasca IL 60143

SITE PLAN

Proposed new brick Paver patio 14 x 15 to be located at Southwest rear corner of Dwelling

FOUND IRON PIPE AT ALL CORNERS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE:</th>
<th>Kiddie Academy Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS:</td>
<td>1133 N. Prospect Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIN:</td>
<td>03-05-203-020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPOSAL:** Kunjun Shah, as representative of the owner MRK Realty, LLC, are requesting the following:

1. Approval of a Wall Sign “A” that exceeds 48 ft.² as required by Section 13.03-3.
2. Variance to Section 13.03-3-a of the Zoning Ordinance to allow for two wall signs, whereas the maximum allowed is one.
BACKGROUND

The Village Board approved Ordinance #1918-19 in July 2019, granting an amendment to the Prospect Courtyard Office Park Planned Development, Special Use Permit and Class I Site Plan Approval for Kiddie Academy to operate a childcare facility.

The construction of the building is nearing completion and Kiddie Academy submitted sign permit applications for the installation of various signage on the property and building. After a zoning review by Village Staff, it was determined that Kiddie Academy would need to request approval and a variance for their proposed wall signage.

PLANNING & ZONING ANALYSIS

The zoning regulation table below summarizes the applicable code requirements and how the proposed signage complies with the Zoning Ordinance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Allowed</th>
<th>Proposed 1133 N Prospect</th>
<th>Sign A</th>
<th>Sign B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.03-3-b</td>
<td>Number of Wall Signs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.03-3-a</td>
<td>Total Area of All Signs</td>
<td>240 ft.²</td>
<td>123.5 ft.²</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.03-3-e</td>
<td>Total Area of All Wall Signs</td>
<td>160 ft.²</td>
<td>123.5 ft.²</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.03-3</td>
<td>Area per Sign</td>
<td>48 ft.²</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>76 ft.²</td>
<td>47.5 ft.²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The subject property is unique in that it is an internal lot without direct frontage along a public street, Prospect Ave. Had this property been a corner lot or through lot, it would be permitted to have a second wall sign by right.

SUMMARY

Granting this variance would not alter the essential character of the area and would be consistent with signage that exists on buildings that are corner lots or are situated on the corner of a multi-tenant building.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

As of July 8, 2020, Village Staff has received no public comments regarding this petition.

STAFF RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Staff recommends the following conditions be included if a favorable recommendation is made by the Plan Commission:

1. Permit Documents must be in substantial compliance with the Plan Commission and Village Board Submittals.
2. The proposed signage must comply with all Village Ordinance and Building Codes in place at time of permit application.
3. The proposed signage shall be installed within one (1) year from the date of Ordinance approval.

REQUIRED FINDINGS OF FACT FOR VARIANCES

Section 14.09-3 sets forth the following standards for variances:

(Staff’s Response are in Italics)

No Variance shall be granted by the President and Board of Trustees unless the specific findings are made based on the evidence presented to the Plan Commission:

1. The property in question cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used only under the conditions allowed by the regulations governing the district in which it is located;

2. The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances, and

3. The variation, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality.

In making this determination, the Plan Commission shall consider whether there are particular difficulties or particular hardships, and take into consideration whether the following facts have been established by evidence:

1. The particular physical surroundings, shape or topographical conditions of the specific property involved would bring a particular hardship upon the owner, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience if the strict letter of the regulations were to be carried out;

2. The conditions upon which the petition for variation is based would not be applicable generally to other property within the same zoning classification;

3. The purpose of the variation is not based exclusively upon a desire to make more money from the property, or merely for the convenience of the owner;

4. The alleged difficulty or hardship has not been created by any person presently having an interest in the property;

5. The granting of the variation will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located; or

6. That the proposed variation will not impair an adequate supply of light on adjacent property or substantially increase the danger of fire or otherwise endanger the public safety or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood.

DOCUMENTS ATTACHED

1. Petition for Variance, dated June 22, 2020
2. Plat of Survey, dated February 19, 2019
3. Sign Drawings, dated March 8, 2020
SEE ATTACHED FOR 1 THRU 6
4.) State and explain the particular factors of the property (e.g., physical surroundings, shape or topographical conditions, etc.) that bring a hardship to the owner under the strict letter of the Zoning Ordinance.

5.) Explain how the plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances and not generally applicable to other properties in the neighborhood.

6.) State the effects of the proposed variation(s) upon the character of the neighborhood, the property values, traffic conditions, public utilities, storm water detention, and other matters pertaining to the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the community. Explain how the variation will not alter the essential character of the locality.

Owner's Name(s): Kunjan Shah (M&K Properties)
Address: 8225 w Church St
Miles, IL 6094

Phone: 224-622-2894
Email: Kunjan.shah@kidicacorp.net

Petitioner's Name(s): Kunjan Shah
Address(es): 8325 w Church St (Miles) IL 6094

Phone: 224-622-2894
Email: Kunjan.shah@kidicacorp.net

Agent or Attorney (if applicable)
Name:
Firm:
Address:
Phone:
Email:

Site Planner or Engineer (if applicable)
Name:
Firm:
Address:
Phone:
Email:
Village of Itasca
Community Development Department
550 West Irving Park Rd. Itasca, IL 60143
Phone: 630/773-5568; Fax: 630/773-0852
www.itasca.com

CONSULTANT SERVICES AGREEMENT

Pursuant to Section 4.05(5) of the Village of Itasca Zoning Ordinance, the Village of Itasca may use the services of professional consultants for research, investigation and professional opinion in the processing of any application.

Section 4.04(5) of the Itasca Zoning Ordinance:
CONSULTANTS: The Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals and the Village Board may utilize the services of professional consultants for research, investigation, and professional opinion, for assistance in arriving at recommendations or decisions. The applicant whose request to the Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals, or Village Board, requires the use of such professional services, shall reimburse the Village the reasonable cost it incurred for the services rendered by its consultants within ten (10) days after the submission of the bill by the Village. The consultants shall bill for their services at the same hourly rate which they normally charge municipal clients. The Village consultants shall include but no be limited to the persons who provide the Village with advice in the field of engineering, law, planning, traffic, design, finance, and court reporters.

I/we the applicant(s) understand that when the services of a consultant are utilized in accordance with the above section for research, investigation, professional opinion or other assistance, I/we shall pay all costs incurred within ten (10) days of submission of a bill by the Village of Itasca.

Kunj Shah (MRX RealEs, LLC)
Name of Applicant

8325 W Church St
Street Address

Miles IL 6014
City State Zip

224-622-2894
Telephone

Kunj Shah @ KiddiAcres.net
E-Mail

Signature of Applicant

Agent or Attorney (if applicable)

Street Address

City State Zip

Telephone

E-Mail

Date:

Please indicate who the bills for the costs incurred for the petition should be sent to.

Applicant: X Agent: 0 Other: 0

If other, please complete the below information.

Name:

Address:

City, State, Zip:

Phone: E-Mail:
1. Sign “A” variance is to increase the front of the building sign square footage from 48 sq ft to 75 sq ft. Sign “B” is to allow a second smaller sign that would be visible from Prospect Road. Sign “B” would be at 48 sq ft. This sign would be on the building wall.

2. The reason we are asking for these two variances is because of the building's poor visibility on Prospect. Sign “B” on the south end of the building is the only visible in part to public/vehicles passing by. Also, prospect courtyard has no monument sign along the road so no one knows what business are included within the business park. The building along the prospect avenue has a banner sign behind their building for people to see what they have to offer but my building is not visible and only putting the sign in the corner is more appropriate than putting a banner to preserve the value of the brand we are offering. Sign “A” was designed/ sized to fit the frontage of the building appropriately, while making it easier to see once you pull in the office park, where we are. Sign “A” fits the back brick portion of the front wall directly above the arc and door.

3. This location is not ideal from a standpoint of visibility. It is important for residents and businesses to see that Kiddie Academy is now a partner in Itasca. The building's visibility is greatly restricted, and the only identification that will be visible from Prospect will be having Sign “B”. Otherwise, we are located in the back of an office park, and no one will know we are there. It’s important that have some kind of visible identity to operate.

4. My building is part of prospect courtyard. First, courtyard has no monument sign along the road so nobody know what business is inside the courtyard. Second, other buildings along the prospect avenue use banners to promote their products. My building will lose brand if a banner will be used and banner is a temp solution not a permanent one. Also, we offer educational-based childcare and it is in Itasca community interest to see the sign so they are aware of the childcare in their area since Itasca only has 2 childcare and only one of the branded one which belongs to the business park and not much to the general public. The business park has one access point. If you miss it, it is not safe to turn around or make a u turns. You will have to pull into other drives and turn around. There is absolutely no identifier to let anyone know we are in the back. No monument sign, no directional.

5. Being that this building is behind/on the inside of the business park, visibility is almost nonexistent. We need visibility to be a viable business for the type of business we are. Parents and caregivers will be coming and going from this facility. Dropping off and picking up from morning until evening. We have no street frontage, therefore, we need use the small amount of visibility space we have to identify where we are, and who we are.

6. Sign “A” and sign “B” will have no negative effects on the neighborhood. Sign “B” would directly face Itasca’s Water Tower to the West. None of Hamilton’s apartments will have a view of either sign “A” or “B”. Sign “A” is on the interior of the business park. Having some visibility and identification will make our customers aware of where we are. Less vehicles turning around in other driveways and/or making u turns when they figure out they missed the single drive. Sign “A” was sized to fit the frontage of the building, which is substantial. It looks undersized for the frontage, if we have to meet the 48 sq ft. We have a brand and we want to preserve it signage. It’s one of the pillars of the brand. My building signs will actually help the community realize that they have educational-based childcare in their own area and will also be a provider to the businesses in Itasca. Nowadays, educational childcare is rare, but we are bringing it to Itasca and
we want all the children to take advantage of it and signage is one of the brand awareness. We built an exceptional building, and will have exceptional services for the children and parents of the area. We are offering a branded educational based childcare in Itasca. Itasca only has 2 other day cares. It only has one educational based daycare, which belongs to a business park. Also, both are corporate owned and we are offering owner owned education based childcare to Itasca area. This will not impact other surrounding properties because what we are offering is unique and it’s for the future of the children. We make them ready for Kindergarten. We want to help as many children ready and succeed once they leave our academy.
PLAT OF SURVEY

PART OF LOT 1 IN ISLAND LAKES EAST AMENDMENT, PLAT NUMBER 1, A SUBDIVISION IN THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 8, TOWNSHIP 11 NORTH, RANGE 11, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED AUGUST 15, 1996 AS DOCUMENT NUMBER 9209-202-33, DUPage COUNTY, ILLINOIS, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 1; THENCE SOUTH 89 DEGREES 21 MINUTES 03 SECONDS EAST 63.37 FEET TO THE SOUTHEASTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 227.00 FEET; THENCE NORTH 89 DEGREES 21 MINUTES 03 SECONDS WEST 63.37 FEET; THENCE NORTH 43 DEGREES 33 SECONDS EAST 30.14 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 43 DEGREES 33 SECONDS BY NORTH 63.37 FEET TO THE SOUTHEASTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT; THEREFROM SOUTHEAST 89 DEGREES 21 MINUTES 03 SECONDS BY SOUTH 63.37 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

AREA SUMMARY

[Drawing of the plat with a measurement of 22.81 acres]

GENERAL NOTES:

1. THE DRAWING SHOWN ON THIS PLAT AND BASED ON THE CLARKE'S 1866 FLAT PLAN CORRECTION SYSTEM IS NOT SIZE CORRECT.
2. SCALE DETERMINATION WITH SOUTHWEST CORNER AND SOUTHEAST CORNER OF PLAT NUMBER 1, LOT 1, BLOCK 1, ISLAND LAKES EAST AMENDMENT.
3. ALL AREAS LISTED IN THE AREA SUMMARY TABLE ARE MORE OR LESS.
4. ALL OUTLIERS ARE DRAWN IN FEET AND DO NOT REPRESENT TRUE DISTANCE.
5. SURVEYORS AND EXPERIMENTAL COORDINATES WERE NOT CHECKED OR CONSIDERED TO BE ACCURATE OUTSIDE OF THE LIMITS OF THE DRAWING.

PLAT OF SURVEY
ITASCA, ILLINOIS

KUNJAN SHAH

ENGINEERING RESOURCE ASSOCIATES

STATE OF ILLINOIS
COUNTY OF DUPage

SIGNED UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY, THIS 30TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2019

FILE WORK COMPLETED FEBRUARY 15, 2019

[Signatures and seals of surveyors]

[Scale and north arrow on the plat]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REV#</th>
<th>REV. DESCRIPTION HISTORY</th>
<th>REQUESTED BY</th>
<th>CSC DESIGNER</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Itasca, IL Sign Pkg Rev 0</td>
<td>Shannon Lubiano</td>
<td>James Brooks</td>
<td>2/26/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Revised entire sign package</td>
<td>Shannon Lubiano</td>
<td>James Brooks</td>
<td>11/26/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Removed monument sign</td>
<td>Shannon Lubiano</td>
<td>James Brooks</td>
<td>2/25/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Added Southwest Elevation Signage</td>
<td>Shannon Lubiano</td>
<td>James Brooks</td>
<td>3/18/20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kiddie Academy
1119 N. Prospect Ave.
Itasca, IL 60143
Kiddie Academy - SIGN “A”

18'10"

3'-11 1/2"
1'-1"
3'-1 3/4"
1'-4 3/4"

Kiddie Academy
Educational Child Care

LED ILLUMINATED RACEWAY MOUNT CHANNEL LETTERS
SCALE: 3/8" = 1'-0"

SIGN TYPE
- SINGLE FACE
- ILLUMINATED
- WALL

SPECIFICATIONS
- SINGLE FACE ILLUMINATED RACEWAY MOUNT CHANNEL LETTERS
- 1/8" ALUMINUM SIGNS AND SIGNS FINISHED BLACK
- 1/8" CLEAR ACRYLIC DIGITALLY PRINTED FACES FOR "KIDDE" TO MATCH PMS 1807 RED
- 1/8" CLEAR ACRYLIC DIGITALLY PRINTED FACES TO MATCH PMS COOL GRAY 10 FOR "ACADEMY"
- 1/8" BLACK/WHITE ACRYLIC FACES FOR "LOGO CAP"
- 1/8" CLEAR ACRYLIC DIGITALLY PRINTED FACES FOR TAG LINE CABINET
- RED LED FOR "KIDDE", WHITE LED FOR REMAINING GRAPHICS
- ALUMINUM REGISTER MARK
- FABRICATED ALUMINUM RACEWAY PAINTED TO MATCH FASCIA

COLORS
- DCMA0002
- PMS 1807 RED
- COOL GRAY 10
- BLACK
- BLACK/WHITE ACRYLIC

SIGN SURVEY
- FACE TRIMS
- FACADE COLOR
- RADIUS DIM.
- BUILDING DIM.
- FACADE ANGLE
- OTHER

ARTWORK
- PROVIDED
- REQUIRED
- If required, customer to provide Custom Sign Center, Inc. with camera ready or appropriate digital file. Please contact your design person or Design Staff for appropriate file types.

