

ARCHITECTURAL

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF A MEETING  
BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF NORTHFIELD  
ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION

COMMISSION

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of  
Northfield Architectural Commission taken at the Village of  
Northfield, 361 Happ Road, First Floor Board Room,  
Northfield, Illinois on the 11th day of October, 2021, at the  
hour of 7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

TEV BOND, Chairperson  
JEFFREY EIGEL  
PATRICIA MORRELL  
JOE McINERNEY

MEMBERS ABSENT:

ANDREW BOWYER  
KATHRYN TALTY  
NANCY NAZARIAN

ALSO PRESENT:

STEVE GUTIERREZ, Community Development Director  
CHARLES ORTH, Village Trustee Liaison

1 CHAIRPERSON BOND: I'd like to call to order  
2 the October 11th meeting of the Architectural  
3 Commission. My name is Tev Bond; I'm the Chair. We  
4 have in attendance Joe McInerney, Patty Morrell, Jeff  
5 Eigel, and we are anticipating Andy Bowyer will be  
6 joining us soon. Steve Gutierrez is representing the  
7 Village of Northfield, and Charles Orth is here as our  
8 Trustee Liaison.

9 May I have a motion to approve the  
10 minutes for the June 14th, 2021 meeting?

11 COMMISSIONER MORRELL: So moved.

12 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Second?

13 COMMISSIONER EIGEL: Seconded.

14 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Thank you, approved.

15 We have two items on our agenda tonight:  
16 1725 Winnetka Road and 191 Waukegan Road.

17 Our first item is 1725 Winnetka Road,  
18 consideration of a request for an amendment to the  
19 approved landscape plan to allow for the replacement of  
20 the fountain in the center of the courtyard with a large  
21 shade tree and changes to certain plantings within the  
22 courtyard, for the Northfield Mews rental townhomes  
23 located at 1725 Winnetka Road.

24 Whoever is in attendance who would like  
25 to speak on behalf of the project, if you could please  
26 approach the podium? If you could please raise your  
27 right hand?

28 (Witness sworn.)

29 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Will you please state your  
30 name?

31 MR. JAMES: Jerry James.

32 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Hello, Mr. James. The  
33 floor is yours.

34 MR. JAMES: Thank you very much. Madam  
35 Chairman and members of the Commission, it's nice to be  
36 back.

37 I appreciate the opportunity to explain  
38 some of the changes. I will try to get to the point and  
39 let you then ask questions of me to the extent you have  
40 some.

41 But essentially, we put this project  
42 together two years ago. Happy to report that it's doing  
43 well in terms of its occupancy, we're fully occupied,  
44 fully leased. As anticipated, I think we have filled a  
45 niche for people that are either in transition or feel  
46 that this is a better living arrangement. So, the  
47 project is working for us.

48 As a context to the discussion of  
49 landscaping, we continue to own the project and plan to  
50 own the project. One of the things that we've noticed  
51 and I think I've made note to our team is that the  
52 fulfillment of leases, the demand for these homes is an

1 expression I think of their own needs, but also  
2 evaluating the quality of the experience, okay, and  
3 that's both inside and outside. So, to my team, I said  
4 one of the things we're going to have to do is to  
5 continue to maintain this community, both with respect  
6 to how it appears inside the homes and also as they come  
7 to the community and experience it from the courtyard.

8 The other weekend I came in and there was  
9 a cluster of people standing in the courtyard, and I was  
10 just thrilled to see it. I think with COVID abating to  
11 some extent, people are coming out and they're enjoying  
12 that. I've also seen people adorning their own areas,  
13 private areas, their balconies with landscape, planters  
14 that is, some lighting, and during the holidays some  
15 holiday decor. To me that's private ownership, even  
16 though they don't own it, but it's really nice to see.  
17 In most parts, it's been really tastefully done.

18 So, we're thrilled about that. As far as  
19 the changes, we spent a lot of time in the original  
20 approvals talking about the fountain, which was my  
21 vision for what might be a nice background noise and  
22 aesthetic to the courtyard. You can imagine some of the  
23 Italian courtyards that you see, and that was in my  
24 mind's eye. As we got into the project as is so often  
25 the case, we had a chance to see it come to life.

26 As we discussed with our team, we  
27 realized that while a fountain could be possible, the  
28 question was is that really going to function the way we  
29 envisioned it? As it turned out, you know, we realized  
30 it's going to be a seasonal type of amenity if you will  
31 that's going to be shut down and reopened. We've done a  
32 fountain over at Westgate, we know what it involved. We  
33 came to a conclusion that there's probably a better  
34 thing to do. The better thing is to try and add more  
35 greenery inside to what is a lot of hardscape inside  
36 that courtyard.

37 So, we did substitute a number of  
38 deciduous flowering trees, not just bushes or what have  
39 you, and tried to put those in as best we could. What  
40 may or may not be, you might not recall is that there is  
41 about a half million dollars of concrete in that center  
42 island to accommodate stormwater detention. So, we had  
43 to go about with this tree building a planting box if  
44 you will, which is a fairly large structure. You can  
45 see it I think in the pictures.

46 So, we've got approximately, you know,  
47 I'm not sure, about 20 inches of soil there, another 18  
48 inches of soil below that. In that center, as you saw,  
49 we planted a, it was a four or five-inch caliper elm  
50 tree. So, I think it has achieved the purpose that we  
51 had hoped, which is to provide some greenery to that  
52 center island. It will continue to grow and during the

1 wintertime as it defoliates, we can put lights up there,  
2 people seem to really enjoy that. It becomes a nesting  
3 point, a focal point that you can see, not just during  
4 the summer months with the fountain, but year-round in  
5 addition to the eco-positive, if you will, more so than  
6 a fountain for sure.

7 The creation of that planter box was such  
8 that, I don't think we saved any money. We did save I  
9 think overall in terms of maintenance ongoing, so that  
10 is true. But in terms of the economics and some of the  
11 other changes, we like the roses, they're explosive.  
12 They come back usually and they provide a real punch of  
13 color. So, we took the direction of adding roses at the  
14 entrances and within the courtyard, and you'll see some  
15 pictures in your packet I think of how those appear.

16 I was out there today walking the grounds  
17 with one of our superintendents. I came upon a resident  
18 and she said to me, I had not met her before but she's a  
19 university professor, and she said we just love it here.  
20 I thought, you know, those are words that are music to  
21 my ears, and explained to her that this summer, and I  
22 wanted to convey this to you, is that while I didn't  
23 want to come back to this committee, in some respects  
24 it's serving the purpose because I think it brought  
25 attention to the fact that this summer has been really  
26 difficult on our vegetation. We had a drought and then  
27 we had three inches of rain. I don't know if you've  
28 experienced it in your own yards, but certainly it put a  
29 lot of stress on the material we have.

30 So, I had even before this asked my team  
31 including our landscaper to go out there last week and  
32 put together a comprehensive list of items that need to  
33 be replaced, and that was done. So, that list is  
34 already in hand, materials have been ordered so that we  
35 can out there and replace some of the bushes and trees  
36 and so forth that need to be replaced. Prior to this  
37 meeting though, Steve and I had conversations, some very  
38 pleasant ones with Steve, and he spurred and motivated  
39 me to get out there, thanks to I think our Chair here  
40 who went out herself to look at this community, to get  
41 out there and see it first-hand. I must thank you  
42 because frankly, while I did instruct my team last week  
43 to go see it, I had not seen it personally.

44 When I got there, I was a little bit  
45 horrified because there was so much that did need to be  
46 replaced. You know, I can see it from the front, but I  
47 didn't get around to see. I walked 360, took a bunch of  
48 photos, sent them off to our team just to reiterate what  
49 we expect, okay. So, that process is in the works.  
50 Again, thank you for taking your time to go out and see  
51 it, and Steve, you can follow up with me. That was time  
52 well spent and I guess tonight well spent as well with

1 you.

2 So, I think that's kind of an overview of  
3 what we're trying to achieve. I guess we took poetic  
4 license. It is a PD, I understand that that was not  
5 within the four squares of the PD, but with all good  
6 intent. We've certainly, apologies, spent more than we  
7 had planned and we installed more than we intended or  
8 were required to do in the original approval. That's  
9 pretty consistent with what we've done in our other  
10 developments here in town including Fox Meadow and of  
11 course Hibbard Gardens. You know, you just, you do the  
12 best you can on paper, but it's not until you see this  
13 stuff coming up and you see holes, and we take great  
14 pride in our landscaping because it's what we're known  
15 for, to fill in things that we just couldn't see in two  
16 dimensions, but we could certainly see in three.

