

**City of Rolling Meadows
Planning and Zoning Commission
City Council Chambers
7:30 PM
January 9, 2019**

APPROVED

Motion to Open the Meeting

Chairman Bisesi asked for a motion to open the January Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Mr. Whitney moved to open the meeting and Mr. Patterson seconded. Motion carried. Roll call:

Presiding: Chairman Bisesi

Present: Fink, O'Brien, Patterson, Rataiczky, Whitney

Absent: Lynch, Rybarczyk, Stefaniuk

Also Present: Fred Vogt, Public Works Director; Elizabeth Payne, Administrative Services Coordinator; Judy Brose, Deputy City Clerk (Recording Secretary); Martha Corner, Business Advocate

Call to Order

Chairman Bisesi called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm and declared a quorum.

Approval of Minutes

Chairman Bisesi asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the December 4, 2018 Planning and Zoning Commission. Mr. Whitney moved to approve the minutes as written and Mr. Patterson seconded.

Roll call:

Mr. Fink: Yes

Mr. O'Brien: Yes

Mr. Patterson: Yes

Mr. Rataiczky: Yes

Mr. Whitney: Yes

Chairman Bisesi: Yes

Motion carried. Minutes approved as written.

Upcoming Public Hearings: NONE

Pending Business: NONE

New Business:

- 1. Amendment to Planned Development for modifications to the parking lot and permitted signs for property located at the Preserves of Woodfield, R-3 General Residence District, David Foos, Redwood Construction, Petitioner**

Chairman Bisesi asked if the file was in order.

Mr. Vogt stated that the file was in order and was made part of the record.

David Foos, 4700 Arbor Drive, Rolling Meadows, IL was sworn in by Chairman Bisesi.

Mr. Foos – I'm here on behalf of the Preserves of Woodfield to present to you a new monument sign and signage for the property. I believe renderings were given to everyone to review and at this time we're looking for approval to move forward with the monument sign installation. Any questions?

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Chairman Bisesi opened the meeting to commissioners' questions and comments.

Mr. Rataiczuk - I think generally my questions mirror the questions that Staff has about actual placement of the sign on the property and the actual location placement of the curbs. I would like to have some kind of rendering on where everything is going to go, a more detailed drawing.

Mr. Foos - There's two things that we're doing, the monument sign and then we're also asking for parking barriers in the rear of the property to slow traffic down as we're having a lot of speeders in the back parking lot. Instead of doing speed bumps, we're actually looking to do some concrete islands.

Mr. Vogt - If you want Staff to clarify, about two pages beyond what you held up, is a map with the building address numbers, it's on the far right hand side. Actually, south oriented for the entire site closest to the tollway, they're proposing three islands along where the parking stalls are located and then one circled at the far right by the 4726 building. That's what Staff was commenting on with regards to needing more details for that. It's certainly what we would expect as we go through permit process but it's for concept purposes for consideration of the PUD amendment.

Mr. Rataiczuk - You received the response from Staff at some point. This goes out to the Petitioner? Correct?

Mr. Vogt - Yes.

Mr. Rataiczuk - There is a litany and most of it is detail oriented, questions and clarifications that are on here that are not addressed in the petition that I would like to see more detail. I'm making it as a general statement because I'm trying to avoid getting into the "weeds" on stuff that you probably don't have details on sitting in front you right now and I don't want to hold you to it without some sort of documentation or greater clarification.

Mr. Foos - It's just a standard curb.

Mr. Rataiczky - I understand. Based on what's submitted, I am generally not opposed to the petition but I would like to see a fair amount more or documentation, clarification on these items before I'll actually be in favor of it.

Ms. Payne – Thank you, Chairman. Staff would like to note that one of the conditions that staff has recommended in the motion for approval of Mr. Foos's petition is that additional details will be provided during the building permit submittals. So those concerns should be addressed.

Mr. Rataiczky - I get that, but for a consideration standpoint now, it's hard for me to get behind something that I don't have those clarifications and details on.

Mr. Foos - The only clarifications that we'll be giving you are just construction documents basically showing the same thing that it's showing right now, just with actual concrete dimensions of the curb detail.

Mr. Vogt - Our understanding is that what the Petitioner's is proposing even though the drawings given are rather crude but there is a concrete curb detail attached to that crude drawing and the location map so unless the Petitioner is proposing something out of the ordinary or out of what the City's standards would be that's what we will be looking for at the time of permit application, review and approval.

Mr. Rataiczky – That's all I have.

Mr. Whitney – The sign is the circle, correct?

Mr. Foos – No, that is incorrect. That circle represents a turnabout curb. That is not the location for the sign.

Mr. Whitney – Where would we find this sign location on the drawing?

Ms. Payne – Mr. Whitney, there was a separate set of documents that should have been attached in your packet, it was stapled separately but it shows the sign renderings and the last page is the sign location.

Mr. Whitney – Okay, that was my only question. I don't see a problem with this, I think the sign is pretty attractive. I think that if it's .75 footcandles instead of 75 footcandles that would be acceptable. You know if .75 footcandles is correct?

Mr. Foos – I don't know at this time.

Mr. Whitney – Okay, because 75 footcandles would be pretty bright.

Mr. Foos – It's not.

Mr. Whitney – In fact, it might melt the sign.

Mr. Foos – It's going to be more of a shadow effect.

