



- APPROVED** Minutes of the **REGULAR MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD** held on Tuesday, September 16, 2014, in the Public Meeting Room of the Village Hall, One Olde Half Day Road, Lincolnshire, IL.
- PRESENT:** Chairman Pro Tem Gulatee, Members Kennerley and Schlecht.
- ABSENT:** Chairman Grover, Member Hardnock and Trustee Liaison McDonough.
- ALSO PRESENT:** Stephen Robles, Village Planner and Steve McNellis, Community & Economic Development Director
- CALL TO ORDER:** Planner Robles noted that Chairman Grover would be absent and requested the ARB elect a Chairman Pro Tem for this meeting. After discussion Member Gulatee agreed to act as Chairman Pro Tem and called the meeting to order at 7:11 p.m.

#### 1.0 ROLL CALL

The roll was called by **Planner Robles** and **Chairman Pro Tem Gulatee** declared a quorum to be present.

#### 2.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2.1 Approval of the Minutes of the Regular Architectural Review Board Meeting held Tuesday, June 17, 2014.

**Member Schlecht** moved and **Member Kennerley** seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of the Architectural Review Board held on June 17, 2014, as presented. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

#### 3.0 ITEMS OF GENERAL BUSINESS:

3.1 Consideration and Discussion regarding conceptual design plans for a proposed parking deck at 25/75 Tri-State International Office Center (Trammell Crow Company / Principal Real Estate Investors).

**Director McNellis** presented Staff's summary of the proposal and noted the ARB will be informed by the Petitioner this evening that the parking structure has increased from a split-level deck to four uniform stories. He also noted this is a conceptual review discussion and the basic design discussed tonight will be refined and detailed and will return to the October meeting for full review. This gives the Petitioner the opportunity to see if any big picture comments need to be addressed.

**Grady Hamilton** of Trammell Crow, represented the Petitioner and introduced other members of his team, including John Carlson of Trammell Crow, Roger Heerema and Aji Adebawale of Wright Heerema Architects and Kelly Morrissey of Colliers (Property Manager). Mr. Hamilton noted that 56% of his 550,000 sq. ft. property is



leased today. He further noted that the office world has changed, due to a shift in trends because of technology. As a result, companies use space differently. The company that Tri-State hopes to attract is a good example. They are not prepared to move forward with this project with the parking as currently situated, so we all need to be creative.

**Grady Hamilton** provided a powerpoint presentation of the Petitioner's proposal. He noted the parking easement is now moot and will be abandoned with Village approval. He also confirmed the parking deck will now be a full four stories. The reason for this, and the good news, is that the request of this tenant now includes Buildings 25, 75 and 100. The other good news is that the requirement for parking for the 100 building is less intensive so the overall parking requirement becomes more balanced.

**Member Schlect** asked what was driving the need for more parking. **Grady Hamilton** said the new office trends were for more densely occupied floor plates. Dead file storage is no longer a big requirement, as those needs are now satisfied through the use of technology. Also, the 70's culture of big offices and big conference rooms is no longer the norm. Now, companies are trying to reduce floor space requirements.

**Grady Hamilton** went on to note that in Chicago, offices get away without parking requirements because there are shared public garages and mass transit options. Suburban offices cant offer this and have had a hard time competing recently. Past tenants in the Tri-State office center have paid for expensive shuttles to train stations, but its not efficient. Suburbs need to realize that parking demands will increase and office space per employee will reduce, if they are to compete with Chicago. Four parking spaces per 1,000 sq. ft. will no longer be the case. In this case, allowing this parking deck at this location means the Village has the opportunity to bring 1700 employees into this office center and modernize the site.

**Member Schlect** asked if the 6/1,000 sq. ft. requirement of this tenant was happening in other communities? **Grady Hamilton** noted this is increasingly becoming the norm. Any new office in Chicago or new facilities in the suburbs look for this. **Member Schlect** inquired "with less cubicles and more bench tops?" to which Mr. Hamilton said "yes" and added this prospective company ahs a team atmosphere. Their need for private offices is less important. The office Center is under-parked now. So, doing this would be right for any new tenant at this location.

