

MINUTES OF THE APPEARANCE REVIEW COMMISSION
September 16, 2019

The regular meeting of the Appearance Review Commission was called to order by Chairman John Robbins at 7:00 p.m. at the Village Hall.

Members Present: Chairman John Robbins, Tom Flader, Brad Meyer, and Jennifer Tarello.

Members Absent: Rich Seneczko.

A quorum was established.

Village Staff Present: David Smith, Senior Planner.

Commissioner Meyer made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Flader, to approve the August 19, 2019, Appearance Review Commission meeting minutes, as written.

Motion carried 4 - 0.

OLD BUSINESS:

**ARC 19-42 HR Boost LLC, Authorized Agent for Wynkoop Holdings, LLC
306 Peterson Road**

Request is for new signage.

Mr. Jay Cash, Signarama sign company and agent for the petitioner, stated that they have adjusted the tenant panel sign by moving it to the center of the existing freestanding sign hanging below the existing frame.

Ms. Kari Ugent, applicant, from HRBoost, stated that the revised sign plan submitted tonight shows how the proposed sign panel will attached to the pole and it shows that the panel edges are capped with an edge creating an enclosed cabinet effect.

Chairman Robbins asked if the mansard roof-like structure is currently part of the top of the existing sign or not. Mr. Steve Martin, property owner, stated that the mansard roof element is an existing part of the top of the sign.

Commissioner Meyer stated that the changes made to the sign proposal are better.

Commissioner Tarello stated that the changes are better.

Ms. Ugent stated that the lighting will be more uniform with this change.

Mr. Cash stated that the background will be opaque with translucent lettering.

Minutes of the September 16, 2019, Appearance Review Commission Meeting
Page 2 of 8

Commissioner Meyer made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Flader, to recommend the Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals approve the application for new signage at 306 Peterson Road, in accordance with the plans submitted.

Motion carried 4 - 0.

NEW BUSINESS:

ARC 19-45 Kenneth Sossong, Authorized Agent for BRIT-LIBERTYVILLE LLC
1930 Innovation Way

Request is for new building facades, landscaping, and signage.

Mr. Kenneth Sossong, applicant, introduced the propose site changes to 1930 Innovation Way. He stated they are proposing to re-install four dock doors where they once existed on the south facade of the building. He stated that they have a tenant that wants to take up to 61,000 square feet of the building space and they need dock doors. He stated that there will also be two man doors installed per Fire Department regulations and some site work to reduce the length of a landscaped island currently located in front of where the new truck dock doors are proposed to be installed.

Chairman Robbins asked for clarification about the proposed window signage. Chairman Robbins stated that the way the sign is graphics applied to the window glass and is not at least 12 inches behind the glass and therefore does not fall under the exemption of the window sign definition found in the Zoning Code as indicated in the Village Staff report.

Mr. David Smith, Senior Planner, stated that the proposed window sign had the floor separation behind the sign providing an opaque background making it difficult to interpret the proposal as a window sign and not a wall sign.

Mr. Sossong stated that they will revise the sign plan to be Code compliant.

Chairman Robbins stated that consideration could be given to tabling the sign plan review for another meeting and make a motion on the other appearance items tonight in order to keep the applicant moving through the process.

Mr. Sossong stated that they plan to relocate a couple trees on the property or plant replacements as needed.

Commissioner Tarello stated that the sign location should be either above or below the floor/ceiling spandrel area.

Mr. Smith stated that the limitation on window signage is for it to not exceed 35% of the window area on the facade facing the street frontage in order to not require a permit.

Minutes of the September 16, 2019, Appearance Review Commission Meeting
Page 3 of 8

Mr. Sossong stated that he can get a larger sign if it were to be relocated below the spandrel as that window area seems larger.

Chairman Robbins suggested to Mr. Sossong to revise the sign plan and then come back with a new plan.

Commissioner Tarello made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Flader, to recommend the Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals approve the application for new building facades, landscaping, and signage at 1930 Innovation Way, subject to the following condition: 1) That the sign portion of the plan proposal is removed from request at this time in order to make revisions and come back to the Appearance Review Commission at a later date.

Motion carried 4 - 0.