17 So, with that, I'm open to any questions.

18 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Thank you.

19 Commissioners, do you have questions?

20 COMMISSIONER MORRELL: I think you answered my  
21 questions. I also went out there and took a look, and  
22 there was a lot of things suffering. The tree, I do  
23 worry about the tree roots though currently in that  
24 planter.

25 MR. JAMES: Yes. I had that conversation with  
26 our landscape person, and the honest answer is I think  
27 that tree is good for 15 years given the volume that is  
28 in that planting bed, you know, as I said before,  
29 nothing is forever. You would hope to have a forever  
30 tree, but we'll watch it and, as needed, you know, we'll  
31 make steps to either have it replaced or, you know,  
32 attend to it as needed. So, that's just kind of the  
33 honest answer.

34 COMMISSIONER MORRELL: Thank you.

35 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: I also have no  
36 problem with the change. I am glad to hear that you are  
37 going to be replacing some things because I did do a  
38 walk around as well and was a little surprised at the  
39 amount of things that needed to be replaced.

40 MR. JAMES: Yes.

41 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: So, hopefully you  
42 guys can keep on that. I know that that's probably not  
43 the end result you're looking for, how it looks now.

44 MR. JAMES: No.

45 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: But I have no problem  
46 with making changes. I certainly understand the  
47 maintenance issue of a fountain, and I think the planter  
48 box looks great.

49 MR. JAMES: Thank you.

50 COMMISSIONER EIGEL: I noticed in the notes  
51 that it had mentioned that you had quite a bit of  
52 irrigation above and beyond what was originally

1 intended?

2 MR. JAMES: Yes, I'm glad you asked that  
3 question.

4 COMMISSIONER EIGEL: I wonder, was that all up  
5 and running when you did lose some of these plantings?

6 MR. JAMES: No.

7 COMMISSIONER EIGEL: Or was that sort of being  
8 phased in and now you're more confident that you'll be  
9 able to better, you know, have these things thrive in  
10 the future?

11 MR. JAMES: Well, it's a great question that  
12 you raised. It's something that I wanted to point out,  
13 and the cover letter said that irrigation was  
14 throughout. That's not entirely correct. That western  
15 boundary on the west side, it gets a lot of sun and does  
16 not have irrigation along that row. So, I have asked  
17 for a quote to install either a quick couplers that will  
18 hold a sprinkler or we'll have an irrigation system  
19 along that bed, along that line there, because you'll  
20 note that's where a lot of them lost, and the turf, too,  
21 could use some of that.

22 So, that's going to be done and just part  
23 and parcel of, you know, what we do. Yes, in  
24 retrospect, that was, you know, a judgment call on the  
25 extent to which we do it. Certain courtyards are  
26 irrigated in the front as to those visual elements, but  
27 that west that gets a lot of the sun and really got  
28 baked this summer, we're going to put some water in.  
29 So, it's a good question, thank you.

30 CHAIRPERSON BOND: I spoke with three of your  
31 residents. I spoke with three residents, and two of  
32 them jointly complimented living there and that they  
33 feel that it is the most successful rental property in  
34 the New Trier Township. So, congratulations for that.

35 MR. JAMES: It's a team effort.

36 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Yes.

37 MR. JAMES: Between this community and me and  
38 my team, and I mean it sincerely. There's a lot of  
39 effort that you all had to expend to secure those  
40 approvals in what was a transitional area, formerly an  
41 industrial site or industrial zoning. So, it would not  
42 have happened but for the good will and faith and hard  
43 work frankly of the Staff and each of you with your own  
44 visions to meet me somewhere in the middle. I think we  
45 got it done and the work continues. So, thank you.

46 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Yes, and I appreciate and  
47 am very encouraged by what you said about the  
48 landscaping because that was their only frustration,  
49 especially the one that has been there for a while,  
50 because she said it was beautiful the year prior.

51 MR. JAMES: Yes.

52 CHAIRPERSON BOND: So, I know it was a

1 difficult year. So, thank you very much for all of  
2 that.

3 MR. GUTIERREZ: Real quickly, as I indicated  
4 in our Staff report, the Village retained Hitchcock  
5 Design Group, landscape architects, to review the  
6 changes just to give us a baseline as to whether the  
7 changes were a significant decrease or increase in the  
8 quality, overall quality of the landscape plan as  
9 planted. So, you have that report. Tim King with  
10 Hitchcock is actually here if you have any questions for  
11 them.

12 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Commissioners, would you  
13 like to present any questions? No?

14 (No response.)

15 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Okay, thank you then.  
16 Thank you very much for that.

17 Is there anyone in the audience who would  
18 like to speak? No?

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRPERSON BOND: All right, thank you very  
21 much for your time, Mr. James.

22 MR. JAMES: Thanks for your attention,  
23 appreciate it very much, and thank you for your  
24 consideration.

25 CHAIRPERSON BOND: May I have a motion?

26 COMMISSIONER MORRELL: **Motion to approve the**  
27 **substitution of a tree in lieu of the fountain made to**  
28 **the landscape plan to the Northfield Mews and Townhome**  
29 **development located at 1721-1773 Winnetka Road.**

30 CHAIRPERSON BOND: May I have a second?

31 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: I'll second.

32 CHAIRPERSON BOND: We will do a roll call  
33 vote.

34 Joe McInerney.

35 MR. McINERNEY: Yes.

36 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Patty Morrell.

37 COMMISSIONER MORRELL: Yes.

38 COMMISSIONER EIGEL: Yes.

39 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Thank you, from Jeff Eigel.

40 The motion passes. Congratulations,  
41 thank you very much.

42 MR. JAMES: Thank you, Madam Chairman and the  
43 Commission, thank you.

44 CHAIRPERSON BOND: All right, you need my vote  
45 on that, too, don't you?

46 MR. GUTIERREZ: Yes.

47 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Yes. So, sorry,  
48 Commissioner's vote is yes. Thank you. I don't  
49 normally vote, for anyone in the audience, but tonight I  
50 am.

51 CHAIRPERSON BOND: 191 Waukegan Road is a  
52 consideration f a request for a permanent ground sign

1 with 99.3 square feet of sign face for the office  
2 building located at 191 Waukegan Road. The Petitioner  
3 is also requesting a variation to Section 12-4.6 of the  
4 Sign Ordinance which sets 24 square feet as the maximum  
5 area of the face of a ground sign.

6           Whoever is here to present on behalf, if  
7 you could please approach? I can swear you both in at  
8 the same if you prefer. So, if you could please raise  
9 your right hands?

10                           (Witnesses sworn.)

11           CHAIRPERSON BOND: If you could please state  
12 your names?

13           MR. SOLIS: My name is Arthur Solis with North  
14 Shore Sign.

15           MR. BAWMANN: And my name is Matt Bawmann, one  
16 of the owners of the building.

17           CHAIRPERSON BOND: Thank you.

18           MR. BAWMANN: Thank you, Commissioner and  
19 others, for allowing us to come up here and speak today  
20 for our sign. You know, we originally had this designed  
21 with the intent of making it very consistent with the  
22 improvements to the building that we are doing as well,  
23 and that is how we came up with this current design that  
24 you see before you.

25                           I appreciate the pictures of the other  
26 signs on the street that staff included in the packets  
27 because it helps keep everything in perspective.

28                           So, when we, you know, when we looked to  
29 the north of us, when we looked at that North Shore  
30 sign, the face of that sign, you guys measured it at 77  
31 square feet, is that correct? Okay, the face of our  
32 sign, the actual panel itself, the panels themselves at  
33 least were slightly under 45 if I'm not mistaken. So,  
34 while the entire monument itself is 99 square feet, the  
35 face of the panel is much smaller than our neighbors' to  
36 the north of us.

37                           Our intent is not to make anything look  
38 gaudy and we're not trying to create like this, you  
39 know, a bad look. We're trying to keep it very  
40 consistent with what we're doing at the property  
41 improvement-wise, and we want to give our tenants some  
42 visibility. We have a good number of doctors and  
43 service providers in that building. This is a real nice  
44 thing for them as they set forth and think about kind of  
45 how they're going about their practices.

46                           So, I don't have much more. Art, I'll  
47 turn to you.

48           MR. SOLIS: What Matt has mentioned to you in  
49 that is that there's two items in this particular sign,  
50 one being the tenant panels, and the other being the  
51 address. Presently at this location, there is a brick  
52 monument at the entrance with the address numerals on it



1 that are not illuminated. I went over there this  
2 evening to just check and see if there's flood lights  
3 available. There's no floods for this particular  
4 building.

