



**APPROVED** Minutes of the **ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD** held on Tuesday, April 21, 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

**ABSENT:** Tom McDonough, Trustee

**ALSO PRESENT:** Stephen Robles, Village Planner

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Grover called the meeting to order at 7:02 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, March 17, 2015.

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

**3.0 ITEMS OF GENERAL BUSINESS:**

3.1 CONTINUED Consideration and Discussion regarding text amendments to Chapter 2 of Title 13, Landscaping, of the Lincolnshire Village Code to revise and update the Village's landscaping requirements (Village of Lincolnshire).

**Village Planner Robles** presented Staff's memorandum and explained the Village's Landscaping requirements of Chapter 2, Title 13, were introduced to the ARB at the September 16, 2014 meeting. He continued that the objective was to review the current landscaping requirements to balance the Village's aesthetic expectations with commercial developments' desire for openness and visibility and to align the regulations with current practices. The following was a summary of the previous items discussed and the resulting code revisions, as well as newly proposed revisions based on further Staff review.

**Village Planner Robles** presented the first item of the memorandum of opening Purpose Section. He explained traditionally, zoning regulations begin with a purpose statement to identify the objectives of the given code regulations, which were absent from the current Code. While the Landscaping Code is not part of the Zoning Title of the Village Code, a purpose statement should be provided. Staff previously proposed six statements from review of comparable community's codes. However, the ARB felt the statements should focus on the positives of landscaping,



contain less legal terminology, and include the desire for year-round landscaping. He presented the revised purpose statements as follows:

- A. Promote and maintain the high quality visual appearance and environmental benefits throughout the year through landscaping and preservation of native vegetation.
- B. Encourage and promote the implementation of best management practices to minimize erosion and stormwater runoff in a manner which provides functionality and visual appeal.
- C. Enhance the visual and environmental impacts of the Village's built environment through the utilization of attentive landscape design.

**Member Kennerley** expressed Statement C read too vague and recommended revising to be more specific to purpose of the statement.

**Village Planner Robles** proceeded with the second item regarding a new addition to the Code, Replacement Requirements Section, which was added as Staff noticed an increase in requests for entire landscaping replacements on non-residential property. He explained that since most properties had an approved landscape plan, holistic changes were not permitted without approval by the ARB. The existing code only permits replacements of 20% or more due to region wide infestation or disease. Staff believed the Code should not discourage a property owner from reinvesting in the property through landscape improvements. Therefore, Staff proposed the following requirements for landscape replacements, which would no longer require ARB review:

- a. Replacement plantings shall be not less than the size specified on the approved landscape plan. If no approved landscape plan is available, single stem trees shall be not less than 2.5" DBH, clump and evergreen varieties shall be not less than 8 feet in height.
- b. Evergreen trees shall be replaced with evergreen trees and deciduous trees shall be replaced with deciduous trees.
- c. The replacement plan may be implemented over a period of time not to exceed three (3) years.
- d. Any tree which existed on the property prior to development and has been preserved, as determined by the Village, may be removed subject to Section 13-1-3(D) and 13-1-3(K) of this Title, except any tree which is dead or irreversibly declining due to natural circumstances does not require replacement.
- e. If the plantings to be removed are considered to be a hazard to life and/or property, the specific plantings shall be flagged and verbal authorization by the Village Arborist for removal may be granted, which shall be conditioned upon the submittal of a Tree Removal Permit and Landscape Replacement Plan identified in 13-2-3(B)(1) within thirty (30) days of the authorization for removal.



**Member Kennerley** questioned if the newly created replacement requirements permitted the removal of landscaping and trees without replacement. **Village Planner Robles** explained tree removal without replacements would only be permitted if the tree existed on the property prior to development and had been preserved. Otherwise, a tree that is removed from a non-residential property would require replacing even if it declined due to disease, which Staff would encourage replacement with a different species.

