

Appearance Review Commission

Meeting Minutes

March 14, 2016

A meeting of the Appearance Review Commission was held on Monday, March 14, 2016 at 7:30 p.m. at the Village Hall Conference Room, 850 Waukegan Road, Deerfield, Illinois. Chairman Dick Coen called the meeting to order at 7:31 p.m.

Present were

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

Also Present:

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 February 22, 2016 Appearance Review Commission meeting. Ms. Flores seconded the motion. Ms. Dunn had a few changes to the minutes. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Chaitman, Dunn, Flores, Golub (4)

NAYS: None (0)

ABSTAIN: Coen, Low (2)

Business:

1. Portillo's, 700 Lake Cook Road – new construction, building, site and signage, preliminary review

Sherri Abruscato, chief operating officer and Walter Sydor, architect with Portillo Restaurant Group, Jarrett Jensen, president of Jensen & Jensen Architects, Jim Sakanich, senior vice president with CBRE, Scott Nicholson, managing director and Dan Uebelhor, project manager with InSite, Jeffery Atkins with Mercury Studios, Rob

Whitehead, president, Olympic Signs and Shawn Benson, project manager with Wight & Company were present.

Mr. Uebelhor noted his company, InSite Real Estate, would become the property owner and landlord for the property. Ch. Coen noted this is the second proposal in this location for Portillo's. Mr. Uebelhor explained the site is a former landfill site and they accommodated for a deep foundation system composed of steel piles down to depths that will provide a solid foundation that will perform as if the soil was good. They are also proposing a structural slab for the site. Mr. Nicholson indicated the other difference is the partnership between InSite and The Portillo Restaurant Group.

Ch. Coen noted the Commission is charged with ensuring the proposed building meets the Appearance Code. Mr. Jensen explained the previous plan from 2014 is the same plan as previously submitted, but the building exterior design and footprint have changed. He explained everything is in the same location as the prior submittal. Ms. Dunn asked about the directional sign locations. Mr. Atkins explained the directional signs would be located at all three entrances to the lot. Mr. Jensen explained the monument sign would be located in the center of the property along Lake Cook Road. Ch. Coen noted the submittal shows a utility easement running along the road and questioned the sign location. He cautioned the petitioner about adding the monument sign in the easement area. Mr. Benson explained that the proposed sign location is at the edge of the easement area. Ms. Flores asked about the building footprint. Mr. Atkins explained they added a layer of brick that added about 150 feet to the building.

Mr. Golub asked about the retaining wall near the trash enclosure. Mr. Jensen explained Mr. Portillo previously suggested adding a berm up to the trash enclosure and adding landscape up to the berm. Mr. Uebelhor explained they were looking for ways to screen the trash enclosure and would like feedback from the Commission. The trash enclosure will have a masonry wall. Ms. Abruscato suggested adding evergreen trees to help screen the enclosure. Mr. Golub does not believe this is a logical location for the trash enclosure. Ch. Coen expressed concern about the berm blocking the visibility of the signage from westbound traffic. He understands the operational concerns, but believes the trash enclosure appears as the most dominant feature of the building. Ch. Coen noted the front of the building is toward the interior of the site while the rear of the building is facing the main thoroughfare. He suggested looking into other locations for the trash enclosure. Mr. Uebelhor understands the concerns, but noted the location needs to work with the operations of the business.

Ch. Coen indicated the outdoor seating area needs to be enclosed due to the proposed liquor license. Ch. Coen noted the Commission would need to review the outdoor seating area and enclosure.

The commissioners discussed the proposed light fixture. Ch. Coen noted the proposed light fixture and pole would be black and the building storefront is proposed to be green. Ch. Coen indicated the parking lot fixtures will be LED. He requested the building

illumination to be LED rather than metal halide. Mr. Atkins explained there are black details on the building, including the soffits and diamond trim around the soffit sign elements. There were some discrepancies in the fixture and pole color, but Mr. Atkins explained they should be black. Ms. Dunn noted the arm length shows 9" on the photometric plan and 18" on the submittal. Ch. Coen requested the petitioner coordinate the fixture and pole color and arm length for the site fixtures before final consideration. Ch. Coen noted some of the perimeter parking show photometrics of 0.4. He requested the petitioner look at the placement of the fixtures for better coverage of the perimeter. Ms. Dunn questioned the height of the light poles. Mr. Jensen explained the light poles would be 22' high and 25' high. The poles that are 22' high will be graded 3' higher, so they will appear the same height as the 25' high poles. Ch. Coen noted there does not appear to be a transformer on the site. He noted the Commission will need to review it.

