



VILLAGE OF WILMETTE

1200 Wilmette Avenue
WILMETTE, ILLINOIS 60091-0040

MEETING MINUTES

APPEARANCE REVIEW COMMISSION

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 2014

7:30 P.M.

VILLAGE BOARD CONFERENCE ROOM

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

Members Absent: Mason Miller

Guests: Donley Klug, 111 Green Bay Road
Thomas Steele, 356 Tioga Trail, Wood Dale, IL
Bob Joyce, 356 Tioga Trail, Wood Dale, IL
Sandy Petnick, 1616 Sheridan Road
John Doyle, 204 Gary, Wheaton, IL
Kevin Metzger, 1413 Sherman, Romeoville, IL
Jeff Leven, 6611 Laburnum, Northbrook, IL
John Kosich, 521 Green Bay Road
Tim Brooker, 189 Poplar, Northbrook, IL

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 AUGUST 4, 2014.

Mr. Bradford moved the Commission approve the August 4, 2014 meeting minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Phillips. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan and Commissioners Bradford, Collyer, Elkins, Phillips, Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

III. CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Bradford moved to approve an Appearance Review Certificate for Case 2014-AR-26, 1148 Wilmette, Exhibit, Awning Sign, and Case 2014-AR-28, 1116 Central, Koya in Wilmette, Window Sign. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elkins. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan and Commissioners Bradford, Collyer, Elkins, Phillips, Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

IV. CASES

**2014-AR-24
1616 Sheridan Condo Assoc.**

**1616 Sheridan Road
Appearance Review Certificate**

Mr. Sivertsen called Case 2014-AR-24, 1616 Sheridan Road, 1616 Sheridan Condominium Association, for an Appearance Review Certificate to remodel the existing balconies.

Mr. Steele said the condominium association had elected to undertake a balcony restoration project where they will be removing the existing balcony railings and enclosures to perform repairs to the concrete balconies. New railings and enclosures would be installed which are a modified design from the existing.

Mr. Steele showed photos of the existing building and a rendering showing what the building would look like with proposed railings and enclosures.

Mr. Sheridan asked if the railing and enclosure glass would be clear.

Mr. Steele said it would be clear glass.

Mr. Bradford said the drawings showed both railings and enclosures. He wanted to know which they were proposing to install.

Mr. Steele said the architect prepared the drawings at a time in which the association was considering installing enclosures on all of the balconies. Since that time, the association decided to give each owner the option to have an enclosure or railing.

Mr. Bradford asked if units currently with railings would get new railings and units currently with enclosures would get new enclosures.

Mr. Joyce said that was almost accurate. Some of the units who had railings would be getting enclosures. Twenty-three units in total will be getting enclosures.

Mr. Sheridan asked if they could identify specifically, which units would be replacing their enclosures and which ones would be new enclosures who previously had railings only.

Mr. Joyce said he didn't know which units would be changing from railings to enclosures.

Mr. Bradford said the railing sample presented had an inch separation on the sides between the frame and the glass. He asked for clarification of whether or not the glass enclosure would have a separation.

Mr. Joyce said the enclosure would not have a separation.

Mr. Bradford asked for a detail of the sliding glass enclosures.

Mr. Joyce said they don't have that detail.

Mr. Bradford said the mullions of the sliding glass doors would be much thicker than the rest of the window frames. If that were the case, it could have a profound impact on the appearance.

Ms. Woleben-Meade asked why the color of the window frames didn't match the color of the window surrounds. She pointed out the existing windows had a black frame and the proposed railings and enclosures had a white frame.

Mr. Joyce said they were trying to match the color of the existing railings.

Mr. Phillips asked if the renderings were accurate.

Mr. Joyce said the renderings may be confusing because they did not necessarily accurately reflect which units would have railings and which would have enclosures.

Mr. Phillips asked if the unit owners voted on whether or not they wanted an enclosure.

Ms. Petnick said she was a member of the condominium board. The board gave the option to each owner as to whether or not they wanted to pay extra for an enclosure.

Mr. Phillips asked how many enclosure profiles were proposed.

