



APPROVED Minutes of the regularly scheduled **ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD** held on Tuesday, February 19, 2019 in the Public Meeting Room of the Village Hall, One Olde Half Day Road, Lincolnshire, IL

PRESENT: Chair Kennerley and Members McCall, Baskin, and Santosuosso

ABSENT: Members Tapia and Orzeske; Trustee-Liaison Hancock

ALSO PRESENT: Ben Gilbertson, Assistant Village Manager/Director of Community and Economic Development (AVM/CED) and Tonya Zozulya, Planning and Development Manager (PDM)

CALL TO ORDER

1.0 ROLL CALL

The roll was called by **PDM Zozulya, Chair Kennerley** declared a quorum to be present.

2.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2.1 Approval of the Minutes of the Architectural Review Board held on Tuesday, January 15, 2019.

Member Baskin moved and **Member Santosuosso** seconded the motion to approve the minutes as written for the January 15, 2019 Architectural Review Board.

The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

3.0 ITEMS OF GENERAL BUSINESS

3.1 Approval of a Minor Amendment to an Existing Special Use Permit for Adlai E. Stevenson High School District 125 (**SHS**) to Permit Construction of a New Parking Lot, 1 Stevenson Drive (Adlai E. Stevenson High School District 125).

George Dreger of Eriksson Engineering representing SHS provided an overview of the proposed 100-space parking lot over an existing unused tennis court. The parking lot will have two entrances accessible only through the SHS property. Design, lighting, and landscape requirements comply with all Village and accessibility codes. In addition, there will be a retaining wall on the north side of the lot with landscape screening to include deciduous plantings. In response to **Chair Kennerley's** question, **George Dreger** stated the parking lot retaining wall is not intended to serve as a barrier to the soccer field, but provide separation between the soccer field and the parking lot.



Member McCall inquired about the use of this lot and whether it would provide the needs of the growing student population or if there would be a parking deck planned in the future. **George Dreger** stated SHS did consider a parking deck but decided not to pursue it as the costs are substantially higher at approximately \$40,000 per space, which they felt would not be the best use of tax payer money. He further added SHS is LEED Certified (Leadership in Energy and Environment Design) and the school constantly strives to maintain a balance between school needs and environmental consideration.

Member Baskin inquired about the caliper of the trees, impact of winter conditions, and if evergreens are included to soften the plan. **George Dreger** stated the landscape plan calls for 4" diameter-at-breast-height deciduous trees; no evergreens are proposed due to concerns about security camera visibility. **Member Baskin** stated he has had no issues including evergreens or addressing camera visibility when working with his school clients. He added it has been a challenge in Lincolnshire to provide more year-round variety in landscape plans and believes SHS should consider adding evergreens to this plan if there is an opportunity to do so.

Member Santosuosso inquired about drainage, design elements, and why storm inlets are not under the parking lot. **George Dreger** stated there are cost concerns with trenching and backfill, and they opted for storm traps in the grass versus the lot. In regards to drainage and grading comments noted by **Member Santosuosso**, it was noted SHS is working with Lake County Storm Water Management Commission (SMC) for permits.

PDM Zozulya noted this petition is for a minor amendment to the SHS Special Use Permit and does not require Village Board approval. Any decision made by the Architectural Review Board will be final. **George Dreger** stated the parking lot conceptual plan was included in the 2017 amendment to the Special Use for the addition.

Member Santosuosso moved, seconded by **Member McCall**, the Architectural Review Board to approve a minor amendment to the existing Special Use to permit a new parking lot for Adlai E. Stevenson High School District 125, as presented in the packet submitted by Eriksson Engineering Associates, date stamped received February 7, 2019, and further subject to consideration of adding coniferous trees to the landscape plan for wintergreen.

Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

- 3.2** Public Hearing regarding Amendments to Chapter 13, Temporary Signs, of Title 12, Sign Control, of the Village Code to Revise Temporary Sign Regulations in the Residential Sign District (Village of Lincolnshire)

Chair Kennerley recessed the Architectural Review Board (ARB) meeting and convened the Public Hearing.



