

**VILLAGE OF LAKE BLUFF  
ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW  
REGULAR MEETING  
SEPTEMBER 3, 2019**

**APPROVED MINUTES**

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call**

The meeting of the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) of the Village of Lake Bluff was called to order on September 3, 2019 at 7:00 p.m. in the Village Hall Board Room (40 E. Center Avenue) and the following were present.

Present: Neil Dahlmann  
Edward Deegan  
Julie Wehmeyer  
Bob Hunter, Chair

Absent: Tim Callahan  
Matthew Kerouac

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

**2. Consideration of the August 14, 2019 ABR Special Meeting Minutes**

Member Dahlmann made a motion, to approve the minutes of the August 14, 2019 ABR meeting as amended. Member Deegan seconded the motion. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote.

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

Chairman Hunter asked if anyone would like to address the ABR on any matter not on the agenda. There were no requests to address the ABR.

**4. A Public Hearing to Review a Site Plan to Replace Benches and Lights at the Central Lake County Joint Action Water Agency at 200 Rockland Road**

Chair Hunter introduced the agenda item and invited the applicant to the podium.

Bill Soucie, Acting Executive Director CLCJAWA, said the plan is to replace the four flat wood benches situated around the pond in front of the facility and add one new bench near the LBOLA entrance. The bench styles will be a combination of flat and traditional benches with backs, eight feet long, built with “resinwood” recycled plastic slats, and powder coated steel frames. Mr. Soucie said they will add a fifth bench near the LBOLA parking area if LBOLA wants that. Mr. Soucie said they would also like the opportunity to reconfigure the location of the benches, if necessary, to move the easternmost bench away from the fence.

Chair Hunter had no comments then opened the floor to questions from the commissioners.

In response to a comment from Member Dahlmann, Mr. Soucie said the color of the benches will be light cedar brown.

Member Deegan made a motion to recommend the Village Board approve the replacement benches as described. Member Wehmeyer seconded the motion. The motion passed on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Dahlmann, Deegan, Wehmeyer and Chair Hunter  
Nays: None  
Absent: Callahan and Kerouac

A discussion regarding replacement of the existing lighting followed.

Mr. Soucie said the plan is to replace the existing exterior wall sconces on both of the buildings. He described the features associated with the current fixtures and said the plan is to replace them with the modern LED equivalent, shielded version, with a BUG rating of B1-U0-G1. The fixtures are designed to shine down to allow 4712 lumens of 4000K warm white light to spill down the wall and/or door. The replacement fixtures will have a bronze finish to match the existing building window frames/trim and will be installed in the same location as the current fixtures.

In response to a comment from Chair Hunter, Mr. Soucie said the light temperature will be the same as the current fixtures. Currently there are 23 shielded and 6 unshielded wall scones located primarily over doors and entrances which allows operators moving around the property, especially in the rear, to locate the entrances to the building.

In response to a question from Member Wehmeyer, Mr. Soucie said all the replacement fixtures will be shielded.

Chair Hunter opened the floor for questions from the commissioners.

Member Deegan had no issues with the request and said that he thinks it is positive that the replacement lights will be shielded.

Mr. Soucie said the current and replacement housing and light temperature is identical then he explained why the proposal was being presented to the ABR for review.

Member Wehmeyer made a motion to recommend the Village Board approve the lighting site plan as presented. Member Deegan seconded the motion. The motion passed on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Dahlmann, Deegan, Wehmeyer and Chair Hunter  
Nays: None  
Absent: Callahan and Kerouac

**5. Consideration of an Application for a Change of Antennas and Equipment on the Cell Tower at 45 East Center Avenue**

Chair Hunter introduced the agenda item and invited the applicant to the podium.

Suzanne Kingsland, Real Estate Specialist for Crown Castle, the owner of the cell tower, said the application was submitted on behalf of their tenant T-Mobile. The plan is to replace three antennas and six radios, and remove six antennas and two radios on the existing cell tower located at the Public Safety Building.

In response to a comment from Chair Hunter, Ms. Kingsland said three antennas will be replaced and six removed but everything else will remain the same.

