

The City of Lake Forest
Building Review Board
Proceedings of July 5, 2018 Meeting

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Building Review Board was held on Thursday, July 5, 2018 at 6:30 p.m., at the City's Municipal Services Facility, 800 Field Drive, Lake Forest, Illinois.

Building Review Board members present: Chairman Ted Notz and Board members Robert Reda, Chris Bires, Jim Diamond, Ross Friedman and Richard Walther

Building Review Board members absent: Board member Fred Moyer

Staff present: Catherine Czerniak, Director of Community Development

1. Introduction of Board members and staff, overview of meeting procedures – Chairman Notz

Chairman Notz reviewed the role of the Building Review Board and the meeting procedures followed by the Board. He asked the members of the Board and staff to introduce themselves.

2. Consideration of the minutes of the June 6, 2018 meeting of the Building Review Board.

The minutes of the June 6, 2018 meeting were approved.

3. Continued consideration of a request for a building scale variance to allow the addition of a three-season room at the rear of the residence at 690 Oakwood Avenue.

Owners: John and Cindy Simons

Representative: Jonathan Clair, architect

Chairman Notz asked the Board members for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest, hearing none; he invited a presentation from the petitioner.

Mr. Clair noted that this petition was continued from the last meeting. He briefly reviewed the project noting that the residence was built about two years ago. He stated that the petitioners desire to add a three season room at the rear of the home. He noted the form of the front dormer in relation to the proposed rear addition. He reviewed the existing landscaping and six foot stockade fence located along the side of the property. He noted that the three season room is desired in part because the property is across from a municipal parking lot, so there is not much privacy at the front of the house. He reviewed the site plan noting the proposed location of the proposed addition. He noted the lack of durability with a simple screen porch and explained that a concrete slab is proposed for durability. He noted that the room is a simple rectangle and

explained how it transitions to the house, right below the second floor window sill in the master bedroom. He explained that since the last meeting, the overhang was extended and carried across the elevation and noted that the porch, on the rear elevation of the three season room, was stepped back and projects to a lesser extent than in the previous plans. He added that in response to Board comments, the portion of the roof closest to the existing house was simplified and the roof mass is kept away from the second floor windows. He pointed out that when viewed from the north and south sides, the mass of the roof on the new room is minimized. He stated that other roof forms were considered but rejected because they added to the appearance of mass from the ground and from the second floor windows. He stated that the exterior materials will match those on the house. He described the window and screen system noting that it offers more durability than just screens and avoids the need to store screens seasonally. He stated that the window system is fiberglass and metal, with nice detailing. He stated that the room will not be insulated and the rafters will be exposed, with tongue and groove sheathing spanning the area between the rafters. He stated that the refined design achieves a less massive design than the earlier plans.

Ms. Czerniak stated that at the last meeting, the Board expressed support for the building scale variance and continued the petition to allow further study and refinement of the design. She stated that the petitioners are requesting a variance to allow the addition of a three season room after which the house will be 13 percent over the allowable square footage. She stated that the refined design appears to address some of the concerns raised by the Board at the last meeting. She noted that the massing models are helpful in evaluating the roof options that were studied. She stated that findings in support of the petition are provided in the staff report.

In response to questions from board member Diamond, Ms. Czerniak stated that the letter received from a neighbor a few houses away objected to granting a variance on principal, since the house was only recently constructed. She noted that a letter in support of the petition overall was received from the adjacent property owner to the south. She confirmed that the project complies with the zoning requirements.

In response to Board member Diamond, Mr. Clair clarified that the tip of the gable is not aligned with the windows above.

In response to questions from Board member Friedman, Mr. Clair confirmed that the three season room will not have insulation, air conditioning or heat and will be used when the temperatures permit. He stated that there will be an electrical fan and can lights. He stated that the concrete stoop will support a brick paver patio. He reviewed the roof pitch and confirmed that the gutters and downspouts will match those on the house.

