

**MEETING MINUTES OF THE  
LONG GROVE ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
May 20, 2013  
7:00 P.M.**

**Call to Order:** Chairman Michaelson-Cohn, called the regular meeting of the Long Grove Architectural Commission (AC) to order at 7:07 p.m. with the following members present;

Members Present: Lynn Michaelson-Cohn; Chair, Valerie Plunkett, Eric Styer, and Mark Howard.

Also Present: Village Planner James Hogue, and members of the public.

Absent: George Tapas & Valerie Plunkett

**1. Approval of the April 15, 2013 Draft Meeting Minutes.**

Typographical errors were noted in the draft minutes. A motion was made by Commissioner Plunkett seconded by Commissioner Styer, to accept the draft minutes as corrected. On a voice vote; all aye.

**2. Consideration of a request for signage for Suite D, 3976 Rt. 22, ( Building 6), Long Grove Commons, submitted by Signscapes Inc, on behalf of Dr. Craig Oswald.**

Planner Hogue explained the request noting as proposed signage is contemplated to be made of high density urethane (HDU), sand blasted and painted with a green and white color scheme. The signage will be non-illuminated. Signage for the north side has not been submitted and the building interior may have been reconfigured from what was originally approved to accommodate current tenants. The dimension of the sign is 12” x 72” (6 square feet). As such, the square footage of the proposed sign is within the allowable square footage for signage at the location per the PUD approval and is approvable.

Upon review of the signage as requested the AC had no issues with the proposed signage at this location. A motion was made by Commissioner Styer and seconded by Commissioner Howard to recommend approval of the signage as submitted. On a voice vote; all aye.

**3. Consideration of a request for signage for Red Mango, “Building B”, 4196 Route 83 and within the Sunset Grove Development, submitted by Identity Sign & Lighting.**

Planner Hogue reviewed the petitioners’ request noting as proposed two wall signs on the east and west facades of “Building B” in the locations approved as the “Designated Zone for Placement of Signage and Graphics” are indicated. This is consistent with the final PUD approvals.

The size of the proposed signage is as follows;

<u>Proposed Sq. Footage</u>	<u>Sq. Footage Allowed per PUD</u>
West Elevation: 14' - 5.75" x 2' - 5.75" (39.8 sq. ft.)	53.55 Sq. ft.
East Elevation: 2'-6" x 13' 2" – (33 sq. ft.)	159.6 Sq. ft.

The proposed signage is within the allowable square footage limitations for such signage as allowed by the approved PUD ordinance.

He indicated the signage is proposed to be channel letters with a white & red color scheme (non-illuminated). Letters will be mounted to the building. Signs are proposed to be illuminated with backlit LED lighting. Spec 3-1 identifies a sign which will be suspended inside of the building visible through the front window. This is considered a window sign and is exempted from the signage area and placement restrictions. The signage as proposed is permissible under the approved PUD Ordinance. He urged the AC to review the request for consistency as well as any impacts to overall character of the development with regard to the individual signage request.

The AC asked if this was a prototypical “Red Mango” sign and if it would be centered in the “Designated Zone for Placement of Signage and Graphics” for west elevation of this structure. The petitioner responded “yes” to both questions.

The AC had no other issues with the proposed signage. A motion was made by Commissioner Styer and seconded by Commissioner Howard to recommend approval of the signage as submitted. On a voice vote; all aye.

**4. Consideration of a lighting plan for Kildeer Countryside School, 3100 Old McHenry Road submitted by Gewalt Hamilton Associates o behalf of Kildeer District 96.**

Planner Hogue provided an overview of the proposal. Lighting is proposed as a component of the reconfiguration of the parking lot for the Kildeer-Countryside school. As proposed the main parking area in front of the school (“Parking Lot A”) would be expanded both east and west from the present configuration. The parking area behind the school and nearest to Village Hall (“Parking Lot B”) would remain in the same configuration but receive additional lighting. In total 28 light poles 37 fixtures would be installed. Details of these fixtures (height, type of lighting, wattage, etc.) have also been included in the application information. Proposed fixtures and pole height are identical to the previously approved (2007) and existing parking lot lighting. Existing fixtures and poles will be relocated and reused in the new parking lot configuration.

Parking Lot “A” would contain 22 light poles with 30 fixtures. Parking Lot “B” would contain 6 light poles with 7 fixtures (See attached sheet E-1). Double fixtures are proposed for the interior of the areas of the lot nearer to the school building. New poles will be 15 feet tall and will be “Cooper Lighting – round tapered pole” with both a double and single arm arrangements. Fixtures will be “Cooper Lighting – Lumark Tribute Series”. These fixtures are “dark sky” compliant. Parking lot lighting will be timer controlled. Lamps will include a metal halide light source with wattage proposed at 250 watts (120 volts). Fixtures and poles will be bronze in color.

Photometrics as submitted indicate that there will be no “leakage” of lighting off-site (Sheet attached sheet E2).

The AC questioned if LED lights were considered and if maintenance of the metal halide light source was an issue. The petitioner responded that LED was not considered and metal halide was chosen as it performed well and was consistent with the previously approved and existing lighting. Maintenance of the metal halide lights was not an issue and replacement of bulbs was not often required. The school district hopes to start construction in June.

