

Appearance Review Commission

Meeting Minutes

January 11, 2016

A meeting of the Appearance Review Commission was held on Monday, January 11, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. at the Village Hall Conference Room, 850 Waukegan Road, Deerfield, Illinois. Ch. Dick Coen called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m.

Present were

Dick Coen, Chairman
Lisa Dunn
Sherry Flores
Jason Golub
Elizabeth Low

Absent was:

Beth Chaitman

Also Present:

Robert Milani, Consultant
Barbara Rosborough, Consultant
Jean Spagnoli, Village Planner
Jeri Cotton, Secretary

Public Comment:

There was no Public Comment.

Document Approval

Ms. Dunn moved to approve the minutes from the December 14, 2015 Appearance Review Commission meeting. Ms. Low seconded the motion. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Coen, Dunn, Flores, Low (4)

NAYS: None (0)

ABSTAIN: Golub (1)

Business:

Ch. Coen introduced and welcomed Barbara Rosborough and Robert Milani, both registered landscape architects and horticulturists.

1. Appearance Code Update

a. Site Design, review draft

Ch. Coen read through the rough draft of the site design section of the Appearance Code, prepared by Ms. Spagnoli. Ms. Dunn questioned section 1a, "Existing trees shall be identified, and if deemed to be desirable, protected as part of project planning and implementation." She asked who would deem the existing trees to be desirable. Ms. Low questioned whether the Tree Preservation Ordinance would be considered when a developer presents a landscape plan.

Ms. Rosborough noted other communities assume all trees are considered desirable. If someone wants to remove a tree, they have to explain why the tree is undesirable and should be removed. Ch. Coen suggested if a tree is removed, it should be replaced. Ms. Rosborough believes there should be a form/permit required to remove any tree. If a tree is approved for removal, there needs to be a mitigating factor. Section 1a will now read, "Existing trees shall be identified and protected as part of the project planning and implementation subject to the Tree Preservation Ordinance." Mr. Milani confirmed there will be tree mitigation. Ms. Low does not believe commercial properties have trees that are more than 8". Mr. Milani noted some Villages state 6" and above are worth preserving. The commissioners would consider changing the caliper to 6" instead of 8". Ms. Low expressed concern because some developers will replace the trees with a smaller caliper. The purpose of the Ordinance is to keep the number of trees or increase them.

The commissioners discussed section 1b. Ms. Low suggested modifying the section to read, "The overall site landscape plan should consider options for providing color and textures throughout the growing season, along with interest created for the dormant winter season" instead of 'during' the dormant season.

The commissioners discussed section 1d. They questioned what resource should be used. Ms. Rosborough suggested using Conserve Lake County as the resource. Mr. Milani suggested the Village could create a list. Ch. Coen explained Ms. Low previously expressed concern about creating a list, because lists need to be maintained over time.

The commissioners discussed section 1e. Ms. Spagnoli questioned whether the resource should be changed from ChicagoBotanic.org to Conserve Lake County. Ms. Rosborough would look into Conserve Lake County, because Chicago Botanic is very restrictive with species that could be a problem in Southern Illinois but not in Northern Illinois. Ms. Low questioned whether the Appearance Code should require removal of commercial invasive plantings. Ms. Rosborough noted some invasive species do provide screening. The commissioners do not believe invasive species should be replanted. They also do not believe removal of the invasive species should be mandatory.

The commissioners discussed section 1f. Ms. Rosborough suggested using the planting list for the 50/50 tree program as a resource. Mr. Milani noted there should be additional trees added to this list. Ms. Low noted the City of Chicago has a good reference as well. Mr. Milani will look for a source for the tree list.

The commissioners discussed section 1g. The commissioners believe the section should read, "Single trunk trees shall have a straight central leader and should be a minimum of 3 caliper inches measured 6 inches above the ground at the time of planting to increase the success of the tree's survival. Ms. Low suggested adding a statement about multi-stem trees. Multi-stem trees shall be no less than 7 feet in height.

The commissioners discussed section 1h. They decided the section should read, "In the area around trees, plants or mulch should be used instead of turf grass, as lawnmowers and other equipment repeatedly disturb shallow root systems resulting in sick and dead trees."

The commissioners discussed section 1k. Mr. Milani expressed concern with the phrase Internal irrigation systems and suggested using, "In-ground irrigation systems."

The commissioners discussed section 1l. Ms. Low questioned the use of the phrase periodic fertilization and suggested changing it to "organic fertilization."

