

**The City of Lake Forest
Building Review Board
Proceedings of May 3, 2023 Meeting**

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Building Review Board was held on Wednesday, May 3, 2023 at 6:30 p.m., at the Municipal Services Building, 800 Field Drive, Lake Forest, Illinois.

Building Review Board members present: Chairman John Looby and Board members, Joanne Bluhm, Sally Downey, and Scott Renken

Building Review Board members absent: Timothy G. Franzen, two vacant positions

Staff present: Catherine Czerniak, Director of Community Development
Jennifer Baehr, Planner

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

Chairman Looby 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 ta themselves.

2. Consideration of the minutes from the April 10, 2023 Building Review Board meeting.

The minutes of the April 10, 2023 meeting were approved as presented.

**3. Consideration of a request for approval the demolition of the existing residence at
866 Oak Knoll Drive and consideration of a replacement residence, conceptual
landscape plan, and overall site plan.**

Property Owner: Alex Carterson

Project Representative: Thomas Budzik, architect

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

Mr. Budzik stated that initially the petitioners planned to renovate the existing residence, but after studying the existing conditions of the home it was decided that the home will be demolished with the exception of the foundation which will remain. He reviewed a site plan noting the existing footprint of the house and pointed out the areas where the foundation and building footprint will be expanded. He stated that the style of the proposed residence started as a ranch home, but the petitioners decided that some second floor space would make the home more functional. He stated that the existing residence on the property was built in 1964 and is a ranch style home, which is typical for the neighborhood. He added that the existing house is in moderate condition but given the scope of the proposed addition, it was not possible to work with the existing home. He noted that the existing foundation was reviewed and found to be able to support a new residence. He stated that the general layout of the proposed residence is similar to

the existing. He noted that the existing home has a two-car garage, and the proposed residence has a four-car garage that is proposed on the north side of the home. He stated that the proposed residence has a story and a half massing and the second floor is built within the roof to minimize the appearance of mass and height. He noted the strong horizontal directionality of the home and noted that efforts were made to keep the home simple. He noted that the front elevation presents the main entrance with wood accents, a bay window and a shed dormer centered on the roof. He discussed the overlapping gable elements on the front elevation and noted that alternate designs were considered. He noted that it is difficult to fit the desired bedroom on the second floor under different roof forms. He noted that the larger gable on the front elevation is stepped back to minimize its prominence. He noted that the large shed dormer on the rear elevation has no windows because it is a closet and has limited visibility from the street. He reviewed the exterior materials. He stated that the proposed stone will have warm tones and the stucco will be beige and will not be stark white. He added that the roof will be a pewter color and the entrance will have natural wood elements. He stated that the dormers will have dark siding so that they blend in with the roof to minimize their appearance. He presented color renderings of the home reflecting the intended appearance. He distributed material samples.

Ms. Baehr reviewed that the request is for approval of demolition of more than 50 percent of the home. She stated that the foundation will remain and as a result, the new home will be generally in the same location but with an expanded footprint to the east and west. She stated that the existing residence does not have any architectural significance, and staff is supportive of the demolition request. She stated that the proposed residence is more contemporary than others in the neighborhood but noted that the proposed residence is generally consistent with the massing, simple detailing and height of the other homes in the area. She noted that the Building Review Board normally limits the exterior to two wall materials, however in addition to the proposed stucco and stone on the exterior walls, the use of an engineered wood siding is proposed in some areas, adding a third wall material. She noted that the color palette appears softer and less stark than some recent more trendy homes that present a starker appearance. She recommended that a mock up be required prior to the installation to review the proposed material and color palette. She noted a condition related to the addition of openings on the dormer on the rear elevation. She stated that some of the trees on the site are in marginal condition. She noted trees that the City Arborist recommended for preservation. She noted a particular tree in the front yard, that is of high quality, and ideally should be preserved. She added that if the trees identified for preservation are removed, double inch for inch replacements for removal of the trees will be required.

Chairman Looby invited questions from the Board.

