

**Meeting Minutes**  
**Sycamore Township Zoning Commission**  
**Township Administration Building**  
**8540 Kenwood Road**  
**Monday, December 11, 2023**  
**5:30 p.m.**

Mr. Roger Friedmann – Chairman  
Mr. Rich Barrick – Vice-Chairman  
Ms. Anne Flanagan – Member  
Mr. Bill Mees – Member  
Mr. Steve Roos – Member  
Mr. Bill Swanson - Alternate

**Item 1. – Meeting called to Order**

Mr. Friedmann called the meeting of the Zoning Commission to order at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, December 11, 2023.

**Item 2. – Roll Call of the Board**

Mr. Mees called the roll.

Members Present: Ms. Flanagan, Mr. Friedmann, Mr. Roos, Mr. Mees, Mr. Barrick

Alternate Member Present: Mr. Swanson

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Jeff Uckotter, Kevin Clark, Jon Ragan

**Item 3. – Approval of October 10, 2023, Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Friedmann asked if there was a motion to approve the October 10, 2023, meeting minutes.

Mr. Mees made a motion to approve the October 10, 2023, minutes.

Mr. Swanson seconded the motion.

All in favor, none opposed.

**Item 4. – Old Business**

None.

## **Item 5. -New Business**

Case: 2023-15MA (LASR)

Applicant: Michael Rosenbaum

Location: 11500 Northlake Drive

Request: Major adjustment to a LASR

Mr. Uckotter presented the case noting 2023-15MA(LASR) is a Major Adjustment of parent case 2005-17(LASR). Mr. Uckotter read the staff report annotating the background of the case, current and proposed signage, the staff analysis, and staff recommendations.

**Background:** Mr. Uckotter noted that the 1982 office building is 180,468 sf of finished space. According to the applicant, building occupancy has climbed to approximately 66% in 2023. To aid in the applicant's negotiations with potential future tenants, more flexibility is sought for the building's wall signage.

**Signage:** Mr. Uckotter displayed a wall sign plan that shows four (4) wall sign areas. Mr. Uckotter stated that currently there are two (2) existing wall signs on the building. Sign number one (1) Arizona College of Nursing, and sign number three (3) VITAS. Four (4) wall signs are proposed for the I-71 elevation of the building (an addition of two (2) new signs). The proposal of signs number two (2) and number four (4) have been proposed with tenant conditions from the applicant regarding square footage occupied, and the term of the lease. Mr. Uckotter mentioned the current monument sign noting that it was previously approved without a masonry base. Staff recommendation is that if it is ever replaced, a masonry base is required at that time. Mr. Uckotter stated that an I-71 monument sign was approved by the Zoning Commission in 2005 that was never built, and a new major adjustment case would be required for its erection. Mr. Uckotter stated staff recommends repealing conditions one (1), two (2), and three (3) of case 2005-17(LASR) while maintaining conditions four (4) and five (5) in full force and effect.

**Staff Analysis:** Mr. Uckotter noted that it is a natural time to update the LASR given the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic and its effect on the office leasing and interest rate market. Mr. Uckotter stated that staff is in agreement with the applicant to include square foot minimums for the new wall signs two (2) and four (4). Mr. Uckotter explained that based on the scale and size of the building, an additional two (2) signs for a total of four (4) is reasonable. With no plans to construct an I-71 monument sign and with no tenants requesting an I-71 facing sign, staff views it unnecessary to maintain the monument sign provision in the LASR.

**Recommendation:** Mr. Uckotter stated that staff recommends the LASR that governs the site be modified as follows. (See conditions on page six (6)).

Mr. Friedmann asked the Board if there were any questions.

Ms. Flanagan asked about sign number three (3), regarding uniformity, noting that the sign is smaller in square feet than sign one (1) and the proposed signs number two (2) and four (4).

Mr. Uckotter stated that the size of sign three (3) is preexisting, and the applicant did not request any additional square footage for the sign.

Ms. Flanagan asked about the proposal for wall signs two (2) and four (4) stating the term of the lease must be a minimum of five (5) years. If the tenant downsizes to under 10,000 sf their sign must be removed.

Mr. Uckotter noted that this proposal should be included in the recommendation as it would be supportive language if enforcement is ever required.

There was discussion about the varied minimum square foot recommendations. 12,000 sf minimum, vs. 15,000 sf minimum.

Mr. Swanson asked if there was an official definition of a digital sign.

Mr. Uckotter stated that an example of a digital sign would be a video board, digital message board, something that is not a backlite sign, a "TV" screen. Mr. Uckotter noted that the Sycamore Township Zoning Resolution prohibits flashing or moving images of any kind.

Mr. Friedmann asked if the applicant would like to speak.

The applicant Michael Rosenbaum (11500 Northlake Dr.) introduced himself from the podium. Mr. Rosenbaum stated that he is the General Operations Manager for the building. Mr. Rosenbaum stated that one of the first questions a prospective tenant asks is if they can hang a wall sign on the building facing the highway. He noted that this Major Adjustment would give them the availability to give two (2) new tenants signage. Mr. Rosenbaum stated that a lot of money has been spent recently on-site improvements such as a new lobby, dumpster enclosure, and a new parking lot.

Mr. Mees asked Mr. Rosenbaum what he felt an ideal square footage size for a tenant was. Mr. Rosenbaum stated 10,000 sf to 15,000 sf.

Mr. Friedmann asked if anyone would like to make a motion.

