

MINUTES OF THE APPEARANCE REVIEW COMMISSION
January 19, 2026

The regular meeting of the Appearance Review Commission was called to order by Commissioner Kollman at 4:06 p.m. at the Village Hall, 118 W. Cook Avenue.

Commissioner Neuendank made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Enochs, to appoint Commissioner Kollman as Chair Pro-tem for the January 19, 2026, Appearance Review Commission Meeting.

Members Present: Chair Pro-tem Mike Kollman, Brian Enochs, Tom Flader, Les Galo, Kevin Neuendank, and Dale Villiard.

Commissioner Galo was absent during roll call but arrived at 4:15 p.m. and was present for the remainder of the meeting.

Members Absent: None.

A quorum was established.

Village Staff Present: Heather Rowe, Director of Community Development, Tony Repp, Deputy Director of Community Development, and Wil Richardson, Planner.

Commissioner Flader made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Enochs, to approve the December 15, 2025, Appearance Review Commission meeting minutes, as written.

Motion carried 6 - 0.

OLD BUSINESS: None.

NEW BUSINESS:

**ARC 26-01 Shivam 9 Holdings, LLC, Authorized Agent for Anel Pasic, Property Owner;
Club Five Health, Tenant
1163 S. Milwaukee Avenue**

Request is for new signage.

Mr. Jaimin Patel presented the request for new signage at 1163 S. Milwaukee Avenue. Mr. Patel stated that they intend to replace the XSport signage with new signage for Club Five Health. Mr. Patel explained that he discussed the project and signage with staff. He stated that the building will be repainted to freshen it up from the previous tenant.

Commissioner Neuendank asked for clarification on the number of signs proposed. Mr. Patel indicated that monument sign panels and a wall sign are proposed.

Minutes of the January 19, 2026, Appearance Review Commission Meeting
Page 2 of 11

Commissioner Neuendank asked if the wall behind the previous XSport signs will be patched and repainted to match the color of the building. Mr. Patel stated that they intend to complete this work. He noted they need to wait for the weather to improve.

Ms. Heather Rowe, Director of Community Development, asked for clarification that the previous XSport signs on the left and right sides of the storefront entrance will be removed. Mr. Patel stated that these will be removed and the wall will be repainted to address any ghosting.

Mr. Wil Richardson, Planner, asked if the monument sign will be illuminated. Mr. Patel stated that the monument sign is not illuminated.

Commissioner Enochs made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Flader, to recommend that the Village Board of Trustees approve the application for new signage at 1163 S. Milwaukee Avenue, in accordance with the plans submitted.

Motion carried 5 - 0.

**ARC 26-02 Hering Signs | Signarama Libertyville, Authorized Agent for Filzah Pavalon, Property Owner; Toy Court, Tenant
401 E. Park Avenue #102**

Request is for new signage.

Mr. Aaron Hering presented the request for new signage at 401 E. Park Avenue #102. Mr. Hering stated that new channel letters will be installed on the storefront. The previous tenant had channel letters that stretched across the storefront, and the proposed sign will be shorter in length. He explained that the sign is for a toy store and the signage is designed to reflect that.

Commissioner Neuendank stated that he understood the staff comment to leave judgment on the appropriateness of the amount of colors to the Commission. Mr. Richardson explained that staff included this comment because the Appearance Code addresses colors in signage. In this situation, it appears that the colors support the business identity. Commissioner Neuendank stated his agreement with this interpretation.

Chair Pro-tem Kollman asked how many tenants are in the subject building. Mr. Hering stated that they are reserving space for an additional sign if needed for the other tenant.

Commissioner Neuendank made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Enochs, to recommend that the Village Board of Trustees approve the application for new signage at 401 E. Park Avenue, in accordance with the plans submitted.

Motion carried 5 - 0.

Minutes of the January 19, 2026, Appearance Review Commission Meeting
Page 3 of 11

**ARC 26-03 Prairie Retail Holdings, LLC, Authorized Agent for 7868 LLC, Property Owner; Good Behavior Co., Tenant
1195 S. Milwaukee Avenue**

Request is for new building facades, landscaping, lighting, and signage.

