

**APPROVED AS SUBMITTED** Minutes of the **REGULAR MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD** held on Tuesday, June 17, 2008, in the Public Meeting Room in the Village Hall, One Olde Half Day Road, Lincolnshire, IL

**PRESENT:** Chairman McCall, Members Grover, Hardnock, Gulatee, Oler, and Wang, Alternate Kennerley, and Trustee Liaison Brandt

**ABSENT:** None

**ALSO PRESENT:** Stephen Robles, Planner, and Tonya Zozulya, Planner

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman McCall called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

### **1.0 ROLL CALL**

The roll was called by the secretary and **Chairman McCall** 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, May 20, 2008.

**Mr. Grover** moved and **Mr. Hardnock** seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Architectural Review Board held Tuesday, May 20, 2008, as submitted. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

2.2 Approval of the Minutes of the Joint Special Committee of the Whole/Special Meeting of the Architectural Review Board held Thursday, April 17, 2008.

**Mr. Oler** moved and **Mr. Hardnock** seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the Joint Special Committee of the Whole/Special Meeting of the Architectural Review Board held Tuesday, April 17, 2008, as submitted. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

### **3.0 ITEMS OF GENERAL BUSINESS:**

3.1 Consideration and discussion regarding a proposed ground-mounted sign with a related landscape plan for the existing Bank of America building, located at 195 Milwaukee Avenue (Sign Productions, Inc./Bank of America).

**Tonya Zozulya, Planner**, summarized Staff's memorandum dated June 13, 2008, and noted that the Petitioner is requesting a monument sign for the existing Bank of America building. This would be a new addition to the bank site, which has never contained a monument sign before, and the property owner is entitled to a monument sign per Code. The proposed sign would be located near the intersection of Milwaukee Avenue and Olde Half Day Road, within existing easements, along the Olde Half Day Road frontage, and positioned perpendicular to the Olde Half Day Road frontage in such a way as to maximize its visibility. Given the number of several existing public utility easements and obstructions near the intersection, Staff is recommending that the Petitioner be required to sign an Easement Agreement with

the Village and contact all applicable utility providers as a condition of sign approval and prior to the issuance of a building permit. Since the property is located in the Downtown Development District Area of Special Sign Control, it is subject to special sign regulations. The sign materials consist of a stone base, a brick sign face, and a metal cap. The proposed sign surface area measures 15.6 square feet and would display "Bank of America" in blue metal lettering, along with the bank's red and blue logo. Although our Code requires white letters, it also states that there must be consistency between the ground-mounted sign lettering and the accompanying wall signs. The existing wall signs on the bank building are blue, and the proposed sign logo matches the existing logo colors on the building. The total height of the proposed sign is 6 feet, and although Staff has suggested to the Petitioner that the sign base be reduced to make the sign more proportionate, we believe that the base height would be softened by the landscaping. The Village Forester has reviewed the proposed landscape plan provided by the Petitioner and found it to be acceptable. Also, the sign would be externally illuminated with floodlights. **Planner Zozulya** noted that, in Staff's review of the proposed sign, it meets all sign regulation standards regarding sign location, content, height, length, area, as well as illumination and landscaping. Albeit the designed sign, with the exception of the sign cap, is compatible with the existing bank building design, which primarily consists of brick and stone materials, Staff is concerned with the aluminum material of the sign cap and the matching horizontal element underneath it. Staff suggested that the Petitioner revise the cap and horizontal element metal material to stone material in order to reflect the Village Code's requirement for natural materials. Further, Staff has suggested that the approximately 2' tall sign base, including the horizontal element above it, be reduced in height by at least 6", to make the overall sign structure more proportional and harmonious with the building base and the stone horizontal element immediately above that base. However, the Petitioner would like to maintain the aluminum material and the current base height due to their desire to replicate the look of the bank building with a metal roof and a sizeable base. The Petitioner will provide sign cap material samples and answer any questions.

**Darin Grice, Project Manager**, with Sign Productions, Inc., and on behalf of the Petitioner, addressed the material concern of the proposed sign cap and inquired if there was a design preference for same. **Planner Zozulya** noted that the sign cap design is optional, as long as it is a natural material per Code. **Chairman McCall** offered that the Petitioner should revise the material of the aluminum sign cap to a stone cap in the same design, to which **Mr. Grice** responded affirmatively. **Ms. Kennerley** pointed out that the landscape plan for the proposed sign favors the warmer seasons and consideration should be given to the addition of year-round plantings in order to properly screen the sign base, to which **Mr. Grice** affirmed. **Mr. Oler** noted that the height of the sign base should match the height of the building base. **Mr. Grice** pointed out that the proposed height of the sign base replicates the visual impact of the bank building base, and is scaled accordingly. Therefore, the Zoning Board concluded that, since it was not included within Staff's recommendation, the sign base would not be an issue with proper landscaping. **Mr. Grover** inquired if the ground illumination would be positioned in such a manner to

avoid bleeding outside of the sign masonry area, to which **Mr. Grice** stated that it was the intent to do so.