FILENAME: KA-CLL-20
DATE: 1/4/19
REV.#: DGNR: JLB
SCALE: AS NOTED
SALES: SHEEHY

Approval Signatures Required to ensure that all spelling, colors, and specifications for sign(s) render as customer & landlord approval.

CUSTOMER: ___________________ LANDLORD: ___________________
DATE: ___________________ DATE: ___________________
**SIGN "B"**

**Kiddie Academy**

**EDUCATIONAL CHILD CARE**

**LED ILLUMINATED RACEWAY MOUNT CHANNEL LETTERS**

**SCALE: 3/8" = 1'-0"**

### SIGN TYPE
- SINGLE FACE
- ILLUMINATED
- WALL

### SPECIFICATIONS
- SINGLE FACE ILLUMINATED RACEWAY MOUNT CHANNEL LETTERS
  - 3/8" ALUMINUM SIGNS AND MACHINES FINISHED BLACK
  - 1/8" CLEAR ACRYLIC DIGITALLY PRINTED FACES FOR "KIDDE" TO MATCH PMS 1807 RED
  - 1/8" CLEAR ACRYLIC DIGITALLY PRINTED FACES TO MATCH PMS COOL GRAY 10 FOR "ACADEMY"
  - 1/8" BLACK/WHITE ACRYLIC FACES FOR "LOGO CAP"
  - 1/8" CLEAR ACRYLIC DIGITALLY PRINTED FACES FOR TALL EDGE CABINET
  - RED LED FOR "KIDDE", WHITE LED FOR REMAINING GRAPHICS
  - ALUMINUM REGISTER MARK
  - FABRICATED ALUMINUM RACEWAY PAINTED TO MATCH FASCIA

### COLORS
- DCMA0022
- PMS 1807 RED
- COOL GRAY 10
- BLACK
- BLACK/WHITE ACRYLIC

### SIGN SURVEY
- FACE TRIMS
- FASCIA COLOR
- RADIUS DIM.
- BUILDING DM.
- FACADE ANGLE
- OTHER

### ARTWORK
- PROVIDED
- REQUIRED

---

**FILENAME: KA-CLL-16**
**DATE: 1/4/19**
**REV. DATE:**
**DGNR: LB**
**SALES: SHEEHY**

**Approval Signatures Required:** to ensure that all spelling, colors, and specifications for sign(s) render as customer & landlord approval.

**CUSTOMER:**
**DATE:**

**LANDLORD:**
**DATE:**

---

This original design and all information herein are the property of Custom Sign Center, Inc. Artwork is subject to return if not purchased. Any unauthorized use is forbidden.
PUBLIC HEARING DATE: JULY 15, 2020

TITLE: Blue Stone Planned Development & Subdivision
ADDRESS: Southeast Corner of Rohlwing Rd. & Devon Ave.
PIN: 03-06-100-010; 03-06-200-013

PROPOSAL: BSTP Midwest, LLC, Petitioner, and as representative of the property owner, Bridge Itasca, LLC, is requesting the following:

1. Approval of a Planned Development by Special Use in accordance with Section 14.12 of the Zoning Ordinance for the construction of a hotel, gas station, and multi-tenant retail/restaurant building, with the noted requested exceptions to the Zoning Ordinance:
   A. Exception to Section 8.02-1 to allow Outdoor Storage/Sales in the B-3, Service Business, Zoning District.
   B. Exception to Section 13.03-2-b-5 to allow Gas Station Front Entrance Sign to project 51”, whereas the maximum allowed is 18 in.
   C. Exception to Section 13.03-2-b-7 to allow 3 ground signs on Lot 2, whereas the maximum allowed is 2 signs.
   D. Exception to Section 13.03-2-b-8 to allow for the Gas Station Pole Sign to be a height of 80 ft., whereas the maximum allowed is 20 ft.
   E. Exception to Section 13.03-2-b-8 to allow for the Gas Station Pole Sign to have a sign area of 330 ft.², whereas the maximum allowed is 48 ft.².
   F. Exception to Section 13.03-2-b-2 to allow for total gross surface area for wall signs on Lot 1B to be 420 ft.², whereas the maximum allowed is 300 ft.².
   G. Exception to Section 13.02-2-b-6 to allow for a Hotel Wall Sign height to be 42 ft. 4 in., whereas the maximum allowed is 30 ft.

2. Approval of a Class I Site Plan Review in accordance with 14.13 of the Zoning Ordinance.

3. Approval of a Final Plat of Subdivision in accordance with Section 7.09 of the Subdivision Ordinance.

BACKGROUND

The Village Board approved Ordinance # 1893.3-19 in June 2019 which granted a Planned Development by Special Use, Final Plat of Subdivision, and a Final Class I Site Plan Review for the construction of three warehouse buildings and the designation of an approximately 7-acre site along Rohlwing Rd. for the construction of a multitenant retail building, two free-standing restaurant sites, a hotel, and stormwater/common area open space.

The construction of the building shell for all three industrial building are nearing competition, with a portion of Building #2 currently being built out of a tenant.
The property owner, Bridge Itasca, LLC, along with their real estate brokers have marketed the commercial portion of the development to various end-users and developers. BSTP Midwest, LLC is under contract to purchase the commercial portion of the development pending approval of their request.

The commercial components of the overall Planned Development were negotiated as a condition of approval for the industrial portion of the development, all of which is governed and generally consistent with the Village Board approved Planned Development agreement.

**PLANNING & ZONING ANALYSIS**

The proposed development is approximately 7-acres and located on the east side of Rohlwing Rd. between Devon Ave. and Illinois Route 390. The property is zoned B-3 Service Business District. The adjacent property zoning and uses are as follows:

- North: Automotive Service, Hotel, and Restaurant (Elk Grove Village)
- South: Illinois Route 390
- East: M Limited Manufacturing – Warehouse
- West: M Limited Manufacturing – Office

The B-3 Service Business District is, “designed to provide for automotive, service, and freestanding commercial activities which require limited comparison shopping. Customers usually arrive by automobile, making a separate stop for each errand. Uses permitted in this district usually require larger sites and buildings and often provide services which are not compatible with other commercial or residential districts. These commercial areas are usually located along major arterials or adjacent to limited access highway interchanges.”

The proposed uses of a gas station (including a truck fueling station) with a convenience store, hotel, and a multi-tenant retail/restaurant building are consistent with the intention of the B-3 Service Business District, as it provides for a variety of automotive, service and commercial uses.

The proposed uses are also complementary to the adjacent property uses as they will provide services that will be in need and in use by adjacent and nearby office and warehouse businesses. The proposed location of the three uses are also ideal for both the developer and the Village as the gas station will be located along the IL-390 frontage and reserve the corner lot for the multi-tenant restaurant/retail building per the originally approved conceptual plans.

The proposed Thornton’s Gas Station will provide an approximately 5,600 ft.$^2$ convenience store, 20 gas station pumps for passenger vehicles, and 4 truck fueling stations. The proposed gas station site will also have a limited outdoor storage/sale area where they will have materials/goods for sales common to be found at gas stations, including but not limited to an ice box machine, propane tank storage, car accessories, etc.

The proposed Holiday Inn Express & Suites Hotel will be approximately 54,233 ft.$^2$ and provide a total of 93 rooms, a business center, fitness center, pool, and other amenities.
The proposed multi-tenant restaurant/retail building will be approximately 8,400 ft.\(^2\) and is proposed to have two tenant spaces, one each for restaurant and retail. The site plan proposes to locate the restaurant on the northern portion of the building where a drive-through lane can be constructed if the user requires one. This allows for the developer to market the restaurant site to a variety of restaurant users. Once a user is identified, the developer will have to return for a Class I Site Plan Approval and if necessary, a Special Use approval dependent on the type of user.

**Bulk Standards & Off-Street Parking Requirements**

The following table provides a summary of the proposed development’s compliance with the B-3 Zoning Bulk Standards and Off-Street Parking Requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Multi-Tenant Restaurant/ Retail (Lot 1A)</th>
<th>Hotel (Lot 1B)</th>
<th>Gas Station (Lot 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.05-4</td>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>≤ 0.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.05-5</td>
<td>Lot Size</td>
<td>No Minimum</td>
<td>85, 949 ft.(^2)</td>
<td>113,502 ft.(^2)</td>
<td>148,150 ft.(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.05-6</td>
<td>Front-Yard Setback(^1)</td>
<td>≥ 25 ft.</td>
<td>156 ft.</td>
<td>116 ft.</td>
<td>148 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.05-6</td>
<td>Side-Yard Setback(^1)</td>
<td>≥ 5 ft.</td>
<td>83 ft.</td>
<td>76 ft. / 93 ft.</td>
<td>83 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.05-6</td>
<td>Corner-Side Yard Setback(^1)</td>
<td>≥ 25 ft.</td>
<td>88 ft.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>378 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.05-6</td>
<td>Rear-Yard Setback(^1)</td>
<td>≥ 20 ft.</td>
<td>74 ft.</td>
<td>102 ft.</td>
<td>76 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.05-8</td>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>≤ 45 ft. or 3 Stories, whichever is less</td>
<td>N/A(^3)</td>
<td>45 ft. 4” 4 stories(^2)</td>
<td>24 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.03-1-a-(3)</td>
<td>Parking Lot Setback</td>
<td>≥ 5 ft.</td>
<td>15 ft.</td>
<td>10 ft.</td>
<td>119 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.03-5</td>
<td>Parking Stall Dimension</td>
<td>≥ 9 ft. Wide x 18 ft. Length</td>
<td>9 ft. x 18 ft.</td>
<td>9 ft. x 18 ft.</td>
<td>9 ft. x 20.5 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.03-5</td>
<td>ADA Stall Dimension</td>
<td>≥ 16 ft. Wide x 18 ft. Length</td>
<td>16 ft. x 18 ft.</td>
<td>16 ft. x 18 ft.</td>
<td>16 ft. x 18 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.06</td>
<td>Drive Aisle Width</td>
<td>≥ 24 ft.</td>
<td>24 ft.</td>
<td>24 ft.</td>
<td>24 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.05</td>
<td>Min. # of Parking Stalls</td>
<td>≥ 70 / 107 / 24</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.05</td>
<td>Min. # of ADA Stalls</td>
<td>4 / 5 / 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.12-7-c- (2)-(c)</td>
<td>Building Coverage</td>
<td>≤ 25%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.12-7-(2)- (d)</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>≥ 15%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>31.2$</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Yard setbacks: Each front, side, and rear setback or required yard shall be increased by two (2) feet for each additional one (1) foot of building height over thirty (30) feet.

2 Ordinance # 1889-18 approved a building height and stories for the hotel to exceed maximum height of 45 ft. and maximum of 3 stories.

3 Construction of the Multi-Tenant Restaurant/Retail Building is not proposed now as the end users have not been identified. Developer will return for amended Final Approval once users are identified and building plans have been drafted.

**Site Access**

Site Access will be provided by a right-in and right-out curb cut on Devon Ave., right-in curb-cut and a full access curb-cut along Rohlwing Rd. Access easements will be provided on the Plat of Subdivision to allow for internal access between all three lots as well as access to the warehouse development to the east with access to the curb-cut with the newly planned traffic light at Devon Ave. & Nerge Rd.

**Landscaping Requirements**

Section 14.19 requires that a Landscaping Plan be provided with any proposed development for review and approval. Section 14.19-3 states when drafting the landscape plan, “landscape materials shall be selected and sited to produce a hardy drought resistant landscape area. Selection shall include: consideration of soil type and depth; spacing for opacity; exposure to sun, wind and water; slope and contours of the site; building walls, overhangs and compatibility with existing native vegetation preserved on site.”

The proposed landscape plan provides for a variety of coniferous and deciduous trees, shrubs, plantings, and ground cover. Appropriate landscaping is being provided at the base of the monument signage as well as appropriate landscaping and fence screening around trash enclosure areas. Trees are being provided in the parking lot islands as well as shrubs along the perimeter of parking areas that have street frontage.

**Signage**

Site Signage Matrix Exhibit provides a summary of the proposed development’s compliance with Section 13.03 of the Zoning Ordinance related to sign regulations. The proposed signage for the development is in scale with the size of the development. The majority of exceptions being requested as part of the Planned Development are related to signage and this is to allow for the signage to be easily visible to motorists on IL Route 390.

**SUMMARY**

The proposed development is consistent with B-3 Zoning District and will bring a diverse development with significant economic development impact to the this previously undeveloped
parcel. It will work towards the Village’s Comprehensive goal of bringing more commercial uses and activity along the Rohlwing Rd. / IL-53 Corridor. Adequate access to the site will be provided along both Rohlwing Rd. and Devon Ave. as well as internal drive aisles. Significant landscaping will be provided to balance hardscape and greenspace on the site. Signage proposed is consistent with those for developments located next to major highway systems.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

As of July 8, 2020, Village Staff has received no public comments regarding this petition.

STAFF RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Staff recommends the following conditions be included if a favorable recommendation is made by the Plan Commission:

1. Final Plat of Subdivision, Final Engineering Plans, and Final Building Elevations must be in substantial compliance with the Plan Commission and Village Board Submittals.
2. Final Plat of Subdivision shall be reviewed and approved by Village’s Community Development and Engineering Staff prior to recording the Plat with DuPage County’s Recorder’s Office.
3. The project must comply with all Village Ordinances, Building Codes, Subdivision Regulations, Standards Specifications, and the DuPage County Stormwater Ordinance in place at the time of permit application.
4. The project must comply with the approved Development Agreement (Ord. # 1889-18) governing this mixed-use industrial and commercial site.
5. Any favorable recommendation is subject to final building permit approval.
6. The proposal is subject to adherence to previously issued review comments.
7. Ordinarily, project approvals of this nature are conditioned to be valid for one year. Staff recommends that the phasing schedule and timeline of the proposed development be consistent with the approved Development Agreement.
8. If the project does not commence within three years of Village Board approval, the requests shall return to the Board for reauthorization. Furthermore, if for any reason BSTP Midwest, LLC is not able to complete this project, any future assignees will be required to obtain Village Board approval to amend the approvals for the new ownership entity.