Board member Downey noted that she is familiar with the street and noted that it is interesting to see the two houses on tonight's agenda that are directly next to each other. She noted that the two, off-center windows on the large front gable are distracting. She noted that the shed dormer on the front elevation could be improved with the removal of the horizontal muntins. She commented on the rear dormer noting

that it appears as an afterthought when the rest of the home is so well done. She questioned where the black siding will be used and cautioned that the petitioner avoid a shiny finish on the siding. She asked whether the large tree in the front yard could be moved.

Board member Renken stated that the general proportions of the house are nice. He agreed with removing the horizontal muntins in the front dormer windows and encouraged consideration be given to making the windows in the front dormer taller. He discussed the divisions in the windows on the front elevation, noting that the bay window in the library should follow the same muntin pattern as the other windows. He commented on the off-center windows on the large front gable noting that windows usually are centered on the peak of a gable. He stated that the off-center windows appear to almost touch the rakeboard. He acknowledged that the house is asymmetrical but pointed out that one gable on the front elevation is stucco and the other is stone. He noted that the stone in the gable appears a bit heavy. He stated that the areas where the siding is proposed appear more like trim rather than a wall material, so he is not concerned about the use of the siding on the home. He noted that on the rear dormers, the siding is proposed on a larger mass and asked if there is some texture. He suggested that the rear dormer in the master closet should have some detail rather than a blank wall. He stated that the color palette is soft and subtle, not stark black and white. He complimented the proportions on the rear of the house but noted the dormers need further study.

In response to questions from Board member Renken, Mr. Budzik clarified that their original proposal included bronze color windows, however the property owner is now interested in black windows. He explained that they decided to change the window color because the original bronze color in combination with the beige stucco and stone appeared outdated. He added that the black windows present a more modern appearance.

Board member Bluhm noted that no houses on that portion of Oak Knoll Drive have garages that come forward toward the street. She noted that the rear master closet dormer is not an elegant solution. She stated that the dormer on the front is acceptable as presented. She asked about the black siding material.

In response to questions from Board member Bluhm, Mr. Budzik stated that the siding material can be painted any color and can have a non-glossy finish. He added that the siding will be smooth as opposed to having a imitation wood grain texture.

Chairman Looby stated that the house will fit into the neighborhood well. He noted the wooded nature of the area and he encouraged consideration of preserving the large pine tree in the front yard.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Budzik identified the areas where the engineering wood siding is proposed. He stated that the intent is to make the dormers disappear into the roof. He commented on the large front gable and noted that other options that they studied are more complicated. He stated that that the roof pitch

could be increased, or another gable could be added to resolve the off-center windows. He stated that a steeper roof pitch will provide more space to work with to shift the windows slightly. He stated that the rear master closet dormer will be painted black and noted that a lighter color will make it more visible.

Board member Renken discussed the rear dormer and asked about adding transom type windows or making it stucco. He pointed out that the rear dormer is the largest dormer on the house.

Chairman Looby invited public comment. Hearing none, he invited final Board comments, hearing no further comments from the Board, Chairman Looby invited a motion for the demolition request.

Board member Renken made a motion to recommend approval of demolition of the existing residence based on the findings presented in the staff report and incorporating the Board's deliberations as additional findings.

Board member Bluhm seconded the motion and was approved by a vote of 4 to 0.

Chairman Looby asked the petitioner to strongly consider the comments raised by the Board.

Mr. Carterson stated that he would like to preserve the large pine tree in the front yard, however, given its proximity to the front of the house, he is concerned that the tree may not survive through construction. He stated that he is willing to replant new trees on the site to make up for the removal of the pine tree.

Chairman Looby invited a motion.

Board member Renken made a motion to recommend approval of the replacement residence, attached garage, conceptual landscape and overall site plan based on the findings presented in this staff report and incorporating the Board's deliberations as additional findings. Staff recommends approval subject to the following conditions of approval.

