



VILLAGE OF WILMETTE

1200 Wilmette Avenue
WILMETTE, ILLINOIS 60091-0040

MEETING MINUTES

APPEARANCE REVIEW COMMISSION

MONDAY, DECEMBER 1, 2014

7:30 P.M.

SECOND FLOOR TRAINING ROOM

Members Present: William Bradford
Daniel Elkins
Craig Phillips
Tim Sheridan, Chairman
Carrie Woleben-Meade

Members Absent: Dan Collyer
Mason Miller

Guests: John Phelan, 1342 Elmwood
Todd Markman, 809 Ridge Road
Eric Smoot, 1211 Washington
Silviu Gansca, 1211 Washington
Cody Hague, 34 Forest Avenue, River Forest
Tony Perry, 564 Lincoln, Winnetka
Spencer Padget, 564 Lincoln, Winnetka
Anthony Perry, 564 Lincoln, Winnetka

Staff Present: Lucas Sivertsen, Planner III

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Sheridan called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES; APPEARANCE REVIEW COMMISSION MEETING OF NOVEMBER 3, 2014.

Mr. Bradford moved the Commission approve the November 3, 2014 meeting minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Phillips. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan and Commissioners Bradford, Elkins, Phillips, Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

III. CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Phillips moved to approve an Appearance Review Certificate for Case 2014-AR-37, 1221 Green Bay Road, Green Bay Animal Hospital, Awning. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elkins. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan and Commissioners Bradford, Elkins, Phillips, Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

IV. CONTINUANCES

Mr. Elkins moved to continued Case 2014-AR-29, 825 Green Bay Road, Hoffmann Commercial Real Estate; Case 2014-AR-33, 911 Michigan, Michigan Shores Club; and Case 2014-AR-21, 111 Green Bay Road, Firefly Kitchen to the January 5, 2015 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bradford. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan and Commissioners Bradford, Elkins, Phillips, Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

V. CASES

**2014-AR-36
State Farm Insurance**

**809 Ridge Road
Sign Variation**

Mr. Sivertsen called Case 2014-AR-36, 809 Ridge, State Farm Insurance, for a sign variation to display more than one window sign and an additional seven items of information.

Mr. Phelan stated he was the sign contractor representing the State Farm agent. They were requesting approval for a new wall sign and window sign to replace graphics that were updated by their corporate offices.

Mr. Sheridan asked for clarification on why the variations were required.

Mr. Sivertsen said the applicant's proposed window graphics were laid out in a configuration that had two distinct sign areas. Only one window sign is permitted for the business. In addition, the window sign consisting of a red stripe with lettering was proposed to display 14 items of information. The code only allows seven items of information per sign.

Mr. Sheridan asked if the existing window sign was approved by the Commission.

Mr. Sivertsen said the existing striped window sign was installed without a permit.

Mr. Phelan said that sign was installed by another sign company and that he was not aware the sign had been installed illegally until Mr. Sivertsen discovered the signage and brought it to his attention during the application process.

Ms. Woleben-Meade asked if State Farm was alerted after they put in the signage that it was non-conforming.

Mr. Sivertsen said the signage wasn't discovered until the most recent application.

Mr. Markman said he assumed his sign contractor, Sign a Rama, obtained a permit to install the sign.

Mr. Elkins said he thought the proposed signage had already been installed.

Mr. Sheridan asked about the hours of operation.

Mr. Sivertsen said hours of operation are considered exempt signage and do not require a permit or review by the Appearance Review Commission. It was not part of the variation.

Mr. Sheridan asked if there was any particular reason the hours of operation were located where they were in the proposal. He asked if they could configure the signage in a different way so a variation was not required. The items of information would still be an issue but maybe they could eliminate at least one variation.

Mr. Phelan said State Farm's corporate offices specified where the hours should be located on the building. Regarding the items of information he asked if each tag line could be counted as one item of information.

Mr. Phillips said that's not how the code defined descriptive words. Each word was a separate item of information.

Ms. Woleben-Meade referred back to a similar case when Coldwell Banker wanted to display a similar sign. The Commission denied that request.

Mr. Phillips said that while State Farm's corporate offices have signage packages, not every State Farm agent is able to display the same exact signage. Corporate branding is made to fit the situation, and in this case the signage isn't permitted by code.

Ms. Woleben-Meade said she felt the standards of review should be applied consistently. If the past variation was not granted she didn't feel she could support the requested variation. She asked how the stripe would be regulated.

Mr. Sivertsen said the stripe itself, without any words, symbols, or graphics would not be regulated by the sign code, but would need a Certificate.

Mr. Sheridan agreed with Ms. Woleben-Meade and pointed out it wouldn't be fair to other applicants who changed their signage to conform to the sign regulations. There was no unique hardship in this case.

Ms. Woleben-Meade asked the applicant if they would like to amend their request and vote on only the conforming signage.

Mr. Markman indicated he would like the Commission to vote on the conforming signage.