Mr. Steele said there were two different types of enclosures. The main level had a taller enclosure because the floor to ceiling height of the main floor was taller. The enclosures on the upper floors were all the same.

Mr. Bradford asked if the railing height matched the frame height on the enclosures.

Mr. Joyce said they were the same height.

Mr. Sheridan said there was a note on the drawings that said the taller enclosure may have an additional horizontal mullion for support in which case the upper lite would be fixed. He wanted to make sure they would be consistent across the level.

Mr. Joyce said at this time they intended for the top lite to be fixed on the taller enclosures.

Mr. Sheridan said the detail of the railing shows the vertical support would hang off the edge of the balcony, but the plan view drawings did not. He wondered which was correct.

Mr. Joyce said the railings would be on top of the balcony and that the support plate would not hang off the balcony.

Mr. Bradford said the proposal would improve the overall appearance of the building.

Mr. Elkins was concerned the plans didn't provide the full height enclosure details, the mullion size, or the sliding window detail. If the mullions were much thicker than the other frame it could dramatically change the appearance. A key component of the proposal was missing.

Mr. Bradford said he would feel more comfortable having those details before voting.

Ms. Woleben-Meade asked if the Commission could approve railing details so they can get started on that work and then come back to the Commission with the enclosure details.

Mr. Phillips said he didn't like the idea of approving it without knowing all the details. Changing one component later could negatively impact the original approval.

Mr. Bradford asked if it would be ok to provide a partial approval for removal of the railings and repair of the balconies.

Ms. Petnick said the condominium association would greatly appreciate a partial approval.

Mr. Joyce said the railings and enclosures wouldn't be installed until next year. It will take the manufacturer 14 weeks to deliver the enclosures and railings once they're ordered.

Mr. Bradford moved to grant an Appearance Review Certificate in Case 2014-AR-24, 1616 Sheridan Road, for the removal of the existing railings and enclosures, to replace and repair the existing concrete, and to install weatherproof membrane and paint the underside of the existing balconies. The motion was seconded by Ms. Woleben-Meade. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan and Commissioners Bradford, Collyer, Elkins, Phillips, Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

Mr. Bradford moved to continue Case 2014-AR-24 to the October 6, 2014 meeting, where the railings and enclosures will be discussed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elkins. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan and Commissioners Bradford, Collyer, Elkins, Phillips, Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

**2014-AR-21
Firefly Kitchen**

**111 Green Bay Road
Sign Variation and Appearance Review Certificate**

Mr. Sivertsen called Case 2014-AR-21, 111 Green Bay Road, Firefly Kitchen, requesting an Appearance Review Certificate for new landscaping and wall and window signs, a sign variation to paint a sign directly to a wall, a sign variation to display more than one window sign along a single street frontage and sign variation to display more than one wall sign along a single street frontage.

Mr. Sheridan asked if one of the sign variations had been eliminated from the previous submittal.

Mr. Sivertsen said the wall sign coverage variation for the first floor wall sign had been eliminated. The wooden background of the sign had been divided into three panels. The middle panel where the business name would be displayed was within the 30% allowable coverage.

Mr. Sheridan said there were three options presented in the landscape plans. He asked Ms. Klug which option they wished to be approved.

Ms. Klug said they were proposing to remove the bench and replace it with landscaping that would be salt tolerant. She asked for the Commission's expertise in determining which option would be the best.

Ms. Woleben-Meade said most of the landscaping shown in the proposal were annuals. She was concerned with the financial commitment needed to constantly replace the landscaping each season. She recommended option B which had some shrubs that wouldn't need to be replaced each season. The annuals could then be planted around the shrubs for a seasonal display, but the bulk of the landscaping would remain. The railroad tie will take up a lot of room in the limited planting bed. She recommended using a narrow wooden edging.

Mr. Sheridan said he was concerned the railroad tie would become a tripping hazard if it were raised. He thought it should be flush with the grade.

Mr. Leven said the change in grade would cause the railroad tie to be raised above the sidewalk at some point.

Mr. Sivertsen said if the metal fence on the south end of the building remained it would eliminate the tripping hazard at that point.