Conditions of Approval

1. Conduct further study and refinement of the following:
 - a. The window placement on the large gable on the north end of the front elevation.
 - b. The proportions of the windows on the front dormer.
 - c. Consideration shall be given to breaking up the solid appearance of the rear dormer.
2. The windows shall have exterior and interior muntins.
3. The composite siding must have a smooth and matte finish.

4. The color palette shall be soft and warm tones. A mock up the exterior materials shall be provided for staff review, and will be subject to staff approval, prior to installation of the materials.
5. All modifications to the plans including those detailed above and any others made in response to Board direction or discussion, or as the result of final design development, shall be clearly called out on the plan and a copy of the plan originally provided to the Board 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.
6. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a detailed landscape plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The plan shall, at a minimum, meet the landscaping standards for new residences detailed in the Code and all required replacement tree inches to account for trees removed to the extent possible using good forestry practices. The landscape plan must include the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping.
7. Tree Protection Plan – Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect the parkway trees and other trees that may be impacted during construction must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City.
8. At the time of submittal for a building permit, detailed drainage and grading plans must be submitted. No grading or filling shall be permitted except the absolute minimum necessary to meet accepted engineering standards and practices.
9. Details of exterior lighting shall be submitted with the plans submitted for permit. Cut sheets for all light fixtures shall be provided and all fixtures, except those illuminated by natural gas at low light levels, shall direct light down and the source of the light shall be fully shielded from view. All exterior lights shall be set on automatic timers to go off no later than 11 p.m. except for security motion detector lights.
10. A plan for construction parking and materials' staging shall be submitted for review and will be subject to approval by the City's Certified Arborist, City Engineer and Director of Community Development.

The motion was seconded by Board member Bluhm and was approved by a vote of 4 to 0.

4. Consideration of a request for approval of the demolition of an existing residence

and approval of a new single-family residence, conceptual landscape plan, and overall site plan for the property addressed as 890 Oak Knoll Drive.

Property Owner: Janeth and Toby McDonough

Project Representatives: Ewa Polanski, architect

Nancy Hannick, landscape architect

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

Ms. Polanski noted that the property owners have been looking for a site to build a new residence for several years. She stated that consideration was given to rehabilitating the existing house however the foundation is deteriorating, the scale of the house desired is twice as large as the existing and there is water damage to the existing home. She stated that they determined that the existing home is not worth preserving and they are proposing complete demolition of the existing structure. She reviewed the existing site plan noting that the proposed residence is much larger but noted that consideration was given to the location of the existing trees and efforts were made to save as many as possible. She stated that the location of the garage and driveway was driven by the location of the trees. She presented photos of the existing house noting that it has no architectural or historical significance. She reviewed the floor plan noting that the orientation of the house will remain, with the front of the house facing east, toward the street. She stated that the proposed residence has a one and a half story massing with the second floor living space located under the roof form. She stated that the floor plan was designed to allow ample natural light into the home with a strong connection between the interior and exterior. She presented images of other homes in the neighborhood. She stated that the proposed exterior materials were chosen based on other homes in the neighborhood. She presented a streetscape image. She presented the exterior elevations of the proposed residence. She stated that in response to a recommendation offered in the staff report, the windows in the north gable, on the front elevation were made more vertical to match the other windows around the home. She noted that the master bathroom and closet are located on the north elevation so the ability for additional windows as recommended in the staff report is limited. She presented colored renderings of the proposed residence. She stated that the windows are bronze, the siding paint color is off-white, and the proposed stone is gray. She stated that the roof will be a charcoal color. She stated that the intent is not to have a striking contrast between the different materials and colors. She presented images of different style garage doors that they are considering. She noted that they would like a modern style garage door that will still have some detailing.