5 The tenants, we're trying to give them a  
6 space on this panel so that they can show their names,  
7 similar to the display for North Shore, okay. It's very  
8 important. The location of this sign is set back from  
9 the sidewalk considerably, between the sidewalk and the  
10 parking lot in a nice big curve. What you have there  
11 also are trees at either end that are somewhat blocking  
12 the view, but we're looking at this particular position  
13 to place the sign so that, as you're driving down the  
14 road, Waukegan Road which is 40 miles an hour, you can  
15 not only see the address but you can also see the six  
16 tenants that are in the building.

17 The sign will be manufactured out of  
18 aluminum. The sign will be painted as the sample shows  
19 in the light tan and the brown color that's a  
20 polyurethane finish, acrylic polyurethane. The  
21 illumination is as specified as white LED illumination,  
22 current illumination. We have been very successful with  
23 these products for quite a long-term, and North Shore  
24 has been in business for over 92 years. So, we have  
25 taken our experience and our knowledge of materials and  
26 worked with Matt in regards to the design of the sign.  
27 We have come down in size from the original drawing  
28 considerably just so that he can still have the  
29 visibility that he needs for that particular location.

30 Any questions?

31 COMMISSIONER MORRELL: Do the tenants have to  
32 pay to have their name put on there, or do you provide  
33 that?

34 MR. BAWMANN: No, we provide it, and it's a  
35 negotiation for the most part but we provide it on our  
36 end for a couple of our newer tenants who are larger  
37 tenants, we've said if we're able to get this sign  
38 approved, we'll put your name on that panel. So, it's  
39 not an income generator --

40 COMMISSIONER MORRELL: It's your hope that  
41 you're going to full at all times, I mean, the blank  
42 sign part concerns me a little bit.

43 MR. BAWMANN: Yes, we'd want to do that.  
44 We've got 18 tenants in the building; they're going to  
45 be --

46 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: I guess I have a  
47 couple of questions then, although the first question on  
48 that, for each tenant that you name, who approves that?  
49 Does that then have to come before us? Because I look  
50 at that North Shore sign and I'm like, that looks like a  
51 train wreck with all the different colors and fonts and  
52 things like that. Will this follow any sort of, do they

1 have to come back for each name that they put on?  
2 MR. GUTIERREZ: No, that's not the way our  
3 code is set up, but there is a tenant monument sign  
4 that's approved that, you know, would allow the tenant  
5 their logo, they might have a branded color or font, et  
6 cetera.  
7 CHAIRPERSON BOND: But Steve, when it came to  
8 Northfield Road, we have been very specific about having  
9 a full sign, and we've been very specific about the  
10 text, the color, the logo for Northfield Road.  
11 MR. GUTIERREZ: So, that's your choice. If  
12 you want to prescribe some parameters for the tenant  
13 signage on the monument sign, the individual tenant  
14 displays, you can do that. But you can do that,  
15 however, when a tenant changes on that Plexiglas, it  
16 doesn't require approval.  
17 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Yes, and I guess that  
18 was my question. I wouldn't want to have to, I was just  
19 wondering who decides on what they can put on it because  
20 we have to approve all these other signs. That seems  
21 odd that we wouldn't --  
22 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Right.  
23 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: -- have something in  
24 there that says, hey, it has to follow this type of  
25 look; otherwise, you end up like the North Shore one  
26 that has the --  
27 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Right.  
28 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: It just looks  
29 terrible.  
30 COMMISSIONER EIGEL: Well, it does indicate on  
31 the design, the black font copy is what's intended, but  
32 I don't know if that for sure carries through the  
33 execution of it.  
34 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Right, that's my  
35 question.  
36 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Right.  
37 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: My second question  
38 then is on this table of the sizes of signs. For your  
39 99 square feet, is that just the panel part, or is that  
40 the whole sign?  
41 MR. SOLIS: That's the whole sign.  
42 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: So, that includes the  
43 brick and all that or whatever that signing is made of,  
44 this aluminum?  
45 MR. SOLIS: Yes.  
46 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: So, then my question  
47 on the other one is that 211 I guess Waukegan says it's  
48 154 square feet. What are we, it says 77 square feet  
49 times two faces. What are we measuring there then?  
50 MR. GUTIERREZ: Which address was that?  
51 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: 211.  
52 MR. GUTIERREZ: Yes, so we're measuring

1 everything on top of those brick columns.  
2 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: So, it's not really  
3 apples to apples then.  
4 MR. GUTIERREZ: The code defines the sign area  
5 as not including the base. So, with the proposed sign,  
6 Staff there was not a defined base. The tenant portion  
7 of the, the tenant displays really integrated into the  
8 whole sign. We didn't feel there was a distinct base so  
9 to speak, that the sign read as a whole as opposed to  
10 just that tenant display.  
11 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Right. I would say  
12 then they're being penalized by not having a sign on top  
13 of a base, right?  
14 MR. GUTIERREZ: I wouldn't say they're  
15 penalized, just that's the way the code reads. So, if  
16 they chose to put the sign on a brick base, we would not  
17 have counted that.  
18 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Right, no, I see  
19 that.  
20 MR. GUTIERREZ: As far as apples to apples,  
21 yes. What we are presenting are the measurements per  
22 the code. How you perceive the size of the signs is  
23 exactly why we gave you the pictures along with --  
24 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Right.  
25 MR. GUTIERREZ: Chris standing next to it so  
26 that you get a little bit of the scale.  
27 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: So, what is your  
28 total square footage then for just the verbiage of the  
29 tenant display?  
30 MR. SOLIS: Just the tenant section is 85.75  
31 square feet. You have it, it is dimensioned at seven  
32 feet.  
33 MR. BAWMANN: That's both faces.  
34 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Both sides, got you.  
35 MR. BAWMANN: Yes. This is --  
36 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: In fact, even that 99  
37 square feet is not both sides, that's just one side,  
38 correct?  
39 MR. SOLIS: One side.  
40 COMMISSIONER EIGEL: So, by code, the tenant  
41 placard is 42 and change.  
42 MR. SOLIS: Right.  
43 COMMISSIONER EIGEL: And the other 40-some odd  
44 feet is the surrounding area.  
45 MR. SOLIS: Correct.  
46 COMMISSIONER EIGEL: Steve, just a question on  
47 Staff's interpretation of the code. Just  
48 hypothetically, if the surrounding support material were  
49 masonry, would that be considered also signage, that and  
50 only the placard was sign material?  
51 MR. GUTIERREZ: No, I wouldn't call something  
52 like a wall that is behind the tenant display a base.

1 COMMISSIONER EIGEL: Right.

2 MR. GUTIERREZ: I wouldn't call that a base, I  
3 would call that an integral part of the sign.

4 COMMISSIONER EIGEL: So, the integration part  
5 of the placard given the whole, that sort of pulls the  
6 whole thing into that calculation of it all being the  
7 sign?

8 MR. GUTIERREZ: Correct.

9 MR. BAWMANN: Also, in terms of, when you look  
10 at this North Shore one and you look at the one we're  
11 proposing, I don't like this at all. I think it's  
12 actually ugly and I think it's an eyesore, and it's  
13 bumped out like this, right? So, what you're saying is  
14 that I can bump my sign up just like this, I can add  
15 another 30 square feet in order to get close to that. I  
16 just don't think this would look good. I'd rather just  
17 have it --

18 MR. GUTIERREZ: I'll be honest with you, I  
19 would not have recommended approval of the sign at 211  
20 Waukegan. That sign reads massively because it sits so  
21 high on those columns, and you can't really read the  
22 space between the columns because there's landscaping  
23 there.

24 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Right.

25 MR. GUTIERREZ: So, I think the question that  
26 Staff had was where do you want to draw the line. So,  
27 it's a judgment as to whether you think the sign could  
28 achieve its goal within some size parameter. Obviously,  
29 24 square feet is not cutting it down Waukegan Road,  
30 that I absolutely can see. It's where you draw the  
31 line.

32 You know, the Petitioner's property is  
33 the largest office building and office property on this  
34 stretch of Waukegan Road. Their property and building  
35 is substantially smaller, however, than an institutional  
36 property like Christian Heritage Academy, whose signs  
37 are smaller than the proposed sign.

38 So, with all the things that we throw in  
39 the mix, we zeroed in on the size of the proposed sign  
40 relative to the other signs on the street based on how  
41 our code calculates the sign area.

42 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Yes, and to me, just  
43 looking at it, I wouldn't have the whole thing be a sign  
44 area because to me it's not, but that's how I would --

45 MR. GUTIERREZ: Just we had to set --

46 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: I understand how you  
47 calculated it.

