



VILLAGE OF LINCOLNSHIRE

MINUTES ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING Tuesday, September 19, 2023

Present:

Chair Kennerley

Member McCall

~~Member Santosuosso~~

Alternate Member Malhotra (voted due
absence of a full member)

Member Hefner

Member Orzeske

Trustee-Liaison Raizin (Arrived at 7:09 p.m.)

Planning & Development Manager Zozulya

1.0 ROLL CALL

Chair Kennerley called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m. and Planning & Development Manager (PDM) Zozulya called the Roll.

2.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2.1 Approval of the Minutes of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) Meeting Held on Tuesday, August 15, 2023.

Member Hefner moved and Member Orzeske seconded the motion to approve the minutes as amended for the Tuesday, August 15, 2023, ARB meeting.

AYES: Kennerley, Hefner, McCall, Orzeske, and Malhotra

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Santosuosso

ABSTAIN: None

PDM Zozulya declared the motion carried.

3.0 ITEMS OF GENERAL BUSINESS

3.1 Public Hearing Regarding Sign Variances from Title 12 (Sign Control), Section 12-9-1 (Table 1) of the Lincolnshire Village Code in the Office/Industrial Sign District (500 Tower Parkway – Carl A. Haas Automobile Imports/Newman Haas Racing).

Chair Kennerley opened the public hearing and reviewed the public hearing procedures.

PDM Zozulya provided a staff review for the consideration of variances for signage at 500 Tower Parkway.

PDM Zozulya stated the request is for three variances for an existing ground monument identification sign that was installed in 1986. At the

time of installation, the sign was compliant with all codes but is now legally non-conforming due to the code change in 2011. PDM Zozulya stated the three variances requested are for sign height (6'7" instead of the maximum permitted 6'), width (15'2.5" instead of the maximum permitted 12') and area (100 sq. ft. instead of the maximum permitted 72 sq. ft. allowed). The sign has not been altered since its installation.

Chair Kennerley swore in Attorney Calvin Bernstein, Samuels & Bernstein, representing the petitioner. Attorney Bernstein stated 500 Tower Parkway is home to Carl Haas and the Newman Haas Racing Team.

Attorney Bernstein stated the sign identifies Carl Haas and Newman Haas Racing and has space for up to four tenant's total. The sign allows flexibility for additional signage for companies Carl Haas and Newman Haas distribute for.

Attorney Bernstein explained the property has visibility issues due to vegetation, berms, and the curved road; therefore, the existing sign is needed for adequate branding of the building.

Attorney Bernstein provided responses to the sign variance findings of fact stating the sign plan is consistent with the design criteria of the Sign Code. The sign is on an interior street in the Lincolnshire Corporate Center and highlights who is at the location. There have been no complaints in 35 years and the petitioner asks that the Architectural Review Board recommends approval of the variances to the Village Board.

Chair Kennerley asked Attorney Bernstein if he would like the variance findings of fact entered into the record to which Petitioner Bernstein responded affirmatively.

Chair Kennerley asked if the utility boxes in the renderings belonged to the Newman Haas property.

Attorney Bernstein stated they are on a neighboring property.

Chair Kennerley asked if the grey color of the sign would provide enough visibility at night.

Ken Kolmin, Newman Haas, stated the red Newman Haas logo really pops out against the grey color and the sign has ground lights to illuminate it.

Member Hefner asked about the structural support for the large signage on a single pole.

Attorney Bernstein stated the sign company designed it and the drawings from 1986 specify the details.

Chair Kennerley closed the public hearing.

Member McCall moved and Member Hefner seconded the motion to recommend approval of the sign code variances to the Village Board.

AYES: Kennerley, Hefner, McCall, Orzeske, and Malhotra
NAYS: None
ABSENT: Santosuosso
ABSTAIN: None

PDM Zozulya declared the motion carried.

3.2 Continued Review and Recommendation of Site and Building Design, Signage, Landscaping, Lighting, and Site Amenities for Proposed Office/Warehouse Buildings (15730 Aptakistic Road – Panattoni Development Company Inc.)

PDM Zozulya gave an overview of the proposed petition stating Panattoni was before the ARB in July for a comprehensive review. At that time the ARB provided suggestions and requests for the petitioner to address at a future meeting.