**Member Schlect** asked if this would be enough to get the Letter of Interest to get this company on-board. Mr. Hamilton answered it would, but they really have to have this parking deck. This is their top priority. The total square footage they take in this office center could be from 249,000 to 300,000.

**Member Kennerly** asked if the building of the deck would coincide with the tenant moving-in or be prior to their move-in. Mr. Hamilton said the deck construction would start in the Spring and the tenant would occupy by the end of next year. They're currently in leased space. The goal is to have their occupancy coterminous



with their current lease expiration. So, the parking structure will be completed for their occupancy. Member Kennerly further inquired if Lincolnshire was their top choice if this all moves forward. **Grady Hamilton** did not have an answer but stated there would likely be a parking improvement at this site, but it would be delayed if this tenant doesn't come.

**Chairman Pro Tem Gulatee** confirmed that if there are 1700 people coming with this tenant the deck will be four levels. **Director McNellis** confirmed that is the proposal. He further noted he wasn't aware at this time exactly how many parking spaces that would be. Mr. amilton noted there would be approximately 1,250 employees in the 25/75 building and 500 more in 100 Tri-State.

**Chairman Pro Tem Gulatee** asked if any traffic studies had been completed, and if there would be one main entry into the parking structure. **Grady Hamilton** said there would be one main entry. He further noted they will complete a traffic study, as was also discussed with the Village Board earlier. **Chairman Pro Tem Gulatee** asked if the Traffic Study would not just be on-site, but also on Westminster Way. **Director McNellis** stated the Village Board had requested a traffic study. He further noted traffic would be in and outbound the opposite of most traffic in the Village. He noted the traffic impact on the community could be minimal. However, a study is important and they will need to do one. He further noted there were also a few zoning matters regarding setbacks and height that will be addressed, along with the Traffic Study, in the proper zoning process, which will occur after the ARB review of this project in October.

**Member Schlect** asked if traffic was going to be reviewed during the zoning process with the Village Board. Director McNellis stated it would and that the ARB should keep in mind this Center was once full, at a time when Rt. 22 was two lanes, not the current four. Member Schlect further inquired about the neighbors at Sutton Place. Director McNellis noted the parking structure isn't next to the neighbors and they won't see any of it from their homes.

**Member Schlect** noted he feels traffic is the issue. **Grady Hamilton** said they will do outreach but the scale of this project isn't as big as some might think. Most ingress/egress is against the prevailing patterns. **Chairman Pro tem Gulatee** stated they should do the Traffic Study first to see if parking will even work. **Director McNellis** noted again that occupancy at this building was once 92%. There are around 500 people being added to that past scenario when there was an intersection on Rt. 22 that was only two lanes, not the current four. **Grady Hamilton** stated they have hired traffic consultants and believe there is enough capacity and that the Traffic Study will show there is sufficient capacity. **Member Kennerly** reiterated this is a zoning responsibility, not the ARB's so lets move on.

**Roger Heerema** of Wright Heerema Architects presented reasons for siting the deck, including views to and from the building and preserving circulation around the building. He noted the proposed deck provides an efficient layout without consuming a lot of land or height. He noted the building is a typical 1970's horizontal banded building. The deck would also be pre-cast concrete stained to



match the building, so it will fit in well with the existing context. Signage is something they'll come back for later. It is an important factor.

**Chairman Pro Tem Gulatee** asked what the dimensions were. **Roger Heerema** said it was a typical 2-way 90 degree parking with 10' floor to floor height and a little taller on the ground floor to allow accessible vans.