Mr. Bradford moved to grant an Appearance Review Certificate for Case 2014-AR-36, 809 Ridge, State Farm Insurance, based on the plans submitted with the amendment to remove the lettering on the striped red window vinyl. The motion was seconded by Mr. Phillips. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan and Commissioners Bradford, Elkins, Phillips, Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

**2014-AR-32
Newlook Construction**

**905-907 Ridge Road
Appearance Review Certificate**

Mr. Sivertsen called Case 2014-AR-32, 905-907 Ridge Road, Newlook Construction, requesting an Appearance Review Certificate to construct an addition to the rear of the building to accommodate an attached garage.

Mr. Freiburger stated they would like to construct an attached garage on the rear of the building. The design intent was to complement the building by using a stone veneer material to match the front façade and wood siding to match the rear of the building. The scale of the addition was done to accommodate the proposed function of the garage. The square windows at the top of the building were proposed to match the windows in the addition of the adjacent auto body shop.

The stone veneer is a concrete aggregate product with cast-in clips for mounting. The siding would be a tongue and groove joint panel that would be stained. The fence would have horizontal pickets and would be stained the same color as the siding.

Ms. Woleben-Meade asked if there was a landscape plan for the area bordering the 3 foot wide walk.

Mr. Freiburger said there's not much room in that area to support sustainable landscaping.

Ms. Woleben-Meade said even a small area could sustain vegetation.

Mr. Freiburger said he is supportive of providing landscaping, but he was concerned it wouldn't get enough light and water.

Ms. Woleben-Meade asked if vines would be allowed to grow on the stone veneer.

Mr. Freiburger said he thought that would be fine and was open to any suggestions the Commission had.

Mr. Sheridan asked if the elevation showed an accurate representation of the height of Treasure Island's wall adjacent to the property line.

Mr. Freiburger said Treasure Island's building was actually shorter than the proposed addition. He thought it was about 18 feet in height.

There was discussion of how the coping and parapet wall would be constructed so as not to become a maintenance issue.

Mr. Elkins noted the pitch of the roof shown in the cross section didn't match the elevation drawing. Also, given the dimensions of the doorway and the location of the parking stalls he wasn't sure the site plan would provide proper turning movements for backing a vehicle out of the garage.

Mr. Freiburger said he realized the situation and agreed with Mr. Elkins. They needed to provide six parking spaces to meet the parking requirement.

Mr. Elkins said they need to put more thought into the details of how they're going to transition materials at the corners of the addition.

Mr. Bradford asked how the fence would be protected from traffic. A bollard or guard rail might be needed. The change in grade from the alley to the back of the building is fairly significant. He wanted to make sure they had put thought into how the site would be graded.

Mr. Bradford said on Sheet A3.0, Foundation Plan, he wasn't sure where the foundation would be located relative to grade. It should be at least 6 inches from grade. On Sheet A5.0, he wanted to make sure a structural engineer had taken a look at the spacing of the joists. On A6.0, the footing adjacent to the property line was encroaching onto the neighboring property.

Mr. Sheridan said the proposed trash area conflicted with the location of the garage door.

Mr. Sivertsen said if they were using totes that could be stored inside the building a trash enclosure wasn't necessary.

Mr. Freiburger said they would use totes.

Mr. Sheridan asked how the corner joints would be treated.

Mr. Freiburger said the stone manufacturer makes corner pieces so they would wrap around the building and have a four inch return. The siding would have a miter joint.

Ms. Woleben-Meade asked if there were any proposed mechanical units.

Mr. Freiburger said they would not have any new mechanical units.

Mr. Sheridan said they still need information on the fence, stain color, landscaping, and photometric plan.

Ms. Woleben-Meade said Boston Ivy would be a good choice for the climbing vines.

Mr. Sheridan thought the proposal met the applicable standards of review.

Mr. Elkins moved to approve an Appearance Review Certificate for Case 2014-AR-32, 905-907 Ridge with the condition that the following items are submitted prior to installation: 1) final wood siding and coping color, 2) fencing, 3) planting materials, 4) photometric plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Phillips. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan and Commissioners Bradford, Elkins, Phillips, Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

**2014-AR-35
A. Perry Homes**

**1218 Washington Avenue
Variation and Appearance Review Certificate**

Mr. Sivertsen called Case 2014-AR-35, 1218 Washington Avenue, A. Perry Homes, for an Appearance Review Certificate to construct a second story addition and a variation to construct the addition beyond the 10 foot required build-to-zone.

Mr. Perry stated he was the owner of A. Perry Homes and the contract purchaser of 1218 Washington. The building is currently an existing concrete block building with a stone façade. The adjacent building is of similar construction and style. The proposal is to remodel the existing building and construct a second story addition. The reason for setting the second story addition back was because the two buildings were very similar in style. On the alley side the proposed work includes stuccoing the building and replacing the windows. They will likely do limestone sills for all windows. The proposed lattice work is intended to soften the wall. The addition will be done in stucco as well. The front of the addition is intended to be as transparent as possible.

Mr. Bradford said the east elevation plans were missing. He wanted to know what the building would look like on that elevation.

