



**AGENDA
ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING**

Monday, June 20, 2022 at 7:00 P.M.

**Location: Long Grove Village Hall
3110 Old McHenry Road, Long Grove, IL 60047**

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. ATTENDANCE**
- 3. VISITOR BUSINESS / PUBLIC COMMENTARY**
- 4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. Approval of the May 16, 2022 Draft Meeting Minutes
- 5. OLD BUSINESS**
- 6. NEW BUSINESS**
 - a. Consideration of a request for a sign for "TTO Bokki", 4196 IL Route 83 and within the Sunset Grove HR-1 Highway Retail Planned Unit Development, submitted by Chul Yong Kim the business owner.
- 7. QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS**
- 8. ADJOURNMENT**

Next Regularly Scheduled Meeting: August 15, 2022 @ 7:00 PM

The Village of Long Grove is subject to the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 Individuals with disabilities who plan to attend this meeting and who require certain accommodations in order to allow them to observe and/or participate in this meeting, or who have questions regarding the accessibility of the meeting or the facilities, are requested to phone the Long Grove Village Manager at 847-634-9440 or TDD 847-634- 9650 promptly to allow the Village of Long Grove to make reasonable accommodations for those persons.

MEETING MINUTES

**MEETING MINUTES OF THE
LONG GROVE ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
May 16, 2022
7:00 P.M.**

Chairwoman Sylvester called the meeting of the Long Grove Architectural Commission (AC) to order at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present.

Members Present: Jeanne Sylvester; Laura Mikolajczak; Allen Roiter; and Matthew Akins

Members Absent: John Marshall and John Plunkett

Also Present: Taylor Wegrzyn, Community Development Services, and members of the public.

VISITORS BUSINESS

Chairwoman Sylvester asked if anyone in attendance desired to provide public comments on a topic other than those already on the agenda. All in attendance confirmed that they did not have commentary on other business. Chairwoman Sylvester clarified that the agenda item concerning Joanie's Pizzeria would be a review of the deck's design and any comments concerning the specific use of the deck should be reserved for a future hearing before the PCZBA. The Architectural Commission does not consider zoning relief or actions which fall under the purview of the Planning Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals (PCZBA) or Village Board. T. Wegrzyn noted that notice of any such PCZBA meeting will be posted on the Village's website, newspaper, property, and certified mailings will be sent out. He confirmed that PCZBA petitions require separate notifications and that the Architectural Commission does not share those same notification requirements. He also confirmed that an application for a Special Use Permit has been received by the Village and is still under staff review. If a Special Use Permit is required and a complete application is received, the zoning matter will be placed on a PCZBA agenda and notifications sent out to neighboring property owners. Roger Goble, a member of the public, spoke from the crowd to dispute the Village's notification requirements. Another member of the public requested that item #3 on the agenda be moved up before item #2.

NEW BUSINESS

1) Approval of the April 18, 2022 Meeting Minutes.

Corrections were made to the spelling of Commissioner Mikolajczak's name throughout. A reference to a landscaping recommendation for 145 Old McHenry Road was corrected to better reflect the intent of the comment. Grammar corrections were made to two instances of the term "newel post". The Commission's recommendation for signage at the Oatflow Café was corrected to replace the word "blend" with "resemble" in reference to the sign's border and its compatibility with other signs on the site.

Motion. A motion was made by Commissioner Roiter, seconded by Commissioner Mikolajczak to recommend approval of the April 18, 2022, meeting minutes, as amended.

Ayes: A. Roiter; L. Mikolajczak; M. Akins; J. Sylvester
Nays:
Absent: J. Marshall; J. Plunkett

Motion. A motion was made by Commissioner Roiter, seconded by Commissioner Akin, to move agenda item #3 before item #2.

Ayes: A. Roiter; L. Mikolajczak; M. Akins; J. Sylvester
Nays:
Absent: J. Marshall; J. Plunkett

2) Consideration of a request for an exterior deck for “Joanie’s Pizzeria”, 235 Robert Parker Coffin Road and within in the B-1 Historical Downtown Business District, submitted by Chris Kanzler.