**Member Schlect** noted that unfortunately the building lends itself to spancrete. He further noted setbacks are not just a zoning issue, they're also an aesthetic issue. The majority of the tenants will be looking at the deck. This is the Village's front door. He noted he would challenge the architects to make the deck look more like the building, with a base, a mid-section and a top. It seems like a massing study right now. He inquired if they had looked at burying the floor and if there was any other way to not put this at the Village's "front door". **Roger Heerema** stated they share the ARB's concerns. He noted the Landscape Plan will be creative to break down the length of the deck, but that this is the most logical place for the deck.

**Member Schlect** asked if they could at least enclose the deck on the Tri-State side with a panelized system/ He noted it is not aesthetically pleasing to "look through it". **Grady Hamilton** said the deck is sort of topographically concealed by the on-ramp and to put a structure further down the Tollway frontage would be even more conspicuous. **Member Schlect** stated he understood why it had to be located here. He inquired if they could have a 45 degree screen wall on the north and south side of the deck along the on-ramp, that captures the building character a little more. He wondered how you could make it look more like a building. He suggested they put in these angled walls and a panelized system.

**Grady Hamilton** noted if you incorporate glass around the stairtower so it looks more like the building maybe that would help. Perhaps spandrel or vision glass in the stairtower. **Member Schlect** stated they should draw more on the horizontals on the side facing the on-ramp. **Grady Hamilton** agreed improvement could be made to the building design without enclosing it. **Member Schlect** stated he wasn't proposing completely enclosing it, but how about a simple panel system at least on the on-ramp side to screen that side off? He further noted the buildings themselves are broken-up He asked if there could be a reveal on one side of the parking garage that breaks up the massing like that.

**Roger Heerema** stated the question is "what does this look like when you're driving down the ramp?" We can show that. **Member Schlect** noted the wing walls he is proposing would be a good place for a sign. **Chairman Pro Tem Gulatee** agreed that seeing a wing wall when you're driving north on the Tollway means you won't see the deck head-on. He further inquired if putting the deck here was adding value to the buildings. **Grady Hamilton** noted there was a lot of square footage in these two buildings that won't be impacted by the deck. **Chairman Pro tem Gulatee** further noted he is not in favor of using landscaping to resolve other issues.

**Grady Hamilton** noted once again this is the least obtrusive location for the parking deck. **Member Kennerly** asked with people parking in this deck along the Tollway



have there been any thoughts about how windy and drafty it might be and whether or not this will create a wind tunnel. She also suggested making the parking structure look more like the building with glass. **Roger Heerema** stated he did not think wind loads would be an issue. **Planner Robles** inquired if snow loads had been figured in, to which Roger Heerema responded yes.

**Member Schlect** asked if there were any other improvements they're considering at this time, to which Mr. Hamilton stated not at the moment. **Member Schlect** stated we're here to help, but keep in mind its our front door so we don't want to just dump a structure there.

- 3.2 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).

Due to lack of quorum, this item was not discussed.

- 3.3 Consideration and Discussion regarding Text Amendments to Chapter 2, 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 following direction from the Village Board, Staff was authorized to review the current landscaping requirements to balance the Village's aesthetic expectations with commercial developments' desire for openness and visibility. He continued that the landscaping requirements were located in Chapter 2 of Title 13 of the Village Code and applied to all properties in the Village. Since the landscape regulations were not zoning codes, a public hearing on text amendments was not required. However, since the ARB regularly reviews and enforces landscaping requirements, Staff and the Village Board sought ARB input. **Village Planner Robles** noted that the night's meeting was to be a general summary of big picture modifications being proposed based on Staff's review of the current Landscaping code. He noted minor revisions and updates were proposed throughout the Landscaping Title, with a detailed in summary provided in the memo. Before proposing new code language, Staff sought the ARB's input and direction.

