

Village of Hanover Park

Municipal Building
2121 West Lake Street
Hanover Park, Illinois
60133-4398

Rodney S. Craig
Village President

Eira L. Corral
Village Clerk

630-823-5600
Fax 630-823-5786

Ronald A. Moser
Village Manager



VILLAGE OF HANOVER PARK
VILLAGE BOARD
REGULAR WORKSHOP MEETING
Municipal Building: 2121 W. Lake Street
Hanover Park, IL 60133

Thursday, August 2, 2012
6:00 p.m.

AGENDA

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. ROLL CALL**
- 3. AGENDA ITEM REVIEW**
- 4. BOARD MEMBER CONCERNS**
 - a. MWRD Update
- 5. STAFF UPDATES**
 - a. October 18, 2012 Board Meeting – IML Conference
 - b. Update on Zoning Variation Request (Muirfield)
 - c. Zoning Code Text Amendment-Commercial Vehicles
 - d. Scenarios and Options for Hanover Square Redevelopment
 - e. Regulation of Automatic Changeable Copy Signs
- 6. ADJOURNMENT**



TO: Village President and Board of Trustees

FROM: Craig A. Haigh, Interim Village Manager
Katie Bowman, Village Planner

SUBJECT: Zoning Code Text Amendment to the regulations related to the parking of commercial vehicles in residentially zoned districts

ACTION

REQUESTED: Approval Concurrence Discussion Information

MEETING DATE: August 2, 2012 – Board Workshop

Executive Summary

Pass an Ordinance amending Zoning Ordinance, Section 110-6.2.4.a – General parking provisions, related to the regulation of parking of commercial vehicles in residential districts.

Discussion

At their meeting of July 12, 2012, the Development Commission held a public hearing and reviewed the Village Board's recommended changes to the regulation of parking of commercial vehicles in residential districts. They recommended approval of the ordinance with several adjustments as noted below. No residents appeared to provide public comments.

Section 6.2.4 General parking provisions.

- a. Parking of commercial vehicles in residential districts **is not permitted, except under the conditions stated below in items (1) through (5):** No commercial vehicle, having a gross weight in pounds, including vehicle and maximum load, in excess of eight thousand one (8,001) pounds and bearing a class designation other than "B" under the provisions of section 5/15-111 of (625 ILCS 5/15-111, as amended), shall be parked or stored on any residential premises, except when making a delivery or rendering a service at such premises or as listed below. The storage of a commercial vehicle or contractor's equipment at a place of residence shall not constitute the making of a delivery or the rendering of a service and shall be prohibited unless specifically permitted below in this Section 6.2.4.

Comment – additional wording added for clarification

- (1) Box trucks, flat bed trucks, dump trucks, light weight duty dump trucks, platform / stake bodies, semi-trailer or truck/tractor combination, dovetail body, mechanical cranes, hoists, booms, ~~bed lifts~~, step trucks or step vans shall be prohibited to be parked or stored in a residential district regardless of size or license plate classification, except when making a delivery or rendering a service in the residential district.

Comment – Development Commission was unclear as to what a bed lift is, once this was determined, found that they could also be considered a dump truck, which is otherwise prohibited

- (2) Commercial vehicles having a gross weight when fully loaded of twelve thousand (12,000) pounds or less, including those within such weight bearing a classification of “D” under the provisions of the Illinois Vehicle Code and displaying a current Illinois state inspection sticker, but excluding those vehicles described in (1) above, may be permitted to be parked in a zoning area classified as a residential district provided equipment and racks/ladders and cargo which do not extend beyond the front or rear of the body of the vehicle may remain on top of the vehicle parked in a residential district provided such equipment and racks/ladders and cargo and the vehicle shall together not exceed **nine feet (9')** ~~eight feet (8')~~ ~~six inches (6")~~ in height as measured from the surface at ground level nearest the vehicle. One (1) commercial vehicle shall be permitted to be parked per residential property.