**Village Planner Robles** continued presenting the proposed revisions to the Landscape Screening Section. He explained the section included regulations requiring a landscape barrier to certain unattractive or monotonous elements of a site plan, such as building walls, mechanical equipment, and parking lots. The problem, he identified, was that many of the existing requirements did not account for customer areas that retailers rely on for increased traffic, such as building signage, parking areas, storefronts, etc. The proposed revisions would clarify that those portions of building that do not contain a primary architectural element must be screened. Since ground-mounted equipment screening requirements were outlined in the Zoning Code, a cross-reference had been added. He further explained that parking lot screening had been significantly revised by establishing two categories; 1) residential zoning districts, and 2) non-residential zoning districts, with regulations appropriate for each type of parking lot. Landscaping for parking lot islands had also been expanded to reflect current Village objectives.

**Village Planner Robles** moved onto Single-Family Residential Requirements Section and noted the section had been renamed to make clear it applies to single-family residentially zoned property. Additionally, the Section had been moved out of the General Landscape Requirements Section since it contains specific regulations, which was better suited to be an independent Section. He noted that the ARB previously agreed that very basic and minimal plantings for single-family residential lots only applicable to new home construction should be included. **Village Planner Robles** presented a chart that outlined the minimum tree planting requirements of based on the front, side and rear yards of a residential lot. **Member Kennerley** questioned if the planting requirements would apply to an existing residence constructing an addition or recladding the façade of the home. **Village Planner Robles** clarified that such requirement would not apply in that situation. The intent was to only apply to new home construction to prevent a builder and/or developer from constructing a home and not provide a minimum number of trees. **Village Planner Robles** acknowledge this situation would be rare given the significant woodland areas of the Village; however, there were unincorporated areas that could eventually be developed residential that did not contain significant wooded areas. **Member Hardnock** expressed concern the proposed planting requirement would allow a resident to clear cut their existing trees and only leave four trees on the lot. **Village Planner Robles** noted that Chapter 1 of the Landscaping Code contained specific regulations for tree removal and replacement, which would not be altered by the text amendments proposed. **Chairman Grover** questioned if existing single-family lots should also be subject to the proposed planting requirements, and if so, how could the Village ensure the lot achieved compliance, such as placing a hold on the real estate transfer stamps. **Village Planner Robles** responded that holding the transfer of real estate stamps for a landscaping matter would be rather extreme



and believed that was not Staff's intent of the proposed revisions. **Chairman Grover** expressed concern that some residential side yards are small and may not sufficiently sized for a tree, and questioned if there should be flexibility to allow the planting of trees in the side yard or front yard. **Member Kennerley** concurred and recommended the tree requirement of the front, side and corner side yards be combined, provided at least one tree is located in the front yard. **Chairman Grover** questioned if trees within a dedicated conservation area could be used to achieve the minimum tree requirement. **Village Planner Robles** agreed with **Chairman Grover's** concern and identified that conservation areas would not be permitted to achieve compliance.

**Village Planner Robles** proceeded with his presentation and noted a separate Section on Subdivision landscape requirements had been relocated into the Single-Family Residential Requirement Section since the regulations primarily pertained to parkway plantings and maintenance, and now included procedures and requirements following current practices for single-family subdivisions.

The Landscape Improvement Deposit Section was the next section identified by **Village Planner Robles** and noted the deposit requirements of the section were identical to requirements of the Subdivision Code, Title 7, and had been relocated for consistency.

**Village Planner Robles** moved onto the All Other Property Requirements Section, which was the location of commercial landscaping requirements. Included in the requirements was a tree distribution chart, which required a variety of trees totaling 34 trees per acre. A previously presented, Staff analyzed two commercial properties to determine if the existing tree planting requirements remained viable. In both samples, neither site achieved code compliancy, but the number of trees were more than abundant for each sample site. Based on the study, Staff questioned if the minimum tree quantities should be reduced to create better visual lines of sight to commercial properties. The minimum number of trees to be planted was proposed to be reduced to 30 trees per acre and the balance of tree variety had also been revised. **Village Planner Robles** pointed out that the number of deciduous shade trees were proposed to be reduced, which the environment of Northern Illinois had more of that type of tree, naturally, than the other two types. **Member Kennerley** felt the proposed tree distribution was acceptable. The remainder of the ARB concurred.

