



APPROVED Minutes of the **ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD** held on Tuesday, March 17, 2015, in the Public Meeting Room of the Village Hall, One Olde Half Day Road, Lincolnshire, IL.

PRESENT: Chairman Grover, Members Gulatee, Hardnock, and Kennerley

ALSO PRESENT: Steve McNellis, Community & Economic Development Director and Tonya Zozulya, Economic Development Coordinator

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

1.0 ROLL CALL

The roll was called by Community & Economic Development Director McNellis and **Chairman Grover** declared a quorum to be present.

2.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2.1 Approval of the Minutes of the Architectural Review Board held Tuesday, February 17, 2015.

Member Hardnock moved and **Member Kennerley** seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of the Architectural Review Board held on February 17, 2015, as presented. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

3.0 ITEMS OF GENERAL BUSINESS:

3.1 Consideration and Discussion of a Minor Amendment to existing Special Ordinance No. 05-1954-18 which granted approval of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) for a mixed-use retail development to permit a canopy addition and wall signage for Lot H of Lincolnshire Commons (CFNX Linshire, LLC).

Steve McNellis, Director of Community and Economic Development summarized a staff memo dated March 17, 2015. He stated the ARB informally reviewed a canopy rendering for Northshore University HealthSystem under "New Business" at the February 17, 2015 meeting. He said the current request includes a canopy addition and new wall signage. The previous rendering showed a canopy-mounted sign which has since been eliminated from the request. **Director McNellis** stated the ARB has final approval of minor PUD amendments. Staff will provide the Village Board with an update of the ARB's recommendation for informational purposes.

Angelo Roncone, Integrated Facilities Solutions, introduced the project team representing Northshore University HealthSystem. **William Lampkin**, Eckenhoff Saunders Architects, stated they propose minor revisions to the existing Barnes & Noble canopy. The proposed canopy is similar to existing. The canopy depth has been expanded to allow for extra patron protection in inclement weather. Two new



cultured stone columns would match the building. The width of the canopy has been shortened. The existing wall will be patched.

Member Gulatee inquired about the canopy material. He stated the previous rendering called for a copper material. **Mr. Lampkin** stated the canopy would be painted steel with an aluminum top.

Member Gulatee stated the base of the columns should be increased with which **Mr. Lampkin** concurred.

Member Kennerley inquired about the depth of the two columns. **Mr. Lampkin** said the depth is estimated to be 5-6'.

Michael Kinsella, Poblocki Signs, stated new LED (halo lit) illuminated wall signs are proposed on the south, north and east building elevations. The proposed aluminum letter faces are 1" thick. The proposed logo is 1" acrylic which is Northshore Medical's standard logo design. The letters will have blue and black translucent faces. **Mr. Kinsella** stated he believes the halo illumination will produce a more elegant appearance than channel illumination.

Chairman Grover inquired about the size of the letters relative to other Lincolnshire Commons wall signs. **Director McNellis** said staff does not have concerns about the proposed letter size but has two recommendations. The first one is a request to increase the depth of the letters. Both Kona Grill and LensCrafter's Optique wall signs appear to have deeper letters. The second recommendation is regarding the sign back. Staff believes it should be light grey to match the building rather than silver, as shown in the rendering.

Mr. Kinsella produced a color material sample showing a grey color. He stated the color is more grey than silver. **Mr. Kinsella** stated the Kona and LensCrafter's Optique wall signs have channel letters.

Member Kennerley inquired whether the sign back is big enough to cover the damaged wall area after the removal of the current Barnes & Noble sign. **Mr. Kinsella** responded affirmatively.

Member Kennerley inquired what impact increased sign depth would have on wall sign readability. **Mr. Kinsella** responded the signs would be better read with push-thru halo letters than channel letters. It was the consensus of the ARB to leave the letter depth as proposed.

Member Gulatee moved and **Member Hardnock** seconded a motion to approve Minor Amendments to Ordinance No. 05-1954-18 which granted approval of a Planned Unit Development for a mixed-use retail development known as Lincolnshire Commons to permit a canopy addition and wall signage for Lot H subject to presentation plans, dated March 9, 2015, and subject to the wall sign lettering color being flat grey.

The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.



- 3.2 Consideration and discussion of a Minor Amendment to existing Special use Ordinance No.14-3339-66 which granted an Amendment to the original Special Use for the Tri-State International Office Center to permit the addition of a three-story connector corridor between 25 and 75 Tri-State International (CDW).

