

**MEETING MINUTES OF THE
LONG GROVE ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING - Kildeer-Countryside School
December 15, 2014
7:00 P.M.**

Call to Order: Chairman Lynn Michaelson-Cohn, called the regular meeting of the Long Grove Architectural Commission (AC) to order at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present;

Members Present: Chairman Lynn Michaelson-Cohn, George Tapas, Eric Styer, Eric Closson and Jeanne Sylvester

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

Members Absent: None

1) Approval of the November 10, 2014 Draft Special Meeting Minutes.

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

2) Consideration of a request for signage at Long Grove Commons for “The Grooming Lodge” (formerly “Dog Days Grooming”, Building #6, Suite C in Long Grove Commons, RT. 22 & Old McHenry Road, within the B-2 PUD District, Submitted by Only Signs on behalf of Ms. Patricia Anderson

Planner Hogue explained in February of 2010 the AC approved one (1) sign constructed of PVC with a cream background a green border with red copy and & brown “paw prints” representing the color scheme. This sign was placed on the structure above the archway near the entrance to the structure. Signage was non-illuminated. This signage measured 18” X 96” (or 1.5’ x 8’ for a total of 12 square feet) at this location. Sixteen (16) square feet of signage was allocated at this location. A change in ownership has prompted this request for revised signage.

As originally approved internally illuminated signage was not specifically prohibited with the development however external signage illumination was preferred. However, overtime the AC has received and approved requests for internally illuminated signage within the development.

Petitioners have requested one (1) sign constructed of an acrylic sign face with a green background red copy with a white border representing the color scheme. The sign will be placed on the structure above the archway near the entrance to the structure in approximately the same location as the previously approved sign. Signage is proposed to be LED illuminated. As proposed signage would measure 18” X 105” (or 1.5’ x 8.75’ for a total of 13.1 square feet) at this location. Sixteen (16) square feet of signage was allocated at this location per the PUD approval for Long Grove Commons.

Commissioner Closson asked if there was any relief for the sign. The petitioner indicated there was not. The petitioner then presented illustrations of his proposed signage and other signage within the development.

After discussion the Commission had concerns with the opacity of the sign and the visibility of the lettering and suggested a border around the lettering.

A motion was made by Commissioner Closson, seconded by Commissioner Sylvester to recommend approval of the sign with the opacity of the green back ground increased to better illuminate the lettering and exploration of a white border around the lettering to improve the contrast of the sign; subject to staff review and approval. On a voice vote; all aye.

3) Consideration of a request for signage for “Coldwell Banker” “Building A”; 4192 Route 83; within the Sunset Grove Development, submitted by Identity Sign & Lighting, Inc.

Planner Hogue reviewed the history of the property indicating the property is located on the southeast corner of Route 83 and Aptakistic Road. The property consists of 16 +/- acres of land area. The property is presently zoned HR-1 Commercial District & OS-P with a special use permit for a Planned Unit Development. The Village Board granted final PUD plan & plat approval in November 2008 (Ord. # 2008-O-27).

“Building A” is one of the last two structures to be built in the Sunset Grove Development and received AC review and approval as part of the original PUD approval in 2008. At that time it was noted individual signage requests would be brought back to the Commission as received for further consideration.

Coldwell Banker is the first and “anchor” tenant for “Building A”

The property in question is located at 4192 Route 83 and is located in Building “A” north of and adjacent to the Sunset Food Building in the Sunset Grove Development.

Petitioner is proposing one wall sign on the west facade of “Building A” over the building entrance and in the location approved as the “Designated Zone for Placement of Signage and Graphics”. This is consistent with the final PUD approval.

The size of the proposed signage is as follows;

	<u>Proposed Sq. Footage</u>	<u>Sq. Footage Allowed per PUD Approval</u>
East Elevation:	16.1’ x 1.2’ (18.6 sq. ft.)	46.2 Sq. ft.

The proposed signage is on the west elevation and is within the allowable square footage for such signage as allowed by the PUD approval ordinance.