T. Wegrzyn provided an overview of the petitioner’s request and context. It is located within the B1 Historic Business District. The deck is on the north side of the building and measures 15 feet x 39 feet. It would be attached to the existing deck and building. A 4-foot walkway would be removed for the deck expansion. Photos of the immediate vicinity and the existing conditions were shown. He further explained that the deck design is up for the Commission’s consideration tonight. The deck satisfies the bulk, yard, and setback regulations for the district. The use of the deck would be a matter for consideration by the PCZBA and Village Board, if required.

Ken Siwieck, representing New Midwest Capital, presented on behalf of the project. There is a new operator of the business, and they desire to improve the property by expanding the deck. The expansion would improve the look of the property over what is presently there. The deck matches the existing deck in material and design. Eventual expansion of the outdoor dining would allow the business to increase revenue, expand their capacity, and improve the aesthetics of the property.

The deck material is a newer rendition of the material used on the existing deck. It is carbonate decking. Wood picket railing is to be used to match the majority of the existing deck. There are a few sections of metal railing, but they wouldn’t be able to match that material. The serving station would be removed to make a pass through between the old and new deck. The existing walkway and planters are severely weathered and would be removed. The deck would extend approximately one foot beyond the eastern-most sliding door. No roof is proposed. Mr. Siwieck provided a physical example of the decking material. The existing walkway is made of wood. Chairwoman Sylvester asked if the newel posts match any existing posts. There are no other newel posts at the business to match. The lattice below the deck would match the existing lattice and would be stained.

Chairwoman Sylvester noted that the Downtown Guidelines recommend planters along 50% of the railings. There are some hanging baskets and boxes at the existing deck. She strongly recommended that these be applied to the new deck as well along 50% of the railings. Commissioner Mikolajczak asked if they could be permanent. Mr. Siwieck confirmed that no lighting is proposed.

Chairwoman Sylvester opened the meeting to public comment. T. Wegrzyn noted that everyone would have an opportunity to speak. Commentary would be limited to one turn each and back-and-forth commentary will not be allowed. Chris Beckord asked the applicant whether they had given any consideration, when designing the deck, on the impact of the immediate neighbors. Mr. Siwieck noted that the design is based on complementing the existing deck and building. Mr. Beckord claimed that the Zoning Code has restrictions on noise and buffer requirements for outdoor dining. Roger Goble asked if the Commission had seen the Special Use Permits which were issued for this property. The Commission did not review any Special Use Permits for this property. Mr. Goble also noted requirements for a 300-yard buffer requirement. He expressed a desire to see a landscape plan to buffer the structure and use from adjacent properties.

John Heidmann, a member of the public, spoke. He commented that the style of the deck was not consistent with that of Long Grove: rural, nineteenth century, and country. Nineteenth Century buildings did not have decks. A member of the public questioned whether the submitted plans were sufficient. T. Wegrzyn confirmed that permit-ready building plans are not required for an application to appear before the Architectural Commission. The Commission may request an additional appearance with more detailed drawings if they find the plans to be insufficient. Mr. Heidmann questioned why the Architectural Commission doesn't consider zoning in its determination.

There were comments made from the crowd regarding the Architectural Commission's consideration of zoning standards. Chairwoman Sylvester reiterated that the Planning and Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals has jurisdiction over zoning matters and will consider those aspects of the proposed project at such time that the PCZBA hears a petition concerning the use of the deck. The Architectural Commission will strictly be considering the design of the proposed deck. T. Wegrzyn explained that the Architectural Commission meeting was being held prior to any PCZBA hearing because the design could impact the specific zoning relief or approvals required for the project. T. Wegrzyn, in response to a question from the crowd, explained that a hypothetical building proposed to be in the middle of the roadway would not be heard by the Architectural Commission because it would need the owner's signature of approval. It was clarified that the proposal does not include a roof or enclosed porch.