PDM Zozulya listed specific items the ARB Board noted for follow-up which included proposed fountains, outdoor gathering areas, roof material/color, rooftop unit enclosure color, building canopies, ground sign landscaping, site irrigation, EV charging stations, green space opportunities, solar panels, tree root impacts, art installations, traffic studies for a potential need for a traffic signal, and building screening.

Chair Kennerley noted Member Santosuosso provided several written comments to her prior to the meeting which she will review with the petitioner.

Attorney Russell Whitaker, Rosanova & Whitaker, Ltd., representing the petitioner, provided a response to the items of concern from the previous ARB meeting. He stated they updated the detention basins to be wet bottom basins with proposed aerators.

Attorney Whitaker stated they added two additional outdoor patio areas for employees, one on the north side of Building 1 and one on the west side of Building 2. Attorney Whitaker also stated they evaluated additional green space opportunities but felt the parking was necessary and appropriate given the code requirements while keeping below the impervious surface threshold.

Attorney Whitaker addressed screening of the north side of building 2 by providing a drone view rendering from that angle for evaluation.

Kasey Kluxdal, Harris Architects, representing the petitioner, provided details about the proposed roof materials, and explained they revised the materials to a lighter color and more reflective whitewashed river rock to coordinate better with the building colors.

Mr. Kluxdal stated they propose two coordinating selections to match the base colors of the rooftop units per the request from the previous meeting. For the canopies on the south building elevation, Mr. Kluxdal explained they added a similar red canopy to the curtain wall system to coordinate with the other south-facing entries and canopies.

Kathryn Talty, Kathryn Talty Landscape Architecture, representing the petitioner, explained they adjusted the arrangement of landscaping around the base of the proposed ground sign to ensure the lowest profile plants did not obscure the building address text.

Ms. Talty confirmed that Panattoni intends to provide irrigation both along Aptakasic Road and the building foundation. When asked about tree root impacts and asphalt, Ms. Talty explained standard protocol is to root prune trees prior to site work. Ms. Talty provided a full tree preservation plan as part of the landscape set that includes standard tree protection measures.

Attorney Whitaker addressed the concern about view corridors from surrounding office buildings. He noted the selected office buildings are located over 330 yards away from where Building 2 would be situated. Attorney Whitaker stated at that substantial distance and with the buildings being 26 feet tall, he did not think there would be any negative impacts to views or views corridors from the office buildings.

Attorney Whitaker addressed the infrastructure for EV charging stations and stated they would include conduit to allow for EV charging stations to be applied on a move forward basis by tenants. Attorney Whitaker noted that EV charging is more of a tenant improvement rather than a core and shell improvement by the developer.

Attorney Whitaker spoke about the potential for a solar installation stating designing a solar system for the building at this time would likely outweigh the benefits since they do not know the specific electrical needs and layout preferences of future tenants. Attorney Whitaker noted there is an opportunity for tenants to retrofit the buildings with solar panels in the future if desired.

Michael Werthmann, KLOA, representing the petitioner, addressed the ARB's concerns regarding the traffic study.

Mr. Werthmann stated most traffic from the development would likely be traveling eastbound on Route 22 towards the freeway system.

Mr. Werthmann stated IDOT's standard is to have a quarter mile spacing between signalized intersections on strategic regional arterials like Route 22 and multiple access points are available to enter and exit the business park via Millbrook Drive, Schelter Road, and Barclay Boulevard.

Mr. Werthmann said that based on expected traffic impacts, a signal was not likely warranted at Route 22 and Schelter Road, and it would not be approved by IDOT due to the close spacing.

Chair Kennerley asked how the pond levels will be maintained at a nominal 6 feet when the grading plan appears to be the same as previously submitted.

Dan Stevens, SPACECO, representing the petitioner, responded by stating the grading plans for the ponds were not changing and would remain the same from the outlet down. Based on feedback from the

previous ARB meeting, the ponds were redesigned to have a full wet bottom depth of 6 feet, allowing for open water and the addition of aerators or fountains as proposed. Mr. Stevens stated the outlet for the pond is controlled to drain the existing site drainage location as required.

Chair Kennerley asked if renderings or details were provided for the proposed patio areas showing proposed materials like stamped patterns or colors.

Mr. Stevens responded by acknowledging that only a conceptual box was shown without detail. He explained that at the previous meeting, there was discussion about providing a minimum amenity like bench seating in a stamped concrete patio area surrounded by landscaping. While the intent was not to invite the public, this would provide outdoor space for employees that could be accessed internally from the building.