The commissioners discussed section 2, "Foundation Landscaping." Ms. Flores questioned whether this includes the rear of a building. The commissioners believe the section should be considered on a case-by-case basis.

The commissioners discussed section 3, "Alternate Landscape Materials." Mr. Milani suggested changing the section to read, "In areas where plantings will not thrive, other structures such as fences, walls and paving materials such as wood, brick, stone, gravel and cobbles should be used. Carefully selected plants shall be combined with such materials where possible."

The commissioners discussed section 4c, regarding parking areas. The commissioners believe diamond planting areas shall not be used rather than be strongly discouraged. The section will read, "Diamond shaped planting areas between parking stalls shall not be used as the area is not suitable for viable plant growth and is not considered good parking lot design."

The commissioners discussed section 4e. Ms. Dunn suggested removing the phrase "during summer months." The section should read, "Canopy trees shall be installed in parking lots to provide shade, among other benefits. A minimum of one (1) shade tree shall be provided for every six (6) parking stalls, and shall be located within a curbed island or within three (3) feet of the parking lot perimeter. At the time of planting, the

minimum trunk shall be three (3) caliper inches, measured 6 inches above the ground or multi-stem trees 7 foot in height.”

The commissioners discussed section 4f. They believe it should read, “Consideration shall be given to designating an area(s) for snow storage. Snow piles should not interfere with vehicular or pedestrian sightlines. Care should be taken to protect landscape plantings from snow plowing and storage.”

The commissioners discussed section 5b(1) regarding screening. Ch. Coen noted this Ordinance has not been enacted anywhere in the Village. He suggested changing the Appearance Code. Ms. Low questioned whether the intent is to completely screen a parking lot or to dress up a parking lot. Ch. Coen does not believe this should be included if it is not enforced. He suggested the Village revisit this in the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Milani suggested looking at other municipalities to see their restrictions. Ch. Coen suggested providing language to create a better looking commercial environment.

The commissioners discussed section 5b(2). Ch. Coen believes requiring a five (5) foot wide perimeter planting area without vehicular overhang would require at least 6-1/2 feet as there will be vehicular overhang. Ms. Rosborough believes five feet is appropriate. The Commission will revisit this section.

The commissioners discussed section 5c. They believe the end of the sentence should read, “Free standing transformers and utility boxes should be screened with landscaping. Where limited space exists, a solid screen wall or decorative cedar wood fence may be appropriate and shall relate to the principle structure.”

The commissioners discussed section 5d(2). The commissioners believe the section should read, “Trash enclosures should have wall surfaces which match the material of the principal building and metal gates, and wherever possible, have the gate opening oriented away from public right-of-ways and public views.”

The commissioners discussed section 6a regarding site considerations. Ms. Low expressed concern about changing topography. She would not want topography changes to runoff to other properties. Ms. Rosborough suggested, “The existing topography should be preserved, and only allowed to be modified when it contributes to a good appearance, is appropriate and complies with Village Ordinances.”

(1) Exhibits

The commissioners discussed the proposed exhibits. The commissioners question how the trees are disbursed within the parking lot. Ms. Low believes the trees should be interspersed throughout the parking area. Ch. Coen explained that section 4e determines the number of trees required in an area while section 4b does not specify specific locations for the required number of trees. There have to be landscaping

islands, but not every landscaping island needs to have trees. Ms. Spagnoli will add something about encouraging the even distribution of trees to section 4e.

The commissioners believe the Site Considerations exhibit needs a description for the “no” image.

b. Maintenance and Upkeep, review

Ch. Coen read through the maintenance and upkeep section of the Appearance Code. The commissioners believe the first paragraph should read, “Maintenance and upkeep are required for all the parts and objects which compose the Village’s image. Lawns and plantings require considerably more periodic attention than do buildings; nonetheless both require maintenance in order to retain a good appearance. Proper maintenance increases value and results in a good appearance. Therefore, it is necessary that maintenance be a concern of the Appearance Review Commission and the Appearance Code.”

The commissioners discussed section 2b. They believe it should read, “Plant materials which have deteriorated or died shall be replaced with healthy plantings at the earliest opportunity. All changes to landscape plans must be approved by the Appearance Review Commission before installation.”

The commissioners discussed section 2e. Ch. Coen believes the Ordinances need to be cited.

Items from Staff

Ms. Spagnoli noted the next meeting has a full agenda. The meeting will start at 7:00 pm.

Adjournment

There being no further business or discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 9:37 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeri Cotton
Secretary