

**VILLAGE OF LAKE BLUFF
ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW
REGULAR MEETING
FEBRUARY 5, 2013**

APPROVED MINUTES

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

The Regular Meeting of the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) of the Village of Lake Bluff was called to order on February 5, 2013 at 7:15 p.m. in the Village Hall Board Room (40 E. Center Avenue).

Present: Steve Rappin
Carol Russ
Matthew Kerouac
Chair Hunter

Absent: Ed Deegan
Austin DePree
Neil Dahlman

Also Present: Gerald Nellessen, Building Codes Supervisor

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

Chair Hunter noted there were no requests to address the ABR but Chair Hunter did update the Board on the work that has been accomplished by the Waukegan Road Corridor sub committee.

3. Workshop Discussion Regarding Possible Redevelopment of the Former Shepard Chevrolet Property and the Waukegan Road Corridor Study materials

Chair Hunter provided an overview of the redevelopment project at the Shepard site and what has been transpiring since the design charette. Chair Hunter also wanted to get a couple things on the table for the proposed design criteria for the Waukegan Road Corridor Study; wall penetrations, walls facing Rt. 43 if the setback is changed to 50' from 100' and a single story building at 22 feet high if located in that setback. Chair Hunter brought up what Member Kerouac provided from Oak Park regarding % of openings in a wall. Chair Hunter provided a diagram of a 100' long wall 20' high with 20%, 25% and 30% openings. 20% seems to be the minimum that other areas had. The last one has quite a bit of transparency in it. Mickey Collins, HOK Architects, indicated that they use 40% as an absolute maximum, mostly due to energy consumption. Chair Hunter relayed to Member Rappin that this applies to Rt. 43 but would like this to apply to Rt 176 also even though they are two zoning districts. The Shepard redevelopment could bring something different. Member Kerouac indicated that 30% may be a burden and 20% is not much but 25% may be a good point. Maybe this could be the minimum. He doesn't want to set the criteria so high that everyone will be coming in looking for a variance. What level of transparency; is it reflective of non-reflective? Chair Hunter had indicated that the building at 71 S. Waukegan Road had wanted to install mirrored glass and the Village would not allow it. There was discussion on mirrored-opaque and frosted glass. Member Russ agrees. There is the feeling of a flat wall and there is a premium on creating the

openness of the wall. Not all are rectangular flat planes. 30% may get to looking like separate storefronts versus one building. There will need to be a definition of what openness is.

Chair Hunter indicated that the way the code would read is the percentage of transparency. There was discussion on what zone of the wall the transparency is located. Member Rappin indicated that anything facing Waukegan Road should have as much transparency as possible. This should be at least 30%. Member Kerouac asked whether there is a scale issue with this one blanket percentage no matter what the frontage is? There was discussion. Chair Hunter indicated that if they go with more than less percentage then you could see more requests for variances. Member Kerouac indicated that this is an aesthetic issue and not a light-vent type issue. There was discussion on heights also; 22' versus 30'. Staff recommends 30 feet. There was discussion on height versus openness/transparency and locations of openings in a wall of 30 feet in height. Chair Hunter indicated that Carriageway has the highest point at 36' and the ridge is 27 1/2 '. There was discussion on grades and topography; how building heights are determined and from what grade.

There was continued discussion on building heights including what are the prescriptive heights for buildings of these types. The determination of the board was to leave the building heights at 22 feet (consensus) and transparency could be 25%; Steve likes 30% but will go with the group if they want 25%. Member Russ indicated that they not prescribe materials for walls but encourage materials that will make long walls “go away”. This can be done with glass or other materials.

Consensus was if you build in the 50' beyond the setback then you will need 25% transparency in glass and the other 75% can be other materials as indicated by Member Russ. Both the L-1 and L-2 Districts should have building heights limited to 22 feet and there can be a 50 foot setback for both Route 43 and Route 176. There were some setback questions on Route 41 setback which is 100 feet and is not adhered to in many places.

7. Adjournment

There being no further business to consider, Member Rappin moved to adjourn the meeting. Member Kerouac seconded the motion. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 8:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gerald Nellessen
Building Codes Supervisor