Chair Kennerley asked how they intended to restrict access to the patio space such as having a fence or gate.

Mr. Stevens stated there is no sidewalk access to the patio. The plantings surrounding the patio, the separation from the road, and the lack of access would make the patio sufficiently screened and isolated from public interaction.

Member Orzeske asked if there was a possibility to move the building 2 patio closer to the building.

Ms. Talty explained the siting of the building does not allow for ample green space to comfortably accommodate the patio. The only area that could accommodate the space was next to the truck dock and circulation area. They felt it was better to locate the patio where it would be more isolated and accessible internally from the building rather than across the drive where it could interfere with traffic.

Chair Kennerley asked if the roof structure was designed to support a solar panel installation or if it would need to be reinforced.

Mr. Kluxdal stated it depends on the specific solar system layout, footprint, and equipment. He said there is some structural capacity to carry additional small loads, but the exact design solution would depend on the configuration proposed by tenants for their specific needs and electrical usage. He noted that it would be difficult to give a specific percentage of roof capacity without knowing the details of a proposed solar array.

PDM Zozulya asked if they would consider taking advantage of off-site community solar.

Attorney Whitaker responded that he has experience working on 12 utility-scale solar projects across Illinois, including some located on former coal plant sites. He noted they are working with third-party businesses to offtake the power generated, allowing those businesses

to monetize tax credits and incentives while reducing their operational costs.

Member Orzeske noted some confusion based on the colors used to indicate potential future dock locations. He asked if one location shown in a darker color was proposed to have a dock, which could disrupt the rhythm of the lighter color bands.

Attorney Whitaker clarified that the darker colors indicated staircases and main entry doors, which would not be dock locations. He stated they want flexibility to add docks in other panel locations based on tenant needs.

Mr. Kluxdal added that the intent was not to specify exact dock locations, just to show potential future flexibility consistent with approved colors.

There was further discussion about keeping dock locations within the lighter color bands for consistency and aesthetics.

Attorney Whitaker stated they will add a note to the plans regarding the future dock location.

Chair Kennerley asked about the proposed fence at the top of the detention basin retaining wall for the two areas. Specifically, she asked for the length, height, style, material, and treatment/color of the proposed fence, as no renderings or color samples were provided.

Ms. Talty stated they had not yet specified the fence details but typically propose a 3'-tall black aluminum or steel picket fence. She noted they are also trying to fit trees along the fence line and the intent is to irrigate the turf.

Member McCall asked if there was any way to sign trucks exiting the site to go towards Schelter Road rather than Route 22, as the preferred route.

Mr. Werthmann said they could put up directional signage but noted that most trucks leaving the site would likely be traveling eastbound on Route 22 toward the freeway system. He added that the intersection of Route 22 and Schelter Road operates well currently based on his observations, and there is no reason to expect the development traffic would warrant installing a traffic signal there based on impacts.

Chair Kennerley opened the floor to public comment.

Jamie Godshalk stated he sees a tremendous excess of industrial facilities like the ones being proposed, and that many existing similar facilities appear largely unused. He referenced several nearby facilities on Route 22 and Milwaukee Avenue that have vacant industrial spaces without significant truck activity.

Mr. Godshalk questioned the viability of these types of developments if existing ones seem unsuccessful and suggested the Village look for a

verified business plan to show the proposal is viable and long-lasting, rather than leaving potential tax loss, demolition costs, if it fails.

Mr. Godshalk proposed the possibility of requiring a security bond from developers in case the business closes and leaves residue for the village to handle.

PDM Zozulya noted that the examples Mr. Godshalk gave of vacant buildings are occupied, with one fully leased and the other tenants having negligible truck traffic and stated industrial flex spaces like those referenced have under 1% vacancy in Lincolnshire.

PDM Zozulya stated the subject property is zoned for industrial uses and the Village Board recently reaffirmed this as an appropriate zoning. Panattoni also went through a pre-application review with the Village Board to get initial feedback on the proposal and the ARB is not charged with reviewing the appropriateness of the use, only design elements, and those types of concerns should be raised to the Village Board.

PDM Zozulya encouraged Godshalk to attend future Village Board meetings when this will be discussed as the appropriate forum. She stated she will notify Mr. Godshalk and other concerned individuals of the meeting date once it is known.

