

APPROVED AS SUBMITTED Minutes of the **REGULAR MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD** held on Tuesday, April 15, 2008, in the Public Meeting Room in the Village Hall, One Olde Half Day Road, Lincolnshire, IL

PRESENT: Acting Chairman Grover, Members Gulatee, Hardnock, Oler, Wang, and alternate Kennerley. Chairman McCall arrived at 7:28 p.m.

ABSENT: Trustee Liaison Brandt

ALSO PRESENT: Steve McNellis, Director and Stephen Robles, Planner

CALL TO ORDER: Acting Chairman Grover called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m.

1.0 ROLL CALL

The roll was called by **Director McNellis** and **Acting Chairman Grover** 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, March 18, 2008.

Mr. Hardnock moved and **Mr. Oler** seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Architectural Review Board held Tuesday, March 18, 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 Aptakistic Road (Lincolnshire Bridge, LLC.).

Stephen Robles, Planner, summarized Staff's memorandum dated April 11, 2008, and noted the design changes that had been made to the building, based upon comments received at the March meeting. There are now two schemes for the ARB review, with subtle changes in precast concrete and glass colors. He further noted that Staff was supportive of both proposed schemes, as presented.

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 contractor, Allen Zucker with Premier Design + Building Group, LLC. **Mr. Christensen** made a short presentation, in which he noted that Bridge had looked at several iterations to arrive at an alternate scheme for the building design.

Scott Hindsley, AIA, Architect with ArchIdeas, provided a power point presentation of the site and building designs. In this presentation, he showed the original scheme, which had more of a gray tone with blue-green glass, and noted the material sample

board for this concept. He believed that some of the colors may have been a little contrasty, so they muted the colors of the pre-cast and altered the color of the glass to more accurately depict the blue-green glass color. He noted that given the adjacent UAW building, as well as the openness of the site, he felt a warmer color scheme may be more appropriate. They have altered the values of the pre-cast to lighten up the color, along with a darker green glass for the alternate scheme. This alternate scheme also has a dark bronze mullion. Bridge feels that the alternate is a little more bland, and that the original design may be more appropriate for Bridge, and more representative of what's current in the market. In his opinion, the main concept for both schemes is a strong structural expression, with overall verticality.

Chairman Grover inquired as to whether the sole change from last time, from a building perspective, was the coloration. **Mr. Hindsley** responded that it was, as from the past comments, he felt the most tangible one was to take a look at an alternate color scheme. **Mr. Gulatee** agreed that color was one of the issues. He believed the main issue, however, was how to place the building in its context. He believes this is standing by itself and not in context with City Park and Sedgebrook. He stated he is having issues with seeing this building on this site, and isn't sure if a simple tonal change would put the building in context. He further wondered if the pre-cast material was the right material for this building. He noted that there are a lot of buildings with brick and spandrel windows in Lincolnshire. He further stated that he didn't know what the right material expression is here, but he has issues with the pre-cast concrete, though he understood that pre-cast does allow value engineering. Finally, he noted that we're building this for a long time and that pre-cast will weather ok, but is it right? **Ms. Kennerley** stated that Mr. Hindsley said that Bridge had looked at other buildings in the area and wondered if they could show the ARB some examples to justify why this fits in our community. **Mr. Hindsley** went through a series of examples in his power point presentation, including Millbrook, 111 Barclay, a building on Knightsbridge, 1 Overlook Point, 4 Overlook Point, Acco, a Bridge multi-tenant building south of Aptakasic, Buffalo Grove buildings and UAW. He discussed his opinion that there really is no context, regarding the immediate neighbors to this site. He further noted that pre-cast gives an opportunity to add depth and character to a wall, and that cost vs. quality is a balancing act. Finally, he noted that he believed that pre-cast is the right material, especially given the fact that it can be stained to an appropriate color.

