

**MEETING MINUTES OF THE  
LONG GROVE ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
October 20, 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 7:03 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:** Commissioner Howard

**1) Approval of the August 18, 2014 Draft Regular Meeting Minutes.**

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

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

Planner Hogue stated per the final approval ordinance for the Eastgate Estates PUD granted in 2007, all elevations of any residence to be constructed in the development are to be reviewed by the AC. This structure is proposed on one of the last remaining lots within the development. Per staff review this structure appears in conformance with the Village Anti-Monotony regulations.

Elevations for the structure, including materials and a copy of a portion of the final plat which provides the location of the property in question within the subdivision were presented to the AC for consideration.

As proposed this structure would be a two story structure. The exterior of the structure would be composed of predominantly brick with stone accents and asphalt shingles. The structure would be predominantly tan in color.

After very little discussion a motion was made by Commissioner Styer, seconded by Commissioner Tapas to recommend approval of the elevations as submitted. On a voice vote; all aye.

**3) Consideration of a request for signage for “Galena Canning Company” 217 Robert Parker Coffin Road and within the B-1 Historic District, submitted by Mr. Ken Siwieck, New Midwest Capital.**

Planner Hogue noted the petitioner is requesting signage for the space at 217 Robert Parker Coffin Road. This space was formerly occupied by “Trio Boutique”. This is part of the Mill Pond Development.

Based upon the items submitted the petitioner is requesting one single (1) wall sign, to be affixed to the front (Robert Parker Coffin Road) side of the building and would measure 5' x 4' ( 20 square feet). Materials out of which the sign will be constructed are carved wood with raised lettering. The signage would be principally dark brown with gold lettering. No request for illumination was included with the signage application however existing illumination (up lighting) is in place and anticipated to be utilized by the petitioner for sign illumination.

Square footage of the commercial space for which the signage is being requested is approximately 1090 square feet. For retail spaces containing 1,001 to 3000 sq. ft. of floor area 20 square feet of signage may be allowed per the adopted Village Zoning Code.

Based upon the total square footage of the leasable commercial space and square footage of the signage proposed (20 square feet), the request is at the maximum square footage limitation for the floor area at this location and is approvable from the Village Code perspective.

The AC liked the look of the sign but noted a concern with the transition of the signage into the building and that the sign blends into the building and looks “pasted” on the wall of the structure. The AC suggested a border (possibly white in color) be placed between the edge of the sign and copy to better delineate the sign on the building.

The petitioner was amenable to the suggestion but noted that the sign was based upon the vendors’ label which has no border. The sign design was chosen to reiterate the vendors “logo”.

A motion was made by Commissioner Tapas, seconded by Commissioner Styer, to approve the sign as submitted with the condition that additional delineation/articulation be added around the border of the sign to better delineate the sign copy (per the “Downtown Design Guidelines”) subject to final review and approval by staff. On a voice vote; all aye.

**4) Consideration of the final site plan, landscaping, lighting, signage and elevation plans as part of an application by Harbor Retirement Associates for an amendment to the previously approved Special Use Permit and Planned Unit Development known as the Fairfield Village Planned Unit Development and within the R-2 PUD District to provide for a senior living center with Memory Care and Assisted Living Facilities for the property at 1190 Old McHenry Road, submitted by Harbor Retirement Associates.**

Planner Hogue briefly explained the request noting the history of the development and previous approvals which took place in June of this year. With the exception of a few minor issues final plans as submitted are in “substantial compliance” with the previously approved preliminary plans.

He urged the AC needs to review the revised elevations per their initial comments and concerns as well consider deferring to the recommendations of the Village Arborist with regard to the landscape plan.

The petitioner had submitted additional signage (two signs; double faced) at the entrances of the development. These signs are proposed to be up-lit (specs not submitted). A ground (monument) sign of approximately 84 square feet is contemplated for the site. Location of this sign is on the corner of the berm facing Route 53 & 83 and will be illuminated (specs not submitted) with up-lighting being contemplated. The monument sign is very similar to monument sign for at Sunset Grove (Rt. 83 &

Aptakasic). Signage would be composed of metal lettering mounted to a stone veneer face. Materials appear identical to the stone accents on the façade of the principal structure.

The site plan/plat as submitted by the petitioner has been carefully crafted to work within the constraints of the approved PUD. These constraints have been an impediment to redevelopment of this property. Of note the site plan is more or less consistent with the current configuration of the site and works within the plat constraints of the PUD as well. The temporary location of the cell tower should be consistent on the site plans and plat however.

The petitioners then gave a general overview of the project and specifically the final plans relating to the elevations, landscaping, lighting, signage and the overall plan and plat for the development. They noted the property owner was negotiating with T-mobile regarding relocation of the cell tower in the bank building but the location as depicted on the final plans works best for them. It is also the most consistent with the preliminary approval.

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

### **Elevations:**

The petitioner explained the layout of the building and presented material samples to be used in the construction of the structure. They noted materials would be similar to those used in the Sunset Grove Development and consisted of brick, hardiboard, stone and with an asphalt shingle roof. Mechanical equipment would be placed on the roof of the structure and screened from view. This is consistent with the preliminary approval.