Ms. Hannick noted that the inspiration for the proposed residence and landscape design comes from the agrarian and prairie landscapes of Illinois. She noted that the property is almost three acres with groves of Bur Oak and Hickory trees in the east front yard and northwest rear yard. She stated that the expansive rear yard is open and sunny. She stated that the house is rotated to the southwest to achieve maximum light for the interior spaces. She stated that the existing circular driveway will be removed, and the proposed driveway will partially remain within the footprint of the existing driveway in an effort to preserve the existing trees. She noted that the proposed

driveway has a gentle curve to maintain a soft approach to the home and the oak canopy in the front yard. She noted that a guest parking area is nestled in the trees in the front yard, partially in the location of the existing driveway. She stated that a zoning variance is needed for the location of the proposed driveway. She noted that the trees will receive pre and post construction treatment. She reviewed the proposed foundation plantings with shrubs, ground cover and ornamental trees. She stated that outdoor dining and entertaining areas are located on the rear of the home and on bluestone terraces. She noted that a swimming pool is proposed in the rear yard that will be well screened by a fence and new plantings. She added that adjacent to the pool is an open pergola and outdoor kitchen. She stated that most of the rear of the lot will be transformed into a meadow to eliminate maintenance and benefit wildlife. She noted that the proposed landscape compliments the architecture of the home and enhances the wooded character of the existing property.

Ms. Baehr stated that this property is located directly south of the previous petition. She noted that the existing home on the property is a ranch style home built in the 1950's, adding that the existing home does not present architectural or historical significance. She noted that staff supports the demolition request. She stated that the proposed one and a half story massing and low profile of the proposed residence fits well into existing neighborhood. She stated that the main mass of the proposed residence is sited a bit further back on the site than the existing residence. She acknowledged that the circular driveway will be removed, and it is the petitioner's intent to preserve the trees in the front yard, adding that if the trees are negatively impacted by construction or removal of the driveway, replacement inches for the trees will be required. She noted the staff recommendations and summarized the conditions. She recommended some enhancement of the architectural detailing to set the home apart from homes in a more tract production style housing development. She clarified that the swimming pool and related pergola are not part of this petition and are proposed as part of a future phase.

Board member Bluhm stated some concern about the north elevation. She stated that the bay window on the north elevation appears small. She complimented the bronze instead of black windows. She asked to see samples of the proposed materials. She stated support for the softer color palette. She complimented the proposed landscaping and stated support for moving the house back on the site from the existing footprint. She stated that the images of the garage doors as presented by the petitioner are better than what is shown on the drawings included in the packet.

Board member Downey asked for further information about the dormer on the north elevation noting that it appears off balance. She stated that the bay window appears more as a door than a bay window. She stated that the bay window as configured does not appear to fit in and asked that a better solution be explored. She commented on the east elevation and the small window in the gable above the garage.

Board member Renken stated that the house has symmetry and good proportions. He suggested that to enhance the symmetry on the front elevation, the bay window on the north side be repeated on the south side. He stated that the rear of the home looks as

good as the front. He stated that it is not a tract style house but agreed that every little detail helps. He explained that to get away from a tract-like home, consideration should be given to the spacing of the board and batten. He suggested a different spacing of the board and batten between the first and second floors to enhance the detailing of the home. He commented on the north elevation and acknowledged that the bay window is in the center of the elevation and suggested the addition of a triple window in the bay to make it wider. He asked the petitioner to consider an additional dormer on the north elevation to balance the proposed single dormer. He stated that the exterior trumps the interior. He complimented the eave detailing. He asked about the material that will be used for the porch ceiling and eaves. He asked about the color of the gutters and their location. He stated that it appears that the petitioner has addressed the concerns about the verticality of the windows in the front gable. He commented that the side entry door on the south elevation appears very narrow, noting that it should be wider. He stated that the garage doors as presented do not appear commercial-like.

Chairman Looby complimented the house and the prairie in the back. He asked about the width of the board and batten. He noted that if the board and batten spacing is wider, it appears less tract-like.

