

UNAPPROVED Minutes of the **REGULAR MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD** held on Tuesday, March 18, 2008, in the Public Meeting Room in the Village Hall, One Olde Half Day Road, Lincolnshire, IL

PRESENT: Acting Chairman Hardnock, Members Oler, Gulatee, and Wang

ABSENT: Chairman McCall, Member Grover, Alternate Kennerley and Trustee Liaison Brandt

ALSO PRESENT: Stephen Robles, Planner

CALL TO ORDER: Acting Chairman Hardnock called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

1.0 ROLL CALL

The roll was called by the secretary and **Acting Chairman Hardnock** declared a quorum to be present.

2.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2.1 Approval of the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Architectural Review Board held Tuesday, January 15, 2008.

Mr. Oler moved and **Mr. Gulatee** seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Architectural Review Board held Tuesday, January 15, 2008, as submitted. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

3.0 ITEMS OF GENERAL BUSINESS:

3.1 Consideration and discussion of the site plan, building elevations, building materials and colors, landscape plan, rooftop equipment plan, and site lighting for the proposed four-story, 169,800-square foot, Class-A professional office building, located at 535-555 Aptakisic Road (Lincolnshire Bridge, LLC.)

Stephen Robles, Planner, summarized Staff’s memorandum dated March 14, 2008, and noted that the Petitioner is seeking approval of the design package for the proposed four-story, Class-A professional office building, and that the signage has not been submitted for approval at this time and will be reviewed by the Architectural Review Board at a later date. As presented in the Petitioner’s presentation packet, the 169,800 square foot office building would be located directly west of the existing United Auto Workers Union office building. This proposed use would be consistent with the existing Office/Industrial Zoning District, as well as the Village Comprehensive Land Use Plan recommendation of Office/Research uses. **Planner Robles** pointed out that the proposed site design will orient the four-story office building along the Aptakisic Road frontage. The single-point of vehicular access will be from a new street entrance that will ultimately serve as the southern terminus of Schelter Road. The main entrance drive into the site will be “temporary” until the southern leg of Schelter Road is extended, at which point the driveway will be relocated further north on the site. A total of 680 spaces will be provided which is in compliance with the Off-Street Parking requirements of the Village Code. Based on the proposed building height and the site layout, **Planner Robles** noted that the

southern row of parking stalls is located within the required front yard and the western row of parking is located within the required corner side yard setback which is prohibited by the O/I Zoning District. However, at the March 11, 2008, Zoning Board meeting, the Petitioner received a recommendation for approval of a variation to permit off-street parking as shown within the 50' front and corner side yard setbacks. He also noted that the proposed office building design incorporates a mixture of architectural precast finish and tinted glass for each of the building's four elevations and provides visual interest and articulation to the building facade. The combination of materials and colors creates a modern exterior that is in keeping with the proposed office use and offers a new design character to the area adjacent to the Lincolnshire Business and Corporate Centers. In addition, a rooftop equipment plan have been provided for review, which depicts the proposed E.I.F.S. rooftop screen walls designed to completely obscure the equipment from public view and blend with the building's architectural design. Further, the Petitioner has proposed a comprehensive landscape plan for the site, incorporating a diversity of species and strongly accentuating the building foundation and berming along Aptakisic Road. The Village Forester has reviewed the provided conceptual landscape plan and notes the site is well landscaped and is more than acceptable. With regard to the photometric plan, the Village Engineer has provided three comments for revisions as outlined in the Staff memorandum. **Planner Robles** noted that these revisions should be incorporated prior to any Village Board action. Staff has received a revised photometric plan, which was distributed to the Architectural Review Board members along with this presentation and not yet reviewed by Staff. Albeit one of the items has been addressed, Staff recommends the inclusion of the revisions in their entirety be included within any recommendation. Overall, the design team has proposed an office building with architectural interest and detail, along with a site design that has been fully landscaped in a manner consistent with the adjacent corporate center properties. Therefore, Staff is supportive of the submitted plans including the three recommendations within the Staff memorandum.

Mark Christensen, with Bridge Development Partners, LLC, introduced the design team of Scott Hindsley, Architect, with ArchIdeas, Larry Dziurdzik, Landscape Architect with Allen L. Kracower & Associates, Inc., and contractors, Brian Paul and Steve Miller with Premier Design + Building Group, LLC. **Mr. Christensen** offered the architectural and landscape design presentations to Mr. Hindsley and Mr. Dziurdzik respectively.

