

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: **APPEARANCE REVIEW COMMISSION**
Sarah Burger, Chair
Dale Villiard
Brian Enochs
Tom Flader
Les Galo
Mike Kollman
Kevin Neuendank

FROM: Wil Richardson, Planner

DATE: October 17, 2025

RE: Materials for the Appearance Review Commission Meeting
on **Monday, October 20, 2025**

The following is the list of cases scheduled for the Appearance Review Commission Meeting on Monday, October 20, 2025. **The meeting will be held in the Board Room of the Village Hall at 118 W. Cook Avenue, Libertyville, IL.** If you should have any questions or comments regarding any of the items below, please feel free to contact me at (847) 918-2028.

OLD BUSINESS:

NEW BUSINESS:

| **ARC 25-25:** 1133 S. Milwaukee Ave

Applicant(s): Brandy Flores, All Right Sign Inc., Authorized Agent for Anel Pasic, Owner.

Tenant: Caravel Autism Health

Request: Request is for signage.

Suggested Action: *The Appearance Review Commission shall forward a recommendation to the Village Board of Trustees.*

APPEARANCE CODE AND ZONING CODE ISSUES:

None.

Memorandum to the Appearance Review Commission
Page 2 of 9

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. The façade surface behind the wall sign should be repainted to remove any stains, markings, or fading left by the previous sign. The new paint must match the rest of the façade.
 2. Staff observes that all the other existing wall signs within the Green Tree Plaza consist of individual channel letters mounted on a raceway. Consideration shall be given to revising the proposed signage to use individually mounted channel letters to maintain consistency with the existing sign styles in the plaza instead of being mounted on a single backer pan as shown on the plans submitted.
-

| ARC 25-26: 221 Park Pl.

Applicant(s): St. Joseph Catholic Church

Request: Request is for new playground.

Suggested Action: The Appearance Review Commission shall forward a recommendation to the Village Board of Trustees.

APPEARANCE CODE AND ZONING CODE ISSUES:

None.

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. Staff notes that the utilization of bollards, as shown in the provided renderings, will serve as a temporary safety measure and that the applicant intends to submit fencing plans at a later date.
-

| ARC 25-27: 375 W. Winchester Rd

Applicant(s): Matt Laska, North Shore Sign Inc., Authorized Agent for NorthEnd Apartments, LLC., Owner.

Request: Request is for signage.

Suggested Action: The Appearance Review Commission shall forward a recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals

APPEARANCE CODE AND ZONING CODE ISSUES:

1. Per the Zoning Code Sec. 26-11-9(b5), freestanding signs in the residential districts shall be set back a minimum distance of fifteen (15) feet from all lot lines or from the public right-of-way.

C: The proposed signage shown on the plans prepared by North Shore Sign, dated November 26, 2024, indicates that the freestanding sign will be set back seven (7) feet from the northern public right-of-way. The applicant has requested a variation to reduce the required setback for a freestanding sign within a residential district.

2. Per the Zoning Code Sec. 26-11-9(b3), the maximum gross surface area for a freestanding sign in a residential district shall not exceed twelve (12) square feet per sign face.

C: The proposed signage shown on the plans prepared by North Shore Sign, dated November 26, 2024, indicates a gross surface area of approximately 30 square feet, which exceeds the maximum permitted twelve (12) square feet. The applicant has not requested a variation to increase the maximum gross surface area for a freestanding sign within a residential district. This variation shall be added to the request prior to review by the Zoning Board of Appeals.

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. The applicant is scheduled to be heard before the Zoning Board of Appeals on November 10, 2025 for a variation to reduce the required setback for a freestanding sign in a residential district.
2. Staff notes a discrepancy in the height shown on the Front and Side View illustrations of the proposed sign on the plans prepared by North Shore Sign, dated November 26, 2024. The Front View notes a height of 5'-0", while the Side View notes a height of 5'-4½". Clarify this discrepancy and revise the plans accordingly.

| ARC 25-28: 939 E. Park Ave

Applicant(s): Robert Bleck, Authorized Agent for Jeff Davidson, Owner

Request: Request is for building facades, lighting and signage.

Suggested Action: The Appearance Review Commission shall forward a recommendation to the Village Board of Trustees.

APPEARANCE CODE AND ZONING CODE ISSUES:

None.

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. This project was initially presented and approved in mid-2022, including a conditional use, setback variation, ARC review, and site plan. In 2023, several minor changes were made to the approved plan. The applicant resubmitted for the approval of all items previously approved, along with revisions in September of 2024, given that the prior approvals had expired. The applicant is now presenting additional revisions to the approved plans that include various changes to the building facades, fencing and the removal of a proposed addition.
-

| ARC 25-29: 610 Peterson Rd

Applicant(s): Pulte Home Company, LLC (SB Holdings, LTD)

Owner(s): Debra Stokovich, SB Reserve Properties Inc., SB Holdings LTD

Request: Request is for building facades, landscaping, signage & lighting.