Ms. Polanski stated that they previously had a second dormer on the north elevation, however it was eliminated because it was not necessary. She stated that the bay window on the north elevation is small because of the size of the master closet, adding that the bay was enlarged to the extent possible. She stated that trees will be planted to screen the north elevation. She stated that a generator will be located on the north elevation. She stated that the board and batten will be spaced 12 inches but they could consider 16 inches and agreed that wider spacing is better to provide more depth and shadow. She stated that the side entry door on the south elevation can be increased to three feet. She stated that the eaves will be cedar and the porch ceiling will be cedar tongue and groove paneling. She stated that the windows in the front gable were narrowed to appear more vertical. She confirmed that the garage doors have windows on the top with detailing around the garage doors to avoid a commercial look. She added that the garage doors will be a dark color. She clarified that the board and batten siding is cedar. She noted that the gutters and downspouts will be aluminum in a bronze color. She clarified that the fascia boards will be painted bronze to blend in with the gutter.

Board member Bluhm stated that the window in the gable above the garage needs to be increased in size. She asked for further clarification about the dormers on the north elevation. She asked whether bronze light fixtures would be appropriate with the bronze windows and garage doors.

Ms. Hannick noted that the north elevation will be hidden by existing trees.

Ms. Baehr stated that the petitioner originally proposed two dormers on the north elevation. She explained that it was staff's understanding that the windows in the dormers were not necessary to meet the Code requirements and in an effort to simplify

the elevation, it was recommended that the dormers be eliminated. She explained that if the petitioner desires to keep one dormer, then a second dormer should be added to provide balance, or alternatively, the single dormer should be eliminated. She stated that it is not ideal to rely on landscaping to hide flaws in the design of a home.

Board member Renken asked if the dormer window on the north elevation is needed to meet light and ventilation requirements.

Ms. Polanski stated that the dormer window is not needed to meet light and ventilation requirements, but the property owners wanted the dormer window to have a small sitting area in the bedroom.

Board member Renken agreed that the single dormer on the north elevation be eliminated, or a second dormer is added to provide balance. He reiterated that the bay window on the north elevation is too small and it should be enlarged.

Board member Renken made a motion to recommend approval of demolition of the existing residence based on the findings presented in the staff report and incorporating the Board's deliberations as additional findings.

The motion was seconded by Board member Bluhm and was approved by a vote of 4 to 0.

Board member Renken recommended approval of the residence, attached garage, conceptual landscape and overall site plan based on the findings presented in this staff report and incorporating the Board's deliberations as additional findings. Staff recommends approval subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. Refine the proportions of the windows on the front north gable to follow the proportions of the other windows around the home.
2. Consideration shall be given to incorporating a double window on the front garage gable to match the north front gable.
3. Conduct further study and refinement of the size of the bay window on the north elevation to appear more intentional and in line with the scale of the north elevation.
4. The single dormer shall be centered, eliminated, or a second dormer shall be added to the north elevation to create a more balanced appearance.
5. Conduct further study of the spacing of the board and batten siding.
6. The width of the side entry door shall be increased.
7. The exterior light fixtures shall have a bronze finish to match the color palette of the home.

8. Details on the garage doors shall be provided at the time of submittal for permit and the appearance of the garage doors shall be reviewed by staff to affirm that they have a residential, rather than commercial appearance.
9. All modifications to the plans including those detailed above and any others made in response to Board direction or as the result of final design development, shall be clearly called out on the plan and a copy of the plan originally provided to the Board 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.
10. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a detailed landscape plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The plan shall, at a minimum, meet the landscaping standards for new residences detailed in the Code and all required replacement tree inches to account for trees removed to the extent possible using good forestry practices. The landscape plan must include the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping.
11. Tree Protection Plan – Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect the parkway trees and all other trees that may be impacted during construction must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City.
12. On an ongoing basis, for three years after the issuance of the final Certificate of Occupancy for the new residence, the City shall inspect the trees on the site at the start and near the end of each growing season annually and assess whether any of the trees in or near the construction site, staging areas, and construction access routes are failing to thrive. At the sole discretion of the City Arborist, the property owner may be required to plant replacement inches in an amount set by the City Arborist. At the end of the three year period, the deposit will be fully refunded if all required tree replacement inches have been planted to the satisfaction of the City Arborist.
13. At the time of submittal for a building permit, detailed drainage and grading plans must be submitted. No grading or filling shall be permitted except the absolute minimum necessary to meet accepted engineering standards and practices.
14. Details of exterior lighting shall be submitted with the plans submitted for permit. Cut sheets for all light fixtures shall be provided and all fixtures, except those illuminated by natural gas at low light levels, shall direct light down and the source of the light shall be fully shielded from view. All exterior lights shall be set on automatic timers to go off no later than 11 p.m. except for security motion detector lights.