Mr. Oler asked Mr. Hindsley if, regarding Millbrook, didn't he think that it has a horizontal message, as do all the other examples. Mr. Oler doesn't see a message when he looks at Bridge's building. It doesn't matter to him that it's pre-cast, it's that the other buildings fit and are pleasing, whereas Bridge's design looks brutalistic and imposing. He believes that the design is not good enough for this Village or this street. Finally, he mentioned that he wouldn't notice this building, and that's a problem, as it is "noisy" where the other buildings are not. **Mr. Hindsley** countered that there is more that can be done than simply utilizing a ribbon window, which he felt was not modern, but rather, is "70's style" architecture. **Mr. Gulatee** stated that it's really a question of context, that we're setting a tone and once this building goes in, others will follow its example. **Acting Chairman Grover** stated that he doesn't find this building objectionable. He believes it's something different, that provides verticality, which he likes. He prefers gray, but not opposed to either of the two concepts. He doesn't see

this building being much different, from a scale perspective, than the other examples.

Chairman McCall arrived at 7:28, apologized for being late and noted that he wasn't in attendance at the March meeting, so he may be asking questions that were already answered. He inquired as to whether the panels are flat, have an architectural finish, are painted or textured. **Mr. Hindsley** stated that the panels are semi-sand blasted, stained aggregate, with the stain applied in the field, which shows the natural material. **Chairman McCall** asked if the top of the building is a darker color or is it a shadow, to which Mr. Hindsley replied that the lightest of the three colors on the building is at the top, below the 3' cornice, which adds a visual terminus to the building. **Chairman McCall** asked if the penthouse is made up of EIFS panels. **Mr. Hindsley** stated that they are, and that they originally proposed metal panels, but Staff urged them to use something more textural, in keeping with the finish of the concrete panels. **Director McNellis** noted that most of the rooftop screening on the Village is EIFS, because it is generally the closest match to the building materials in the Business and Corporate centers. **Chairman McCall** asked if Mr. Hindsley could review the window colors. **Mr. Hindsley** stated that there are two different glass color types; the original scheme has blue/green tinted glass and the alternate scheme has a deeper green glass. He noted that the glass takes on a different character, depending on what's going on behind it. He showed examples of some other glass colors on Lincolnshire buildings and other Chicago-area buildings. He further noted that whether its pre-cast, brick or granite, they're all veneers on the building that are applied to express what's going on inside, dimensionally, other than utilizing a long, undistinguished glass ribbon. **Chairman McCall** asked if there are three colors of materials on the building, to which Mr. Hindsley responded affirmatively. He further inquired as to whether or not Mr. Hindsley looked at utilizing only two colors or possibly more than three. **Mr. Hindsley** responded that he didn't want it to be too contrasting, that they studied a variety of colors, and that he felt subtle changes were most appropriate. **Chairman McCall** stated that on the warmer buff-color scheme, that the third color does not have a subtle change.

Ms. Kennerley made a suggestion, based on her belief that what is troubling to some is all of the activity going on with the architecture, including horizontals, verticals, heavy, light, color shades and glass. She suggested that they consider replicating the top floor design on all floors, eliminating the thin columns on either side of the main front entry core of the building. She stated that this would still provide contrast, with a more subdued color that would bring the whole design together. She further stated that she likes the lighter color scheme, darker mullions and the landscaping works well with it. **Mr. Hindsley** stated that he views the columns that Ms. Kennerley suggested removing as a basic building block. **Mr. Gulatee** asked if, in the evolution of the design, they considered other materials, such as all-glass or all-metal, to which Mr. Hindsley responded that they did not, as they tried to complete the building with a delicate balance of design and cost. **Mr. Hardnock** stated that he appreciated the different color efforts that had been made, but that he likes the original color scheme, with the darker mullions. He believes the design is not far off, and generally nice looking. He further noted that while the design is somewhat busy, he feels the darker mullions help blend everything together. **Ms. Wang** stated that she likes the original building design, with the original color. **Mr. Gulatee** asked what the function of the

cornice is, to which Mr. Hindsley responded that it is a visual cap, with a strong horizontal element that adds character. **Alan Zucker**, of Premier Design & Building Group, spoke about the cornice detail and that it will be one continuous piece of pre-cast.

There was a considerable amount of discussion, amongst ARB members, to come to a consensus. **Chairman McCall** noted that the ARB is a recommending body only, and requested a positive motion to approve the design, with stipulations. **Director McNellis** stated that it appeared as though we have five members generally ok with the overall design, but the ARB simply has to decide whether it's the "warm" scheme versus the "cool" and the color of the mullions. **Chairman McCall** informally polled the ARB on the lighting and rooftop equipment screening. There was a general consensus that both were appropriate.