The commissioners discussed the proposed landscaping plan. Mr. Benson explained the proposed plantings are low maintenance. They propose incorporating additional non-invasive species into the landscape plan, which will be shown in the next submittal. Ch. Coen asked if there are any existing larger trees that are in good condition. Mr. Benson explained there are three 12" trees that they are trying to save. Ch. Coen encouraged the petitioner to try to preserve as many trees as possible. Ms. Low appreciates the larger groupings of various trees. She expressed concern about the 8' height of the trash enclosure wall. Mr. Benson explained they propose adding planters. Ms. Abruscato suggested there are ways to add landscaping around the retaining wall rather than a berm, because the building and trash enclosure are now real brick.

The commissioners discussed the placement and quantities of the landscaping. Mr. Golub believes the east side of the drive-thru is very heavily planted, while the west side of the building just has six trees. He requested the landscaping be better balanced by adding more plantings to the west. Ms. Abruscato will look at the neighboring properties to determine what is there. Ms. Low questioned whether there would be planters near the building. Mr. Jensen explained they will have a decorative steel lattice that may have planters. Mr. Atkins explained they would not have planters near the front door, as they tend to collect trash. Ch. Coen suggested there are 25 uninterrupted parking spaces along the northwest property line. He believes it seems excessive. Ms. Low believes the petitioner should add a landscape island in a stall or the perimeter plantings should be better spaced. She suggested making the landscape islands larger as well. The commissioners requested the petitioner come back with additional landscaping.

The commissioners discussed the exterior elevations. Mr. Atkins explained the mezzanine would be in the back third of the building. The exterior will be precast with a full masonry face. The front entryway bump out will be cultured stone over the precast wall. The cultured stone will also be in the back bump out as well. There will be a steel canopy over the windows near the outdoor seating area.

The commissioners discussed the ornamental blocks. Ms. Dunn believes ornamental blocks on each elevation should be clear rather than painted green, to better tie in with the natural color. Ms. Flores agreed, noting the clear piers will better tie into the building colorations. Ms. Chaitman is more concerned with the exterior design. She asked whether the trellises have something growing on them. Mr. Atkins explained there are some areas with concrete planters, but the current site is fairly tight. Ms. Chaitman does not believe the trellises add to the building. Mr. Low is okay with the trellises and the green concrete block. Ms. Flores is okay with the trellises. Ms. Dunn and Ch. Coen would prefer not to have the trellises. Mr. Golub noted the second floor appears to be a flat box. He would like to see some spandrel windows and relief added to the second floor. Ms. Chaitman, Ms. Dunn, Ms. Flores and Ch. Coen are not in favor of the red film on the windows. Mr. Golub and Ms. Low could live with the window film. Mr. Atkins noted the film would be placed on the window interior.

Mr. Adkins explained the proposed theme is a 70s theme, but it was toned down on the building exterior. Mr. Golub noted there are modern elements on the exterior. Ch. Coen believes the number of gooseneck fixtures is excessive. Mr. Adkins explained the south, east and west elements have gooseneck fixtures every eight feet. Ch. Coen noted the gooseneck fixtures are illuminating the building, rather than providing lighting for customers. Mr. Adkins indicated this is how they light Portillo's restaurants. Ms. Dunn believes the fixtures could be lowered. Ch. Coen believes the gooseneck fixtures create a horizontal banding of light that just illuminates the building. Ms. Low indicated the lights illuminate the building with 3200k LEDs. Ms. Chaitman does not believe the gooseneck fixtures should illuminate the building. She also believes there are too many fixtures. Mr. Adkins does not believe reducing the number of lights would provide enough safety for their drive-thru workers. Ms. Low believes the fixtures are decorative elements on the sides of the building. Mr. Golub indicated the fixtures are at 15'. Ch. Coen noted the safety lighting can be accomplished through parking lot lights. Ms. Low and Ms. Flores would be okay with fewer gooseneck lights, but the other commissioners believe there are substantially too many gooseneck fixtures.

The commissioners discussed the LED lights outlining the building. The commissioners have consistently not approved exposed LED illuminations. Mr. Whitehead explained the lights have been painted to appear as the color of the building so the lights do not show during the day but the building appears to be glowing at night. The commissioners are not in favor of illuminating the building with a yellow band running along the top of the entire structure. Ch. Coen noted the Commission made similar comments during the previous two reviews. Ms. Spagnoli noted the Commission suggested that McDonalds could select a few locations to illuminate the building with indirect lighting.