15. A plan for construction parking and materials' staging shall be submitted for review and will be subject to approval by the City's Certified Arborist, City Engineer and Director of Community Development.

The motion was seconded by Board member Bluhm and was approved by a vote of 4 to 0.

Howard Lambert, 831 Oak Knoll Drive, pointed out that the west elevation of the proposed home has a large expanse of glass that overlooks the prairie. He cautioned the property owners that with that amount of glass it will get very warm inside. He stated that he has experienced issues with drainage in the area. He encouraged the property owners to carefully look at drainage.

Chairman Looby noted that the plans will be reviewed by the City Engineer before a building permit is issued.

3. Consideration of a request for approval of an additional sign for Consumers Credit Union at 300 Field Drive. Consideration of a request for approval of an additional sign for the Consumers Credit Union.
Property Owner: Joseph
Project Representative:

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

Mr. Bellisario stated that originally a plan with a total of four signs was submitted to the City. He stated that the four signs originally proposed included one monument sign facing Field Drive, a second monument sign facing the tollway, a wall sign at the top of the building facing the tollway, and a wall sign at the top of the south elevation. He noted that three of the four signs were approved, a permit was issued, and the three approved signs have been installed. He noted that the sign that they did not receive approval for was the wall sign on the south elevation. He stated that the initial comments from the City asked that a sight line study for the south wall sign be provided. He noted that Conway Park's signage guidelines state that wall signs, except those facing the tollway, should be located as low as possible on the building. He stated that there are mature trees and architectural elements of the building that would obscure the sign if it were lower on the building. He stated that the proposed sign is smaller than allowed. He noted that they would prefer to have a much larger sign, however due to some of the architectural elements of the building there is not much of an opportunity to make the sign larger. He explained that the sign is comprised of illuminated channel letters in the Consumers Credit Union brand colors. He stated that the illumination of the wall sign should not negatively affect the rooms in the neighboring hotel. He noted that there are only five rooms on the north end of the hotel and there is approximately 200 feet between the hotel and where the sign is proposed. He added that the hotel and Consumers Credit Union building are off-set from one another so the hotel rooms are not directly facing the sign. He added that there are lamp posts in the parking lot that emit quite a bit of ambient light that will wash out the lighting of the sign. He stated that the illumination of the sign would be subject to the requirements of the Conway Park

standards which allows signs to be illuminated only during business hours. He commented on the conditions in the staff report. He asked that if a building was constructed on the vacant lot to the south that would obscure the sign on the south elevation if they could come back to request a variance to maintain the sign even if it was hidden by the new building. He added that this condition makes a presumption that the only acceptable sign visibility is from the tollway. He noted that the Trustmark building to the north has a similar sign on the south elevation. He presented images of the proposed sign and the sight line studies from Field Drive.