REQUIRED STANDARDS OF APPROVAL FOR PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS

Section 14.12-7 of the Zoning Ordinance states no planned development shall be authorized unless the Plan Commission shall find and recommend, in addition to those standards established herein for Special Uses, that the following standards shall be met:

General:

1. The uses permitted by such exceptions as may be requested or recommended are necessary or desirable and appropriate to the purpose of the development.
2. The uses permitted in such development are not of such nature or so located as to exercise an undue detrimental influence or effect upon the surrounding neighborhood.

3. That any industrial park areas established in the planned development conform to all requirements therefore, as set forth elsewhere in this Ordinance.

4. That all minimum requirements pertaining to commercial, residential, institutional, or other uses established in the planned development shall be subject to the requirements for each individual classification as established elsewhere in this Ordinance, except as may be specifically varied in the Ordinance granting and establishing a planned development use.

5. When private streets and common driveways are made a part of the planned development or private common open space recreational facilities are provided, the applicant shall submit, as part of the application, the method and arrangement whereby these private facilities shall be operated and maintained. Such arrangements for operating and maintaining private facilities shall be subject to the approval of the Village Board.

6. That any bulk exceptions shall be solely for the purpose of promoting an integrated site plan more beneficial to the residents or occupants of such development as well as neighboring property, that would be obtained under the bulk regulations of this Ordinance for building developed on separate zoning lots.

7. Architectural Consistency. The architectural style and features established for an approved planned development shall be maintained throughout the entire project unless otherwise recommended by the Plan Commission and approved by the Village Board.

Business:

That in a planned business development, the following additional requirements are hereby specified:

1. All buildings shall be set back not less than fifty (50) feet from all street rights-of-way lines bounding the site; and set back forty (40) feet from any residentially zoned land.

2. Required off-street parking spaces shall be provided in accordance with Section 12.00 of this Ordinance and set back not less than twenty-five (25) feet from any residentially zoned land.

3. All walks within the planned development shall be paved with a hard-surfaced material meeting the specification of the Village.

4. Any part of the planned development not used for buildings, loading and access ways, shall be attractively landscaped with grass, trees, shrubs, or pedestrian walkways, according to a landscape plan, as approved by the Plan Commission.

5. The overall floor area ratio for the Planned Development shall not exceed by more than twenty (20) percent the maximum floor area ratio which would be determined on the basis of the amount required for the individual uses in such Planned Development as stipulated in each district.

6. The buildings in the planned development shall be planned and designed as a unified and single project.
Variation of Minimum Requirements:

1. Wherever the applicant proposes to provide and set out, by platting, deeding, dedication, restriction, or covenant, any land or space separate from single-family or multi-family residential districts to be used for parks, playgrounds, commons, greenways or open areas, the Plan Commission may consider and recommend to the Village Board, and the Village Board may vary the applicable minimum requirements of the subdivision regulations and the zoning ordinance which may include but not necessarily be limited to the following:
   a. Front Yard
   b. Rear Yard
   c. Side Yard
   d. Lot Area
   e. Bulk
   f. Intensity of Use
   g. Street Width
   h. Sidewalks
   i. Public Utilities
   j. Off-Street Parking

2. Business
   a. Business uses shall be as prescribed by the Plan Commission.
   b. All business shall be conducted, and material shall be stored within a completed enclosed building.
   c. Not more than twenty-five (25) percent of the lot area shall be covered by buildings or structures.
   d. Not less than fifteen (15) percent of the lot shall be provided or landscaping and open space purposes.
   e. No building shall be more than sixty-five (65) feet in height.

REQUIRED STANDARDS OF REVIEW FOR SUBDIVISIONS

Section 2.00 of the Subdivision Ordinance sets the following standards for review when considering a Subdivision Request.

1. To ensure sound, harmonious subdivision development including Planned Developments and community growth, and to safeguard the interest of the homeowner, the subdivider, the investor, and the Village.

   To assure that no subdivisions shall be approved that is not energy efficient as practicable in terms of density, mixture of use, site selections, building layout and orientation and landscaping.

2. To provide permanent assets to the locality and to the Village.

3. To prevent scattered development beyond existing public utilities and prevent excessive development costs.

4. To assure development of land for optimum use with necessary protection against deterioration and obsolescence.
5. To limit and control the pollution of the environment that can be caused by inadequate or incomplete urban development.

6. To provide common grounds of understanding and a sound working relationship between the Village and Subdivider.

7. To lessen congestion in the streets and highways.

8. To provide for adequate light and air.

9. To facilitate adequate provision for transportation, water, sewerage, schools, and other public necessities.

10. To ensure proper legal description and proper monumenting of subdivided land.

DOCUMENTS ATTACHED

1. Petition for Special Use, dated March 6, 2020
2. Petition for Subdivision, dated March 6, 2020
3. Project Narrative, dated July 6, 2020
4. Plat of Survey, revision date of November 27, 2018
5. Plat of Subdivision, revision date of March 5, 2020
6. Civil Site Plans, revision date of July 6, 2020
7. Landscape Plan, revision date of July 2, 2020
8. Photometric Plan, dated February 28, 2020
9. Traffic Analysis / Trip Generation Memo, dated March 5, 2020
10. Truck Turn Exhibit, dated July 6, 2020
11. Holiday Inn Building Elevation & Floor Plan, dated July 6, 2020
12. Thornton’s Building Elevation, dated July 6, 2020
13. Site Signage Drawings, dated July 6, 2020
14. Site Signage Matrix
PETITION FOR SPECIAL USE

Village of Itasca Plan Commission
c/o Community Development Department
550 W. Irving Park Rd.
Itasca, IL 60143
(Ph): 630-773-5568 (F): 630-773-0852
comdev@itasca.com

Date Submitted: 3/6/20

ALL ITEMS MUST BE COMPLETE TO PROCESS APPLICATION

Address(es) of Property: 7N771 RT. 53 Itasca, IL 60143

Owner(s) of Property: Bridge Itasca, LLC

Petitioner(s) (if other than owners): BSTP Midwest, LLC

Existing Use: Vacant Zoning: B-3

P.I.N. #(s): Portion of PIN 0306100010 Lot Size (sq. ft.): 348,654.24

Please answer the following questions (you may attach additional sheets if needed):

1.) Please provide a detailed description of the use requested.
   See attached narrative

2.) Please explain how the special use requested is in the interest of the public and is not solely for the interest of the applicant.
   See attached narrative

3.) Explain the reasons why the special use is necessary or desirable for the public convenience and how it will contribute to the general welfare of the neighborhood or community at this location.
   See attached narrative
4.) Will the special use be detrimental to the health, safety, morals or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity? Please explain your answer. See attached narrative.

5.) What effect will the use have on property values and improvements in the vicinity? Please explain your answer. See attached narrative.

Owner’s Name(s): Bridge Itasca, LLC c/o Bridge Development Partners, LLC - Attn. Nick Siegel
Address: 1000 W. Irving Park Road, Suite 150
Itasca, IL 60143
Phone: 312-683-7230
Email: nsiegel@bridgedev.com

Petitioner’s Name(s): BSTP Midwest, LLC
Address(es): 410 North Michigan Avenue, Suite 850
Chicago, IL 60611
Phone: 617-320-2759
Email: drew@bluestonestp.com

Agent or Attorney (if applicable)       Site Planner or Engineer (if applicable)
Name: Brett Duffy
Name: Brett Duffy
Firm: SpaceCo
Firm: SpaceCo
Address: 9575 W. Higgins Road, Suite 750
Address: 9575 W. Higgins Road, Suite 750
Rosemont, IL 60018
Rosemont, IL 60018
Phone: 847-696-4060
Phone: 847-696-4060
Email: bduffy@spacecoinc.com
Email: bduffy@spacecoinc.com

Please attach the following:

- Legal description of property (from title policy or plat of survey) – required for all variances.
- Current plat of survey (showing all site improvements/structures and easements).
- Architectural renderings of new or altered structures (if applicable).
- Site Plan (drawn to scale showing buildings, parking spaces, storm water detention and all other significant data with all pertinent dimensions fully noted).
- If held in trust, letter naming all beneficiaries of the trust and authorizing the below signed person to act on the matters related to the petition request. The letter must be signed by all beneficiaries of the trust.
I/WE Bridge Itasca, LLC DO HEREBY CERTIFY OR AFFIRM THAT I/WE ARE THE OWNER(S) OF RECORD OF THE AFORESAID DESCRIBED PROPERTY AND HEREBY MADE APPLICATION AS SUCH.

Signature: [Signature] Date: 2/28/20

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO
BEFORE ME THIS 28th DAY OF February, 2020

BY AMY McMURRAY
NOTARY PUBLIC

OFFICIAL SEAL
AMY McMURRAY
Notary Public – State of Illinois
My Commission Expires November 12, 2022
CONSULTANT SERVICES AGREEMENT

Pursuant to Section 4.05(5) of the Village of Itasca Zoning Ordinance, the Village of Itasca may use the services of professional consultants for research, investigation and professional opinion in the processing of any application.

Section 4.04(5) of the Itasca Zoning Ordinance:

CONSULTANTS: The Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals and the Village Board may utilize the services of professional consultants for research, investigation, and professional opinion, for assistance in arriving at recommendations or decisions. The applicant whose request to the Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals, or Village Board, requires the use of such professional services, shall reimburse the Village the reasonable cost it incurred for the services rendered by its consultants within ten (10) days after the submission of the bill by the Village. The consultants shall bill for their services at the same hourly rate which they normally charge municipal clients. The Village consultants shall include but no be limited to the persons who provide the Village with advice in the field of engineering, law, planning, traffic, design, finance, and court reporters.

I/We the applicant(s) understand that when the services of a consultant are utilized in accordance with the above section for research, investigation, professional opinion or other assistance, I/we shall pay all costs incurred within ten (10) days of submission of a bill by the Village of Itasca.

BSTP Midwest, LLC
Name of Applicant

410 Michigan Avenue, Suite 410
Street Address

Chicago, IL 60611
City                                        State      Zip

617-320-2759
Telephone

drew@bluestonestp.com
E-Mail

Signature of Applicant

Please indicate who the bills for the costs incurred for the petition should be sent to.

Applicant: ☒    Agent: ☐    Other: ☐

If other, please complete the below information.

Name: ________________________________
Address: ______________________________
City, State, Zip: ______________________________
Phone: _______________________________ E-Mail: _______________________________
PETITION FOR SUBDIVISION

VILLAGE OF ITASCA PLAN COMMISSION
Community Development Department
111 Line Street
Itasca, IL 60143
(630) 773-5558
Fax: (630) 773-0852

DATE _____/_______/_______

ALL ITEMS MUST BE COMPLETE TO PROCESS APPLICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address(es) of Property</th>
<th>7N771 RT. 53 Itasca, IL 60143</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision Name</td>
<td>Bridge Point Itasca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Use</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Zoning</td>
<td>B-3 &amp; M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All P.I.N. #'s</td>
<td>0306100010, 030620013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Acres</td>
<td>50.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Size</td>
<td>See attached plat for Lot sizes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attach preliminary plat of subdivision with legal description

THE LEGAL TITLEHOLDER MUST SIGN THIS PETITION. Where the property is held in trust, the trust officer must sign the petition and include a letter naming all beneficiaries of the trust and authorizing the beneficiaries to act on the matters related to this petition request. The undersigned acknowledges and agrees that this application and all documentation submitted becomes public record and may be viewed by the public.

Owner’s Name(s) | Bridge Itasca, LLC c/o Bridge Development Partners, LLC - Attn. Nick Siegal |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address(es)</td>
<td>1000 W. Irving Park Road, Suite 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>312-663-7230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Petitioner(s) | BSTP Midwest, LLC |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address(es)</td>
<td>410 North Michigan Avenue, Suite 850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>617-320-2759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agent or Attorney Information

Name | 
|--------------------------|
Firm | 
|--------------------------|
Address | 
|--------------------------|
Phone | 
|--------------------------|

Site Planner or Engineer

Name | Brett Duffy |
|--------------------------|
Firm | SpaceCo |
Address | 9575 W. Higgins Road, Suite 750 |
|--------------------------|
Phone | 847-696-4060 |

I/we, Bridge Itasca, LLC, do hereby certify or affirm that I/we are the owner(s) of record of the aforesaid described property and hereby make application as such.

Signature | [Signature] Date 2/26/20

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO

BEFORE ME THIS 28 DAY OF February 2020

[Signature] Amy McMurray
NOTARY PUBLIC

OFFICIAL SEAL
AMY McMURRAY
Notary Public – State of Illinois
My Commission Expires November 12, 2022
July 6, 2020

Mo Khan
Village Planner
Village of Itasca
550 W. Irving Park Road
Itasca, IL 60143

Re: Commercial Development (IL-53 & Devon)
Petition for Planned Development by Special Use

Mr. Khan,

BSTP Midwest, LLC is proposing a mixed-use commercial development on the southeast corner of N. Rohlwing Road (IL-53) and Devon Avenue. The development on the approximately 8 acre tract will consist of three individual lots as shown on the attached Plat of Subdivision: Lot 1B will contain a 93 room Holiday Inn Express & Suites, and Lot 2 will contain a 5,500 square foot convenience store and fuel center. We are actively marketing Lot 1A to retail and/or restaurant users, and we will submit a formal plan to the Village upon identification of that end user. The proposed building consists of a 2,000 square foot drive-in eating tenant and a 6,400 square foot retail tenant.

The business class national hotel on Lot 1B, proposed to be a Holiday Inn Express & Suites, will be 4 stories and provide 93 rooms with a fitness center, meeting rooms, indoor pool, breakfast bar, business center and guest laundry. The proposed parking field will wrap the hotel and include a porte-cochere entrance feature along the western elevation (IL-53 frontage) for check-ins. The proposed hotel is expected to create 15 full time and up to 10 part time jobs (approximately 12-14 employees per shift), has an estimated building value of $14-$15 million dollars and is expected to generate $2,800,000 in annual revenue (susceptible to sales tax).

The proposed convenience store on Lot 2 includes an approximately 5,500 square foot convenience store, which will offer pre-packaged and freshly prepared food and drink items. The fuel center provides 20 automobile fueling positions. In the rear of the convenience store, there are three commercial fueling lanes to service commercial vehicles, with a by-pass lane. The commercial vehicles will circulate counterclockwise through the Lot. Our convenience store and fuel center operator, Thorntons, has a very successful track record in the Illinois market and across the Midwest. The proposed Thorntons will generate 15 full time and 10 part time new jobs (mix of part time and full time) and is estimated to generate $150,000 a year in sales tax revenue for the Village of Itasca. The estimated sales tax revenue is based on Thorntons’ fuel and inside sales projections for this location, the 10 year market average retail price of fuel and the Village’s applicable portions of state sales tax, RTA tax and non-home rule tax.