Suggested Action: The Appearance Review Commission shall forward a recommendation to the Plan Commission.

APPEARANCE CODE AND ZONING CODE ISSUES:

None.

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. Staff has found that the final development plans submitted by the applicant are in substantial conformance with the preliminary development plans as they relate to matters under the purview of the ARC.
2. Staff understands that the applicant has not made any revisions to the approved building elevation and color packages or the anti-monotony plans and will therefore remain as previously approved in the preliminary plans.

Memorandum to the Appearance Review Commission
Page 5 of 9

3. As part of the Board of Trustees review, the proposed public park designed in coordination with the Libertyville Recreation Department was relocated, swapping places with the homes north of its previous location. This change included a request for added parking spaces around the playground and modified curb cuts, which consequently eliminated the opportunity for street trees around the park that were previously shown. As indicated on Sheet L2.0, Final Landscape Schedule, of the plans prepared by Kimley Horn and dated October 7, 2025, the number of proposed street trees were reduced from 158 to 122. The proposed reduction does not appear to match the number of trees previously shown that were removed around the park. Clarify whether any trees were removed outside of the park relocation and indicate if those trees are proposed to be relocated. The relocation of street trees is not necessary for conformity with the preliminary landscape plans.

Additionally, at the February 17, 2025, ARC meeting, it was requested that the street tree species be distributed evenly. While the schedule was revised in response, the current street tree distribution appears less balanced. Consideration should be given to providing an evenly distributed variety of street tree species consistent with the approved preliminary landscape plan, at the time of permit application, subject to review by staff and the Village Arborist.

| ARC 25-30: 200 E Cook Ave

Applicant(s): Village of Libertyville

Request: Request is for building facades, landscaping & lighting

Proposal: The applicant, Village of Libertyville, is proposing to construct a new Police Station at 200 E. Cook Avenue. The proposal includes demolition of the existing Police Station and the construction of a new, larger building to provide a contemporary municipal facility for Police services on the same site. The subject property is zoned in the IB Institutional Buildings District.

Suggested Action: The Appearance Review Commission shall forward a recommendation to the Plan Commission

STANDARDS AND CONSIDERATIONS FOR EXTERIOR DESIGN ELEMENTS
(APPEARANCE CODE SEC. 7-57):

The following is an excerpt from Chapter 7 of the Village of Libertyville Municipal Code containing the visual compatibility standards by which all projects are reviewed:

Visual compatibility. All development and redevelopment requiring approval of exterior design elements shall meet the following standards for visual compatibility:

Memorandum to the Appearance Review Commission

Page 6 of 9

- a. *Height.* The height of the proposed building or structure shall be visually compatible with adjacent buildings.
- b. *Proportion of front facade.* The relationship of the width to the height of the front facade of the proposed building or structure shall be visually compatible with buildings, public ways, and places to which it is visually related.
- c. *Proportion of openings.* The relationship of the width to height of windows of the proposed building or structure shall be visually compatible with buildings, public ways, and places to which it is visually related.
- d. *Rhythm of solids to voids in front facades.* The relationship of solids to voids in the front facade of the proposed building or structure shall be visually compatible with buildings, public ways, and places to which it is visually related.
- e. *Rhythm of spacing and buildings on streets.* The relationship of a building or structure to the open space between it and adjoining buildings or structures shall be visually compatible with the buildings, public ways, and places to which it is visually related.
- f. *Rhythm of entrance porch and other projections.* The relationship of entrances and other projections of the proposed building or structure to sidewalks shall be visually compatible with the buildings, public ways, and places to which it is visually related.
- g. *Relationship of materials, texture, and color.* The relationship of the materials, texture, and color of the facade of the proposed building or structure shall be visually compatible with the predominant materials used in the buildings and structures to which it is visually related.
- h. *Roof shapes.* The roof shape of the proposed building or structure shall be visually compatible with the buildings to which it is visually related.
- i. *Walls of continuity.* Building facades and appurtenances such as walls, fences, and landscape masses shall, when it is a characteristic of the area, form cohesive walls of enclosure along a street to ensure visual compatibility with the buildings, public ways, and places to which such elements are visually related.
- j. *Scale of building.* The size and mass of the proposed building or structure in relation to open spaces, windows, door openings, porches, and balconies shall be visually compatible with the buildings, public ways, and places to which it is visually related.
- k. *Directional expression of front elevation.* A building shall be visually compatible with the buildings, public ways, and places to which it is visually related in its directional character, whether this be vertical character, horizontal character, or nondirectional character.

