



APPROVED AS AMENDED

Minutes of the regularly scheduled **ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD** held on Tuesday, September 4, 2018 in the Public Meeting Room of the Village Hall, One Olde Half Day Road, Lincolnshire, IL.

PRESENT: Chairperson Kennerley, Members Baskin, McCall, Tapia and Santosuosso

ABSENT: Trustee-Liaison Hancock and Members Jensen and Orzeske.

ALSO PRESENT: Tonya Zozulya, Economic Development Coordinator and Ben Gilbertson, Assistant Village Manager/Director of Community and Economic Development

CALL TO ORDER: Chairperson Kennerley called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

1.0 ROLL CALL

The roll was called by **Tonya Zozulya, Economic Development Coordinator**. Chairperson Kennerley declared a quorum to be present.

2.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2.1 Approval of the May 31, 2018 Minutes of the Architectural Review Board.

Member Tapia moved and **Member McCall** seconded the motion to approve the minutes as written for the May 31, 2018 Architectural Review Board. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

3.0 ITEMS OF GENERAL BUSINESS

3.1 Consideration and Discussion of a Petition for a Major Amendment to Westgate of Lincolnshire Planned Unit Development (PUD) to Install a Fence on a Berm along Route 22/Half Day Road (Westgate of Lincolnshire Homeowners Association).

Ben Gilbertson, Assistant Village Manager/CED Director summarized the proposal sought by the Westgate Lincolnshire Homeowners Association of a major amendment to the PUD to install a fence along Half Day Road/Route 22, noting the concern the homeowner's association has raised in regards to Stevenson school pedestrian traffic impact on the Westgate residents. The fence as proposed per Westgate Lincolnshire Homeowners association would include:

- Increase in fence height from maximum permitted 6 ft. to 8 ft.
- Placement of the fence on the berm, following the contours of the berm.
- Installation of a board and batten style solid wood fence which does not include post end caps as required by code.



Gordon Grote, Acting VP, Special Projects Westgate Board of Directors addressed the Board noting the student population at Stevenson has increased to more than 4,000 currently. He noted the existing berm at Stevenson Drive and Route 22 is very low; they are dealing with students and parents parking illegally in Westgate during school hours and other functions, cutting across the berm to get to the school. He stated the homeowners association seeks to cut off the flow of pedestrians across the southern edge of the berm by extending the fence approximately 319 feet along the southern boundary perpendicular to Route 22. The fence would be located 5 ft. back from the right-of-way and would be same style as the existing original installed fence. No trees will be removed; some trimming of trees and additional landscaping will be needed. He added the Westgate Homeowners Association has been diligent in maintaining the existing landscaping and berms for the past 25 years and will be equally diligent with the new fence, berm and landscaping along the southern border if the Village approves this amendment.

In response to questioning by **Chairperson Kennerley** about the pedestrian traffic, **Gordon Grote** replied it occurs throughout the day, but with greater traffic before and after school; much from Hotz Road with students parking in those driveways and cutting through the Westgate southern berm to get to school. **Member McCall** asked if they considered a metal fence. **Gordon Grote** replied the association wanted to keep the fence similar with the existing fence. **Bob Barnhill, Westgate Homeowners Association Treasure**, noted the landscaping was planted 25 years ago and has grown into a forest; students like to cut through it as the canopy is high enough to allow pedestrian passage.

Member Baskin noted Westgate has a wonderful green belt around the perimeter but disagreed with the lower plant materials being of any significance to screen the fence as proposed and the “wall effect” of a solid fence. **Member Baskin** asked if they considered a fence that is not so linear and would undulate between the existing trees. **Gordon Grote** disagreed with Member Baskin, saying he felt the Village is asking them to meet a standard no one else along Route 22 has to meet and reiterated they are committed to building a fence and high quality landscaping. **Member Baskin** said the fence is a solution, but not the best solution; this is why the Village has an Architectural Review Board. **Bob Barnhill** addressed the suggestion of an undulating fence; noting they have right-of-way, utility, and setback issues which need to be taken into consideration. In addition, **Bob Barnhill** noted there are height issues with the berm; adding an undulating fence may not look right. **Member Baskin** said he would like to see the fence capture the beauty of the existing trees and keep them as a feature versus putting the fence in front of the trees. He suggested substituting the low juniper bushes with taller species and incorporate an undulating pattern for the fence. **Bob Barnhill** noted they have to deal with salt during winter which is why the plants shown on the plans were selected. In response to the petitioners saying they are considering for a screen, **Member Santosuosso** commented ivy may cause some decay issues with the wood so they should take into consideration.