A sign placard will also be placed on pylon sign on the Route 83 frontage. This sign will be consistent with the other placards on the pylon sign and is permissible at this location.

The signage is proposed to be channel letters with in white acrylic with blue vinyl lettering. The “Coldwell Banker” logo in white & blue will also be incorporated into the sign. Signs are proposed to be illuminated with backlit LED lighting consistent with other illumination within the development.

The AC had one concern with the placement of sign and indicated it should be centered above the doorway.

A motion was made by Commissioner Tapas, seconded by Commissioner Closson, to recommend approval of the signage as submitted subject to the final placement of the sign being centered over the doorway. On a voice vote; all aye.

4) Consideration of a request for signage for “Epilogue”, 130 Old McHenry Road within the B-1 Historic District, submitted by Signs Now.

Planner Hogue indicated the property in question is located on the north side of Old McHenry Road and across the street from “The Tavern” and adjacent to the building formerly occupied by “Wine Splash”.

As submitted the petitioner proposes two signs, a triangular wall sign measuring $3' \times 3' \sqrt{2} = (4.5 \text{ sq. ft.})$ and a hanging sign measuring 36” x 16” (3.9 sq. ft.). Square footage of the commercial space for which the sign is being requested is approximately 1,200 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.

Based upon the total square footage of signage proposed (8.4 square feet +/-), the requested signage is 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 as allocated by floor area.

The wall sign would be mounted to the gable of the front of the building. The hanging sign would be placed on the existing post. The signs as proposed are to be sandblasted foam board with raised lettering in black and white and burgundy color scheme. The signs will use existing illumination sources; no new illumination is proposed.

Commissioner Tapas noted the hanging sign looked “bland” and suggested a border be placed around the sign to add emphasis. He also noted the color scheme of the wall sign tended to blend with the color of the wall and becomes “lost” against the wall. It was suggested a light blue border (similar to the building trim) be added.

The petitioner noted this problematic given the age of the building and need for a “custom fit” for the sign in the triangle.

Commissioner Sylvester suggested considering altering the text of the sign to better highlight the “Epilogue” portion of the wall sign.

Commissioner Closson noted that whatever modifications are chosen they should be consistent on both signs so they match. He too shared the concern with visibility of the proposed signage.

A motion was made by Commissioner Tapas, seconded by Commissioner Sylvester, recommending approval of the sign as submitted with the following considerations;

- Consider adding a border to the hanging sign to add “strength” to the sign;
- Consider adding a border to the wall sign to match; (note: field measurements may be required by the sign maker to ensure the sign fits the space);
- All modifications shall be subject to staff review and approval.

On voice vote; all aye.

5) Consideration of a request for signage (change of copy) for “Clayoven Tandoor” (formerly “Urban Tandoor) , 3970 Rt. 22, Long Grove Commons, Building 8, within the B-2 PUD District, submitted by Sign-A-Rama.

Planner Hogue reviewed the history of the property in question which is located at 3970 Route 22 and is one of two buildings located on the west end of Long Grove Commons Development. The structure was previously occupied by “Eggsperience”, “Rhapsody Café” and more recently the “Urban Tandoor” restaurant. The restaurant has changed ownership necessitating the signage request.

As submitted the petitioner proposes two wall signs measuring 7’ x 2.5’ (17.5 Sq. Ft.). Signage for the commercial space for which the sign is being requested was determined as part of the overall PUD approval process for Long Grove Commons. Building 8 was allocated signage as follows:

- North Elevation – No signage approved
- South Elevation - 1 sign; 6 square feet
- East Elevation - 2 signs; 6 & 18 square feet respectively
- West Elevation - 2 signs; 6 & 18 square feet respectively

Copies of the approved elevations which identify sign placement on building 8 (as well as the square footage allocated to each sign) were provided to the AC for consideration. With the exception of the name change this request is identical to the previously approved “Urban Tandoor” signage request.

