

**MEETING MINUTES OF THE
LONG GROVE ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
March 16, 2015
7:00 P.M.**

Appointment of Chairman *pro tem*. Commissioner Closson nominated Commissioner Styer as Chairman pro tem for purposes of this Architectural Commission meeting; seconded by Commissioner Sylvester. On a voice vote, all ayes; no nays.

Call to Order: Chairman Pro-Tem Styer 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: Chairman Pro-Tem Eric Styer, Eric Closson and Jeanne Sylvester and Laura Mikolajczak.

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

Members Absent: Lynn Michaelson-Cohn, George Tapas

1) Approval of the February 9, 2015 Draft Special Meeting Minutes.

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

2) Consideration of a request for railing replacement (front porch) with a composite material for “Cigars & More” 445 Robert Parker Coffin Road and with the B-1 Historic District submitted by Ms. Julie Neuman.

Planner Hogue reported in August of 2014 staff explained a proposed amendment to the Zoning Code which 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 were consistent with the existing exterior of the structure. If modifications were found to be inconsistent with the existing structure or a “major” improvement referral to the AC for review would be required. This is the first such request which may be considered under this amendment.

The purpose of bringing this item to the AC was twofold; 1). To further discuss procedures as they relate to the processing of “minor” modifications, and, 2) have the AC review this request as well.

The AC discussed the replacement material as proposed and noted several concerns with the materials as proposed including;

- The attachment of the material to the structure;
- The look of the smooth glossy finish in relation to the rest of the building;
- The lack of detail regarding (i.e. “a spec sheet”) the proposed material;
- The potential for the yellowing of material over time;

The consensus of the AC was to have staff draft a letter (to be reviewed by the chair) outlining the concerns of the AC to the petitioner and continue this item to the April 20th meeting.

A motion was made by Commissioner Closson, seconded by Commissioner Sylvester to direct staff to draft a letter outlining the concerns of the AC with regard to the replacement materials as proposed by the Commission and to continue this item to the April 20th meeting. On a voice vote all aye.

The AC also discussed procedures related to the amendment to the Zoning Code which would allow minor exterior changes to structures in the historic district subject to administrative review by a subcommittee of the AC. Administrative approval of minor modifications would be allowed if the materials/colors were consistent with the existing exterior of the structure. If not, full AC review (as is now the case) would be required.

Per this discussion the AC directed staff to modify their Rules and Procedures to allow a subcommittee of two (2) AC members (the chair and another member to be selected on a rotating basis) to review requests for “minor” modifications. If consensus on the request cannot be reached by the sub-committee then full AC review will be required.

The AC noted that for this system to work it was imperative that the petitioner submit as much information as possible and in particular manufacturer “spec sheets” on the material. Once a material is approved it would be placed on a running list. Future requests for such replacement could then be handled administratively by staff provided the materials for replacement have been pre-approved.

3) Consideration of a request for signage for “Fidelity Wes Builders,” 203 Robert Parker Coffin Road within the B-1 Historic District, submitted by Mr. Mike Demar.

Planner Hogue noted he had contacted the petitioner per the direction of the AC at the March meeting. Based on that direction the petitioner had submitted modifications which appear to only show the wall sign now mounted to a frame on the front of the building. The hanging sign no longer appears to be part of the request. Twenty (20) square feet of signage is the maximum square footage of signage permissible at this location.

Mr. Mike Demar, Fidelity Wes Builders attempted to clarify the signage proposal. He noted the scale of the sign as proposed worked well for their needs and was very visible at that location.

The AC noticed that an existing “Firehouse Shops” sign was on the building and inquired if that sign could remain. Mr. Demar indicated that sign was made of 3/4” plywood and interfered with the location of the signage as proposed.

The AC raised concerns with the lack of detail with regard to the request for signage and requested a “proof” be submitted which identified the exact nature of the sign (including “integral” and “framework” elements of the sign. They also suggested the petitioner consider scalloping the edges of the sign to soften the appearance of the sign. Given the relatively large size of the sign requested details of how the sign would be mounted to the building. The AC continued this request to the April 20th meeting.

A motion was made by Commissioner Sylvester, seconded by Commissioner Closson to recommend continuation of this request for signage to the April 20th meeting to allow the petitioner time to submit a proof of the sign, subject to the discussion held at this meeting and including; color, copy, integral and non-integral sign elements, location of the sign on the building, techniques to soften the appearance of the sign and specifications for mounting the sign to the building. On a voice vote; all aye.

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

Planner Hogue reported that at the February meeting the AC again discussed this proposal. At that meeting the AC noted concerns with the proposed structure and offered the following suggestions or remedy those concerns as follows;

- *Provide further articulation of the structure to reduce the scale of the structure to provide more of a residential look;*
- *Articulate trim board around the structure;*
- *Project dormers down the north and south side of the building (to break-up window lines);*
- *Revised elevations shall identify building lighting including fixture details and photometrics (if possible).*

Mr. John Finnemore briefly explained the changes noting most were self evident in the revised elevations presented to the AC.

The AC noted the changes as overall improvements to the proposed structure and as addressing the concerns raised regarding the building elevations. In particular the stone base was noted as a substantial change in resolving the “monotony” issue of the structure.

A motion was made by Commissioner Sylvester, seconded by Commissioner Closson to recommend approval of the revised elevations for the Primrose School as prepared by Mark P. Davey, Architect; dated 3.4.2015. On a voice vote; all aye

The AC also reviewed the Photometric plan and fixture detail as submitted by the petitioner. There was a brief discussion of the lighting and in particular the illumination of the cupola on the structure.

A motion was made by Commissioner Closson, seconded by Commissioner Mikolajczak to recommend approval of the lighting plans including fixtures as prepared by RME Engineers Inc, and dated 2.11.2015, subject to the condition that no light source be visible from Old McHenry Road.

On a voice vote; all aye

OTHER BUSINESS: NONE

Adjournment: Commissioner Sylvester made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Commissioner Closson. On a voice vote; all aye. Meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
James M. Hogue

Village Planner