Member McCall moved the Architectural Review Board to recommend to the Village Board their approval of the proposed fence height, material, and location, as well as landscaping for the Westgate of Lincolnshire Homeowners Association, with the cover letter dated August 30, 2018, subject to staff's recommendation and further subject to the Architectural Review Boards suggestions of an undulating fence between the trees and/or addition of taller landscaping material to complement the existing material that exists with the ultimate desire to soften the fence and make it the right scale along Half Day Road.

Gordon Grote requested clarification on the motion, noting his association has a budget to adhere to for the fence, and asked if they do an undulating fence on the berm which results in a higher fence, would they have to come back to this board for another height variation. **Chairperson Kennerley** stated they are suggesting if the Association can, with staff supervision, look at potentially weaving the fence in between the trees and maybe only on a couple of sections. **Gordon Grote** said they would work with their landscaper and Village staff for alternatives to a straight linear fence. **Chairperson Kennerley** noted this Board is also suggesting some additional plant materials in addition to the day lilies and hydrangea which will be dormant in the winter to supplement. **Cheryl Pratt of Westgate Homeowners Association** came forward; she said their landscaper had concerns about taller type plants growing up into the trees; they also grouped some species together for height and also have to take into consideration roadway salt in winter. **Member Baskin** suggested Red Twig Dogwood as a good contrast against the fence and to maintain a softer visual. **Tonya Zozulya** stated staff will review alternatives to the fence with the homeowners association; it will be reviewed by the Village Board at a hearing for final consideration.

Motion seconded by Member Tapia. Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

3.2 Consideration and Discussion of a Petition for a Major Amendment to Lincolnshire Marketplace Planned Unit Development (PUD) to Permit Front-Lit Illumination for Existing Wall Signs on Culver's Resdaurant Building at 405 Milwaukee Avenue (Culver's of Lincolnshire).

Tonya Zozulya, Economic Development Coordinator, stated Culver's has appeared before this board a few times since 2016. At that time of the initial design and approval, the three existing wall signs were approved to be externally lit with LED lights; photos of which were included in the packet. She stated Culver's indicated to the Village nighttime customer volume is not where it should be. She noted the comments received by Culver's and from customers stated the existing sign at night makes it look like the business is closed; hence the request from Culver's for the major amendment to the Lincolnshire Marketplace PUD. She added staff suggested changing to a backlit sign which is permitted by code, but Culver's indicated this would still not meet their requirements. The Village Board did review this proposal and were favorable in



terms of sign illumination change. **Tonya Zozulya** said she also completed a field review of signs in the immediate area; noting some signs were backlit, some externally and some front lit.

Kevin Weasler, Culver's Lincolnshire addressed the Board, stating when they were going through the approval process for Culver's; they did not think the sign design through very well and he takes the responsibility for those design decisions. Recently one night when he looked up at the sign, he said it appeared to be turned off, giving the impression Culver's was closed. He noted other signs along the Milwaukee Avenue Corridor have numerous internally lit signs. He stated their primary goal is to look open and remain competitive for Lincolnshire. He added the sign company can add the tools to dim the sign if needed and will turn the sign off at the close of business each day. He presented sign pictures which indicated the visual difference between the existing and proposed sign. **Member Tapia** stated he noticed the sign one evening and he thought they were closed; other members were in support of the proposed sign change.

Eric Tapia moved the Architectural Review Board recommends to the Village Board for their approval of the proposed front-lit illumination for three existing wall signs on the north, south and west elevations on the existing Culver's Restaurant building at 405 Milwaukee Avenue, as presented in the packet submitted by Culver's of Lincolnshire, with the cover letter dated August 29, 2018, subject to staff's recommendation all three wall signs be turned off at business close.

Motion seconded by Member McCall. Motion passed unanimously passed by voice vote.

3.3 Continued Consideration and Discussion of Text Amendments to Various Sections to Title 12, Sign Control, of the Lincolnshire Village Code, to revise the Clarify Requirements for Permanent and Temporary Signs (Village of Lincolnshire).