Scott Hindsley, AIA, Architect with ArchIdeas, provided a power point presentation of the site design and orientation of the proposed office building as it faces Aptakisic Road. He pointed out the berming along Aptakisic Road, which screens the cars from view, and the massing of the building and its relationship to the berm. The 11.3 acre site is an assemblage of three different parcels located on the north side of Aptakisic Road and west of the UAW facility at 680 Barclay Blvd, and surrounded by farmland to the north and west of the building. Located directly across from the site on the south side of Aptakisic Road is the Aptakisic Creek Corporate Park, another Bridge Development site. The development of these two sites at the corner of Lieder Lane to the south and Schelter Road to the north, warrant a traffic signal as they intersect Aptakisic Road. The introduction of the Schelter Road extension provides access to the site and the building is largely surrounded by parking; although due to its frontal

disposition, it is not set too far back from Aptakistic Road. There is a 50' parking setback on the front and corner side yards and set back 15' at the rear and side yards. The actual building is set back in excess of the required 72'-8" on each street frontage and the 52'-8" required on the side and rear. Stormwater detention encompasses the balance of the site along the north property line. **Mr. Hindsley** noted that the building's presence on the site provides circulation around the building for vehicular traffic with the opportunity for entrance into the building from both the north and south sides. There is a two-story entrance lobby on the north side and a one-story lobby on the south side entry of the building. With the majority of the parking to the north, it was determined that the north entrance would be the main entry to the building. The second floor is approximately a 42,000 square foot footprint with a center opening the two-story lobby below, while the third and fourth floor plans are much the same. **Mr. Hindsley** pointed out that the location of the two areas of restrooms and three stairwells offer flexibility for half-floor tenants, as well. He also noted that the four rooftop units at 10'+ in height and are hidden behind an 11'+ tall screen wall set back 40' from the building edge.

In presenting the south and west building elevations, **Mr. Hindsley** noted the series of white vertical columns expressed on the building facade and serves to add visual interest, which counteracts the horizontal nature of the building. Since the building is 360 feet in length, the white pilaster spaced 15' on center adds counter interest to the design. He pointed out that every other pilaster elevates up to the fourth floor and helps to open the glass line on the fourth floor, which is capped by a 3' projecting cornice line to add a "quasi-prairie" look to the building despite its modern design. **Mr. Hindsley** displayed the building materials, which consisted of a blue/green tinted glass with a clear anodized aluminum mullion system and the precast samples. The goal is to add texture to the building with the use of sandblasted precast with limestone aggregate, along with the spark of the tinted glass. **Mr. Oler** questioned the pilaster material, which **Mr. Hindsley** acknowledged as the precast with the exposed limestone aggregate that reads almost white at some distance. The intention is to stain the precast in contrasting colors to offset the difference values and articulate the facade. He also stated that the north and east elevations are identical to the south and west elevations, as there are no distinguishing characteristics between the north and south facade. In explaining the color contrast of the vertical pilasters and a typical bay elevation, **Mr. Hindsley** noted that the darkest color is at the base of the building and projects out 6" from the medium gray color seen in the vertical columns and the spandrel beams. The darkest gray is also used as part of a transom element as precast above the window and held in several inches, which expands the read of the window opening element so it does not appear as a heavy concrete building with a punched window. To offer a further offset, a canted window sill, also in natural precast, is tilted back slightly so it leads into the window, with the tinted glass inset and framed with a lighter color sill and dark color transom. He noted that the dark color adds some strength and power to the facade, whereas a previously considered muted color scheme did not project the authority required of a building of this style and class. In referencing the vertical white pilasters, **Mr. Hindsley** pointed out that the white pilasters sandwiched by the medium gray precast measure 5' in width and terminates at the base of the fourth floor and turn into 18" as it ascends to the cornice line where it adds terminus to the building. Lastly, he eluded to the loading dock and trash enclosure located on the east side of the building, with a slab-on-grade loading dock

and a precast enclosure for the dumpsters. This is also the area where all incoming services are received. In the elevation drawing of this area, the massing of the columns can be seen as they meet the ground.

