

**MEETING MINUTES OF THE
LONG GROVE ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
September 16, 2013
7:00 P.M.**

Call to Order: Chairman Pro Tem Tapas, called the regular meeting of the Long Grove Architectural Commission (AC) to order at 7:05 p.m. with the following members present;

Members Present: Lynn Michaelson-Cohn; Chairman, Valerie Plunkett, Eric Styer, George Tapas, Mark Howard and Marietta Calas.

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

Absent: None

1. Approval of the July 15, 2013 Draft Meeting Minutes.

A motion was made by Commissioner Tapas, seconded by Commissioner Styer, to accept the draft minutes as presented. On a voice vote; all aye.

2. Consideration of a request for signage, including setbacks, for “Rivellino School of Art”, 216 Robert Parker Coffin Road (Gosswiller School) and within the B-1 Historic District, Submitted by Roshel Rivellino.

Planner Hogue explained the request noting that in February of this year the petitioner submitted a request for two signs, a wall sign measuring approximately 4' x 3.25' (13 sq. ft.) and a hanging sign (possibly double faced) with dimensions to be determined. The wall sign will be placed on the front of the structure above the existing sign “Long Grove Confectionary Sign”. The hanging sign was to be suspended from the porch on the rear of the structure. Square footage of the commercial space for which the sign is being requested is approximately 1200 square feet. For retail spaces containing 1,001 to 3,000 sq. ft. of floor area 20 square feet of signage may be allowed per the Village Zoning Code as signage will be less than 50' from the road pavement.

This request was approved subject to the following conditions; 1) that the sign colors be “grayed down” to achieve a better balance between the building color and sign color; and, 2) the total square footage of the proposed shall not exceed the maximum permissible square footage of 20 sq. ft. for signage at this location; 3) to be submitted to staff for final review and approval.

The petitioner is now requesting the wall sign (46.5” x 13”) 4.2 sq. ft. and a double faced ground sign to be placed on the Robert Parker Coffin Road frontage and measuring 4.86 square feet (37” x 10.5”). The petitioner proposed the ground sign to be placed 3' from the back of the brick walkway located on Robert Parker Coffin Road. Unless otherwise specified, setbacks shall be subject to the review and approval of the architectural commission.

Signage will still be constructed of sandblasted wood. Copy will be painted on the signage utilizing a yellow background and multicolored lettering. This color pattern is proposed to be identical for both signs. Colors have been “grayed down” from the original submittal and per the direction of the AC. Signage will be non-illuminated.

Mr. Steve Curtis representing the petitioner noted that the only entrance to the leased space for the art school is on the back of the structure away from Robert Parker Coffin Road. The height of the wall sign on the RPC frontage was determined to be too high to be effective. He also noted similar ground signs for other businesses within the downtown.

Commissioner Plunkett inquired about other “directional” signage given the entrance to the business. Planner Hogue explained directional signage, not containing advertising material and not to exceed two (2) square feet was allowed as permit exempt signage. He encouraged such signage to be of high quality materials which complement the area and look more “permanent” as opposed to cardboard or foam board signs stuck in the ground.

After discussion the AC determined that at this location a 3 foot setback was appropriate and did not pose a hazard to pedestrian or vehicular traffic.

A motion was made by Commissioner Styer, seconded by Commissioner Tapas to recommend approval of the ground sign as submitted, including the 3 foot setback and appropriate directional signage as needed. On a voice vote; all aye.

3). Consideration of a request for signage within the B-1 Historic District for property at 404 -B Robert Parker Coffin Road for “Beata’s Soul Art” submitted by Beata Krasuski.

Planner Hogue indicated the property in question is located on the southwest corner of Robert Parker Coffin Road and Old McHenry Road and is behind the former “Struts” shoe store.

As submitted the petitioner proposes one (1) wall sign to be placed above the front entrance to the structure. As proposed the sign will be made of wood with painted copy. The color scheme which has been submitted by the petitioner for the copy includes a white background with gold and blue letters and black shadowing to highlight the gold lettering. The sign as proposed, measures 72” x 17” (8.5 sq. ft. +/-). The square footage as proposed is well within the maximum square footage for signage at this location. Additionally, per the village sign regulations, one wall sign is permissible at this location.

The AC asked about the visibility of the sign and the potential for additional signage. The petitioner responded that the sign as proposed would be visible and if additional signage were needed it would be requested at a later date.

A motion was made by Commissioner Calas, seconded by Commissioner Plunkett to approve the sign as submitted. On a voice vote; all aye.

4). Consideration of a request for signage on “Building E” within the Sunset Grove Development and zoned HR-1 PUD District, for “The Tutoring Center” submitted by Devine Sign & Graphics.

Planner Hogue introduced the request noting the property in question is located at 4188 Route 83 and is located south of and adjacent to the Sunset Food Building in “Building E” of the Sunset Grove Development and is adjacent to the Verizon Wireless Store. Signage as it relates to this tenant space must be placed in the "Designated Zone for Placement of Signage and Graphics" as indicated on the approved final PUD plans.

Per the building plans submitted for approval the "Designated Zone for Placement of Signage and Graphics" (as it relates to this tenant space) is as follows;

West Elevation - 1 sign;

Placement Zone Dimensions 16' x 5' = 80 sq. ft. x .70 = 56 sq. foot of signage

Petitioner is proposing a single wall sign on the west facade of "Building E" in the location approved as the "Designated Zone for Placement of Signage and Graphics". This is consistent with the final PUD approvals.