48 MR. GUTIERREZ: Yes.

49 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: I just, when I was  
50 looking at it just trying to figure it out scale-wise  
51 with the other ones how you came to these calculations  
52 and how this one is 99 square feet when --

1 MR. GUTIERREZ: Really, it comes down to your  
2 judgment on how you feel it reads, how it reads relative  
3 to what you to see out there. That's always something  
4 you want to consider, that is the current pattern of  
5 development, in this case these signs.

6 CHAIRPERSON BOND: So, I am curious. The way  
7 it's being presented is that you will have six tenants  
8 on the sign, correct?

9 MR. SOLIS: Correct, on one side.

10 CHAIRPERSON BOND: On one side?

11 MR. SOLIS: Right. I've had situations where  
12 they've had more than the one side of tenants in a  
13 particular facility. So, what we recommend to the owner  
14 is both sides. So, therefore, now instead of six, you  
15 have 12.

16 CHAIRPERSON BOND: But you're presenting six  
17 maximum or you're presenting six per side?

18 MR. SOLIS: Six per side.

19 CHAIRPERSON BOND: So, you're presenting for  
20 12; however, you have 85 tenants in your building. So,  
21 how do you determine the 12? I'm a little confused as  
22 to why you're even presenting 12 tenants when you have  
23 so many tenants in your building.

24 MR. SOLIS: Once you start --

25 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Or if your tenant signage  
26 should actually be after you turn into your parking lot  
27 and your 191 is what people, because today way-finding  
28 is done predominantly by your phone or your GPS in your  
29 car.

30 MR. SOLIS: Yes.

31 CHAIRPERSON BOND: So, once you get to that  
32 location on Waukegan Road, I think that it's when you're  
33 slowing down in that parking lot that you can focus more  
34 on where you're going than when you're coming up on it.  
35 So, you're predominantly looking for a number, and your  
36 GPS is telling you you're turning now.

37 So, if you've got six people or 12, I  
38 guess I'm curious what's the real benefit of having  
39 those six or 12 out on Waukegan Road versus maybe  
40 rethinking this being more in the path of being in the  
41 lot, once you turn in.

42 MR. SOLIS: Okay, Matt, I'm going to let you  
43 answer that.

44 MR. BAWMANN: Yes, I mean, we don't have a lot  
45 of room. One of the problems that we have with this  
46 visibility here is that if you've, I mean, you guys have  
47 driven into there. We have a tiny little sign of 191  
48 right at the entrance but, you know, it's short and it's  
49 really hard to see. You have an entrance, by the way,  
50 that is also for 211.

51 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Correct.

52 MR. BAWMANN: So, the idea, there is not

1 enough room right there to do this sign, okay, because  
2 you're right. You're 100 percent correct. We would  
3 like them, as owners, by the entrance, but we just don't  
4 have that option here because there's not enough room.  
5 CHAIRPERSON BOND: What are, I'm wondering  
6 whether or not having the businesses on the sign is  
7 really that relevant if it isn't more about just getting  
8 people to 191, because I have actually gone to a  
9 business in this building.

10 MR. BAWMANN: Sure.

11 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Once I knew where my  
12 business was, I was good to go, which was an eye doctor,  
13 right? So, the first time perhaps was a little bit of  
14 way-finding. I'm like 191, this is me, I know I'm here,  
15 here is my building, I'm going in, but when you have 85  
16 tenants, I don't see why you would just have six or 12  
17 tenants --

18 MR. BAWMANN: If I may, we don't have 85  
19 tenants. We have I believe 16 or 18. So, yes, the  
20 building is only 60,000 square feet.

21 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Okay, sorry. Maybe I mis-  
22 heard that.

23 MR. BAWMANN: That's okay. My users range in  
24 size from the largest being a little north of 5,000  
25 square feet down to 600 square feet. The idea behind  
26 this is to give the service providers, so your eye  
27 doctor, your dentist, the pulmonologist, the headache  
28 doctor, just to give them some branding and some  
29 visibility off the street. It's, you know, it's  
30 commercial real estate 101 frankly for office to have a  
31 sign of some sort.

32 In an office setting like this, it's  
33 probably not as usual, but it's been something that's  
34 been asked of us as owners. I mean, every time you have  
35 someone come through, it's like hey, what are you going  
36 to do about signage? You know, we're throwing up our  
37 hands because we have people that are frustrated with  
38 buying into a building with no tenant signage.

39 I don't disagree with you, I do not  
40 disagree with you at all. I would have no problem  
41 finding this building because it isn't difficult, but  
42 you know, the narrative of the optics are a different  
43 ball game.

44 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Yes, and I understand  
45 that a tenant wants that, their name out there.

46 MR. BAWMANN: Yes, it's common, yes.

47 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Yes, even if no one  
48 uses it, they want to see it.

49 MR. BAWMANN: Going into the psychology of it  
50 is, the egos.

51 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: My only really  
52 concern is, the size to me seems fine I guess because I

1 don't measure it as the whole thing. I just measure it  
2 as the panels. I just want to see some consistency in  
3 those panels, that it's not --

4 MR. BAWMANN: As do we, by the way. It's not  
5 something that we're looking at, no.

6 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: It doesn't look like  
7 a circus. So, how do we get that done if we approve it  
8 would be my concern.

9 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Right. So, this is the  
10 first time that, that I've been on the Commission, that  
11 we've been presented with basically blank, that we don't  
12 know exactly what it's going to look like. Typically,  
13 we know what the tenants are and there's a mockup that  
14 shows this is what we're thinking. So, that's where I  
15 think we have a disconnect right now is that we just  
16 have this blank space and we have in the past sometimes  
17 made decisions based on what we think you understand  
18 what we're talking about and doesn't turn out. So,  
19 we're not likely to just say, okay, this is, we'll just  
20 trust you, go do it and it will turn out. We need to  
21 make sure it will turn out.

22 So, I think that, we'll see what the  
23 other Commissioners feel, we need to have an actual  
24 mockup of who they are and how it will look from you.  
25 So, what it is that you're anticipating so it doesn't  
26 look like the sign that we have discussed that nobody  
27 cares for, right? So, how is it going to be consistent?  
28 Is it all the same text? Is it all the same  
29 background? Is it white background with black text? Is  
30 it black background with white lettering? So that we  
31 can have a very definitive discussion about how it will  
32 look.

33 MR. BAWMANN: Sure. Are there guidelines for  
34 that or is that --

35 CHAIRPERSON BOND: If you want to look at  
36 Northfield Road, we have passed those monument signs  
37 within the last four years I think is when those  
38 started, and there is some consistency there. They're  
39 smaller, it's a smaller road, but there is some  
40 consistency that could offer some guideline for that.

41 MR. BAWMANN: Sure.

42 MR. SOLIS: Certainly.

43 MR. BAWMANN: Our goal on this was to align  
44 it, design-wise align it with what we're going to be  
45 doing in the property. So, I mean, it's an improvement  
46 that we're trying to keep it as consistent, the branding  
47 and all the colors on this.

48 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Right.

49 MR. BAWMANN: This is going to be a very  
50 purposeful design, that we had to hire a designer for it  
51 and asked Art to, you know, help with manufacturing it  
52 going forward.

1 CHAIRPERSON BOND: So, I think this has been a  
2 productive dialogue.

3 MR. BAWMANN: Yes.

4 MR. SOLIS: Yes.

5 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Okay, we're understanding  
6 where you want to go, you're understanding where we  
7 would like to see it go. I think also this is the first  
8 time that we've been presented with a sign that wants to  
9 do six on one side and six on the other side versus it's  
10 all the same. That's something else that I think that  
11 the Commissioners will need to consider for final  
12 approval.

13 MR. SOLIS: Again, that's just a situation  
14 that we have been involved with, with other individuals  
15 that own a facility like this where it's not enough  
16 tenant panels on one side so let's use both sides.  
17 Again, based on the leasing space of that particular  
18 tenant, the owner decides, okay, well, you're going to  
19 have it but you're not going to have it because you've  
20 got only 600 square feet but you have 5,000. It's again  
21 his choice.

22 I agree with you, coming up with an ideal  
23 branding for these tenant panels that are all very  
24 similar, perhaps just using their particular color logo  
25 and use that font, maybe something as simple as that.  
26 That keeps it consistent, that works very well.