In response to questions from Board member Reda, Mr. Clair explained that the projecting roof on the rear elevation of the three season room is intended to

provide protection for the door. He stated that the roof will extend far enough to allow the gutter to dive into it, about six inches, and will be supported by brackets. He stated that the dormer on the front elevation will not be seen in combination with the projecting porch roof. He commented that the front dormer has a strange pattern and appears as though it should be one window.

In response to questions from Board member Friedman, Mr. Clair commented that he is not sure whether there is a downside to recessing the pediment to match the setback but commented from a design perspective, he would not support that approach. He explained that the Arborvitaes were planted a year and half or two years ago and have grown significantly since that time. He stated that they should grow three to five feet a year, ultimately reaching forty feet in height. He reiterated that the three season room will not be seen from the street or from the neighboring properties.

In response to questions from Board member Reda, Mr. Clair discussed the pediment above the door explaining how it works with the eave. He noted that it would be easier and cheaper to run the gutter straight across the front, without a projection. He stated that in his opinion, the design, as proposed offers human scale and character.

Board member Bires stated that the models were helpful in understanding the study that has been done on the roof forms.

Hearing no further questions from the Board, Chairman Notz invited public comments. Hearing none, he invited final comments and a motion from the Board.

Board member Reda made a motion to recommend approval of a building scale variance based on the findings detailed in the staff report and the Board's discussion. He stated that the recommendation is subject to the following conditions.

1. Any modifications made to the plans as the result of final design development shall be clearly called out on the plans submitted for permit and a copy of the plans originally provided to the Board, with the areas of change highlighted, shall be attached for comparison purposes. Staff is directed to review any changes, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to determine whether the modifications are in conformance with the Board's direction and approval prior to the issuance of any permits.
2. All exterior light fixtures, if any are proposed, shall fully shield the source of the light and direct light down. Cut sheets of all exterior fixtures shall be submitted for review and will be subject to approval prior to installation.

3. Plans for construction parking, material staging and tree protection shall be submitted for review and will be subject to approval by the City's Certified Arborist, City Engineer and Director of Community Development.
 - a. Parking of construction vehicles on Oakwood Avenue is not permitted since this is a route for commuter buses and other traffic related to the Central Business District.
 - b. Off-site parking may be required and permits for parking in the public lots may be purchased from the City.

The motion was seconded by Board member Friedman and was approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

**4. Consideration of a request for approval of signage and exterior lighting for the new Chase Bank Building under construction at 884 S. Waukegan Road.
Owner: 884 S. Waukegan Road, LLC (Frank Mariani 50%, John Fiore, Jr., 50%)
Representative: Jonathan Krissoff, Market Director for Real Estate, JP Morgan Chase and Company**

Chairman Notz asked the Board members for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest, hearing none; he invited a presentation from the petitioner.

Mr. Krissoff stated that the bank building, as previously approved by the Board, is under construction and, as directed by the Board, the signage and exterior lighting are now presented for the Board's review and approval. He introduced the Chase Bank project team members

Ms. McCloud stated that she oversees signage for Chase Banks. She stated that Chase is pleased with the outcome of the process to date and the design of the building. She described the monument sign proposed on the Waukegan Road frontage noting that it is designed to be compatible with the building. She stated that the sign is proposed in generally the same location as the recently removed McDonald's monument sign. She stated that the stone base will match the stone on the building. She described the soft edge lighting proposed around the perimeter of the letters and explained that it is intended to provide a soft wash of light on the sign. She noted that during the day, the nickel color on the face of the sign will provide a contrast to the stainless steel letters. She described the wall signs proposed on the building. She stated that black letters are proposed, with halo illumination, to provide a soft wash of light behind the letters and a soft wash of light on the stone. She reviewed the proposed locations of the wall signs in relation to the entrance to the building and the elements of each elevation. She described the location of the ATM on the south side of the building and the signage proposed to call attention to the location. She noted that edge lighting is proposed around the ATM. She noted that the words "Lake Forest" are proposed as part of the west facing wall sign in response to a request from a resident at the last meeting to help identify the train station stop. She added that a temporary marketing sign is proposed on the site to announce the construction of the new bank.