**Village Planner Robles** continued, traditionally zoning regulations began with a purpose statement to identify the objectives of the given code regulations, which were absent. As a result, Staff proposed the following:

*This Landscaping Code is adopted for the following purposes:*

- A. *Promote and maintain the high quality visual appearance of the Village through landscaping and preservation of native vegetation in conjunction with new developments and redevelopment of existing properties.*
- 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. Provide natural buffers between neighboring properties to screen against noise pollution and the precipitation of dust and other airborne pollutants.*
- D. Minimize the visual and environmental impacts of paved surfaces and buildings, and aid in the reduction of air pollution through the removal of harmful carbon dioxide.*
- E. Balance the property rights of individual property owners with those of the overall health, safety and welfare interests of the Village.*
- F. Protect and increase property values in a manner that maintains each property owner's enjoyment of their property.*

**Member Schlecht** expressed the focus should be on positives of landscaping and less reliant on the legal requirements. **Member Kennerley** concurred and noted focus should also include enhancement of commercial and industrial buildings. She continued, the statement should be skimmed down to follow more of a vision statement format, or more of a broad statement of why landscaping is important component to the Village. The intent of the landscaping regulations should also note the importance of year-round landscaping.

**Village Planner Robles** proceeded, and explained the Landscape Screening section included regulations requiring a visual barrier to certain unattractive or monotonous elements; such as building walls, mechanical equipment, and parking lots. While landscape barriers of unattractive elements should continue, many of the requirements did account for the visual obstruction of customer areas that retailers rely on for increased traffic. Staff proposed to revise this section to achieve a balance in obscuring unsightly site elements while allowing parking areas and commercial buildings to remain visible to the public.

**Member Kennerley** noted the use of the word “barrier” was appropriate when addressing landscape screening of commercial properties adjacent to residential. **Member Schlecht** questioned the need for the current amount of detailed outlined by the Code, noting the extent of landscaping should be in the determination of the ARB and Staff. **Member Kennerley** responded the need to have guidelines for such. **Chairman Pro Tem Gulatee** expressed the landscaping regulations should be left to common sense. **Member Kennerley** reinforced the need for guidance offered by the Code.

**Village Planner Robles** continued his presentation and explained the Landscape Improvements to Private Property Section was intended for residentially zoned property and should be moved out of the General Landscape Requirements Section. He noted the Landscaping Code is absent of any basic planting requirements for residential properties, and Staff questioned if minimum requirements would be appropriate. Any requirements would establish very basic and minimal plantings, only applicable to new home construction.



**Member Schlecht** noted this absence was a big hole in the Code. **Member Kennerley** questioned what Staff was considering. **Village Planner Robles** provided an example, that for a newly constructed single-family lot, a minimum of three trees would be required by Code. Each tree would need to be planted in one of the four yards; front, either side yards, or rear yard. There would not be any specification on the species of tree, just a minimum number to be easily achieved, but provide assurances the developer of a residential lot would not turn a lot over to a new resident without any trees. **Member Kennerley** pointed out the back yard was important as there was typically less landscaping investment in rear yards. She also recommended an evergreen-type tree was included on the list. **Member Schlecht** offered that established neighborhoods within the immediate area of a new residence could establish what should be planted in a new lot and/or neighborhood. **Chairman Pro Tem Gulatee** verified if code required trees to be planted along the parkway. **Village Planner Robles** confirmed the Landscaping Code required parkway tree plantings, however, the proposed amendment would establish a minimum threshold for trees to be planted on private residential lots – new construction only.

**Village Planner Robles** continued his presentation with Landscape Improvement Deposits, which the deposit requirements of in that section were identical to the requirements of the Subdivision Code. Staff proposed to relocate the section to the Subdivisions Code for consistency with similar improvement deposit requirements.

The ARB concurred with this recommendation.