Given the easements and utilities within the bank building site, **Mr. Gulatee** expressed concern for the final determination of the proposed sign location. **Mr. Grice** noted that the sign location will be based upon J.U.L.I.E.'s utilities locations, and they anticipate missing any utilities and entering into an easement agreement with the Village per Staff's recommendations.

**Trustee Liaison Brandt** noted the Village Board's concurrence with year-round landscaping for the sign base. She also cautioned the Petitioner, with regard to sign location and required setbacks, of the potential widening of the intersection of Milwaukee Avenue and Rte. 45, and any affect it may have on the Olde Half Day Road area, as well.

*Mr. Grover moved and Mr. Hardnock seconded a motion to approve and recommend to the Village Board approval of the proposed ground-mounted identification sign with a related landscape plan for the existing Bank of America building, located at 195 Milwaukee Avenue, as depicted in the Presentation Packet submitted by Sign Productions, Inc., date stamp received June 4, 2008, and further subject to:*

- 1. Revise the material of the aluminum sign cap to a stone cap in the same design.*
- 2. Place the ground illumination in such a way as to avoid any light spillover beyond the sign face.*
- 3. Revise the landscape plan to include year-round plant species.*

*The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.*

- 3.2 **Public Hearing** regarding variations to Section 12-14-3, titled Building Mounted Identification, of the Downtown Development District Sign Chapter of the Lincolnshire Village Code for the installation of a wall mounted sign for Camping World, located at 2 Marriott Drive (Priority Sign, Inc.).

**Chairman McCall** recessed the Architectural Review Board meeting and opened the Public Hearing.

**Stephen Robles, Planner**, summarized Staff's memorandum dated June 13, 2008, and noted that, the property owner's proposed wall sign at the southwest corner of the building, along the Milwaukee Avenue frontage, exceeds the permitted height, length, area, and lighting permitted by the Downtown Development District Sign Ordinance. A table has been included in the Staff memorandum comparing the proposed wall sign dimensions to the Downtown District Sign Ordinance and the General Sign Regulations. Also, the reason for the number of variations requested is a result of a misinterpretation of the Sign Code by the Petitioner who believed the General Sign Regulations applied to the site, and not the Downtown District sign code regulations. Based on the misinterpretation and without building permit approval, the proposed wall sign was fabricated. An additional Staff concern with

the wall sign was the proposed internal illumination, as the lighting component will be located inside the letter set. However, when the wall sign is illuminated, only a reverse halo-lit effect will result. Staff does not object to the use of halo illumination, since this lighting effect has been consistently used throughout the Village and the Downtown Sign District. To provide consistency with Camping World's corporate color scheme, the night illumination will be blue. Although there are not restrictions on lighting color used for wall signs in the Downtown Development District, the Architectural Review Board should also consider the proposed lighting color, as it will be visible from Milwaukee Avenue. **Planner Robles** further noted that, while Staff understands how the misinterpretation of the Sign Code occurred, we cannot use this as offering our support for the granting of a variance, especially considering the fact that the permit process was not followed prior to sign fabrication. Therefore, based on the reasons outlined in the Petitioner's Letter of Request, Staff cannot determine that a hardship exists in complying with the Downtown Development District Sign Ordinance, and does not recommend approval of the requested variations for the installation of the proposed wall sign.

**Chairman McCall** noted that according to the proposed size of the sign, the area appears to be more than doubled to the Downtown Sign District code requirements as shown in the table illustration. **Planner Robles** explained that the General Sign Regulations allow for 10% of the area of the front facade to be used in determining sign area, etc., which were mistakenly used by the Petitioner. **Mr. Oler** inquired as to the boundary proximity of the Downtown Development Sign District, to which **Planner Robles** stated that Aptakisic Road is the southern boundary, and both CityPark and Lincolnshire Commons are PUDs and have their own Area of Special Sign Control. **Mr. Oler** added that, albeit the proposed wall sign is not according to the Downtown Sign District code, it would appear satisfactory as 10% of the area of the front facade, given the overall size of the building.