Director McNellis presented the Staff report and recommendations

Architect Ted Garnett of Garnett Architects presented the Petitioner's presentation, explaining the proposed additions to the building. He noted the bridge connector will be obscured along the Tollway elevation by the approved new parking deck. The intent is to make the connector transparent. He further noted they are interested in highlighting the main entry to the building with the new red canopy, which is in CDW's corporate colors. There are two schemes in the packet, with simple variations, one being more transparent and the other sacrificing some transparency to emphasize the connection with the existing buildings. Both the Architects and the client agree Scheme 1 is their preferred option.

Member Hardnock stated he preferred the more transparent look. **Member Kennerley** noted it seems as though there is one design concept for the existing buildings, another for the new parking deck and now a third for this connector, which she stated seems a little like a mish-mosh. She further noted with regard to the canopy the red is too prevalent, so the Petitioner may want to bring in the neighbors to see the proposal.

Architect Garnett stated that if they were to try to make the connector match the building, it would be too monolithic. He further noted with regard to the canopy the client has a strong desire to create branding and a sense of entry there. **Member Kennerley** reiterated her concerns about getting neighbor feedback. **Director McNellis** responded that based on the distance between this building and the nearest home he didn't believe the canopy will be very visible to the neighbors, especially with the mature landscaping added in. **Architect Garnett** agreed the nearest residential building is quite far away.

Chairman Grover noted he prefers Scheme 1, because it adds more transparency. **Member Gulatee** believes its important to keep the buildings distinct from the connector. He felt it is not important to read the bands from the building through the connector. In fact, he believes it is best to disconnect the connector from the top of the building and the edges and offset it, so it appears the structure is being inserted.

Architect Garnett stated they can decrease the connector width slightly and reduce the height at the parapet. **Member Gulatee** stated if you try to match the buildings, you'll never succeed. **Architect Garnett** also stated the transparency will look very good at night. **Chairman Grover** stated he agrees with reducing the parapet height on Scheme 1, to which **Member Hardnock** concurred.

Architect Davin Pirkola of Garnett Architects stated that where the expansion happens between the connector bridge and the existing towers it could be pinched in. Regarding the canopy, he noted there would be uplighting on it and that its



setback from the surface parking lot is such that it's not as obvious as you might think.

Director McNellis confirmed with the ARB it seemed as though Scheme 1 is preferred with the idea of dropping the parapet height, recessing the connector in slightly, and maintaining the canopy as presented. There was general consensus and no other comments.

***Member Hardnock** moved and **Member Gulatee** seconded a motion to approve a three-story building connector with corridors and new entrance canopy at 25/75 Tri-State International Office Center, as a Minor Amendment to the existing Special Use for a PUD, authorized by Ordinance No. 14-3339-66, as presented in Scheme 1 in a presentation packet, with cover letter from CBRE, dated March 9, 2015, subject to 1) reducing the height of the parapet on the connector, 2) recessing the connector on the east (Tollway) side, and both stipulations being subject to Staff approval.*

The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

3.3 Consideration and Discussion of Preliminary Development Plans for a proposed 101-unit townhome PUD on Sedgebrook Lot 2 (Pulte Homes).

Director McNellis presented the Staff report and comments. **Mark Mastrorocco, Director of Land Acquisition for Pulte Homes** introduced his team and provided his initial comments regarding revisions based upon ARB feedback at the February workshop.

Chuck Hanlon Urban Planning Principal of Wills Burke Kelsey Associates (WBK Associates) began his presentation with a recap of where Pulte had left off at the end of the Workshop meeting. He summarized the overall direction of the ARB from that meeting was to provide a site plan that starts from the original Concept 1 geometry and open space but adds some of the curvilinear features from concept #2.

Chuck Hanlon of WBK Associates summarized the revisions as follows: a change in entry geometry from Riverside Drive, addition of curvature to main North-South roadway in the development from the main entry, enlarged north park area slightly, reduced lot area behind townhouse buildings on inner lots and removed "backyard" sidewalks, increased green space "link" between the two main park areas, created a break along the main North-South road to add a small pocket park area along the west side of that road and included a traffic-calming island in the middle of the road, reconfigured south main park area to increase green space in that area, provided curvature to easternmost boundary road, and modified intersections with softened radii. He also noted park changes have provided active and passive spaces.