ARC 19-46 John Sexton, Authorized Agent for Libertyville Business Park
0 Technology Way

Request is for new landscaping.

Mr. John Sexton, agent for Libertyville Business Park Association, stated that he owns one of the buildings in the business park. He stated that the original owner established the association and then disappeared. He stated that for about 25 years the common areas have not been maintained. He stated that last year one of the tenants in the business park had a chemical spill in the detention pond. He stated that the Village of Libertyville sent letters to all of the businesses in the Libertyville Business Park Association and requested that they address the spill and other maintenance issues in the pond.

Mr. Sexton stated that the detention pond has had a beaver problem as they have dammed up the outflow of the pond. He stated that the beaver dam has destabilized the earthen berm putting it at risk of collapsing. He stated that over time the business park's association has worked very hard to trap up to 8 beavers and 10 muskrats. He stated that both of these types of animals have created serious problems for the detention pond.

Mr. Sexton stated that he met with all of the other business owners and he agreed that he would be the president of the association. He stated that they mowed the trees down located on the earthen dam because the original landscape plan did not call for any trees on the dam. He stated that you should never allow trees to grow on an earthen dam because the tree roots will eventually loosen the soil within the earthen dam causing it to destabilize. He stated that they restored the face of the dam and the tree removal was part of that process. He stated that the landscape plan also called for no trees around the pond in order to discourage beavers from moving in.

Mr. Sexton stated that some of the trees called for were Ash trees. He stated that they have become either dead or in serious decline. He stated that they have lost few Maple trees and a couple of Willow trees. He stated that for the most part the pond has been restored to the

Minutes of the September 16, 2019, Appearance Review Commission Meeting
Page 4 of 8

original intent. He stated that they also removed numerous Ash trees that were dead and still standing which seemed to be a risk to the public as they walked along the path. He stated that this is why he decided to take the trees down. He stated that as a consequence, he is before the Appearance Review Commission to discuss their landscaping options tonight.

Mr. Sexton stated that the Village has requested that 74 trees to be replaced of the trees removed. He stated that the majority of the trees removed were Buckthorn and dead Ash. He stated that quality trees classified as Group A and Group B trees remain on site. He stated that what was removed would have been considered Group D trees. He stated that they would like to propose to restore the site to the original 1994 landscape plan which would be about 20 trees. He stated that they will get a Tree Survey. He stated that they would add another 15 to 20 trees around the pond. He stated that they would like to offer Sycamore trees, Swamp White Oak trees, and Catalpa trees. He stated that the proposed tree species will need significant spacing so that they don't crowd together too much and not reach their full potential.

Mr. Sexton asked the Appearance Review Commission if they would allow the business park association to do a tree survey and to bring the landscaping into conformity with the original 1994 landscape plan. He stated that the White Swamp Oak and Catalpa trees would be a really nice addition to the pond. He stated that they have no intention to plant anything on the earthen dam. He stated that their proposal is to plant less than the requested 74 trees, but they don't have an exact number at this point. He stated that their intent is to improve the association property.

Chairman Robbins stated that it appears that most of the trees along the east side were volunteer tree species.

Mr. Sexton concurred with Chairman Robbins and stated that most of those trees were Buckthorn, and a few dead Ash trees.

Chairman Robbins asked if the Ash trees were originally part of the landscape plan. Mr. Sexton stated that on the landscape plan they bubbled it and labeled it as 'forested area'. He stated that went into the Pine Meadow Golf Course.

Chairman Robbins stated that he assumed that it would have stayed as a natural vegetation area. He stated that he does not believe that an invasive tree species that is dead would not be required to be replaced. He stated that the Village does not control anything past the east property line. He stated that he believes that this is the golf course and located in the Village of Mundelein. He stated that the removal of the Ash trees would have been necessary regardless. He stated that he questions whether a one for one replacement is necessary. He stated that there should be a practical limit with better tree species.

Commissioner Flader stated that the landscape plan on hand is vague.

Mr. Sexton stated that he made a sketch from the original landscape plan to be used as a discussion point. He stated that he would be happy to create an up-to-date landscape plan when

Minutes of the September 16, 2019, Appearance Review Commission Meeting
Page 5 of 8

the time is appropriate. He stated that he wanted to get a gauge reading from the Appearance Review Commission before spending a lot of time and money on an updated landscape plan.