Mr. Perry said the wall would be completely stucco without any windows.

Ms. Woleben-Meade asked where the HVAC units would be located.

Mr. Perry said they would be located on the roof of the second story addition.

Mr. Bradford said mechanical units are required to be screened.

Mr. Elkins asked about the area well located at the north end of the second story addition.

Mr. Perry said the windows do not go below the roof deck and the area well would be completely interior.

Mr. Bradford asked where the columns on the front roof deck shown on Sheet A-6 are supported below.

Mr. Perry said there was a steel beam below that would carry the weight.

Ms. Woleben-Meade said the proposed Zebra Grass is on the invasive species list. They could replace that with Feather Reed Grass. The Clematis will not grow up to the second floor as drawn.

Mr. Perry explained the wall behind the metal lattice would be open to allow a planter to be located on the second floor deck. The Clematis would grow through the opening in the wall.

Mr. Phillips asked Mr. Perry to explain the thought behind the choice in architectural style for the second floor. The second floor introduces a lot of new materials, sizes, and shapes.

Mr. Perry said they wanted to get as much glass as possible so as to be as transparent as possible. He wanted the addition to disappear from view. The first floor had a dark bronze metal that might have been covering an old awning.

Mr. Bradford asked if there were doors going from the second floor onto the terrace.

Mr. Perry said the only door leading to the front terrace is the overhead garage door.

Mr. Elkins asked about the color of the materials.

Mr. Perry said there would be two colors of stucco. A lighter colored stucco and a stucco painted black to match the proposed black metal.

Mr. Elkins was unsure how black the stucco would actually appear. Also if different metals are used for the coping, doors, window frames, and fascia are all of those black metals going to be the same color of black. If those materials are being sourced from different manufacturers they might not match. He would like to see samples of those materials.

Mr. Sheridan asked how thick the roof would be when actually be constructed. In order to accommodate the roof pitch and structural members the roof would likely be thicker than drawn.

Mr. Perry said the roof would pitch to the alley side of the building and they would add scuppers to the alley side.

Mr. Sheridan asked how they were going to conceal the pitch.

Mr. Perry said they would like to get the roof band on the front elevation to look as straight as possible.

Mr. Phillips asked if the electrical poles were going to interfere with the proposed addition.

Mr. Perry said a portion of the poles projected into the property. They have already begun working with the electric company to have that addressed. The rest of the lines are not electric. The second floor windows that are close to the power lines will not be operable.

Mr. Sheridan asked how the openings on the second floor for the lattice will be designed.

Mr. Perry said the side and top returns will be stucco and the sill will be limestone. The sill will align with the sill of the other second floor windows.

Mr. Sheridan was concerned the amount of metal needed for the coping cap will tend to "oil can" if not constructed property.

Mr. Bradford suggested putting bends or breaks in the metal to keep the sheet metal from curling.

Mr. Phillips said he had concerns with the color scheme. The addition looks entirely different from the existing building façade.

Mr. Bradford suggested using a dark gray stucco rather than a black stucco. It will still provide the contrast that the applicant wanted to achieve.

Mr. Sheridan said he shared Mr. Bradford's concern.

Mr. Sheridan said the existing stone on the building returns to the alley side. That is not reflected on the drawing.

Mr. Perry said that was a good point. He wasn't sure how to treat that detail. They might saw cut the stone, or run the stucco right up to the existing return.

Mr. Sheridan said the west façade seems a little flat. He thinks there are more opportunities to express they are adding onto the building by accentuating the second floor.

Mr. Sheridan said he hasn't heard a reason for granting the setback variation. The ordinance seeks to establish a street wall that is up to the sidewalk. By setting the second story back on this building it sets a precedent for the adjacent building. If the neighboring building decides they want to build a second story addition up to the property line as required by code, it will greatly contrast with the proposed addition.

Mr. Bradford said the setback does not bother him as much. The cornice line comes up the 10 foot required setback and helps to establish the street wall.

Mr. Perry said he was trying to be sensitive to the surrounding buildings by setting the second floor back.

Mr. Smoot, owner of Redefined Fitness, said he was attending tonight's meeting to understand the traffic and parking impacts of the project.

Mr. Perry said they were already approved by the Village Board for the parking variation. He said most of their employees use public transportation and most of their client meetings are at night or on the weekends.

Mr. Sheridan said the parking concerns were addressed by the Zoning Board and Village Board. The Appearance Commission does not review those matters.

Mr. Sheridan said he doesn't have enough information to make a decision tonight. He still needs to see the mechanical screening, material samples, location of utility poles on the elevation, scuppers, downspouts, roof structure of the overhang, control joints, photometric plan, coping detail, and stone return on the alley side.

Mr. Elkins moved to continue Case 2014-AR-35, 1218 Washington Avenue, to the January 5, 2014 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bradford. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan and Commissioners Bradford, Elkins, Phillips, Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

VI. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:50 p.m., Mr. Elkins moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bradford. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan and Commissioners Bradford, Elkins, Phillips, Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**