Ms. Czerniak stated that Lake Forest takes signage very seriously. She added that signage is limited throughout the community. She noted that most people seem to appreciate the steps that the City has taken to limit signage. She noted that two of the most frequent complaints that staff receives is related to lighting and signage. She explained that in Conway Park, care has been taken to keep this a high-quality and very sophisticated appearing business park. She noted that staff works closely with the Conway Park Owners' Association and in 2019 the Building Review Board recommended approval of an amendment to the signage standards for Conway Park. She noted that the intent has always been to be careful and conscious of how signage could dramatically change the character of the park over time. She explained that in this case, three signs were approved on this building. She noted that a monument sign facing Field Drive was approved and is consistent with all the buildings along Field Drive, a building sign at the top of the west elevation was approved, and a monument sign facing the tollway was approved. She stated that in 2019, the amendment to the Conway Park signage standards allowed wall signs on other portions of the building. She noted that Trustmark was the first company to install signage on the south facing elevation, and their sign is very visible from the tollway because of the configuration of the building and the fact that the sign is well detailed and well placed on the building. She explained that the petitioner has come forward with a south facing sign at the top of the building and review by the Building Review Board is required for this type of sign, and staff cannot approve the sign administratively. She stated that it is staff's understanding that the intent of the proposed south facing sign is to increase the visibility of identification of this building from the tollway. She reiterated that there is already a sign on the west elevation of the building facing the tollway and a monument sign along the tollway. She explained that the Consumers Credit Union building is pushed toward Field Drive and a mock-up of the proposed sign has been installed on the south elevation of the building. She noted that the mock up of the sign is really not visible from the tollway. She added that staff does not want to set the precedent of putting up signage on the building that does not provide any visibility and serves no purpose. She noted that staff is concerned that the rooms on the north side of the hotel, which are the larger suites, could be impacted by the lighting of the sign. She added that if the Board decides to allow the sign to be internally illuminated, that there be a condition added that requires the sign to be turned off after business hours, which is not necessarily required for signage that faces the tollway. She stated that staff is supportive of the request and staff has heard from the Conway Park Owners' Association that they are in support of the request. She noted that the sign does meet the size limitation, however its placement at the top of the south elevation is not consistent with the Conway Park signage standards. She added that staff is recommending that the sign

not be illuminated and that if the lot to the south, adjacent to the hotel, is developed that the sign be removed since the intent of signage in Lake Forest has always been for business identification and not for advertising purposes. She stated that businesses today have many other ways to advertise themselves, and most drivers along the tollway are not going to be visiting the building unless they are an employee. She stated that the petitioner can always come back to the Board for additional review for a different proposal or to keep the signage on the south side of the building after the lot to the south is developed. She stated that staff is trying to maintain a balance of the intent of the signage standards in Conway Park with the needs of the business without putting signage in a place that is not visible and will not serve a long term purpose of identifying the building.

Chairman Looby invited questions from the Board.

In response to questions from Board member Renken, Ms. Czerniak clarified that staff is recommending that the sign not be illuminated at any time. She noted that the monument signs and building sign already installed are illuminated. She stated that if the Board recommends approval of an illuminated sign, then staff recommends that the sign be turned off after business hours, which is not a requirement for signs that completely face the tollway. She clarified that there is already a very large, illuminated sign on the west elevation of the building that is very visible from the tollway.

Chairman Looby stated that this sign is proposed in addition to the existing sign on the tollway side, and is essentially a vanity sign.

Board member Downey stated that she drove by the building several times and she could barely see the mock-up of the sign that was installed on the south elevation of the building. She questioned the purpose of the sign if it is barely visible. She acknowledged that it would be difficult to see the sign from the hotel. She stated that she can accept the sign in its proposed location, however she does not believe the additional sign accomplishes the petitioner's goal. She stated that the sign should not be illuminated at night. She stated that if a building is constructed on the vacant lot to the south it may not completely obscure the sign if the new building is lower. She questioned the time limit of 60 days after a building is constructed on the vacant lot to the south to remove the sign that is included as part of the conditions in the staff report.

In response to questions from Board member Downey, Ms. Czerniak stated that the condition that staff is suggesting is that after a building is constructed on the vacant lot to the south, if the sign is no longer visible staff would evaluate the sign and if it has any value or purpose. She added that that is where the 60 day time limit came from because there needs to be an end cap on that condition. She added that the condition is not necessarily saying that the sign has to be removed after 60 days of a building being constructed on the lot to the south, but if the sign is not visible from the tollway it really does not have any value. She noted that it would be inconsistent with the City's signage regulations to have signs on a building that do not serve any purpose. She explained that the Trustmark sign on the south elevation is very different in that it is highly visible from the tollway, because of the orientation of the building and the

projection of the building toward the tollway. She confirmed that the hotel has an illuminated sign on the west elevation facing the tollway.