Mr. Smith stated that from a Staff's perspective it was difficult to determine where the property line is located from the exhibit provided by the petitioner. He stated that it will be vital that a tree survey be completed in order to show where the trees lie in relation to the property line.

Chairman Robbins stated that it will be important to identify where the property line is located. He stated that it should be looked at comprehensively. He stated that the petitioner should show where the new trees are going in.

Mr. Sexton stated that turf is planted around the detention pond which will make it easier to maintain by periodically cutting the grass. He stated that this will also make it easier to monitor the earthen dam. He stated that the intent of the association is to fix the landscaping by 2020. He stated that they already have a permit to fix the walking path around the detention pond. He stated that they may want to plant some trees in November initially. He stated that they do not plan to plant anything on the east side of the dam. He stated that by gauging the location of an existing fence that they have a good idea of where the property line is located. He stated that during October through November they are planning on planting about 25 Norway Spruce trees at 2-3 feet in height in the area where they removed the Ash trees.

Chairman Robbins stated that they will make a motion to continue this item on the Appearance Review Commission agenda to next month.

Mr. Smith stated that the Appearance Review Commission will need to approve a landscape plan before the petitioner plants any trees.

Mr. Sexton stated that they will get a tree survey, find out what trees are there, draw up a landscape plan, that will indicate what trees are missing and what trees are proposed.

Chairman Robbins stated that the petitioner's landscape plan should be cross-checked against the Tree Preservation Ordinance requirements in order to make certain how much latitude the petitioner has on the replacement requirements and to get an accurate and acceptable tree count.

Commissioner Tarello made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Meyer, to continue the application for new landscaping at 0 Technology Way to the October 21, 2019, Appearance Review Commission meeting.

Motion carried 4 - 0.

ARC 19-47 Triboyo Libertyville, LLC, Applicant
1201 S. Milwaukee Avenue

Request is for new building facades, landscaping, lighting, and signage.

Minutes of the September 16, 2019, Appearance Review Commission Meeting
Page 6 of 8

Mr. Greg Mauro, Gregory Infiniti in Libertyville, applicant, introduced the proposed development. He stated that he bought the dealership from Field's Infinity and has been there for about 5 or 6 years. He stated that they are outgrowing their current location. He stated that they are proposing to redevelop the old Chase bank location at 1201 S. Milwaukee Avenue with a new Infiniti dealership. He stated that just to the south of the site on the west side of Milwaukee Avenue is the Village of Vernon Hills.

Mr. Mauro stated that due to the cost of the land of the subject site it was important to include a stand-alone car wash along with the dealership. He stated that there are some topographical challenges to the subject site. He stated that their new site plan did not require any changes to the existing curb cuts to the property. He stated that existing Chase bank drive-thru entrance from GreenTree Parkway will remain as the access drive for the proposed car wash.

Mr. Mauro stated that there will be little change to the topographical grades on the property. He stated that much of the material on site will be recycled and used in the redevelopment.

Mr. Mauro stated that the proposed car dealership building will be about 24,000 square feet in size and the car wash building is approximately 4,000 square feet in size. He stated that the drying system in the car wash will be extremely quiet.

Mr. Mauro stated that they are projecting 44 million dollars in revenue for the upcoming year. He stated that this does not include projections for the car wash. He stated that the car wash will be open to the public.

Chairman Robbins stated that there are Staff review comments in the report that are asking for additional information. He stated that they will need to see specific information on final colors, materials for the refuse enclosure, and additional information on the landscape plan. He stated that it will be advantageous if the architect shows renderings of both buildings on the same exhibit. He stated that the two buildings are extremely close to each other. He stated that both buildings have different characters.

Mr. Eric Pepa, architect for the applicant, stated that the challenge was to keep them distinct visually. He stated that Infiniti does not want to be associated with the car wash. He stated that the colors are similar between the two buildings. He stated that the store fronts will have some similarities, but the branding will be different.

Mr. Mauro stated that the two buildings will complement each other, but they are two different businesses.