PDM Zozulya provided background on the deliberations and code changes related to temporary signs in the Residential Sign District. She stated in September and November 2017, staff presented amendments to the sign code to bring the Village into compliance with *Reed v. Town of Gilbert* Supreme Court case ruling regarding content neutrality for commercial and non-commercial signs. She added over the course of a public hearing and several meetings, it was the recommendation of the ARB for the VB adopt the new sign code, which included reducing the height and square footage sizes for residential real estate signs, as well as implementing a time duration of 91 days in the Residential Sign District. Following adoption of the new code, staff sent notifications to local businesses and realtors regarding the new requirements. Staff then received concerns from several local brokerages, indicating they were concerned about the revised size requirements as being too small and having to take sign down after 91 duration period, as the non-continuous display would add to the cost of hiring sign companies to put up and take down signs. Responding to brokers' concern, **PDM Zozulya** stated the VB did not want temporary signs becoming permanent in nature, such as membership drive signs that could be up indefinitely. The VB also expressed concern over the condition of these signs, and sought temporary signs be replaced after one year.

Member Baskin inquired about duration of temporary signs in Lake Forest and Lake Bluff. **PDM Zozulya** stated she has not yet seen time limits imposed on residential real estate signs in other communities, where residential real estate signs do not have a display time limit. **Chair Kennerley** added another item to consider is whether the VB would consider giving staff the administrative authority to extend sign duration deadlines.

Chair Kennerley opened the floor to members of the audience. Joseph Roth, Edie Love, Steve Grunyk, and Julianne Spilotro came to the podium and were sworn in.

Joseph Roth, Illinois Realtors Association, discussed statistics regarding Lincolnshire and Lake Forest: the Lincolnshire average market time is 123 days, whereas the average market time in Lake Forest is 207 days and the price of a home is nearly double. For further comparison, **Mr. Roth** stated the market conditions in the communities of Riverwoods and Deerfield are similar to Lincolnshire, but those communities allow larger real estate signs. He added signs are a very important part of their marketing, with 10% of buyers locating new homes via signage. He added signs are taken down shortly after the closing.

Member McCall inquired about sign installation. **Edie Love**, Koennig Rubloff, stated they hire sign companies to install signs. She added the number of days on the market fluctuates widely and to put a time limitation would be difficult. She questioned the Village's ability to monitor and enforce the code requirements.

Steve Grunyk stated the recent market has been tough with declines in recent years, and that additional restrictions could cause home sales to lose momentum.



Winfield Cohen, Keller Williams, stated the purpose of the sign is to not keep a sale a secret, adding the industry is on the front end of a market decline. Larger signs are utilized nationwide as they convey a stronger message and provide room for additional 'riders' on the sign. He also stated he preferred the time duration should be until the property sells.

Julianne Spilotro, CB Exchange, requested clarification on what prompted the sign code changes and whether the Village asked the sellers or local agents about the changes in advance. The changes create an undue burden on the realtors.

Chair Kennerley thanked the realtors for their comments. She added the Village has to consider the impact of the code changes to all temporary signs, not only real estate signs.

Steve Grunyk stated he has not seen dilapidated signs in Lincolnshire. **Joseph Roth** noted the property maintenance code should cover any issues with conditions of signs and the vast majority of brokers should not be penalized due to some brokers not maintaining signs well. **Winfield Cohen** stated they have accountability with their clients to maintain their signs.

Discussion ensued regarding a separate category for real estate signs. **PDM Zozulya** stated the content neutrality premise would prohibit this; the only differentiation between sizes and display periods would be based on the sign district. **PDM Zozulya** read the draft ordinance as prepared by the Village Attorney in regards to the time duration which would allow signs to be installed and continuously displayed until 5 days after the conclusion of an event. She added the draft ordinance stipulates that signs displayed for more than one year must be replaced to ensure they remain in good condition.

Member Baskin asked if there are particular instances of signs that are problematic. Discussion ensued regarding membership enrollment signs for area clubs that can become "permanent" due to the ongoing recruitment. **Member Baskin** added the Village is requiring local realtors to deal with the smaller signs and would not be in favor of putting more encumbrances on them. He inquired who would be monitoring sign conditions. **PDM Zozulya** stated the Village's Code Enforcement staff would enforce it either through observation or in response to complaints. **Member Santosuosso** noted Section 5 of the proposed code covers conditions and maintenance of signs. Therefore, he does not see the need for mandatory sign replacement after one year of display. **Member McCall** concurred.

PDM Zozulya read the proposed language regarding removal of the sign within 5 days of various conditions, including the conclusion of an event/project, permit expiration, product sale/lease, or removal of a product from the market. **Chair Kennerley** asked the realtors present if this was acceptable in which they appeared to concur. She also reviewed the current code definitions of permanent and temporary signs.



Edie Love asked how they can get the Village to reconsider the size of the sign. **PDM Zozulya** said this would have to be discussed and the Village Board level and that she will notify all interested parties when this goes back to the Board.

Chair Kennerley closed the public hearing and reconvened the Architectural Review Board meeting.

