

**VILLAGE OF LAKE BLUFF
ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW
REGULAR MEETING
JULY 2, 2019**

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 July 2, 2019 at 7:00 p.m. in the Village Hall Board Room (40 E. Center Avenue) and the following were present.

Present: Tim Callahan
 Neil Dahlmann
 Edward Deegan
 Matthew Kerouac
 Carol Russ
 Julie Wehmeyer

Absent: Bob Hunter, Chair

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

Member Russ volunteered to serve as Chair Pro Tem and a motion was duly made and seconded. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote.

2. Consideration of the June 4, 2019 ABR Regular Meeting Minutes

Member Dahlmann made a motion, to approve the minutes of the June 4, 2019 ABR meeting as submitted. Member Kerouac seconded the motion. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote.

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

Chair Pro Tem Russ asked if anyone would like to address the ABR on any matter not on the agenda. There were no requests to address the ABR.

4. Discussion of Amendments to the Sign Code for the Industrial Districts

Chair Pro Tem Russ introduced the agenda item and invited the Consultant to the podium.

Arista Strungys of Camiros Ltd, introduced herself and provided background information about the firm. She said the information in her memorandum is intended to solicit feedback from the ABR on how to proceed with revisions to the Sign Code, specifically Section 10-10-14 (D). Following her tour of the industrial park it appears there are three major type of developments within those districts: Multi-tenant retail/service centers, Single-occupant properties, and Multi-tenant office developments then she reviewed her observation for each use:

- Multi-Tenant Retail/Service Center – Retail centers like Target outlots and Carriage Way mall have multiple tenants, both in the main in-line building and in the outlots. It seems that the sign standards within the Target Store Planned Commercial Development work well for the development, particularly allowing two wall signs for each tenant. This set of standards could be looked at as a basis for the revision for this development type. Other notable multi-tenant buildings include 960-970 North Shore Drive (the building that includes Yuppy Puppy), 49-51 Sherwood Terrace, and the 910 Sherwood Drive – 42 Sherwood Terrace pair of buildings, all of which have outside entrances for individual tenants;

- Single-Occupant Properties – For single occupant properties, such as North Shore University Health System, Profile Plastics, and Anesthesia Management Partners, current regulations seem to address sign needs;
- Multi-Tenant Office Developments – Multi-tenant office developments present different issues, some of which depend on the type of development. For a coordinated, corporate development, wall signs of either the name or address of the development seem to be common with some developments taking advantage of including a tenant directory ground sign. These are the types of developments that have entryways for the building as a whole, as opposed to each individual tenant’s suites.

Ms. Strungys said multi-tenant office developments comprised of individual tenants with individual entrances are more complex. Her key observations include: Window signs are not permitted, though allowing the name/suite of the tenant on the door is allowed. However, in some cases, such information has been placed on the window because of the size constrictions of the door; Since the development as a whole is only allowed one wall sign per façade, each tenant cannot have an individual wall sign; Directory ground signs for the development seem more frequent for this type of development; and Sign regulations should be mindful of situations where what was a single-tenant development may divide interior space to become a multi-tenant development.

In conclusion, Ms. Strungys said there are two additional approaches/revisions that the ABR should consider:

- The larger scale of development within the L-1 and L-2 Districts. The Board may want to consider increasing the maximum size of address numbers. Currently, this is limited to two square feet, which for a large development may be out of proportion to the lot and/or building size. Conservatively, in these districts, a size of eight square feet may be appropriate; and
- The Target Store Planned Commercial Development has shown how well coordinated tenant signage can work. The ABR may want to consider adding a requirement for developments of two or more non-residential uses designed as separate store fronts/office spaces to submit a “Master Sign Plan (MSP)” as part of their development approval. The intent is to create a set of sign regulations that all tenants, current and future, would need to comply with. The ABR should consider in which cases MSPs should be required to get Village Board approval (after ABR recommendation) and in which cases MSPs could receive final approval from the ABR. Given that sign code exemptions currently require Village Board approval while conforming signs are eligible for final approval by the ABR, perhaps a similar arrangement would work for the MSPs.

Chair Pro Tem Russ opened the floor to comments from the commissioners.

Member Wehmeyer said the majority of sign exemption requests come from multi-tenant building occupants desiring to have their business represented but this does not seem feasible based on the square footage of the building. The process should be reviewed to prevent individuals from manipulating the system to receive a variance.

Member Kerouac said the multi-tenant building located at 917 Sherwood Drive is an example of a small snowball that could get larger because each applicant presented a compelling reason why they needed a sign. The building is presently lined with business names and this not what the Code intended but he does not see a resolution that will make sense. A discussion followed.

BCS Croak said one of the interesting things about that particular case was Julie was alluding to different regulations for different types of building. So like the building where everyone has an individual entrance

to a retail or service establishment, such as Yuppy Puppy or the Target Outlot, it is common to allow individual signs there but this is going to a different building type. This is the type where there is a central interior corridor and just one entrance for the whole building and yet we have allowed individual signage. A discussion followed.

Member Dahlmann said it might have been a mistake to allow the other signage because that set the precedent that there could be letters on the building. A discussion followed.

Member Kerouac said signage for multi-tenant buildings must be treated fairly and occupants should be allowed to market their business. It is easy to be restrictive but it may not be conducive to enticing businesses to operate in those districts.

Member Dahlmann said the “L” refers to light industrial but the uses has gradually evolved into retail/office and it seems to him the area needs to be rezoned accordingly. There are not many light industrial businesses in those districts and he cannot visualize any returning in the future.

Member Callahan agreed with the commissioners and said he would prefer to see signage consistent across the board.

Chair Pro Tem Russ thanked the Consultant for categorizing the different buildings. She commented on the examples used regarding multi-tenant buildings then shared the following feedback:

- She would say “yes” to signage that does not need ABR review such as the multi-tenant building (with Yuppy Puppy);
- If it is tenant standard language for signage than Staff can review and there could be tenant standard signage in different kinds of buildings;
- Need some general signage guidelines as the goal is to reduce visual clutter in the community and achieve parity;
- It is important to identify times when the ABR should say “yes”;
- Landlords are required to maintain multi-tenant sign if located in the parkway;
- Need to discuss lighted signs, specifically a way to measure light and method of redress;
- Lighting levels in the CBD should be lower than those in the Industrial Park;
- Establish a way to streamline review and provide more consistency and uniformity;
- Review dark sky requirements and implement the language in Village regulations; and
- Communication with designers regarding lighting.

Ms. Strungys expressed her understanding that the ABR’s desired approach is not to establish a set of standards but review signage by the development types within the district, consider options such as MSPs, and sign exemption requirements must be approved by both the ABR and Village Board.

Member Dahlmann said the signage discussions are a result of a sign permit application from Wine Brokers of Illinois regarding window signage/banner and he noted this type of signage is occurring more often along the North Shore. A discussion followed. Member Kerouac said the ABR continues to respond to individual challenges and he thinks there are a wide swath of issues and it will be difficult to pigeonhole specific situations.

Ms. Strungys noted that it is common for communities to require master signage plans for buildings with more than three tenants.

5. Staff Report

6. Adjournment

There being no further business to consider, Member Deegan made a motion, seconded by Member Kerouac, to adjourn the meeting at 7:39 PM. Motion passed.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Croak, CBO, CBCO
Building Codes Supervisor