Larry Dziurdzik, ASLA, Landscape Architect and Director of Planning and Design, with Allen L. Kracower & Associates, Inc., noted that he had made a presentation in March regarding the landscaping, and that there had been very few questions at that time. He reiterated that the berm height along Aptakisic would range in height from 6' at the east side to 3' near the new intersection of Schelter Road and Aptakisic, as requested by the Village Board. He further noted that the tree sizes would range from 2.5" in parking islands, to 3.5" along Aptakisic and 4.5" at the building foundation. He also noted that the east detention pond will be wet-bottom with native plantings, as would the west pond. However, the west pond will be more natural in shape. **Director McNellis** noted that the reason the east pond is more "man-made" looking, is because of Lake County SMC requirements, which we are stuck with. **Chairman McCall** inquired as to the species of trees in the foundation planting, to which Mr. Dziurdzik responded that they will be upright Aristocrat Pears in a 10' wide area, and that the trees were lined-up with the pilasters on the building, 30' on center. The general consensus of the ARB was that the landscape looked good.

Chairman McCall inquired as to the ARB's preference on the building color scheme - "cool" vs. "warm"? The ARB was polled informally on their preferences. **Ms. Kennerley** stated that she still wanted to have some of the verticals removed. **Mr. Oler** stated that he was hesitant to vote on major changes, like removing verticals, without seeing such a design rendered. He felt that the ARB should either vote on the current proposal or reject it and have Bridge revise it for next time. **Mark Christensen** requested that there be a vote, either up or down, this evening.

Mr. Grover moved and Mr. Hardnock seconded a motion to approve and recommend to the Village Board for their approval, the site plan, Scheme A.1 of the building elevations, building materials and colors, landscape plan, rooftop equipment plan and site lighting as presented in a presentation packet and sample materials board submitted by Archideas, Allen L. Kracower & Associates, Inc., and Premier Design+Build Group, LLC., dated April 8, 2008, for the Lincolnshire Office Center located at 535-555 Aptakisic Road, subject to the Staff recommendations in a memorandum dated April 11, 2008.

*The motion carried with a roll call vote as follows: 4 Ayes - McCall, Grover,
Hardnock, Wang
2 Nays - Oler, Gulatee*

- 3.2 Consideration and discussion of a Map Amendment in Chapter 14 of the Sign Control Title of the Lincolnshire Village Code pertaining to a modification to the boundaries of the Downtown Development District map, in order to remove the area immediately north of Aptakisic Road, west of Milwaukee Avenue, from the Downtown Development District signage requirements (Village of Lincolnshire).

Stephen Robles, Planner, made a presentation stating that this request was to remove an appendage of the Downtown Development District Sign area boundary for an area that has not developed in a commercial manner, which was the intent of this district. **Mr. Grover** asked why Lincolnshire Commons would be removed from the Downtown District, as it relates to signs. **Planner Robles** stated that Lincolnshire Commons has their own Area of Special Sign Control, separate from the Downtown criteria. **Director McNellis** stated that this is similar to City Park, which was also removed. **Mr. Grover** inquired about the Shell station and whether or not it had signage approved within the Downtown requirements. **Director McNellis** stated that the signage was approved for Shell, but is not consistent with Downtown guidelines. It was simply reviewed as its own sign package, and that Code permits the ARB to vary from the Downtown requirements, which it was decided by the Village was appropriate in that case, as it was a gas station.

Mr. Hardnock moved and Mr. Grover seconded a motion to approve, and recommend to the Village Board for their approval, a map amendment to the Downtown Development Sign District boundary to remove the area immediately north of Aptakisic Road, west of Milwaukee Avenue, from the Downtown Development District, placing these properties under the regulations of the general sign code (Title 12).