Mr. Whitney – Okay. I'm good with it.

Mr. O'Brien - A couple of questions. The first one will be for Staff, has Chief Nowacki weigh in on this? There's regular patrols over there but in terms of speeding? The other question is for you, I guess in earlier discussions there was talk about putting in speed bumps, was that not correct in the first request or has that changed to do the circles now.

Mr. Foos – We thought about doing speed bumps but we found that it wouldn't be conducive for what we're looking to represent with more green space in the parking lot so we could add some trees or what not to add a little more color back there as well as slowing traffic down. We're trying to get two things knocked out with one safety precaution.

Mr. O'Brien - Just confirming the height of the new sign is the same as the existing one, right? My other thought was based on some of the pictures of some of the signs, if it's the same as today that would be fine but obviously the Stadium Club and the different pictures of the business is behind you, that would not obscure their signage. By the write up it's going to be the same exact sign as now?

Mr. Foos – One sign is staying in that same structure and the new monument sign is going to be taller than the existing monument sign in a new location on our property.

Mr. O'Brien - The curbs will allow snowplows, garbage trucks and fire trucks and that will all be part of your final submission?

Mr. Foos – Yes.

Mr. O'Brien - Great. That's all.

Mr. Fink - All my questions have been asked and answered by Mr. Whitney and Mr. O'Brien. I have no further questions.

Mr. Patterson - I am going to second that.

Chairman Bisesi - I am going to concur. I think it's a pretty attractive sign and the plan looks to be pretty good on the surface. Mr. Vogt do you have anything else you need to add to this?

Mr. Vogt – No, not at this time. It would be appropriate to go through the discussion as long as the Commission is comfortable with the conditions to proceed forward.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Chairman Bisesi opened the meeting for comments from the public. With there being no public comment, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. O'Brien – I'll make a Motion to recommend the approval for the Amendment to the Ramlin Rose Planned Development to an additional sign and site modifications for landscaped islands at the Preserves at Woodfield, 4700 Arbor Drive, R-3 General Residence District, David Foos, Redwood Construction, Petitioner.

With the following conditions:

1. Building permits are required for changes to the site and installation of signs.
2. Additional information is required regarding the illumination of the proposed sign.
3. The existing sign, currently located 100 feet north of the proposed new sign, will be removed.
4. Additional detail will be provided to staff regarding drive aisle widths and use of existing parking stalls prior to issuance of permits.
5. Future submittals will include information regarding the islands, including dimensions and drainage prior to issuance of permits.

Mr. Whitney seconded.

Roll call:

Mr. Rataiczky: No
Mr. Patterson: Yes
Mr. Whitney: Yes
Mr. O'Brien: Yes
Mr. Fink: Yes
Chairman Bisesi: Yes

Yeas – (5) – Patterson, Whitney, O'Brien, Fink, Bisesi

Nays – (1) – Rataiczky

Absent – (3) – Rybarczyk, Stefaniuk, Lynch

Abstain – (0) – NONE

Motion approved.

Chairman Bisesi – You have a 5-1 vote with 3 absences, the item would go before the City Council with a positive recommendation.

Mr. Vogt – Scheduled expected to be Tuesday, January 22, 2019, pending 1st reading approval, February 12, 2019 for 2nd reading.

2. Sign appeal to allow an electronic billboard sign at 3105 Tollview Drive, M-1 Manufacturing District, Sam Roti, Genband Media, Petitioner

Chairman Bisesi asked if the file was in order.

Mr. Vogt stated that the file was in order and was made part of the record.

Sam Roti, 3935 N. Council Hill Rd., Galena, IL was sworn in by Chairman Bisesi.

Mr. Roti - Hello, my name is Sam Roti, member of Genband Media, on behalf of the property owner, MAI McDonald. I'd like to thank you for letting me appear at this hearing. We are requesting approval for an off premise advertising billboard at 3105 Tollview Drive in Corporate Park North. The proposed billboard would have two digital sign faces, each sign face would be 20 x 60 for a total of 1200 square feet at a height of 60 feet above the grade of I-90. We're proposing to meet all the requirements and rules of the Route 53 sign overlay district ordinance plus we are requesting to be allowed to operate the sign on a 24 hour basis. The proposed billboard pole would be located approximately 15 feet into the sub properties parking lot and it would take up approximately one parking stall. The sign structure itself would encroach over the electric lines by approximately 8 feet, just the tip of the sign. The electrical lines would hang 12 feet below the sign structure.

Reviewing the Staff's summary comments, I'd like to apologize for not being more descriptive in the property owners hardships which I would like to add that for over 13 years the property owner has operated two businesses on the property and desires to remain. The vacancies in Corporate Park North are challenging as well as the expenses to maintain the property. The rents for the billboards will offset some of these costs. Also, both businesses that are operated on the property are both manufacturing rep companies and the billboard will increase their business awareness. The variances are necessary for the proposed billboard to be competitive with other digital billboards in the surrounding areas along the highways.

Also, to clear up Staff's other question, they asked me to explain what I meant by saying the hardship is caused by the ordinance and not by the person having an interest in the property. This statement probably didn't need to be made, but means as an example, the property owner did not overlook a code issue and they came to this Commission to request a variance from the ordinance.

