

**Village of Lemont**  
**Planning and Zoning Commission**  
Regular Meeting of October 20, 2010

A meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission of the Village of Lemont was held at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, October 20, 2010, in the second floor Board Room of the Village Hall, 418 Main Street, Lemont, Illinois.

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**A. Pledge of Allegiance**

Chairman Schubert led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**B. Verify Quorum**

Upon roll call the following were:

Present: Armijo, Erber, Maher, O'Malley, Spinelli, Schubert

Absent: Murphy

Village Planner Charity Jones and Village Trustee Ron Stapleton were also present.

**C. Approve Minutes**

Commissioner Maher made a motion, seconded by Commissioner O'Malley to approve the minutes of the September 15, 2010 meeting with no changes. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

**II. CHAIRMAN COMMENTS**

Chairman Schubert asked the audience to stand and raise his or her right hand. He then administered the oath.

**III. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Case #10-14: Lemont Village Square Sign Plan Amendment.**

Review of request to amend the Lemont Village Square Annexation Agreement to revise the sign plan for the shopping center.

Mrs. Jones stated that the application before the Board is to amend the annexation agreement. She said the sign plan for the Lemont Village Square was incorporated when the property was annexed in 2005. Mrs. Jones stated that as tenants have moved in there have been some issues with the sign plan. She then presented to the Board and the audience, via power point, a drawing of the building and how it is laid out on the property. Mrs. Jones stated that Starbucks, who is a tenant on the property, did have a problem with the sign plan. Starbucks pursued and received a variation for their

signage. She stated that signage on the east or north-facing façade of the building was not allowed according to the UDO and sign plan. Mrs. Jones then presented pictures, via power point, showing the variation for Starbucks. Mrs. Jones stated that another example that was deemed appropriate was Verizon Wireless. She said that the sign plan states that wall signs will not include tag lines. Verizon Wireless has the words “premium retailer” under their name. She stated that Verizon’s sign meets the square footage. However, the tag line could be an issue with another tenant. She said that another example would be Jimmy John’s who has not yet opened. Mrs. Jones did not have an photo of their sign. She said based on their application submitted, the size of the sign was fine, however the sign height was too tall. She stated that the sign would be similar to the Coldstone sign that was there.

Mrs. Jones stated that the requirements to the monument sign would stay the same as were adopted in ordinance 0-71-07. She said the amendment would mostly affect wall signage. She said for the main building, staff is proposing one retail sign per unit. Mrs. Jones stated that if a tenant had three retail units then they could have three signs. She said that tenants in corner units would be allowed one sign per façade. She stated that a façade would be anything facing a parking lot or pedestrian walkway in the shopping center. Mrs. Jones stated that normally in the UDO a façade is defined as only a street facing façade, which often causes issues in shopping centers. She stated that as far as maximum allowable sign area, the signs would have to be consistent with the UDO. She said that the amendment would allow corner units to transfer the allowable signage from one facade to the other. She stated that this would only apply to a couple of units. She stated that where Slammers is going in, it is tucked back in the corner of the shopping center. She said that this would allow them some sign flexibility with their signage. She said that the size that would be allowed, based on the linear footage, would be about 60 square feet.

Mrs. Jones stated that the outbuildings would be allowed one sign per façade. She stated that this means that the units on the ends could have signage on all three sides. That is what Starbuck’s was allowed to have. She said that those units would not be allowed to transfer allowable square footage from one façade to another. Mrs. Jones stated that awning signs are prohibited and that would remain the same. She stated that they would be subject to all the other requirements of the UDO that were not conflicting with the revisions of this plan.

Chairman Schubert asked Mr. Byarski if there was anything else he would like to add.

Brad Byarski, OS Lemont Development, LLC, owner of the subject property stated that Slammers is the reason this all came about. He said because of lettering, how the square footage is measured, and the design of the storefront he figured it was time to have it amended.

Mrs. Jones stated that allowing the signage on the non-street facing façade of the outbuilding would be consistent with what was allowed in the plaza by Target and Kohl’s.

Chairman Schubert stated that allowing signage on the back of businesses in circumstances like this makes it easier for customers to know that these businesses are there.

Chairman Schubert asked if there were any questions or comments. None responded.

He then read the Findings of Fact:

1. The current sign plan is unduly burdensome and vague. A revised sign plan would expedite sign approvals and be in the best interest of the shopping center's tenants and the Village.
2. The proposed sign plan provides adequate signage for businesses and includes proper controls to ensure an attractive environment for residents and customers.

*All Commissioners agreed.*

Commissioner Spinelli made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Armijo to recommend approval of Case #10-14. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

#### **IV. GENERAL DISCUSSION**

Chairman Schubert stated that Palos is trying to annex property by the forest preserve, Mid-Iron and then continue right on thru to Glen Eagles, Cog Hill and so on. He said that the Village is working hard to not let this happen.

Mr. Stapleton stated that Mayor Reeves is working hard and is sitting down with as many people as he can. He said that Mayor Reeves is very upset with the Mayor of Palos. Mr. Stapleton stated that in December Palos passed their Comprehensive Plan and it states right in the plan that they were going after 2,000 acres of Lemont Township.

Mr. Stapleton then provided to the Board a map showing the properties that Palos might try to annex. He stated that Palos is planning on zoning the property that is annexed as commercial.

Discussion then continued as to how Palos would get water and sewer out to the area and what areas they are looking to annex.

Commissioner Spinelli asked when they were going to hear the Judge's decision on the billboard case.

Mr. Stapleton stated that on Thursday, October 21<sup>st</sup> at 11:00 a.m.

Mrs. Jones stated that she gave the Board some fliers on the Canal Corridor Association. She stated they are looking for some public input at their workshops so if anyone would like to attend they are welcome to.

V. **ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Armijo made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Erbert to adjourn the meeting. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

*Minutes prepared by Peggy Halper*