Larry Dziurdzik, ASLA, Landscape Architect and Director of Planning and Design, with Allen L. Kracower & Associates, Inc., presented a power point review of the overall site plan with the landscape concept for the project, which he grouped into four components. The undulating berm on the south side of the site along Aptakisic Road begins with its highest point at 6' to 5' at the easternmost end and decreases slightly in height to approximately 4' as it moves toward the west, until it reaches a 3' height at the intersection. The berm will be heavily landscaped with shade, ornamental, and evergreen trees accented with four large planted masses of perennials and will provide screening for the cars parked on site, as well as offer an attractive appearance along Aptakisic Road. The second component of the landscape plan is the interior space comprised of the planted islands, and some of the perimeter plantings. The parking islands will be heavily landscaped with two shade trees each, underplanted with deciduous shrubs and accented with a mixed variety of perennials and flowering grasses, all of which will help cut down on the heat transfer index on the asphalt. The stormwater management area to the north is the third component of the landscape plan with two detention areas, consisting of a pond or wet detention basin to the west and a wetland-type basin to the east, with approximately 6" of water at all times and heavily planted with emergent plants and an extensive plant list. The north side of the property will be a naturalistic area with three different varieties of oak trees, accented with alders, sumac, and grey dogwood trees. The building foundation plantings is the fourth area of the landscape plan. In consideration of the massing where the pilasters fall, aristocrat pear trees, spaced 30' on center in front of the smaller pilaster, have been selected to be planted around the entire building to give it some consistency. Because it is a four-story building, two different plant palates are planned for the north and the south sides due to the light levels and wind characteristics. An evergreen hedge will run continuous around the foundation of the building and dense evergreen plantings, ranging from 8'-6" to 10' in height, will landscape the area of the loading dock, trash enclosure, and the electrical transformer. The south entrance to the building will be accented with magnolia trees, and the north main entrance to the building will be planted with service berry trees, which adapt to the micro-climates created by the height and the location of the building and are similar to the pear trees.

In conclusion of the Petitioner's presentation, **Mr. Hindsley** noted his optimism that the illustration of the architectural design has been thoughtful and orchestrated in such a way to bring some qualities to this development. The building itself has served to ground everything around it and it all leads up to a glassier expression at the front and center of both facades. He expressed his excitement with the proposed overall design and considers it to be a great addition to Lincolnshire.

Mr. Oler questioned the architectural concept of the building and noted that there was a mention of a prairie style and classic columns, but he is still seeking the intended raw message of the building. **Mr. Hindsley** responded that his concept was a contemporary design that felt at home on a flat landscape. He explained that he was trying to balance the building height with its horizontality, and the proposed cornice around the top of the building achieves the purpose in keeping with the flat landscape.

The balance of the design with its columns, pilasters, glass, and the building base are formal elements that help articulate the building. He believes that it is an expressive design on its own and is responsive to the needs of office users by offering large amounts of glass, and a great exposure to the south providing natural lighting. **Mr. Oler** requested clarification as to the contextual fit of the design with Lincolnshire, to which **Mr. Hindsley** responded that it fits well, notwithstanding the fact that it is not brick (and there is a lot of brick in Lincolnshire). He believes that it plays off certain classic themes, as the cornice, columns, and the strength of repetition adds organization that is an undeniable classic design, as well as its natural expression of materials will help to give it a presence in Lincolnshire. **Mr. Oler** noted that he was struggling with the glass and precast and its “fit” in Lincolnshire, as there is a general theme through the use of certain materials. He added that he is trying to shake his paradigm and get comfortable with the building, and he is not able to do so yet. He noted that the design is brutally modern and the prairie-style roof line do not seem to fit together. **Mr. Hindsley** pointed out that there are a variety of different building styles and materials in the Village, such as curtain walls and polished granite, to which **Mr. Oler** stated that we cannot correct the mistakes of the past, and he must look to the future to offer his honest, frank feedback in order to maintain going forward with an architectural place in Lincolnshire. From his point of view, he feels that the proposed design is not fitting in Lincolnshire.

Mr. Gulatee suggested transposing some of the building colors to brick on the columns and spandrels with a less tinted glass. He expressed concern for the way the building stands out among the other building architecture in the area and its contextual place. **Mr. Hindsley** responded that the proposed building would be the leader in the neighborhood as a four-story structure. From a scale standpoint, the best he can do architecturally is try to keep this building’s appearance grounded by emphasizing the horizontal and subtly emphasizing the vertical at the same time in order to avoid a boring architectural expression. With regard to building materials, the design team felt that the proposed color scheme was more visually interesting and projects a strength of character than a warmer color scheme. Also, since the building faces south, a tinted glass must be considered and the type proposed allows a high degree of visible light transmittance. From the glass sample displayed, **Ms. Wang** requested a clarification as to color, to which **Mr. Hindsley** stated that it is a blue-green and it is difficult to present it in a rendering.