27 If we can look back at the sign that is  
28 for the medical facility, I forgot what the name is, but  
29 if you look at the tenant panels there, all of them are  
30 faded, okay. We take definite pride in using 3M brand  
31 quality vinyl materials that last eight to 12 years.  
32 So, you're going to get longevity out of those  
33 particular names on those panels and we're going to  
34 definitely come up with a program and that was something  
35 that --

36 MR. BAWMANN: That's if they stay around  
37 longer.

38 MR. SOLIS: Right, but I was definitely going  
39 to sit down with Matt and let's come up with a program  
40 that we're going to keep it consistent.

41 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: I mean, do we want to  
42 give them some guidance on, are we going to approve the  
43 size and then we're just waiting for them to come back?

44 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Most likely today we're  
45 doing a continuation, right? I think that would be  
46 smarter.

47 MR. GUTIERREZ: I think that more guidance  
48 would be helpful, however.

49 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Yes.

50 MR. GUTIERREZ: So, if they come back next  
51 time with the same size, but with uniform fonts or, you  
52 know, whatever that uniformity is going to look like so



1 we're not in a position then to say, oh, come back again  
2 with a smaller size. Maybe we can give them feedback on  
3 the color of the materials, the rest of the sign, all of  
4 the components - that would be very helpful.

5 COMMISSIONER EIGEL: Would there be a less  
6 integrated plinth that would not be considered part of  
7 the signage that could possibly be considered so that  
8 they don't, you know, just try to find a way, you know,  
9 the overall thing, if really the overall size of the  
10 sign and the plinth is still going to be considered the  
11 size of the sign?

12 MR. GUTIERREZ: Any kind of defined base we  
13 would deduct from the calculation. Technically,  
14 however, they're just always going to be above the  
15 allowed 24 square feet.

16 COMMISSIONER EIGEL: It's just that this one  
17 becomes sort of an outlier size-wise to its neighbors,  
18 and a big contributor to that is, you know, counting  
19 that entire base.

20 MR. GUTIERREZ: Yes, we to have to determine  
21 the square footage based on how the code defines the  
22 sign area.

23 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: But that's a judgment  
24 call by you of what is considered the signage part,  
25 correct?

26 MR. GUTIERREZ: No, the sign area is defined  
27 in the code and it says that a base is not to be  
28 included in the calculation. I don't know how you would  
29 call --

30 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Well, right, I would  
31 include part of this as the base of the sign, the whole  
32 thing. To me, that is the base, but that's how I  
33 would --

34 CHAIRPERSON BOND: The 191, is that lit?

35 MR. SOLIS: Yes, it is.

36 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Okay, I thought so. I just  
37 wanted to clarify.

38 MR. SOLIS: This is a sample that I brought to  
39 show you that it's a routed out letter push-through with  
40 a three-quarter inch plastic material with white vinyl  
41 laminate on it. So, at night when it illuminates, this  
42 perimeter will light up very nice, very sharp, and this  
43 white vinyl will light up very dimly. More emphasis on  
44 the perimeter of the 191.

45 Same thing in the colors. You have the  
46 color samples. This will be the color background for  
47 the 191.

48 COMMISSIONER MORRELL: I wanted to ask you, do  
49 you have a lot of experience with this color and this  
50 product? I've just seen some problems with the dark  
51 brown, but it might be a different product completely.

52 MR. SOLIS: It's probably a different product.

1 Our experience is that, what you're seeing is basically  
2 an automotive finish, Matthew's paint, okay. We apply  
3 two coats of the finish, two coats of the primary, and  
4 we sand the material and get it all prepared for it to  
5 last a long time.

6 COMMISSIONER MORRELL: Okay, I just have one  
7 more question.

8 CHAIRPERSON BOND: All right, you can ask.

9 COMMISSIONER MORRELL: The tenant signs, are  
10 those lit up as well?

11 MR. SOLIS: Yes, they are.

12 CHAIRPERSON BOND: So, I am still struggling a  
13 bit with the tenant presence and having them all on this  
14 sign and if that is the correct direction. So, the  
15 primary goal is to get the tenant's name to be seen, and  
16 you feel that this is the correct location. However, if  
17 that name is on the building, on the exterior of the  
18 building, would that then have tenant presence that  
19 would make them, that you feel would satisfy their  
20 request? Because while, I'm sorry, I did not look at  
21 the building itself that closely, but there could be the  
22 possibility of putting that presence on the building.

23 MR. BAWMANN: I mean, I think you would find  
24 that really to be very anti what we're trying to do  
25 here. That's not a good solution. I don't want to put  
26 a bunch of names on the face of the building, I just  
27 don't think that looks good. I think the building  
28 stands, it's a nice, architecturally sound building  
29 looking at it right now. That to me is just, I don't  
30 think you'd like that, like at all.

31 In most municipalities, we only do one  
32 tenant name on the face of the building. That's, you  
33 know --

34 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Right.

35 MR. BAWMANN: -- I assume that's your problem  
36 here, too, right? You wouldn't want to have multiple  
37 tenants on the face of a building.

38 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Right, it would be more of  
39 a standardized listing of the same color. So, on the  
40 sign, it's a lot of tenant presence to have 12  
41 different, six on one side, six on the other. If you're  
42 coming in one direction, you'll see the six, the other  
43 direction you'll see the other six.

44 MR. BAWMANN: To be honest, that's not  
45 important to me. I'd rather stick to six tenants. It's  
46 intended for the bigger service providers that are in  
47 there and who have been there for a long time and they  
48 could benefit from this. That's the idea.

49 So, I mean, if it's a numbers question,  
50 I'm happy to keep it at six. That was never, I mean,  
51 when Art mentioned 12, I was like how are you going to  
52 fit it in? But I mean, ultimately, that's probably not

1 a good direction to go.

2 MR. SOLIS: Again, I reiterate, that was just  
3 a suggestion, what we've done in the past.

4 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Okay, Commissioners, do you  
5 have other questions right now?

6 COMMISSIONER EIGEL: I guess my main question  
7 would still be going back to the size and the  
8 interpretation of, you know, what our interpretation is  
9 going to hold up to be of what is the total sign because  
10 it is an outlier as compared to its neighbors. If we're  
11 going to ask them to come back to us with more detail on  
12 how all those tenant panels are going to be appear,  
13 maybe we need to give some guidance as to, you know,  
14 whether that's still the number that we're going to  
15 interpret this size of the sign to be, and if, you know,  
16 that is starting to move the ball, you know, into a much  
17 bigger of a sign.

18 CHAIRPERSON BOND: So, you're suggesting that  
19 if the size is different, it could end up being a  
20 complete redesign rather than a smaller version of their  
21 current design?

22 COMMISSIONER EIGEL: I don't, it's not that I  
23 dislike the design. It does seem to be in keeping with  
24 the building but, you know, what they're driving at  
25 design-wise, it just doesn't fit in with their neighbors  
26 relative to, you know, it's clearly the biggest sign by  
27 quite a bit, and that's by much. Even though it doesn't  
28 necessarily appear that way, that's how it's  
29 interpreted.

30 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Right. So, I think  
31 you're just looking at what the Staff's interpretation  
32 of that is, not how, I mean, you can see the perspective  
33 elevation. You can see both signs, the one in the  
34 building behind it is a much larger sign, you know, what  
35 I consider a sign, white with writing on it, much  
36 bigger, higher and sort of not just working. You know,  
37 to me the surrounding of this actually, it does fit in  
38 with the style of that building.

39 But I understand what you're saying is  
40 that you're setting a precedent. I would just like to  
41 have something in there that we're defining the, and I  
42 don't know if we can, if we're defining the sign as just  
43 the six placards, you know, the tenant placards.

44 COMMISSIONER EIGEL: It would seem to me that  
45 if we were to accept this design, we would have to say  
46 that that's how we interpret it.

47 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Right, and I think  
48 that if we had some language in there that said we're  
49 interpreting this as, you know, the other part as being  
50 a base, maybe we can do that.

51 MR. GUTIERREZ: No, I'm sorry, but that's  
52 really beyond the purview, in this context, of the

1 Architectural Commission. You can decide that we're  
2 going to allow something larger but you can't change the  
3 definition here.

4 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Right.  
5 MR. GUTIERREZ: You can do that, but let me  
6 read the definition of sign area to you: "In the case  
7 of a sign made up of separate letters for  
8 characterizations, the area shall be computed as the  
9 area line within straight lines connecting the outer  
10 edges of the sign." This is the important sentence.  
11 "In the case of a ground sign, the supporting base of a  
12 sign shall not be counted towards the whole square  
13 footage of the sign unless it is designed as an integral  
14 part of the sign by use of color or material."