In response to a request from Chairman Notz, Ms. Czerniak reviewed the proposed monument sign. She stated that the sign conforms to the maximum allowable size of twenty five square feet. She stated that as proposed, the sign is about twenty two and a half inches. She stated that the overall height of the sign is consistent with the maximum height allowed by the Code, five feet, and is illuminated. She stated that the sign as proposed includes two graphic images which together, total less than fifteen percent of the total face of the sign and therefore, are consistent with the Code from a size perspective. She noted however that the City's Design Guidelines discourage the use of logos however, the Board can approve the use of graphics. She noted that the graphics as proposed appear discreet and generally consistent with the high quality character intended for the building. She stated that as proposed, the sign is generally consistent with other bank signage in the area. She stated that findings in support of the monument sign are detailed in the staff report along with recommended conditions of approval.

In response to questions from Board member Friedman, Mr. Meseck confirmed that the intent is to match the true limestone on the base of the building adding that the pieces of stone will be smaller to achieve a pedestrian scale.

In response to questions from Board member Walther, Ms. McCloud confirmed that the interior of the sign is not visible. She stated that the edges of the letters are frosted and opaque. She stated that the face of the letters is a brushed stainless steel and the light, a soft glow, will appear only along the edges of the letters.

In response to questions from Chairman Notz, Ms. McCloud reviewed the materials on the sign noting that the sign itself has a brown nickel finish, the reveals are a darker nickel color, and the face of the letters is aluminum.

In response to questions from Board member Reda, Ms. McCloud explained the graphic noting that the extra, small octagon on top of the normal logo identifies that the location offers Chase Private Client services.

Chairman Notz invited public comment, hearing none, he invited final questions or comments from the Board, hearing none; he invited a motion.

Board member Reda made a motion to recommend approval of the monument sign based on findings in the staff report and subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. Finishes shall be brushed as opposed to shiny or glossy.
2. Lighting shall be turned off after business hours for retail uses in the area.
3. Prior to the issuance of a permit for the monument sign, and once the building has taken shape, a mock-up of the monument sign shall be

installed to allow final verification of the specific siting, size and appearance of the sign.

4. A detailed landscape plan shall be submitted with the construction plans for the monument sign for plantings around the base of the sign. The plantings near the sign shall be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist to verify that the plantings serve to soften and screen the structural base of the sign.

At the request of Chairman Notz, Ms. Czerniak reviewed the proposed wall signs. She explained that on a corner property, the Code permits two wall signs and limits the total size of the two signs to twenty five square feet. She stated that four wall signs are proposed, one on each elevation, and each sign is proposed at just over nineteen square feet. She stated that the proposed wall signs exceed the Code limitations both in number and size and as a result, Chase is requesting a variance. She noted that in combination with the monument sign, the proposed wall signage, on all elevations, is excessive and is more signage than appears on any other bank. She stated that staff recommends that the wall sign be eliminated from the south elevation because that elevation has limited visibility and signage for the ATM is also proposed on that elevation. She stated that wall signs on the north and east elevations are reasonable given the prominence of those elevations from Waukegan Road. She stated that the signage on the west elevation is out of the ordinary and exceeds what is permitted in the Code however, as noted by a resident at the earlier meeting, adding "Lake Forest" to the sign could help to identify the train station stop. She stated that if the Board chooses to recommend approval of three wall signs, rather than two as permitted by the Code, at a size larger than permitted by the Code, consideration could be given to eliminating the graphic on the wall signs on the east and west sides of the building. She noted that the graphic will already be visible on the monument sign on the east side of the building and adding it to the wall sign on the east elevation will be duplicative. She commented that the blue logo proposed for the signs could appear as stark in combination with the aluminum letters but noted that Chase representatives have stated that the blue will be a subdued color.

Ms. McCloud stated that Chase Bank is comfortable with the conditions as presented by staff. She stated that the bank was aware of the Code limitations, but presented the desired signage for consideration. She stated that the bank expected and accepts the limitations as recommended by staff.