The wall signs as proposed will be constructed of plastic letters mounted to the building façade, red and black in color. A temporary sign has been approved and placed on the south side of the structure. The temporary sign mirrors the proposed permanent signage. Permanent signage is proposed to be non-illuminated.

A motion was made by Commissioner Closson, seconded by Commissioner Sylvester, to recommend approval of the change in copy as submitted subject to the final placement of the sign copy being centered over the doorway. On a voice vote; all aye.

6) Consideration of a request for signage for “Clover”, 225 Robert Parker Coffin Road within the B-1 Historic District, submitted by Jing Wu.

Planner Hogue reviewed the request noting the property in question is located in the Mill Pond Development. The space was formerly occupied by “Dandy Things”.

Based upon the items submitted the petitioner is requesting two signs (1) wall sign measuring 27”x 9” (1.68 sq. ft.) and one (1) double faced hanging sign to be placed on the corner of the structure measuring 28”x 9” (1.7 sq. ft.). The sum total of the requested signage is 3.4 square feet. Materials out of which the signs will be constructed are wood with raised wood letters. The signage would be brown with black letters and a green logo regard to the color scheme and is non-illuminated.

Square footage of the commercial space for which the signage is being requested is approximately 680 square feet. For retail spaces containing 501 to 1000 sq. ft. of floor area 12 square feet of signage may be allowed per the Village Zoning Code.

Based upon the total square footage of the leasable commercial space and square footage of the signage proposed (3.4 square feet), the request is within the maximum square footage limitation for the floor area at this location.

Per the village sign regulations one wall sign and one hanging sign are permissible at this location.

There was discussion regarding the types of signs proposed. The AC noted the exhibit presented appeared to show two hanging signs for the structure which would be prohibited. The petitioner indicated one sign would be mounted on the face of the building and the other would hang at the corner of the building.

After discussion the AC had three considerations for the petitioner;

- Consider adding borders to both signs for better visibility;
- Borders should be consistent with both signs;
- Consider mounting the wall sign to an additional piece of wood (backboard) to create a border and add additional relief to sign.

A motion was made by Commissioner Closson, seconded by Commissioner Sylvester to recommend approval of the signage as submitted subject to the condition that the wall sign be mounted to a backboard or frame before being attached to the building with a similar treatment being done on the hanging sign subject to staff review and approval. On a voice vote; all aye.

7) Consideration of exterior elevations for house plans on property at 3998 RFD (Lot 4; The Orchards PUD) submitted by Mr. William Gronow, Castle Creek Homes.

Planner Hogue reports that per the preliminary approval ordinance for The Orchards PUD granted in 2004, all elevations of any residence to be constructed in the development are to be reviewed by the AC.

Elevations for the proposed residence, as well as a materials list, on the aforementioned lot within The Orchards PUD were provided to the AC for consideration in evaluation of the request. This is the fourth residence to be built within the development. Staff finds the structure to be in compliance with the Village Anti-monotony code.

As proposed the structure will be a single story with a hardiboard and & stone façade with asphalt shingles. Elevations for the structure were supplied to the AC. Material samples were presented to the AC by the petitioner at the meeting.

Mr. William Gronow, Castle Creek Homes, representing the petitioner, reviewed the material sample he presented noting a real stone base (not manufactured stone) was proposed for the base of the structure. Hardiboard siding is also proposed with an architectural asphalt shingle. Earth tones will be used for the color scheme.

Mr. Gronow then explained the elevations noting this was a “craftsman style” home. He further noted this was the only ranch style home in the development and that there was no particular architectural style prevalent within the development.

After discussion the AC found the elevations as proposed to be consistent with the Village anti-monotony code.

A motion was made by Commissioner Tapas, seconded by Commissioner Closson, to recommend approval of the elevations (BLR Architects; dated 12.2.14) and materials list as submitted to the Architectural Commission for consideration. On a voice vote; all aye.