Ms. Flanagan moved that the Board consider case 2023-15MA with the conditions as proposed.

Mr. Mees seconded the motion.

There was a discussion between Mr. Mees and Ms. Flanagan about the universal size of all four (4) signs, (4') by (25'). Ms. Flanagan also mentioned the 10,000-sf sign removal provision. Mr. Uckotter noted that this proposal is to give the landlord of the building leverage in the future.

Mr. Roos asked about the location of the proposed signs.

Mr. Uckotter showed the Board the site plan where the proposed and existing signage is located.

Mr. Barrick noted that the formed motion should include the elevations, suggesting that the plan be shown in a diagram.

There was further discussion between Mr. Mees and Ms. Flanagan on the conditions of approval.

Mr. Uckotter noted that the signage diagram would be superimposed into the meeting minutes for future reference.

Mr. Barrick reviewed the conditions as proposed by staff from the staff report recommendation. Mr. Barrick suggested that for existing signs one (1) and three (3), in the event that the tenant leaves, a minimum square foot requirement be implemented for the future tenant.

Mr. Uckotter stated that staff agrees with the applicant, explaining that sign locations one (1) and three (3) are proposed to have no minimum square footage requirement, thus giving the building owners flexibility in the future.

There was discussion on whether a minimum square footage requirement should be implemented.

Mr. Friedmann asked about the never built I-71 monument sign.

Mr. Uckotter stated that the repeal of condition three (3) from case 2005-17, would remove it from the conditions.

Ms. Flanagan moved to amend the prior motion, case 2023-15MA with the Conditions as follows. (see page six (6), for approved conditions).

Mr. Mees seconded the motion.

Mr. Mees called roll.

Ms. Flanagan-Aye  
Mr. Barrick-Aye  
Mr. Friedmann-Aye  
Mr. Roos-Aye  
Mr. Mees-Aye

Mr. Friedmann asked if this case would go to the Trustees.

Mr. Uckotter stated that this case would not go to the Trustees.

Case: 2023-16MA (LASR)  
Applicant: Atlantic Sign Company  
Location: 5905 E. Galbraith Rd  
Request: Major adjustment to a LASR

(At the request of the applicant, the case has been tabled to the next meeting, January 08, 2024, at 6:00p.m.)

Case: 2023-17MA  
Applicant: Kenwood SCA II, LLC  
Location: 4751 Luxe Blvd  
Request: Major adjustment to a PUD

(At the request of the applicant, the case has been tabled to the next meeting, January 08, 2024, at 6:00p.m.)

**Item 6. - Date of next meeting**

January 08, 2024, at 6:00pm.

**Item 7. – Township Report**

Mr. Friedmann asked Mr. Uckotter if there was anything to report from the Trustees, noting that case 2023-16MA(LASR) and case 2023-17MA are to be tabled until the January 08, 2024, meeting at the request of the applicants. Mr. Uckotter noted that there was nothing to report from the Trustees.

**Item 8. – Adjournment**

Mr. Roos moved to adjourn. Mr. Barrick seconded. Mr. Friedmann called for a vote. All voted yes.

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.  
12/11/2023 Meeting minutes recorded by Jon Ragan

\_\_\_\_\_  
Roger Friedmann, Chairman                      Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bill Mees, Secretary                              Date

**Approved conditions as follows:**

- 1) Conditions one (1), two (2), and three (3) of case 2005-17LASR are repealed.
- 2) Conditions four (4) and five (5) of case 2005-17LASR are to be maintained in full force and effect.
- 3) The 2023 wall sign arrangement corresponding to the wall sign plan of 2023-15MA shall be referenced by a diagram in the meeting minutes. (See page six (7)).
  - a) New wall sign locations two (2) and four (4) shall have a maximum square footage of (25') by (4') and shall apply to a new tenant or current tenant renewal, with a lease no less than five (5) years, with a footprint of no less than 12,000 square feet of office space. In the event that the tenant square footage falls below 12,000 square feet, sign location two (2) or (4) are subject to removal.
  - b) The existing wall sign locations one (1) and three (3) shall have a maximum square footage of (25') by (4') each, with no tenant square footage minimum requirements applied to these wall signs.
- 4) For wall signs one (1), two (2), three (3), and four (4), these wall sign locations shall never be digital (no EMC) and must adhere to all applicable sign rules of the Zoning Resolution (e.g., no sign flashing). There shall be no validity period for the wall sign plan (unless amended by a future case). The size, site arrangement of the four (4) wall signs, and other wall sign stipulations noted in this case shall only be amended via a future major adjustment case.
- 5) The monument sign noted in this case that was approved and installed in 2020 shall remain. If it is replaced in the future, it shall comply with the Zoning Resolution (e.g., implement a masonry base). There is no other monument sign approved at this time.



Wall Sign Site Arrangement  
 12/11/2023: Approved  
 Case 2023-15MA  
 No Digital (No EMC)  
 No Flashing Signage  
 No Validity Period unless amended by future case



4" deep front-lit LED illuminated channel letters with white acrylic faces and translucent vinyl graphics applied  
 Returns and trim to match face colors

Wall Signs 2 or 4 are eligible for a zoning certificate, if and only if, a tenant leases at least 12,000 square feet of office space on a minimum 5-year lease. If the tenant drops below 12,000 square feet, the wall sign shall be removed. Wall Signs 1 and 3 do not require a minimum of office square footage leased, nor is there a lease term requirement.