Comment - Schaumburg uses this height and several tradesmen commissioners spoke with thought this would be a better maximum height

- (3) Except for the equipment and racks/ladders and cargo located upon the top of the commercial vehicle described in 2. above, the storage of equipment or commercial/contractor material within or upon a commercial vehicle otherwise permitted to be parked in a residential district, shall be **completely** concealed from view by a commercial grade manufactured bed cap, ~~or~~ permanent original equipment (OE) grade enclosure, **or manufactured cover secured to the body of the vehicle.** The following types of materials ~~is are~~ prohibited: plywood or homemade material used as bed risers or height extenders, ~~and tarps or cloth enclosures.~~

Comment – ‘completely’ added to help ensure that covers properly enclose material. Eliminate hard to define word tarp and replace with a description of the type of cover that is desired. Under this rationale, a tarp that is merely a sheet of plastic would not be permitted, as it is not manufactured specifically as a cover.

- (4) All commercial vehicles permitted by this Section 6.2.4. to be parked in a residential zoning classification shall: display plate classification on the front and rear of the vehicle at all times; be parked on a permanent paved surface as otherwise required by this Code; and be owned ~~or and~~ under the control or possession of one or more of the ~~owners or~~ occupants of the residence.

Comment – Adding ‘or’ allows for contractors who officially utilize, but do not own, a company car. Removing ‘owners’ ensures that an owner who does not live at a residence, but rents it, may not park their commercial vehicle there. If a person owns and occupies a residence, they are permitted to park.

- (5) It shall be unlawful for any person to park a public passenger vehicle, other than a taxicab or limo, in any zoning area classified as a residential district between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. except when dropping off or picking up a passenger.

Comment – Find that residents currently park standard limos and that they are similar to taxis in use and impact.

Recommended Action

Staff requests that the Village President and Board of Trustees Pass an Ordinance amending the Zoning Ordinance, Section 110-6.2.4.a – General parking provisions, related to the regulation of parking of commercial vehicles in residential districts, incorporating the Development Commission’s recommended changes as desired and making any additional changes as necessary.

Attachments:

- Exhibit 1 – Ordinance – including changes recommended by Development Commission
- Exhibit 2 – Development Commission Findings of Fact
- Exhibit 3 – Draft Development Commission Minutes – July 12, 2012

ORDINANCE NO. O-12-_____

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING PARAGRAPH a. OF SECTION 110-6.2.4.
OF CHAPTER 110 OF THE HANOVER PARK COMPREHENSIVE ZONING
ORDINANCE BY REVISING PARKING REGULATIONS OF COMMERCIAL
VEHICLES IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS**

WHEREAS, the President and Board of Trustees initiated this amendment to the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance by referring it to the Development Commission for its review and recommendation following a public hearing thereon; and

WHEREAS, the Development Commission, pursuant to prior published notice, has conducted a public hearing on the proposed amendments and has forwarded its written recommendations and report on the amendment to the Village Board; and

WHEREAS, the President and Board of Trustees have reviewed said report and recommendations and determined that such amendment is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan, in the public interest, and agrees with the report and recommendation; and

WHEREAS, the Village of Hanover Park is a home rule unit of local government by virtue of the 1970 Constitution of the State of Illinois and hereby adopts these amendments to the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance pursuant to its home rule authority;
NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT ORDAINED by the President and Board of Trustees of the Village of Hanover Park, Cook and DuPage Counties, Illinois, as follows:

SECTION 1: That paragraph a. of Section 110-6.2.4. in Chapter 110 of the Municipal Code of Hanover Park, as amended, be and is hereby amended to read as follows:

Section 6.2.4 General parking provisions.

