

**MEETING MINUTES OF THE  
LONG GROVE ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
April 21, 2014  
7:00 P.M.**

**Call to Order:** Chairman Michaelson-Cohn, called the regular meeting of the Long Grove Architectural Commission (AC) to order at 7:04 p.m. with the following members present;

Members Present: Lynn Michaelson-Cohn, Chairman, George Tapas, Mark Howard, Eric Styer, Eric Closson.

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

Absent: Commissioner's Helen Makaritis & Marietta Calas.

**1. Approval of the March 17, 2014 Draft Meeting Minutes.**

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

**2. Consideration of elevations (continued) for a residence at 1147 Steepleview Drive (Lot 6; Steepleview Estates PUD) submitted by KCD Construction.**

Planner Hogue indicated that at the March 17<sup>th</sup> AC meeting the AC had concerns with aesthetics of the proposed structure. The AC suggested that the landscaping be coordinated with the building design to allow wainscoting to be continued completely around the structure. A blend of materials (brick & stone) around all four sides of the structure was desirable from the architectural and aesthetic perspectives of the structure and carrying this "theme" or "language" around the entire structure should be considered.

Revised elevations (attached) have been submitted which now identify the use of stone on architectural elements of the front façade and brick all the way around the rest of the structure. This is a substantial change from the previous submittal of stone around most of the base of the building. He indicated that as revised the elevations are now consistent with anti-monotony provisions of the Village Code.

The Commission inquired as to the use of stucco on dormer by the garage and the color of this feature. The petitioner responded this would be white to match the trim color. A concern was also raised with regard to balustrades in the rear of the property maintaining a consistent look with the front of the property. A question was raised regarding the stone course around the front doorway. The petitioner responded that feature would be made of cut limestone.

Commissioner Styer noted the differences in the revised elevations and indicated the improvements to the elevations were consistent with previous suggestions of the AC and urged consistency in the materials for the balustrades both front and rear.

A motion was made by Commissioner Styer, seconded by Commissioner Tapas to approve the revised elevations as submitted with the following conditions;

- Technical specifications are submitted regarding the balustrades and columns which demonstrate

consistency in the function, uses and look of these elements on both the front and rear of the structure.

- Final review and approval shall be subject to staff review.

On a voice vote; all aye.

**3. Consideration of elevations for a residence at 5181 Eastgate Lane (Lot 1; Eastgate Estates PUD) submitted by Alba Construction.**

Staff explained the request noting this structure is proposed on one of the last three remaining lots within the development.

As proposed this structure would be a two story structure with a basement. The exterior of the structure would be composed of brick, stone and cedar siding and asphalt shingles. Material samples were provided at the meeting for consideration by the AC.

Planner Hogue further noted this structure **does not** appear to be in conformance with the Village Anti-Monotony regulations and specifically 5-3-11 (B) 3 highlighted below. From the code interpretation perspective and very simply put building materials placed on one elevation need to be carried around to the other 3 elevations of the structure unless used for “emphasis” to architectural feature such as a building projection or wing.

Non-compliance stems from the use of stone on the front elevation only and not the other three elevations. If stone is to be used to window sill height on the front elevation it needs to be carried around to windowsill height on the other 3 elevations. Similarly, the use of brick on the second floor of the front elevation and cedar siding on the second floor of the rear, left and right elevations pose a similar issue; either cedar siding needs to be placed on the front elevation or the brick carried around to the other three elevations.

After review the AC found that the structure did not comply with the Village Anti-monotony regulations. The petitioner explained the rationale for the selection and placement of materials on the structure. The AC noted that materials as chosen were not the issue but those materials needed to be reorganized on the structure to maintain consistency in materials on all four (4) sides of the structure. In short, the “language” of brick & stone and cedar need to be carried around the structure.

A motion was made by Commissioner Tapas seconded by Commissioner Closson to submit revised drawings to the AC for consideration at the next meeting of the AC which detail the anti-monotony regulations being met and that materials be better “blended” on all four sides of the structure. On a voice vote all aye.

Note: Later in the meeting the petitioners indicated to the AC that they were facing a school enrollment deadline for their children and needed to begin construction on this structure as soon as possible. The addition of a month to that timeline caused a hardship for them with their construction schedule to meet that deadline. They were amenable to the changes as suggested by the AC and asked if the approval could be subject to staff review.

The Commission noted the hardship as expressed by the petitioner and made the following amended motion to the request;

Commissioner Tapas made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Closson, to recommend approval of the elevations as submitted subject to revised elevations being submitted for staff review and approval which are consistent with the Village Anti-Monotony code and which better “blend” the use of stone, brick & cedar on all four sides of the structure. On a voice vote, all aye.

