

**MEETING MINUTES OF THE  
LONG GROVE ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING**

**August 18, 2014**

**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 7:02 p.m. with the following members present;

Members Present; Lynn Michaelson-Cohn, Chairman; George Tapas, Eric Styer and Eric Closson

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

Absent: Commissioner Mark Howard

**1. Approval of the June 16, 2014 Draft 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 approval for a replacement sign for “Apex Autoworks”, (formerly “OBD Tune & Lube”) on property known as 7151 Rt. 83 Unit C, Submitted by Sign for Success on behalf of Jerry Good.**

Planner Hogue explained Mr. Jerry Good has now leased the tenant space in Unit C of the building and is requesting approval of new signage for his business. Existing signage will be removed and replaced with new signage with copy reading “Apex Autoworks”.

A court order in 1986 established parameters for two types of signage on the property. One set of parameters was established for the “center sign” which is located in the front of the building on Route 83. No changes are proposed to this signage except to remove the “OBD” placard from the sign and replace it with a new placard with copy stating Apex Autoworks – Foreign & Domestic Repairs”. The other set of standards was for building or tenant signage. These standards supersede the Village Zoning Code in this instance.

The wall sign is contemplated to be made of formed plastic letters with a red & white color scheme. As proposed the signage will be non-illuminated. A rendering of the proposed location of the signage was presented. As proposed letters are 18” inches high. This is in compliance with the court ordered limited on letter height.

Petitioners further explained the request and presented material & colors samples.

AC discussion of the proposal centered on the visibility of the signage and the attachment of the signage to the structure.

A motion was made by Commissioner Styer, seconded by Commissioner Closson, to approve the request for signage as submitted for “Apex Autoworks” with the mounting of the wall sign to be done per building code requirements subject to staff (building inspection) review. On voice vote, all aye.

**3) Consideration of a request for signage for 4196 Route 83; Building “B” (Peets Coffee –formerly Caribou Coffee) Suite “A, within the Sunset Grove PUD, submitted by Neon Images Inc.**

Planner Hogue explained the property in question is located at 4196 Route 83, Suite A and is located Building “B” of the Sunset Grove Development. This site was formerly occupied by Caribou Coffee. Peets’ Coffee is the new lessee for the space.

Petitioner is proposing three wall signs on the north, east and west facades of “Building B” in the locations approved as the “Designated Zone for Placement of Signage and Graphics”. This is consistent with the final PUD approvals.

<u>Proposed Sq. Footage</u>	<u>Sq. Ft. Allowed per PUD Approval</u>
North Elevation: 4.5’ x 14.33 (64.5 sq. ft)	122.5 Sq. ft.
West Elevation: 4.5’ x 14.33’ (64.5 sq. ft.)	122.5 Sq. ft.
East Elevation: 4.5’ x 14.33’ (64.5 sq. ft.)	178.5 Sq. ft.

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

The signage is proposed to be made of aluminum returns with acrylic letters (faces) with a brown, blue & white color scheme. Letters will be mounted on an aluminum raceway painted to match the wall color. Signs are proposed to be illuminated with LED illumination.

Other signage including the monument placards located on Pylon Signs 1 & 3 as well as refaced on-site directional and menu board signage are also included in the proposal.

All other signage will conform to the same color scheme as the building signage.

The placards located on the pylon signs appear consistent with previous approvals as well as other placards location on the pylon signs.

The AC had concerns with the consistency of colors with all elements of the proposed signage and asked for clarification of colors to ensure consistency with all proposed signage.

A motion was made by Commissioner Tapas, seconded by Commissioner Closson, to approve the request for signage as submitted for “Peets’ Coffee” including placards re-facing of directional and

menu board signage subject to staff review of sign color to clarify and confirm sign color is matching on all proposed signage. On voice vote, all aye.

**4) Consideration of a request for signage for 4194 Route 83; Building “C” (Sherwin Williams) Unit A, within the Sunset Grove PUD, submitted by VanBruggen Signs.**

Staff explained the petitioner is proposing two wall signs on the north and east facades of “Building B” in the locations approved as the “Designated Zone for Placement of Signage and Graphics”. This is consistent with the final PUD approvals. Both signs are identical in terms of square footage.