- a.** Parking of commercial vehicles in residential districts is not permitted, except under the conditions stated below in items (1) through (5): No commercial vehicle, having a gross weight in pounds, including vehicle and maximum load, in excess of eight thousand one (8,001) pounds and bearing a class designation other than “B” under the provisions of section 5/15-111 of (625 ILCS 5/15-111, as amended), shall be parked or stored on any residential premises, except when making a delivery or rendering a service at such premises or as listed below. The storage of a commercial vehicle or contractor’s equipment at a place of residence shall not

constitute the making of a delivery or the rendering of a service and shall be prohibited unless specifically permitted below in this Section 6.2.4.

(1) Box trucks, flat bed trucks, dump trucks, light weight duty dump trucks, platform / stake bodies, semi-trailer or truck/tractor combination, dovetail body, mechanical cranes, hoists, booms, , step trucks or step vans shall be prohibited to be parked or stored in a residential district regardless of size or license plate classification, except when making a delivery or rendering a service in the residential district.

(2) Commercial vehicles having a gross weight when fully loaded of twelve thousand (12,000) pounds or less, including those within such weight bearing a classification of “D” under the provisions of the Illinois Vehicle Code and displaying a current Illinois state inspection sticker, but excluding those vehicles described in **(1)** above, may be permitted to be parked in a zoning area classified as a residential district provided equipment and racks/ladders and cargo which do not extend beyond the front or rear of the body of the vehicle may remain on top of the vehicle parked in a residential district provided such equipment and racks/ladders and cargo and the vehicle shall together not exceed nine feet in height as measured from the surface at ground level nearest the vehicle. One (1) commercial vehicle shall be permitted to be parked per residential property.

(3) Except for the equipment and racks/ladders and cargo located upon the top of the commercial vehicle described in 2. above, the storage of equipment or commercial/contractor material within or upon a commercial vehicle otherwise permitted to be parked in a residential district, shall be completely concealed from view by a commercial grade manufactured bed cap, permanent original equipment (OE) grade enclosure, or manufactured cover secured to the body of the vehicle. The following type of materials is prohibited: plywood or homemade material used as bed risers or height extenders.

(4) All commercial vehicles permitted by this Section 6.2.4. to be parked in a residential zoning classification shall: display plate classification on the front and rear of the vehicle at all times; be parked on a permanent paved surface as otherwise required by this Code; and be owned or under the control or possession of one of the occupants of the residence.

DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
FINDINGS OF FACT
TEXT AMENDMENT
COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE, SECTION 110-6.2.4.a
PARKING OF COMMERCIAL VEHICLES IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS

I. Subject

Consideration of a request by the Village of Hanover Park for a text amendment to amend regulations related to the parking of commercial vehicles in residentially zoned districts. Specifically, the following item is requested:

- Amendment to Section 110-6.2.4.a – General Parking Provisions

II. Findings

On July 12, 2012 after due notice as required by law, the Hanover Park Development Commission held a public hearing on the subject request concerning the text amendment no objectors appeared and no written objections were filed.

The Development Commission has made the following findings regarding the text amendment request:

Conformance with Comprehensive Plan

Approval of the text amendment is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan. Amended regulations for the parking of commercial vehicles in residential districts will promote the vision of the Village to develop strong neighborhoods that provide a safe, and well-maintained ambiance, and to foster a positive community image and promotion of quality community aesthetics.

Public Interest

The text amendment is in the public interest and is not solely for the interest of the applicant. The amended regulations will apply to all residential districts throughout the Village.

Necessity of Amendment

The amendment is necessary in order to address certain vagaries that exist in the current Zoning Ordinance. Amended regulations will better regulate of the parking of all types of commercial vehicles across all classifications residential districts.

III. Recommendations

Accordingly, by a vote of 6 to 1, the Development Commission recommends approval of the request.

Village of Hanover Park

Municipal Building
2121 Lake Street
Hanover Park, Illinois
60133-4398

Rodney S. Craig
Village President

Eira L. Corral
Village Clerk

630.823.5600
Fax 630.823.5786

Craig Haigh
Interim Village
Manager

**VILLAGE OF HANOVER PARK
DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
MEETING**

**Municipal Building, Village Board Room 214
2121 W. Lake Street
Hanover Park, IL 60133**

Thursday, July 12, 2012

7:00 p.m.

MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER: ROLL CALL

Chairperson Wachsmuth called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

PRESENT:	Commissioners:	Arthur Berthelot, Mark Mercier, Scot Neil, Chuck Plaia, Gary Rasmussen, Patrick Watkins, Chairperson Virginia Wachsmuth
ABSENT:	Commissioners:	Robert Hain
ALSO PRESENT:		Auxiliary Member James Aird, Mayor Rod Craig, Village Planner Katie Bowman, BC John Doubek, Secretary Regina Mullen; Planning Intern Brian Hacker, Nypro Program Manager Robert Wszolek

2. PLEDGE OF ALLIEGENCE:

3. ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA:

Motion by Commissioner Mercier to accept the Agenda as presented, seconded by Commissioner Berthelot.

Voice Vote:
All AYES.

Motion Carried: Agenda Accepted.

4. PRESENTATIONS/REPORTS:

Mayor Craig addressed the Commission thanking them for their years of service. The Mayor requested the Commission recommend a Co-Chair for this Committee to forward to the Village Board for their consideration.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

5-a. Request to Approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of May 10, 2012.

Motion by Commissioner Mercier to approve Minutes, seconded by Commissioner Berthelot.

Voice Votes:

All AYES.

Motions Carried: Approved the Regular Minutes of May 10, 2012.

6. ACTION ITEMS:

6-a. Public Hearing: Consider a request by Robert Wszolek of Nypro Inc. (applicant), on behalf of Industrial Developments International (property owner), for a Variation from the Village of Hanover Park Zoning Ordinance of 18'7" from the maximum allowed accessory structure height of 15' for the construction of two storage silos; and a request to allow a Variation from the Village of Hanover Park Zoning Ordinance of 11'8" from the maximum allowed accessory structure height of 15' for the construction of an evaporation tower on the subject property at 6325 Muirfield Drive.

Chairperson Wachsmuth entertained a Motion to Open the Public Hearing. Motion by Commissioner Mercier to Open the Public Hearing, seconded by Commissioner Berthelot.

Voice Votes:

All AYES.

Motion Carried: Public Hearing Opened.

Village Planner Bowman stated a Notice of the Public Hearing was posted in the *Daily Herald* on June 26, 2012 and Return Receipt Requests were received from the applicant. A summary of the case was presented along with site photos. Impact of the additional silos will be minimal and are in keeping with the existing buildings. This request is consistent with the High-Cube district permitting light to medium industrial uses in promoting desirable economic activities.

Chairperson Wachsmuth – Requests the Petitioner step up to the podium. Petitioner Robert Wszolek of Nypro, Inc. is sworn in.

Petitioner Wszolek– Nypro produces plastic parts and, because the business is expanding, they are requesting this variance.

Chairperson Wachsmuth – Offered the Commission and members of the audience an opportunity to speak. Commissioner had no questions and there were no speakers signed up to speak.

Chairperson Wachsmuth entertained a motion to close the Public Hearing. Motion by Commissioner Watkins to close the Public Hearing, seconded by Commissioner Mercier.

Voice Votes:

All AYES.

Motion Carried: Public Hearing Closed.

Village Planner Bowman presented the Draft Findings of Fact.

Chairperson Wachsmuth entertained a motion to Approve the Draft Findings of Fact. Motion by Commissioner Mercier to approve the Draft Findings of Fact, seconded by Commissioner Berthelot.

Voice Votes:

All AYES.

Motion Carried: Approved Draft Findings of Fact.

Chairperson Wachsmuth entertained a motion to approve the Petitioners request. Motion by Commissioner Neil by approve Petitioner’s request, seconded by Commissioner Plaia.

Roll Call Vote:

AYES:	Commissioners:	Berthelot, Mercier, Neil, Plaia, Rasmussen, Watkins, Chairperson Wachsmuth
NAYS:	Commissioner:	None
ABSENT:	Commissioners:	Hain

Motion Carried: Approved the Variance and requests this item be presented to the Village Board for consideration at the August 2, 2012 meeting.