The size of the proposed signage (w/logo) is as follows;

	<u>Proposed Sq. Footage</u>	<u>Sq. Footage Allowed per PUD Approval</u>
West Elevation:	13.4' x 3.0' = 40.2 sq. ft.	56 Sq. ft.

The proposed signage is within the allowable square footage for such signage as allowed by the PUD approval ordinance including the logo.

The signage is proposed to be individual channel letters with an acrylic face in a red. A green and white logo is proposed to be placed to the left of the sign copy. Letters will be mounted on an aluminum back panel painted to match the wall color.

LED backlighting is proposed for illumination. This is consistent with other signs with in the development.

The AC had a concern with this sign as it related to the position on the building noting that the signage looked "tight" on this facade.

Commissioner Howard asked if the overall the sign could be reduced by 5 or 10% to address this issue.

The petitioner was concerned with visibility as this sign would be the only signage available to for the space. As such, the sign needs to be visible from Rt. 83 as well. The sign could likely be reduced (proportionally) by 5% and still remain functional however.

A motion was made by Commissioner Tapas, seconded by Commissioner Styer, to accept the sign as presented subject to the following conditions;

- The height and width of the sign be reduced proportionally by 5%
- The lettering & logo on the sign be moved closer together to allow the sign to be better centered on the building façade.
- Revisions shall be subject to staff review and approval.

On a voice vote; all aye.

5) Consideration of elevations for "Building C"; 4192 Route 83 and within the Sunset Grove Development, including the site plan, sign placement, elevations, and building materials and zoned HR-1 PUD District, submitted by Mr. Kurt Wandrey, Lakewood Real Estate Solutions LLC .

Planner Hogue explained the history of the Sunset Grove PUD approval. He indicated the petitioner now seeks approval of elevations for "Building C".

He then reviewed the proposed elevations for this structure noting “Building C” is largely a copy of “Building B” which is west of this structure and fronts on Route 83 (Caribou, Rosen Eye Care, The Barkery) .

“Building C” as proposed will measure 26 feet in height with a tower proposed to be approximately 40’ in height located on the west end of the structure. Both are within the height limitations of for structures within the development of 30 feet and 41 feet respectively. These building heights were established as part of the final PUD approval. A garage door is proposed on the south side of the structure to accommodate material delivery for a tenet. Aside for this difference the building elevations are identical to “Building B” as modified.

As proposed this building will measure 80’ x 100’ and contain 8000 square feet of floor area. The square footage proposed is consistent with the final PUD approval. The location of the proposed structure is within the building box as established on the final PUD site plan and is consistent with that plan. Materials proposed for this structure are identical to those used for “Building B”. Landscaping will be installed in accordance with the approved final landscaping plan. 75 parking spaces will be provided for “Building C”. This is consistent with the final PUD approval. The parking area is essentially installed save pavement stripping.

Individual tenant signage will be brought to the AC at a later date as requested. Signage will be handled with a “designated zone for placement” as was done with other structures within the development. Maximum signage size will be limited (70% of placement zone) as allowed by the PUD approval Ordinance. The designated placement zone is identified on the proposed elevations.

Mr. Kurt Wandry, Lakewood Development, representing the property owner, further reviewed the site plan and building materials. He presented material samples to the AC for consideration noting they are identical to the materials used on “Building B”. He stressed there was no change to the site plan, landscape plan or parking from the final approved PUD site plan.

After discussion the AC made the following motions;

- A motion was made by Commissioner Styer, seconded by Commissioner Tapas, to accept the elevations for “Building C” dated September 6th 2013 as prepared by OKW Architects (project # 13010) and presented to the Architectural Commission on September 16th 2013. On a voice vote; all aye.
- A motion was made by Commissioner Howard, seconded by Commissioner Calas, to accept the building materials schedule for “Building C” as identified on “Exhibit 14” dated September 6th 2013 as prepared by OKW Architects (project # 13010) and presented to the Architectural Commission on September 16th 2013. On a voice vote; all aye.
- A motion was made by Commissioner Styer, seconded by Commissioner Tapas, to acknowledge that no changes will occur to the landscaping plan and landscaping will be installed as previously approved (Sheet L106) prepared by OKW Architects and dated 7.24.2008. On a voice vote; all aye.

OTHER BUSINESS:

1). Revised Signage Application -

Planner Hogue explained at the July 15th regular meeting Mr. Tobin Fraley, resident, downtown merchant and LGBCP Design Committee Member, addressed the AC concerning the aesthetics of signage in the Historic Downtown. As a result of the discussion the AC directed staff as follows;

The AC asked that a better submittal package be created, with emphasis on submission criteria, and brought back to the AC for consideration in an effort to improve signage in the village while working within the established policy parameters for signage.

Staff suggested a simple change to the current application for signage as it relates to the B-1 District which calls out the suggested design guidelines for signage in the B-1 District. Also, as proposed, an excerpt from the adopted “Historic Downtown & Business District Planning & Design Guidelines” would be attached to the application form. This includes pictures of signage, some of which were rated by Mr. Fraley, which provide illustrations of the types of preferred signage.

This approach is simple; calls attention to the “higher standard” of signage desired in the downtown HBD and also works within the policy framework for signage as established by the Village Board.

The AC liked this approach and supported the modifications as proposed. The AC found the modifications as proposed did not over regulate the issue of signage, allowed for flexibility and diversity of signage and was within the existing policy parameter for such signage as adopted by the Village Board.

Adjournment: Commissioner Calas made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Commissioner Tapas. On a voice vote; all aye. Meeting adjourned at 8:09 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

James M. Hogue

James M. Hogue, Village Planner