After additional comments made from the crowd, Chairwoman Sylvester addressed the crowd to note that public concerns regarding the use should be presented before the PCZBA. T. Wegrzyn noted that those public comments received by May 6th were included in the agenda packet and provided to the Architectural Commission members prior to the meeting. Any comments received after that date were printed out and provided to the Commission at the meeting. Chairwoman Sylvester asked T. Wegrzyn whether there was any chance that the deck would not have to go to the PCZBA. T. Wegrzyn responded to note that the petitioner's application was still under staff and legal review. If the review finds that there is no requirement for the deck to appear before the PCZBA then there will not be a public comment period regarding the use. However, if the proposed use does require a hearing before the PCZBA then there will be an opportunity for the public to provide their comments. Whether or not a hearing is required or not, there is always a general commentary period at the start of all PCZBA meetings. The Special Use Permit application submitted by the petitioner and requesting an outdoor dining facility is still under review. Architectural Commission is required for any addition to a commercial building in the B1 district, whether or not a Special Use Permit is also needed.

Comments from Randall Harland, Chris Beckord, David Mundt, Debbie Handler, John Heidmann, Randy Towner, Shelley Frain, and Jon Garlovsky were included in the materials provided to the Architectural Commission. It was asked what would happen if the Commission wanted to continue its review of the application. T. Wegrzyn responded that the matter would be continued until the Commission felt that sufficient information and materials had been provided. If PZCBA action was required, it could proceed before that body and return to the Architectural Commission at its next meeting. If additional time was needed to provide additional information, the Commission could continue the matter further. The Commission can place a condition that its review be subject to any further approvals or conditions required by the PCZBA and/or Village Board.

Chairwoman Sylvester opined that the newel posts were very standard and could be more decorative. The building is very vernacular, but there may be other decorative elements on the property that could be reflected in the newel posts. Commissioner Roiter confirmed that the additional decorating is needed. A finial or other decoration could be used. Planters are encouraged along 50% of the railing. Commissioner Mikolajczak recommended that a planter be installed across the whole railing. Chairwoman Sylvester noted that any future changes such as size, length, design, materials, or lighting would require an additional appearance before the Commission. Mr. Goble spoke from the crowd to recommend that the review be continued until revised plans can be considered. The Commission considered whether the proposal required additional time for review. Members of the public also pointed out that the deck does not comply with the Special Use Permit issued previously or the Zoning Code standards.

Chairwoman Sylvester asked the commission whether the proposed deck, with changes to the newel posts, the recommended planters, and subject to any further conditions by the PCZBA, would be acceptable. Plans for the newel posts and planters will need to be provided to staff and reviewed together with the Chair of the Architectural Commission. Any further changes to the project will require further review by the Architectural Commission. Mr. Siwieck confirmed his understanding of the proposed conditions. Chairwoman Sylvester continued and asked whether any member of the Commission would like to make a motion or see the matter continued.

Motion. A motion was made by Commissioner Roiter, seconded by Commissioner Mikolajczak to recommend approval of the exterior deck, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Plans for newel posts with additional detailing and in character with the immediate vicinity to be submitted for review by staff and the Commission Chair.
- 2) Planters be placed along 50% of the deck railing.
- 3) Subject to any additional requirements or review by the Plan Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals and Village Board resulting from the proposed use of the deck expansion.

Ayes: A. Roiter; L. Mikolajczak; M. Akins J. Sylvester

Nays:

Absent: J. Marshall; J. Plunkett

Chairwoman Sylvester encouraged those in attendance to contact the Village to ensure that the project comes before the Plan Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals. She thanked everyone for

their participation in this process and thanked the applicant for the contributions of their business to the Village.

3) Consideration of a request for a new commercial structure “KEEP.Rental, Inc.”, 2798 Route 53 and within the R-2, Single Family Residential, submitted by Thomas and Douglas Olson.

T. Wegrzyn provided an overview of the proposed commercial structure at 2798 IL Route 53. The site is presently zoned R-2 and would require approval of to be determined zoning actions by the Village Board. Self-Storage Facilities are not a permitted use within the R-2 zoning district. The property is at the southern extent of the Village’s corporate limits. There is a large estate property to the north which is expected to be redeveloped in the future. The project previously was presented to the Village Board in February 2022. The Board referred the project to the appropriate Commissions and recommended that the design resemble other commercial structures in the vicinity such as Menards. He further explained that the project was appearing before the Architectural Commission first because any further changes to the design of the building may impact the extent to which any zoning relief is needed. If the plans are altered by any request of the PCZBA or Village Board, or if the applicant modifies the design on their own account, then the project will require another review by the Commission. The property is 2.19 acres in size. A photo was shown of the property. There is a ranch home located on the property which was built in the 1960’s. Renderings of the property were shown. The proposal includes lighting, signage, and landscaping in addition to the building structure. Melt Span is proposed for the exterior siding. Nichiha Kurastone is also proposed as an accent siding material. The plans for the signage, landscaping, lighting, materials, and site were shown. Additional photos of commercial buildings within the Village and surrounding areas were also shown.