Mr. Joe Pascolla, JTS Architects, presented the request for new building facades, landscaping, lighting, and signage at 1195 S. Milwaukee Avenue. Mr. Pascolla explained that the project involves remodeling the Bakers Square property at 1195 S. Milwaukee Avenue into a multi-tenant property. The site will remain as existing apart from restriping and patching the parking lot. Existing utilities and delivery areas will remain. Mr. Pascolla indicated that minor façade changes will be included.

Mr. Pascolla noted that the gable on the front of the subject building will be modified to create additional room for multiple tenant wall signs. The glass solarium on the east elevation will be removed, and the space will be used as an open patio space. Everything else, except for the landscaping, will remain the same. Mr. Pascolla noted that the new landscape plan is code compliant. He explained that they will be keeping the existing access for the stairway and ADA ramp. On the elevations, Mr. Pascolla explained that the materials will remain the same, but the building will be painted. Mr. Pascolla brought a physical material board to showcase the colors of the building.

He noted that rooftop screening is included on the rear portion of the building. He is uncertain where the RTU will be located but indicated they are flexible on the type and location of screening. He noted that they will use a prefab metal roof screen.

Mr. Pascolla explained that they removed one wall sign and will be keeping a wall sign for each tenant on the east elevation as well as a monument sign. He reiterated they tried to keep much of the site as existing.

Mr. Pascolla noted that the photometric plan is compliant and they have addressed the staff comments.

Mr. Pascolla read through the staff comments listed in the ARC staff memorandum. He noted that the signs have been revised to comply with applicable illumination requirements for signage.

Ms. Heather Rowe, Director of Community Development, asked for clarification on how the colors and materials of the signage would be changed to address this requirement. Mr. Pascolla stated that the sign colors would be reversed so that the background is black with white colors. Only the letters will be illuminated.

Ms. Rowe asked how the lower tenant panel will be used in the interim before a tenant moves in. Mr. Pascolla stated they could leave it blank or black.

Mr. Pascolla stated that the existing wall sign was removed.

Minutes of the January 19, 2026, Appearance Review Commission Meeting
Page 4 of 11

Mr. Pascolla brought forward a staff comment regarding the photometric plan. Mr. Tony Repp, Deputy Director of Community Development, explained that staff noticed an excessive convergence of light in one location on the photometric plan. Mr. Pascolla explained that this was due to the location of the light fixtures, but efforts are being made to reduce the output.

Chair Pro-tem Kollman asked for clarification on the excessive light output in this location. Mr. Pascolla noted that lights were added for additional security. Chair Pro-tem Kollman asked why this location specifically. Mr. Wil Richardson, Planner, noted that the submitted plans indicated that this area would output 19 foot-candles, but it appears to be revised. Mr. Pascolla stated that this may have all been an error. There will be security lighting in the subject corner. Ms. Rowe noted that the lighting is otherwise compliant with the Zoning Code.

Mr. Pascolla explained that the inset diagrams on the photometric plan were revised to match one another.

Mr. Pascolla indicated that the rooftop screening would be a grayish color to stay neutral. Mr. Repp asked if this will match other components of the building. Mr. Pascolla noted that the screening will be a neutral color to match.

Commissioner Neuendank asked if the storefront is new. Mr. Pascolla confirmed. Commissioner Neuendank asked if the other elevations would remain the same. Mr. Pascolla confirmed. Commissioner Neuendank asked if the changes would be close to dark bronze. Mr. Pascolla confirmed. Commissioner Neuendank noted that the brick will be stained and the EIFS will get new paint. Mr. Pascolla confirmed. Commissioner Neuendank noted the wood would be painted. Mr. Pascolla confirmed. Commissioner Neuendank asked if the applicant will try to match the roof as best as they can during repitching and roof work. Mr. Pascolla confirmed.

Commissioner Flader asked if the windows will be opaque or clear. Mr. Pascolla stated that the windows will be clear. Commissioner Flader asked if they would be tinted. Commissioner Neuendank asked if you could see in from outside. Mr. Pascolla confirmed.