**Bill Kreutz**, Project Coordinator, with Priority Sign Inc., Sheboygan, WI, admitted his misinterpretation of the Village sign codes applicable to this site. He noted that the sign fabrication was based on the location, size, and color of the building, as well as consideration was given to the blue corporate color of Camping World. He explained that the aluminum face, reverse-lit, halo effect lettering with a subtle blue effect, will appear white during the daytime, and not have an impact. He displayed an illuminated letter showing the subtle blue color which will emit only during the night time hours. **Mr. Kreutz** noted that the halo effect is dependent upon the distance that the letter is placed from the wall, and it is generally placed 1/2" from the wall which would emit only a subtle blue halo effect. With regard to any possible bleed-through on the face, he added that the face is aluminum and there would be no light bleed through. The logo mountain scene on the sign would also be back-lit.

**Marcus Lemonis**, Owner of Camping World, noted that he moved to Lincolnshire and started his business as an RV outdoor retailer approximately five years ago, and had been previously located in the corporate building of CityPark. Due to the acquisition and consolidation of several other businesses, it necessitated his move

into a larger facility. He purchased the building at 2 Marriott Drive and has since invested over \$4 million for improvements. He noted that they have approximately 100 employees. Since he has been a resident of Lincolnshire for the past eight years, he was very cognizant of the design elements and the requirements of Lincolnshire, and chose to stay in the “neighborhood”. **Mr. Lemonis** noted that they took occupancy of the building in February this year and have been working on this signage since last August, and changing the sign more than once in an effort to make it work. He is frustrated with the antiquated sign and preferred a discreet and simple solution to identify his business to local people, passers-by, employees, and the staff members from around the world who train in his facility. He also noted that if his logo is not allowed on the wall sign, then he would not want a sign at all. Additionally, if the Architectural Review Board determined that only one ground sign is sufficient, he would be satisfied with their decision.

**Chairman McCall** closed the Public Hearing and reconvened the Architectural Review Board.

- 3.3 Consideration and discussion regarding variations to Section 12-14-3, titled Building Mounted Identification, of the Downtown Development District Sign Chapter of the Lincolnshire Village Code for the installation of a wall mounted sign for Camping World, located at 2 Marriott Drive (Priority Sign, Inc.).

As a comparison, **Mr. Grover** eluded to the wall sign on Bank Financial which appears larger and recalled a variance request in order to install same, which looks appropriate on that bank building. **Chairman McCall** noted that the sign is presented according to scale. **Mr. Oler** noted his satisfaction with the length of the sign in relationship to the scale of the facade. **Mr. Hardnock** inquired as to the length of the building front, to which **Mr. Kreutz** stated that the building measures 310 feet long fronting Milwaukee Avenue, and the wall sign, including the logo, measures approximately 27 feet. Given the size of the building, **Mr. Hardnock** added that the scale of a smaller logo would appear insignificant. **Mr. Gulatee** expressed concern for setting a precedent by allowing a larger sign; albeit he is sympathetic to the request, as it architecturally makes sense to do so. In **Chairman McCall's** opinion, he does not see the allowance for a larger sign as setting a precedent, as it would be based upon the scale of the building. Limited discussion ensued with concerns for such a consideration, with **Planner Robles** noting that, if granting a variation request is for the betterment of the Village as opposed to not granting the variation, then, the Architectural Review Board would determine whether or not the code is over regulatory. **Mr. Grover** noted that the sign code for that site is limiting in consideration of the size and scale of the building, and it would not look appropriate to have a smaller code compliant sign on a larger building.

*Mr. Oler moved and Mr. Grover seconded a motion to approve, and recommend to the Village Board for their approval of variations to Section 12-14-3, titled Building Mounted Identification, of the Downtown Development District Sign Chapter of the Lincolnshire Village Code to permit the installation of a wall sign located at 2*

*Marriott Drive, as presented in a presentation packet and sample materials submitted by Priority Sign Inc., dated June 11, 2008, and based on the facts as presented in a Public Hearing held on June 19, 2008.*

*The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.*

- 3.4 Consideration and discussion regarding two proposed ground-mounted signs to replace existing ground-mounted signs for the Camping World office building, located at 2 Marriott Drive (Priority Sign, Inc.).