The primary access for the development will be provided via the non-signalized extension of Hamilton Parkway, which will run between Lot 1B and Lot 2. This roadway extension will have a full access intersection with Rohlwing Road. Lot 1B and Lot 2 will have access off this internal roadway. Lot 2 will have no direct access to IL-53. Access points to the fuel center on Lot 2 will be segregated into passenger and commercial vehicle driveways as shown on the attached site plan. Lot 1A/1B will also be served by a right-in only driveway along Rohlwing Road. Finally, a right-in/right-out driveway to Lot 1A is proposed along Devon Avenue. The Devon Avenue access is currently approved by Cook County to be located on the
adjacent industrial property; however, to make Lot 1A more viable for retail development, we are requesting from Cook County to move the access driveway further west as shown on the site plan.

There will be cross-access between the Lots as shown on the attached site plan. The previously approved Development Agreement between the Village of Itasca and Bridge Itasca (the current landowner) contained reference to a Traffic Impact Study prepared by KLOA dated June 8, 2018. This traffic study contained initial trip generation projections for the commercial outlots referenced in this application. A revised trip generation memo has been prepared by KLOA which includes updated trip generation projections based on the site plan included in this application. The revised study indicates a reduction in overall daily trips to the site including during the AM and PM peak periods. As such, the original off-site roadway infrastructure recommendations remain unchanged.

The proposed signage for the development is as shown on the enclosed plans. Additionally, the development has designated a Village gateway signage feature on the northeast corner of Lot 1A (hard corner of IL-53 & Devon) and a Development sign located in the median of the Rohlwing Road entrance. These signs will be constructed by Bridge Itasca. The ultimate design and configuration of the Village’s gateway feature and Development sign will be further discussed with staff as the development progresses.

**PLANNED DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENT VIA SPECIAL USE CRITERIA**

1. **Please provide a detailed description of the use requested**
   
   See Project Narrative.

2. **Please explain how the special use requested is in the interest of the public and is not solely for the interest of the applicant**

   The proposed fuel center includes a 5,500 square foot convenience store, 10 multi-product dispensers (20 fueling positions) and 3 commercial fueling lanes. The location of the proposed fuel center is located on Lot 2 of the proposed subdivision, directly abutting the IL-390 Elgin-O’Hare Tollway and Rohlwing Road. The Rohlwing Road corridor was identified in the Village’s Comprehensive Plan as an area of increased traffic flow that was repositioned to support retail development and in turn provide a strong and stable source of tax revenue for the Village. This was a key issue found in the community feedback accompanying the Comprehensive Plan, namely to “gain stability of sales tax revenue and overall fiscal health of the Village”. The significant sales tax revenue associated with the fuel center will help expand public facilities and services throughout the Village. The location of the fuel center, at the edge of the Village limits, is capable of drawing traffic from beyond Itasca to diversify the tax base and lessen the tax burden borne by local residents.

   The proposed Holiday Inn Express on Lot 1B will provide appealing amenities to both business and pleasure travelers in a convenient location, west of O’Hare airport. The Holiday Inn Express brand has quickly earned the reputation as the smart choice for business savvy patrons. As part of the world’s most recognized hotel brand family, the Holiday Inn Express brand is one of the largest and most successful limited service brands in the industry.
We have not yet identified a tenant for the multi-tenant retail/restaurant building and as such have not provided building elevations or proposed sign renderings. The search for retail and restaurant users will provide another option for Itasca residents and businesses to dine at and provides for a development with diversified and compatible uses.

3. **Explain the reasons why the special use is necessary or desirable for the public convenience and how it will contribute to the general welfare of the neighborhood or community at this location.**

The proposed fuel station is necessary to fill a strategic void in the trade area and to serve the existing commuter base that exists on the roadway network today. Industrial and business parks should consist of a range of business uses, including service- and consumer-oriented businesses. The fuel center will provide competitively priced fuel and a wide variety of food options including convenience items, gourmet coffee, ready-serve snacks and refreshments. The fuel center will also serve the commercial fueling needs of the adjacent industrial trade area which are severely lacking.

The fuel center use will provide the appropriate landscaping & screening, full cut-off LED lighting with no light trespass, convenient ingress and egress points, and competitive goods that will contribute to the general welfare of the neighborhood and community.

The hotel use will provide an upbeat, dynamic and friendly environment, with varying sightlines that ensure amenities are easily identifiable and accessible. This type of environment allows the smart traveler to control and tailor their experiences to meet their needs, whether interacting with an individual or group, working, or taking a break. The public spaces provide the right mix of flexible area and furnishings to accommodate a wide range of needs and functions simultaneously.

4. **Will the special use be detrimental to the health, safety, morals or general welfare of persons residing or working the vicinity? Please explain your answer.**

The Village’s Comprehensive Plan also discusses developing larger tracts of land, with multiple uses, concurrently. The intent of this approach is to leverage end users to pay “their fair share” of roadway and other infrastructure improvements. In this case, the overall development generated several off-site roadway improvements to the adjacent roadway network to minimize the impact of the development and to promote the health, safety and general welfare of the adjacent community. The revised trip generation table (included in the application) shows a reduction in overall traffic to the site compared to the originally approved site plan, thus the development-generated traffic can be accommodated efficiently by the previously approved infrastructure.

Due to the reduction in overall traffic to the site from the previously approved traffic study and quality of the proposed commercial operators we believe this Planned Development amendment will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals or general welfare of person residing or working in the vicinity

5. **What effect will the use have on property values and improvements in the vicinity? Please explain your answer.**
The fuel center is situated on the subject property to minimize the impact to the community. Lot 2 is bounded to the north by B-3 commercial zoning, to the east by M limited manufacturing district, to the west by Rohlwing Road (an arterial) with no direct access to the Lot, and to the south by IL-390. Based on the adjacent uses and the commercial corridor to which it is adjacent, the fuel center is compatible with the adjacent uses and will not have a negative impact on the property values in the vicinity. In general, the proposed project will increase the property and sales tax base for the Village while maintaining the character of the corridor.

**PROJECT VARIANCES**

1. Variance to Section 13.03-2-b-7 for 3 ground signs, whereas the maximum allowed is 2 for the gas station site.
2. Variance to Section 13.03-2-b-8 for a gas station pole sign height of 80 ft., whereas the maximum allowed is 20 ft.
3. Variance to Section 13.03-2-b-8 for a gas station pole sign total surface area of 330 sf., whereas the maximum allowed is 48 sf.
4. Variance to Section 13.03-2-b-2 for a total gross surface area of wall signs of 420 sf., whereas the maximum allowed is 300 sf.
5. Variance to Section 13.03-2-b-6 for a wall sign height of 48 ft., whereas the maximum allowed is 30 ft.
6. Variance to Section 8.02-1 to include an outdoor sales area on proposed Lot 2.

**Signage Variances**

1. Variance to Section 13.03-2-b-7 for 3 ground signs, whereas the maximum allowed is 2 for the gas station site.
2. Variance to Section 13.03-2-b-8 for a gas station pole sign height of 80 ft., whereas the maximum allowed is 20 ft.
3. Variance to Section 13.03-2-b-8 for a gas station pole sign total surface area of 330 sf., whereas the maximum allowed is 48 sf.

We respectfully request variances to the Village zoning code outlined in #1 through #3 above. As evidenced by the nature of the variances requested, which are almost all related to signage, signage is a critical element to the viability of this development. Without the requested signage variances, the fuel station and hotel lots will be difficult to develop. Projections for retail sales for a fuel center are based on many factors with visibility and traffic patterns near the top of the list. Due to the location and arrangement of the IL-390 Tollway and IL-53 overpass, visibility to the project is hindered to the following traffic patterns:

- Eastbound IL-390 traffic exiting off of IL-53 to go south
- Northbound IL-53 traffic entering on to IL-390 to go east
- Eastbound and Westbound traffic on IL-390 adjacent to the project site

With no true minor road traffic, maximizing visibility to the movements and traffic patterns on IL-53 and IL-390 described above is required. The decision point for vehicles traveling on IL-390 is just over a mile away and eighty (80) feet is the minimum height necessary for visibility at that decision point.
point. The proposed high-rise sign will be placed at the very southern end of the property at the highest elevation possible which was intended to reduce our variance request as much as possible.

The unique circumstances of the site which include its shared property line with IL-390 right of way combined with the existing grading of the property which sits 15+ feet below the IL-53 overpass and the site’s adjacency to other compatible commercial and industrial uses yields our requested variance.

As outlined in the Village’s zoning code the proposed uses for this PUD allow us to construct up to four (4) twenty (20) foot pole (pylon) signs, two (2) for the fuel station on Lot 2 and two (2) for the retail development at the hard corner of Devon and IL-53 on Lot 1A. Per code, these signs could be up to eighty (80) square feet each totaling 320 square feet in surface area. In lieu of pursuing these signs we have combined the height and square footage into one sign that will maximize visibility for the development and draw traffic from outside the Itasca tax base while minimizing any impact to neighboring properties.

1. Variance to Section 13.03-2-b-2 for a total gross surface area of wall signs of 420 sf, whereas the maximum allowed is 300 sf.
2. Variance to Section 13.03-2-b-6 for a wall sign height of 48 ft., whereas the maximum allowed is 30 ft.

We respectfully request variances to the Village zoning code outlined in #1 and #2 above. The proposed development is an extension of the terms of the Development Agreement dated May 7, 2019 between the Village and Bridge Itasca (the current owner of the subject property). As discussed in the Development Agreement certain variances and relief were granted to entice a hotel development on the subject property. The Development Agreement specifically contemplated a seventy (70) foot tall hotel building. In lieu of a building of this height a more modest forty-five (45) foot tall building is being proposed which is more compatible with the adjacent buildings along this commercial/industrial corridor. The appropriate signage for a hotel of this variety would be located near the top of the building as is prototypical. As the height of the building was recommended for a variance, we believe the associated signage should also be considered for a variance as this is incidental to the height of the overall structure.

**Outdoor Sales**

We respectfully request a variance to Section 8.02-1 to the Village’s zoning code to allow for outdoor sales at the proposed fuel station located on Lot 2. The outdoor sales area would include seasonal items, ice and propane and would be located in the area shown on the attached site plan labeled “Outdoor Sales”. The sale of seasonal items, ice and propane is consistent with other fuel stations within the Village (including the Bucky’s and Speedway fuel stations located at the Devon Ave and Arlington Heights intersection) and is customary for fuel stations as these items are deemed essential to the typical c-store guest.

Should you have any questions on our application please do not hesitate to contact me.
Respectfully,

[Signature]

Drew Zazofsky
Senior Manager of Development

/Enclosures
A.L.T.A./N.S.P.S. LAND TITLE SURVEY
EXISTING TOPOGRAPHIC INFORMATION
SEE SHEET 1 FOR EXISTING BOUNDARY INFORMATION AND NOTES)
INTERSECTION OF DEVON AVENUE AND ROWLING ROAD.
ELEVATION = 716.37 NAVD88

NOTE: Horizontal and Vertical scales are not consistent.

INTERIM DRAFT - NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

PHOTO: (847) 696-4060   FAX: (847) 696-4065
1. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO THE BACK OF CURB UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
2. ALL CURB AND GUTTER ARE TYPE B-6.12 UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
3. ALL TRUCK AREAS AND DRIVE AISLES SHALL BE HEAVY DUTY PAVEMENT. ALL AUTO PARKING SPACE TO BE DUST CONTROLLED.
4. ALL TERRAIN-SHAPED RETAINING WALLS TO BE HIGH QUALITY YELLOW PRECAST UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
5. ALL ACCESSIBLE WALKWAYS SHALL MEET MINIMUM ACCESSIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.
6. ALL ACCESSIBLE WALKWAYS SHALL BE MEASURED IN A SLOPING POSITION EQUIVALENT TO A MINIMUM 5% GRADE.
NOTES:

TOTAL IMPERVIOUS AREA
ACCESSIBLE PARKING
FLOOR AREA RATIO (F.A.R.)
REQUIRED PARKING
BICYCLE RACK
RETAINING WALL
STOP SIGN
SIGN (BY OTHERS)
MONUMENT SIGN
GATEWAY TO ITASCA
DEVELOPMENT AREA
LOT 1A
LOT 1B
LOT 2

STOP SIGN
156'
25'
82.8'
24'
13.5'
75 SPACES
STOP SIGN
13'
127'
22
9
18'
10
6
8
248,362 SF
5.10 AC
2.80 AC
2.00 AC
3.00 AC
1.41 AC
0.56 AC
1.80 AC
0.49 AC
0.10 AC
5,600 S.F.
20.6'
6. SEE ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS FOR FINAL DIMENSIONS, DESIGN AND DETAILS.

