

**MEETING MINUTES OF THE
LONG GROVE ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
JUNE 20, 2016 AT 7:00 P.M.**

Call to Order: Chairman Michaelson-Cohn called the regular meeting of the Long Grove Architectural Commission (AC) to order at 7:03 p.m. with the following members present;

Members Present: Lynn Michaelson-Cohn; Chairman, Jeanne Sylvester, Chuck Nora, George Tapas and Laura Mikolajczak.

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

Members Absent: Eric Styer, Moanna Mower

VISITORS BUSINESS: Chairman Michaelson-Cohn asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to address the Commission on a non-agenda item. Hearing none the meeting proceeded on to the next agenda item.

1) Approval of the May 16, 2016 Draft Meeting Minutes.

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

NEW BUSINESS

1) Consideration of a request for signage for “Bentley’s Pet Stuff” (formerly “Bentley’s Corner Barkery”) 4196 Route 83 (Suite D &E) within the Sunset Grove PUD, submitted by Southwater Signs on behalf of Lisa Senafe.

Planner Hogue explained the request and the history of the Sunset Grove Development and modifications to the sign regulations per the PUD approval tied to the property. Existing signage for this business, at this location, was previously approved in 2013. This signage was placed over the west elevation of the building above the windows. Two wall signs measuring 24 square feet (Suite D) and 34 square feet (Suite E) are currently located on the structure. He noted signage would be the same in terms of colors but the fonts, copy and sign style would change.

Sign will be constructed with raceway mounted channel letters and LED illumination bolted to the wall of the building. Plexiglas sign faces in green, black and white will be utilized. This is the identical color scheme of the existing signage. A dark bronze trim cap/return will also be utilized. The raceway will be colored to match the building fascia.

The sign is proposed to be illuminated with LED illumination in a manner consistent with other signage within the rest of the development.

As signage relates to this portion of building (Suites “D” & “E”) , the “Bentley’s Pet Stuff” signage, as proposed, is in the "Designated Zone for Placement of Signage and Graphics" as indicated on the approved PUD plans.

Per the building plans submitted for approval the "Designated Zone for Placement of Signage and Graphics" is as follows;

West Elevation – 1 sign;

Placement Zone Dimensions: $17' \times 4.5' = 75.5 \text{ sq. ft.} \times .70 = 53.55 \text{ sq. foot of signage}$

East Elevation – 1 sign;

Placement Zone Dimensions: $57' \times 4' = 228 \text{ sq. ft.} \times .70 = 159.6 \text{ sq. foot of signage}$

The petitioner is proposing a wall sign on the west facade of "Building B" in the location approved as the "Designated Zone for Placement of Signage and Graphics". This is consistent with the final PUD approvals. A Paw Logo will be placed on the east façade as well as window graphics which may be permit exempt. Standardized replacement placards will also be placed on the existing monument signage on the perimeter of the development.

The size of the proposed signage is as follows;

	<u>Proposed Sq. Footage</u>	<u>Sq. Footage Allowed per PUD Approval</u>
Suite D		
West Elevation :	No signage proposed	53.55 Sq. ft.
Suite E		
West Elevation :	141" x 36.25" (35.25 sq. ft.)	53.55 Sq. Ft.
East Elevation:	24' x 22.75" Logo (3.79 sq. ft.)	159.6 Sq. ft.

The proposed signage is within the allowable square footage for such signage as allowed by the PUD approval ordinance and includes the paw print logo in the calculation. The window signs and treatments, if mounted on the inside of the window, are exempted from the signage area and placement restrictions. Green paw prints are also proposed on the windows leading patrons to the door as well as a green paw print logo on the east elevation.

The AC questioned the need for the change and the petitioner responded it was a corporate decision to change the name of the business. The AC noted concerns with the raceway on which the letters would be mounted citing aesthetic and maintenance concerns. The AC asked if the sign style could be kept more in line with the existing sign through the elimination or integration of the raceway into the sign (which is also more consistent with overall signage in the development). The petitioner indicated this modification could most likely be easily done. The AC noted if this was not possible then alternative signage proposals would need to be brought back to the AC for further consideration.

A motion was made by Commissioner Tapas, seconded by Commissioner Sylvester to recommend approval of the signage subject to the raceway being eliminated or integrated into the sign to eliminate maintenance issues and make the sign more consistent aesthetically with other signs in the development or submit alternative signage proposals which address these issues to the AC for further consideration.

On a voice vote; all aye.

2) Consideration of a request for structural alteration (demolition & replacement) signage and hardscape (bench) for “Red Oaks” 340 Old McHenry Road within the B-1 Historic District, submitted by Mr. Jesse DeSoto, contract purchaser.

Planner Hogue reviewed the request and history of the property. The property is commonly known as “Red Oaks” and was occupied by “Red Oaks Furniture” and has remained vacant since the furniture store went out of business in 2011/2012.