Chuck Hanlon of WBK Associates further discussed setbacks and how they relate favorably to other developments. He addressed the elevation behind the berm along Milwaukee Avenue and presented an exhibit showing a cross-section that depicted building setbacks and what might be visible from Milwaukee Avenue.



He noted the view toward the development from Milwaukee Avenue is solid at the lower levels, but that you will get a partial filtered view of the townhouse buildings where the existing landscaping on the berm is less dense. **Chuck Hanlon of WBK Associates** showed photos of the existing berm along Milwaukee Avenue and discussed the relative low visibility of the proposed building elevations in relation to the existing Sedgebrook buildings visibility.

Member Gulatee stated if you have great architecture you don't have to screen it. He believes the Village tends to screen buildings when we don' need to. **Chuck Hanlon of WBK Associates** noted the future townhouse owners along Milwaukee Avenue would probably like the screening and its already in place anyway.

Landscape Architect Greg Sagen, President of Signature Design Group presented some revisions to the landscape plans, including the entranceway from Riverside Drive. **Member Gulatee** inquired as to the the responsibility for maintenance of the trailhead "triangle". **Mark Mastrorocco of Pulte** noted they hadn't spent a lot of time figuring this out yet but it will be a public space and based on his experience, Pulte would look to the Village for maintenance. **Director McNellis** echoed Mr. Mastrorocco's comments about this not having been fleshed-out yet and that it's part of a broader discussion regarding required park donations. Those donations could take many forms, whether that's land provision and building the amenities of the trailhead based on a Village-approved design, or a cash donation. Regardless, either the Village or Pulte will maintain and that will be worked-out for final approvals.

Landscape Architect Greg Sagen also discussed the stone and wrought-iron entrance walls, the "park corridor" including the north park and south park and connector green space. He also noted there are just under two acres of park green space within the development. He further noted in the south park they have left sufficient space to add a tennis court or basketball court, should the future Association desire a more-active component.

Landscape Architect Greg Sagen went on to explain the interior part of the development, which encompasses about 40% of the units, will not have any yard fencing, while perimeter units will have an opportunity for 4' tall aluminum fencing. He noted as far as the wood fence along the south property line and the ARB's request to revise the material from wood to a more maintenance-friendly material like textured PVC, other Pulte communities have had a bad experience with this. He stated commercial landscape maintenance companies tend to knock the fence panels out, and it is costly to replace them. So, Pulte prefers the proposed cedar material. With regard to the landscape material in this area, he stated they will add landscaping along the fence on the south property line per Staff's request.

Landscape Architect Greg Sagen continued his presentation and discussed the existing berm on Riverside Drive, stating its very attractive and Pulte wants to maintain it. They have revised the grading so it does not cut into the berm to protect the townhouses south of it. The only exception is Lot 14, where they may creep a little into the berm, but that minor grading will not impact the existing trees on the berm, except in the area where they are punching through the berm for the



emergency access drive. He also noted they have provided illustrations of the building foundation landscaping, which will provide 360 degree landscaping with a mix of deciduous and evergreen species.

Mike Hollister, Construction Manager with Pulte Homes discussed building architectural revisions, including; revising materials so stone and brick is continuous, adding some new rear elevation architectural materials including shutters, and adding a trim board to delineate the units.

Member Gulatee inquired why shutters are being added if they'll never be used in this climate, to which Mr. Hollister stated they help to break up the massing of the rear wall. **Member Kennerley** stated she believes the shutters help soften the façade. **Member Hardnock** noted the rear elevations look like an apartment complex without the shutters.

Member Gulatee stated he still wasn't happy with the elevations. He felt they did not have a character of their own. An example is the roof, which appears to be one large constant roof and is not broken up enough. **Mark Mastrococco of Pulte** stated on other projects they've sometimes created too much unit identity and it has ended up being too busy. The proposed townhomes will be expensive and they want to provide a sense of place for each unit, but the unit architecture has to be complementary within each building. He further noted they would work on color packages to create more identity.

Mike Hollister of Pulte presented all of the Villa and Terrace products. He noted the addition of a continuous brick water table on rear elevations, as well as the addition of shutters. Pulte is proposing up to 20 different possible color palettes, five of which are being shown to the ARB this evening. This will ultimately be whittled down to 6-7 palettes.

