

**MEETING MINUTES OF THE
LONG GROVE PLAN COMMISSION AND ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
REGULAR MEETING – NOVEMBER 1, 2016**

IN ATTENDANCE:

Chairman: Fred Phillips
Commissioners Present: Jeff Kazmer, Shelly Rubin, Jodi Smith, Charles Cohn, Helen Wilson, William Peltin
Commissioners Absent: None
Village Planner: James Hogue
Village Attorney: Betsy Gates-Alford
Clerk: Magdalena Dworak
Members of the Public

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** At 7:03 p.m., Chairman Phillips called the meeting to order.
2. **VISITOR’S BUSINESS:** None.
3. **NEW BUSINESS:** None.
4. **OLD BUSINESS:** Continuation of discussion concerning a proposed modification to a Village Ordinance, Title 5, Chapter 5, Section 5-9-5, “Signs.”

Discussion: Village Planner James Hogue initiated the discussion, providing an overview of the current “for sale” sign regulations in the Village and PCZBA’s prior discussions on the subject. The current “for sale” sign regulation has remained virtually unchanged since it was first adopted in 1957. While in 2007 and 2011 the signage regulations were amended, those amendments did not concern sign quantity or placement. PCZBA now seeks to make a recommendation to the Village Board to amend Section 5-9-5 of the Village Code by addressing the sizing, the quantity and the placement of **small real estate signs** within the Village.

The proposed modification reads as follows:

Small Real Estate Signs, within the B-1 District, one (1) real estate sign shall be permitted per lot or per principal structure. Except as otherwise specified provided herein, such signs must comply with the regulations for small real estate signs set forth in paragraph (F)(1) of this section. In addition, if a temporary real estate is affixed to a principal structure, then no such sign, or any portion thereof, shall be placed at a height of greater than seven (7) feet as measured from grade at the wall of the structure on which said sign is affixed to the upper most edge of the sign face.

Commissioner Kazmer noted that the seven (7) foot limitation did not seem to apply to signs mounted outside of the principal structure. Village Attorney Betsy Gates-Alford stated that in fact the modification addresses only signs attached to structures and does not address a sign that could possibly be mounted on a post or a similar structure. Planner Hogue stated that the

amendment could be further modified to address this issue and that a 7 foot limitation for the height from grade level to the upper side of the sign should be uniform and applicable to all small real estate signs in the Village and particularly in the Historic Downtown B-1 District.

Commissioner Peltin inquired about the applicability of the proposed modification to large real estate signs. Mike Sarlitto, of the public, asked whether the new amendment would apply to a “certain large sign by a blue building downtown.” Planner Hogue explained that the proposed amendment will apply only to small (6 square feet) real estate signs, not large real estate signs. Planner Hogue stated that large real estate signs are subject to separate regulations and require a permit.

Commissioner Cohn asked about the oversized real estate sign located on Arlington Heights Rd by Rt. 53. He said that that sign seemed way over the allowed size limits. Planner Hogue responded by explaining that that particular sign is in compliance with all current regulations because the size of the lot on which it is situated justifies its increased measurements.

A short discussion was had about the enforcement of the proposed amendment. Planner Hogue stated that, historically, the Village did not have any problems with enforcement of signage regulations. If, based on complaints, a person was found to be in violation, a citation was issued or the person voluntarily corrected the violation.

A discussion was had about whether the existing, noncomplying signs (particularly those in District B-1) would become subject to the amendment at any point in time. The Village Attorney stated that she was not aware as to how the amendment could be applied retroactively. Planner Hogue stated that once those buildings sell or are taken off the market, the amendment would apply to them at that time. The amendment is designed to deal with future signage.

Chairman Phillips directed the Village Attorney to make the additional modifications as discussed today. Once modified, the proposed amendment will be submitted to the Village Board for final approval.

Motion: Commissioner Kazmer made a motion to approve the amendment with the proposed modifications as discussed; seconded by Commissioner Peltin.

Voice Vote: All ayes. Motion carried.

5. Approval of Minutes of October 4, 2016:

Motion: Commissioner Cohn made a motion to approve the October 4, 2016 minutes as submitted; seconded by Commissioner Kazmer.

Voice Vote: All ayes. Motion carried.

6. OTHER BUSINESS:

Update to the Proposed Amendments to the Village of Long Grove Comprehensive Plan - Steering Committee Updates.

The Steering Committee meets every few months to update the residents on the Village's Comprehensive Plan. Many changes made to the Comprehensive Plan are the results of public hearings.

Mike Sarlitto and Rita O'Connor of the public, raised the issue of inability/difficulty they encountered while trying to post comments on the Village's webpage that was designed for communications with the residents.

Ms. O'Connor stated that the consultant report, for example, contains a number of erroneous statements and when she attempted to comment on the report, the webpage would not allow her to post any comments.

She also raised the following specific issues she had with the expert report: (1) the report stated that at the meeting held at the Grove, there was only one group contributing to the discussions there. There were in fact two groups. Rita stated that because the report negated one entire group of residents, who had valid concerns and questions, she, and many others, distrust the entire report; and (2) the report includes a proposal concerning an area near Rt. 83 and Aptakistic Road and erroneously states that there were discussions concerning this area. However, this area was never part of any discussions.

Planner Hogue said that he would check on the webpage and would also post her comments on the webpage. Ms. O'Connor said she was present at meetings with the consultant Teska Associates and her concerns were ignored.

Planner Hogue stated that when discussing these concerns with the consultant, the Committee should make sure that (1) all issues raised by the residents and interested parties are integrated, and (2) there is an ongoing communication about the residents' input, comments and concerns.

A short discussion was had about the projected time frame for the Comprehensive Plan to be completed, especially in the light of the upcoming municipal elections. Planner Hogue noted that due to variety of reasons, the process is taking a long time. Input from the residents is still being gathered. The current aim is to have the plan in order in the spring of 2017, if possible.

7. **ADJOURNMENT:** At 7:30 p.m., Commissioner Kazmer made a motion to adjourn; seconded by Commissioner Cohn. On a voice vote - all ayes, the meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Submitted by Magdalena Dworak.