In reference to Staff comments about the industry standard for brightness, we have submitted a photometric study to Staff for their review and comments. Mike Mallon is here to speak from Watchfire Signs to speak to the industry standards for brightness.

In reference to the IDOT application, Petitioner has not made an application with IDOT as of yet, we typically wait for the municipalities conditional approval which is pending until the Petitioner obtains all IDOT approvals and City building permits because it's one of the requirements for the IDOT application.

In reference to Staff's concern about the size of the sign face, it should be noted that the Department of Transportation restricts any advertising sign face to a maximum of 800 square feet unless the sign is in a county that is populated by more than 2 million people and only in those areas will IDOT allow a

sign 1200 square feet. This proposed billboard meets IDOT's requirements.

Staff also noted concern over the proposed billboard proximity to Route 53 interchange, the proposed billboard is over 800 linear feet from the first entrance ramp to Route 53 and is over 2400 linear feet from Route 53 South. IDOT restricts any advertising billboard within 500 feet from a highway interchange unless it is in an incorporated municipality. If it's in an incorporated municipality there is no limitation on how close the billboard can be from the highway interchange. This proposed billboard meets those requirements as well.

I mention these two IDOT requirements only for the purpose of demonstrating that IDOT considers a 1200 square foot sign face as well as a sign being right up to the highway interchange to meet their safety requirements for Highway safety. It also should be noted that I-90 has almost twice the amount of traffic as Route 53 which is why we feel the largest sign face is justified. Mike Mallon will also speak to Staff's safety concerns for 1200 square foot sign face. Are there any other questions?

Chairman Bisesi - Before we do our questions, I wanted to ask Fred a couple of quick questions. I know we talked about and he stated that the overlay district along Route 53 allows a sign but it is not within any overlay district at this time. We are currently doing our Comprehensive Plan and there is a possibility there could be an additional overlay area. Do you have any history or thoughts that you want to share regarding the signs that are currently in the overlay district?

Mr. Rataiczuk - The signs that are already there, that are outside of the overlay district, they were installed before the overlay district was created, isn't that what you're kind of driving at?

Mr. Vogt – Okay. If you refer to the Staff Report on the bottom of the first page, there is a chart that indicates the existing billboards within the City of Rolling Meadows limits, the one billboard that was recently approved at 3975 Algonquin Rd which is the last one on the list, is 672 square feet per side that is not in the overlay district. The overlay district generally is along Route 53 north of Euclid Avenue. The billboards that are indicated here are 1200 square feet in size, I believe most, if not all, of them were approved prior to the overlay district. The overlay district was created about roughly 8 to 10 years ago and some of these billboards have been there far more than 20 years. Staff that is here in 2019 really can't speak to how the overlay district was established but kind of believe that because of billboards that were already 1200 square feet in existence, was the standard that was used to establish the existing overlay district on Route 53 north of Euclid.

In addition, the fact that the Comprehensive Plan is in the process of being updated to be followed by and as authorized by City Council last evening, the work on updating the Zoning Code which is inclusive of the Sign Code is one of the reasons why Staff felt that it might be prudent to do that endeavor before taking any action on this petition, a postponement until such time as those efforts are made might be in the best interest of the City. With that I'll turn it over to Elizabeth.

Ms. Payne – Just one small pertinent observation, the listing of billboards that you have before you this evening, all but two of those currently align with what is considered the Route 53 overlay district whether they pre-date the district or were constructed within the confines of the district. The only two that are not included in the district are 2201 Plum Grove Road which was annexed in as existing and the recently approved 3975 Algonquin Road, all of the others currently exist within the overlay district

north of Euclid. They currently exist as what is currently known as the Route 53 overlay sign district.

Chairman Bisesi – I'd like to get a quick vote from the Commission on whether to proceed or postpone the whole thing now.

Mr. Rataiczuk – It's not up to us to postpone it, it's whether or not the Petitioner would want to withdraw or postpone.

Chairman Bisesi – Would you have any comments on that?

Mr. Roti – I look forward to working with your Staff to make sure we get everyone comfortable with what we're proposing to do and see what develops. I think there's some other issues, we're also proposing a public-private partnership that we would like to talk to the Staff more about that is not appropriate for this meeting. I bow to whatever the Commission would like to do.

Mr. Whitney - If we postpone we're probably looking at a three month delay.

Mr. O'Brien - From our perspective it's probably at least three months, right Staff? I don't know how that aligns with your business plan.

Ms. Payne - The update to the Sign Code will happen in the context of the Comprehensive Plan. Staff has recommended for your consideration a three-month postponement of this matter with Staff providing an emphasis with our consultant once the Zoning Code update begins to bring the Sign Code forward a little bit faster so that we can get a better idea if another overlay district is warranted or if modification to the off premise Sign Code as existing is warranted as well. Staff has suggested the April meeting for this matter to come back.

Mr. Rataiczuk – I think that there is a presumption that this ordinance as written is not going to pass today. A big piece of that, again presumptuous, you are asking for the parameters of the overlay district while being decidedly outside of the overlay district. We are in the midst of the Comprehensive Plan and in the midst of a much needed overhaul of the Zoning Code. I think what everyone is driving at is if that changes and the overlay district is expanded, this body is likely to give a much greater consideration for a passing of a sign if your property is within that district, whether or not it will we cannot say one way or another but I think it changes the consideration, it would strengthen your case.