Mr. Richardson asked whether there were any additional comments on the proposed photometric plan. The photometric plan presented has reduced the measurements that staff pointed out and is in compliance with the Zoning Code. Commissioner Neuendank expressed that he does not have any issues. Chair Pro-tem Kollman asked if the light fixtures are being replaced. Mr. Pascolla is only replacing ones that are broken. Chair Pro-tem Kollman asked the applicant to show any light fixtures not presented at some point.

Commissioner Neuendank stated that he would like to see the signs again.

Commissioner Flader reviewed the landscaping with the Commission. Chair Pro-tem Kollman asked how much landscaping is existing versus new. Mr. Pascolla stated that it is approximately 50/50. Commissioner Neuendank asked if the large evergreen tree encroaching into the building will be removed. Mr. Pascolla stated that it would.

Minutes of the January 19, 2026, Appearance Review Commission Meeting
Page 5 of 11

Chair Pro-tem Kollman reviewed the signage with the applicant. He asked for confirmation that the background would be dark black with white letters, the signs would be illuminated, and all the signs would be consistently designed like this. Mr. Pascolla confirmed. Chair Pro-tem Kollman asked for confirmation from staff that the size is compliant. Staff confirmed. Chair Pro-tem Kollman stated that the photometric plan is acceptable based on the clarifications made. Chair Pro-tem Kollman stated that the applicant indicated the RTU will be located on the west portion of the building and screened appropriately. Mr. Pascolla confirmed. Mr. Pascolla asked if the unit must be screened from the parapet or if only the unit must be screened. Ms. Rowe stated that the unit can be screened. Mr. Pascolla explained that the location of the RTU screening shown is expected but may change. Chair Pro-tem Kollman stated that they would like to see that change when available. Chair Pro-tem Kollman stated that it appears the landscape plan is acceptable.

Chair Pro-tem Kollman asked if the Commission had any questions.

Chair Pro-tem Kollman stated that the project is an improvement and noted the various improvements and unaddressed items.

Chair Pro-tem Kollman opened the discussion for public comment.

Ms. Marie Deutschmann rescinded her comment.

Mr. Chandler Nissen rescinded his comment.

Ms. Carol Nissen, 1028 Dawes Street, stated she is a long-term resident and had a question about signage. Ms. Nissen stated that she understands the applicant is applying for a special use permit and text amendment to allow a cannabis dispensary, but stated that the Village does not have signage requirements specific to a cannabis dispensary. Lake County does have signage requirements for a cannabis dispensary, and she explained several of Lake County's requirements. Ms. Nissen stated that the Village should explore signage limitations for cannabis dispensaries to protect the community, similar to the limitations set by Lake County.

Ms. Rebecca Gables, 332 W. Austin Avenue, stated she is not in favor of the proposed dispensary.

Ms. Audrey McCartney, 337 1/2 W. Austin Avenue, stated that she understands this meeting is appearance-focused but would like to express that they are not in favor of the proposed dispensary.

Mr. Ted Hanagan, 156 W. Austin Avenue, expressed his appreciation of the appearance considerations of the Village, but believes that the proposed tenant would change perceptions of Libertyville, and is not in favor of the proposed dispensary.

Chair Pro-tem Kollman asked for confirmation from staff that the proposed signage is in compliance with the Village Zoning Code. Staff confirmed.

Commissioner Flader stated that the Commission has previously discussed the appropriateness of including a business description with the business signage name.

Minutes of the January 19, 2026, Appearance Review Commission Meeting
Page 6 of 11

Chair Pro-tem Kollman asked if staff had any comments on that. Staff stated that business descriptions as a part of signage are not explicitly regulated in the Zoning Code and explained that regulating content can be difficult.

Commissioner Enochs asked if a representative of the business could explain where “Good Behavior Co.” is registered. The business representative stated that it is a business name under Prairie Retail Holdings. Commissioner Enochs asked if the company has national branding. The business representative stated it does not. Commissioner Enochs asked if the company has any branding guidelines. The business representative stated they do not. Commissioner Enochs stated then that “Cannabis Dispensary” would not have to be included in the sign. The business representative confirmed. Commissioner Enochs brought forward the idea of removing that text from the signage. The business representative explained that it would not be a branding issue but could create a business issue. Commissioner Enochs stated that he believes that it would not harm the business identity to remove the “Cannabis Dispensary” language and has sympathy for the public comments regarding the signage.