Commissioner Roiter asked for clarification on the project location. It is located just north of Lake-Cook Road, west of Menards, and along Route 53. He asked what vehicular access would be provided to the site. Doug Olson, the applicant, responded that the access is proposed as right-in, right-out. Chairwoman Sylvester asked if that influenced the location of the signs. Mr. Olson clarified that there is a sign proposed on the north façade and on the west façade towards the south end of the building. The design has two stories on the front side and three at the rear due to the grade of the site. Two elevators would be located on center. Two overhead doors would be located on center at the rear to allow for loading inside of the building. Chairwoman Sylvester asked Mr. Olson to clarify how the property would be screened from Lake-Cook Road. The property’s rear faces a wetland area on the neighboring property and there are existing trees further obscuring the view. The applicant does not own the adjacent property. There will be no access from Lake-Cook Road. No wetlands are on the property, however, there are wetlands on the properties immediately surrounding it. Mr. Olson continued to note that the property will not generate a significant amount of traffic, but they were still intentional about placing the vehicular entrance as far from the intersection as possible. They have contacted IDOT regarding their request for access. Lighting at the rear of the building is intended to cover some of the driveway aisle while lighting along the sides of the building is directed downward and up the side of the building. There are lights also by the access doors. One pole light is to be along the drive lane near the property entrance. The signs are backlit.

Chairwoman Sylvester noted that the staff report indicated that Village Board expressed a desire for the project to reflect the architecture of other commercial developments in the Village such as the Menards or Sunset Grove. Mr. Olson described how the Nichiha stone was applied to the office

portion, south tower, and center bump out of the building to address the Village Board's recommendation. T. Wegrzyn asked the Petitioner to clarify what portions of the building were Metl Span and which were Nichiha. Mr. Olson responded that only the stone is Nichiha. The metal panels are two-tone but extend the whole height of the building. There is no physical separation between the colors on the panels. Mr. Olson further described how the building has little negative impact in terms of noise or fumes to the surrounding properties. Commissioner Mikolajczak asked whether the windows were real. Mr. Olson responded that the windows would either have blackout film applied or have backings with interior lighting to give the effect of a functional window. There would be no visible lockers as you look through the windows. The majority of customers find these facilities through the internet. Commissioner Roiter inquired as to how many storage units are in the building. There would be approximately 500 units, varying in size from 12'x30' and 10'x5'. Chairwoman Sylvester asked if there was any consideration to giving the building a break in texture along the larger facades of the building. Mr. Olson replied that there was no precedent in the Village to look to, but they tried their best to minimize the mass of the building. They were not opposed to changing the aesthetics and would like further direction from the Commission if there are any recommendations. Chairwoman Sylvester, to facilitate the conversation, asked that the group tackle the facades, fenestration, and signage separately.

Concerning the facades, Chairwoman Sylvester pointed to the variations in pattern and texture at the Menards building located across Route 53. She also noted that there was no precedent for metal siding within the Village. T. Wegrzyn confirmed that there are no modern buildings in the Village with metal siding. Mr. Olson also referred to the Menards and indicated that the building has some larger horizontal lines which are broken up only in a few positions. He also pointed out that the building's southeast corner and façade are the most likely to be visible to the public. Commissioner Mikolajczak recommended paint to break up the larger expanses of façade. Chairwoman Sylvester asked if they were decided on using metal siding. Mr. Olson indicated that due to the design of the building, which is based on the storage units themselves, the exterior is merely a skin. Commissioner Roiter recommended a 6:12 or 10:12 pitch to the roofs of the towers to increase visibility and the project aesthetics. There is a long façade and the articulation in the middle could also have a similar roof treatment. Chairwoman Sylvester noted that the other commercial shopping centers in town have variegated roof lines and steeper roof pitches. Could other siding materials be used to provide variation. There has to be some texture to the walls. There should be some other element to further distinguish between the two stories of the building. Some masonry is strongly encouraged because there are no other metal sided buildings in the Village. The ridges on the proposed metal siding are not pronounced enough. Shadow lines will give the building some depth. Chairwoman Sylvester also agreed with Commissioner Roiter on the towers. Mr. Olson pointed out the canopy on the façade. Chairwoman Sylvester noted that the building's presence at a gateway intersection into the Village. She clarified that a four-foot band of stone would not be desired along the whole building. Adding more wall articulation may be beneficial, but the Commissioners expressed a desire to see how it would work visually.