Tonya Zozulya, Economic Development Coordinator addressed the Board, recapped the content neutrality nature of the code; permissible signs will be based upon which zoning district they are located in. She stated in previous meetings with the Architectural Review Board there was agreement signs should be turned off at night when located within 120 ft. of residential dwellings, but there was a request for a dimming standard for signs 120 ft. outside of residential dwellings. On July 19, 2018 staff conducted nighttime field inspections at 15 sign locations using a light meter. The results of these findings are included, the last page of the packet. The information was collected at various distances from the sign; the property line assumed to be at the curb. She stated none of the signs measured exceeded the allowable .5 foot candles at the property line; in fact most were all at 0. Only exception was the Marriott electronic message board along Milwaukee Avenue, which seemed to be dependent upon the background showing at the time of the survey. **Chairperson Kennerley** thanked Village staff for conducting the sign



brightness inventory; reviewing these findings was very helpful. As this dimming issue was the last remaining open item on the proposed sign code, **Chairperson Kennerley** asked if this Board was ready to make a motion.

Member McCall moved, having conducted a public hearing on January 16, 2018 and having held further consideration and discussion on March 20, 2018, May 31, 2018 and September 4, 2018, the Architectural Review Board recommend to the Village Board for their approval of comprehensive Sign Code revisions to Title 12 of the Lincolnshire Village Code regarding permanent and temporary signs, as presented in the draft Sign Ordinance prepared by the Village Attorney; no additional conditions.

Motion Seconded by Member Tapia. Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

3.4 Continued Consideration and Discussion of Single Family Residential Design and Bulk Regulations (Village of Lincolnshire).

Ben Gilbertson, Assistant Village Manager/CED Director presented a brief recap for the Board

- Initially discussed at November 21, 2017 and January 16, 2018 after referral from Village Board.
- Four areas of special consideration including limiting siding materials, minimum code requirement for landscaping, front door orientation, and “lantern effect”.
- Village of Glencoe voluntary guidelines, incentives and historic preservation of certain areas within Glencoe.

Member McCall asked if the Village Attorney has reviewed what has been discussed to date. Staff replied the Village Attorney had not reviewed the items discussed. **Member Baskin** inquired as to what the ARB wanted to achieve and what the community should look like. **Chairperson Kennerley** noted this came from an individual issue but the Architectural Review Board wanted to accomplish some guidelines for new homes and improvements to existing homes for residents and builders to consider. **Member Tapia** commented on the neighborhood character and asked the Board to consider what that character is versus people’s taste and style. **Member Baskin** said this was an opportunity to put a ‘stake in the ground” and do something a little different. **Chairperson Kennerley** said the residents should have some input as to what the character of Lincolnshire is and should become. **Member Tapia** said the Architectural Review Board also needed to consider changing demographics of the Village.

Ben Gilbertson stated the Village is currently re-evaluating the Village branding and logo. **Chairperson Kennerley** said if that is the case, this Board should wait until the “branding” process is completed. **Ben Gilbertson** said there is a consultant under contract who has done previous work on branding with the Village and has revised some of those initial proposals. He further added much of the previous discussion on bulk regulations included potentially



expanding the purview of the Architectural Review Board. **Ben Gilbertson** said if the Architectural Review Board did not want to expand their review authority; whatever guidelines would come from this Board and Zoning Board would be up to staff to interpret and execute those guidelines.

Member Baskin noted recent trends to build smaller homes but recent developments in the Village seemed to go bigger. On the branding issue, **Member Tapia** asked why the Village Board is considering the rebranding. **Chairperson Kennerley** asked about the branding issue, what the look is and what does it represent; how will the residents react to the new branding?

Ben Gilbertson stated in regards to the branding, the Village Board will mainly focus on the actual logo, but will also include discussion about how the Village communicates with the community. **Chairperson Kennerley** noted the Architectural Review Board would want to see the approved logo and branding but also to learn what led the Village Board to reconsider the branding at this time.

Member Santosuosso commented when there is new development and no existing “neighborhood character”, it should be considered as a commercial development and appear before the Architectural Review Board, requiring minimum design requirements with the intent to build neighborhood character. He added that in regards to existing subdivisions and neighborhoods, he was against further regulation but does see the need to further review the tear down issue. **Tonya Zozulya** clarified multi-family projects do appear before the ARB, but single-family, non-PUD subdivisions such as Whytegate are not required to appear before the Architectural Review Board. **Member Santosuosso** said the guidelines could be useful, but did not want them to set precedent.

Chairperson Kennerley requested staff and the branding consultant provide to the Architectural Review Board reasons for the final branding designs; stating this would be very useful for the Architectural Review Board to take into consideration during their deliberation of the bulk regulations.

4.0 UNFINISHED BUSINESS (None)

5.0 NEW BUSINESS (None)

6.0 CITIZEN COMMENTS (None)

7.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, **Chairperson Kennerley** adjourned the meeting at 9:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Carol Lustig
Administrative Assistant, Community & Economic Development Dept.