Memorandum to the Appearance Review Commission
Page 7 of 9

Quality of design and site development. All development and redevelopment requiring approval of exterior design elements shall be evaluated pursuant to the following quality of design and site development criteria:

- a. *Open spaces.* The quality of the open spaces between buildings and between street and facade.
- b. *Materials.* The quality of materials and their relationship to those of existing adjacent structures.
- c. *General design.* The quality of the design in general and its relationship to the overall character of neighborhood.
- d. *General site development.* The quality of the site design development in terms of landscaping and other aesthetic features

APPEARANCE CODE AND ZONING CODE ISSUES:

1. Per the Zoning Code Sec. 26-9-2.12. *Exterior lighting*, any permitted accessory lighting fixtures shall be so designed, arranged, and operated as to prevent glare and direct rays of light from being cast onto any adjacent public or private property or street and so as not to produce excessive sky-reflected glare. Except for street lights, no exterior light in or adjacent to any residential district shall be so designed, arranged, or operated to produce an intensity of light exceeding two (2) foot candle at any non-residential lot line and one-half (½) foot candle at any residential lot line.

C: Sheet E0.02, Electric Site Lighting Photometric Plan, of the plans designed by FGM Architects, dated October 10, 2025, shows that the proposed foot candle will exceed one-half foot-candle at the north-west residential lot line. The applicant has committed to adjusting the foot-candle levels along the northwest lot line. Additionally, the applicant has committed to evaluating the final location and design of the fixtures and will implement shielding or other modifications as needed to remove off-site glare.

2. Per the Zoning Code Sec. 25-13-3.1, in addition to the requirements of [section 26-13-2](#) for perimeter landscaped open space, every parking lot shall be buffered and screened with appropriate screening devices such as decorative walls, fences, or berms. The landscaping and screening treatment shall be designed and maintained to a height of at least six (6) feet along every lot line abutting a residential district and to a height of at least three (3) feet along every other lot line (see figure 26-13-2). For parking lot screening installed along lot lines abutting a residential district, the landscaping and screening treatment shall have a minimum height of three (3) feet at time of planting.

*C: Based on Sheet L1.00, Site Landscape Plan, additional screening treatment and/or landscaping should be provided at the north-west corner of the subject development where a non-solid fence is proposed to ensure compliance with six foot screening along the residential lot lines abutting the School street subdivision. **The applicant has acknowledged the requirement for screening and has committed to modify the landscape plan to include evergreen trees and plantings that will sufficiently screen the north-west corner of the subject property's parking lot and to provide additional privacy panels on the western parking lot fence.***

*C2: On Sheet L1.00, Site Landscape Plan, the evergreen shrubs proposed along the property lines are stated to be approximately 24" in height. **The applicant has acknowledged the requirement for screening and has committed to modify the landscape plan to raise the height of the evergreen shrubs to 36" at the time of planting.***

3. Per the Zoning Code Sec. 26-13-2.2, every required perimeter landscaped open space shall consist of a combination of shade and ornamental trees, evergreen trees and shrubs (see figure 26-13-1).

*C: Several of the proposed canopy trees shown on Sheet L1.00, Site Landscape Plan, are sized at 1.5" caliper. The Zoning Code Sec. 26-13-2.2 only considers trees to meet the perimeter landscaped open space requirement if they are sized between 2" and 4.5" caliper. **The applicant has acknowledged this requirement and has committed to modify the landscape planting schedule to increase the size of the proposed canopy trees to at least 2" caliper.***

*C2: Based on Sheet L1.00, Site Landscape Plan, there are not currently any evergreen trees proposed on the landscape plan, however, in accordance with Zoning Code Sec. 26-13-2.2(d), when unique natural features such as topography, soil, geological characteristics, water features and existing vegetation; or space limitations such as an unusually shaped lot; or the location of existing structures and other built features make it impractical to comply with the requirements of subsection 26-13-2.2, the board of trustees may approve in writing, substitutions to the quantity, size and distribution of required plant materials. **Staff acknowledges that the proposed landscape plan does not currently include evergreen trees. The applicant is requesting approval from the Board of Trustees to omit the requirement of evergreen trees due to impracticality with the existing grade, retaining walls, and other ecological factors that would prevent their long-term health. However, the applicant has committed to incorporate some evergreen trees into the plan at the time of permit, notably at the northwest corner of the site, to provide additional screening.***

Memorandum to the Appearance Review Commission

Page 9 of 9

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. The applicant has provided imagery of a wall sign in the building elevations and rendering for representation purposes only. Staff notes that a separate signage package will be submitted at a later date for review by the Appearance Review Commission.
 2. At the time of building permit application, the building elevation plans shall reflect the following:
 - I. The material and color of the overhead doors on Sheet A2.00, Exterior Elevations.
 - II. The color and opacity of the spandrel glass on Sheet A2.01 an A2.03, Exterior Elevations.
 3. Given the relatively minor changes indicated by Staff, which the applicant has committed to resolving, the project will proceed to review by the Plan Commission and is not expected to return to the Appearance Review Commission except for any future signage proposals.
-