NOTE:

SCALE 1" = 40'
NOTES:
1. CALCULATION POINTS ARE AT GROUND LEVEL.
2. ALL RETAIL AREA POLE FIXTURES ARE MOUNTED AT 25'-0" WITH A 2'-0" BASE. ABOVE GRADE UNO.
3. ALL TRUCK AREA POLE FIXTURES ARE MOUNTED AT 30'-0" ABOVE GRADE. UNO.
4. ALL CANOPY FIXTURES ARE SURFACE MOUNTED AT 10'-0" SPACING.
5. CARS, SHRUBBERY, EQUIPMENT AND SIGNAGE CAN CAUSE REDUCED LIGHT LEVELS FROM WHAT IS EXPECTED.
7. CALCULATIONS PROVIDED ARE NOT A GUARANTEE OF PERFORMANCE. ACTUAL LIGHT LEVELS MAY VARY.
**FIELD VERIFICATION REQUIRED.
** THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL AND PROPRIETARY INFORMATION OF KSA LIGHTING & CONTROLS. THIS DOCUMENT MAY ONLY BE USED BY OR FOR THE BENEFIT OF KSA LIGHTING & CONTROLS REPRESENTATIVES AND CUSTOMERS. FOR LIGHTING DESIGNS THIS LIGHTING DESIGN IS NOT A PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING DRAWING AND IS PROVIDED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY, WITHOUT WARRANTY AS TO ACCURACY, COMPLETENESS, RELIABILITY OR OTHERWISE. KSA LIGHTING & CONTROLS IS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR SPECIFYING THE LIGHTING OR ILLUMINATION REQUIREMENTS FOR ANY SPECIFIC PROJECT, INCLUDING MUNICIPAL OR BUILDING CODE REQUIREMENTS. IT IS THE OBLIGATION OF THE END-USER TO CONSULT WITH A PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING ADVISOR TO DETERMINE WHETHER THIS LIGHTING DESIGN MEETS THE APPLICABLE PROJECT REQUIREMENTS FOR LIGHTING SYSTEM PERFORMANCE, SAFETY, SUITABILITY AND EFFECTIVENESS FOR USE IN A PARTICULAR APPLICATION. FIELD VERIFICATION IS RECOMMENDED WHEN CALCULATIONS ARE BASED ON END-USER OR CUSTOMER-PROVIDED INFORMATION. END-USER ENVIRONMENT AND APPLICATION (INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, VOLTAGE VARIATION AND DIRT ACCUMULATION) CAN CAUSE ACTUAL FIELD PERFORMANCE TO DIFFER FROM THE CALCULATED PHOTOOMETRIC PERFORMANCE REPRESENTED IN THIS LIGHTING DESIGN.
### Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Catalog Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lamps</th>
<th>Lumens per Lamp</th>
<th>LLF</th>
<th>Watts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>Lithonia Lighting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DSX1 LED P6 50K T5M MVOLT</td>
<td>DSX1 LED P6 50K T5M MVOLT</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td>20015</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>SOLAS RAY LIGHTING</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>CS18-150-50-U</td>
<td>CANOPY CS SERIES</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td>22945</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>150.511</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Lithonia Lighting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DSX1 LED P4 40K T3M MVOLT</td>
<td>DSX1 LED P4 40K T3M MVOLT</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td>14073</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Lithonia Lighting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DSX1 LED P4 40K T4M MVOLT</td>
<td>DSX1 LED P4 40K T4M MVOLT</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td>14181</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td>Lithonia Lighting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>WDG2 LED P4 50K 80CRI VW</td>
<td>WDG2 LED WITH P4 - PERFORMANCE PACKAGE, 5000K, 840 UV, VISUAL COMFORT WIDE OPTIC</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td>4517</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>34.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2</td>
<td>Lithonia Lighting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DSX1 LED P6 50K T7FM MVOLT</td>
<td>DSX1 LED P6 50K T7FM MVOLT</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td>19278</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max/Min</th>
<th>Avg/Min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FULL AREA CALC.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.3 ft</td>
<td>21.9 ft</td>
<td>0.0 ft</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETAIL CANOPY CALC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.3 ft</td>
<td>62.6 ft</td>
<td>18.8 ft</td>
<td>3.3:1</td>
<td>2.3:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETAIL PAVED AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.2 ft</td>
<td>21.9 ft</td>
<td>0.3 ft</td>
<td>20.7:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUCK CANOPY CALC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.3 ft</td>
<td>54.2 ft</td>
<td>32.2 ft</td>
<td>1.7:1</td>
<td>1.3:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUCK PAVED AREA CALC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 ft</td>
<td>20.9 ft</td>
<td>0.7 ft</td>
<td>29.9:1</td>
<td>3.6:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
1. CALCULATED FOOTLUX ARE AT GROUND LEVEL.
2. ALL RETAIL AREA POLE FIXTURES ARE MOUNTED AT 20'-0" ABOVE GRADE UNO.
3. ALL TRUCK AREA POLE FIXTURES ARE MOUNTED AT 20'-0" ABOVE GRADE UNO.
4. ALL CANOPY FIXTURES ARE MOUNTED AT 10'-0" ABOVE GRADE UNO.
5. CABLE, SHRUBBERY, EQUIPMENT AND SIGNAGE CAN CAUSE REDUCED LIGHT LEVELS FROM WHAT IS EXPECTED.
6. CALCULATIONS PROVIDED ARE NOT A GUARANTEE OF PERFORMANCE. ACTUAL LIGHT LEVELS MAY VARY.
7. **FIELD VERIFICATION REQUIRED.**
NOTES:
1. CALCULATIONS MADE IN FOOTCANDLES AT GROUND LEVEL.
2. ALL LIGHT AREA POLE FIXTURES MOUNTED AT 25'-0" ABOVE GRADE UNO.
3. ALL LIGHT AREA POLE FIXTURES MOUNTED AT 30'-0" ABOVE GRADE UNO.
4. ALL CANTILEVER FIXTURES AND SURFACE MOUNTED FIXTURES MOUNTED AT 15'-0" ABOVE GRADE UNO.
5. CABLE, GROUNDBED EQUIPMENT AND SIGNAGE CAN CAUSE REDUCED LIGHT LEVELS FROM WHAT IS EXPECTED.
6. CALCULATIONS PROVIDED ARE NOT A GUARANTEE OF PERFORMANCE. ACTUAL LIGHT LEVELS MAY VARY.
**FIELD VERIFICATION REQUIRED.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Catalog Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lamp</th>
<th>Lumens per Watt</th>
<th>LLF</th>
<th>Wattage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lithonia Lighting</td>
<td>DSK1 LED P6 50K T5M MVOLT</td>
<td>DSK1 LED P6 50K T5M MVOLT</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td>20115</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>SOLAS RAY LIGHTING</td>
<td>CS18-150-50-U</td>
<td>CANOPY CS SERIES</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td>22945</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>150.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lithonia Lighting</td>
<td>DSK1 LED P4 40K T3M MVOLT</td>
<td>DSK1 LED P4 40K T3M MVOLT</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td>14073</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lithonia Lighting</td>
<td>DSK1 LED P4 40K T4M MVOLT</td>
<td>DSK1 LED P4 40K T4M MVOLT</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td>14181</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lithonia Lighting</td>
<td>WDG202 LED P4 50K 80CRI VW</td>
<td>WDG2 LED WITH P4 - PERFORMANCE PACKAGE, 5000K, 1/2, VISUAL COMFORT WIDE OPTIC</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td>4517</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>34.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lithonia Lighting</td>
<td>DSK1 LED P6 50K T7FM MVOLT</td>
<td>DSK1 LED P6 50K T7FM MVOLT</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td>19278</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTES:
1. CALCULATION POINTS ARE AT GROUND LEVEL.
2. ALL RETAIL AREA POLE FIXTURES ARE MOUNTED AT 25'-0" ABOVE GRADE UNO.
3. ALL TRUCK AREA POLE FIXTURES ARE MOUNTED AT 15'-0" ABOVE GRADE UNO.
4. ALL CANOPY FIXTURES ARE SURFACE MOUNTED AT 15'-0" ABOVE GRADE UNO.
5. CARS, SHRUBBERRY, EQUIPMENT AND SIGNAGE CAN CAUSE REDUCED LIGHT LEVELS FROM WHAT IS EXPECTED.
6. CALCULATIONS PROVIDED ARE NOT A GUARANTEE OF PERFORMANCE. ACTUAL LIGHT LEVELS MAY VARY.
7. FIELD VERIFICATION REQUIRED.

**FIELD VERIFICATION REQUIRED.**

**THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL AND PROPRIETARY INFORMATION OF KSA LIGHTING & CONTROLS. THIS DOCUMENT MAY ONLY BE USED BY OR FOR THE BENEFIT OF KSA LIGHTING & CONTROLS REPRESENTATIONS AND CUSTOMERS. FOR LIGHTING DESIGN THIS LIGHTING DESIGN IS NOT A PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING DRAWING AND IS PROVIDED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY. WITHOUT WARRANTY AS TO ACCURACY, COMPLETENESS, RELIABILITY OR OTHERWISE. THE LIGHTING DESIGNER IS RESPONSIBLE FOR CONFIRMATION OF LIGHTING REQUIREMENTS FOR ANY SPECIFIC PROJECT. LIGHTING REQUIREMENTS INCLUDE, BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO, LIGHTING DESIGN, LIGHTING PRACTICE, LIGHTING SAFETY AND ALL APPLICABLE STATE, PROVINCIAL, AND LOCAL CODES AND GUIDELINES. LIGHTING DESIGNER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL LIGHTING REQUIREMENTS FOR ANY SPECIFIC PROJECT. LIGHTING DESIGNER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR COMPLIANCE WITH ALL LIGHTING DESIGN GUIDELINES AND CODES. WITHOUT LIMITATION TO, LIGHTING DESIGNER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL LIGHTING REQUIREMENTS FOR ANY SPECIFIC PROJECT. LIGHTING DESIGNER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR COMPLIANCE WITH ALL LIGHTING DESIGN GUIDELINES AND CODES. WITHOUT LIMITATION TO, LIGHTING DESIGNER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR LIGHTING SYSTEM PERFORMANCE, SAFETY, SUITABILITY AND EFFECTIVENESS FOR USE IN A PARTICULAR APPLICATION. FIELD VERIFICATION IS RECOMMENDED WHEN CALCULATIONS ARE BASED ON EN-USE OR CUSTOMER PROVIDED INFORMATION. EN-USE INFORMATION AND APPLICATION (INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, VOLTAGE VARIATION AND DIET ACCUMULATION) CAN CAUSE ACTUAL FIELD PERFORMANCE TO DIFFER FROM THE CALCULATED PHOTOMETRIC PERFORMANCE REPRESENTED IN THIS LIGHTING DESIGN. IN NO EVENT WILL KSA LIGHTING & CONTROLS BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY LOSS RESULTING FROM ANY USE OF THIS LIGHTING DESIGN.**

**COMMERCIAL USE PERMITTED ONLY WITH WRITTEN PERMISSION FROM KSA LIGHTING & CONTROLS.**
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### Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Catalog Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lamp</th>
<th>Lumens per Lamp</th>
<th>LLF</th>
<th>Watts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lithonia Lighting</td>
<td>DSK1 LED P6 50K T5M MVOLT</td>
<td>DSK1 LED P6 50K T5M MVOLT</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td>20915</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>SOLAS RAY LIGHTING</td>
<td>CS18-150-50-U</td>
<td>CANOPY CS SERIES</td>
<td>22945</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>150.511</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lithonia Lighting</td>
<td>DSK1 LED P4 40K T3M MVOLT</td>
<td>DSK1 LED P4 40K T3M MVOLT</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td>14073</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lithonia Lighting</td>
<td>DSK1 LED P4 40K T4M MVOLT</td>
<td>DSK1 LED P4 40K T4M MVOLT</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td>14181</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lithonia Lighting</td>
<td>WIDGE2 LED P4 50K 80CRI VW</td>
<td>WIDGE2 LED WITH P4 - PERFORMANCE PACKAGE, 5000K, 80CRI, VISUAL COMFORT WIDE OPTIC</td>
<td>4517</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>34.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lithonia Lighting</td>
<td>DSK1 LED P6 50K T1FM MVOLT</td>
<td>DSK1 LED P6 50K T1FM MVOLT</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td>19278</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Avg.</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max/Min</th>
<th>Avg/Min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FULL AREA CALC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 ft</td>
<td>21.9 ft</td>
<td>0.0 ft</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETAIL CANOPY CALC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.3 ft</td>
<td>62.6 ft</td>
<td>18.8 ft</td>
<td>3.3:1</td>
<td>2.3:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETAIL PAVED AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.2 ft</td>
<td>21.9 ft</td>
<td>0.3 ft</td>
<td>73:1</td>
<td>20.7:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUCK CANOPY CALC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.3 ft</td>
<td>54.2 ft</td>
<td>32.2 ft</td>
<td>1.7:1</td>
<td>1.3:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUCK PAVED AREA CALC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 ft</td>
<td>20.9 ft</td>
<td>0.7 ft</td>
<td>29.9:1</td>
<td>3.6:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**TABLES CONTAIN CONFIDENTIAL AND PROPRIETARY INFORMATION OF KSA LIGHTING & CONTROLS. THIS TABLE MAY ONLY BE USED BY OR FOR THE BENEFIT OF KSA LIGHTING & CONTROLS REPRESENTATIONS AND CUSTOMERS. FOR LIGHTING DESIGN THIS LIGHTING DESIGN IS NOT A PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING DRAWING AND IS PROVIDED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY. WITHOUT WARRANTY AS TO ACCURACY, COMPLETENESS, RELIABILITY OR OTHERWISE. THE LIGHTING DESIGNER IS RESPONSIBLE FOR CONFIRMATION OF LIGHTING REQUIREMENTS FOR ANY SPECIFIC PROJECT. LIGHTING REQUIREMENTS INCLUDE, BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO, LIGHTING DESIGN, LIGHTING PRACTICE, LIGHTING SAFETY AND ALL APPLICABLE STATE, PROVINCIAL, AND LOCAL CODES AND GUIDELINES. LIGHTING DESIGNER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL LIGHTING REQUIREMENTS FOR ANY SPECIFIC PROJECT. LIGHTING DESIGNER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR LIGHTING SYSTEM PERFORMANCE, SAFETY, SUITABILITY AND EFFECTIVENESS FOR USE IN A PARTICULAR APPLICATION. FIELD VERIFICATION IS RECOMMENDED WHEN CALCULATIONS ARE BASED ON EN-USE OR CUSTOMER PROVIDED INFORMATION. EN-USE INFORMATION AND APPLICATION (INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, VOLTAGE VARIATION AND DIET ACCUMULATION) CAN CAUSE ACTUAL FIELD PERFORMANCE TO DIFFER FROM THE CALCULATED PHOTOMETRIC PERFORMANCE REPRESENTED IN THIS LIGHTING DESIGN. IN NO EVENT WILL KSA LIGHTING & CONTROLS BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY LOSS RESULTING FROM ANY USE OF THIS LIGHTING DESIGN.**
MEMORANDUM TO:  Drew Zazofsky, PE  
Bluestone Single Tenant Properties, LLC

FROM:  Michael A. Werthmann, PE, PTOE  
Principal

DATE:  March 5, 2020

SUBJECT:  Trip Generation Comparison  
Proposed Business Park  
Itasca, Illinois

This memorandum is an addendum to the January 16, 2020 traffic study conducted by KLOA, Inc. for the Bridge Development Partners, LLC business park to be located in Itasca, Illinois. The development is to be located in the southeast quadrant of the intersection of Rohlwing Road (IL 53) with Devon Avenue. The development was approved to contain (1) a warehouse/distribution development consisting of four buildings totaling 741,621 square feet and (2) a commercial development to include the following uses:

- A 170-room hotel  
- A 13,752 square-foot retail building  
- A 2,000 square-foot coffee shop with drive-through lane  
- A 7,943 square-foot high turnover restaurant  
- A 5,040 square-foot fast-food restaurant with drive-through lane

The commercial portion of the overall development plan has been revised and is now proposed to contain the following uses:

- A 93-room hotel  
- A 6,400 square-foot retail building  
- A 2,000-square-foot coffee shop with drive-through lane  
- A fuel center and convenience store with 20 passenger vehicle fueling positions and three truck fueling positions

The purpose of the addendum was to compare the traffic to be generated by the approved commercial plan and currently proposed commercial plan.

