

**VILLAGE OF LAKE BLUFF  
ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW  
REGULAR MEETING  
NOVEMBER 7, 2017**

**APPROVED MINUTES**

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call**

The meeting of the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) of the Village of Lake Bluff was called to order on November 7, 2017 at 7:00 p.m. in the Village Hall Board Room (40 E. Center Avenue) and the following were present.

Present: Jill Danly  
Neil Dahlmann  
Matthew Kerouac  
Carol Russ  
Bob Hunter, Chair

Absent: Edward Deegan  
Julie Wehmeyer

Also Present: Mike Croak, Building Codes Supervisor (BCS)

**2. Consideration of the October 3, 2017 ABR Regular Meeting Minutes**

Member Russ moved to approve the minutes of the October 3, 2017 ABR meeting as presented. Member Danly seconded the motion. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote.

**3. Non-Agenda Items and Visitors (Public Comment Time)**

Chair Hunter stated the ABR Chair and Board Members allocate fifteen minutes during this item for those individuals who would like the opportunity to address the Board on any matter not listed on the agenda.

There were no requests to address the ABR.

**4. Consideration of a Sign Permit Application for 71 Waukegan Road**

Chair Hunter introduced the agenda item and invited the applicant to the podium.

BCS Croak said he inadvertently included two different versions of the wall sign. The request is only for the larger wall sign which requires an exemption. The applicant does not plan to install the smaller sign.

Mr. Jeremy Hall introduced Mr. Mike Kinsella of Poblocki Sign; he then spoke on behalf of Northshore University Health System, a tenant at 71 Waukegan Road. The requested variance is for the monument sign at the corner of Waukegan Road and Albrecht Drive as well as the building sign. The plan is to go with the sign on the wall of the building in lieu of the smaller sign over the door. Mr. Hall reviewed the sign specifications for the proposed single tenant monument sign located on the southwest corner of the site. Currently there is one entrance to this particular site and the goal is to provide additional way-finding to the building. This is a multi-tenant building and the wall sign would identify their entranceway. The proposed wall sign is consistent in character with the proposed ground signage.

In response to a question from Member Russ, Mr. Hall said North Shore University Health System occupies approximately 50% of the building and the two other occupied spaces represent approximately 3,000 sq. ft.

Member Russ said this is a multi-tenant building and it may be a dilemma to have the building identified instead of tenant identification. It is great that the applicant is located on the corner of the building and has two signs, that works well, but in a multi-tenant situation there needs to be other accommodations in addition to the proposed signage. She favors conforming to the sign code if there is no hardship, and to her the sign is too large. These are good looking signs and a wonderful identification program. She questioned the size of the sign and what should be done about other tenants if the prime position has been approved for a single tenant that occupies the largest percentage of the building. Mr. Hall said they had spoken with the landlord because their goal is to eventually occupy the entire building. At the present they have solely secured the sign rights to the building for approximately 15 years and the landlord does not plan to ask for any additional signage for the other on-site tenants.

In response to a question from Chair Hunter, Mr. Hall said the long term plan is to occupy the entire building but currently there are other tenants in the building that recently renewed their leases.

Member Kerouac said he has an issue with the height and asked if it could be shorter. Mr. Hall said the plan is to have landscaping under the proposed sign and they want the sign at such a height to prevent the address from being covered by the landscaping.

Member Kerouac asked, if the landscaping was eliminated, could they be successful with a smaller sign. Mr. Hall said he does not know how well people would see the sign if it was shorter but he is willing to have the conversation about it. The primary goal would be to keep the North Shore face on the signage consistent and as large as possible, more so than the brick underneath.

Member Kerouac expressed concern regarding the proposed monument sign #2 in relation to the existing stop sign exiting the driveway. He asked for clarification to ensure the sign would not create any safety hazards. Mr. Kinsella said visibility will be considered when the final location is staked so as not to create a hazardous situation. Lastly, Member Kerouac asked if there were any hardship situations they were trying to accommodate besides the landscaping.

Member Danly said she appreciates the plan to replace the landscaping. The proposed monument sign is extremely over-scaled and she feels that there is not a need for that especially when a 6 ft. sign seem appropriate and is consistent with the sign code. She questioned the need for the larger sign because she does not think landscaping is the reason for the larger sign. Member Danly commented on the proposed building sign and disposition of the existing tree not shown in the rendering. Mr. Hall said the tree would have to be relocated because it would block the proposed building sign.

Member Danly asked if they had considered individual lettering that illuminates from behind instead of the box lettering. Mr. Hall stated the Northshore University Health System branding process is a compilation of various signage types. This is not a fluorescent light bulb back lit box but rather a push through lettering sign. This design gives it a nice color and glow behind the letters that does not make it appear cheap like the older box signs. Mr. Hall said Northshore

University Health System chose this type because it is the easiest to read both during the day and night hours.

Mr. Kinsella briefly explained the North Shore University logo noting that it would be impossible to fabricate the rule line in a lit element to be readable and individually placed on the building. Also the black color in the North Shore logo when placed on a brick façade is not readable. The plan to make the signage more fashionable and the proposed signage is common at most of their facilities.