The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote

- 3.3 Consideration and discussion of the signage plans 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, made a presentation on the Bridge sign package. He noted that they also requested a 50 sq. ft. sign on the building wall, but that sign regulations prohibit wall signs for multi-tenant office buildings, so it would be premature to review this request at this time, as we don't know if this building will end up with a single tenant or multiple tenants. Staff would recommend that if it does lease to a single tenant, that Bridge return with this request at that time. In summary, Planner Robles stated that Staff supports the ground sign with specific stipulations, but no approval for the wall signage. **Mr. Christensen** did not object to coming back in the future for a wall sign request and stated that he agreed with Staff. **Mr. Hindsley** briefly described the ground sign design, which has letters and fins

that are polished stainless steel, with landscaping that is in conformance with Village standards.

Mr. Hardnock moved and Mr. Grover seconded a motion to approve, and recommend to the Village Board for their approval, a signage request for a monument sign only, as depicted on the plans prepared by Archideas, date stamp received April 8, 2008, for a four-story, 169,800-square foot, Class-A professional office building, to be located at 535-555 Aptakisic Road, subject to the Village approval of a map amendment to the Downtown Development Sign District boundary line which would apply the regulations of the general sign code to this site, and subject to the Staff recommendations in a memorandum dated April 11, 2008.

The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote

- 3.4 Consideration and discussion of the site plan, building elevations, building materials and colors, landscape plan, rooftop equipment plan, and site lighting for the proposed seven-story, 138-room, Aloft Hotel, located at 260 Parkway Drive/CityPark (ECD Company).

Planner Robles made a presentation regarding the proposed aloft hotel; its location on a deck on the detention pond, as well as the shared parking concept, the building materials and Staff recommendations. **Scott Greenberg**, President of ECD Company, made a presentation in which he talked about the context of this hotel building. He stated that this is a unique development in the suburbs, in which they are attempting to provide an urban, walking environment. Along the way, compromises were made. For example, they placed the movie theater a long way from the retail, and they tried to strengthen the linkage between the two, but ended up short. He believes this new development has an opportunity to correct that, and enhance the walkway, which is why so much attention has been given to landscaping that is external to this particular lot. He also stated that the axis between all of the buildings is important. Here, they are trying to stress the axis across City Park, in an east-west fashion, as well as strengthening the axis from the Aptakisic Road entrance, which is even more pronounced now that Lincolnshire Commons has been built. Mr. Greenberg went on to discuss this hotel brand, which is being introduced to Lincolnshire, and that it is a younger, more social brand than a typical hotel. **Mark Hopkins**, architect with HKM Architects & Planners, presented the details of the building, site and landscaping.

Mr. Gulatee asked what kind of hotel is this. **Mr. Greenberg** stated that it is a select service hotel, with no full-service restaurant. It is Starwood-branded, and very social with an upscale feel. Starwood also has W hotels, St. Regis, Westin and others under their brand. There are currently other locations planned, or under construction, for aloft in River North, the South Loop and O'Hare. This is really a boutique hotel for the suburbs, said Mr. Greenberg. **Chairman McCall** inquired as to the price point, to which Mr. Greenberg replied that it would be about \$10-15 more than the Courtyard per night and \$30 less than the Westin per night.

Mark Hopkins continued with his presentation, stating that this hotel building would

complete the “street wall” established by the office building to the east. He also noted that since there is not enough room to meet the landscape requirements on the deck, we need to make creative decisions that make sense. For example, putting greenery on the railings and adding green screens helps to provide the look of green foundation plantings. **Chairman McCall** felt that the green screen worked in concept, but in reality it is a tough sell. He asked how long it would take for the green screen to fill-in, to which Mr. Hopkins responded that they believe it will take three years to fill-in, and they feel it is a good, solid design. **Chairman McCall** asked if there would be lighting on the building, to which Mr. Hopkins responded that there would be limited lighting at the porte cochere and the “swoop” on top of the building, as well as on the water cannons on the lake shore slope. **Mr. Greenberg** noted that aloft hotel has LED strip lighting in their standard design, but not uplighting. The LED lights don’t spread light, but rather, they create a glow and are specific to certain areas. The LED light strips are typically embedded in the wall.