Commissioner Enochs asked the Commission if the words “Cannabis Dispensary” could be removed from the sign. Commissioner Neuendank stated he had no issue with this.

Commissioner Enochs made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Neuendank, to recommend the Plan Commission approve the application for new building facades, landscaping, lighting, and signage at 1195 S. Milwaukee Avenue, with the following conditions: 1) The verbiage ‘Cannabis Dispensary’ shall be removed from all proposed signage; 2) Additional information shall be provided for the screening and location of the rooftop mechanical units to ensure the units are adequately screened; 3) The proposed signage colors shall be revised to white on black to ensure that the background is opaque and that only the letters are illuminated; and 4) Additional information shall be provided on the proposed light fixtures.

Motion carried 5 - 1, with Commissioner Flader voting against.

**ARC 26-04 Aston Villa Land Partners, LLC, Property Owner; Bath Concepts, Tenant
30532-30568 N. Harris Road**

Request is for new building facades, landscaping, lighting, and signage

Mr. Jim Brucato, Principal Construction Corp, presented the request for new building facades, landscaping, lighting, and signage. The subject site is bounded by Peterson Road to the south, Midlothian Road to the west, and the railroad to the east. Mr. Brucato introduced his team to the Commission. Mr. Brucato stated that this project is for Bath Concepts Inc.’s new facility. Mr. Brucato noted that this development will be on the portion of the site east of Harris Road and completely within the Village of Libertyville. The facility is organized linearly so that the office is on the southern component. Moving up north on the building is warehousing, light assembly, and finally a full manufacturing facility. Mr. Brucato stated the various professional groups who have worked and will work on designing and managing this project.

Minutes of the January 19, 2026, Appearance Review Commission Meeting
Page 7 of 11

Mr. Brucato noted the location of the truck docking area and parking areas. He also indicated locations for retention. Mr. Brucato stated that the tenant is forward-thinking, and it is their goal to design a quality, long lasting building.

Mr. Mike Baumstark, Nelson Worldwide, presented the architectural details of the proposed development. He noted the location of the main employee entrance on the SW corner of the building. He described the glass elements at this entrance. Predominantly, the building will be load-bearing precast with four different colors. He explained that the east side is primarily docks for the trucks.

Commissioner Neuendank asked about the projecting material that extends over the storefront. Mr. Baumstark stated this would be a type of manufactured metal material. Mr. Brucato stated that they are trying to avoid color fading.

Mr. Baumstark stated that they have not yet shown all their signage. He stated that the ground sign meets the signage code and stated that it has a translucent panel. He stated that the two trash enclosures will be screened with a material that matches the building and extends above the containers.

Commissioner Neuendank asked if the boiler room is shown on the elevations. Mr. Baumstark stated that it is not, but it will be constructed out of the same precast concrete.

Chair Pro-tem Kollman asked how many levels are in this building. Mr. Baumstark stated that the office is two stories, but the rest of the building is one story.

Mr. Danny O'Brian, Teska Associates, presented the landscape plans. He stated that the facility will have perimeter foundation plantings and landscaped parking lot areas. In front will be the southern perimeter planting area to serve as a buffer along Peterson. The parkway coming up will have landscaping. The stormwater areas to the north and the south will also have landscaping. The north side of the landscape is primarily designed for stormwater retention. The western landscape buffer will have a variety of evergreen and ornamental plantings. There is also some landscaping in the northern portion of the site. He stated that the area designated for land banking will be designed as lawn area for now until future landscaping plans are designed.

Mr. O'Brian explained that they designed the landscaping to play off the patterning and size of the architecture. He showed that there is a landscaped terrace for employees and landscaping for the monument sign. Mr. O'Brian presented renderings to showcase the screening of the truck court. He also explained how they will address the comments about additional screening in this area.

Chair Pro-tem Kollman asked what the plan is for the agricultural area to the west of Harris Road. Mr. O'Brian stated that it will be mass graded and prepared for future development but planted with crops in the meantime. Mr. Brucato stated that it is likely that the lot to the SE of the building would be developed next. The site needs to be graded to the west to balance the site.