Chairwoman Sylvester moved the conversation to the windows. She noted that the current windows look very plain and as if they were "punched" into the façade. Sills or other treatments may help. Dormers could also help along the roofline to break up the mass. The walls and rooflines should be interrupted, and the windows could be more articulated. The windows are otherwise to scale. Shutters would not be appropriate for this style of building. Commissioner Roiter recommended stacking the

windows. Mr. Olson noted that there are some areas of the Menards where there are canopies with blank areas below. T. Wegrzyn showed some photographs of newer, modern storage facilities in the region. Mr. Olson recommended putting windows on the lower level with some dormers above. Commissioner Roiter confirmed that those improvements would look more commercial. Mr. Olson asked for clarification on the southern tower. Chairwoman Sylvester noted that adding sills would be beneficial and should be reflected on the north side of the building where there is the façade that is not part of the tower feature.

T. Wegrzyn asked for a recap of the recommendations so far. A greater roof pitch is recommended at all towers. Additional stone is recommended at the towers. Breaking up of the roofline and additional canopies to break up the façade further. Some additional elements to break up the “flatness” of the walls is also needed. Sunset Grove was pointed to as having a good level of variation to the materials, colors, and elements to break up the building façades. There is masonry, clapboard, and brackets supporting canopies. Mr. Olson again pointed to “bump outs” at the Menards with roofs. Chairwoman Sylvester responded to suggest that the metal siding is the primary concern. Metal should be reduced first. The proposed Nichiha or stone would be preferred. Accents with these materials, bumped out from the façade, might be acceptable. This would avoid changing out the whole wall. Mr. Olson will prepare additional renderings. Commissioner Mikolajczak recommended that they prepare multiple design renderings for the Commission to consider. Mr. Olson prepared the renderings from the application himself.

The Commission moved on to discuss the signage. The business logo is used in the design. Mr. Olson clarified that Keep.rentals is also the business’ website. T. Wegrzyn noted that the signage may need additional relief from the Village’s sign ordinance. Staff are working with the Village attorney to determine the best path forward for zoning entitlement on the project. There are a few different routes it could proceed; however, all would require additional action by the PCZBA and Village Board. Depending on which type of zoning relief is requested, there are different zoning and sign standards which would apply to the project. The internally illuminated signs would require specific relief. Chairwoman Sylvester asked whether the applicant had considered placing signage on the east façade of the building. Mr. Olson responded that they were attempting to be subtle with the branding. Traffic heading southbound is likely to be the best audience to reach with signage. He noted that the sign may shift towards the corner of the building more. Multiple Commissioners quickly responded to request that the sign stay centered on the building. A sign facing Lake-Cook Road would not likely be visible. The sign was placed on the north side of the building so that there was space on the eastern façade for windows.

Chairwoman Sylvester again opined that the Commission should review the design again at an upcoming meeting. Mr. Olson thanked the Commission for their feedback. Commissioner Mikolajczak asked how tall the overhead doors were. Mr. Olson responded that the two center doors are 14 feet tall. The other doors would either be 10 or 12 feet tall.

The group agreed that the lighting was acceptable as proposed.

T. Wegrzyn asked for clarification as to which overhead door designs were being used. The glass doors would be used in the center bay. The other doors provide direct access to units.