Mark Mastrococco of Pulte discussed park space as it compares to Whytegate Park, which the ARB and staff had requested they do. He noted Whytegate Park serves 130 single-family homes, is 3.37 acres in size and the amount of the Whytegate area that is park is approximately 3.6%. He then noted the Pulte-proposed Camberley Club has less units (101) and is providing a larger percentage of their development area for park space, 1.98 acres of park land in a 19-acre development which equates to 10.4% of the development area being park space. He further noted that single-family homes tend to have a more intense park need than townhomes. He then went through a calculation based on the expected population of Camberley Club versus Whytegate noting he feels the calculated expected population, based on formulas from the Village's donation schedules, for Whytegate would be 455 people, while there would be 232 people at Camberley Club. Given these numbers, he felt that only half the park space available at Whytegate Park should be necessary in the Pulte development. There are 3.73 acres of parkland at Whytegate Park, so 1.87 should be necessary at Camberley Club, of which 1.9 acres is actually proposed, and it's all private. Mr. Mastrococco then stated their presentation was concluded and they would be glad to answer any questions of the ARB.



Chairman Grover stated that with regard to parks, he believes with townhouses, you have less usable space in your backyards than single-family homes do, which could impact your demand for park space. He inquired if Pulte had any statistics on park usage for townhomes versus single-family homes. Chairman Grover felt that in a townhouse you're almost forced to go to a park with less of your own usable green space. **Mark Mastrococco of Pulte** noted this proposed development actually has more green space in their yards in comparison with most townhouse communities, but he has no specific data on usage between townhouses and single-family homes.

Director McNellis weighed-in on green space as it relates to park donations. He noted that Village Park donation requirements don't distinguish between townhouses and single-family homes. In this case, the Village Park Donation calculation figures to about 2.75 acres of park space being required. He further noted even if you include the trailhead triangle at the corner (to be dedicated to the Village) you end up with 2.36 acres of park space in this proposal. He stated this speaks to park space still not really meeting the Village Code requirements. Staff is not outright saying it doesn't, as we recognize there are a lot of factors at play.

Mark Mastrococco of Pulte stated this is a private gated-community. He noted the bonus here is Pulte is providing two acres of parkland but is still assuming they're paying the full "Cash-in-lieu" contribution on top of that. So, he noted, they're providing both. He stated Pulte gets hit twice because they're providing park space but because its private the Village won't allow it to be part of the cash contribution for parks.

Director McNellis noted based on the amount of park space the Code envisions per person, this proposal does not meet that number. **Mark Mastrococco of Pulte** countered this is all based on the Village assumption that townhomes and single-family residential generate the same impact, whereas Pulte believes single-family generates more impact. He noted Pulte will be paying a significant amount of money to facilitate park improvements in other parts of the Village.

Member Kennerley inquired as to how much parkland the proposal is short. **Director McNellis** noted that if you use the number straight from the formula, and nothing else, it's about .39 acres short, but Staff recognizes there are a lot of pieces being assembled in this calculation. Staff is bringing to the ARB's attention this is an issue raised by the Village Board at Referral, and also an issue raised by Trustee McDonough and discussed by the ARB at the workshop meeting. The ARB previously discussed this is an isolated subdivision so it should provide its own park space.

Director McNellis acknowledged recognition they've grown the park space since the last meeting by adding an open lot along the inside of the Milwaukee Avenue berm and further opening up the south park. Staff is simply asking the ARB is this the appropriate amount of park space for this development. **Mark Mastrococco of Pulte** stated again he believed to ask more park space is a sort of "double-dipping" since Pulte gets no credit for parks in their community and still have to pay a full park donation.



Chairman Grover acknowledged one townhouse unit has been removed in the redesign. He wondered if Pulte had thought about moving Building #22 out of the south park area to create greater park space. **Chuck Hanlon of WBK Associates** responded Pulte has thought about it and has actually created slide with an example. He noted that in that slide Pulte removed Building #22 and moved two of the three units into other 3-unit buildings to make each of those 4-unit buildings. As a result, there is a larger green space area of .33 acres added and the development is reduced to 100 units. However, Pulte doesn't think this provides quality green or park space.

Member Kennerley noted there may be more green space in this alternate, but you end up adding another inside" townhouse unit in the other buildings and taking away a more desirable end unit. She questioned if that was really an improvement. **Member Hardnock** stated he felt as though we're' just trying to force a specific number in here and he doesn't know if this really should even be the ARB decision to make. **Member Kennerley** also noted she really likes the green space design presented in the first proposal this evening, not the alternate. She felt Pulte accomplished on that plan what the ARB had asked and it feels less cramped. **Member Hardnock** stated he feels the Alternate proposal has a "leg" that is really unusable.