Minutes of the January 19, 2026, Appearance Review Commission Meeting
Page 8 of 11

Chair Pro-tem Kollman asked about the trees that will be removed within this area of the site to the west of Harris Road. Mr. Brucato stated that since this area will be graded, the trees cannot be saved.

Chair Pro-tem Kollman asked what the depth of the stormwater detention ponds will be. Mr. O'Brian stated they are approximately 6 to 7 feet in depth. He clarified that these are normal detention ponds.

Commissioner Flader asked if there is any rail access to the site. It was stated that there is not.

Chair Pro-tem Kollman asked what the waste management plan is. Mr. Brucato stated that much of the waste is recycled, and other waste is minimized. The tenant has a grinder on-site. The tenant resells a lot of material which is warehoused within the facility and shipped by truck.

Chair Pro-tem Kollman stated that the Commission should go through the staff comments.

Mr. Brucato discussed the staff comment regarding the rooftop screening. He stated that the units will likely have screening attached to the units, similarly to the Pharma Logistics property. He stated that the details have not yet been provided.

Mr. Wil Richardson, Planner, asked when these details may be provided. Mr. Brucato stated that a timeline is not certain yet, but they can provide examples. Commissioner Neuendank stated that the applicant will likely need to come back for screening, which has not been shown. He suggested that the applicant figure out their design process first and then figure out what the screening elements are and present those afterwards.

Ms. Heather Rowe, Director of Community Development, asked about the potential height of the screening. Mr. Brucato stated that this is very dependent on the type of system they choose.

Mr. Brucato discussed the staff comment regarding a signage discrepancy. Mr. Richardson stated that it appears this was a rendering issue which a member of the team had clarified to staff.

Mr. Brucato discussed the staff comment regarding the illumination of the monument sign. Mr. Baumstark stated that the ground sign will have a panel that is translucent. Chair Pro-tem Kollman asked if only the letters will be illuminated. The applicant confirmed. Ms. Rowe asked if there will be a material to ensure the background is not illuminated. Mr. Tony Repp, Deputy Director of Community Development, stated how this could be done. Mr. Baumstark stated that they will reverse the colors to have a dark background and white letters. Mr. Baumstark stated he will revise the signage plan because it currently states that the lower two panels would also be illuminated.

Mr. Richardson stated the proposed wall sign is a variation that has been requested by the applicant to increase the maximum permitted sign area. He noted that the Village has approved similar variations due to the size of the buildings.

Minutes of the January 19, 2026, Appearance Review Commission Meeting
Page 9 of 11

Mr. Brucato discussed the comment regarding the parking lot landscaping height. Mr. Danny O'Brian stated that they will revise the landscape planting heights to be compliant with the Zoning Code. He asked if deciduous shrubs could be used alongside the parking lot because of salt concerns. Mr. Richardson asked that they update the landscape schedule.

Ms. Rowe stated that the Commission could discuss the scale of the proposed signage. The Commission did not have an issue with the signage's scale.

Mr. Richardson explained that the next comment is a variation to reduce the amount of parking lot screening, which the Commission could discuss. Mr. Danny O'Brian stated that they are requesting a variation because any new development on the southeast corner of the development would interfere with these plantings and they would prefer to create a landscape plan for the future development instead. The other variation is regarding the eastern portion of the truck court. They would like to utilize the existing landscape buffer next to the rail. Ms. Rowe asked if this hedge next to the rail is within the management of the subject property. The applicant stated that it is not. Ms. Rowe stated that this area of landscaping could potentially be removed then by the other property owner. Mr. O'Brian stated that there are also utilities that they would like to not interfere with.

Mr. Brucato stated they are requesting a variation to the height of the building for the entry feature. Commissioner Neuendank stated that he is in favor of the entry feature height.

Commissioner Enochs stated that he is very supportive of this project and that it is well designed.

Mr. Richardson explained the first staff comment on the tree preservation plan. Mr. O'Brian stated they did a full tree inventory of this area and stated that the trees were not of good quality and therefore not preserved.