6-b.Public Hearing: Consider a request by the President and Board of Trustees of the Village of Hanover Park for a public hearing on a text amendment referred to the Development Commission by the Village Board, which amendment to the Zoning Ordinance, Sections 110-6.2.4.a, would amend regulations related to the parking of commercial vehicles in residentially zoned districts.

Chairperson Wachsmuth entertained a Motion to Open the Public Hearing. Motion by Commissioner Neil to Open the Public Hearing, seconded by Commissioner Berthelot.

Voice Votes:

All AYES.

Motion Carried: Public Hearing Opened.

Chairperson Wachsmuth – Noted no one in the audience and no one signed up to speak on this item.

Village Planner Bowman stated a Notice of the Public Hearing was posted in the *Daily Herald* on June 26, 2012. A summary of the case was presented to the Commission stating that at their June 21, 2012 meeting the Village Board agreed upon a draft ordinance amending regulations for the parking of commercial vehicles in residential districts. In conformance with the processes in place, the Village Board referred this matter to the Development Commission for comments and recommendations.

Chairperson Wachsmuth – Opened up the discussion by making the following recommendations:

1. Section 6.2.4 a., of the Draft Ordinance, is confusing to the reader. First sentence should read “Parking of commercial vehicles in residential districts is not permitted, except under the conditions stated in Items (1) – (5).”
2. Item (2) Change 8’6” to 9’ - “cargo and vehicle shall together not exceed nine feet (9’) in height as measured from the surface at ground level nearest the vehicle. (The Village of Schaumburg is using 9’ and some of the new vehicles like sprinter trucks are a little higher.)
3. Item (3) relating to the use of tarps - Chairman Wachsmuth is concerned about the aesthetics and recommended changing the text of Item (3) to read “parked in a residential district, shall be completely concealed from view by a commercial grade manufactured bed cap, or permanent original equipment (OE) grade enclosure or fitted tarp secured to the body of the vehicle. The following types of materials are prohibited: plywood or homemade material used as bed risers or height extenders. ~~and tarps or cloth enclosures.~~
4. Item (5) Add limo to “unlawful for any person to park a public passenger

vehicle, other than a taxicab or limo,

Chairman Wachsmuth turned the meeting over to the Commission for questions.

Commissioner Neil – Agrees with suggested changes and further suggested “manufactured covered” language versus “tarp.” The language in Item (3) should read “fitted manufactured cover secured to the body of the vehicle.”

Commissioner Berthelot – Requested clarification of the term “dovetail.” Commissioner Mercier Googled this term. A “dovetail” is a short extension beyond the back of a truck beyond which there is a much longer ramp. Also, what is a “bed lift?” Planning Intern Hacker Googled this term. The Google results were shared with the Commission and clarified these terms.

Item (1) strike “bed lift” because dump truck is already prohibited.

Item (4) “and be owned or under the control or possession”.

Commissioner Plaia – Questioned the use of plywood, but is comfortable with the suggested language of “fitted manufactured cover secured to the body of the vehicle.”

Commissioner Rasmussen – In agreement with suggested changes to the language.

Commissioner Watkins – In agreement with suggested changes to the language. Concerned over the use of “limo” as it cannot be parked over the driveway.

Commissioner Mercier – Item (4) Remove “owner” from the language and leave it at occupants of the residence.

Commissioner Mercier believes this is a remedy looking for a problem. The statics presented for 2011 showed only 32 tickets issued, with 7 getting multiple tickets. That means there were 25 who dealt with the problem. The trend shows the current ratio down. That is less than 1/10 of 1% of the Village population. This is not a big problem. This is going to be a challenge to put in place for those conducting the inspections.

For those who do have a problem with this, they still have the ability to come to us and state their hardship. I’m still of the opinion that we should not do anything.