Chairman Bisesi – Actually, I would think that if this is in conformance with the current overlay then you wouldn't even have to go through all of this.

Mr. O'Brien – You wouldn't have to come before us since it would fit within the Code.

Mr. Rataiczuk – We can take a straw vote and see what Commissioners would actually vote if we were going to vote on it tonight and then we can postpone it if that's not going to be favorable for you, we can postpone it for a few months until we actually go through this piece of the Comprehensive Plan and if that changes we can revisit it. If you say I want to push through, I want to answer more questions, I want to know what you guys think, and I want your feedback and I want a vote tonight, then that's what we do.

Mr. Roti – No, I'm saying that I want to work with your Staff and the members here.

Mr. Patterson – So the three month delay won't give you a hardship?

Mr. Rataiczuk – It's up to you, we cannot say to postpone it.

Mr. Roti – Since I have Michael Mallon here, I would like him to at least go over the sign because I don't know if he'll be available if I have to appear again. I would postpone this and hopefully continue to work with Staff.

Mr. Vogt – One thing that I would also point out during the course of this particular discussion is the second to the last bullet point in the Staff report. The City Manager asked me to highlight this for the benefit of the Commission and Petitioner, as has been past practice, new billboard requests have been required to be scheduled for presentation and discussion with the Mayor and City Council at one of their Committee-of-the-Whole meetings that's held monthly. Because that hasn't been done, we scheduled the Petitioner for this meeting. Certainly, if the desire is to postpone we can certainly work with the Petitioner and schedule that meeting between now and the date of the postponement to cover that. Per the City Manager, it needs to go to the Council Committee-of-the-Whole before it would come for Ordinance considerations anyway, so that step whether it happens before or after.

Mr. Fink – If we listen to this gentleman now give his testimony and the other guys aren't here that kind of deters that they're not getting the same testimony?

Ms. Payne – I would just like to point out Commissioner Fink that these proceedings are being recorded and minutes will be provided. With Deputy Clerk Judy Brose taking over production of the minutes they will be verbatim so all of the members of the Commission will have access to the same information.

Mr. Fink – I just want to make sure.

Chairman Bisesi – I think we should proceed with our standard way of doing things, we'll let the public speak, if they choose to speak, and once we've gotten through all of that we'll make a decision to make a motion to approve or make a motion to postpone.

Michael Mallon, 501 N. Garfield St., Lombard, Illinois was sworn in by Chairman Bisesi.

Mr. Mallon - I have a few items here to handout if you're interested in looking at them now I have copies for everybody. Mr. Roti invited me here today, it sounded like there were some questions that the Commission had and it seemed like a good opportunity to answer those questions. I'll be happy to come back at a later date if there are more questions that should arise.

Based on some dialog that we had, it sounded like there were a number of items that Staff wanted clarification on. A little bit of background on myself, I live in Lombard I've worked at Watchfire for 15 years. Watchfire's headquartered in Danville Illinois, we're a manufacturer of digital signage and we ship products all over the world. We're a little nugget of technology here in Central Illinois.

With regard to the billboards, the technology that's being used here is similar to the digital sign that's in front of City Hall. Billboards have a little bit more advanced compliment of technology for a number of reasons. The controls that go into the billboards are in place for a couple of reasons. Performance is really critical on a billboard and ultimately with the size and the relationship to the roadway and sometimes residential areas, it's really important that they look good all the time. That's really our goal, it's one of our tag lines at Watchfire, *everyone looks good*. That's the goal, the sign should look good, and the advertiser should look good and should reflect well in the community.

I think there were a few concerns regarding the brightness of the LED displays. The first hand out is multi-page, a little bit of information on that is Watchfire and a lot of other companies in the marketplace used advanced photocell technology to control the brightness on the LED billboards. Most of you are probably familiar with a photocell as being an on/off switch, this actually works more like a dimmer switch. It takes readings of ambient light and it adjusts the brightness of the billboard to compensate for lack or gain of ambient light, in most cases the sun. A good example, today was kind of a sunny day, a billboard would operate at a high level because it's competing with the sun. Monday was a crummy day, it was a rainy day, and a sign would operate at a 30% brightness so it's making adjustments constantly. There is an item in the handouts called Photocell Fact Sheet, its good information on how this system works. The signs also have a software photocell backup, with the photocell being a piece of hardware, we have an embedded code that's built in the controller of the sign, should that piece of hardware fail for any reason it would notify us and the software would back it up. When it becomes dusk the sign would dim down, a multi-step process, and at dawn it would bring it back up to daytime brightness.

The brightness range on the billboards is compliant with the State regulations, the peak brightness is 7500 NITS (daytime). Most ads run about 4500-5000 NITS which is pretty average and 300 NITS during nighttime operation. Both day and night maximum brightness is capped via software and cannot be brightened in the field.

There is a multi-page handout, OAAA Outdoor Advertising Association of America, when digital billboards came online we obviously had a vested interest in making sure that we put our best foot forward so our signs would be good neighbors. There is several pages here, if you look on page 4, it's a nice little summary. "Why was 0.3 Footcandles chosen as the limit?" The Watchfire billboards are compliant with the OAAA standards. There is a couple different ways you can measure brightness on digital signs, our signs do not exceed 0.3 footcandles which is adjusted throughout the day with the use of photocell technology. I should mention if there is any interest on page 4 or 5, these standards were developed in conjunction with Dr. Ian Lewis who is a lighting engineer with a Ph.D, this gentleman has worked with all types of industries and understands the needs of all communities. I have that full report so if anyone is interested I'd be happy to send it to Staff and they can distribute it to you, it's about 30 pages long.