A motion was made by Commissioner Howard and seconded by Commissioner Styer to approve the lighting plan, fixtures and 250 watt metal halide light source per the plans submitted by Gewalt Hamilton and dated 4.4.13. On a voice vote all aye.

**5. Consideration of a request by C.K. Concepts LLC (Mr. George Callas, Manager) to allow modification of the to the previously approved plans for lots 68 and 70 within the Preserves PUD, including signage, outdoor dining area and storage building specifications for Double G’s Restaurant, 4868 Illinois Route 83 and zoned under the R-2 PUD District classification within the Village of Long Grove, Illinois**

At the April 15<sup>th</sup> meeting the AC reviewed the request for modification to Lots 68 & 70 of the Preserve PUD. Overall the reaction to the proposal was positive. The AC noted the site plan was well thought out with regard to neighboring properties and provided good access (both internal and external) to the site as well as providing needed parking for the restaurant use.

The AC, recommended approval of the request, but had concerns with some of the details of the proposal. Addition information was requested to be brought back to the AC regarding the storage shed, signage and the outdoor dining area. These details were considered by the AC as follows;

- Storage Shed Details – the petitioner submitted an exhibit detailing the proposed storage shed. The shed will measure 14’ x 20’ and be located on the west side of Lot 70 adjacent to the parking lot. The shed will be 15’ tall and used to store maintenance equipment for the property. The shed will be of wood frame construction with vinyl siding and trim to match the restaurant building (i.e. Waterford “Cobblestone Wicker Siding”, Aluminum “Evergreen” Trim, and architectural shingles to match the restaurant building). Materials samples were presented to the AC at the meeting.

A motion was made by Commissioner Styer and seconded by Commissioner Plunkett to recommend approval of the storage shed as presented; petitioner may wish to consider a darker color for the main door and garage door (to match the siding or restaurant building). On a voice vote; all aye.

- Outdoor Dining Area Details – Petitioner submitted an exhibit showing more detail with regard to the outdoor dining area. The awning fixture will be a “Hawk Awning Patio 500” which is a vinyl laminate. Material samples to be brought to the meeting. Under canopy lighting will be identical to the existing under canopy/vestibule lighting. Fencing around the outdoor dining area will be 4’ foot in height and of a wrought iron style. The fence will be black coated aluminum and Ameristar “Genesis” in style. Material samples were presented to the AC at the meeting.

The AC discussed the details of the outdoor dining proposal and made the following recommendation;

A motion was made by Commissioner Styer and seconded by Commissioner Plunkett to recommend approval of the of the outdoor dining request as submitted with the following conditions and considerations;

1. Under canopy lighting shall not be exposed to public view; any fans or signage on the canopy shall be brought back to the AC for further consideration;
2. Decorative elements may be consider for addition to the fence posts;
3. Landscape screening (small or low hedge) around the outdoor dining area may be considered to separate that area from the parking lot.

On a voice vote; all aye.

- Signage – Petitioner submitted revised sign details which, among other things, indicate a proposed name change for the restaurant from “Double G’s” to “Pub 83”. Sign color and style remain the same as does the general location of the wall sign on the building. The existing ground sign will remain the same except for the sign face which will be replaced. The second ground sign will remain adjacent to the new entrance on Gilmer Road. The area of the wall sign proposed on the north elevation of the building measures 3.5’ x 16.5’ or approximately 58 square feet of signage. This signage will be constructed of white and red channel letters (polycarbonate faces) w/ black returns and trim caps. Red & white LED illumination is proposed. The ground signs will have an area of 8.3’ x 1.9 feet or 15.77 square feet of sign area. This does not include the background or monument upon which the sign will be placed. The signage will be constructed in the same manner as the wall sign with regard to colors, materials and illumination.

The AC made two recommendations with regard to the proposed signage;

A motion was made by Commissioner Howard, seconded by Commissioner Styer, recommending approval of two ground signs, double faced and substantially identical shall be allowed; one as existing with replacement sign faces, another to be located adjacent to the new entrance on Gilmer Road per the submittal to the AC by Kieffer & Co., Inc and dated 4.25.13. On a voice vote, all aye.

A motion was made by Commissioner Plunkett, seconded by Commissioner Styer to recommend approval of one wall sign, to be located on the north façade of the restaurant building per the plan submitted by Kieffer & Co., Inc and dated 4.25.13 subject to the sign being centered on the north façade of the building. On a voice vote; all aye.

4. **OTHER BUSINESS:**

Historic Preservation Ordinance Ad-Hoc Committee – Planner Hogue reported the Village Board is looking to form an ad-hoc committee to create a historic preservation ordinance for the downtown. The Board is looking for one (1) member of the AC to sit in on this ad-hoc committee. He asked if anyone on the AC would be interested in being a part of this committee.

The AC asked to see what regulations were currently in place with regard to the preservation of the downtown.

Planner Hogue indicated he would provide that information to the AC via e-mail.

**Adjournment:** Chair Michaelson-Cohn made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Commissioner Styer. On a voice vote; all aye. Meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

*James M. Hogue*

James M. Hogue, Village Planner