15 That was my point is just it's part of  
16 that sign. I don't know how you get around this reading  
17 of the definition of how we are to calculate the sign  
18 area, you know. That's not a value judgment on whether  
19 a sign is too big for Waukegan Road --

20 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Sure.  
21 MR. GUTIERREZ: -- but there's no getting  
22 around that definition. That's what the area of the  
23 sign is.

24 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Me personally, I  
25 would rather see this sign than the one at 211 Waukegan.

26 MR. GUTIERREZ: I don't disagree with you.

27 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Just the style of  
28 that --

29 MR. GUTIERREZ: I don't think the proposed  
30 sign is unattractive.

31 CHAIRPERSON BOND: I believe we're all in  
32 agreement that the 211 sign is egregious and oversized,  
33 and it's not something that we're looking to repeat.

34 This sign that we're looking at for this  
35 evening is 12 feet five inches by eight feet. That's  
36 it.

37 COMMISSIONER MORRELL: 12 feet five inches  
38 long.

39 CHAIRPERSON BOND: 12 feet five inches by  
40 eight feet tall.

41 COMMISSIONER MORRELL: Correct.

42 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Right.

43 COMMISSIONER MORRELL: 12 inches deep.

44 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Yes, and I'm going back to  
45 the discussions that we've had, particularly what's come  
46 to the monument signs on Northfield Road which is it's  
47 more about just having way-finding than you're going to  
48 look at it and say, oh, that's where I want to go.  
49 You're already en route to get there, right?

50 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Yes, I would just say  
51 that Waukegan Road is a little different than --

52 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Of course, yes, it is but

1 that doesn't mean that we have to continually put up  
2 bigger and bigger signs.  
3 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Correct.  
4 CHAIRPERSON BOND: So, I think we have not  
5 come to a conclusion yet about the size.  
6 COMMISSIONER EIGEL: So, if they were 15 to 20  
7 percent overall smaller in scale, at least that would be  
8 not the biggest sign in that stretch of the road.  
9 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Correct.  
10 COMMISSIONER EIGEL: It would at least sort of  
11 be up against what the bigger of current signs were. I  
12 guess it doesn't seem like the definition of the sign,  
13 based on your design, is going to be able to be changed  
14 for our purposes. It is a nice design, but it does kind  
15 of run off against how it's defined as a sign.  
16 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Correct.  
17 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Steve, on 315  
18 Waukegan, the Christian Heritage sign, what of that is  
19 included in the base? You have it, it's in there. I  
20 just want to make sure, did you guys total, or is none  
21 of that base?  
22 MR. GUTIERREZ: Let me find that. Let me just  
23 scroll up. Christian Heritage?  
24 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Not the long one, the  
25 one --  
26 MR. GUTIERREZ: The columns coming around the  
27 side of the edge?  
28 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Yes.  
29 MR. GUTIERREZ: Yes, I don't think we included  
30 those.  
31 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: So, none of that is a  
32 base.  
33 MR. BAWMANN: I mean, I would argue that ours  
34 is --  
35 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Smaller?  
36 MR. BAWMANN: Exactly the same as that except  
37 that our face is a lot smaller than those.  
38 MR. GUTIERREZ: Yes, that would be another  
39 judgment call, you know.  
40 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Right, I'm just doing  
41 the --  
42 MR. GUTIERREZ: Different materials, kind of  
43 more integrated into the base, but I understand, it  
44 reads larger in terms of its mass --  
45 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: I got nine by 12.5,  
46 and then you guys have an area of 75 square feet, but I  
47 don't see any of that being a different base.  
48 MR. GUTIERREZ: So, let's say you included the  
49 columns. Chris, what do you recall those columns, three  
50 feet? Three feet wide, maybe two feet?  
51 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Two feet.  
52

1 MR. GUTIERREZ: The answer to this is how  
2 you're reading it, right?  
3 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Right.  
4 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Yes, I mean, I guess  
5 I look at that and say, well, that's a, it seems to me a  
6 scale bigger sign.  
7 MR. GUTIERREZ: If you think that would read  
8 fine, or that's acceptable, yes, then, you know, by all  
9 means use that as a benchmark.  
10 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Just trying to figure  
11 it out.  
12 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Okay, so to keep this  
13 moving, Commissioner McInerney, do I understand that  
14 what you are saying is that you are currently okay with  
15 the sign as the size that it is currently?  
16 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: I think I'm fine with  
17 it just based on everything else. I'm just really  
18 confused at how we're calculating, you know --  
19 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Okay, but --  
20 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: -- but yes. Yes.  
21 CHAIRPERSON BOND: So, this is a variation by  
22 code. We can't rewrite code. So, are you saying that  
23 you are okay with the size?  
24 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: I am okay with it and  
25 I think that it is in keeping with the size of the other  
26 signs on Waukegan Road.  
27 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Okay, and Commissioner  
28 Morrell, do you have, I'm trying to get a sense, before  
29 the continuation --  
30 COMMISSIONER MORRELL: Yes, I agree with your  
31 point except for, I just think a smaller sign is going  
32 to look a whole lot better. I mean, I don't know that I  
33 want to keep doing what everybody else is doing or  
34 what's been done, because it's not 211, and even  
35 Christian Heritage's is massive, and it's advertising.  
36 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Correct.  
37 COMMISSIONER MORRELL: So, I mean, what are we  
38 doing I guess is my question. What is our goal here?  
39 To have the address shown or to have the address shown  
40 and advertise?  
41 MR. BAWMANN: I was, from an owner's  
42 perspective, it's both.  
43 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Right.  
44 MR. BAWMANN: Right, I have to have the  
45 address 191 on the sign.  
46 COMMISSIONER MORRELL: Our family is in  
47 residential and commercial real estate, so I get it.  
48 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Commissioner Eigel, where  
49 do you feel, how do you stand on the size?  
50 COMMISSIONER EIGEL: I think that just because  
51 we know in the future that our Commission, our future  
52 people sitting in our seats are going to come up against

1 this with other buildings on the street, I think it  
2 might be wise to come back to us with something that's  
3 just a slightly smaller scale because the whole thing is  
4 going to be considered a sign.

5 MR. BAWMANN: So, you guys want me to think  
6 about considering that a base?

7 COMMISSIONER EIGEL: I don't think we can --

8 MR. BAWMANN: Where the actual face sits on  
9 the panel?

10 COMMISSIONER EIGEL: I don't think that our  
11 Commission can.

12 MR. BAWMANN: We're going to interpret --

13 CHAIRPERSON BOND: I think the overall size of  
14 the sign is, this evening we are telling you for the  
15 continuation, so we're not denying your proposal, we're  
16 going to continue so you can come back and we can have a  
17 further discussion hopefully with more Commissioners  
18 also which makes it easier for decisions. So, we are  
19 suggesting a smaller sign.

20 MR. BAWMANN: By what percentage?

21 CHAIRPERSON BOND: I do not think we can give  
22 you an exact percentage this evening. I think that this  
23 is a proposal which we're going to have a bit of an  
24 impasse to give you an exact percentage.

25 COMMISSIONER EIGEL: We could count the  
26 biggest sign on the stretch of this, what was it, 78  
27 feet or something?

28 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Which sign?

29 CHAIRPERSON BOND: I don't recall. Do you  
30 recall? Steve?

31 MR. BAWMANN: 211 is 78, right?

32 MR. GUTIERREZ: Yes, 211 is --

33 MR. BAWMANN: 77?

34 CHAIRPERSON BOND: So, a maximum of 78.

35 MR. BAWMANN: Again, our face is 44.

36 COMMISSIONER EIGEL: It's bigger than their  
37 already biggest one.

38 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Right.

39 MR. GUTIERREZ: 211 is 77. The next one is at  
40 Christian Heritage which really is at 315.

41 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: That's 75, but  
42 again --

43 MR. GUTIERREZ: And that's all just the sign,  
44 none of the columns.

45 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: But I guess my point  
46 is if they came back to us with something that looks  
47 like the Christian Heritage one, it is 75 feet, but it  
48 looks, with a much bigger sign area, are we going to  
49 say, okay? I don't like, that's the question.

50 MR. BAWMANN: I mean, we're going to have to  
51 redesign the whole --

52 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Right.

1 MR. BAWMANN: -- I mean, it's not like we can  
2 go and just trim it down, because it doesn't, it's got  
3 to work. I mean, the face of the panel itself is what's  
4 most important to us and the 191 and keeping it  
5 consistent with the other improvements that we're doing  
6 on the property. So, you know, from that standpoint, I  
7 mean, if we have to put this thing up on stilts to  
8 satisfy the code, that's going to, I don't think you're  
9 going to like that either.