Chairman Robbins stated that overall the proposal is an exciting idea. He stated that it seems to be a great marketing strategy. He stated that the buildings are exceptionally close to each other and it is difficult to make a distinction between the two buildings and is asking what that distinction should be. Mr. Mauro stated he wants to keep the appearance of the car wash more 'high end', user friendly, and inviting. He stated that Infiniti wanted to have the two buildings have a distinct difference. He stated that the appearance is intended to be inviting to the public.

Minutes of the September 16, 2019, Appearance Review Commission Meeting
Page 7 of 8

Chairman Robbins stated that the exhibits include two separate renderings for the two buildings. He stated that they should combine both buildings on the same rendering exhibit in order to see the building in context. He stated that he wants to make sure that the applicant is accomplishing their intent aesthetically. He stated that the two buildings need to be seen in concert with each other.

Chairman Robbins inquired about Infiniti's current signage and whether it will be relocated to the proposed site. Mr. Mauro stated that they will get new signage.

Chairman Robbins stated that the applicant did a nice job incorporating the development into the site while taking into consideration the challenging topographical variations on the site.

Chairman Robbins inquired if the applicant is concerned about site security in the rear of the subject site. Mr. Mauro stated that the subject site is a secured location and that they are not worried about security issues.

Chairman Robbins stated that the Staff report made comments about the maximum permitted parking lot light standards.

Mr. Pepa, architect, stated that the photometric plan identifies the light poles on the rear 1/3 of the lot to be not more than ten (10) feet in height. He stated that the footcandle illuminations are Code compliant as well along the property lines.

Mr. Bob Remsing, General Contractor for the applicant, stated that they will revise the location of the proposed signage on the Site Plan in response to Staff comments.

Chairman Robbins asked if the applicant will keep the flag pole currently existing. Mr. Mauro stated that they would like to keep it.

Commissioner Flader stated that there appears to be a number of trees that are proposed to be relocated.

Mr. Mauro stated that there are a lot of dead trees on the site. He stated that they had a tree survey and inventory done by an arborist.

Mr. Remsing stated that they will preserve the existing trees along the west property line. He stated that they will come back to the Appearance Review Commission to show how they will enclose the refuse dumpsters.

Chairman Robbins requested clarification as to how the roof top mechanical units will be screened. Mr. Pepa stated that there will be screening around each mechanical unit, but there will not be a parapet surrounding the entire roof. He stated that they have used a product called CityScape in the past which are screening devices that attached directly to the mechanical units themselves.

Minutes of the September 16, 2019, Appearance Review Commission Meeting
Page 8 of 8

Mr. Remsing stated that they can bring material samples for the proposed roof top screening devices.

Chairman Robbins stated that the applicant should show all of the signage that is being contemplated for this proposed development.

Mr. Remsing stated that they will take a closer look at how the proposed trees will affect line of site visibility of the proposed freestanding dealership sign.

Commissioner Flader stated that consideration could be given to locating the trees in a clustered formation in order to help signage visibility.

Chairman Robbins stated that improving the diversity of the trees could be considered. He stated that a mix of tree specimens can improve their sustainability.

Commissioner Flader stated that the foundation planting areas appear to only proposed perennials in the landscape plan. He stated that incorporating some evergreen shrubbery into the foundation planting beds could be considered in order to improve the aesthetics during the winter time.

Chairman Robbins stated that it is advisable that the petitioner respond to each of the Staff comments provided in the Staff report in a line-by-line fashion so that everyone will be on the same page.

Mr. Remsing stated that the demo permit application requires that the adjacent property owners are to be notified. He stated that they want to take advantage of that requirement and host an event to invite the neighbors in to show them the project.

Mr. Smith stated that the invite of the neighbors to show the project should not replace the notice requirements for the demolition permit. He stated that the applicant should contact the Building Commissioner to ask what the requirements are for giving notice of an upcoming demolition.

Commissioner Tarello made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Flader, to continue the application for new building facades, landscaping, lighting, and signage to the October 21, 2019, Appearance Review Commission meeting.

Motion carried 4 - 0.

COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCUSSION: None.

With no further discussion, Commissioner Meyer moved and Commissioner Tarello seconded a motion to adjourn.

Motion carried 4 - 0.

Meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.