Member Gulatee stated he likes Building #22 and wouldn't want to lose it,. Members Kennerley and Hardnock agreed. They both appreciated that Building #22 in the first proposal tonight has green space all around it. **Member Kennerley** stated the first proposal tonight is the best, and it has good flow. **Member Hardnock** inquired of the ARB – does it feel as though there isn't enough green space and park land here? He noted these are townhouses so you expect things to be tighter. He sees a benefit in that all units are a two-minute or less walk from the park. **Chairman Grover** noted he also likes tonight's first plan the best, to which all ARB members agreed.

Chairman Grover moved on to the site grading and asked about the fill. **Chuck Hanlon of WBK Associates** stated there was a maximum of about 5' of fill, to which Member Kennerley inquired as to how the drainage flows. **Andy Heinen, Senior Project Manager at Kimley Horn** noted he has been working on engineering on this site for 10 years, first with the original Sedgebrook owner. He stated the reason for the fill is to get proper drainage from the southwest corner of the site down to Riverside Road, and then on to the existing stormwater pond to the east. Further, he stated that because of the plan to have basements you can't go below the Base Flood Elevation (BFE), so this requires placing the basement at a certain grade and then you need to fill to get the proper drainage.

Chairman Grover inquired if there were any other comments regarding the visibility of the buildings along Milwaukee Avenue, through the trees. **Member Hardnock** noted he didn't have a problem with it. He felt we're not trying to hide the development, but the benefit of having the berm is that it's good sound insulation from the road.



Chairman Grover asked the ARB to move on to design comments. **Member Kennerley** asked if the color scheme had changed, to which Pulte responded it had not. **Member Hardnock** stated he felt the building façade design was a little more cohesive now. **Mark Mastrorocco of Pulte** pointed out the five material/color packages for which samples were provided for viewing at tonight's meeting. **Chairman Grover** stated he likes the shutter look as he feels it visually helps the second floor. **Member Gulatee** stated he believes the stone on both floors is fine. A general discussion on building colors and material ensued. **Director McNellis** inquired as to whether or not blue-colored siding was still proposed on the façade, to which mark Mastrorocco noted it has been removed from the plans.

Member Hardnock inquired as to how the transition between stone and brick on the front facades was being handled. Director McNellis noted Staff had the same comment. **Mike Hollister of Pulte** stated they typically use a trim board material. **Members Hardnock and Kennerley** agreed it seems odd to have the two materials up against each other without a transition. **Mike Hollister of Pulte** stated they would definitely resolve this with a trim board.

Member Gulatee inquired as to the material for the soldier course above the garage arch, when the surrounding material is stone. **Mike Hollister of Pulte** responded there will be a brick soldier course on the headers above the garage doors and the unit windows.

Chairman Grover moved the ARB on to the Landscaping Plans, about which he explained he had no comments. **Member Kennerley** noted she was happy with the additional evergreens in the plan, to which Member Hardnock agreed. **Member Hardnock** questioned the pedestrian access across Riverside Drive to the Trailhead, from the townhouse project, in light of fast traffic turning onto Riverside off Milwaukee Avenue. **Andy Heinen of Kimley Horn** noted the intersection with Milwaukee Avenue is a signalized one, with traffic control, and pedestrian sidewalks at that intersection, so that should help. He further noted IDOT is not requiring any roadway improvements into the site, so the only change is the new fourth leg of the signalization.

Chairman Grover inquired as to any other comments, to which Director McNellis summarized the six Staff comments: As to stipulation #1, the consensus was to stick with the original plan presented this evening. For stipulation #2, regarding tweaking the North-South roadway from the main entry, Pulte agrees to modify the roadway. For stipulation #3, regarding fenceline landscaping, Pulte agrees to provide. For stipulation #4, regarding the impact of Riverside Road berm re-grading on existing evergreens, **Landscape Architect Greg Sagen** noted Pulte has revised the grading so there is only limited impact behind Building 14. However, it does not impact existing evergreens and Pulte agrees not to impact the existing vegetation. He stated the only place existing trees will be compromised is in the area where the berm is being removed for emergency fire lane access. For stipulation #5, regarding dispersing evergreens at the entrance off Riverside Drive, Pulte has already made that revision. For stipulation #6, there are five parts, as follows: 6a) window shutters have been completed as requested. 6b) the materials on the window sills and headers has been simplified as requested. The problem is with the depiction on the



plans due to problems with a printer. The ARB suggested photos be taken of this same treatment out in the field at existing Pulte properties to show how it really looks, to which Pulte agreed. 6c) regarding transition between materials, Pulte has agreed to add a trim board. 6d) regarding the material color on the rear gable dormers matching the siding below, the ARB agreed to the existing proposal per Pulte's statement that the colors will be compatible and not clash. 6e) regarding omitting the blue-toned siding, Pulte has agreed to this revision.