**Village Planner Robles** proceeded with Landscape Requirements for Commercial Developments, which were applicable to all new, non-residential developments. Included in the code was a tree distribution chart, which required 34 trees per acre. Staff analyzed a landscape plan from a 2008 project to determine suitability of the tree quantities. While this plan included 40 total trees, it failed to achieve the required tree diversity. Also sampled was a 2-acre commercial site, and the site was five trees short of the 68 tree requirement. In both samples, the number of trees, regardless of achieving code compliance, were more than abundant for the site. As a result, Staff questioned if the minimum tree quantities should be reduced to create better visual lines of sight to commercial properties. Staff also proposed to establish requirements for modifications to approved landscape plans to establish clear procedures missing from the Code.

**Chairman Pro Tem Gulatee** commented that when trees are first planted, the site is sparsely landscaped, but after some time, the landscaping becomes too overcrowded. **Member Kennerley** expressed landscaping in front of a building should be low growing trees and shrubs. **Member Schlecht** noted the code should not specify where to install landscaping, rather the minimum amount. **Village Planner Robles** responded the Code attempted to identify locations of required landscaping to ensure a balanced site. **Member Schlecht** expressed the challenges of such code requirements, which were very subjective, making it difficult to establish an appropriate number. **Village Planner Robles** noted Staff would continue to explore



suitable options for required plantings of commercial developments, and return to the ARB for further analysis.

**Village Planner Robles** continued Staff's presentation of Landscape Requirements for Subdivisions, and noted the uncertainty of whether the section was intended for residential subdivisions or all types of land subdivisions. Staff proposed to conduct an overall cleanup of this section to provide clarity in the application of such regulations.

The ARB concurred with this recommendation.

**Village Planner Robles** proceeded with landscape requirements for stormwater detention facilities and explained the section was to ensure detention facilities were designed, constructed, and maintained in a manner which provided functionality as well as visual appeal. As a result, all stormwater facilities must be planted with native landscaping, subject to the following framework; A) Design Plan, B) Construction/Establishment Plan, C) Maintenance and Monitoring Plan, and D) Enforcement. **Village Planner Robles** explained such subsections contained detailed regulations requiring substantial knowledge in the installation, monitoring and maintenance of native vegetation. Based on the Code language, Village Staff was responsible for the implementation and enforcement of the requirements, which required specific personnel with professional expertise no longer part of the administrative structure. A restructuring of the section was recommended to employ the services of a qualified environmental consultant to continue achieving code compliance.

**Member Kennerley** noted her awareness of certain high-visible stormwater detention ponds in the Village and the need to continue efforts of the landscaping requirements. **Member Schlecht** questioned if stormwater detention facilities could be used for active space. **Village Planner Robles** explained the Village is subject to the Lake County Watershed Development Ordinance (WDO) administered by Lake County Stormwater Management Commission (LCSMC) and any use of stormwater facilities for activity purposes would be subject to the WDO and LCSMC. **Member Kennerley** questioned who is responsible for the maintenance of the various stormwater facilities. **Village Planner Robles** identified that in residential subdivisions, maintenance is typically the responsibility of the homeowner's associations. In the commercial and office/industrial areas of the Village, he explained the property owners or business association were responsible for maintenance. **Member Kennerley** suggested the section in question could be revised to offer an "or" option so that Village Staff would not be the sole responsible party for establishment, maintenance and enforcement.

Following discussion of landscaping requirements for stormwater detention facilities, the ARB concurred with Staff's recommendation to revise the code section to utilize the services of outside consultants.



There being no further discussion, the ARB requested additional revisions to the proposed text amendments and for Staff to return at the next regularly scheduled ARB meeting for further consideration.

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

**Member Schlecht** noted his preference for the entire ARB Members to be present during the discussion of this agenda item, and requested this item be continued to the October 21<sup>st</sup> ARB meeting. **Chairman Pro Tem Gulatee** concurred and tabled discussion to the October ARB meeting.

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

There being no further business, **Chairman Pro Tem Gulatee** sought a motion for adjournment. **Member Schlecht** moved, and **Member Kennerley** seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Steve McNellis, Director of Community and Economic Development and Stephen Robles, Village Planner.