



APPROVED Minutes of the **ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD** held on Wednesday, September 16, 2015, in the Public Meeting Room of the Village Hall, One Olde Half Day Road, Lincolnshire, IL.

PRESENT: Chairman Grover, Members Gulatee, Hardnock, Kennerley, Jensen and Trustee Hancock.

ABSENT: Member Barranco.

ALSO PRESENT: Stephen Robles, AICP - Village Planner

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman Grover called the meeting to order at 7:08 p.m.

1.0 ROLL CALL

The roll was called by Village Planner Robles 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, April 21, 2015.

Member Hardnock moved and **Member Gulatee** seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of the Architectural Review Board held on April 21, 2015, as presented. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

3.0 ITEMS OF GENERAL BUSINESS:

3.1 Continued Consideration and Discussion regarding concepts and objectives for the Update to the Lincolnshire Design Guidelines (Village of Lincolnshire).

Village Planner Robles presented Staff's memorandum and noted that back in April, Staff introduced the Village's Design Guidelines to the ARB and outlined the need for the proposed updates. The existing guidelines were established in the early 1990's, through the services of external consultants, and had not been updated in over 20 years. The original intent of the Guidelines focused solely on the Village Center referred to as the "Half Day Area", and described building use, placement, height, parking, etc. in a very specific manner, which limited design creativity and monotonous developments. He continued, the objective of the updates were to modernize the Guidelines and establish contemporary guides for new construction and redevelopment of non-residential properties within the area of the Guidelines. Staff proposed to expand the area beyond the Village Center to properties along Route 22, Milwaukee Avenue and Aptakisic Road, as they were the most visible areas of the Village. **Village Planner Robles** re-summarized the objectives of the Guidelines as: 1) further the vision of the Update 2012 Comprehensive Plan by providing design and aesthetic standards for commercial, mixed-use and office development within the Village's commercial corridor; 2) create a contextual relationship with the existing Village character, while



avoiding/without creating repetitive and uninteresting environments; 3) establish reasonable expectations regarding architecture and landscape quality to strengthen the Village's economic tax base; and 4) create safe and efficient pedestrian and vehicular networks linking development and public spaces along the Village's commercial corridors.

Village Planner Robles continued, that at the April 21st ARB meeting, the Board provided comments on the following items:

Item 1 - Building Placement: Building placement and orientation is an important element of site design. The existing Guidelines specified building placement, including minimum and maximum building setbacks for each area of the guidelines. Those detailed location requirements significantly limited design flexibility of building placement based on physical site conditions and ultimate use of the building. He explained that Staff's aim of the updates was to identify design and aesthetic standards by establishing reasonable expectations of building design and site development. Rather than defining specific building placement within the Guidelines, identifying preferred building orientation, such as fronting the street, was more suitable. Staff sought the ARB's direction whether basic building locations is preferred, rather than exact building locations.

Member Hardnock expressed uncertainty how to get to a level of detail with building placement since many properties of the Guidelines were not building from scratch. **Chairman Grover** noted that it was his preference to control minimum building setbacks from the street, rather than placement or orientation. **Member Hardnock** explained there were many past discussions about the Village's Downtown area, but the current development does not fit with those past discussions. **Member Jensen** sought clarification on the reason for the Design Guidelines, especially if the idea was to require existing buildings to follow what will be established. **Village Planner Robles** explained that the Guidelines will serve as a tool for developers, as well as Staff and the ARB, in providing direction regarding new development and redevelopment of properties within the proposed area. The intent was not to require existing properties to comply with the Guidelines since they serve as guides, rather than code requirements. **Member Gulatee** expressed that if there were still undeveloped properties, the ARB should assess each property to determine how it could be developed. Pedestrian access and connectivity must also be considered, which was not the current reality. Many of the properties on Milwaukee Avenue are not conducive to pedestrians and can improve with streetscape and having IDOT impose speed limit restrictions to slow down traffic. He continued that the pocket park located near the Fresh Market should have included a boardwalk along the Indian Creek, as it was designed, however, it was determined nobody would use it expect for the Fresh Market and the neighboring residents.

Village Planner Robles continued that Member Gulatee's comments on pedestrian connectivity tied in with Item 2 – Encouraging Connectivity, and explained the ARB expressed the need for connectivity to promote pedestrian access to retail and services, and decrease traffic congestion. One of the primary objectives of the Guidelines is to create safe and efficient pedestrian and vehicular networks to link



developments and public spaces, which would aid in reducing traffic on local roads.

Village Planner Robles proceeded with Item 3 – Understanding Village’s Vision for Areas in the Guidelines, noting the ARB also expressed the need to understand the Village’s vision for the areas within the Guidelines. Community visioning is a common exercise within urban planning for developing consensus about what future the community desires and deciding actions necessary to achieve it. The Guidelines were intended to represent design objectives to convey the main elements of quality site and building design without inhibiting architectural creativity or impede the implementation of best practices. Since the Guidelines were intended to serve as guides rather than specific requirements for commercial development, Staff believed that could be accomplished without an extensive visioning exercise.

Member Jensen clarified with Staff regarding the request for expanding the area of the Guidelines. **Village Planner Robles** confirmed that was a recommendation proposed by Staff. **Chairman Grover** concurred with the expanded area proposed. **Village Planner Robles** continued that a proposed Departmental Goal of 2016 was to develop a master plan for Milwaukee Avenue corridor, which would focus on those elements described by Member Gulatee.

Additional discussion occurred regarding the overall purpose of the Village’s Design Guidelines and its timing related to the proposed Milwaukee Avenue Corridor Study proposed by Staff for 2016.

Member Hardnock expressed that the Board was overthinking the purpose of the Guidelines and felt this document could serve as a quality control document regarding fit and finish of development. He continued by asking if the ARB had read the proposed Outline of updates prepared by Staff, noting it was really well done.

Chairman Grover requested a consensus of the ARB in support of the expanded coverage area of the Guidelines and with the Staff proposed Outline. There was a consensus amongst the ARB, with Staff to return to the next regularly scheduled meeting to present a draft Guidelines document based on the Outline.

4.0 UNFINISHED BUSINESS (None)

5.0 NEW BUSINESS

Chairman Grover welcomed Todd Jensen as a new member to the ARB.

Trustee Hancock expressed that the Village’s Codes for residential are rather restrictive, such as shed placement and size, trees, etc., but the Codes did not address home design and inquired if the ARB had ever considered such review. He continued, that house size is further based on Codes, but only due to a ratio based on the lot size, which could led to a very large home despite compliance with Code. **Chairman Grover** noted that historically the ARB did not conduct such reviews. **Trustee Hancock** also noted his concern that a home could be constructed without any requirements for landscaping around the house, apart from trees. Lastly, he inquired if any residential subdivisions should require ARB review to prevent repetitive home styles. **Member Hardnock** concurred that new residential subdivision should also be reviewed by the



ARB. **Member Kennerley** also agreed and noted what should be the threshold for ARB review.

6.0 CITIZENS COMMENTS (None)

7.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, **Chairman Grover** adjourned the meeting at 8:20 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Stephen Robles - AICP, Village Planner.