In response to questions from Board member Walther, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that there is an access easement located along the western portion of the property to provide access to Forest Square. She stated that it is not a public street, but is open to the public.

In response to questions from Board member Walther, Ms. McCloud confirmed that the words "Lake Forest" will be illuminated. She explained that the diffuser is intended to soften the light coming from the graphic. She stated that the intent is

that the intensity of the light will be the same for the letters and graphic symbol. She stated that the paint on the black letters is specified to combat the elements and may appear to have a sheen initially but should soften to a satin finish. She stated that a mock-up of the paint color on the letters will be provided once the building is in place.

Board member Bires stated that he is supportive of the wall signs as proposed subject to the conditions as recommended by staff.

In response to questions from Board member Reda, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that the staff recommendation allows the graphic as part of the wall sign on the north elevation but eliminates the graphic on the east and west facing wall signs. She stated that staff recommends that the fourth wall sign, proposed for the south side of the building, be eliminated. She reiterated the importance of a mock-up once the building is in place to allow the Board, as would normally occur, to see the size and placement of the letters in the context of the building. She explained that Chase is requesting approval of the signage at this time so they have a sense of the types and numbers of signs that will be permitted. She stated that final details can be resolved, including the intensity of the lighting, once mock-ups are in place.

Board member Reda noted the importance of assuring that the lighting of the signs is not too bright and does not reflect on to elements of the building. He noted that the Code does not permit up lighting on buildings adding that light should not spread on to the building façade.

Hearing no further questions or comments from the Board, Chairman Notz noted that it is important to document the aspects of the site that differentiate it from other sites such as the visibility from all sides, the surrounding traffic patterns, the adjacency to the railroad tracks and the lack of any adjacent residential properties. He stated that in his opinion, this approval does not set a precedent for other sites because each site is considered based on its own unique setting and attributes.

Board member Walther added that the owners of the adjacent property to the north stated support for the overall project at past meetings.

Chairman Notz invited public comments, hearing none, he invited final comments from the Board, hearing none; he invited a motion.

Board member Reda made a motion to recommend approval of a variance to allow three wall signs instead of two and to allow the signs together, to exceed the permitted 25 square feet. He stated that the variance is based on the unique characteristics of the site as discussed by the Board, the adjacency to public streets on two sides, a public easement and railroad tracks on a third side and based on the inclusion of "Lake Forest" in the sign on the west elevation, facing the railroad tracks. He stated that the motion is also based on the findings in the

staff report and the discussion of the Board. He stated that the motion is subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. No wall sign is permitted on the south facing elevation.
2. The blue graphic shall only be permitted on the north facing façade.
3. The blue graphic shall be eliminated from the east and west facing signs.
4. Lighting in the wall signs shall be turned off after business hours of retail establishments in the area and no later than 9 p.m.
5. The finish on the letters and graphic shall be brushed or flat, rather than glossy.
6. Prior to the issuance of a permit for any wall signs, and once the building has taken shape, a mock-up of the wall signs shall be installed to allow final review of the proportion and scale of the signs in relation to each building façade.
7. Illumination of all of the signs shall be reviewed after installation to assure that the intensity of the light is subdued, that the light source is not visible and that light does not spillover on to or reflect off of nearby walls, windows or other building elements.

The motion was seconded by Board member Friedman and was approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

In response to questions from Board member Walther Ms. Czerniak stated that temporary "opening soon" signs can be approved at the staff level with the issuance of a time-limited permit. She noted that the contractors currently have signs at the site so the temporary signage overall will need to be considered to avoid over signing the property even in the short term.

In response to a question from the Board, Mr. Meseck stated that the opening of the bank is scheduled for late November or early December.