8) Consideration of modifications to the approved elevations for Building 1 in the Long Grove Commons PUD for the for the “Primrose School” submitted by Mr. John Finnemore

Planner Hogue explained the history of the Long Grove Commons development noting approval as a Planned Unit Development was received in May of 2005. As part of that approval building elevations were approved by the Architectural Commission including the architectural plans for Building #1. Buildings 1 and Building 2 are the last two buildings left to be constructed in the development. The lots on which these structures are proposed have remained vacant since they were approved/platted in 2005. The approved elevations and structure per the PUD do not meet needs of the petitioner. Modifications to the structure as proposed are similar to those previously approved per the PUD approval and require AC approval.

The Cloverleaf Group, property owner and the Primrose School, contract purchaser, requested reconfiguration of the parking area Lots 6 & 7 (adjacent to buildings 1 & 2) and the modification of the building footprint for Lot 7 (Building 1). This would be done to accommodate the needs of the proposed tenant and contract purchaser (of both Lots 6 & 7) Primrose Schools. This request was approved by the Village Board as a minor PUD amendment at their November 11th 2014 regular meeting.

Changes to Building 1 (as previously approved) to accommodate the needs Primrose School of Long Grove are proposed. As approved this building was an “L” shaped two story building with false second floor. Materials proposed for the building were hardboard and stone siding with asphalt shingles. Petitioners have requested the change due to the needs of their business.

Proposed elevations for the building were submitted for AC consideration. The modified structure will have a smaller footprint with an occupied second floor. The structure will be placed in the same general location as anticipated in the original approval. Parking is proposed to be reconfigured and has been approved as part of the minor amendment to the original PUD approval.

Petitioners are proposing a two story structure similar in nature to the PUD approval. Materials for the proposed structure include; hardboard siding, stone and asphalt shingles, which are similar to those in the original approval. Earth tones are anticipated for the building color scheme. Material samples were presented to the AC for consideration at the meeting.

Chairman Michealson-Cohn explained the goals of the architecture for the development and the similarity to the structures in downtown Long Grove (i.e. the Long Grove style). She noted the style of the structures in Long Grove Commons needs to be consistent throughout the development. She noted the elevations submitted by the petitioner were a good starting point for discussion.

After discussion the AC noted the “monolithic” appearance of the structure in relation to the rest of the development. The AC noted the following concerns;

- Elements of the “Long Grove Style” should be better incorporated into the structure;
- More contrast should be added to the color scheme of the building;
- Elevations should incorporate more of the architectural details found in the existing structures in Long Grove Commons;
- A fencing detail should be provided;
- A final landscaping plan should be provided;
- Revisions to be presented to the AC at the February 9th meeting (11” x 17” format).

A motion was made by Commissioner Closson, seconded by Commissioner Sylvester that the petitioner brings back revised elevations and landscape plans, subject to the discussion of the AC at the December 15th 2014 regular meeting, for further consideration at the February 9th regular meeting. On a voice vote; all aye

OTHER BUSINESS:

- 1) **Memorial Commissioner Howard;** Discussion was held regarding a donation by the AC to the memorial college fund for Commissioner Howards' children. Commissioner Tapas will forward information on to staff for distribution to the Commission. Those interested in participating should have contributions to staff by the February 9th meeting. Staff will then forward these on behalf of the AC to the contact (BMO Harris Bank) per the instructions in Commissioner Howards' obituary.

- 2) **Harbor Chase Elevations;** Planner Hogue noted that a conditional approval was given at the November 11th Village Board meeting for the Harbor Chase project. As a condition of approval, the direction was given to form a small committee to further discuss the proposed Harbor Chase elevations. Two representatives from the AC (along with staff, two Village Board members, the petitioner and their representatives) were anticipated as part of this committee those being the chair and an additional AC member. The meeting will be held on January 7th 2015 in Village Hall at 10:00 AM. Commissioner Closson indicated he was willing and able to attend this meeting on behalf of the AC as well as Chair Michaelson-Cohn .

Adjournment: Commissioner Tapas made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Commissioner Sylvester. On a voice vote; all aye. Meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

James M. Hogue

Village Planner