Mr. Gulatee concurred with Mr. Oler’s comments regarding building materials and observed that most of the buildings in the Village consist of noble materials, such as brick and cast stone which are more subdued and have a tendency to last longer. He believes that this building is a huge departure from the Lincolnshire architecture. **Acting Chairman Hardnock** noted that it feels like a departure, because during the past year the Architectural Review Board has primarily reviewed commercial properties, which were of a much smaller scale and favored more natural materials. He pointed out that the industrial area to the north of the proposed building have been designed with more metal, glass and the execution of different materials such as EIFS. Due to the overall size of the proposed building, **Mr. Gulatee** expressed concern for its presence; however, he is acceptable of the building’s proportions. **Mr. Hindsley** offered renderings of a building designed and constructed using the blue-green tinted

glass with a slight buff color tint in the aggregate. **Mr. Gulatee** encouraged exploring another material option, as the expression seems to be fine with the transitions from a bigger span to a small span, as well as using the vertical fenestrations provides interest. He suggested using brick as a possible material option. **Acting Chairman Hardnock** expressed concern that the use of brick on such a large building with a lot of detail would compound the complexity of the design. He texturally prefers the proposed design. **Mr. Oler** added that if brick were to replace the proposed building material on the building he would still not like the design, and noted his concerns for the building's "fit" in Lincolnshire. **Mr. Gulatee** noted that brick would dictate larger spandrels. **Acting Chairman Hardnock** agreed that brick would not be the optional building material. **Mr. Hindsley** noted that this is a frame-expression building, and brick would not be the appropriate building material to apply to a frame, and to properly use brick, a punched window design comes into play. The use of brick on a building of this size would project it as a fortress-like structure. **Mr. Oler** questioned the area surrounding the building, to which **Planner Robles** noted that the 2-story UAW building is to the east and its building materials are glass, EIFS, precast, and stonework, and further east of the proposed site are single-family homes which were forced annexed into the Village. To the north of the site is a large industrial building with the standard precast panels with an office in the front of the building.

Planner Robles noted that he received a phone call from **Chairman McCall**, who could be not be present at this meeting and requested clarification on the precast, whether or not it would be stained or colored at the site. **Mr. Hindsley** stated that it is proposed to be stained with a penetrating semi-transparent stain which allows the aggregate to read through. In questioning the stain process, **Chairman McCall** emphasized his preference to have the stain processed, as opposed to the painted coloring. Overall he noted that the layout was fine and it was a decent site. In addition, **Member Wes Grover**, who was also unable to attend, questioned the adequacies of the parking, which does meet the code, and the compliancy of the road width, which has been scrutinized by the Village Engineer and Lake County Department of Transportation. **Mr. Grover** noted his satisfaction with the building and building materials; however, for consideration purposes, the single width door on the east end of the building at the loading dock be increased to a double door to accommodate larger materials/items passing through for loading purposes.

Mr. Gulatee pointed out that because of the interplay of precast and glass, the building at night would look very different. With the light coming from the inside, the building would be an exact opposite expression and the break-up of the pilasters will not be that noticeable, as you will see more of a punched window effect. **Acting Chairman Hardnock** stated that he has no objection to the overall design and the stones give it a little more perceived value and a nice texture, so that it does not appear to be engineered panels and glass. He did express concern for the framing of the windows and suggested a different color, rather than the white or ivory against the glass, in order to avoid the elevations appearing a "little busy" with the various vertical and horizontal elements. **Mr. Hindsley** noted that the windows are framed in a clear anodized finish which gives a silvery read to it. He also noted that consideration was given to a darker mullion color; however, with the glass color selection, the building benefits from the metallic color. He stated that adjustments to the glass and mullions

colors would still work for this design and he is willing to do so. **Ms. Wang** noted her satisfaction with the contemporary and modern design of the building and inquired if there was any exterior flood lighting on the building at night. **Mr. Hindsley** stated that no exterior flood lighting has been proposed at this time. However, there is parking lot lighting, bollard lighting at the front entrances highlighting the walkway, as well as recessed can lighting illuminating the two entrances. He noted that the intent is to keep the lighting soft and subtle.