The Watchfire digitals has a diagnostic feature that is built in to the displays, the sign reports back to our headquarters and tells us exactly what is going on with the sign, it's an automated process. The goal is that if something does go wrong we can either take corrective action from our headquarters or send someone out so that can be done quickly, its monitored 24/7.

All of you should have received a Photometric Study in the handouts, if you have any questions on that I'd be happy to address those questions. It's pretty straightforward, I think based on the standards that we just discussed, I think you will find that the Watchfire displays meet those standards.

Just a quick note on hold times, IDOT regulations are 10 seconds and that hold time is locked when we ship the sign so it can't be manipulated by the operator. It's preset at the factory and there are no transition effects, these signs work like a slide show.

Lastly, I think there were questions regarding size, we probably have a couple of hundred digital billboards in the Northern Illinois market which includes about 100 in the Chicago Metro area. The bulk of the interstate applications are 20x60 digital billboards, these are designed for long reads and for multiple lanes of traffic, just as you have out there on I-90. Just a couple of examples, JC Decaux whom the City of Chicago is working with, has about 50 digitals there, almost all of the them are 20x60, those are all on the Kennedy, Dan Ryan and the Eisenhower Expressway and most of them are close to exits. The second item here with the State Farm ad, this is actually at the split as you go west on the Eisenhower by Roosevelt Road and the toll way. The last example is at the exit ramp for North Avenue. One thing I'd like to note, the last two images, both are running ads for State Farm, they are obviously an arbiter of safety. In 2017 State Farm had one of the largest digital ads so they're fans of digital advertising and they don't see a lot of issues with safety on the roadway. If you have any other questions I can come back at a later date that is convenient.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Chairman Bisesi opened the meeting to commissioners' questions and comments.

Mr. Fink – I'm looking at your light study that we just received tonight, could you just clarify some things for me. On page 2, where it says 100 feet, 0 degrees .8, 20 degrees .7, 40 degrees .4, can you help educate me on how those numbers are higher than everyone elses and why?

Mr. Mallon – Basically what we're looking at here is that there is 2 photos that follow and both of them have an overlay grid showing different degrees and different distances. The foot-candle reading is typically taken at 200 feet so when we start looking at the distances LED's are a directional light source that is the intent behind them. Your highest point of intensity is at 0 degrees when you're standing directly in front of it, the further you go off 20, 30, 70 degrees the light diminishes significantly and that's illustrated here. Realistically with the elevation of the sign and the setback people are typically not going to get closer than couple hundred feet when looking at it.

Mr. O'Brien - Kind of along the same lines as Mr. Fink, on page 7 of the OAAA handout, (d) for changeable message signs greater than 680 square feet, can you walk me through that grid because I was comparing it to your second slide and also in your presentation that it would never be more than .3 foot candles, if I'm looking here at 100 feet it's 3.6 foot candle level? It's .3 compared to 3.6, it's 100x brighter, do these even go hand and hand is my question? One report says 3.6 but this is saying it will be .3.

Mr. Mallon – This is kind of a general guideline from OAAA, this is actually specifically to the Watchfire product, if that makes sense.

Mr. O'Brien – Yes, that does.

Mr. Mallon – This is a one size fits all, this is specific to the proposed digital.

Mr. O'Brien – Okay, there is just one other question but it's probably for Mr. Roti. Is it just bigger is better? Is that what's going in the industry now compared to the current code of 672 that has been our precedent for the non-overlay, that's what is in the industry now?

Mr. Roti – There are studies for high dense areas that bigger signs are safer because they're easier to read, smaller signs someone has to spend more time trying to pick up what it's saying.

Mr. O'Brien – One more question, type of advertisements? What type of stipulations are you going to have for the type of advertisement?

Mr. Roti – Not that we're in the 53 overlay, there is some language in there on the type of ads that can be displayed, we are going to follow those ad guidelines. This sign would be operated by one of the large sign operators, there's also federal guidelines that have to be met as well and we would be open to any specific things that the City feels that they need that's particular to the City of Rolling Meadows.

Mr. Whitney – I think all my questions have been answered.

Mr. Patterson – Are you a sales engineer or just a salesman?

Mr. Mallon – Salesman. I've been doing this for a long time, 15 years.

Mr. Patterson – Okay. I don't remember the calculations between foot candles and candela's.

Mr. Mallon – There are 2 different measurements that are out there. There's a NIT measurement which is candelas per square meter and then there's a foot candle measurement. Those are 2 distinct measurements. Foot candle measurement measures luminance that's basically what you perceive as you approach an object, a NIT measurement is very specific distance orientated you have to be directly in front of the sign to get a NIT measurement. It's generally agreed upon that a foot candle reading is basically what impacts the individual so it's generally the most useful measurement to use not to mention that it's a lot easier to perform. NIT guns are expensive, they're about \$2-3000 and you can buy a luminance meter for \$40. From a regulatory standpoint, it's a lot easier for a community to regulate on a foot candle standard.