Chairperson Wachsmuth – entertained a motion to close the Public Hearing.

Motion by Commissioner Neil to close the Public Hearing, seconded by Commissioner Watkins.

Voice Votes:
All AYES.

Motion Carried: Public Hearing Closed.

Village Planner Bowman – Presented the Draft of Findings and stated that it is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan promoting the vision of the Village, it is in the public interest, it is necessary in order to address certain vagaries that exist in the current Zoning Ordinance, and it will regulate the parking of all types of commercial vehicles in all types of residential districts.

Chairperson Wachsmuth – entertained a motion to approve the Draft Findings of Fact.

Motion by Commissioner Plaia to approve the Draft Findings of Fact, seconded by Commissioner Neil.

Chairperson Wachsmuth – entertained a motion to approve the Text Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance amending regulations related to the parking of commercial vehicles in residentially zoned districts with this Commissions recommended changes.

Motion by Commissioner Plaia to approve the Text Amendment with recommended changes, seconded by Commissioner Neil.

Roll Call Vote:

AYES:	Commissioners:	Berthelot, Neil, Plaia, Rasmussen, Watkins, Chairperson Wachsmuth
NAYS:	Commissioner:	Mercier
ABSENT:	Commissioners:	Hain

Motion Carried: Approved the Text Amendment, with recommended changes, to the Zoning Ordinance and requested this item be presented to the Village Board for consideration.

8. **OLD BUSINESS (NON-ACTION ITEMS):** None.

9. **NEW BUSINESS (NON-ACTION ITEMS):** None

9-a. **Community Development Update**

Commissioner Berthelot requested a review of the Fencing Code where the fences would be joined together on properties, tying the fences together.

Chairperson Wachsmuth requests staff refer this matter to the Village Board for direction to this Commission.

Village Planner Bowman

1. Urbana-Champaign 2012 APA Illinois Chapter State Conference – Commissioners were provided information on upcoming training as the role of planning commissioner. This conference will be held in September and there are monies in the budget. Additional details will be shared with this Commission as available. Commissioners should check on their availability and desire to attend. There is also the option of providing training as a group and that can be explored by staff upon direction of the Commission.
2. The Village has hired Ann Marie Hess as Chief of Inspectional Services. Ms. Hess will be attending future Commission meetings. Her start date is July 23, 2012. Also, introduced was the Village Planning Intern Brian Hacker. Mr. Hacker will be managing future Development Commission case reports and presentations.
3. The Village Board has appointed a new Village Manager. Juliana Maller will begin her employment with the Village on August 20, 2012. Ms. Maller comes from the Village of Park Ridge and has a strong background in Economic Development.
4. Irving Park Road Corridor Study – All Commissioners are invited to attend an upcoming Reception on August 1 at 5:30 p.m. to be held at Parkwood Elementary School.
5. Staff is working on establishing a Tif 5 District centering on the Old Menards and surrounding area. A Public Hearing will be held at the October 14, 2012 Village Board meeting.

Chairperson Wachsmuth – Requested the Commission present a Co-Chair to the Village Board for their consideration. Following a brief discussion, the Commission requests the Village Board consider Commissioner Mark Mercier for this position.

10. ADJOURNMENT:

Motion by Commissioner Mercier, seconded by Commissioner Neil.

Voice Vote:

All AYES.

Motion Carried. Meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Recorded and Transcribed by:

Regina Mullen, Secretary
this 12 day of July, 2012

Virginia Wachsmuth, Chairperson



TO: Village President and Board of Trustees

FROM: Craig Haigh, Interim Village Manager
Katie Bowman, Village Planner
Rebekah Flakus, Finance Director
Kay Nees, Assistant Finance Director

SUBJECT: Scenarios and Options for Hanover Square Redevelopment

ACTION

REQUESTED: Approval Concurrence Discussion Information

MEETING DATE: August 2, 2012 – Board Workshop

Executive Summary

The Finance Committee and Staff met and discussed several options and scenarios regarding Hanover Square and the possible redevelopment of the center. Staff is requesting direction to proceed with the option as recommended by the Finance Committee and direction to start preparing an RFQ (request for qualification) for a construction manager to start the redevelopment. Staff is also seeking direction to work with consultants to simultaneously prepare an RFQ for a private developer.