Member Danly asked if they feel like a larger sign at the entrance is appropriate. Mr. Hall said both designs were shown to their client and they felt the larger sign would attract additional traffic. In terms of overall size, the proposed sign fits the building and fill up the vacant space in the corner. The plan is to get the sign to fit the location more than trying to drive the size of the sign. A discussion regarding the size and location followed.

Member Danly asked if they tried the smaller sign on the building. Mr. Kinsella said they let the building conditions drive the size of the sign.

In response to a comment from Member Russ, BCS Croak said the original verbiage in the staff report described the other version of the wall sign, not the actually sign being requested. Member Russ said the memorandum should reflect the proposed sign does not comply with the sign code.

Member Dahlmann inquired of the height of the existing Deerpath Medical monument sign. Mr. Kinsella said he does not know but can get the information. Member Dahlmann said he is glad the landscaping will be replaced, but he would prefer a smaller sign.

Chair Hunter said he think all the proposed signs are too big. The signage at the West Lake Forest facility is nowhere near this size. He asked if the landscaping would remain around the main monument sign. Mr. Hall said the plan is to landscape the new sign as it is installed with more appropriate shrubbery. Chair Hunter said this is not a high speed highway and the proposed larger sign will be visible from a distance, so he does not see the need for an exemption.

Member Russ said she is good with the size of the corner and wall sign. She questions if the rendering shows the setback of monument sign #2 in relation to the stop sign and parking lot. Member Russ said she favors compliance with the sign ordinance because she does not see any hardship. Mr. Hall said their hardship is to ensure their patrons can find the building. He asked if the concern is that the sign is too tall or big or is it that the sign is generally large as it relates to the ordinance.

Member Russ said they are fortunate to be located on a corner lot and to be able to have two signs, but she does not see a visibility problem. Mr. Kinsella said it is a busy corner and they want to alert users to their location. The Village code as written encompasses the entire face of the sign which includes all the brick. There is a lot of brick on the base that is included in the square footage. They could consider reducing the brick. The only concern is that the address is on the sign and they do not want anything to obstruct the identification/address.

Chair Hunter said the proposed signage is larger than the two new entrance sign to the new Northwestern Hospital which is located on the same street. He said the purpose of the sign code is to reduce the impact of signage without reducing visibility. A discussion regarding size followed.

Mr. Hall said he would prefer not to compare their signage to the low speed retail area. The idea is to make sure their patients can find the building. Mr. Kinsella said they have discussed having the address illuminated and asked if that would be heading in the right direction. A discussion regarding size followed.

Member Dahlmann asked if they would consider doing individually internally lit letters. Mr. Kinsella said the proposed font is the standard North Shore font and it makes the fabrication more difficult because of its size. If they are held to a 64 sq. ft. per side and 4.5 inches it may be difficult to fabrication a letter of that size. Mr. Hall said the sign at 501 Skokie Blvd in Northbrook, IL was physically removed from the building because the black did not work well with the brick façade and this location has similar condition. A discussion followed.

Following its discussion, Member Russ made a motion to approve the wall sign subject to the condition that it be reduced in size to comply with code. Member Dahlmann seconded the motion. The motion passed on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Dahlmann, Danly, Kerouac, Russ and Chair Hunter  
Nays: None  
Absent: Deegan and Wehmeyer

Following its discussion, Member Kerouac made a motion to approve monument sign #2 subject to the following conditions: (i) Staff approval of the exact location, after field staking, to verify that it would not interfere with visibility for drivers and (ii) the address will be fabricated similar to the North Shore grey bandwidth not to exceed 6 inches. Member Dahlmann seconded the motion. The motion passed on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Russ, Kerouac, Dahlmann and Danly  
Nays: Chair Hunter  
Absent: Deegan and Wehmeyer

Following its discussion, Member Kerouac made a motion to recommend the Village Board grant a variance to allow monument sign #1 to be 64 square feet on each side. Member Dahlmann seconded the motion. The motion passed on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Dahlmann, Danly, Kerouac, Russ and Chair Hunter  
Nays: None  
Absent: Deegan and Wehmeyer

**5. Preliminary Discussion of Proposed Display Pads and Landscaping at Chevy Exchange at 1 Sherwood Terrace and 915 Sherwood Drive**

Chair Hunter introduced the agenda item and invited the applicant to the podium.

Mr. Alan Garfield, an Attorney for the Chevrolet Exchange commented on the process and advised that Staff recommended they appear before the ABR this evening then go back to the Joint

Plan Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals with the ABR's comments. Mr. Garfield said the request is to amend the special use permit to include the adjacent 915 Sherwood Drive building as the Chevrolet Exchange owners have acquired the property and the plan is to use the parking lot for inventory, not for sales or anything else. Also the plan is to have seven display pads along Route 41, two on the north side of the driveway and five on the south side of the driveway. Also included in the packet is the proposed landscape plan for consideration. Mr. Garfield said there will be no interior or exterior changes to the 915 Sherwood Drive building except for a small connection to the rear parking lot. There is a swale in that area and the connection will go from one parking lot to the other to allow vehicles to be move back and forth as well as for people walking. Mr. Garfield introduced Mr. Jeff Lietz to discuss the landscape plan.