Mr. Patterson – The reason I ask, my industry is fire protection, we use candela not foot candles. I'm looking for the comparison.

Mr. Mallon – I think every industry is going to have a little different approach. From a signage standpoint, the foot candle especially when it comes to digital. A NIT is a unit of measurement that is specific to LED's, if you want to be extremely precise, you take NIT measurement. For the sake of general conversation it achieves the same goal to use the foot candle.

Mr. Patterson – I may have missed it here but everyone else that has come before us with billboards has always offered the City to be able to display.

Mr. Mallon – That would be up to Mr. Roti.

Mr. Roti - Our plan is to build an integrated digital system that an emergency can be displayed beyond your borders, if needed.

Mr. Patterson - What I was looking for is community events, things like that.

Mr. Roti – Yes.

Mr. Patterson - I got an education that there's always a qualifier provided that there is space. Is there any consideration on how to work around that? You have 18 slides that circulate, if it takes a minute and ½ or more to go through all them, a community event doesn't need to be broadcasted each time. If you have all those spots filled with paying customers, is there a way to slip in some of those community events every fifth or sixth slide or something like that?

Mr. Roti - Yes, public announcements is part of it. It's part of our comprehensive public-private partnership plan which is the Amber alerts, the silver alerts, the public service announcements, the FBI notices and there is also a revenue component.

Mr. Patterson - That's why I'm saying not every cycle but every few cycles even if you're booked. I want to make it known that and I don't want to sidestep the idea.

Mr. Roti - Yes.

Mr. Rataiczuk – All my questions are for Mr. Roti, more generally about the consideration of the sign. Can you help me understand the hardships that your listing a little bit more?

Mr. Roti - I admit that this is probably my weak point in terms of explaining the hardship. I reviewed all the documents from past billboard approvals and I tried to absorb what they're trying to say and I guess I've done a bad job at relaying that. The way I look at it, the hardship is no different than Nick Kim's hardship, I don't see a difference between them so I apologize as I don't know exactly what you're looking for.

Mr. Rataiczuk – I'm looking for you to explain your hardship and make a case for hardship. I don't believe you've done that. You are asking for a consideration for a sign that is not allowed where you are and as far as I'm concerned you have not made a case as to why we should allow you to put that sign in. With all the engineering considerations being completely separate, just the distillation of the consideration of this sign on your property, I don't believe you've made an argument as to why we should allow you to do so and I'm asking you to make that argument.

Mr. Roti – Under the current ordinance we are allowed to put up a 20 square foot sign, 20 feet above the height of the highway, that sign would not be viable for the purposes that we laid out in our proposal. The variance sign that we're asking for is critical for this sign to be a viable sign. It's critical to

everything that we have proposed to the City of Rolling Meadows. At 20 square foot sign that's 20 feet above the grade of the highway is not a viable sign. Our hardship is that we would not have a sign that's viable.

Mr. Rataiczuk – Viability is subjective.

Mr. Roti - Viable on the visibility, viable on the feasibility.

Mr. Rataiczuk – Also subjective.

Mr. Roti – Feasibility wouldn't be worth the money that you spent to build it.

Ms. Payne - Point of clarification, for the M1 district it is 200 square feet maximum size not 20 square feet that's permitted for off premise billboards like this.

Mr. Roti – It's not a viable sign, these signs are standardized, there's only two sizes that are viable for a highway, 14 x 48 and 20 x 60.

Mr. Rataiczuk – I don't believe the hardships that you've listed are actual hardships.

Mr. Roti - Can you give me an example of what you consider a hardship?

Mr. Rataiczuk – No, it's not up to me to make your case. I don't want to enter into that realm. The fact that your property is not in an overlay district is not hardship it's a matter of location. The fact that the billboard meets the requirements of the overlay district that you are not in is not a hardship, it's just a statement of design.

Mr. Roti - Is it a hardship that the sign limitation of 200 feet is not a viable size?

Mr. Rataiczuk – Again, that is incredibly subjective and viability is not necessarily in and of itself a hardship. I don't believe it's necessarily a hardship. I don't think you've made a case that is actually a hardship.

Chairman Bisesi - I'm going to step into that realm that you didn't want to step into. If you were to put up a sign that is 200 square feet, how visible would it be? Whereas a 1200 square foot sign would be more visible, people would have plenty of time to see it in a safe manner. I'm not sure if that's where you were going but that's how I interpreted what Mr. Roti said because a smaller sign complicates the whole thing, it's less likely that he'll get any advertisers.

Mr. Rataiczuk – But that's not I hardship.

Chairman Bisesi - It wouldn't be viable to put a sign up that you're not going to have anything on.

Mr. Rataiczuk – You can make that argument but it does not make a hardship.

Chairman Bisesi - That's as far as I want to delve into that.

Mr. Whitney – It was made pretty clear in the presentation that the 1200 square foot sign was much safer than a 200 square foot sign. I don't know if you received a copy of this email that was passed out and it explained one of the hardships, that it was hard to meet the expenses of the property for the two businesses so they are looking for a way to supplement, to offset some of that expense and recover some through the use of the sign. I don't think IDOT would approve a 200 square foot sign and by that is somewhat of a hardship.

Mr. Rataiczuk – It potentially could be.

Chairman Bisesi - Once again, that's all speculation.