Member Orzeske moved, and Member McCall seconded the motion to recommend approval of the petitioner's proposal to the Village Board with a condition to add a note regarding potential truck dock location to the building elevations and to bring a fence proposal to the ARB for review.

AYES: Kennerley, Hefner, McCall, Orzeske, and Malhotra

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Santosuosso

ABSTAIN: None

PDM Zozulya declared the motion carried.

3.3 Approval of a Site Plan and Exterior Building Modifications (475 Bond Street – Setna iO)

PDM Zozulya provided an overview of the proposed exterior building and site modifications for 475 Bond Street.

She said the new paint scheme approved by the ARB is currently being applied. She explained the petitioners identified a need for an additional roll up door on the back of the building, which would require eliminating 31 parking spaces. Minor tree removal and landscaping changes were also part of the request. The petitioners also agreed to replace dead trees in the front parking lot per staff's request.

Janelle Weber, Setna iO, and Megan Coyle, Roll Studio, representing the petitioner, stated they are seeking approval for an additional large roll-up door, like the existing loading docks, to be added to the back of

the building. This would require eliminating 31 parking spaces and reconfiguring pavement and driveway in the back to accommodate a truck turning radius. Three precast wall panels would need to be cut to accommodate the new door.

Chair Kennerley stated the site lacks evergreen trees and encouraged the addition of evergreen species in front of the building.

Ms. Coyle indicated Setna iO is open to planting additional evergreens in the front parking lot.

Member Hefner moved, and Member McCall seconded the motion to approve the petitioner's proposal with a condition for the petitioner to consider additional evergreen trees in the front of the building.

AYES: Kennerley, Hefner, McCall, Orzeske, and Malhotra

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Santosuosso

ABSTAIN: None

PDM Zozulya declared the motion carried.

3.4 Consideration of Roof-Mounted Solar Panels in the Industrial Zoning District (645 Heathrow Drive - Verde Solutions/Glentronics)

PDM Zozulya provided an overview of the petition for 645 Heathrow Drive.

PDM Zozulya stated the petitioner is Verde Solutions on behalf of Glentronics who have been in the building since 2010. The building is 26 feet tall, and the solar installation will be on the northern portion of the roof, taking up 11% of the roof area.

PDM Zozulya stated the process requires ARB review and recommendation, then Village Board review and approval before a building permit can be submitted.

PDM Zozulya stated staff is in favor of the proposal as it meets all requirements, and the building official did not identify any structural concerns after being consulted.

Grace Rasmussen, Verde Solutions, stated Verde Solutions is a solar engineering, procurement, and construction company based in Chicago. They analyzed the client's utility bills and designed a solar array to offset 100% of their annual electricity consumption. The proposed system is a 200 panel on-grid solar array that will cover 11% of the roof area.

Ms. Rasmussen stated the location of the proposed array is on the northern portion of the roof, as shown in photos. Details of the proposed panel type, inverters, disconnects and other electrical equipment were provided.

Member McCall asked if structural reinforcement was needed.

Ms. Rasmussen stated the roof was recently repaired and structural engineers approved additional load capacity.

Member Orzeske asked why a ballasted versus a mechanical system was proposed.

Ms. Rasmussen said they wanted to avoid roof penetration on the new roof.

Alternate Member Malhotra asked what the panel weight was.

Ms. Rasmussen stated that each panel is approximately 30-40 lbs. including the racking system.

Member McCall asked what the lifespan of the panels is. Ms. Rasmussen stated the lifespan is 25 years, but panels are expected to perform longer with gradual degradation.

Member Orzeske asked about the snow load.

Ms. Rasmussen stated production models account for snow and panels are tilted at 10 degrees for snow to slide off.

Alternate Member Malhotra moved and Member Orzeske seconded the motion to recommend approval to the Village Board of the proposed roof-mounted solar panels at 645 Heathrow Drive.

AYES: Kennerley, Hefner, McCall, Orzeske, and Malhotra

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Santosuosso

ABSTAIN: None

PDM Zozulya declared the motion carried.

4.0 UNFINISHED BUSINESS

5.0 NEW BUSINESS

PDM Zozulya notified the ARB of a new eligible reason for remote participation due to unexpected childcare obligations which was recently approved by the Village Board. She explained a form would need to be submitted to staff via email at least two hours before the meeting to qualify to participate remotely for that reason.

6.0 CITIZENS COMMENTS

7.0 ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Shannon Latham, Administrative Assistant, Community & Economic Development.