Mr. Lietz reviewed the proposed plans for the Chevy Exchange outdoor displays, the existing and proposed parking configuration for both buildings, the display pads as viewed from U.S. Route 41, the building material for the 20 feet diameter vehicle display pads, the elevation for the raised display pads, the drainage, the landscaping plan, rendering of the landscaping and retainer wall block and areas they are proposing to illuminate.

Following a request from Member Kerouac, Chair Hunter explained the origin of the display pads.

In response to a question from Member Kerouac, BCS Croak said Village Code does not allow parking on the grass but approved display pads are allowed. The ABR should consider the appearance of the display pads and the landscaping plan.

Member Dahlmann asked how the cars get from the parking lot to the pad. Mr. Lietz said the cars on the display pads are meant to be there awhile, unless sold, then it would be moved to the parking lot during a dry period.

In response to a comment from Member Dahlmann, Mr. Lietz said the display pads at the south end are approximately 6 inches higher than the parking lot. A discussion followed.

Member Danly expressed her concern on how the proposed illuminated display pads may impact traffic on U.S. Route 41 and asked if any studies had been done. Mr. Garfield said placing the cars in front of the dealership could help patrons locate the entrance driveway. The cars and lights are stationary with no moving parts. The low profile lighting will shine onto the car at night not into the face of oncoming traffic. BCS Croak said the retaining wall front side is elevated and hopefully this will help the matter. A discussion followed.

Member Kerouac said he would prefer to have assurance that the lighting will stay contained within that perimeter. Also the display pads seems crowded and he asked if one could be eliminated. Mr. Lietz said they determined and placed the display pads based on the number of trees. Member Kerouac said it is difficult to try and create something that is aesthetically pleasing when it's a parking lot and thanked them for their efforts.

Member Russ said LED lighting can be extremely bright and asked if there was a way to dim the lighting. She commented on the proposed number of display pads and expressed the opinion that three might work better. Member Russ said the proposed landscaping is nice then thanked them for the presentation. Mr. Garfield said if there were no trees it would be different. He noticed when driving north to south pass the dealership the five display pads would allow you to see the

cars in between much better. Mr. Lietz explained how different lighting could impact the color of the vehicles.

Chair Hunter said he think this is a good thing particularly because of the existing trees. The front parking lot seems to always be jammed with cars and he agree with the five display pads which should fit nicely between the trees. He does not have a problem with the proposal and questioned why they do not put display pads in front of the new building. Mr. Garfield said they original had proposed display pads for the new building because they thought it would enhance the area but they want to differentiate between the buildings.

Chair Hunter said it is important to ensure the lighting is not pointed upward because the Village could possibly incorporate a Dark Sky Ordinance.

Member Dahlmann asked if the LED lights could be on a dimmer. Mr. Lietz said dimmers are typically used for interior lighting but they can be adjusted to different intensity.

In response to a question from Member Danly, Mr. Lietz said the proposed lighting is shown on the last page of the rendering and there will be four lights for each car. A discussion regarding lighting position and signage followed.

Member Dahlmann mentioned he was initially not in favor of having banners placed on the light poles but have since changed his mind as it is a nice improvement.

Mr. Garfield briefly commented on the plans that will be presented to the ABR at a future meeting.

**6. Discussion of Proposed Design and Material Standards for Single Family Homes**

BCS Croak stated the ABR made a recommendation to the Village Board to adopt Design and Material Standards for Single Family Homes. At the October 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting, Chair Hunter suggested revising the draft ordinance to include multi-family housing. Although the ABR made a motion and noted to make that revision, the vote was not valid because the item had not been listed on the agenda. BCS Croak said it is recommend the ABR discuss the proposed revision to the material and design standards, entertain public comments and questions and vote on whether to revise their recommendation to the Village Board. A discussion regarding the draft ordinance followed.

Member Dahlmann noted that he is not in favor of having Design and Material Standards for single family homes because he is not in favor of dictating design to homeowners.

Following its discussion, Member Russ made a motion to revise their previous recommendation regarding proposed design and material standards for single family homes to also include multi-family buildings. Member Kerouac seconded the motion. The motion passed on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Russ, Kerouac, Danly and Chair Hunter  
Nays: Dahlmann  
Absent: Deegan and Wehmeyer

**7. Staff Report**

BCS Croak said during his final inspection at Chase Bank he noticed the sconce lights on the walls appears to look exactly like the surrounding building. However, at night there are actually two vertical bulbs in their lights which appears to be twice as bright as the other exterior lights. The facility was given permission to install an additional pole sign because Illinois State Law requires lighting around an ATM machine during hours of operation.

BCS Croak said all the monument signs at the Target development have white cabinets. The drawings presented show the white cabinet would be repainted to match the dark grey background on the sign. The sign faces have been installed but the cabinet has not been repainted and asked if the applicant should be held to what was approved. It was the consensus of the ABR to have them comply with the approved drawings.

**8. Adjournment**

There being no further business to consider and upon a motion duly made and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 9:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Croak, CBO, CBCO  
Building Codes Supervisor