Discussion

Previously in Village Board workshops and Village Board meetings, staff was directed to come up with options and scenarios to start getting Hanover Square redeveloped and to present it to the Finance Committee for direction. On Tuesday, July 24th, Finance, Community Development and the Manager's office presented several scenarios and options regarding Hanover Square and the potential redevelopment process. The scenarios presented are briefly listed below:

Option 1 – Private Development – Developer develops the property. The shopping center would be sold through the RFQ process with development standards being established by the Village.

- Make any initial improvements and proceed with RFQ to develop the property

Option 2 – Village Development – Village continues to own the shopping center and develops the property

- **Scenario A** - Obtain a bank loan in TIF #3 and proceed with RFQ for construction manager to oversee the project
- **Scenario B** - Set up inter-governmental loan/transfer between TIF #3 and Vehicle Replacement Fund

- **Scenario C** - Obtain a line of credit and pay-as-you-go and do repairs as the Shopping Center has secured leases

Each option or scenario has pros and cons which were discussed and the Finance Committee's recommendation was to start the process for Option 2 Scenario A and have Staff start contacting banks for possible loans. With this option, the Committee directed Staff to prepare an RFQ for a construction manager that would do the redevelopment. Simultaneously, the Committee directed Staff work with consultants to prepare an RFQ for a private developer to see what possible outcomes would occur.

Staff would like direction from the Village President and Board of Trustees to proceed with the Finance Committee's recommendations.

Recommended Action

Staff is seeking direction on the following items for Hanover Square Shopping Center:

- To proceed with the option recommended by the Finance Committee to fund the redevelopment project of Option 2 Scenario A.
- To start preparing an RFQ for a construction manager to work on the redevelopment of the center.
- To work with consultants and other Staff members to prepare a RFQ for a private developer.

Attachments:



TO: Village President and Board of Trustees

FROM: Craig A. Haigh, Interim Village Manager
Katie Bowman, Village Planner

SUBJECT: Discussion of the regulation of automatic changeable copy signs

ACTION

REQUESTED: Approval Concurrence Discussion Information

MEETING DATE: August 2, 2012 – Board Workshop

Executive Summary

Review preliminary research related to the regulation of automatic changeable copy signs and refer topic to the Development Commission for further research, discussion, and drafting of potential changes to Sign Ordinance.

Discussion

Based upon changes to technology and business desires, Staff recommends that the current regulations related to automatic changeable copy signs (electronic signs) be reviewed and updated as necessary. Current regulations are somewhat stringent and businesses and a church have expressed desire for more complex signs that reflect the display capabilities of current technology. In general, Staff would like to encourage creativity and investment by businesses. An update to regulations would permit this, while also ensuring that negative impacts are controlled.

Additionally, the Village will be displaying electronic messages on the new entryway sign along Barrington Road. Staff is currently formulating standards for display on this sign, which are expected to go beyond that permitted for private businesses. As a governmental sign, this sign is not subject to standard regulations. However, for consistency Staff recommends that regulations for private businesses be updated to be more in line with what the Village will be displaying.

Recommended Action

Staff requests that the Village President and Board of Trustees review preliminary research related to the regulation of automatic changeable copy signs and refer the topic to the Development Commission for further research, discussion, and drafting of potential changes to Sign Ordinance. Following this, a draft Ordinance may be presented to the Village Board for their consideration.