The petitioner has redevelopment plans for Lots 1, 3 & 4 of the “Red Oaks” property which leave the site largely intact. The petitioner is however looking to demolish the north half of the southernmost building (adjacent to “The Studio”) to accommodate a dance studio. The north half of this structure was used for storage and is in a state of disrepair to the point where demolition is required. The petitioner proposes a replacement structure in the exact same footprint using the existing foundation & slab of the demolished building. The south half of the structure (“The Barn”) will be incorporated into the dance studio as the dance floor space.

The replacement structure will complement the remaining barn structure and utilize siding & shingles to match the existing barn. Windows will be replaced in the remaining structure with 24”x 72” casement windows to match the windows in the replacement structure. A covered entryway is also proposed for the new addition. Colors of the building will remain unchanged. (See Attached Elevations).

The petitioner also proposes a ground sign, including a “header” 14”x 40” (3.87 sq. ft.) and five (5) hanging panels beneath the header measuring 6” x 32” (1.33 sq. ft. each x 5) for a total of 6.67square feet (total signage 10.54 sq. ft.). The signage will be mounted on the existing post in front of the Red Oaks Development. All signs will be double faced. Building square footage of Lots 1, 3 & 4 for which the signage is being requested is approximately 16,019 square feet (the dance studio contains 4,103 sq. ft. of floor area). For retail spaces containing 3000 to 5000 sq. ft. of floor area or greater 30 square feet of signage may be allowed per the Village Zoning Code.

Based upon the total square footage of signage proposed (10.54 square feet), the requested signage is well within the square footage limits for the floor area at this location. Signage may be divided up between wall signs, hanging signs and freestanding signs but may not exceed the maximum allowable square footage allocated by floor area.

Signage will be constructed of HDU with a faux wood grain finish. “Header” signage will contain raised white lettering and trim on a red background. The first hanging panel (6”x 32”) for the dance studio will contain white lettering and trim on a black background. Signage will be non-illuminated.

The petitioner also proposes “hardscape” in the form of benches to be located along the walkway “patio” in the front of the “Red Oaks” building on Old McHenry Road. The benches would measure 50” long by 25” wide and 35” inches in height with a weight capacity of 500 lbs. The benches are made of brown hardwood with a lattice back & heavy duty cast iron frame. Benches are designed to seat 2 to 3 people.

Per the “Downtown Design Guidelines” dealing with private site furnishings, the proposed “hardscape” improvements are consistent with these recommendations.

Chair Michealson-Cohn indicated that the AC would consider each facet of the request separately.

With regard to the structural alterations Commissioner Sylvester inquired about the 120 day waiting period on the demolition request. Planner Hogue indicated this issue had been already considered by the Village Board who waived the waiting period requirement. The petitioner noted that portion of the structure was in very poor condition. This had been verified by the Village Building inspector also. He noted the foundation was in good shape and the new structure would utilize the same footprint and foundation.

The AC was favorable to the modifications as proposed by the petition and in particular the sensitivity to the character of the “Red Oaks” development and downtown area in general.

A motion was made by Commissioner Mikolajczak, seconded by Commissioner Nora, to recommend approval of the replacement structure as submitted utilizing the exact same footprint and the existing foundation & slab of the demolished building in the reconstruction. On a voice vote; all aye.

The AC next considered the request for signage. The AC was favorable to the signage as submitted including the black & white format for the panel signs.

A motion was made by Commissioner Tapas, seconded by Commissioner Nora, to recommend approval of the signage as submitted utilizing the existing sign post subject to the following conditions;

- The existing sign post be refurbished;
- Future panel signs, in a black & white format, with dimensions of 6”x 32” or 9” x 13” may be approved by staff without further AC consideration.
- Any other variation in the panel signs shall be brought back to the AC for further consideration.

On a voice vote; all aye.

The AC was favorable to the “hardscape” (benches) as proposed by the petitioner and found the proposed improvements consistent with the recommendations of the “Downtown Design Guidelines”.

A motion was made by Commissioner Nora, seconded by Commissioner Sylvester, to recommend approval of the “hardscape” (benches) as proposed by the petitioner with the condition that the benches be bolted down to add security and stability to the benches.

On a voice vote; all aye.

3) Consideration of final plans including landscaping and signage for the proposed “Karen’s Corner” PUD/ Subdivision in conjunction with the petition for a SUP/PUD development as submitted by Fidelity Wes for property located at Checker Road and Old Hicks commonly known at the Iverson Property.

Planner Hogue reviewed the history of the proposal and past action of the AC noting that at the February 2, 2016 AC meeting the AC considered this matter and made the following recommendation;

A motion was made by Commissioner Styer, seconded by Commissioner Mower, to accept the

preliminary landscape plans as submitted subject to conformity with the recommendations of the Village Arborist. On a voice vote; all aye.