Chairwoman Sylvester asked for the Commission's thoughts on the proposed landscaping. T. Wegrzyn noted that staff would recommend some additional landscaping to the north/northwest could be applied to screen the overhead doors from any future development on the neighboring property. There is presently no landscaping on that portion of the property. The Commissioners agreed that landscaping in that area would be beneficial. T. Wegrzyn also pointed out that there is a 40-foot separation between building and the roadway. Mr. Olson noted that there is a well and septic planned for the site. The septic would be in that space. A sewer connection would be extremely cost prohibitive. That septic has yet to be approved by Lake County. Commissioner Roiter asked if there was an alternative if the septic cannot be installed. Mr. Olson responded that their engineer made it very clear that there really is no cost-effective alternative to the septic. Chairwoman Sylvester asked for additional landscaping along the façade to also help break up that expanse of wall.

Motion. A motion was made by Commissioner Roiter, seconded by Commissioner Akins to approve the preliminary request for a new commercial structure at 2798 Route 53, subject to further review by the Architectural Commission, and with the following recommendations:

1. Increasing the roof pitch of the towers.
2. Consideration of a third tower.
3. Additional masonry or similar materials on the lower level of the building.
4. Enhancing the delineation between the levels of the building through the use of variations in material, canopies, or textures.
5. Recommended window placements and window enhancements such as trim or sills.
6. Additional landscaping along the east façade and northwest property line.
7. Reduction in metal siding and additional texture to any metal siding used.

Ayes: A. Roiter; M. Akins; J. Sylvester; L. Mikolajczak

Nays:

Absent: J. Marshall; J. Plunkett

4) Oman Greenhouse property update.

Chairwoman Sylvester provided a brief update regarding the property at 22155 North Illinois Route 83. The case is expected to appear before the Village's hearing officer in June. A continuation of greenhouse use was contemplated by the owner. Village staff have indicated that greenhouse use is no longer permitted on the property. The Village is aggressively pursuing demolition as a requirement for due to the condition of the property. Chairwoman Sylvester noted that she had brought up this issue to the Village Planner two years ago. Commissioner Mikolajczak asked whether a greenhouse could be built on the property if the site is demolished. T. Wegrzyn noted that the property is zoned R-2, and a greenhouse is not a permitted use within that district. As a legal, non-conforming use, the property was allowed to operate as a greenhouse. That legal status was lost once the use was discontinued for longer than six months and any future use of the property must now comply with the present standards.

OTHER BUSINESS

The group briefly discussed planned absences for the upcoming June 20th Architectural Commission Meeting. Staff will follow up to confirm attendance for the meeting.

Chairwoman Sylvester asked staff to follow up on an unpermitted sign advertising “The Broken Bridge Treats.” All commercial signs require approval by the Architectural Commission and this sign has not been reviewed by the Commission. It was noted that the applicant at 145 Old McHenry Road made changes to the staircase without submitting plans first and that the changes were not aligned with the Commission’s request. T. Wegrzyn added that the owner has been notified of their violation. Staff are working with the owner to bring them into compliance with the Commission’s conditions of approval.

ADJOURNMENT

The next scheduled Architectural Commission meeting is for June 20, 2022 at 7:00 P.M.

Motion. With no further business, a motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Commissioner Roiter, seconded by Commissioner Mikolajczak.

Ayes: A. Roiter; L. Mikolajczak; M. Akins; J. Sylvester

Nays:

Absent: J. Marshall; J. Plunkett

Meeting Adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Taylor Wegrzyn

Taylor Wegrzyn
Planner

TW/JLM

NEW BUSINESS



ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

To: Jeanne Sylvester, Chair
Architectural Commission Members

From: Jessica Marvin, Community Development Services

Subject: TTO Bokki – 4196 IL Route 83

Requests: Install an Illuminated Wall Sign

Public Meeting Date: June 20, 2022

Attachments: 1. Location Map
2. Petitioner's Application
3. Site Plan

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Jessica Marvin".

PETITIONER TFA Signs on behalf of
Chul Yong Kim (Business Owner)
4196 IL Route 83
Long Grove, 60047

REQUEST

Review of material and design of an internal illuminated wall sign located at 4196 IL Route 83.