10 CHAIRPERSON BOND: No.

11 MR. BAWMANN: If we're going to put a base  
12 there, it just kind of raises it up, but hey, I don't  
13 get counted for it. So, I mean, I like this because it  
14 actually sits on the street level and isn't what our  
15 neighbors are, and again, I don't mean to keep going  
16 back to that one, it is what it is, the previous  
17 administration allowed that somehow. But we're trying  
18 to keep it much more I think consistent with, you know,  
19 subtlety, somewhat subtlety, at the same time, given  
20 your branding and role in it.

21 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Right. So, the tenant  
22 visibility is five feet, right? That's basically my  
23 count, right? So, the tenant visibility alone is five  
24 feet. That's big for any sections, correct?

25 MR. BAWMANN: Yes.

26 CHAIRPERSON BOND: So, I think that, yes, we  
27 are asking you to look at a smaller scale overall.

28 MR. BAWMANN: The smaller face panel or is it  
29 the face itself? Is the actual tenant panels  
30 themselves, is that size acceptable? That's 45 which is  
31 much less than our neighbor to the north considering.  
32 We've got to kind of understand what our parameters are  
33 in order to --

34 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Well, it's, I'm looking at  
35 your dimensions. I believe it's almost nine feet by  
36 five feet?

37 MR. BAWMANN: Yes.

38 MR. SOLIS: Yes.

39 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Right. So, the tenant  
40 panels are 4.5 feet by 1.5 feet. I don't think they  
41 need to be that big.

42 MR. SOLIS: The panels themselves are 18  
43 inches tall by 50 and three-quarters inches wide, each  
44 panel.

45 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Yes, by four feet five for  
46 one tenant. So, one tenant is from basically here to  
47 here to here. It's big. I think what we would benefit  
48 from is a presentation that shows more scale or is on  
49 boards. The scale of this, even though we have the  
50 person next to it, I think understanding the overall  
51 scale is a bit difficult from the presentation.

52 MR. SOLIS: Well, we can certainly put the



1 tenant's names in, whatever we come up with to show, you  
2 know, to complement the presentation. But other than  
3 that, and I agree with that, and that is if you're  
4 saying that we can maintain the five feet by nine feet  
5 tenant section, then we have to deduct the 75 square  
6 feet from the rest of the sign. How do we do that? I'm  
7 not sure. It's going to take some time to figure that  
8 out.

9 But we really can't go any smaller with  
10 these tenant panels, because then it becomes really  
11 irrelevant. Why even have it if you can't show the  
12 tenant's name?

13 CHAIRPERSON BOND: But they're huge; they're  
14 4.5 feet by 18 for one tenant, and you want to do six of  
15 them. The sign is, visually I'm having a really hard  
16 time with this looking acceptable on this scale.

17 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: I guess would it help  
18 us to figure out what are the sign, what are the panel  
19 sizes in those other signs? Steve, if you can, just to  
20 give us an idea, because I agree, you know. If it's  
21 going to be overbearing, if we look at that 315 Waukegan  
22 and it turns out that those signs are, are those five by  
23 two, five by 2.5?

24 COMMISSIONER MORRELL: Hang on, where?

25 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: 315 Waukegan.

26 MR. GUTIERREZ: Yes, I think that we can come  
27 back with that.

28 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: You know what I'm  
29 saying?

30 MR. GUTIERREZ: Sure, sure.

31 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Like I guess it is  
32 hard to figure out scale on this.

33 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Right. So, the North Shore  
34 sign, the overall width?

35 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: It's five feet.

36 CHAIRPERSON BOND: And the height of those  
37 individual tenants underneath the North Shore sign, the  
38 question is what is that size I think, right?

39 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Yes, that size and  
40 then 315.

41 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Because this is my concern,  
42 is that this is, we are mimicking the North Shore sign  
43 without the huge North Shore, but everything below it  
44 will be mimicked, because we're talking about a big sign  
45 with multiple tenants.

46 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Yes, my guess is that  
47 their panel sizes are probably going to be about the  
48 same height and probably a foot smaller in length.

49 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Steve, when is our next,  
50 when would this then be seen again? Would it have to be  
51 December or would it be November?

52 MR. GUTIERREZ: No, you have a November 8th

1 meeting --  
2 CHAIRPERSON BOND: And they could make the,  
3 they could submit in time for that?  
4 MR. GUTIERREZ: Sure, if this is a  
5 continuation.  
6 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Yes.  
7 MR. GUTIERREZ: I'll talk to the Applicant  
8 afterwards about when they would need to resubmit  
9 revised plans. Would you guys be able to turn something  
10 around in two weeks?  
11 MR. SOLIS: Sure. I don't see why not.  
12 MR. GUTIERREZ: That would be sufficient for  
13 us.  
14 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Okay.  
15 MR. SOLIS: But I want to point something out  
16 to you, and I just discussed this. I did my own survey  
17 on that North Shore sign, and those tenant panels, the  
18 visible area is 9.5 inches tall by five feet long, okay.  
19 We are going to 18 inches tall by five feet long, okay,  
20 a larger visibility than what you see on that sign.  
21 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: You're less than five  
22 feet, you're four, 50 inches I think.  
23 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Right.  
24 MR. SOLIS: Right, 50 inches, I'm sorry,  
25 you're right.  
26 CHAIRPERSON BOND: So, it's actually bigger  
27 than the North Shore.  
28 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: They're shorter and  
29 taller.  
30 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Right.  
31 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: I think one of the  
32 things on that North Shore, too, is that because it's so  
33 narrow, they're cramming a lot of text into that one  
34 spot that, you know, on a sign you probably want a  
35 little more white space than, you know, trying to jam  
36 everything into that small line. But yes, I mean, I  
37 guess we can see what they can come back with on the  
38 size.  
39 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Right. So, we can offer  
40 guidelines for coming back, but we are not approving any  
41 of the exact parameters this evening.  
42 MR. GUTIERREZ: Are the colors acceptable?  
43 Any direction on any of the other aspects of the sign  
44 that they're proposing? Materials?  
45 COMMISSIONER EIGEL: I don't think there was  
46 any objection to the overall design of the sign. The  
47 materials of the sign and sort of how it looks as  
48 compared to the building, there didn't seem to be any  
49 objection to that. Certainly, with the exception of the  
50 size that the Commission doesn't like and doesn't quite  
51 understand, it seems to fit in well with the, you know,  
52 the neighbors in the stretch of that road.

1 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Right.  
2 So, Commissioners, do you have any  
3 further questions for the Petitioner?  
4 (No response.)  
5 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Okay, you can take a seat  
6 if you prefer. We'll discuss it, thank you.  
7 MR. BAWMANN: Thank you.  
8 CHAIRPERSON BOND: All right, so --  
9 COMMISSIONER MORRELL: The overall size. Does  
10 it meet the 18 --  
11 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: I have 12.  
12 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Probably from, maybe from  
13 the top to the very bottom, from here, and then, you  
14 know, I'm 5'4".  
15 COMMISSIONER MORRELL: Where do you say --  
16 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Here, right?  
17 COMMISSIONER MORRELL: That's really big.  
18 CHAIRPERSON BOND: It's huge. Yes,  
19 personally, the overall size for me is too big.  
20 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Yes, to me it's not  
21 overbearing just because of the street and how far it's  
22 back. You do want enough white space around that logo  
23 that it's not jammed in there like the ones at --  
24 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Right.  
25 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: I mean, I know we all  
26 think that that one's terrible.  
27 CHAIRPERSON BOND: But then that's also, we  
28 asked the question of how much presence has to be on the  
29 sign, how, like is it absolutely necessary?  
30 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Yes, I mean, I think  
31 that if they're allowed to have a sign and want to have  
32 tenant people, I think that's probably his target. I  
33 mean, commercial real estate on a major street, if your  
34 tenant wants to have their name on it, even if you're  
35 not looking for it to go there, they just want their  
36 name. It may not mean anything, but in their mind when  
37 they're leasing, it's an added benefit. So, I  
38 understand that from the owner's point, but getting the  
39 size right I think is important.  
40 COMMISSIONER EIGEL: Yes, and I think that, I  
41 agree that overall in scale it's large. It's also, it  
42 does run up against the problem that the code, you know,  
43 provided without a variance doesn't really make any  
44 sense for that stretch of the road. So, unfortunately,  
45 everybody that's going to put a sign up is going to have  
46 to ask for a variance. So, at some point, maybe that  
47 gets addressed.  
48 But I think that coming back to us with  
49 what these individual placards look like would be very  
50 instructional because a lot of your concern with  
51 visibility and, you know, utility of the sign as sort of  
52 a feature of anybody that's not already out of their car