**Village Planner Robles** continued with the Public Right-of-Ways Requirements Section and explained the regulations for right-of-way plantings were relatively straight-forward and only minor updating occurred, along with the inclusion of approved parkway tree species chart that was formerly located in Appendix IV.

**Village Planner Robles** presented the next section of Landscape Requirements for Stormwater Facilities and noted the section was to insure detention facilities were designed, constructed, and maintained in a manner that provided functionality as well as visual appeal. As a result, the detailed regulations required substantial knowledge in the installation, monitoring and maintenance of native vegetation suitable for stormwater facilities, which specific personnel with such expertise was



no longer part of the Village administrative structure. The section had undergone substantial restructuring to remove Village required review and authorization in favor of a qualified environmental consultant to continue achieving the highest level of stormwater runoff reduction through the use of native vegetation.

**Village Planner Robles** concluded that many of the appendices had been incorporated into the text for continuity and was seeking a recommendation from the ARB.

There being no further discussion, **Chairman Grover** sought a motion.

***Member Hardnock** moved and **Member Kennerley** seconded a motion to recommend approval to the Village Board of text amendments to Chapter 2 of Title 13, Landscaping, of the Lincolnshire Code to revise and update the Village's landscaping requirements, further subject to:*

- 1. Revise purpose statement "C" (Sec. 13-2-1) to clarify the intended purpose.*
- 2. Revise the minimum number of trees required for new single-family residential lots (13-2-5(A)) to combine the planting requirements of the front, side, and rear yards, with at least one tree required in the front yard.*

*The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.*

### 3.2 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 the current Urban Design Guidelines were established in the early 1990's, through the services of external consultants, and had not been updated in over 20 years. The objective of this update was to modernize the Guidelines to identify and illustrate the desired visual character for Lincolnshire's built environment. He continued, the original intent of the Guidelines focused solely on the Village Center referred to as the "Half Day Area". Staff now proposed to expand the area to properties along Route 22, Milwaukee Avenue and Aptakisic Road, as such properties were the most visible areas of the Village. Additionally, Staff believed a more defined character in the "Downtown" area should continue to apply, but at a more basic level to establish common design themes, rather than specific building architecture. **Village Planner Robles** continued and identified that with the update, the objectives were also to be revised based on the expanded focus areas.

**Village Planner Robles** explained a key element missing from the current Guidelines was the identification of Lincolnshire's character, which establishes the expectations of the Village and aims to avoid repetition and oversaturation of similar building designs. Staff believed the Village's commercial architectural style generally fit into three design styles; 1) traditional, 2) postmodern, and 3) prairie school. The current Guidelines described building use, placement, height, parking, etc. in a very specific manner, which can limit design creativity and lead to monotonous developments. The proposed updates would aim to convey the main elements of desired site and building design, without inhibiting architectural



creativity or impeding the implementation of best practices. The “Downtown” area would continue to have a special focus on development character. However, rather than outlining specific design standards, Staff proposed to identify common design elements & themes that characterize the Downtown area.

**Village Planner Robles** moved onto architectural style noting the current document addressed only the architectural style within the Village Green center. The update would illustrate the variety of architectural design and concepts appropriate for the expanded focus area. Beyond architectural style, building materials were also a key element to design. The identification of building materials would be expanded to include new synthetic materials, such as “hardiboard” and composite roofing shingles. At the same time, Staff would also reinforce that EIFS materials be limited to secondary accent materials. New Elements such as site furniture and lighting, service areas, building façades, roofs, and awnings/canopies would be introduced into the updated Guidelines as each element plays a key role in the overall character of a building/development.

**Member Gulatee** expressed that if the Village simply wanted to determine design characteristics, material, aesthetics, etc., such would be easy to do. However, placement of buildings and connectivity of properties and uses is important. He continued, the bigger question is “what does the Village want to be”? **Member Kennerley** concurred and questioned what the vision is for the Village regarding the Design Guidelines, and further, how to visualize that for further discussion. **Member Hardnock** expressed the need for a context of how the Village wants to progress along the identified roadways in order to relate the Guidelines to that goal.

It was the consensus of the ARB to continue this item for Staff to return based on the direction provided.

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

There being no further business, **Chairman Grover** adjourned the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Stephen Robles, Village Planner.