

**APPROVED** Minutes of the **REGULAR MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD** held on Tuesday, April 17, 2012, in the Public Meeting Room of the Village Hall, One Olde Half Day Road, Lincolnshire, IL.

**PRESENT:** Chairman Pro Tem Grover, Members Hardnock, Gulatee, Kennerley and Schlecht.

**ABSENT:** Member Wang and Trustee Liaison McDonough.

**ALSO PRESENT:** Steve McNellis, Director of Community Development, and Tonya Zozulya, Planner.

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Pro Tem Grover called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

### **1.0 ROLL CALL**

The roll was called by Planner Zozulya and Chairman Pro Tem Grover declared a quorum to be present.

### **2.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

2.1 Approval of the Minutes of the Rescheduled Architectural Review Board Meeting held Tuesday, February 7, 2012.

Member Hardnock moved and Member Gulatee seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the rescheduled Meeting of the Architectural Review Board held Tuesday, February 7, 2012, as submitted. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

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

3.1 Consideration and discussion of a site plan; landscape plans; building elevations, materials and colors; rooftop equipment screening plan, and an exterior lighting plan, for a proposed 78,000-square foot warehouse building addition to an existing office/warehouse building, located at 450 Barclay Boulevard (Harris Architects/Durable Packaging International)

Planner Zozulya stated that prior to tonight's meeting, the Petitioner provided a supplement to their presentation packet, featuring close-up renderings of the proposed building elevations as well as paint colors that would be used to stain the proposed precast panels.

She stated that this request was reviewed by the Village Board in January. At that time, the Petitioner was provided with specific building design and site landscaping comments, which they were requested to address prior to the Architectural Review Board review. The Zoning Board reviewed this request, with regard to the Floor Area Ratio and landbanked parking variations, at their April 10, 2012 meeting, and continued the Public Hearings until the regularly scheduled May 8, 2012 meeting.

She stated that the proposed plans illustrate that access into the site will remain unchanged. The plans also depict that one new interior drive-in area is proposed for

the addition. The trash enclosure will remain inside the building. Currently, 69 parking spaces are provided on the site. The Petitioner is proposing to reconfigure their existing parking lot immediately south of the new addition, thereby providing 64 stalls. No new parking is proposed to be built at this time. The remainder of the required parking is proposed to be deferred via landbanking. Based on the existing and proposed office/warehouse use, 127 parking spaces are required by Code. The Petitioner has indicated to Staff that their estimate of parking demand, following the expansion, is that it will not exceed 50 spaces for their employees and occasional visitors. They believe that this demonstrates that the parking to be provided will be sufficient for their immediate parking needs. Staff determined that the proposed trees are appropriate for the site and meet and exceed replacement values required by Code.

**Planner Zozulya** said that the proposed building is designed to match the design of the existing building in height, rooflines and color. However, a different building material is proposed for the addition. The proposed structure height is 29' (the overall height of the building, with the proposed rooftop units and corresponding screens, would be 33.5'), which is in compliance with the Village Code.

**Planner Zozulya** said that the top half of the building is depicted to be constructed of tan-colored smooth-finish precast panels to match the existing light-colored stucco panels. The lower half of the new building is proposed to be constructed of smooth-finish precast concrete panels (with horizontal reveals) stained to match the existing reddish brick color. She stated that while the proposed color elevations demonstrate the same color on the proposed addition as the existing building, Staff has concerns about the proposed precast material on the entire addition. In Staff's review, this material would not only be inconsistent with the existing portion of the building, but also with the immediately adjacent properties along Barclay Boulevard, between Knightsbridge Parkway and Tower Parkway, which all have brick façades facing Barclay Boulevard.

**Planner Zozulya** stated that at the Village Board referral meeting, there was concern expressed regarding the Petitioner's proposal to use a precast material on the entire building addition. She said that while newer buildings have been approved in precast, Staff does not believe there are any existing examples of industrial buildings in the Village where additions to original brick buildings have been completed in a precast material. **Planner Zozulya** provided examples of two immediately adjacent properties (HydraForce at 500 Barclay Boulevard and Varian at 425 Barclay Boulevard) that constructed their building additions in brick, to match the original brick buildings.

**Planner Zozulya** also indicated that the proposed building elevations illustrate the addition of four new rooftop units. The units are proposed to be screened with Envisor thermoplastic panel enclosures extending 6" above each unit. The finish of the unit enclosures will match the light tan color of the top portion of the elevations (which is consistent with the vertical screen panel design of the rooftop units on the existing building). The proposed Site Plan and Photometrics Plan illustrate the removal of one existing light pole and the addition of one new light pole within the parking lot, at the southeast corner of the property.

**Planner Zozulya** stated that the Petitioner is also proposing two new building wall fixtures on the south and east façades, to match the existing fixtures in design and color. No additional wall or ground signage is being proposed. The proposed photometrics plans were reviewed and found to be in compliance with Code requirements.

**Planner Zozulya** said that Staff is in support of the proposal with one recommendation regarding the incorporation of a brick material into the lower portion of the proposed building. She concluded her presentation by stating that the Petitioner was present to make a presentation and answer any questions you may have, as well as provide building materials and color samples.

**Mr. Rick Harris**, Project Manager at Harris Architects, representing the Petitioner, introduced Durable Packaging. He stated that Durable Packaging is a third-generation business that produces and stores durable foil products. The addition would match the height of the existing building, which is 29'. No new truck doors are proposed. The existing parking will be reconfigured. They are providing a substantial amount of landscaping with the addition.