Attachments: Exhibit 1 – Research Report on Automatic Changeable Copy Signs



**Village of Hanover Park
Community Development Department**

**RESEARCH REPORT:
AUTOMATIC CHANGEABLE (ELECTRONIC) SIGN REGULATIONS**

Current Regulations:

Electronic signs that are capable of displaying multiple messages are referred to as *automatic changeable copy signs* in Chapter 6 of the Municipal Code, which regulates signage. Section 6-3 of this chapter requires that such signs adhere to the following conditions:

- One color is allowed for the changeable copy and it must appear on a black background
- No movement is allowed between messages
- Copy changes shall occur in no less than 90 second intervals
- Copy shall not advertise products or services not available on the lot where the sign is located.

In addition to these restrictions, the location of automatic changeable copy signs is restricted to:

- Freestanding signs for businesses not located in shopping centers, provided the maximum sign area for the freestanding sign is not exceeded and,
- Freestanding signs for shopping centers with 300 feet of frontage or more on an arterial street, provided the area of the automatic changeable copy sign does not exceed 25 percent of the maximum permitted sign area for the freestanding sign.

Automatic changeable copy signs are not allowed on church signs, which are regulated under the sections devoted to “Permitted Signs in Residential Districts.”

Regulation Survey:

The municipal codes of surrounding communities reflect a variety of approaches for regulating electronic changeable signs. A review of regulations that various municipalities have put in place revealed that most do not mention digital video displays, but nearly all of them regulate electronic message centers. Others prohibit digital video displays while allowing electronic message centers under regulations, and a small number of municipalities allow digital video displays under strict conditions. Nearly all of the regulations reviewed prohibit signs that move, flash, blink or contain animation. Regulations from six surrounding communities are summarized in the Table 1 below.

In regard to best management practices on this topic, an April 2008 article from the American Planning Association’s *Zoning Practice* titled “Practice Smart Sign Codes” offers some references for how municipalities are regulating the different forms of digital signs, and recommendations for what to consider when writing regulations for them.

Table 1 – Regulation of Electronic Changeable Signs

	Allowed	Permitted Locations	Size Restrictions	Copy Change Restrictions	Other
Bartlett	Yes	Only as time-temperature signs in business districts	No larger than 2' in one dimension and 4' in the largest dimension	Alternating time and temp signs shall change no more than once every seven seconds.	
Bloomington	No				
Carol Stream	Yes	On any types of sign considered "permanent" in residential, business, office and industrial districts	Up to two-thirds of allowable sign area may be changeable	Messages cannot be changed more than every three seconds	Signs may not flash, blink or display images that might distract traffic
Roselle	Yes	Business, office and industrial districts - on plaza or directory signs	There is no restriction on the amount of a sign that can be devoted to an electronic sign. Permitted area is according to business district size restrictions.	For signs within 275' of an intersection with a traffic signal, messages may change no more than once every five seconds.	For signs within 275' of an intersection with a traffic signal, the color of the message shall not be red, yellow or green.
Schaumburg	Yes	Gas station pricing signs and properties with direct frontage on expressways.	450 square feet are permitted for each face of the sign, and must not exceed an aggregate gross surface area of 900 square feet.	Gas station electronic signs may not move or flash. No restrictions on properties fronting expressways.	Design limited to monument ground signs. Must not be located within 15' of any point of vehicular access.
Streamwood	Yes	Permitted by special use process, sign package is typically reviewed as part of approval process for new business	32 square feet	Messages must be static and change no more than once every 30 seconds.	No restrictions on multiple colors.

Considerations:

It is recommended that when a jurisdiction is considering updating its sign ordinance, it should consider elements such as:

- Detailed definition of digital display signage with guidelines for design and aesthetics, including colors, pictures, and videos
- Message duration and transition
- A list of the zoning districts in which such signs are allowed and prohibited
- Restrictions on the placement of signs, such as their orientation to residential districts
- Limits on the percentage of a sign's area that can be devoted to a digital display
- Restrictions on illumination levels during the day and after dark
- Public service announcements: some municipalities require that digital signage be used to display emergency information and amber alerts
- Process by which signs will be approved, whether it be by standard sign plan review or additional special use review