Mr. Richardson asked if any ground-mounted mechanical equipment is proposed. Mr. Brucato stated that there is a potential for silos. The applicant indicated the location of these silos. Mr. Richardson stated these silos should go back to the ARC with the RTU units. Mr. Richardson asked if any equipment is exposed from the boiler room and recommended that a drawing be provided. Mr. Brucato stated that it is just a room.

Mr. Richardson brought forward the next staff comment regarding the area designated for land banked parking spaces. Mr. O'Brian stated that it will be prepared as lawn area until it is determined if the additional parking spaces are needed. The rest of the landscaping would then be installed.

Mr. Richardson stated that a final landscape plan should be prepared that shows the species on the plans instead of an illustrative plan. The applicant confirmed they will do this.

Mr. Richardson explained the last staff comment which asked for additional screening to the truck court. Mr. O'Brian stated that they would like to reorganize the quantity and location of the plants as shown to improve the line of sight screening to the truck court. Mr. O'Brian clarified that they

Minutes of the January 19, 2026, Appearance Review Commission Meeting
Page 10 of 11

would not like to add more landscaping between the two parcels to prevent redundancy when a new development is proposed.

Commissioner Neuendank expressed his opinion that a sufficient amount of landscaping has been provided along Peterson Road. Chair Pro-tem Kollman stated that he thinks a little more landscaping and screening could be introduced for the line of sight. He stated that the applicant should be careful not to cause a visibility issue.

Mr. Brucato asked if there is a fencing component along the southeastern portion of the site. He asked if this component helps with the line of sight to the truck court while driving down Peterson Road. Mr. O'Brian stated that a berm would not be possible. Mr. Brucato stated they will explore options for screening.

Chair Pro-tem Kollman asked if the Commission had any more questions. Chair Pro-tem Kollman asked if there was any public comment.

Commissioner Neuendank made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Enochs, to recommend the Plan Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals approve the application for new building facades, landscaping, signage and lighting at 30532-30568 N. Harris Road with the following conditions: 1) Any additional items beyond the plans presented shall be brought back to the Appearance Review Commission for review, including but not limited to RTU screening, silos, elevation changes, landscaping, and signage. 2) The monument signage shall be changed to an opaque background with only translucent letters to comply with applicable zoning requirements. 3) The height of the proposed plantings for parking lot screening shall be increased to comply with applicable zoning requirements. 4) Additional landscaping and screening shall be provided for the loading dock court to reduce the line of sight.

Motion carried 6 - 0.

COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Neuendank stated the public raised a good point and that it would be a good idea to explore specific signage requirements for cannabis dispensaries. He requested that staff research this topic. He also thanked staff for their excellent customer service, as reported in the 2025 Community Development report.

Ms. Heather Rowe, Director of Community Development, thanked Commissioner Neuendank.

Chair Pro-tem Kollman asked what the process would be to review signage requirements for cannabis dispensaries. Ms. Rowe stated that staff would include these comments for the Plan Commission. The Plan Commission may ask for additional text modifications to address signage.

Chair Pro-tem Kollman asked if Lake County has its own requirements. Ms. Rowe stated she believes that Lake County does and that the State has a few of its own restrictions. Chair Pro-tem

Minutes of the January 19, 2026, Appearance Review Commission Meeting
Page 11 of 11

Kollman stated his agreement that it could be good to explore these options to ensure the Village makes educated decisions.

Chair Pro-tem Kollman asked where the Village is with considering mural regulations. Ms. Rowe provided an update on the status of this project. Chair Pro-tem Kollman asked if this should be discussed with the Commission. Ms. Rowe stated that it would be brought to the Commission when staff has completed their report. Chair Pro-tem Kollman stated it would be good to prepare for this.

Ms. Rowe stated that there is an upcoming training meeting regarding the Open Meetings Act. Commissioner Flader asked if the Commission's personal emails are subject to FOIA. Ms. Rowe explained how the Village FOIA process works.

Commissioner Flader asked if Village emails may be more appropriate for communication. Ms. Rowe stated that anything on the Village server may be subject to FOIA, and that the Village has not provided Village-owned emails for any Commissions.

With no further discussion, Commissioner Enochs moved, and Commissioner Villiard seconded a motion to adjourn.

Motion carried 6 - 0.

Meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.