The size of the proposed signage is as follows;

	<u>Proposed Sq. Footage</u>	<u>Sq. Footage Allowed per PUD Approval</u>
North Elevation:	10.75’ x 3.6’ (37.8 sq. ft.)	33.6 Sq. ft.
East Elevation:	10.75’ x 3.6’ (37.8 sq. ft.)	114.8 Sq. ft.

The proposed signage is on the east elevation is within the allowable square footage for such signage as allowed by the PUD approval ordinance, however the square footage of the signage on the north elevation appears to exceed the maximum allowable square footage by 4.2 square feet.

As no representative for the petitioner was present to explain the proposal or respond to the issues raised by staff, the AC continued this request to the September Meeting.

A motion was made by Commissioner Tapas, seconded by Commissioner Closson, to recommend continuation of the request for signage to the September 15<sup>th</sup> regular AC meeting subject to receipt of additional information regarding the size of the proposed signage on the north elevation of the structure. On voice vote, all aye.

**5) Consideration of a request for hardscape improvements (brick pavers) within the B-1 Historic District submitted by Lori Lyman on behalf of the Long Grove Business and Community Partners Beautification Committee.**

Planner Hogue reported the LGBCP proposes to install brick pavers in various locations within the B-1 Historic District. Two types of bricks are proposed one to be used as sidewalks; the other for street crossings.

The proposed bricks are 4” x 8” in a red blend designed to be compatible with the character of the downtown area. Two types of materials are proposed; a clay paver for walkways (Belgard - “Oxford” and concrete paver for use in roadways as street crossings (Belgard - “Bannockburn Red”). The concrete pavers are proposed in roadways for maintenance reasons.

Overall the AC was supportive of the proposal as submitted but noted concerns with construction of the pavers as it related to the sub-base and accessibility as well as a concern with county acceptance of the proposed concrete pavers in their (i.e. old McHenry Road) right-of-way. They also had concerns

regarding the concrete pavers and whether they were colored or stained concrete. Salt stains and overall fading were concern with this product. The AC had no issues with the clay pavers.

A motion was made by Commissioner Styer, seconded by Commissioner Closson, to recommend approval of the paving materials as submitted subject to the following conditions;

- A spec sheet be submitted to staff regarding the composition of the concrete pavers and their durability particularly with regard to fading & staining;
- Consideration be given to more contrasting colors or a better match between the two types of pavers;
- Information on joint structure and sub-base construction be provided to staff.

On a voice vote; all aye

**6) Consideration of a request for a Special Use Permit and within the R-2 District to provide for a Senior Living Center with Memory Care and Assisted Living Facilities and specifically the signage, landscaping, lighting, site plan and building elevations proposed for the property for property located on the south side of Route 53 between Mardan Drive and Long Grove Road, submitted by the Long Grove Senior Care LLC.**

Planner Hogue briefly explained the request noting the petitioners are seeking a Special Use Permit within the R-2 District with zoning relief requested including parking and floor area to provide for development of the property as a senior living center (“nursing home”) with Memory Care and Assisted Living Facilities on the property. As proposed the facility would contain 100 units. The proposed structure is a two story building with 94,323 sq. ft. of floor area. The facility would be divided into 40 memory care (Alzheimer’s/Dementia Care) units and 60 assisted living units. No reclassification of the property is required or requested as “nursing homes” are considered special uses in the residential districts.

He further noted that at their August 5<sup>th</sup> regular meeting, the PCZBA made the following motion;

To recommend approval of (i) a text amendment to the zoning code authorizing parking and floor area variations for nursing homes operating under a SUP in the R-2 District; (ii) finding all the required standards are met for: (a) the issuance of a SUP for a nursing home consisting of a senior living center with memory care and assisted living facilities, (b) a parking variation, and (c) a floor area variation, all in accordance with the plans submitted for property located on the south side of Route 53 between Mardan Drive and Long Grove Road; and (iii) recommending approval of such SUP and zoning variations subject to the following conditions;

1. The petitioner shall comply with the recommendations of the Village Arborist;
2. Engineering plans shall be approved by the Village Engineer;
3. Access must be from the west side of the of the property to the Long Grove traffic signal creating a four way intersection into the property with intersection improvements to be financed by the petitioner.