Petitioners indicated they had addressed the “monotony” concerns of the AC by adding dormer features to the east and west sides of the building. This additional feature breaks up the monotony of the structure without reinventing the structure (critical given the site constraints of the PUD) and keeps a symmetrical look to the building.

Petitioners also noted the trash receptacle would be made of brick with wooden gates and located in the recessed area on the west side of the structure (near the delivery entrance) and more or less out of site on the property.

The AC was appreciative of the efforts of the petitioner but noted the monotony issues still remained particularly with regard to the single plane of the roof line. The suggested the following;

- Continuation of the dormer elements along the south elevation of the structure;
- Alteration of the roof lines to break up the single plane of the roof;
- A rendering be presented which illustrates the southeast elevation of the structure (view from 83 & 53).

A motion was made by Commissioner Closson, seconded by Commissioner Styer; to direct the petitioner to resubmit elevations for the proposed structure which continue the dormer elements proposed for the east elevation to the south elevation as well as better articulation of the roof lines of the structure to create a more residential look for the east, west and south elevations with a rendering of that portion of the building for further AC consideration. On a voice vote; all aye.

### **Lighting:**

The AC reviewed the lighting plans as submitted, particularly the photometric plan and noted no light “escaped” from the property, particularly along the west lot line abutting residential uses. The AC found the requested lighting to be in conformance with the lighting standards for the Village. Planner Hogue noted the final lighting plans were consistent with preliminary approval.

A motion was made by Commissioner Tapas, seconded by Commissioner Styer, to recommend approval of the proposed final lighting plan as submitted including fixture style, illumination source (LED) and fixture height (18 feet). On a voice vote; all aye.

### **Landscaping:**

The landscape architect for the project explained the landscape plan noting existing natural vegetation on-site would be preserved to the greatest extent possible. The goal is to enhance the existing landscaping with native perennials and grasses to the greatest extent possible although the native species content had not yet been determined. He also noted there were not many significant trees on-site which would require mitigation.

Berms in the scenic corridor would be kept but re-graded to be more undulating in shape. An asphalt pathway (6'-10') would meander through the berm with the monument sign being located on the berm, specialized plantings would be required to ensure the visibility of the sign and screening of the illumination source. Landscaping along the west property line would be greatly enhanced and screen the existing residences from the proposed structure. A bio-swale would be incorporated along the west property line to help filter runoff from the site and enhance the overall water quality of the existing detention pond in Fairfield Village into which the site would drain. Two additional detention areas (required by LCSMC) are proposed on the north edge for the site.

The AC had no questions regarding the landscape plan. A motion was made by Commissioner Styer, seconded by Commissioner Closson, to accept the landscape plan as submitted, subject to a final landscaping plans being reviewed and approved by the Village Arborist (w/signage, sign illumination, sign landscaping to be resubmitted for AC consideration). On a voice vote; all aye.

### **Signage:**

The petitioner presented final signage information noting that “gateway’ status of the property into the community. A monument sign, similar to the Sunset Grove sign, is contemplated to be located on the berm on the southeast corner of the development along the southern edge of the scenic corridor. The monument sign as proposed is approximately 84 square feet in area. Up-lighting is proposed for the sign however specification on lighting and landscaping around the sign were not presented.

Signage would be composed of metal lettering mounted to a stone veneer face. Materials appear identical to the stone accents on the façade of the principal structure. No signage would be placed on the building.

Smaller secondary (directional) signs would be placed in two locations in the development. These would be located near the ingress/egress points of the development at Rt. 83 & Robert Parker Coffin Road. The directional signage (two signs; double faced) would be painted wood with raised lettering

with a stone base. Materials appear identical to the stone accents on the façade of the principal structure. These signs are proposed to be up-lit (lighting/ lighting landscaping specs not submitted).

A motion was made by Commissioner Tapas, seconded by Commissioner Styer, to accept the signage as presented subject to detailed plans for lighting (cut sheets) and landscaping of lighting being submitted for the monument sign and secondary (directional) signage for further AC review. On a voice vote; all aye.

### **Plan & Plat**

The petitioner presented the final site plan and plat. Staff noted alterations to the existing berms are proposed. These include including pathways (6'-10') and regarding of the berms.

Additionally, the existing cell tower is proposed of be located temporarily to the north and west of the principal structure. This is more or less consistent with the general temporary location for the tower as preliminarily proposed. Staff notes that this location is spelled out in the in the final engineering plans but not the final site plan. Staff suggests this location be consistent on both plans.

The AC found the plan and plat to be well thought out and substantially compliant with the preliminary plans for the development. The AC had noted the temporary cell tower location should be consisted on all site plans to avoid any confusion regarding the temporary location

Commissioner Closson made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Tapas, to accept the preliminary plan and plat as submitted including the temporary location of the cell tower to the north and west of the principal structure. On a voice vote; all aye.

### **OTHER BUSINESS: NONE**

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

Respectfully Submitted,

*James M. Hogue*

Village Planner