The estimate of the traffic to be generated by the approved and proposed commercial plans were based on the rates provided in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 10 Edition. Given the limited traffic generation data available for fuel stations specific to trucks, the number of truck peak hour trips estimated to be generated by the commercial vehicle fueling positions was based on previous data from other fueling centers with commercial vehicle fueling positions. Table 1 shows the estimated weekday morning and evening peak hour and daily traffic to be generated by the approved commercial plan and the proposed commercial plan.
Table 1
ORIGINAL AND CURRENT PROPOSED COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS
TRIP GENERATION ESTIMATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use/Size</th>
<th>Weekday Morning Peak Hour</th>
<th>Weekday Evening Peak Hour</th>
<th>Weekday Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Original Commercial Development Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel – 170 rooms (LUC 310)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail – 13,752 s.f. (LUC 820)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee Shop with Drive-Through – 2,000 s.f. (LUC 937)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Turnover Restaurant – 7,943 s.f. (LUC 932)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast-Food Restaurant with Drive-Through – 5,040 s.f. (LUC 934)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>292</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Proposed Commercial Development Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel – 93 rooms (LUC 310)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail – 6,400 s.f. (LUC 820)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee Shop with Drive-Through – 2,000 s.f. (LUC 937)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Center and Convenience Store – 20 fueling positions (LUC 945)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Fueling Positions – 3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>279</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LUC = ITE Trip Generation Manual Land-Use Code
Truck fueling positions based on data from other fueling centers with commercial fueling positions.

From the table it can be seen the proposed commercial plan is estimated to generate approximately 13 fewer trips during the weekday morning peak hour, 38 fewer trips during the weekday evening peak hour, and 50 fewer daily trips compared to the approved commercial plan. As such, the proposed commercial plan is a similar, if not less, traffic-intense development compared to the approved commercial plan and the results and findings of the traffic study are still valid.
Exterior Elevations

East Elevation

West Elevation

Note: This sign is not proposed and is not included in the signage calculations as it does not meet the minimum building requirements.
## Guestrooms Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guestroom Types</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>Total SF</th>
<th>Room Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>14,950</td>
<td>26'-0&quot; x 12'-6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Queen</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>7,150</td>
<td>26'-0&quot; x 12'-6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Suite</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>3,429</td>
<td>30'-6&quot; x 12'-6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King X Wide</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>26'-0&quot; x 16'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QQ Suite</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>2,667</td>
<td>30'-6&quot; x 12'-6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible King</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>26'-0&quot; x 16'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible QQ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>30'-6&quot; x 12'-6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible King Suite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>30'-6&quot; x 12'-6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible Queen Suite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>26'-0&quot; x 12'-6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>3,378</td>
<td>31,733</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Public Areas 1st Floor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Areas</th>
<th>SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast Bar Room</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Center</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Area</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elev. Lobby</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Center</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest Laundry</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Room</td>
<td>1,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Room</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Pool</td>
<td>1,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool-Vest.</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet Mens</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet Ladies</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vestibule</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6,779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Site Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Parking</td>
<td>1.79 Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Space</td>
<td>103 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible Space</td>
<td>5 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spaces</td>
<td>108 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Back of House 1st Floor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Back of House 1st Floor</th>
<th>SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Break Room</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry Chute</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Room</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevator</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elev. Equip.</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng/Maint</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry Equip.</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Manager Office</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Storage</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mech/Elec</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pantry</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Equip. Room</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Office</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Server Room</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stairs</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Restroom</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Area</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,621</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Back of House Upper Floors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Back of House Upper Floors</th>
<th>Per Floor</th>
<th>SF Per Floor</th>
<th>Total SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laundry Chute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBX/Storage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,479</td>
<td>4,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevator Shaft</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stairs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>1,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,797</td>
<td>6,618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Total SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guestrooms Total</td>
<td>31,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Areas Total</td>
<td>6,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOH 1st Floor Total</td>
<td>2,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOH Upper Floors Total</td>
<td>6,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls, Shafts, Etc.</td>
<td>6,482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Gross Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross Building</th>
<th>Total SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>13,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>13,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>13,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>13,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>54,233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Gross SF Per Key        | 584      |
TYPICAL ELEVATIONS SHOWN FOR VIEWING PURPOSES; ACTUAL ELEVATIONS TO BE PROVIDED.

TYPICAL BUILDING FRONT ELEVATION

C

31" Channel letterset on Backer

TYPICAL BUILDING REAR ELEVATION

D

20" Channel letterset on Backer
31 INCH on backer

THORNTONS

15'-2" backer
14'-9" copy

3'-1/2" backer T=31"

2-1/2" x 4'-1" rule
2-1/2" x 8'-2-1/2" rule

2" above beam

8" x 2" existing steel tube

N=21-1/2"

12" raceway - behind backer

FACES: 3/16" #7328 White acrylic

TRIMCAP: 1" Whity jewelite

FITTER BACK: #655 alum - prefinish White all sides

RETURNS: 5" deep 0.40 alum. returns painted GG White

I L L U M : White GE LED’s as required by manufacturer;
Whips to be a minimum of 6'-0" in length;

POWER SUPPLIES TO BE HOUSED WITHIN RACEWAY

BACKER: .080 perforated alum. screen backer; Holes to be .50" diameter
and are 1/16" on centers to allow for 48% visibility; Backer
painted Metallic Silver front & back; Backer to be mounted behind letters &
will help to conceal raceway

INSTALL: Custom 12" high x 6" deep alum. raceway to house all electrical - Painted
Black - all sides;
Raceway mounted to 1/4" steel plate shelf provided at top edge of steel tube
using stainless steel fasteners as required;
1" alum. flat bar to be used for back bracing as necessary - painted Black
to match raceway

QUANTITY: (1) One channel letter set required for storefront elevation

CONSTRUCTION NOTES: ALL SIGNAGE IS REQUIRED TO HAVE EXTERNAL DISCONNECT SWITCHES
AS REQUIRED BY NEC

ELECTRICAL NOTE: ILLINOIS: Any channel letter sets must have
seal tile connectors and housings per code

SECTION DETAIL:

CLIENT:

ADDRESS:

8959 Tyler Boulevard
Mentor, Ohio 44060

MC group
Building Better Brands

440.209.6200
800.627.4460

theMCgroup.com

PROJECT MANAGER:
KEVIN HORN

DATE:

REVIEW HISTORY:

TICKET NO.:
519887

CLIENT SIGNATURE:

DATE:

REVISION HISTORY:

CLIENT SIGNATURE:

DATE:

APPROVAL DATE:

TICKET NO.:

REVIEW HISTORY:

ADDRESS:

PAGE NO.:

ELECTRONIC FILE NAME:

PRINTS ARE THE EXCLUSIVE PROPERTY OF MC GROUP. THIS MATERIAL SHALL NOT BE USED, DUPLICATED, OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF MC GROUP.
20 INCH

9'-6"

21-1/2" T=20"

N=19-1/8"

FACES:
3/16" #7328 White acrylic

TRIMCAP:
1" White jewelite

LETTER BACKS:
.063 alum. - prefinish White all sides

RETURNS:
5" deep .040 alum. returns painted GG White

ILLUM.:
White GE LED's as required by manufacturer;
Whips to be a minimum of 6'-0" in length;
POWER SUPPLIES TO BE HOUSED WITHIN RACEWAY

INSTALL:
Standard 8" high x 8" deep alum. raceway to house all electrical -
Painted to Grip Flex 585 Flame Red match wall surface
Raceway to be thru bolted into 2" alum. framework -
framework provided by others

QUANTITY:
(1) One Channel letterset required for rear elevation

CONSTRUCTION
NOTES:
ALL SIGNAGE IS REQUIRED TO HAVE EXTERNAL DISCONNECT
SWITCHES AS REQUIRED BY NEC

MANUFACTURER
NOTES:
SIGNAGE MUST BE 3 WIRE

COLOR PALETTE

#7328 White Acrylic
Raceway: Gripflex 585 Red

ELECTRICAL NOTE:
ILLINOIS: Any channel letter sets must have
ultra fine connectors and housings
per code

ENGINEERED DRAWING

MC Sign Company
The Sign Shop
2200 W. Ninth Ave.
Columbus, OH 43204
TYPICAL CANOPY VIEW - EXACT MEASUREMENTS OF CANOPY TO BE PROVIDED!

LENGTH TO VARY
Sloan Red LED border top edge of front and short ends of canopy; Installed directly below the red flashing
NO BORDER WITHIN RED BACKER AREAS

Front Elevation

COLOR PALETTE
PMS 8600 C
ALL PAINT FINISHES TO BE HIGH GLOSS UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED!

SAMPLE PLAN VIEW - CANOPY

LENTH TO VARY
Sloan Red LED border top edge of front and short ends of canopy; Installed directly below the red flashing
NO BORDER WITHIN RED BACKER AREAS

Left Side

LENTH TO VARY

Right Side

Red backer area will be Red aluminum panels provided by canopy supplier
FACES: 3/16" #7328 White acrylic
TRIMCAP: 1" White jewelite
LETTER BACKS: .063 alum. - prefinish White all sides
RETURNS: 5" deep ,040 alum. returns painted GG White
ILLUM.: White GE LED’s as required by manufacturer;
Whips to be a minimum of 6'-0" in length
POWER SUPPLIES TO BE HOUSED BEHIND CANOPY FASCIA
INSTALL: Channel letters to be flush mounted to canopy fascia
using 3/8" all thread fasteners as required
QUANTITY: (1) One required for Gas Canopy
MANUFACTURING NOTE: Electric feeds need to be in center of letters
CONSTRUCTION NOTE: All signage required to have external disconnect switches
as required by NEC

ELECTRICAL NOTE:
ILLINOIS: Any channel letter sets must have
seal type connectors and housings per code
48 SF

**Note:** Commodity panels must be street side on both sides of sign.

**SIDE A**
- 7'-4" Cabinet & Base
- VO: 16.5’ x 80’
- Face Face Area: 16’ x 35’

**SIDE B**
- 24’ cabinet & Base

**Thorntons**
- UNLEADED15: 3.89°
- UNLEADED: 3.89°
- DIESEL: 3.89°

**Color Palette**
- #5A5A5A: Fuel Gallon
- Green: Gas Station
- Blue: Pump Numbers

**Engineering Details**
- 3’ x 6”-0” x 2”-2” synthetic limestone cap
- 8’-0” overall height
- 5.563” OIA .25” WALL

**All Engineering Details on Page 12**

**All Paint Finishes to Be Satin Unless Otherwise Specified**
M-25 MONUMENT
Exterior Elevations

Note: The sign is not proposed and is not included in the signage calculations as it does not meet building requirements.

East Elevation

West Elevation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>A - Development Pole Sign</th>
<th>B1 - Truck Gas Station Canopy Sign (West Façade)</th>
<th>B2 - Gas Station Canopy Sign (West Façade)</th>
<th>B3 - Gas Station Canopy Sign (North Façade)</th>
<th>C - West Façade Wall Sign</th>
<th>D - East Façade Wall Sign</th>
<th>E - Gas Station Monument Sign</th>
<th>F - Hotel Monument Sign</th>
<th>G1 - South Façade Wall Sign</th>
<th>G2 - West Façade Wall Sign</th>
<th>G3 - North Façade Wall Sign</th>
<th>H1 - West Monument Sign</th>
<th>H2 - North Monument Sign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.03-2-b-2</td>
<td>Total Gross Surface Area of Wall Signs</td>
<td>≤ 233 sf (Gas Station)</td>
<td>≤ 300 sf (Hotel)</td>
<td>≤ 285 sf (Retail/Restaurant)</td>
<td>186 sf</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.03-2-b-2</td>
<td># of Wall Sign per Building Face with Street Frontage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.03-2-b-2</td>
<td>Wall Sign Surface Area per Building Face with Street Frontage</td>
<td>≤ 80 sf</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>41 sf</td>
<td>41 sf</td>
<td>41 sf</td>
<td>46 sf</td>
<td>17 sf</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>140 sf</td>
<td>140 sf</td>
<td>140 sf</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.03-2-b-5</td>
<td>Wall Sign Projection</td>
<td>≤ 18 in.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5 in.</td>
<td>5 in.</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>5 in.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4 in.</td>
<td>4 in.</td>
<td>4 in.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.03-2-b-7</td>
<td># of Ground Signs (1 per Street Frontage, Max of 2)</td>
<td>≤ 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.03-2-b-6</td>
<td>Wall Sign Height</td>
<td>≤ 30 ft. or higher than building height, whichever is less</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>20 ft. 4 in.</td>
<td>17 ft. 4 in.</td>
<td>17 ft. 4 in.</td>
<td>13 ft. 8 in.</td>
<td>11 ft. 9 in.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>42 ft. 4 in.</td>
<td>42 ft. 4 in.</td>
<td>42 ft. 4 in.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.03-2-b-7</td>
<td>Ground Sign Setback</td>
<td>≤ 15 ft. or 1/2 of FY-Setback, whichever is less</td>
<td>12.6 ft.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12.5 ft.</td>
<td>12.5 ft.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>21 ft.</td>
<td>17 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.03-2-b-7</td>
<td>Ground Sign Height</td>
<td>≤ 8 ft.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8 ft.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.03-2-b-7</td>
<td>Ground Sign Surface Area</td>
<td>≤ 48 sf</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>48 sf.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.03-2-b-8</td>
<td>Gas Station Pole Sign Height</td>
<td>≤ 20 ft.</td>
<td>80 ft.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.03-2-b-8</td>
<td>Gas Station Pole Sign Surface Area</td>
<td>≤ 48 sf</td>
<td>330 sf</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Signage Matrix Exhibit
AMENDED STAFF REPORT: JULY 10, 2020

TITLE: Text Amendments to Dynamic Sign Regulations

PROPOSAL: The Village of Itasca is requesting the following:

1. Text Amendment to Section 13.01-27 of the Zoning Ordinance regarding Dynamic Sign Regulations pertaining to the following:
   a. Minimum required duration/time of a single message.
   b. Shut-off times for Dynamic Signs in or adjacent to residential zoning or uses.

BACKGROUND

In November 2018, the Village Board approved Ordinance 1894-18 amending Chapter 13 of the Itasca Zoning Ordinance related to Sign Regulations to permit either by right or special use Dynamic Signs in various parts of the community as well as associated regulations regarding the design/construction of such a sign and the manner in which dynamic signs can be operated.

Since the approval of the text amendment, there have been a number of dynamic signs that have been installed. There also have been a number of Special Use and Variance requests for the installation of dynamic signs, including:

   1. Itasca Bank & Trust – 308 W. Irving Park Rd.
   4. Lion’s Club – 128 W. Orchard

The construction of the dynamic signs at the above listed properties have raised concerns regarding whether they can effectively be used as dynamic signs and impacts the signs have on adjacent and nearby properties, especially in residential areas.