This motion was approved by a vote of 3 ayes and 2 nays with one absent.

Mr. Jordan Glazov, representing the petitioners then gave a general overview of the project and specifically the general plan of the site. He noted the orientation of the structure was sensitive to wetlands on the property and sought to protect as many existing perimeter trees as possible. Access had been an issue of much discussion and the right-in right-out was acceptable to IDOT with conditions.

The AC discussed the project one element at a time as follows;

**Elevations:**

Mr. Thad Gleason, Gleason Architects, explained the layout of the building and presented material samples to be used in the construction of the structure. He noted materials used would be principally hardiboard siding (light mist in color), a stone base 24" high around the base of the building (light oak ledge stone proposed) and with an architectural asphalt shingle roof (green/grey in color). Trim would be white in color including doors & windows. A standing seam metal roof would be utilized in limited areas and would be green in color. Mechanical equipment would be contained inside the structure and thereby screened from view.

The building would conform to the 35' height requirement of the R-2 District. Variations of both the parking and floor area requirements have been requested. The building was designed to fit the scale and character of the area.

A trash enclosure will be located toward the rear of the structure near the service entrance as well as a gazebo. Small accessory structures are proposed for the pump house and water treatment building

Staff noted enclosure elevations have not been submitted for the accessory structures and suggested the accessory structures be of a style and materials compatible with the principal structure and character of the development; the petitioner verified this would be the case.

Upon discussion the AC noted materials proposed are consistent all around the structure but suggested more contrast in the building materials. A darker stone for the base around the building was suggested. Also, the singular plain of the structure was noted. It was suggested roof lines be lowered to break up the monotony of this feature.

A motion was made by Commissioner Tapas, seconded by Commissioner Styer, to recommend approval of the elevations as submitted subject to the following conditions;

- A darker stone base be submitted for greater contrast around the base of the building;
- The singular plain of the structure be broken up by lowering roof lines;
- Accessory structures be a style and materials compatible with the principal structure and character of the development;
- All revisions subject to staff review and approval

On voice vote, all aye.

## **Lighting:**

Mr. Thad Gleason, Gleason Architects, explained proposed lighting plan. He noted 19<sup>th</sup> century decorative fixtures would be used with the exception of bollard lighting to be used on the south side of the property.

Staff noted the request is best classified as “Class 2” Lighting per the Village Code. Lighting of this nature requires AC review and approval.

28 fixtures are proposed for site illumination. 21 of the proposed fixtures would be 15.5’ feet in height with a 12’ pole & base and 3.5’ bollard (Sun Valley – Shorewood). These fixtures are identified as (L3, L4 and L4S on the photometric plan) and would utilize 150 watt high pressure sodium, light source. 7 fixtures around the southern portion of the site (identified as “B” on the photometric plan) would consist of 36” high cast aluminum bollard fixture (US Architectural Lighting – BDA6). A 70 watt high pressure sodium light source is proposed. Sodium vapor light sources are not permitted per the “lighting system tests” of the Village Code. The AC may vary these standards for “good cause” however. Source wattage as proposed is acceptable. With the exception of the bollard lighting decorative fixtures are proposed for the site. Fixture height is within the established limitation for lighting.

Photometrics for the site have been submitted along with proposed fixtures for the site. Per this plan light does not escape from the site with the exception of the proposed ingress & egress point along Route 53 on north side of the site.

Staff noted two issues for AC consideration with the lighting 1) fixture style particularly the proposed bollard lighting, and illumination source (sodium vapor).

After discussion the AC had no issues with the proposed lighting layout, bollards and decorative fixtures. Concern was raised with high pressure sodium vapor light source. The AC noted a preference for an LED light source as well as a “warmer” light source.