Mr. Bradford asked about the lighting on the front of the building.

Ms. Klug presented the lighting fixture that would be installed to illuminate the second floor sign. It would be located above the sign and shine down. The existing up-light would be removed.

Mr. Sheridan asked how the electrical supply would be provided to the wall sconce.

Mr. Levon said the electrical would be run on the back of the wall and the electrical box would be recessed so the fixture would be mounted flush to the wall.

Ms. Woleben-Meade asked about the variation for the additional window sign.

Ms. Klug said the owner wished to present a Brooklyn bistro feel to the restaurant. The window signs reflected that design.

Mr. Bradford said the window signs had been reduced in size from the original proposal.

Mr. Phillips said to make sure the font of their wall sign matches the other signs.

Ms. Woleben-Meade said she is having an issue applying the standards of review for the two window signs. Only one window sign is permitted.

Mr. Bradford said the two signs provide balance and were in keeping with the symmetry of the storefront.

Ms. Woleben-Meade said she liked the way the signs looked, but she was concerned this would be creating a precedent. She didn't know how the request was unique.

Mr. Elkins said they were already getting a variation to install a second wall sign.

Mr. Sheridan thought the request was consistent in design and scale with other signs nearby. Having two window signs to balance out and provide symmetry to the building looked better than having only one sign that was conforming.

Mr. Phillips asked how close to the window a sign needed to be in order for it to be considered a sign.

Mr. Sheridan said any sign located within 12 inches of the window is regulated by the sign code.

Mr. Sheridan asked how much smaller the window signs were from the original proposal.

Mr. Sivertsen said the signs currently proposed were covering 8.4% of each window.

Mr. Sheridan thought shrinking them to 5.0% of each window would make them too small.

Ms. Klug said she thought the proposed signs are less obtrusive than the other signs along Green Bay Road.

Mr. Bradford said the conditions along Green Bay Road are unique within the Village. The Commission has been willing to grant other variations along Green Bay Road.

Mr. Phillips asked that the light bulbs used for the exterior fixtures be consistent. A 3000k LED bulb should be used to make sure a consistent color of light is displayed.

Mr. Sheridan agreed, and said the 2700k bulb can turn a little green over time.

Findings of Fact

The Commission found the proposed signs are consistent with the character of the surrounding property and would not negatively affect the health safety and welfare of the neighborhood. The design of the building and its location along Green Bay Road present a unique circumstance. The symmetry of the building lends itself to needing consistent graphics on either side of the center entrance. The additional window sign provides a consistent design to the symmetrical building. The building historically displayed two wall signs which is consistent with other signs along Green Bay Road.

Decision

Ms. Woleben-Meade moved to grant an Appearance Review Certificate in Case 2014-AR-21, with the conditions that 1) landscape plan B is used with wood edging between 4-6 inches in height instead of railroad ties, 2) all of the signs use the same style of fonts, 3) exterior light fixtures use 3000k LED bulbs, 4) the wall pack be flush mounted to the wall; and to recommend granting a sign variation to paint a sign directly to a wall, a sign variation to display more than one window sign along a single street frontage, and a sign variation to display more than one wall sign along a single street frontage. The motion was seconded by Mr. Phillips. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan and Commissioners Bradford, Collyer, Elkins, Phillips, Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

Mr. Elkins moved to authorize Chairman Sheridan to prepare the report and recommendation from the Commission for Case 2014-AR-21. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bradford. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan and Commissioners Bradford, Collyer, Elkins, Phillips, Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

**2014-AR-22
Domino's Pizza**

**350 Ridge Road
Sign Variation**

Mr. Sivertsen called Case 2014-AR-22, 350 Ridge Road, Domino's for a 13.1% wall sign coverage variation.

Mr. Doyle said they were requesting a variation so they could add the logo to the sign.

Mr. Sheridan said the applicant submitted a conforming sign at their previous meeting without the logo. He asked why the applicant didn't submit an application for the sign with the logo to begin with.

Mr. Doyle said his employee submitted the application and that he didn't know why that was done.