Director McNellis noted that Stipulations 2, 3 and 4 should be memorialized in any ARB motion, while all other Staff recommendations have been completed on plans shown this evening. There was continued discussion regarding Grading, about which the ARB ultimately agreed they did not have any issues or concerns. **Director McNellis** added a stipulation regarding Lighting. He noted a Photometric Plan that meets Village Code, in terms of its depiction of light intensity at the overall development property line boundaries, is necessary. The ARB requested Staff review such a plan for conformity with Code.

Chairman Grover asked if an ARB member was prepared to make a motion, to which Member Hardnock agreed.

***Member Hardnock** moved and **Member Kennerley** seconded a motion to recommend approval to the Village Board of Preliminary Development Plans for a proposed 102-unit Townhome PUD on Sedgebrook Lot 2, as presented in a presentation packet from Pulte Homes, dated March 17, 2015, subject to the following stipulations which are to be reviewed and approved by Staff: 1) Revise the landscaped traffic island design to improve vehicular access/movement; 2) Incorporate a combination of deciduous and evergreen trees and shrubs along the southern fence line of each lot to further screen the fence from residents; 3) Ensure the proposed grading of the berm along Riverside Road does not impact existing evergreen trees, with the exception of the cut in the berm to provide secondary emergency access, and 4) Provide a revised Photometric Plan which complies with Village Code.*

The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Chairman Grover noted time was approaching 10:30 P.M., and so he requested a motion to extend the ARB up to 30 minutes to complete work on the agenda.

***Member Hardnock** moved and **Member Gulatee** seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.*

- 3.4 CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING regarding text amendments to various sections of Title 12, Sign Control, of the Lincolnshire Village Code, to revise and clarify requirements for permanent and temporary signs (Village of Lincolnshire).

Chairman Grover recessed the ARB meeting and reopened the public hearing.



Economic Development Coordinator Zozulya summarized the staff report dated March 17, 2015. She noted Staff has further refined new regulations for multi-tenant office and industrial wall signs. She asked the ARB whether they are comfortable with the proposed language that requires a minimum separation between multi-tenant office wall signs and the common edge of each building frontage. Staff proposes a minimum separation of 15' or 1/3 of the length of the respective building frontage, whichever is less. She stated the ARB may consider whether 10' separation is sufficient to allow wall signs to be placed closer to the building edge while still preventing two adjoining signs from running up against each other visually. It was the consensus of the ARB that 15' or 1/3 of the frontage length should be incorporated into the code. If the Village finds 15' does not stand the test of time and poses difficulty meeting business needs, the code can be amended at a future date or petitioners can seek a variation to reduce the minimum required wall sign distance.

Member Hardnock stated he would like to further refine the proposed language for multi-tenant industrial wall signs to state the 1' minimum separation applies to cases when wall signs are placed next to two adjacent doors. In all other cases, the minimum wall sign separation must be 5'.

Economic Development Coordinator Zozulya presented a summary of the "take-out" parking survey conducted by staff. She noted the majority of the restaurants in the Village have 2 "take-out" signs, with two restaurants having 3 signs. The ARB felt up to 2 take-out parking signs should be permitted. Additional sign requests can be reviewed by variance.

There being a consensus among the members, Chairman Grover sought a motion.

***Member Kennerley** moved and **Member Hardnock** seconded a motion to recommend approval to the Village Board, based on facts covered in a Public Hearing held on March 17, 2015, of text amendments to various sections of Title 12, Sign Control, of the Lincolnshire Village Code, to revise and clarify requirements for permanent and temporary signs.*

The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

- 4.0 UNFINISHED BUSINESS (None)**
- 5.0 NEW BUSINESS**
- 6.0 CITIZENS COMMENTS (None)**
- 7.0 ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, **Chairman Grover** requested an adjournment, to which **Member Hardnock** made a motion and **Member Kennerley** seconded. The meeting adjourned at 10:48 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Steve McNellis, Community & Economic Development Director and Tonya Zozulya, Economic Development Coordinator.