Mr. Rataiczuk – I think I've made my point. Also, offsetting expenses to maintain a property I don't believe is a hardship, to find outside ways to generate revenue that don't conform to the district that they're in. I don't believe that's a sage argument to a hardship. I don't believe what has been outlined has made a case for consideration for the sign on this property.

Chairman Bisesi - I've said most of what I was going to say. The one issue that I have is really the size of it, it's 1200 square feet. While I would agree 200 square feet is not big enough, that would be my personal opinion. Something in between would maybe be more appropriate. That's why I brought up before we even started the discussion because are going to be having this discussion as part of our Comprehensive Plan about the possibility of postponing. The proposal "as is" I'm inclined maybe not to vote for it but I like to have discussions regarding the zoning changes and my recommendation would be to postpone. We are going to move on with the meeting unless you have any other comments.

Mr. Roti – No. Thank you.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Chairman Bisesi opened the meeting for comments from the public.

Steve Holish, 4811 Deepwood Lane, Palatine, IL was sworn in by Chairman Bisesi.

Mr. Holish - I've been sitting back here listening to the discussions, Rolling Meadows isn't a big City, we have to get businesses in here, we have to do what it takes to get business done and for you as a planning organization to tell a business they have to wait until we get something else done before they can act is not good business. These people should be allowed to bring their sign in, vote on it tonight, look at the ordinances and decide tonight if it goes forward and make the decision. If some point down the road, 3, 6, 9 months the Comprehensive Plan says it doesn't work, he's grandfathered in. As you were told by Staff that other signs have been put in a long time ago that are 1200 square feet. You all should have voted on this tonight saying go ahead. Staff's been doing an excellent job bringing their items forward and saying this is what you have to do to make it work. Give them a variance and let them build the sign and go forward. As far has hardships, anybody knows that if you put up a bigger sign and you get more advertisers, it's more revenue. More revenue, better business. You can't expect a person to put a small sign up and say I'm making \$20 a month if he puts up a \$3000 sign and he's never going to get it back. I believe you as a planning group should be more proactive for making decisions today not what could happen 6 months down the road. In 6 months the Comprehensive Plan

can say the sign is fine. You've then wasted the man's time and he could have had his sign up making revenue. I think the two items up tonight should have been voted on a little bit quicker. I apologize, I didn't get any information online. I looked at your Agenda, there is no detail as to what the signs are, and it just says you're going to discuss these signs. This is the first meeting of the Planning Commission for the year, I think you should get better at deciding quicker to make businesses work easier in Rolling Meadows. Thank you.

Dale Engelking, 3206 Plum Grove Drive, Rolling Meadows, IL was sworn in by Chairman Bisesi.

Mr. Engelking - I'm on the same page as he is. This gentleman has two businesses and Cook County taxes are the highest in the country. As far as a hardship is, as a homeowner, that would be my hardship, is real estate taxes. Here is a gentleman that's worked with Staff, the man's not asking for a TIF or a class 6b, we give those away like cotton candy. The man is just looking to bring in more business. There's tons of signs along the Tollway that are that size. We have to be pro-business in this town, if you want businesses to come and spend their money here we have to work with them. You should look at helping businesses instead of driving them away. Thank you for your time.

Ms. Payne - Staff reports are not published on the website, they may be at some future point. Public information can be requested at any time, contact the Community Development Division and we can certainly provide that information. They are provided to the Petitioner in advance as well.

With there being no further public comment, the public hearing was closed.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Chairman Bisesi opened the meeting to additional questions and comments from the commissioners.

Chairman Bisesi - I need a motion one way or another. Whether it's going to be a motion to approve or a motion to postpone. If we want to have a discussion before we have a motion that would be fine.

Mr. Whitney - The Petitioner has to decide what he wants to do.

Chairman Bisesi - We asked him the question and he said he didn't have a preference one way or another.

Mr. Rataiczky - I don't think it's decision that we can or should make. Mr. Roti, it's up to you whether or not you want us to vote on the petition tonight as it is or if you'd like to postpone it to see what happens with the Zoning and the Comprehensive Plan or we could take a straw poll.

Mr. O'Brien - My concern is based on the discussion tonight, I am okay with doing a vote but I don't think it would be in the Petitioner's favor. If it is with a negative recommendation here, it would still go to the City Council with a negative recommendation. I'm comfortable with the vote but I don't think it would be in the Petitioner's best interest based on our discussion, I don't know if it would pass.

Mr. Rataiczky - For what it's worth that's the vantage point for this body is trying to approach it from is not to hold you up. What we're trying to do is make sure we don't slow you down. If the

Comprehensive Plan and if the Zoning Code is going to change and allow this and expand the district then you're money ahead. If you want to vote tonight and it does not pass then it is going to go to the Council with a negative recommendation.

Mr. O'Brien - They can still approve it because we're just a recommending body.

Chairman Bisesi – Correct me if I'm wrong, if it is postponed and we change the overlay district to include the area along I-90 as well, April/May timeframe, then it wouldn't have to go before anybody, you would just submit a permit application and it's done. No extra expense, no more meetings, none of that.

Mr. Vogt – Correct. That's why Staff is recommending a 90 day deferral, a postponement until April. We certainly can't say at this point that it will definitely be completed by April 1. If the direction is to postpone, we will make every effort to expedite things the best we can.