Mr. Hopkins continued on with details regarding the green screens. They have a species of English Ivy that is evergreen year-round, are about 3-4' when planted, and take two years to fill-out, according to their Landscape Architect. He stated that their hardscape elements pick-up on City Park standards, and they are also proposing a series of new crosswalks for connectivity. The proposal for this site also includes 6-12" pieces of dark granite along the bank where the fountain/water cannons are. **Mr. Hopkins** also provided information regarding the light fixtures. He stated that the idea utilized in the rest of City Park is that when you get some place special, while the same colors are utilized for the poles and fixtures, the design changes somewhat. Currently, in City Park, there is no true pedestrian-level lighting, only parking lot lights, so this request at aloft would be something new.

Mr. Hopkins noted that aloft has certain elements that are a required part of their brand. The swoop feature on top of the building is one of them. It is multiple colors on its underneath side and is lit. The design challenge is trying to coordinate the branded features within the context of City Park. He noted that the background of the swoop is a blue-colored EIFS, and the top band of the building is a scored EIFS. **Mr. Greenberg** stated that the challenges are to blend everything in City Park, and also there are the business challenges. Wayfinding late at night is a business challenge that has to be considered. Signs at the top of the building are very important because the hotel is back, away from the street. The matter of repeating the “two-brick type” concept that is throughout City Park is important, as is providing a unique roofline, similar to other buildings in City Park. **Mr. Hopkins** agrees with Staff’s position that the building needs to be four-sided. He also noted that this building utilizes “pilasters” similar to the pilasters on the office building next door and that they have been adjusted so they are 12" projected, rather than the 3" projections originally proposed, that Staff felt were not deep enough. The signage is all white, except the one on the green screen wall, which is also blue and yellow.

Mr. Gulatee stated that he believes they have done quite nicely on the design. He inquired as to whether or not the floors are 8' high, to which Mr. Hopkins responded that they are 10' high. Mr. Gulatee went on to say that he like the materials. He also inquired as to whether a pedestrian bridge could be added between the parking garage

and the hotel, to which Mr. Hopkins responded that they tried this but couldn't reconcile it with the operations of the hotel, and their requirements that everyone needs to enter by the front desk. **Mr. Grover** stated that he believes it would be helpful to move the building further south by about 100', to create a more dramatic water feature. He also feels the entry to the building being skewed and disconnected from the parking deck is a problem. **Mr. Oler** countered that the further back the building is pulled, the farther the pedestrian connection becomes. **Mr. Grover** went on to say that the office building to the east is close to the road and imposing and that a seven-story building would be right on top of the road in this location. He also inquired as to whether or not there is a screen under the deck to prevent anyone from getting caught between the piles at the water level. Further, he stated that the south and west elevations need some work, as there is not much variation in two colored bricks. Finally, he stated that the green screen is a good concept, but he questions if it will work. **Mr. Oler** stated that he believes the building fits into this environment and is architecturally very nice. **Ms. Wang** asked if the colors are more accurate on the perspective drawings rather than the elevations, to which Mr. Hopkins responded affirmatively. **Mr. Oler** added that he believes this is a very creative way of handling the building elevations. He is worried about pedestrian crossings and safety, especially at the ends of the deck, where it meets the street. As for the green screens, he doesn't think they'll work, but a screen is a good idea, as it softens some things. **Mr. Greenberg** responded that he likes the screen idea a lot, but that he would consider making it more a piece of art, like perhaps a "mondrian" piece.

Ms. Kennerley asked what the overall height of the building is proposed as, to which Mr. Hopkins responded that it would be 85', similar in height to Spring Hill Suites hotel. **Chairman McCall** asked if the corner of the building is a dark gray aluminum panel, and why not a lighter color, to which Mr. Hopkins responded that aloft has a standard for this color, that they call "Honda Gray." **Mr. Oler** stated that he likes the darker color there because it helps this building look like three different buildings, breaks the monotony of each side and adds a good tower or anchor. **Chairman McCall** stated that he believes the building needs some accent lighting or uplighting to help it glow. He also noted that he tried a green screen on a project he's working on in Portland, OR and that it doesn't really work, though he believes the idea of an ornamental "grill" is good. **Ms. Kennerley** stated that she wanted to see the lighting more closely match the rest of City Park, to which Mr. Greenberg stated that this is pedestrian level here, so he would want to see something different from the parking lot light design in the rest of City Park. **Mr. Oler** felt that we were all overthinking the lighting and that it is fine. **Mr. Hopkins** stated that they would look for a design that is still angular, but maybe also a little softer. **Director McNellis** noted that in response to concerns voiced earlier, 1) screens underneath the building deck, in the water may block garbage which may prevent water from moving, causing an issue with Lake County SMC, 2) as to the idea of pulling the building back further, we may have issues with the Fire District, as they would like the ability to fight a fire not only from the deck, but also from Parkway Drive. **Mr. Oler** reiterated his earlier statement that he believes the building location and elevations, as presented, are fine. **Mr. Gulatee** inquired if the A/C units in each window could have perforated panels in front to cover them and provide a more finished look, to which Mr. Hopkins stated that the louvers proposed as covers would not look as harsh as they appear in the rendering.