Board member Renken finds the sign acceptable with the conditions recommended by staff.

Board member Bluhm asked the petitioner if the sign would be of any value to them if it was not illuminated. She asked if the petitioner would be willing to turn the lighting off after business hours.

Mr. Bellisario stated that it would diminish the value of the sign if it is not illuminated. He added that lighted signs are easier to read in the dark and on cloudy days. He stated that if it is required that the sign be turned off after business hours they will comply with that requirement.

Ms. Czerniak stated that staff does not want the petitioner to install the illuminated sign to find out after installation that the lighting does impact the hotel rooms. She noted that if the Board approves an illuminated sign that is turned off after business hours, staff can observe the lighting from the hotel rooms and if staff receives complaints from the hotel, staff can work with the petitioner to reduce the intensity of the lighting.

In response to questions from Chairman Looby, Ms. Czerniak stated that normally end of business hours is considered 9:00 pm.

Board member Bluhm agreed with Board member Downey that it does not appear that the sign will impact the hotel, especially if it is turned off after business hours.

In response to questions from Chairman Looby, Mr. Bellisario stated that the sign will be internally illuminated, and the face of the lettering will be dark blue. He stated that he is not familiar with an illuminated sign on a dimmer but he does not see why that is not possible. He explained that he has never seen a channel letter sign that is not illuminated so if they are not allowed to have an illuminated sign the design of the sign may change to a three-dimensional cut out letter.

Ms. Czerniak stated that a condition that the Board may want to consider is that if the wall sign is illuminated, the intensity of the light shall be subject to evaluation after installation and shall be dimmed if determined to be necessary, but the lighting shall be turned off no later than 9:00 pm. She noted that she has heard from the owner of the hotel property, and he is unsure if the sign would impact the rooms, but the property owner certainly does not want the hotel to be negatively impacted.

Chairman Looby stated that the existing sign on the west elevation facing the tollway is very bright.

Mr. Bellesario stated that the sign proposed on the south elevation will be most visible from the northbound ramp and the existing west facing sign is not visible until passing the building on the tollway.

Ms. Czerniak stated that the existing west facing sign is very visible and this proposed sign is really advertising, which is not the purpose of the City's signage standards.

Mr. Bellesario asked if the 60 day time limit to evaluate the value of the sign if the lot to the south is developed can be extended to 120 days so that there is time to discuss the sign with staff.

Chairman Looby stated that the petitioner will have enough time to discuss with staff while the building to the south is being constructed and it does not seem that an extra 30 days will make a difference.

Ms. Czerniak stated that the building on the vacant lot to the south would come before the Building Review Board.

Hearing no further comments or public testimony, Chairman Looby invited a motion.

Board member Bluhm made a motion to recommend approval of a fourth sign at the location and size proposed for the purpose of identifying the building from the Tollway be subject to the following conditions.

1. The intensity of the wall sign lighting shall be subject to evaluation by City staff after installation and shall be dimmed if determined to be necessary to avoid the potential for negatively impacting the guest rooms at the neighboring hotel. The lighting of the sign shall be turned off no later than 9:00 pm.
2. After a building is constructed on the vacant parcel to the south, if the sign is no longer visible from the Tollway, it shall be removed within 60 days after completion of the new building.
3. The plans submitted for permit shall reflect the plans as presented to the Building Review Board. Any other changes made in response to direction from the Board or as a result of final design development shall be clearly called out on the plans. Changes will be reviewed by staff, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to confirm that the plans are in conformance with the approvals granted.

The motion was seconded by Board member Downey and approved by a motion of 4 to 0.

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

No additional public testimony was presented to the Board.

6. Additional information from staff.

No additional information was presented to the Board.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Baehr
Planner