Mr. Oler inquired if the building was considered “green”, to which **Mr. Hindsley** responded that the building has been oriented on the site in a very positive way through the use of day lighting, the materials would be local, and the selection of glass will also be a factor. **Mr. Dziurdzik** added that some of the ground cover plantings and grasses have been changed to ground tolerant, in order to reduce the amount of irrigation needed.

Mr. Oler reiterated that he was still concerned with how the building “fits”. He stated that it was not an ugly building and he thinks its fine; however, it just does not fit his vision of where he lives. It has nothing to do with the size of the building, but rather it does not fit design wise in the Village. **Mr. Oler** offered to take another look at the proposed site and surrounding area. **Mr. Hindsley** noted that, which “fits”, is contingent on context. In visualizing Aptakistic Road from Milwaukee Avenue to the railroad tracks and using brick material as an example, he pointed out that the proposed building design with brick would stand out as well. With the industrial buildings at the entrance to the business park to the west and retail to the east, as well as the quantity of glass in the retail center at the corner of Milwaukee Avenue and Aptakistic Road, **Mr. Hindsley** noted that the context is widely varied in that area. **Acting Chairman Hardnock** offered for consideration if residential, industrial, and commercial should all be designed the same, to which **Mr. Oler** stated his awareness that everything could never be the same. **Mr. Gulatee** inquired as to the factor of determination to design a building of this size. **Mr. Christensen** noted that they are trying to respond to the site which is determined by the Comprehensive Plan for office development. There seems to be a good strong market in Lincolnshire for full building users and the floor plates of this building would accommodate same. He stated that the design team tried to design a building that was responsive to the market. As the developer, **Mr. Christensen** is extremely pleased with the design, the cornice detail and its effect at the parapet, and the effective use of high-quality precast panels with the staining, which creates a shadowing affect. With regard to earlier comments of brick, he believes that brick buildings are more outstanding in a “downtown” context, as masonry does not lend itself to a multi-story building. He added his willingness to work with any changes **Mr. Hindsley** would consider.

Acting Chairman Hardnock noted that the Board has to give the Petitioner specific direction. **Mr. Oler** stated that he was not ready to vote, and instead was going to take the presentation packet to the site in order to properly visualize and see what the surrounding buildings want as a neighbor. If he had to vote at this time, he stated it would be “no”. **Acting Chairman Hardnock** reiterated that clear direction should be given to the Petitioner in a timely manner to keep the project design ongoing, in order for them to return to a subsequent meeting for a possible recommendation. **Mr. Oler**

expressed concern for setting a precedence, to which there was limited discussion. Once again, **Acting Chairman Hardnock** expressed his satisfaction with the building, with the exception of the glass framing appearing “busy”. He appreciated the detailing throughout the design. He does welcome a different color scheme and the use of some different materials. **Mr. Oler** concurred with Acting Chairman Hardnock’s comments for the interim, but prefers the opportunity to view the site to make a more informed decision. **Mr. Gulatee** asked the Petitioner as to timeframe in developing the site. **Mr. Christensen** responded that they have a limited amount of time with the purchaser, as it is an assemblage of three different properties, with one property on a 60-day extension. He would prefer going through the process sooner, than later, and requested some direction from the Board in order for them to work with Staff to accommodate some of the concerns. Discussion ensued with regard to the Architectural Review Board preferring the opportunity to review the site further versus direction to the Petitioner at this time. **Mr. Christensen** noted the various comments offered from the Architectural Review Board with regard to design issues and the possibility of a design resolve. **Mr. Oler** suggested an interim design review between the Board members and the Petitioner. **Planner Robles** noted that an interim design workshop is atypical for this type of proposal, which is generally reserved for large scale projects and PUD’s. However, if the Architectural Review Board determined a workshop is preferred, that would be up to the decision of the Architectural Review Board.

Following the Petitioner’s presentation of the site plan, building elevations, building materials and colors, landscape plan, rooftop equipment plan, and site lighting for the proposed four-story office building located at 535-555 Aptakasic Road, it was the unanimous consensus of the Architectural Review Board to continue this agenda item until the next regularly scheduled April meeting, along with the potential for an interim workshop with the Petitioner.

4.0 UNFINISHED BUSINESS (None)

5.0 NEW BUSINESS (None)

6.0 CITIZEN COMMENTS (None)

7.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, **Acting Chairman Hardnock** adjourned the meeting at 9:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda S. Jones, Secretary