HISTORY

TTO Bokki, a restaurant, is located at 4196 IL Route 83. They are requesting signage for this location, which was formerly occupied by "Haku Sushi and Bar". This property is located within the (Sunset Grove) HR-1 Highway Retail Planned Unit Development. Existing signs within the development include flat panel, cabinet, raised letter, ground mounted, and illuminated designs. The past tenant of the tenant space, "Haku Sushi and Bar," had an illuminated sign affixed to the front façade along IL Route 83 at the same location of the proposed sign.

PROPOSED PROJECT

The petitioner is requesting an internally illuminated, channel letter sign to be affixed to the front façade along IL Route 83.

- Sign Details:
 - Size: 119.97" x 54"
 - Logo: 36.972 SF
 - Tagline: 4.426 SF

- Total square footage: 41.389 SF
- Materials: Digitally printed graphic on a translucent vinyl film with a black vinyl sticker with die-cut letters
- Illuminated: Yes
- Number of Signs: 1

The square footage of the tenant space is approximately 1,980 square feet. For retail spaces containing 1,001 – 3,000 sq. ft. of floor area, up to 30 square feet of signage is permitted pursuant to the Village Zoning Code. The site plan for the (Sunset Grove) HR-1 Highway Retail Planned Unit Development provides specific areas on the building façade that are designed for signage. For this specific unit the designed area for signage is 10.5 feet by 4 feet and 42 square feet in area. At 41.389 square feet, the proposed sign is compliant with this requirement.

HR-1 Highway Retail (Sunset Grove) Planned Unit Development is designated as a Planned Unit Development (PUD) which provides additional standards on top of those required by the Zoning Code. In this case, the PUD Ordinance does refer to internally illuminated signs stating, “Electronic sign boards, neon signage, flashing signage, and internally illuminated signage shall be prohibited”. However, the Zoning Ordinance allows modifications to signage within a PUD to be approved by a Minor PUD Amendment: a process which can be approved by the Village Board through the Village planner.

As mentioned previously in this report, there are several existing signs within the development which are of a similar design to the proposed sign, including Starbucks, Chase Bank, Domino’s Pizza, and Coldwell Banker Realty. For this reason and should the AC approve of the proposed sign, a new Minor PUD Amendment would be pursued by staff to address internally illuminated signs within this particular development and memorialize such approval for future reference. If such a Minor PUD Amendment were approved, the approval of the AC would still be required for any proposed signage.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION DECISION


The AC should review the request for signage against the aforementioned regulations and render a determination based upon those criteria as well as the appropriateness of the signage at this location in relation to other signage in the area in general.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The property is located at 4196 IL Route 83 and within the (Sunset Grove) HR-1 Highway Retail Planned Unit Development. The proposed illuminated wall sign is simple and to be professionally constructed by TFA Signs in Chicago, Illinois. Other signs located in the (Sunset Grove) HR-1 Highway Retail Planned Unit Development are created out of the same material. The design is clean with a modern font and fits well within this development.

Based upon the total square footage of the leasable space, the request is within the square footage limitation for signage at this location. If the AC approves of the signage request, a minor amendment to the (Sunset Grove) HR-1 Highway Retail Planned Unit Development will be processed to allow for illuminated signs within the Sunset Grove Development, subject to AC approval of any proposed signage. An ordinance memorializing the amendment would then be reviewed by the Village Board for final approval.

JNM/JLM/AO




 Subject Property

Location Map: 4196 IL Route 83, Long Grove, IL



FOR ZONING DEPT. USE ONLY:	
AC Received:	05/09/22
AC Reviewed:	
AC Approved:	
Village Bd. Approved:	



VILLAGE OF
LONG GROVE

FOR BUILDING DEPT. USE ONLY:		
Date Received:		
Permit No.:		
Date Issued:		
Township:		
Sec:	T:	R:
PIN No.:		
Zoning:		

SIGN PERMIT ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION APPLICATION

BUSINESS NAME: Haku Sushi Inc (Ttobokki)	BUS. PHONE #: 847-848-7254
BUSINESS ADDRESS: 4196 IL-83, Long Grove, IL 60047	
BUSINESS OWNER'S NAME: Chul Yong Kim	ALTERNATE PH. #: 847-848-7254