**Mr. Harris** stated that precast has a number of advantages over brick. It is more flexible, load-bearing and faster to construct than brick. He said that warehouses are no longer built in brick.

**Mr. Harris** stated that he disagrees with Staff's comments in Staff's memo. He said that he specifically takes an issue with Staff's statement that the proposed building is inconsistent with surrounding properties. Unlike Durable Packaging, the immediately adjacent properties have fairly small buildings with a small warehouse component (with the majority of the building devoted to an office use). He also stated that there are a number of existing precast buildings on Barclay Boulevard, south of Tower Parkway, and the neighboring Schelter Road to the west. He felt that Staff reviewed existing buildings in a very limited area, focusing on Barclay Road only. **Mr. Harris** also noted a prominent color difference between the original and expanded portions of the HydraForce building at 500 Barclay Boulevard (he distributed photographs). **Mr. Harris** also stated that it is incorrect to state that a trend for precast buildings is a recent one, as precast buildings have been built since the 1990's. He stated that the existing brick on the Durable Packaging building is 30 years old, and would be very difficult to match with new brick. **Mr. Harris** also stated that the existing building is currently not of the same character as the surrounding properties.

**Mr. Darren Anders**, a part owner of Durable Packaging, stated that he did not have anything to add and is available for questions.

**Chairman Pro Tem Grover** asked the Board whether they had any issues with the proposed site plan, landscape plan, rooftop equipment screening plan, signage and trash enclosure. The ARB members in attendance indicated their support for that part of the proposal.

**Chairman Pro Tem Grover** requested the Board's comments regarding the proposed building materials and colors. He requested the Petitioner's confirmation that no stucco material is proposed for the new building, to which the **Mr. Harris** responded that the entire 820 linear feet of the new building is proposed in a precast material that would be stained to match the existing colors. **Planner Zozulya** inquired whether the staining would occur on- or off-site. **Mr. Harris** said that precast panels would be stained on-site. **Chairman Pro Tem Grover** requested clarification regarding the proposed stain colors. **Mr. Harris** stated that his company has done a number of precast buildings and that material/color mismatch is sometimes requested by the property owner, in order to define the addition and original building as different.

**Member Hardnock** inquired whether the Petitioner can provide the cost difference between brick and precast. **Mr. Harris** stated he did not have that information on hand.

**Chairman Pro Tem Grover** asked the Petitioner about the thickness of the bottom panels. **Mr. Harris** said that each panel is 8-9.5" thick and 3' wide.

**Member Gulatee** stated that he does not believe that an exact color match could be achieved by either brick or precast. He inquired about the floor height, to which **Mr. Harris** responded that the proposed clear height is 24'. He suggested exploring other options for building architecture as the problem does not lie in the material alone.

**Member Kennerley** said that while she is not opposed to a precast material, the presented material and color samples do not provide sufficient information for her to make her determination. The Petitioner needs to provide a precast sample with the proposed color. She also requested either an actual existing brick sample or an enlarged photograph of the existing building. She felt that the existing and proposed buildings need to be blended in such a way that they form one cohesive building.

**Chairman Pro Tem Grover** requested further details regarding the proposed reveals.

**Member Schlecht** inquired whether the Petitioner could provide the name of the existing brick. **Mr. Harris** stated that he does not know what kind of brick it is. **Member Schlecht** said that once they know the name of the brick, they could bring in a brick company to investigate what the closest color match would be.

**Mr. Anders** expressed concern about the costs of matching the existing brick.

**Member Schlecht** suggested looking into a face brick or form-lined concrete panels, which is not a very expensive option. He added that the proposed 8" thick reveals look more like blocks than brick.

**Member Schlecht** also inquired about the front (Barclay-facing) building façade. **Mr. Harris** stated that the existing building entrance is off the south façade and that it does not have any special architectural features. **Mr. Anders** added that he does not believe the existing building has any windows. **Member Schlecht** suggested

improving the front façade by adding articulation or windows, in order to break it up, and distinguish it more as it is the main visible façade. He said that it is up to the Petitioner to determine how to accomplish this.

**Member Hardnock** stated that he appreciates the Petitioner's idea about adding brick accents to the Barclay façade. He stated that the front elevation may also require the addition of windows for enhanced articulation.

**Mr. Harris** asked the ARB how they would feel about form-lined concrete panels. **Member Kennerley** requested that the Petitioner provide material/color samples. She would like to be able to compare it with the existing brick material.

**Member Schlecht** asked the Petitioner if they envision requesting a new identification sign during the ARB review. **Mr. Anders** stated that they are considering one, but would prefer to wait until the building addition and landscaping is completed.

**Member Gulatee** stated that he is not opposed to a 2% FAR variation. **Planner Zozulya** said that this variation request is currently reviewed by the Zoning Board, who will provide a recommendation to the Village Board.

*There being no further comments or questions from the ARB, it was the Board's consensus that consideration and discussion of this matter should be continued until the May 15, 2012 ARB meeting, to allow the Petitioner the opportunity to revise their proposed plans and address other items requested by the ARB.*

#### **4.0 UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

#### **5.0 NEW BUSINESS (None)**

#### **6.0 CITIZENS COMMENTS (None)**

#### **7.0 ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, **Chairman Pro Tem Grover** adjourned the meeting at 8:10 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Tonya Zozulya, Planner.