The commissioners discussed the proposed mural. Ms. Dunn was not in favor of the mural. Mr. Adkins explained the mural reflects what is happening inside the building with a 70s, suburban feel. Ms. Flores questioned the need for a mural. Mr. Adkins explained a mural above the entrance is standard for Portillo's. Ms. Dunn would prefer

to see a Portillo's sign in this location, rather than the mural. Ms. Low believes the mural elements are small and does not believe people will understand it. Ch. Coen believes the mural is a very distinctive element. Ms. Dunn believes the mural looks like a visual nuisance. Ms. Chaitman would not want to see this in any architecture in Deerfield; however, she would rather keep the mural and remove some of the other signs. Ch. Coen does not believe this is a necessary architectural feature and removal of the mural would not have a negative effect on their business. Ms. Low believes having interest on that portion of the building would be nice, but does not believe the content of this mural is the best. She also does not believe a mural is necessary. Mr. Golub does not see how the mural goes with the building architecture. He would rather see a building sign above the entrance. Ms. Flores does not believe the mural is needed.

The commissioners discussed the east elevation. Ms. Dunn is not in favor of the trellis, ghost signs or the decorative concrete blocks. Mr. Golub asked if there are canopies or awnings above the drive-thru windows. Mr. Adkins explained they had issues at other locations with the structure being struck by vehicles. Ms. Flores is not in favor of using municipal graphics on a private building. Mr. Adkins explained the Plan Commission recommended they use the Village logo. Mr. Jensen explained they try to use something nostalgic to the community. Ms. Flores believes it appears that the Village is endorsing the business. Ch. Coen suggested the commissioners first discuss ghost signs. Ms. Low is not against ghost signs in general, as long as they relate to the building, site and surrounding area. She would prefer having something historical to Deerfield, but not a municipal sign. Ms. Low does not believe this is the best place for ghost signs. Ms. Chaitman noted the Deerfield Zoning Ordinance does not allow signs painted onto a building. The commissioners are not in favor of ghost signs. Ms. Low would prefer the trellis to be larger, to fill up more space. Ms. Chaitman and Ch. Coen are against the trellis as it takes away from the cultured stone.

The commissioners discussed the rear of the parapet wall, which is visible. Mr. Adkins suggested extending the roofing material to cover the rear of the parapet wall. Ch. Coen would appreciate if the rear of the parapet wall looked similar to the front. Mr. Adkins explained they could paint the material added to the rear of the parapet wall so it is similar to the cultured stone.

The commissioners discussed the proposed ground sign. The proposed sign is 42 square feet, while the code allows 32 square feet. Mr. Whitehead explained the sign needed to be setback due to the easement, so they requested a larger sign. The sign has toned down colors so it will not be stark. The sign will be internally illuminated with LED bulbs. Mr. Benson noted the sign would be approximately 40' from the southernmost edge of the curb. Ch. Coen noted the Appearance Code is very specific, stating the listing of products and services are generally not acceptable. Ch. Coen believes the products listed are menu items and would not be in favor of listing menu items on the monument sign. Mr. Whitehead noted they dropped Hot Dots from their name, but the business logo has beef, burgers and salads. Ms. Abruscato will provide the trademark paperwork showing their logo. Ms. Low questioned the size of the other

restaurant signs and setbacks of the signs in the area. Ms. Spagnoli will look into it, but believes the sign is 32 square feet. Ms. Dunn questioned the need for the 25" deep sign cabinet. Ms. Spagnoli noted the Commission has recommended sign cabinets be increased to 20" deep to avoid LED hot spots. Mr. Whitehead explained the 25" depth is the top of the sign. The commissioners are okay with a wider top and an 18" deep sign but would prefer the sign to be 32 square feet. Mr. Golub questioned the sign materials and recommended the bottom of the sign be changed to brick or stone to match the building. Mr. Whitehead believes the cap should remain aluminum, as proposed. Mr. Adkins agreed to change the base to face brick.

The commissioners discussed the north elevation wall sign. Mr. Whitehead explained this is a single element sign that has been brought down to 9" in depth. The sign will be illuminated with LED. Ch. Coen noted the sign size is within the Sign Code. Ch. Coen noted the proposed sign is 22' above the roof deck, which is at 16'8". The Commission is allowed to grant up to 3' above the roof deck. Mr. Sydor noted if the sign is lowered, the gooseneck fixtures would be relocated above the sign. Mr. Adkins would lower the sign by 1'8" to comply. Ch. Coen would not want the gooseneck fixtures to drive the placement of the sign. Ms. Dunn suggested lowering the sign and having one gooseneck fixture on both sides of the sign. The other gooseneck fixtures would be removed. Ch. Coen, Ms. Low and Ms. Dunn would prefer locating the Portillo's sign in the mural area rather than where it is proposed. The commissioners would support having a higher sign in the location shown for the mural. Otherwise, the sign should be centered vertically.