The current regulation requires that the sign remain static for a minimum of one minute before changing the messaging/image. The concern with this time period is that it does not allow for the sign to be effectively used as a dynamic sign since the messaging/image has to remain static for a minimum of one minute.
The one-minute restriction was placed based on safety concerns that signs changing too fast will distract drivers and lead to a higher number of vehicle crashes and pose a danger to other motorists and pedestrians.

The U.S. Department of Transportation – Federal Highway Administration conducted a recent study on the impact of dynamic (or electronic signage) on a driver’s attention and the potential safety impacts of such signage. The study found that signage that changed approximately every 10 seconds did not provide enough of a distraction to prevent the driver from focusing on their main task of operating a vehicle. However, the study acknowledges that there a multitude of variables that can occur and the study does not take into consideration all these variables and the impacts they have on a driver’s ability to safely operate the vehicle.

The second concern raised with the recent construction of dynamic signs specifically in or adjacent to residential zoning or uses is the brightness of the signs and the adverse impact they may have on residents. The current required shut-off time of 10 PM allows for the sign to be on sunset, especially in the winter months.

**TEXT AMENDMENTS**

Village Staff are proposing the following two text amendments to the dynamic sign regulations:

1. Amend Section 13.01-27-h to allow for messages to be static for a minimum of fifteen (15) seconds.
2. Amend Section 13.01-27-i to require dynamic signs in or adjacent to residential zoning or uses to be powered off between 8 pm and 7 am.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the draft text amendments regarding dynamic sign regulations pertaining to the minimum time limit messages must be static and the shut-off times for signs in or adjacent to residential zoning or uses.

**DOCUMENTS ATTACHED**

1. Exhibit A: Red-Line Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments – Section 13.01-27
2. Exhibit B: Clean Copy Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments – Section 13.01-27
3. Exhibit C: Excerpt of CEVMS and Driver Visual Behavior Study - Peer reviewed report
4. Data Review Memo, dated July 10, 2020
27. Dynamic Display signs, as defined in Section 3 of the Zoning Ordinance, are subject to the following, in addition to other applicable regulations and restrictions contained in this ordinance, regardless of the content of the messages on said signs:

a. Dynamic Display signs are permitted by right in B-1, B-2, B-3, ROC, O-R, and M Zoning Districts when lot lines do not directly adjoin an existing residential use or property.

b. Dynamic Display signs may be allowed by Special Use Permit in accordance with the provisions of Section 14 of the Zoning Ordinance on property featuring school, church, governmental, or other similar institutional uses in R-1, R-2, and R-3 zoning districts and those lots in the B-1, B-2, B-3, ROC, O-R, and M Zoning Districts which are adjacent to existing residential use or property.

c. The dynamic display component of a sign shall comprise no more than 40% of the total allowable sign face area and may only be installed in monument style signs. Such panels may not be installed in other types of signs such as pole, pylon, wall, window signs, etc.

d. The dynamic display component of a sign must be accessory to the primary ground sign; the panel must be mounted or located below the primary business/location identification area.

e. All messages, images, and transitions must be static—without motion, illusion of motion, animation, flashing, video, or other special effects. No live or pre-recorded video is permitted.

f. All transitions between messages must be instantaneous.

g. Messages must be complete in and of themselves, without continuation of content or sequencing from one message to the next.

h. Messages cannot change more than once every 1560 seconds.

i. Dynamic display signs adjacent to or located within residential uses or property are to be powered off between the hours of 8 P.M. and 7 A.M., 10 pm and 7 am.

j. The dynamic display portion of the sign shall include a control panel to regulate the intensity of illumination. The module must include dimmer controls which can be adjusted to meet Village light emission standards and eliminate any light spillover at the lot line. Proof of such module controls must be presented at the time of permit application. The dynamic display portion of the sign shall have the same appearance in terms of brightness as non-dynamic display signs at all times of day and under all weather conditions. No dynamic display sign shall be of such intensity or brilliance as to impair the driver’s operation of a motor vehicle or interfere with the effectiveness of an official traffic sign, control device, or signal. Dynamic display signs shall be dimmed after sunset and adjusted seasonally to account for dusk.

k. The dynamic display sign shall be designed and equipped so that if the display should fail, the display shall immediately discontinue, turn black, or shut off until the appropriate repair can be made.

l. Off premise advertising is prohibited by Section 13.01(13) of the Zoning
Ordinance.

m. Failure to comply with the standards of the Village ordinances and conditions of approval will require that the owner immediately discontinue the use of the dynamic display portion of the sign.
27. Dynamic Display signs, as defined in Section 3 of the Zoning Ordinance, are subject to the following, in addition to other applicable regulations and restrictions contained in this ordinance, regardless of the content of the messages on said signs:

a. Dynamic Display signs are permitted by right in B-1, B-2, B-3, ROC, O-R, and M Zoning Districts when lot lines do not directly adjoin an existing residential use or property.

b. Dynamic Display signs may be allowed by Special Use Permit in accordance with the provisions of Section 14 of the Zoning Ordinance on property featuring school, church, governmental, or other similar institutional uses in R-1, R-2, and R-3 zoning districts and those lots in the B-1, B-2, B-3, ROC, O-R, and M Zoning Districts which are adjacent to existing residential use or property.

c. The dynamic display component of a sign shall comprise no more than 40% of the total allowable sign face area and may only be installed in monument style signs. Such panels may not be installed in other types of signs such as pole, pylon, wall, window signs, etc.

d. The dynamic display component of a sign must be accessory to the primary ground sign; the panel must be mounted or located below the primary business/location identification area.

e. All messages, images, and transitions must be static—without motion, illusion of motion, animation, flashing, video, or other special effects. No live or pre-recorded video is permitted.

f. All transitions between messages must be instantaneous.

g. Messages must be complete in and of themselves, without continuation of content or sequencing from one message to the next.

h. Messages cannot change more than once every 15 seconds.

i. Dynamic display signs adjacent to or located within residential uses or property are to be powered off between the hours of 8 P.M. and 7 A.M.

j. The dynamic display portion of the sign shall include a control panel to regulate the intensity of illumination. The module must include dimmer controls which can be adjusted to meet Village light emission standards and eliminate any light spillover at the lot line. Proof of such module controls must be presented at the time of permit application. The dynamic display portion of the sign shall have the same appearance in terms of brightness as non-dynamic display signs at all times of day and under all weather conditions. No dynamic display sign shall be of such intensity or brilliance as to impair the driver’s operation of a motor vehicle or interfere with the effectiveness of an official traffic sign, control device, or signal. Dynamic display signs shall be dimmed after sunset and adjusted seasonally to account for dusk.

k. The dynamic display sign shall be designed and equipped so that if the display should fail, the display shall immediately discontinue, turn black, or shut off until the appropriate repair can be made.

l. Off premise advertising is prohibited by Section 13.01(13) of the Zoning
Ordinance.

m. Failure to comply with the standards of the Village ordinances and conditions of approval will require that the owner immediately discontinue the use of the dynamic display portion of the sign.
CEVMS and Driver Visual Behavior Study - Peer reviewed report

General Discussion

This study was conducted to investigate the effect of CEVMS on driver visual behavior in a roadway driving environment. An instrumented vehicle with an eye tracking system was used. Roads containing CEVMS, standard billboards, and control areas with no off-premise advertising were selected. The CEVMS and standard billboards were measured with respect to luminance, location, size, and other relevant variables to characterize these visual stimuli. Unlike previous studies on digital billboards, the present study examined CEVMS as deployed in two United States cities and did not contain dynamic video or other dynamic elements. The CEVMS changed content approximately every 8 to 10 seconds, consistent within the limits provided by FHWA guidance. In addition, the eye tracking system used had nearly a 2-degree level of resolution that provided significantly more accuracy in determining what objects the drivers were gazing or fixating on as compared to some previous field studies examining CEVMS.

Conclusions

Do CEVMS attract drivers’ attention away from the forward roadway and other driving relevant stimuli?

Overall, the probability of looking at the road ahead was high across all conditions. In Reading, the CEVMS condition had a lower proportion of gazes to the road ahead than the standard billboard condition on the freeways. Both of the off-premise advertising conditions had a lower proportion of gazes to the road ahead than the control condition on the freeways. The lower proportion of gazes to the road ahead can be attributed to the overall distribution of gazes away from the road ahead and not just to the CEVMS. On the other hand, for the arterials the CEVMS and standard billboard conditions did not differ from each other, but both had a lower proportion of gazes to the road ahead compared to the control. In Richmond there were no differences among the three advertising conditions on the arterials. However, for the freeways the CEVMS and standard billboard conditions did not differ from each other but had a lower proportion of gazes to the road ahead than the control.

The control conditions differed across studies. In Reading, the control condition on arterials showed 92 percent for gazing at the road ahead while on the freeway it was 86 percent. On the other hand, in Richmond the control condition for arterials was 78 percent and for the freeway it was 92 percent. The control conditions on the freeway differed across the two studies. In Reading there were businesses off to the side of the road; whereas in Richmond the sides of the road were mostly covered with trees. The control conditions on the arterials also differed across cities in that both contained businesses and on-premise advertising; however, in Reading arterials had four lanes and in Richmond arterials had six lanes. The reason for these differences across cities was that these control conditions were selected to match the other conditions (CEVMS and standard billboards) that the drivers would experience in the two respective cities. Also, the selection of DCZs was obviously constrained by what was available on the ground in these cities.

The results for the off-premise advertising conditions are consistent with Lee et al., who observed that 76 percent of drivers’ time was spent looking at the road ahead in the CEVMS scenario and 75 percent in the standard billboard scenario. However, it should be kept in mind that drivers did gaze away from the road ahead even when no off-premise advertising was present and that the presence of clutter or salient visual stimuli did not necessarily control where drivers gazed.

Do glances to CEVMS occur that would suggest a decrease in safety?

In DCZs containing CEVMS, about 2.5 percent of the fixations were to CEVMS (about 2.4 percent to standard billboards). The results for fixations are similar to those reported in other field data collection efforts that included advertising signs. Fixations greater than 2,000 ms were not observed for CEVMS or standards billboards. However, an analysis of dwell times to CEVMS showed a mean dwell time of 994 ms (maximum of 1,467 ms) for Reading and a mean of 1,039 ms (maximum of 2,270 ms) for Richmond. Statistical comparisons of average dwell times between CEVMS and standard billboards were not significant in Reading; however, in Richmond the average dwell times to CEVMS were significantly longer than to standard billboards, though below 2,000 ms. There was one dwell time greater than 2,000 ms to a CEVMS across the two cities. On the other hand, for standard billboards there were three long dwell times in Reading; there were no long dwell times to these billboards in Richmond. Review of the video data for these four long dwell times showed that the signs were not far from the forward view when participants were fixating. Therefore, the drivers still had access to information about what was in front of them through peripheral vision.

As the analyses of gazes to the road ahead showed, drivers distributed their gazes away from the road ahead even when there were no off-premise billboards present. Also, drivers gazed and fixated on off-premise signs even though they were generally irrelevant to the driving task. However, the results did not provide evidence indicating that CEVMS were associated with long glances away from the road that may reflect an increase in risk. When long dwell times occurred to CEVMS or standard billboards, the road ahead was still in the driver’s field of view.
**Do drivers look at CEVMS more than at standard billboards?**

The drivers were generally more likely to gaze at CEVMS than at standard billboards. However, there was some variability between the two locations and between type of roadway (arterial or freeway). In Reading, the participants looked more often at CEVMS when on arterials, whereas they looked more often at standard billboards when on freeways. In Richmond, the drivers looked at CEVMS more than standard billboards no matter the type of road they were on, but as in Reading the preference for gazing at CEVMS was greater on arterials (68 percent on arterials and 55 percent on freeways). The slower speed on arterials and sign placement may present drivers with more opportunities to gaze at the signs.

In Richmond, the results showed that drivers gazed more at CEVMS than standard billboards at night; however, for Reading no effect for time of day was found. CEVMS do have higher luminance and contrast than standard billboards at night. The results showed mean luminance of about 56 cd/m² in the two cities where testing was conducted. These signs would appear clearly visible but not overly bright.

**Summary**

The results of these studies are consistent with a wealth of research that has been conducted on vision in natural environments.\(^{(26,22,21)}\) In the driving environment, gaze allocation is principally controlled by the requirements of the task. Consistent results were shown for the proportion of gazes to the road ahead for off-premise advertising conditions across the two cities. Average fixations were similar to CEVMS and standard billboards with no long single fixations evident for either condition. Across the two cities, four long dwell times were observed: one to a CEVMS on a freeway in the day, two to the same standard billboard on a freeway (once at night and once in the daytime), and one to a standard billboard on an arterial at night. Examination of the scene video and eye tracking data indicated that these long dwell times occurred when the billboards were close to the forward field of view where peripheral vision could still be used to gather visual information on the forward roadway.

The present data suggest that the drivers in this study directed the majority of their visual attention to areas of the roadway that were relevant to the task at hand (i.e., the driving task). Furthermore, it is possible, and likely, that in the time that the drivers looked away from the forward roadway, they may have elected to glance at other objects in the surrounding environment (in the absence of billboards) that were not relevant to the driving task. When billboards were present, the drivers in this study sometimes looked at them, but not such that overall attention to the forward roadway decreased.

**Limitations of the Research**

In this study the participants drove a research vehicle with two experimenters on board. The participants were provided with audio turn-by-turn directions and consequently did not have a taxing navigation task to perform. The participants were instructed to drive as they normally would. However, the presence of researchers in the vehicle and the nature of the driving task do limit the degree to which one may generalize the current results to other driving situations. This is a general limitation of instrumented vehicle research.

The two cities employed in the study appeared to follow common practices with respect to the content change frequency (every 8 to 10 seconds) and the brightness of the CEVMS. The current results would not generalize to situations where these guidelines are not being followed.

Participant recruiting was done through libraries, community centers and at a university. This recruiting procedure resulted in a participant demographic distribution that may not be representative of the general driving population.

The study employed a head-free eye tracking device to increase the realism of the driving situation (no head-mounted gear). However, the eye tracker had a sampling rate of 60 Hz, which made determining saccades problematic. The eye tracker and analyses software employed in this effort represents a significant improvement in technology over previous similar efforts in this area.

The study focused on objects that were 1,000 feet or less from the drivers. This was dictated by the accuracy of the eye tracking system and the ability to resolve objects for data reduction. In addition, the geometry of the roadway precluded the consideration of objects at great distances.