Mr. Greenberg noted that he had heard a lot of good ideas here tonight, and he is trying to respect brand issues, as well as Village concerns. He felt as though there was a general good feeling about the design. He noted that this is the culmination of six to eight months of working together with Staff so he respectfully requests that a decision be made tonight on these requests. **Director McNellis** noted that there are six Staff requests in the Staff memo, not all of which necessarily apply anymore, however, all have been discussed, and they are a good basis for forming a recommendation. **Planner Robles** also noted that the only lighting currently being proposed on the building is that on the swoop and at the porte cochere. He further noted that if Mr. Greenberg wanted LED light strips on the building, he would have to return to the ARB with such a request. **Mr. Greenberg** stated that he would add the lighting request for LED strip lights at a later date, as it was not shown in the packet. **Mr. Grover** noted that he still believes that the south and elevations need more work before we should consider approving them. **Director McNellis** also noted that Staff had concern that the first floor of the south elevation and the entire west elevation were a little too blank. However, there was a consensus of the ARB that no additional work was needed on the elevations.

Mr. Oler moved and Mr. Gulatee seconded a motion to approve and recommend to the Village Board for their approval, the site plan, building elevations, building materials and colors, landscape plans, rooftop equipment plan, and site lighting as presented in a presentation packet and sample materials board submitted by HKM Architects + Planners, dated April 15, 2008 and date stamp received April 9, 2008, for the Aloft Hotel located at 260 Parkway Drive (CityPark Lincolnshire), subject to Staff recommended item Numbers 4 and 5 regarding the addition of planting containers and the further review of shoreline plantings, and further subject to:

1. Substitute the proposed green screens with more of an architectural or ornamental design to create an artistic screen wall, that doesn't necessarily require planting, in these areas.

2. The proposed light pole design shall blend and be more compatible with the lighting used in the parking lots of CityPark.

*The motion carried with a roll call vote as follows: 5 Ayes - McCall, Hardnock, Oler, Gulatee, Wang
1 Nay - Grover*

- 3.5 Consideration and discussion of a comprehensive sign package for the Aloft Hotel, amending Ordinance No. 04-1936-52, an Area of Special Sign Control designation for CityPark Lincolnshire (ECD Company).

Chairman McCall noted his belief that the Village's General Sign Code is not what applies here, to which Planner Robles responded that we would be utilizing the City Park Area of Special Sign Control, and that the developer wishes to amend that Area of Special Sign Control to allow the signs as proposed. **Director McNellis** stated that Staff's position is that three of the four signs are ok, it's the large first-floor sign on

the north elevation that Staff feels is generally too large. **Mr. Greenberg** stated that he would be willing to work with Staff to get this to a more acceptable size.

Mr. Oler moved and Mr. Grover seconded a motion to approve, and recommend to the Village Board for their approval, an amendment to the existing Area of Special Sign Control for signage at the Aloft Hotel as presented in a presentation packet submitted by HKM Architects + Planners, Inc., dated April 15, 2008 and received stamp dated April 9, 2008, for the property located at 260 Parkway Drive (CityPark Lincolnshire), subject to:

- 1. Reduce the north elevation "at-grade" wall sign to an area no greater than 174 square feet.*

The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

4.0 UNFINISHED BUSINESS (None)

5.0 NEW BUSINESS (None)

6.0 CITIZEN COMMENTS (None)

7.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, **Chairman McCall** adjourned the meeting at 11:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve McNellis, Secretary