A motion was made by Commissioner Styer, seconded by Commissioner Tapas, to accept the monument signage subject to the following conditions;

- Consider changing the name to Karen's Court instead of Karen's corner;
- Raise the middle of the sign to create an arch in the limestone sign face;
- Lower the side piers to a point below the arch;
- The copy sign face be carved limestone;
- The signage be positioned outside the vision triangle and oriented toward Old Hicks Road.
- Any illumination of the signage shall be brought back to the AC for further review and specifications for the proposed illumination shall be submitted as well.

With regard to the final landscaping plan, Planner Hogue explained a "typical" landscape sheet was included as part of the submittal package. The petitioner has provided internal subdivision landscaping per the requirements of the village code (Title 6, Section 6-6-5 Required Improvements) as shown on this "typical" sheet. A detailed list of plantings has been submitted with the landscape plan as well.

Per the review and recommendations of the Village Arborist (comments attached), plantings shown as "typical" are acceptable. Spacing requirements are suggested between trees (and ornamentals) to allow for growth. Shrubbery should not be placed within 5' of the curb edge of the road and multi-stemmed species (such as river birch) are not recommended in the parkway due to sightline obstruction concerns. The spacing requirements (to allow trees to fully mature w/o crowding) may result in less parkway trees than required by the subdivision code. Should this occur the Village Arborist suggests the "excess" trees be placed on the site so the same numbers of trees are installed on a property, just at different locations than noted in the village code. Ultimately this recommendation needs to be accepted by the Village Board.

The site plan includes a tree inventory for the property. Two species, the black walnut and black cherry are both protected species per the village code. These are located along the periphery of the property. Those located along Hicks Road have been severely pruned to accommodate the power lines in the right-of-way. Should these need to be removed during the development process mitigation (per the tree removal ordinance is not recommended due the poor form of the trees. However, should "gaps" appear in the "natural screening" of the property, additional plantings should be required which will not reach a height sufficient to cause conflict with the power lines. As this area falls within a scenic corridor further CSCC review of the plantings should be undertaken.

The petitioner then reviewed the request including pathway location. The petitioner also noted the Village Arborist indicated that all protected species with a diameter of 12" or greater have been inventoried, but unprotected species of that diameter had not. While the arborist does not necessarily have issues with non-protected trees not being inventoried (mostly "scrub" which has grown up over time), the village code does not make any distinction between inventorying protected or non-protected species. The Village Board should make a determination on this matter as well.

A motion was made by Commissioner Michealson-Cohn, seconded by Commissioner Tapas, to have the Village Arborist recommendations incorporated into the final engineering plans and any

replacements plantings in the scenic corridor be reviewed and approved by the CSCC. On a voice vote, all aye.

Planner Hogue then explained two monument (ground) signs are proposed for identification of the development. These would be placed near both entrances to the development, north of the north entrance and south of the south entrance. Each would measure 5' tall by 4' wide (20 sq. ft. total) in a stacked stone façade with a limestone center. These signs would sit on a concrete base, to be landscaped, with a brick obverse. The comments of the AC (per the February meeting) have been incorporated into this proposal. Signage does not appear to be illuminated. The entrance signage as proposed is in conformance with Village Code and therefore approvable.

Mr. Mike Demar, Fidelity Wes Builders, the indicated sign placement as well as the overall need for such signage was being reconsidered. He asked that consideration of this signage be deferred to a later date if such signage were to be installed.

The AC deferred action on this portion of the request at the petitioners request with the understanding that should the signage be found to be desirable at this location additional review and approval by the AC would be required.

OTHER BUSINESS

Update - Towner Green Signage; As a follow-up to Commissioner Mower's inquiry, Planner Hogue reported that the Towner Green sign had apparently been installed sometime in the past without any review and/or permitting by the LGBCP. He provided pictures to AC noting the deteriorated condition of the sign. He also presented photos of the "Sunset Pavilion Sign" which the AC had accepted as the "standard" for signage denoting common areas in the downtown. It is important that this type of signage remain consistent from a "wayfinding" perspective. He asked if the AC was still in favor of this sign style for this type of sign given the desire for consistency with type signage. If so, the village would pursue replacement with a sign of this style.

The AC was still in favor of this "standard" for signage denoting common areas in the downtown. A motion was made by Commissioner Tapas, seconded by Commissioner Nora to have the "Towner Green" sign be brought into compliance with the "standard" wayfinding signage as illustrated by the "Sunset Pavilion" sign within 60 days. On a voice vote, all aye.

Update - Proposed amendments to the Village of Long Grove Comprehensive Plan. Planner Hogue had nothing new to report since the last meeting.

Adjournment: Commissioner Sylvester made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Commissioner Mikolajczak . On a voice vote; all aye. Meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
James M. Hogue
Village Planner