Member McCall moved, seconded by **Member Baskin**, to approve and recommend amendments to Title 12 of the Lincolnshire Village Code regarding the permitted display period for temporary signs in the Residential Sign District, as presented in the draft Sign Ordinance prepared by the Village Attorney but striking the proposed language regarding sign removal and replacement after one year of display.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Chair Kennerley, Members Baskin, McCall, and Santosuosso

Nayes: None

Chair Kennerley noted the ARB recommendation will now move forward to the Committee of the Whole for discussion and consideration. The public can check the Village's website, under Meeting Agenda's and Minutes, for the meeting date at which this agenda item will be heard.

3.3 Continued Workshop regarding Text Amendments to Title 12, Sign Control, of the Lincolnshire Village Code, to Consolidate and Revise Regulations in the Downtown and Corridor Commercial Sign Districts for Permanent Signs (Village of Lincolnshire)

PDM Zozulya provided background on the continued workshop and recapped previous direction from the ARB from the December 18, 2018 meeting to combine the Downtown and Corridor Commercial sign districts into one district and noted the following areas for staff to further research:

1. Apply current Corridor Commercial wall and ground sign dimensions.
2. Apply current Downtown District monument sign design requirements to include the following design items: base, sign area and cap.
3. Add flexibility in ground sign materials while complementing building architecture.
4. Consider more stringent ground sign landscape regulations.

Member Baskin reiterated his concerns about the design cap requirement as it may not be appropriate in all cases depending on the architecture of the building. **Member Santosuosso** suggested any sign not adhering to base, sign area, and cap requirements would need approval of the ARB. **PDM Zozulya** clarified new sign or structural alteration proposals, which do not require variations, are currently reviewed by staff. When a new PUD or development is proposed, the signage is reviewed by the ARB as part of an overall development package. **Member Baskin** recommended new ground signs and structural alterations to existing ground signs be reviewed by the ARB, while simple ground sign face



changes could be approved administratively. **Chair Kennerley** said this would result in more signs coming before the ARB. She had concerns the sign conversation could require design changes to an existing building. **Member Baskin** clarified it would not be his intent to require a change to the existing building design, but to take the proposed sign changes within the context of the building. There was consensus that ARB should make the final determination on brand new ground signs or ground sign structural alterations. The sign cap be considered as an option but not a code requirement.

In regards to landscape regulations, **Member Baskin** asked why evergreens are an exception when located within 15 feet of a roadway. **PDM Zozulya** stated in the past, properties were required to install evergreen species within ground sign beds adjacent to a roadway. However, after property owners expressed concerns due to road salt impacts, the requirement was eliminated for sign beds within 15' of the road. She further reviewed the landscape requirements with the ARB, noting Lincolnshire has one of the most comprehensive landscape requirements of other area communities. **Member Santosuoso** recommended combining bullet points 3 and 4 in the Ground Sign Landscape Regulations sections. All other ARB members concurred.

Member Baskin inquired if the intent of the code will meet the expectations of staff, adding the sign size and landscape should be in scale with one another and create a unified and aesthetically pleasing look.

PDM Zozulya reiterated the section of the proposed code which states "to achieve both height variation and color interest throughout the four seasons". She said staff would provide recommended language to incorporate the landscape/sign scale.

AVM/CED Gilbertson stated staff would be proactive in communicating with businesses to remind them of code requirements, approved plans, and proper maintenance. ARB members agreed, indicating property owners should be reminded of this on an annual basis.

PDM Zozulya requested ARB comments on commercial wall sign illumination. The ARB decided to eliminate frontlit illumination restrictions in the proposed Commercial District. **PDM Zozulya** also inquired whether the ARB was also interested in removing the same frontlit wall sign illumination conditions from the Office/Industrial Sign District. **Member McCall** noted the use differences between those districts are significant. Therefore, the Village decided to create separate requirements for the Office/Industrial Sign District. The ARB decided to leave the Office/Industrial frontlit conditions unchanged and revisit them in the future when the Office/Industrial Sign District is scheduled for review.

PDM Zozulya noted the proposed changes will require a public hearing. Staff will incorporate the ARB comments and move forward with the public hearing process at a future ARB meeting.



4.0 UNFINISHED BUSINESS (None)

5.0 NEW BUSINESS (None)

6.0 CITIZEN COMMENTS (None)

7.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, **Member Baskin** moved, seconded by **Member Santosuosso**, to adjourn the meeting.

Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Chair Kennerley adjourned the meeting at 9:08 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Carol Lustig
Administrative Assistant, Community & Economic Development Dept.