1 and walking past the sign on the way into building, it's  
2 going to be legibility of those placards and that's a  
3 lot about what does that font look like, what is the  
4 scale of the font, how much of a white space does the  
5 font take up. You know, does that group of placards  
6 become a very busy presence and you're not really  
7 processing those individuals anymore?  
8 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Right.  
9 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Right, and that's my  
10 concern. If you're making it smaller and then, you  
11 know, the font is going to be the same size whether  
12 it's, you know, I would rather have lots of white space  
13 around that font and not have that overwhelming.  
14 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Right, but just making it  
15 bigger for the sake of, I mean, yes, it's Waukegan Road  
16 but it's not expressway either. So, we don't want to,  
17 you know, we've made mistakes with oversizing signs.  
18 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Hundred percent, yes.  
19 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Which is on the corner of  
20 Sunset Ridge and Willow, and terribly oversized. At the  
21 time, they kept getting justified, right?  
22 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Yes, my own point is  
23 this sign is going to be, the scale of it doesn't seem  
24 so big because of the way that they designed it, that  
25 the actual sign portion with the base behind, it's not a  
26 base, it's the aluminum structure behind it.  
27 COMMISSIONER MORRELL: But it feels like a  
28 base.  
29 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: It feels like a base,  
30 right?  
31 COMMISSIONER MORRELL: Yes, it does.  
32 CHAIRPERSON BOND: It does, right.  
33 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: That it's something  
34 that the actual sign is sitting on to me works well, but  
35 I understand the concern of we're just setting a  
36 precedent of just big things. So, maybe it takes just  
37 scaling it down 20 percent or something and that helps,  
38 I don't know.  
39 COMMISSIONER EIGEL: I think that helps.  
40 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Yes, and I wouldn't  
41 want to scale it down though to just show the text than  
42 white part, then it just becomes a jungle is my only  
43 fear.  
44 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Right, but we also don't  
45 want it to look like a tournament sign.  
46 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Agree.  
47 CHAIRPERSON BOND: That especially if this is  
48 supposed to be a professional office building, we don't  
49 want to produce something that ends up looking like it  
50 belongs in front of a tournament.  
51 COMMISSIONER MORRELL: Yes.  
52 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Right, we already

1 have several of the signs on Waukegan already --  
2 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Correct.  
3 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: -- but I'd rather see  
4 them do the low one than just, for the sake of meeting  
5 the code, put it on two pillars and --  
6 CHAIRPERSON BOND: No, we won't approve that.  
7 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Right.  
8 CHAIRPERSON BOND: That's not, the bases that  
9 we've been approving are solid.  
10 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Right.  
11 CHAIRPERSON BOND: And that is something that  
12 was created a while back and it's effective for some  
13 signage. It's not absolutely necessary for this. I  
14 think the overall design is the proportions are well  
15 executed. I think if this was smaller, the sign would  
16 be like, yes, we're good --  
17 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Yes.  
18 CHAIRPERSON BOND: -- but it's the overall  
19 scale, right? I like the proportion of the sign. I  
20 like the 191 font. I think this is very tasteful. The  
21 lighting of that makes sense, especially since we get  
22 dark at 4:00 o'clock, but the overall --  
23 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Scale.  
24 CHAIRPERSON BOND: It's the overall scale and  
25 these seem so big that it has us concerned.  
26 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Yes.  
27 CHAIRPERSON BOND: So, we think maybe a 20  
28 percent reduction would be the suggested, suggested 20  
29 percent reduction.  
30 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: I guess seeing that  
31 with the font, and maybe if you come back with a life  
32 size of that font. I mean, it doesn't, you know, just a  
33 couple of these, like what does that font size that we  
34 can actually see that like make sense.  
35 MR. GUTIERREZ: Mockup of a tenant placard?  
36 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Of a placard, yes.  
37 MR. GUTIERREZ: One placard, sure.  
38 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: I mean, just to have  
39 something, you know, so that we can see, how does the  
40 font that you're going to use work with the white space  
41 on it, I think that would be very helpful.  
42 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Give a good idea of the  
43 scale.  
44 COMMISSIONER EIGEL: I guess overall, really  
45 the design that you already have, all you have to do to  
46 change your perception is make that little person 20  
47 percent bigger and everything else the same.  
48 CHAIRPERSON BOND: What do you think of that  
49 as the motion? Do you think that there's something you  
50 want to add? I'll read it before the --  
51 COMMISSIONER MORRELL: I think that's fine.  
52 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Okay, so Commissioners, is

1 there anything you would want to add if we do a  
2 continuation? Reduce, over at 191 Waukegan Road, to  
3 determine legibility of the placards, including the font  
4 size and color --

5 MR. GUTIERREZ: Tev, I'm sorry, could you  
6 speak up a little bit?

7 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Oh, we're just, I'm just  
8 asking them if this is what they want. I'm sorry.

9 MR. GUTIERREZ: No, I'm just thinking if I  
10 can't hear you, then the recorder isn't going to pick  
11 you up.

12 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Okay, so Commissioners, if  
13 we have a continuation, that would read something like,  
14 let me know if you would like to add or delete from  
15 this, return with legibility of placards including font  
16 size and color, and the suggested 20 percent overall  
17 reduction in size.

18 COMMISSIONER EIGEL: I think that's good.

19 CHAIRPERSON BOND: And to be continued at our  
20 November --

21 MR. GUTIERREZ: 8th.

22 CHAIRPERSON BOND: 8th meeting. Okay, Patty,  
23 would you? We need a motion for a continuation. Do you  
24 want me to read that back?

25 MR. GUTIERREZ: Sure.

26 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Yes?

27 MR. GUTIERREZ: Yes.

28 CHAIRPERSON BOND: May I have a motion please  
29 for the continuation?

30 COMMISSIONER MORRELL: **Continuation of 191**  
31 **Waukegan Road, return with a mockup of a placard**  
32 **including font size and color, and suggested 20 percent**  
33 **overall reduction in the size of the overall sign, to be**  
34 **presented at the November 8th meeting.**

35 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Do we have a second?

36 COMMISSIONER EIGEL: I second that.

37 MR. GUTIERREZ: Do you need any more  
38 direction, the kind of direction you'd like to see? Is  
39 that clear enough?

40 MR. SOLIS: Certainly. I'm assuming when you  
41 say a full size panel, you want to see one, an actual  
42 panel?

43 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Yes, if possible.

44 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Yes, please, of a tenant  
45 panel, yes. It could be paper. It doesn't have to be,  
46 you don't have to spend money.

47 MR. SOLIS: Just the size, right, right.

48 CHAIRPERSON BOND: It could just be on paper.

49 MR. SOLIS: With font.

50 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Yes, yes, it doesn't  
51 have to be exactly.

52 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Right.

1 MR. SOLIS: Okay, and the date?  
2 MR. GUTIERREZ: I'm sorry, again, we're  
3 recording this, so we have to start speaking into the  
4 microphone.  
5 MR. SOLIS: The date that we need to have this  
6 back in your hands?  
7 COMMISSIONER MORRELL: November 8th.  
8 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Well, the earliest would be  
9 November 8th; however, if you need more time, you can  
10 absolutely have more time.  
11 MR. GUTIERREZ: I've got to look at the  
12 calendar and then I'll talk to the petitioner about when  
13 they need to submit the revised plans --  
14 MR. SOLIS: That's fine.  
15 MR. GUTIERREZ: -- and the changes that we  
16 gave towards the mockup you would bring that night.  
17 MR. SOLIS: Yes, okay. That's fine.  
18 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Right, but if you want more  
19 time, that's not an issue for us. You can work with  
20 Steve, and it could be the December meeting instead of  
21 the November meeting.  
22 MR. SOLIS: Well, we're looking to try to get  
23 this sooner than later if we can do so. I mean, once  
24 the ground freezes, that's it. We can't plant anything.  
25 So, thank you.  
26 MR. BAWMANN: Thank you very much.  
27 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Thank you for your time.  
28 Okay, our next meeting is scheduled for  
29 Monday, November 8th.  
30 May I have a motion to adjourn?  
31 COMMISSIONER MORRELL: Move to adjourn.  
32 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Second?  
33 COMMISSIONER McINERNEY: Second.  
34 CHAIRPERSON BOND: Meeting adjourned. Thank  
35 you for your time this evening, Commissioners.  
36 (Whereupon, at 8:23 p.m., the above  
37 meeting was adjourned.)  
38  
39  
40 APPROVED 11/8/21  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51