A motion was made by Commissioner Closson, seconded by Commissioner Styer, to recommend approval of the lighting layout, bollards and decorative fixtures subject to following conditions;

- Petitioner submit a “warmer” light source for the fixtures;
- An LED light source is the preferred light source and shall considered for the proposed lighting fixtures;
- If an LED light source is proven to be not compatible with the proposed fixtures HPS is an acceptable alternative.
- All revisions subject to staff review and approval

On a voice vote; all aye.

## **Landscaping:**

Mr. David Heller, landscape architect for the project, explained the landscape plan noting the site is heavily wooded and existing natural vegetation on-site would be preserved to the greatest extent possible particularly around the perimeter of the site. He noted per the latest landscape plan (finished 8.18.14) and presented to the AC an additional 40 # 2 trees will be preserved on site. Replacement trees will consist of both protected and non-protected species. A natural/ native seed mix is proposed for the perimeter of the structure. Turf grass would only be used near the building.

Staff noted the Village Arborist is presently reviewing the tree preservation /landscape plan for the site. Per the conditional approval of the PCZBA recommendation, “The petitioner shall comply with the recommendations of the Village Arborist”. The AC may wish to ratify the recommendation of the PCZBA with regard to this issue. It is anticipated this review will be completed for the August 26<sup>th</sup> Village Board meeting.

The AC suggested the petitioner consider moving some landscape elements away from the building and closer to the access road around the building. There were two principal reasons for this suggestion; 1) to provide more “natural” views to residents of the structure from both the first and second floor windows; 2) to keep the architectural features of the building from being hidden by the landscaping. The AC was not suggesting less landscaping just reconfiguration of what was proposed.

A motion was made by Commissioner Closson, seconded by Commissioner Tapas to accept the landscape plan as submitted with the following conditions;

- The petitioner investigate reconfiguration of some plantings away for the principal structure and toward the fire lane;
- Natural plantings be used to the greatest extent possible;
- The final landscape plan shall be subject to the review and approval of the village arborist.

On a voice vote; all aye.

## **Signage:**

The petitioners presented preliminary signage information noting the sign will be mounted between 6” x 6” capped decorative posts approximately 7.25’ from the existing grade. 6” metal letters in black will be mounted to a white back panel with a black decorative trim. The copy of the sign may change as the final name of the facility has not yet been determined. Placement of the sign in the “pork chop” is acceptable to IDOT and will be visible to traffic on Route 53. Sight lines will not be disturbed by the placement of the sign.

Staff noted preliminary proposed signage indicates one ground sign (double faced) of approximately 22 square feet (3.5’ x 6.25’) is contemplated for the site. Location is proposed in the “pork chop” identified in the right-in right-out access to the site. Signage will be illuminated by uplighting (3 fixtures per side) of the sign. Fixture specifications for the uplighting have not been submitted; however the illumination source is well landscaped per the submitted landscape plan.

The AC discussed the signage noting a preference for a style of sign which better reflected the architectural elements for the building (such as a stone base instead of wood posts). There was also discussion of the font style for the final copy as well as up lighting specifications.

A motion was made by Commissioner Styer, seconded by Commissioner Closson, to direct the petitioner to resubmit signage plans for AC consideration which reflects more of the style and mass of the principal building and including sign location, final copy/font style, building materials and up lighting placement, screening and fixture specifications being submitted. On a voice vote; all aye.

### **Plan & Plat**

Staff noted the petitioner will comply with the bulk requirement of the R-2 District. Minimum setbacks for the R-2 District will be abided by as well as the maximum height requirement of 35 feet. Relief from the maximum floor area requirement has been requested from the maximum of 13,000 square feet to 94,323 square feet. It should be noted that the 13,000 square foot maximum is the maximum for a single family dwelling on an individual lot. The impervious surface requirement of 40% will be met with approximately 65% of site remaining pervious.

Of the total area of the property approximately 6.9 acres (299,000 square feet) will be disturbed as part of the construction process. Disturbed area will extend into the setback areas on all sides of the property.

