



buildings in development around Chicagoland. He stated they have used this proposed-building design many times, and it has worked well in different states. Mr. Groves showed a material sample board and stated the proposed building would be done in a modular brick with limestone at the base of the building, and the trim done in hardy board. He stated the name of the facility may be changed to Glen Oak Memory Care instead.

Chairman Burdett asked if the sidewalk would remain to which Mr. Groves stated it would.

Commissioner Loftus asked about the rooftop screening to which Mr. Groves showed a picture of the proposed rooftop screening and stated the screening would be made of hardy board siding painted to match the color of the shingles so it will blend in. Commissioner Loftus asked about the generator and sound screening for this. Mr. Groves stated the generator is only there for emergencies and should not run often.

Commissioner Albrecht entered the meeting at 7:25 p.m.

Mr. Groves stated there will be an interior courtyard, and they will be using the same materials in the courtyard as are proposed on the exterior of the building. He stated there will be a trellis in the courtyard as well.

Chairman Burdett asked about the columns to which Mr. Groves stated the columns will be a fiberglass product painted to match the limestone base on the building.

Mr. Groves stated the ground sign will be located on the south side of the driveway that connects to Park Boulevard. Commissioner Loftus suggested it would be better if the sign is on the north side of the driveway so it is not blocked by any cars turning onto Park Boulevard from the driveway. Mr. Groves stated he liked this suggestion. Chairman Burdett asked about how much traffic will be coming and going in this facility. Mr. Groves stated since it is a memory-care facility, the residents do not drive so traffic would consist of staff, visitors and deliveries. Mr. Groves showed a rendering of the proposed ground sign and stated the materials on the sign will match those used on the building. He stated the sign would have external illumination, and there will be two flag poles, one of each side of the sign.

Mr. Groves stated the trash enclosure will be around the back. He stated the enclosure's materials will match the materials proposed for the building, and the enclosure will have metal doors. He stated a 4-foot retaining wall is proposed along the west and south property lines. He stated a 6-foot tall wrought iron fence would be located on top of the wall.

Mr. Groves stated for the lighting plan, there will be lighting by the flag poles and in the parking lot as well as bollard lighting by the path in back of the building.

An audience member asked about the square footage of the proposed sign as she is concerned about the sign's visibility. Mr. Groves stated the sign is 38 square feet on the face, but this square footage does not include the columns on the side of the sign. Mr. Groves stated he did not have the total square footage of the sign with him. He stated this will be a 2-sided sign seen from both the north and the south on Park Boulevard.

Commissioner Dieter asked if the developer had talked to Glenbard South High School about any impact on its property. Mr. Groves stated they have not spoken with anyone from the school, but a recent newspaper article quoted that the school has no issue with the proposed project. Ms. Stegall stated the Village sent a courtesy copy of the plan to the school district a few months ago, but the Village has had no specific response from the school district. Ms. Stegall stated that with this proposed development, the Village plans to annex a 300-foot strip of the high school's property which will give the property at 2S678 Park Boulevard contiguity to the Village limits and that upon requesting the required paperwork to process the Glenbard South annexation in order to facilitate the proposed project, it was promptly return to the Village from District 87.

Commissioner Burket stated he is fine with the design as the building is functional. He stated he has no problem with where the building sits on the property.

Commissioner Albrecht stated this was a thoughtfully put-together design. She stated this is a great building which will look good on the property.

Commissioner Loftus asked about shutters across the windows to which Mr. Groves stated the shutters are yet to be determined. Commissioner Loftus stated the building looks nice, and it will be a welcome addition to the Village.

Commissioner Thompson stated she appreciated the good presentation and thanked the petitioner for the landscape plans and traffic studies.

Commissioner Dieter stated the design is good and suggested the petitioner look into sound-silencers for the generator. He stated he would like the sidewalk to stay.

Chairman Burdett stated the petitioner was respectful of the Appearance Review Guidelines. He stated he likes the low-slung look to the building and the landscape plan.

An audience member asked if the petitioner's presentation is on the Village's website to which Ms. Stegall stated it is not on the website, but the audience is welcome to look at the hard copies of the plans.

Commissioner Thompson made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed plan for exterior appearance as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Dieter and carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

## **6. Chairman's Report**

None

## **7. Trustee's Report**

None

**8. Staff Report**

Ms. Stegall stated there is nothing on the July 22<sup>nd</sup> agenda yet, but there will likely be a meeting on August 12<sup>th</sup> to discuss a possible retail building on Roosevelt Road.

**9. Adjourn**

As there was no other business to discuss, Chairman Burdett asked for a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Loftus moved, seconded by Commissioner Albrecht to adjourn the meeting at 8:05 p.m. The motion carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

Submitted by: Debbie Solomon, Recording Secretary

Reviewed by: Michele Stegall, Village Planner