**Stephen Robles, Planner**, summarized Staff's memorandum dated June 13, 2008, and noted that the Petitioner is seeking to construct two new ground signs that are consistent with the Downtown Development District Sign Ordinance and will replace the existing aluminum cabinet signs. As permitted by the Downtown Development Sign Ordinance, the proposed ground signs will be constructed from a natural wood material, as shown in the Petitioner's presentation packet. While wood has not been utilized on the office building facade, Staff believes that continuing the concrete material of the office building on the ground signs would be inappropriate along this corridor. Staff does have a concern regarding the use of the split-face gray block for a base material, as it does not represent a high-quality material. Since the signs will be installed in the same location as the current signs, the existing landscaping and stone retaining wall along Milwaukee Avenue will remain. The combination of landscaping and the existing stone foundation wall should block any open view of the sign's base. Even though the existing landscaping will remain, the landscaping needs to be enhanced from its current condition in order to comply with the Village's Landscaping Code. Therefore, Staff would recommend that any approval should require year-round landscape screening of the block sign base and the landscaping be updated through enhancements in the plant species, which shall all be subject to the Village Forester's review and acceptance prior to any Village Board action. Further, **Planner Robles** noted that the Downtown District Sign Ordinance also requires ground signs to be topped by a sloped cap that contrasts with the field of the sign in materials and color. Although the proposed signs do not include a sloped cap, the addition of a cap will appear out of place and inconsistent with the building's straight-line design. This omission has been used with neighboring wood signs along Milwaukee Avenue for similar reasons. The Petitioner has worked with Staff to create a sign design that would be compatible with both the Downtown District and the building's design, and therefore, Staff is supportive of the proposed ground signs subject to the two Staff recommendations contained within Staff's memorandum.

With regard to the signs' construction, **Chairman McCall** inquired if the sign will be sitting on top of the block structurally, or will it be anchored to a foundation. **Mr. Kreutz** stated that there will be a 4' deep foundation under the split-face block, which will serve as a frost barrier, and two pegs will support the two wooden signs. He also noted that their intentions are to add evergreen landscape materials, such as junipers which would be low to the ground and high enough to cover the base. In

referencing the wooden sign material, **Mr. Hardnock** questioned the type of wood and if it would be painted or stained. **Mr. Kreutz** responded that it will be sign quality cedar wood and both paint and stain will be used in order to achieve the correct color match to the building. **Chairman McCall** expressed concern for the 1-3/4" sign thickness and the 6" base on which it will be installed. **Mr. Kreutz** noted that the sign base was not yet determined due to Staff's concern for the split-face block, and he offered flagstone or a 4" split-face block as an option, which could be cut to reduce the thickness. He also noted a correction to the sign rendering for Milwaukee Avenue, as there will be an 1-3/4" thick sign face on both sides making a total thickness of 3-1/2". The ground sign facing Marriot Drive will only be single-sided and 1-3/4" thick. **Mr. Hardnock** also expressed concern for the appearance of a 4' x 8' wooden sign with a shallow depth installed on a 6" block base which visually projects a lack of sturdiness, to which **Mr. Grover** concurred. **Ms. Kennerley** noted that the proposed sign is not consistent with the building, with regard to color. **Mr. Kreutz** noted the sign is meant to contrast slightly from the building, and obtaining an exact color match in a computer rendering is always difficult. He assured that the final sign color will be closer to the concrete building color to provide a background for the white lettering. **Mr. Grover** inquired if the Petitioner had intended to install two ground signs, to which **Mr. Kreutz** recalled that Mr. Lemonis offered to have only one ground sign on Milwaukee Avenue dependent upon the Board's final determination. After limited discussion ensued with regard to the ground sign, the Architectural Review Board determined that a 6" sign thickness be included as a recommendation.

**Mr. Lemonis** addressed Ms. Kennerley's dissatisfaction with the ground sign color renderings, to which **Ms. Kennerley** offered a darker color base be considered to offset the lighter gray on the sign, all of which would be complimented by the landscaping. She also noted that the shape of the sign is more contemporary and does not compliment the building which is more traditional. In light of Ms. Kennerley's comment, **Mr. Lemonis** distributed a color photo to the Architectural Review Board depicting their corporate signage used on the building front of their 100 retail stores across the country. He explained that the blue background of the sign would be less brilliant on wood, and the darker stone used in the pillars on either side of the entry would be used in the base of the sign. **Mr. Lemonis** also noted that they had originally considered a design similar to the retail corporate signage, but were uncertain with regard to the blue color. There was immediate consensus among the Architectural Review Board favoring the design, color scheme, and choice of stone, as well as a request to provide a color and material sample for review.

*Following the Petitioner's presentation of the proposed ground-mounted signs to replace the existing ground-mounted signs, the Petitioner presented a photograph of existing signage at one of their retail store locations as a third option for the ARB to consider. The consensus of the Architectural Review Board favored the sign design, color scheme, and choice of stone for the third option. The Architectural Review Board requested that the Petitioner revise the proposed ground-mounted sign to be*

*in context with same and return to the next regularly scheduled Architectural Review Board meeting in July.*

**4.0 UNFINISHED BUSINESS (None)**

**5.0 NEW BUSINESS (None)**

**6.0 CITIZENS COMMENTS (None)**

**7.0 ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business **Chairman McCall** adjourned the meeting at 8:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Jones, Secretary