Mr. Rataiczuk – You caught us at an interesting intersection of time because of the Comprehensive Plan. What we're bringing up is consideration for your best interest, your best shot at getting your sign. If it goes to the Council with a negative recommendation than that's it, it's closed at that point.

Mr. O'Brien - The City Council in the past has given approval with a negative recommendation. It's a tough balance as we don't have the final say.

Mr. Vogt - From Staff's perspective, since this is the first petition to come forward along I-90 tollway, good sound planning, regardless if it's considered, dismissed, withdrawn, voted down, there will be more and that's one of the considerations we have had before the Petitioner came forward in regard to looking at our sign regulations. This came up internally when the 3975 Algonquin billboard was considered and approved last year. So it's something that needs to be looked at a broader scope, it's a long corridor in the City of Rolling Meadows and there will be more requests.

Mr. Rataiczuk – Everyone is better off once those decisions are made and we're prepared. We are better off as a body because we'll have clear parameters that are more contemporary, there will be less red tape all around.

Chairman Bisesi – So that's where we're at. If you would like it postponed, we can postpone it, if you would like us to vote on it, we will. At least you got a recommendation, it's not dead. It's your decision.

Mr. O'Brien – Can I ask one more question? It's probably more for Staff, if Mr. Roti wants to go forward with a negative recommendation, it goes to the City Council and for some reason they say no, the sign can't go up. If the Comprehensive Plan is completed in 4 months and this is allowed, Mr. Roti's company can still do it even if it's not recommended or approved by City Council which wouldn't prohibit him from applying in June?

Mr. Vogt – If it were a matter of the new Zoning Sign Code allowed for this particular Petition, they would just need to go through the permit process. They would not need to come before this Commission.

Chairman Bisesi – With that said, do we know what we want to do? I’m inclined that somebody makes a motion and vote on it because it’s on our Agenda.

Mr. Whitney - Do we want to do a straw poll?

Chairman Bisesi – No.

Mr. O’Brien - We’ve done that in the past to give the Petitioner a feeling of how it would go.

Mr. Rataiczky – It’s a non-official vote, it does not get memorialized.

Chairman Bisesi – I know we have under certain circumstances, I’m not sure if this is one we want to. I’m kind of leaning towards taking the vote, we had our public comments they came out here and they presented their case and we have all the facts that we would need whether we want this or not. If we’re going to start to allow 1200 square foot signs along I-90, is this a spot where we’re going to allow 1200 square foot signs if we were going to extend the overlay? I understand it’s not in our Ordinance yet and I understand the comments from the people who spoke from the public. We should vote on it unless he says that he doesn’t want us to vote on it right now.

Mr. Roti - In the spirit of working with the City of Rolling Meadows, I elect to postpone it.

Chairman Bisesi – Okay, that is your choice. Do I have a motion to postpone?

Mr. Rataiczky moved to postpone the petition for the Sign Appeal for an illuminated billboard sign for the property located at 3105 Tollview Drive, M-1 Manufacturing, Sam Roti, Genband Media, Petitioner, to a future Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting on April 2, 2019 at 7:30 PM in the City Council Chambers.

Mr. Patterson seconded.

Roll call:

Mr. Fink: Yes

Mr. O’Brien: No

Mr. Patterson: Yes

Mr. Whitney: Yes

Mr. Rataiczky: Yes

Chairman Bisesi: Yes

Yeas – (5) – Bisesi, Fink, Patterson, Rataiczky, Whitney

Nays – (1) – O’Brien

Absent – (3) – Lynch, Rybarczyk, Stefaniuk

Abstain – (0) – NONE

Chairman Bisesi - With a vote of 5-1 with 3 absent in favor of postponing to April 2, 2019.

Miscellaneous Business: NONE

Matters Not on the Agenda: NONE

Reports:

Mr. Vogt - We have two pending expected hearings. Additional charging stations for Tesla vehicles at the Meijer store, there currently are 10, Petitioner will be asking for additional ones in generally the same location. We also have scheduled the first draft presentation of the Comprehensive Plan update.

The *News & Views* that was distributed citywide last week indicated that tonight would be the date that we would present the first draft of the Plan. Unfortunately that did not happen due to the fact that it took longer than expected. The newsletter was written a month or more ago, we are certain that we will be ready and we'll have a draft after Staff review and an additional meeting mid-January with the consultant on this project. Staff's intent is to get the draft document to the Planning and Zoning Commission well in advance of the next meeting on February 5, 2019, to give you more time to read through it. The first draft as we've been reviewing it, I believe is about 62 pages, so you can look at that in advance of when you would normally get your packets. There will probably 2 packet distributions, the Comp Plan draft and then the Tesla charging stations and anything else that comes in at the last minute which I don't expect at this time.

Ms. Payne - With the Commissions permission, we may distribute a copy of the Comprehensive Plan draft electronically in advance of the meeting and then include a hard copy with your normal packet distribution just for ease of distribution in advance.

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Rataczyk and seconded by Mr. Patterson. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote. The regular meeting of the January 9, 2019 Planning and Zoning Commission was adjourned at 9:04 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Judy Brose

Judy Brose

Deputy City Clerk

Distribution:

Mayor

City Manager

Planning and Zoning Commissioners

Community Development Department

Clerk's Office

Minutes approved at the February 5, 2019 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting as written.