The study was performed on actual roadways, and this limited the control of the visual scenes except via the route selection process. In an ideal case, one would have had roadways with CEVMS, standard billboards, and no off-premise advertising and in which the context surrounding digital and standard billboards did not differ. This was not the case in this study, although such an exclusive environment would be inconsistent with the experience of most drivers. This presents issues with the interpretation of the specific contributions made by billboards and the environment to the driver's behavior.

Sign content was not investigated (or controlled) in the present study, but may be an important factor to consider in future studies that investigate the distraction potential of advertising signs. Investigations about the effect of content could potentially be performed in driving simulators where this variable could be systematically controlled and manipulated.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Shannon Malik Jarmusz, Director of Community Development
RE: PC 20-005 Text Amendment Dynamic Sign Regulations

FROM: Mo Khan, Village Planner
DATE: July 6, 2020

CC: File
ENCL: Ord. # 1885-18

On June 17, 2020, Village Staff presented the Village of Itasca Plan Commission with a Text Amendment request regarding Dynamic Sign Regulations, which included:

1. Amending the shut-off time of dynamic signs in or adjacent to residential zoning districts or uses from 10 PM to 8 PM.
2. Amending the duration of which dynamic signs must remain static from 60-seconds to 15-seconds.

The Plan Commission was not comfortable voting on the proposed request without obtaining further data and requested such from Village Staff due to that the data provided in the Staff Report for PC 20-005 stated that the study included a number of variables that could not be isolated and such should be taken into considering when reviewing and applying the data and conclusion of the study to regulations.

Village Staff researched and found several various studies related to the impact of digital or electronic signage have on motorist’s attention and the safety to the public. However, these studies similar to the one included in the Staff Report for PC 20-005 all provided disclaimer stating that though assumptions could be made from the data collected there are too many variables in these studies to provide a conclusive result and decision on the impact digital or electronic signage have on motorist’s attention and the safety to the general public. The variables often listed in these studies included the weather, road conditions, road types, types of cars, impact of other motorists on the control subject and different types of digital or electronic signage.

The study included as part of Staff Report for PC 20-005 stated that requiring digital or electronic signs to remain static for 10-seconds was generally effective at maintaining the motorist’s attention to their primary activity of driving and the maintain safety to the general...
public. Staff has requested 15-seconds for the sign to remain static for a longer period compared to the study. The 15-seconds request is also consistent with what was approved by the Village Board for H20 Auto Spa at 1445-1465 N. Arlington Heights Rd.

Sources:


ORDINANCE NO. 1885-18

AN ORDINANCE APPROVING THE REZONING, A SPECIAL USE PERMIT, VARIANCES, A PLAT OF SUBDIVISION, AND A CLASS I SITE PLAN FOR 1345 AND 1365 NORTH ARLINGTON HEIGHTS ROAD (Rocky’s Car Wash)

WHEREAS, Antonio Costa, d/b/a H20 Autospa, and Jacosta Properties, LLC (hereinafter jointly referred to as “Petitioner”) has filed a Petition requesting (1) rezoning; (2) an amended special use; (3) variances from the Itasca Zoning Ordinance; (4) approval of a Plat of Subdivision; and (5) approval of a Class I Site Plan for the property at 1345 and 1365 North Arlington Heights Road in the Village of Itasca (hereinafter “Subject Property”):

WHEREAS, Petitioner seeks rezoning of the south lot of the Subject Property from R-1 Single Family Residence District to B-3 Service Business District;

WHEREAS, Petitioner seeks a special use permit pursuant to Section 8.05(2)(d) of the Itasca Zoning Ordinance to allow an automotive laundry use in the B-3 Community Business District in order to expand the existing car wash use; and

WHEREAS, Petitioner seeks variances from Sections 4.06(8)(p), 13.03(2)(b)(7), and 12.09(1)(b) of the Itasca Zoning Ordinance in order allow a rear yard setback of 5.35 feet, a dynamic display sign measuring 67.35 square feet located approximately 9-feet from the Arlington Heights Property line, and to waive the bicycle parking requirements; and

WHEREAS, Petitioner seeks a continuation of previously granted variances (Ordinance 1098-01) from Section 8.04(6) of the Itasca Zoning Ordinance in order allow a side yard of less than 5 feet, a parking and drive aisle within the first 5 feet of the side and rear yard; and

WHEREAS, Petitioner seeks approval of a Plat of Subdivision to consolidate two parcels into one lot of record; and

WHEREAS, Petitioner proposed a Class I Site Plan, attached hereto as Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, Petitioner submitted an application, attached hereto as Exhibit B, for the rezoning, special use permit, variances from the Itasca Zoning Ordinance, and approval of the Plat of Subdivision, and a public hearing was held by the Itasca Plan Commission on May 16, 2018, pursuant to public notice as required by law, with respect to Petitioner’s application; and

WHEREAS the Plan Commission made the following findings of fact with respect to Petitioner’s application for the rezoning of the Subject Property:

1. The proposed rezoning of the Subject Property is compatible with the surrounding land uses and the general area;

2. The proposed rezoning of the Subject Property within the general area of the property in question is suitable and appropriate;
3. The suitability of the Subject Property to the uses permitted in the existing zoning classification supports the rezoning of the property;

4. The trend of development in the general area of the Subject Property supports the rezoning of the property;

5. The rezoning of the Subject Property is compatible with the official Comprehensive Plan of the Village of Itasca, adopted in October 1997, as amended;

6. The proposed rezoning is in the public interest and is not solely in the interest of the Petitioner; and,

7. The proposed rezoning of the Subject Property will correct an existing error, or changing conditions make the proposed rezoning necessary and desirable.

WHEREAS, the Plan Commission recommended to the Village Board of Trustees that the Subject Property be rezoned from the R-1 Single Family Residence District to B-3 Service Business District; and,

WHEREAS, the Plan Commission made the following findings of facts with respect to the special use permit:

1. The approval of the special use is in the public interest and not solely for the interest of the applicant.

2. The proposed use at the particular location requested is necessary or desirable to provide a service or a facility which is in the interest of public convenience and will contribute to the general welfare of the neighborhood or community.

3. Such use will not under the circumstances of the particular case be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity or injurious to property values or improvements in the vicinity.

4. The proposed use will comply with the regulations and conditions specified in the Zoning Ordinance for such use, and with the stipulations and conditions made a part of the authorization granted by the Village Board of Trustees.

WHEREAS, the Plan Commission made the following findings of fact with respect to the recommended variances:

1. The property in question cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used only under the conditions allowed by the regulations governing the district in which it is located.

2. The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances.
3. The variation, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality.

WHEREAS, the Itasca Plan Commission voted to recommend that the Village authorities grant the special use permit and approve the variances, subject to the following conditions:

1. Permit documents must be in substantial compliance with the Plan Commission and Village Board submittals.

2. The project must comply with all Village Ordinances, Building Codes, Standard Specifications, and the DuPage County Stormwater Ordinance in place at the time of permit application.

3. The variances will become null and void if permits have not been applied for within one year.

4. These approvals are granted to Jacosta Properties, LLC. Any future property owner will be required to affirm the associated ordinances before the Village Board.

5. Approval is subject to final engineering approval and the recommendations within the engineering memo prepared by Amy S. McKenna, PE, dated May 2, 2018.

6. Approval is subject to finalization of turning radius diagram and reinforced pavement standards to be worked out during permitting and final engineering, consistent with concerns raised by Michael Lisek, Fire Prevention Bureau Director, Itasca Fire District.

7. The dynamic display sign will require a permit. That submittal is to include a site plan clearly delineating the sign footprint, setbacks, and clear line of site triangle and be substantially similar to the sign plan included here.

8. The dynamic display portion of the sign shall include a control panel to regulate the intensity of illumination.

9. All messages, images, and transitions must be static—without motion, animation, video, or other special effects. All messages must be held for a minimum period of 15 seconds each before transitioning to a new message.

10. All transitions between messages must be instantaneous.

11. Messages shall be complete in and of themselves, without continuation in content from one message to the next.

12. The dynamic display portion of the sign shall have the same appearance in terms of brightness as non-dynamic display signs at all times of day and under all weather conditions. No dynamic display sign shall be of such intensity or
brilliance as to impair the driver’s operation of a motor vehicle or interfere with the effectiveness of an official traffic sign, control device, or signal.

13. The dynamic display sign shall be designed and equipped so that if the displays should fail, the display shall immediately discontinue, turn black, or shut off until the appropriate repair can be made.

14. Failure to operate the dynamic display sign in compliance with the standards of the Village ordinances and conditions of approval will require that the sign owner immediately discontinue the use of the dynamic display portion of the sign.

15. Approval is conditioned upon modifying the proposed 19’ drive aisle connection in the front yard to 24’ in width.

16. Temporary signs require permits and are limited to a single sign for up to four weeks, three times per year with a new permit required for each display period. Pennant flags, inflatables, spinning signs, and similar will not be permitted.

17. Any wall sign will require a permit and be subject to Section 13.03(2)(b) of the Zoning Ordinance. The sign shown on the architectural exhibit marked “CAR WASH” on the front building elevation was considered informational only, as the dimensions were not included.

18. Lighting information for pay stations and vacuum terminals is required at the time of permit application. One additional light standard will be required on the southern portion of the newly created lot.

19. Plans for ground sign landscaping are required at the time of permit application.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the President and Board of Trustees of the Village of Itasca, DuPage County, Illinois, as follows:

SECTION ONE: The corporate authorities accept the findings of fact and recommendation of the Itasca Plan Commission concerning Petitioner’s application for rezoning, and hereby rezone the south lot of the Subject Property to the B-3 Service Business District.

SECTION TWO: The corporate authorities accept the findings of fact and recommendation of the Itasca Plan Commission and hereby grant Petitioner a special use permit, subject to the conditions below, to allow a special use permit pursuant to Section 8.05(2)(d) of the Itasca Zoning Ordinance to allow an automotive laundry use in the B-3 Community Business District in order to expand the existing car wash use.

SECTION THREE: The corporate authorities accept the findings of fact and recommendation of the Itasca Plan Commission and hereby grant Petitioner variances, subject to the conditions below, from Sections 4.06(8)(p), 13.03(2)(b)(7), and 12.09(1)(b) of the Itasca Zoning Ordinance in order allow a rear yard setback of 5.35 feet, a dynamic display sign
measuring 67.35 square feet located approximately 9-feet from the Arlington Heights Property line, and to waive the bicycle parking requirements; and hereby grant a continuation of previously granted variances (Ordinance 1098-01) from Section 8.04(6) of the Itasca Zoning Ordinance in order allow a side yard of less than 5 feet, a parking and drive aisle within the first 5 feet of the side and rear yard.

SECTION FOUR: The corporate authorities hereby approve Petitioner’s Class I Site Plan.

SECTION FIVE: The corporate authorities hereby approve Petitioner’s Preliminary Plat of Subdivision, attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit C.

SECTION SIX: The special use and variance approved in Section Two and Section Three are subject to the following conditions:

1. Permit documents must be in substantial compliance with the Plan Commission and Village Board submittals.

2. The project must comply with all Village Ordinances, Building Codes, Standard Specifications, and the DuPage County Stormwater Ordinance in place at the time of permit application.

3. The variances will become null and void if permits have not been applied for within one year.

4. These approvals are granted to Jacosta Properties, LLC. Any future property owner will be required to affirm the associated ordinances before the Village Board.

5. Approval is subject to final engineering approval and the recommendations within the engineering memo prepared by Amy S. McKenna, PE, dated May 2, 2018.

6. Approval is subject to finalization of turning radius diagram and reinforced pavement standards to be worked out during permitting and final engineering, consistent with concerns raised by Michael Lisek, Fire Prevention Bureau Director, Itasca Fire District.

7. The dynamic display sign will require a permit. That submittal is to include a site plan clearly delineating the sign footprint, setbacks, and clear line of sight triangle and be substantially similar to the sign plan included here.

8. The dynamic display portion of the sign shall include a control panel to regulate the intensity of illumination.
9. All messages, images, and transitions must be static—without motion, animation, video, or other special effects. All messages must be held for a minimum period of 15 seconds each before transitioning to a new message.

10. All transitions between messages must be instantaneous.

11. Messages shall be complete in and of themselves, without continuation in content from one message to the next.

12. The dynamic display portion of the sign shall have the same appearance in terms of brightness as non-dynamic display signs at all times of day and under all weather conditions. No dynamic display sign shall be of such intensity or brilliance as to impair the driver’s operation of a motor vehicle or interfere with the effectiveness of an official traffic sign, control device, or signal.

13. The dynamic display sign shall be designed and equipped so that if the displays should fail, the display shall immediately discontinue, turn black, or shut off until the appropriate repair can be made.

14. Failure to operate the dynamic display sign in compliance with the standards of the Village ordinances and conditions of approval will require that the sign owner immediately discontinue the use of the dynamic display portion of the sign.

15. Approval is conditioned upon modifying the proposed 19’ drive aisle connection in the front yard to 24’ in width.

16. Temporary signs require permits and are limited to a single sign for up to four weeks, three times per year, with a new permit required for each display period. Pennant flags, inflatables, spinning signs, and similar will not be permitted.

17. Any wall sign will require a permit and be subject to Section 13.03(2)(b) of the Zoning Ordinance. The sign shown on the architectural exhibit marked “CAR WASH” on the front building elevation was considered informational only, as the dimensions were not included.

18. Lighting information for pay stations and vacuum terminals is required at the time of permit application. One additional light standard will be required on the southern portion of the newly created lot.

19. Plans for ground sign landscaping are required at the time of permit application.

SECTION SEVEN: All other aspects of the Subject Property are to be in compliance with all Village ordinances, including, but not limited to, the Itasca Zoning Ordinance, unless otherwise modified by ordinance.
SECTION EIGHT: SEVERABILITY. The various provisions of this Ordinance are to be considered as severable, and if any part or portion of this Ordinance shall be held invalid by any Court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining provisions of this Ordinance.

SECTION NINE: REPEAL OF PRIOR ORDINANCES. All prior Ordinances and Resolutions in conflict or inconsistent herewith are hereby expressly repealed only to the extent of such conflict or inconsistency.

SECTION TEN: EFFECTIVE DATE. This Ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage, approval, and publication in pamphlet form as provided by law.

AYES: HOWER LEAHY AIANI MADARAS LATORIA SANTORSOLA

NAYS: ________________________

ABSENT: ________________________

ABSTAIN: ________________________

APPROVED and ADOPTED by the Village President and Board of Trustees of the Village of Itasca this 19 day of June, 2018.

APPROVED:

Village President Jeffery J. Pruyn

ATTEST:

Village Clerk Cody Conidi