Two areas of wetlands exist on the property on the northwest and northeast sides of the property. These are identified as “Wetland A” and “Wetland B” respectively in the wetland report submitted in the application. Location of the wetlands has been a factor in the placement of the structure on the property. “Wetland A” appears to be under the jurisdiction of Lake County (watershed development ordinance would apply). “Wetland A” is a closed, depressional, wetland containing .33 acre of land area, “Wetland B” is a “Water of the United States” (Army Corps wetland) is a low-lying seasonally flood prone wet area which is an isolated closed depressional area as well. This wetland will be buffered and maintained as part of the development plan.

Per the engineering plans submitted “Wetland A” would be essentially eliminated due to re-grading of that area to accommodate the stormwater detention area. As this appears to be a Lake County Wetland Inventory wetlands (as opposed to ADID wetlands) the Lake County Watershed Development Ordinance would to apply to wetland A only.

Access to the site has been a major issue with this proposal. The present “pork chop” configuration was proposed to permit right-in/right out access to the site. Acceleration and deceleration lanes into and out of the site on Rt. 53 are also proposed.

This modification is proposed to ease concerns about access to the site, particularly site lines and left hand turns onto the site from Rt. 53 as well as to mitigate headlight glare onto adjacent residential properties to the north and has been conceptually accepted by IDOT.

The petitioner noted Wetland “B” is under Army Corps of Engineers jurisdiction and may not be disturbed.

Discussion was held with regard to the nature of the detention area, the pork chop access and impact of emergency vehicles on the residences surrounding the site and placement of the trash enclosure in relation to the patio area.

After discussion to AC had no concerns with the plan and plat but concurred with the recommendation of the PCZBA regarding access. Commissioner Tapas made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Styer, to approve the site plan as submitted subject to compliance with condition # 3 as recommended by the PCZBA regarding access to the site. On a voice vote; all aye.

**7) Consideration of a proposal for amendments to Title 5 of the Village Code for the Village of Long Grove, including definitions, modifications in section 5-11-4 and more specifically Section 5-11-4(F)(2) regarding Architectural Commission jurisdiction within the B-1 Historic District within the Village of Long Grove.**

Staff explained the request noting the proposed amendment to the Zoning Code would allow minor exterior changes to structures in the historic district subject to administrative review by staff. Administrative approval of minor modifications would be allowed if the materials/colors are consistent with the existing exterior of the structure. If staff finds the modification to be inconsistent with the existing structure or a “major” improvement referral to the AC for review would be required.

This is similar to the process already in place where, in certain instances, final locations (such as with signs), materials and occasionally elevations, are left to staff for consideration upon AC review.

The goal of this proposed amendment is to allow property owners to make timely and necessary minor repairs to structures quickly while maintaining the character and integrity of the structure thus improving the overall look of the downtown. This action was precipitated by the property maintenance inspections initiated by the Village in the downtown area.

The AC understood and were receptive to the concept, however had concerns with types of materials which would be used for replacement noting differences in quality and appearance of certain products. The concern is that “inappropriate” materials would be administratively approved. If a list of acceptable replaced materials were created and approved the AC had no issues with request and indicated an exact 1 for 1 replacement of materials should not need AC review even though a building permit may be required.

To this end the AC suggested that a subcommittee of two (2) members of the Commission be formed to review requests for replacement materials. Slight modifications to the permit process could be made such as requesting specifications of replacement materials for subcommittee consideration. These would be distributed to the sub-committee for review and approval outside of the normal AC review process and within the normal permit review timelines thereby expediting the permit/AC review process.

Should the sub-committee not concur on the replacement materials or have issues with the proposal referral to the entire AC would then occur.

Materials which receive subcommittee approval would then be placed on a list of “acceptable” materials which could then be administratively approved by staff in subsequent permit applications and requests.

The AC also noted a concern with maintenance upgrades being done in “piecemeal” fashion and suggested a threshold be established (such a percentage of the element to be replaced) where be the entire architectural element must be replaced.

These suggestions will be reported back to the PCZBA at their September 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting.

**OTHER BUSINESS: NONE**

**Adjournment:** Commissioner Closson made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Commissioner Tapas. On a voice vote; all aye. Meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

*James M. Hogue*

James M. Hogue, Village Planner