In response to a question from Member Wehmeyer, Ms. Kingsland said the new antennas will be the same size as the existing antennas.

As there were no questions from the commissioners, Member Dahlmann made a motion to recommend the Village Board approve the application with the following conditions: (i) the wires run inside the tower, (ii) the ground level equipment be below the top of the brick wall, and (iii) antennas and all equipment on the tower be painted in a color that matches the existing tower. Member Deegan seconded the motion. The motion passed on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Wehmeyer, Dahlmann, Deegan and Chair Hunter  
Nays: None  
Absent: Callahan and Kerouac

## **6. Consideration of Draft Amendments to the Sign Code**

Chair Hunter introduced the agenda item and invited the applicant to the podium.

Arista Strungys, Principal Consultant for Camiros, reviewed the proposed revisions to the Lake Bluff sign regulations for the L-1 and L-2 Districts, specifically the address signage, newly created “Item F” (L-1 and L-2 District standards), and permitted signage (awnings, flags and flagpoles, ground, menu board, wall or fascia signs and window signs.)

Chair Hunter expressed his concern regarding address signage because currently there is no consistency in the number sizes in that area. He provided information regarding a previous application which unintentionally resulted in approval of a sign which exceeded the sign regulations. A discussion regarding calculating the area of the sign to grade ensued.

Chair Hunter explained what prompted the L-1/L-2 District sign review and asked if the sign regulations could be a little less restrictive for certain kind of instances. Ms. Strungys clarified that the multi-tenant non-retail developments with individual entries that would require the sign plan was switched. The proposed master sign plan provides flexibility, not as a variance, but as a modification which would require Village Board approval. A discussion followed.

In response to a comment from Member Dahlmann, Ms. Strungys said the Supreme Court ruling deems it unconstitutional to address the content of signs but there can be restrictions placed on the size and location.

Member Dahlmann said it could be confusing for Staff to administer the proposed total linear frontage of tenant maximum surface area (2, 4, 6 and 8 square feet). He suggested linear feet less than 100 ft. be 4 square feet and 8 square feet for 100 or more linear feet.

In response to a question from Chair Hunter, Ms. Strungys said a master plan is required for buildings with individual tenant entrances and optional for buildings with a shared entryway.

BCS Croak showed a picture of the 917 Building, a discussion regarding the current signage followed.

In response to a question from Member Wehmeyer, Ms. Strungys said in terms of address signage for multi-tenant buildings there will be one sign to identify the overall building and if needed, signage for each individual suite.

In response to a question from an audience member, Member Wehmeyer said a previous applicant occupying a space in the 917 building said the signage was too small for their patients to see but the proposed signage presented did not comply with the code. A discussion followed.

In response to a comment from Chair Hunter, Ms. Strungys explained why universal size is not typically designed for address signs. A discussion regarding variability in the size of the numbers followed.

In response to comments from Members Deegan and Dahlmann, Ms. Strungys said the majority of the proposed changes are for wall, fascia and window signage. The proposed revisions are the actual ordinance language that will be adopted.

Member Wehmeyer said it is important to clarify that the height of the sign is above grade and the provision should not be not repeated throughout the code.

Following a comment from Ms. Strungys, It was the consensus of the ABR to switch the total linear frontage of tenant maximum surface area.

Member Dahlmann asked if the term “total linear frontage of tenant” refers to the lot or building. Ms. Strungys said the language will be clarified to specific that it is proportional to the building.

Chair Hunter opened the floor to questions from the audience. An audience member, Robert Zgonena said he does not see any problems with the 917 building but expressed concern because the business name was not visible.

Member Dahlmann made a motion to recommend the Village Board approve the revisions to the sign regulations with the following changes: (i) changes to the address sign and (ii) confirm the sign area height. Member Wehmeyer seconded the motion. The motion passed on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Wehmeyer, Dahlmann, Deegan and Chair Hunter  
Nays: None  
Absent: Callahan and Kerouac

Following a comment from Chair Hunter, a brief discussion regarding the proposed site plan amendments followed.

## 7. Adjournment

There being no further business to consider, a motion was duly made and passed to adjourn the meeting at 7:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Croak, CBO, CBCO  
Building Codes Supervisor