The petitioners for the next item, consideration of the elevations at 5184 Eastgate Lane (Lot 3) Eastgate Estates, requested to be the last item to be considered on the agenda and that the AC consider the elevations at 5182 (Lot 9 Eastgate Estates) as item 4. The AC was amenable to this request.

**4. Consideration of elevations for a residence at 5182 Eastgate Lane (Lot 9 ;Eastgate Estates PUD) submitted by Fidelity Wes Builders.**

Planner Hogue explained the request noting this structure is proposed on one of the last three remaining lots within the development.

He noted as proposed this structure would be a two story structure with a basement. The exterior of the structure would be composed of predominantly of brick with stone accents on the front elevation and asphalt shingles. Material samples were provided at the meeting for consideration by the AC.

This structure does appear to be in conformance with the Village Anti-Monotony regulations. Brick is the predominate material on the exterior of the structure and is carried around the structure on all three elevation. The stone accents on the corners of the building are considered more of a design element rather an integral part of the structure as it relates to the anti-monotony code. These accents could be considered at other corners of the structure but are not absolutely required from the anti-monotony perspective.

The AC suggested that the stone accents be placed on the corners of the structure and chimney to maintain consistency in the look of the structure on all four sides. Stone accents in the chimney on the rear of the structure should also be considered.

The AC also raised a concern with the portion of the anti-monotony code dealing with “similarly regulated” structures nothing no detached single family dwelling may be similar to any other detached single family dwelling along a street or cul-de-sac, or within one thousand five hundred feet (1,500') (as measured from lot line to lot line), whichever is more restrictive. They noted many similarities in the look of the structure on Lot 3 (5184) and Lot 9 (5182) and specifically the front entryways and window locations on the front elevation.

The petitioner noted several differences between the two proposed structures (garage orientation & roof lines) and suggested differences in materials on the facades (particularly in light of the recommendations to the 5184 structure) would provide sufficient variation in the structures to reduce the monotony issue.

A motion was made by Commissioner Styer, seconded by Commissioner Tapas, to approve the elevations as submitted with the following conditions;

- Articulate the stone accents found on the corners of the structure in a similar fashion around the entire structure;
- Consider stone accents in the chimney on the rear of the structure;
- Review and approval by staff is allowable and minor alteration in materials to alleviate the “similarly regulated” issue are acceptable, however and structural modifications to the proposed building to resolve this issue would require revised elevations for further AC review and approval.

On a voice vote; all aye

**5. Consideration of elevations for a residence at 5184 Eastgate Lane (Lot 3; Eastgate Estates PUD) submitted by Fidelity Wes Builders.**

Planner Hogue explained the request noting this structure is also proposed on one of the last three remaining lots within the development.

As proposed this structure would be a two story structure with a basement. The exterior of the structure would be composed of predominantly hardy siding on three elevations with a brick façade on the front elevation with stone accents and asphalt shingles. Material samples were provided at the meeting for consideration by the AC.

Planner Hogue further noted this structure **does not** appear to be in conformance with the Village Anti-Monotony regulations and specifically 5-3-11 (B) 3 highlighted below. From the code interpretation perspective and very simply put building materials placed on one elevation need to be carried around to the other 3 elevations of the structure unless used for “emphasis” to architectural feature such as a building projection or wing.

Non-compliance stems from the use of brick & stone on the front elevation only and not the other three elevations which are sided in hardiboard. If brick & stone are to be used on the front elevation it needs to be carried around to the other 3 elevations. Conversely, the use of hardy siding, as proposed on the rear, left and right side elevations could be placed on the front elevation to achieve compliance with the anti-monotony provisions of the Village Code. A combination of materials could be used provided they are designed in a manner which “provide emphasis the structure” such as the use of brick to window sill height on all four elevations and siding above. The use of siding on the “projection” over the garage on the front elevation is permissible per the anti-monotony code.

After review the AC found that the structure did not comply with the Village Anti-monotony regulations. The petitioner explained the rational for the selection and placement of materials on the structure and the budgetary constraints of the project. The AC noted that costly revision need not be done to bring the structure into compliance with the anti-monotony regulations. The AC noted a relatively simple solution would be to include more hardi-board siding on the front façade of the structure redistribute the brick as wainscoting around the base of the structure. This would help to keep costs in-line, bring the structure into conformance with the anti-monotony code and provide a

different style to the structure.

Commissioner Tapas made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Styer, to recommend approval of the elevations as submitted subject to revised elevations being submitted for staff review and approval which are consistent with the Village Anti-Monotony code and which better “blend” the use of brick & hardiboard on all four sides of the structure. On a voice vote, all aye.

**OTHER BUSINESS: NONE**

**Adjournment:** Commissioner Closson made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Commissioner Howard. On a voice vote; all aye. Meeting adjourned at 8:37 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,  
*James M. Hogue*  
James M. Hogue, Village Planner