At Chairman Notz' request, Ms. Czerniak reviewed the information provided to staff to date on the exterior lighting planned for the site. She stated that it is staff's understanding that the light poles and fixtures in the parking lot will be consistent with those in the adjacent parking lot to the north, a standard type used throughout the City. She stated that no other lighting on the site is identified on the plans but added that safety and security lighting at the entrances and at the ATM will be needed. She stated that staff will work closely with Chase as the site evolves to assure that lighting is consistent with the character of the area. She stated that after installation, the lighting near the ATMs will be reviewed to assure that the intensity is consistent with the lighting at other ATMs in the area while at the same time, meeting public safety needs.

Mr. Meseck noted that the staff information is incorrect and explained that the parking lot light poles as proposed are taller than the lights at Forest Square to the north. He explained that by having taller lights, the foot candles needed to meet the Automated Teller Machine Security Act can be achieved with fewer lights

than if the poles are shorter like those at Forest Square. He stated that a light level of at least two foot candles is required within 50 feet of the ATM drive-up and within 50 feet of the front entry where an ATM will be accessible to pedestrians. He stated that the lights in the areas of the ATMs will remain on through the night. He stated that the taller poles are not inconsistent with the massing of the building adding that they will not look out of place. He stated that the light poles are proposed at 25 feet, about five to seven feet taller than the parking lot lights at Forest Square. He noted that in the pedestrian areas, ten foot poles are proposed. He stated that if the light poles in the parking lot are lowered, more poles will be needed. He reviewed some options for lowering the lighting levels off hours.

In response to questions from the Board, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that some of the information presented on the lighting was not clear to staff from the materials submitted. She suggested that the proposed 25-foot lights should be looked at carefully in the context of the neighboring commercial development. She added that the building was designed with the intent of making it feel a part of the commercial development to the north noting that taller lights may set it apart.

Chairman Notz stated support for consideration of shorter poles even if that means a few additional poles.

In response to questions from Board member Walther, Mr. Meseck reviewed the proposed locations of the light poles adding that an additional pole near the accessible parking space will probably be needed regardless of the pole height. He stated a willingness to work with staff to finalize the height and number of light poles. He confirmed that recessed lighting will be located under the canopy, near the ATM. He stated that light poles will likely be needed in the area in addition to the lighting under the canopy.

In response to questions from Chairman Notz, Mr. Meseck confirmed that the parking lot lights along the perimeter of the site can be equipped with drop down shields to prevent light spill off of the site.

In response to questions from Board member Walther Mr. Meseck stated that some work is needed to determine how many lights will be needed to achieve the desired lighting levels with shorter light poles.

In response to questions from Chairman Notz, Mr. Meseck stated that sconce lighting is proposed on the pilasters. He stated that the overall lighting on the site will be reviewed and refined.

Ms. Czerniak commented that given the study and refinement that is needed on the lighting plan it may be helpful to have a subcommittee of the Board work with the petitioner and staff to review a refined and more detailed lighting plan.

Chairman Notz agreed that a subcommittee would be appropriate given the changes from the materials presented to staff and the questions raised by the Board. He stated support for the conditions as recommended by staff with the added condition that a further detailed and refined lighting plan will be presented to a subcommittee of the Board and will be subject to the subcommittee's review and approval. He invited public comment, hearing none, he invited a motion.

Board member Reda motion to recommend approval of exterior lighting in the parking lot and on the building subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. Parking light lots shall be consistent with the lights in the adjacent parking lot to the north.
2. A detailed overall lighting plan shall be presented and will be subject to review by a subcommittee of the Board and staff. The detailed plan shall reflect all exterior lighting proposed on the site; parking lot lighting, lighting for pedestrian areas, lighting at the ATM, under canopy lighting, decorative lighting and any other exterior lighting that is proposed.
3. A lighting reduction plan shall be submitted to achieve lower lighting levels on the site after business hours recognizing that minimum lighting levels must be maintained at and around ATMs. The lighting reduction plan shall be subject to review and approval by a subcommittee of the Board and staff.

The motion was seconded by Board member Friedman and was approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

OTHER ITEMS

5. Opportunity for the public to address the Building Review Board on non-agenda items.

No public testimony on non-agenda items was presented to the Board.

6. Additional information from staff.

No additional information was presented by staff.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Czerniak
Director of Community Development