The commissioners discussed the proposed, non-illuminated sign vinyl sign on the north elevation, "A Chicago Tradition." Mr. Adkins noted that sign is typically painted on the soffit. The commissioners do not believe that sign is necessary and would not be in favor of adding it.

The commissioners discussed the east elevation Portillo's wall sign. Ch. Coen noted the sign is on a side elevation, so it can be up to 4% of the wall area which is 69 square feet. The petitioner is requesting a 122 square foot sign. Mr. Whitehead explained this was designed in proportion to the building. If they conformed to the allowed space, the sign would be very small. Mr. Whitehead explained they want the sign to be very visible. Ms. Low would like to know the building sign sizes of adjacent businesses. Mr. Golub would recommend the sign be located on the other bumped out wall rather than where it is proposed. He is not in favor of the variance as requested. Ms. Flores would prefer the sign be closer to what is allowed by the Zoning Ordinance. She suggested having the sign the same size as what is proposed for the north elevation sign, which is 84 square feet. Mr. Benson explained this is the primary sign for people traveling west on Lake Cook Road. Mr. Uebelhor explained there is a unique experience and branding with Portillo's. They want the big, bold draw; that is why the scale is being requested. Mr. Golub would be in favor of a larger sign, but not as large as what is proposed. Ms. Chaitman would be willing to work with the petitioner on a sign that is less than what is proposed. Ms. Dunn and Ch. Coen agreed. Mr. Adkins noted the proposed sign is

located on the second floor of the building, which has a 30'4" roof height. Ch. Coen would prefer to see the sign centered vertically between the top of the gooseneck lights and the top edge masonry banding.

The commissioners discussed the east elevation diamond-shape wall signs. Ch. Coen noted the Zoning Ordinance allows only one sign per elevation. He interprets the proposal as five signs on the elevation. The commissioners are not in favor of allowing more than one sign on the elevation. Ms. Flores believes if the product listing is part of the name, they should be part of the Portillo's sign.

The commissioners discussed the proposed Portillo's wall sign on the south elevation. The proposed sign is 84 square feet while 80 square feet is allowed by the Zoning Ordinance. The commissioners are okay with the 84 square foot sign. Mr. Adkins noted the sign would be below the parapet. Ch. Coen recommended the sign be centered vertically between the top of the gooseneck lights and the roof cap.

The commissioners discussed the proposed Beef, Burgers, Salads, Shakes wall signs on the west elevation. Ch. Coen believes this is four signs rather than just one. Ms. Spagnoli noted the way signs are calculated make this one sign, because the gap is less than one foot between the diamond elements. Mr. Woodhead noted the letters would illuminate, but the entire sign face would not illuminate. Ch. Coen noted the petitioner is requesting 432 square feet while 69 square feet is allowed. Ms. Flores believes Beef Burgers Salads should be under the Portillo's name, as this is their logo. She noted "Shakes" is not part of the petitioner's name and would not be in favor of this sign. The commissioners agreed. If the sign is allowed, Ms. Low would be in favor of allowing the Portillo's sign to be 84 square feet with the additional Beef Burgers Salad portion added to the bottom of their logo. The other commissioners agreed.

The commissioners discussed the menu board ground sign. The proposed sign would be 36 square feet, which the Appearance Review Commission found acceptable. The commissioners discussed the three proposed directional signs. The signs are two square feet and would be illuminated. The commissioners would be in favor of allowing these signs to be illuminated.

Ms. Abruscato explained they would not be in favor of a dark, slimmed down building. Portillo's is trying to bring a nice building into Deerfield. They want to come into Deerfield but do not want to compromise the building to be something different than what Portillo's represents. Ch. Coen encouraged the petitioners to appear before the Mayor and Board of Trustees.

Items from the Commission:

Ms. Flores asked about the area behind the Sach's Center. She noted the trash dumpsters are in the drive aisles.

Items from Staff:

Appearance Review Commission

March 14, 2016

Page 8 of 8

Ms. Spagnoli explained the next Appearance Review Commission meeting will be next Monday. She would like to meet at 7:00 because Chris Siavelis needs to be at both the ARC meeting and the Village Board meeting.

Adjournment:

There being no further business or discussion, Ms. Dunn moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Golub seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously on a voice vote. The meeting was adjourned at 10:41 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeri Cotton
Secretary