TYPE OF SIGN(S) FOR WHICH YOU ARE APPLYING:	Wall Sign
LOCATION(S) OF PROPOSED SIGN PLACEMENT:	4196 IL-83, Long Grove, IL 60047 (West Facade Wall)

The Architectural Commission meets every third (3rd) Monday of the month at 7:00pm in the Village Hall. The applicant (or representative) must be present. Please prepare and submit six (6) sets of all of the following information two weeks prior to the meeting:


1. THIS FULLY COMPLETED APPLICATION SIGNED BY BOTH THE PETITIONER AND THE PROPERTY OWNER
2. REGARDING THE POSITION OR LOCATION OF PROPOSED SIGN ON THE BUILDING OR PROPERTY:
 - (a) PROVIDE SITE PLAN
 - (b) PROVIDE PHOTOGRAPH OF THE LOCATION ON THE PROPERTY OR BUILDING WHERE THE SIGN WOULD BE INSTALLED
 - (c) SQUARE FOOTAGE OF COMMERCIAL SPACE FOR WHICH SIGN IS BEING INSTALLED:

1400 sq. ft.
3. PROVIDE A DETAILED DRAWING (TO SCALE) OF THE PROPOSED SIGN, INCLUDING:
 - (a) DIMENSIONS
 - (b) SAMPLE OF COLORS ON SIGN
 - (c) LETTER STYLE TO BE USED
 - (d) SAMPLE OF ANY UNUSUAL MATERIAL TO BE USED ON THE SIGN

SIGN CONTRACTOR:

COMPANY NAME: TFA Signs	PHONE #: 773-649-6306
CONTACT PERSON: Michelle Martinez	
ADDRESS: 5500 N. Kedzie Ave. Chicago IL 60625	
EMAIL ADDRESS: mich@tfasigns.com	


The property owner's signature is required below before any sign application may be processed. The property owner's signature is confirmation that he/she has read and understands the regulations governing the erection of signs in the Village of Long Grove and further approves the erection of the above-described sign on his/her property.


As Agent for Owner
4/27/2022

PROPERTY OWNER(S) SIGNATURE(S)

Sunset Grove Development, LLC

PROPERTY OWNER(S) PRINTED NAME(S)




BUSINESS OWNER(S) SIGNATURE(S)

(See the reverse side for maximum sign dimensions and fee schedule.)



Front-Lit, Channel Cloud Sign Direct wall mount
Internally Illuminated

- QUANTITY : 1 set
 Logo : 36.972 sq.ft.
 Tagline : 4.426 sq.ft.
 Total Sq.ft. : 41.389 sq.ft.
 Returns : Gloss black
 Backs : Gloss Black
 Trimcaps : Gloss Black
 Face : #7328 WHITE ACRYLIC
 First surface translucent vinyl
 Digital print graphic on translucent vinyl film
 Tagline - Black vinyl sticker with die-cut letters
- Illuminations : WHITE LED
 Raceway : N/A



PLEASE REVIEW DRAWINGS FOR ACCURACY IN COLOR LAYOUT SPELLING APPROVAL STATES ALL CONTENT REPRESENTED IN THIS PROOF IS CORRECT



5500 N. Kedzie Ave Chicago, IL 60625
 773-267-6007 | sales@tfasigns.com

Client Name:
TTO Bokki

Location:
4196 IL-83, Long Grove
IL 60047

Start Date: 04/21/2022
Last Revision: 00/00/2022
Revision No.: R-0
Page: 1 of 2

- Client Approval
- Landlord Approval

Sales Rep:
Seung Park
Designer:
Leo DC





SIGN LOCATION

PLEASE REVIEW DRAWINGS FOR ACCURACY IN COLOR LAYOUT SPELLING APPROVAL STATES ALL CONTENT REPRESENTED IN THIS PROOF IS CORRECT



5500 N. Kedzie Ave Chicago, IL 60625
773-267-6007 | sales@tfasigns.com

Client Name:
TTO Bokki
Location:
4196 IL-83, Long Grove
IL 60047

Start Date: 04/21/2022
Last Revision: 00/00/2022
Revision No.: R-0
Page: 2 of 2

- Client Approval
- Landlord Approval

Sales Rep:
Seung Park
Designer:
Leo DC