Mr. Sivertsen said he thought the applicant applied for the conforming sign first to make sure something was approved by the time the business was scheduled to open. Sign variation requests require notice to be sent at least 15 days prior to the meeting date. The applicant wasn't able to get their application in on time to make the previous month's deadline.

Mr. Sheridan asked why the Domino's sign wasn't reduced in size to meet the size requirement including the impending logo.

Mr. Elkins said he drove by the sign that was approved at last month's meeting and already installed. It wasn't centered over the doorway. He felt like the intent was always for Domino's to come back at a later date and ask for the variation. He felt like the Commission was hoodwinked.

Mr. Doyle said he thought the variation was a formality and didn't know the request would be an issue.

Mr. Phillips said Mr. Doyle was incorrect in his assumption.

Mr. Elkins agreed with Mr. Sheridan in questioning why the size of the sign wasn't just reduced to meet the code.

Mr. Doyle said the intention was always to install the sign with the logo. He said his assistant who hasn't been in the business for that long made the decision with the national sign vendor to install the sign in that fashion. Mr. Doyle thought this was the smallest sign the national vendor typically makes. He didn't think it was the intention to hoodwink the Commission. He also thought the client was going to be open by this point, so the intent may have been to install the sign before they opened.

Mr. Phillips said it's typical for businesses to want their sign up before they open. He didn't have an issue with the sign itself. He thought they could just make the logo smaller so that it fit within the allowable coverage.

Mr. Doyle said in order to keep the proper proportions between the letters and the logo that they would likely need to fabricate a new sign if the logo were to change in size.

Mr. Phillips said didn't know if that was the case. Domino's has different configurations of their logo.

Mr. Doyle acknowledged it wasn't the only configuration for the logo, but in regards to wall signs it was the configuration they used.

Mr. Sivertsen said Domino's had contacted him asking what had previously been approved for that tenant space. He thought they were trying to stay consistent with the signage that previously received a variation.

Mr. Elkins said the size of the sign band relative to the storefront was very small. Given the limited size of the sign band he would have understood the need for relief from the sign code if they would have been upfront at the previous meeting.

Mr. Phillips said the request seemed self-created once they installed a portion of the sign.

Mr. Metzger said he was the Operations Director for the thirteen store franchise of this Domino's. He understood the viewpoints of the Commissioners, but assured them it wasn't their intention to mislead the Commission. They have been through the process of opening many locations and the sign plans are always the same. They don't want to display something that the community doesn't want to see and they were upset the way in which the signage was initially presented.

Mr. Sheridan asked if the channel letters without the logo was already at the maximum coverage of 30%.

Mr. Sivertsen said the lettering alone covered 22.7%.

Mr. Bradford said the logo not only increased the width of the sign, but also the height of the sign because it was several inches taller than the lettering. This difference greatly increased the sign coverage.

Ms. Woleben-Meade asked if there were any other signs, including window signs, they were proposing to install.

Mr. Metzger said the wall sign was the only sign they were proposing.

Mr. Sheridan asked if they had a smaller Domino logo they could install so that it's conforming.

Mr. Doyle said the national sign vendor made the proposed sign, but that their shop could make any size of sign.

Ms. Woleben-Meade said she was looking at this proposal as if it was the Commission's first time looking at the proposal. She understood the Commissioner's frustration, but she would have supported this, especially since the Commission had granted previous approvals for larger variation requests in this building.

Mr. Bradford said he agrees with Ms. Woleben-Meade's view. He has been irritated by creeping variations in the past, but he's doesn't feel the cons outweigh the need for the variation.

Mr. Phillips asked if all the standards of review had to be met in order to vote in favor of the request.

Mr. Sivertsen said the standards of review should be used to help Commissioners reach a decision, but not every standard is applicable in every case.

Mr. Bradford asked if Domino's was proposing to install a sign on the existing pylon sign.

Mr. Sivertsen said Domino's was not proposing to install a sign on the multi-tenant pylon sign.

Findings of Fact

The sign is consistent with other signs in the surrounding area. Other signs in the shopping center and across the street are similar in size. The sign band is small relative to the size of the storefront. The small sign band limits the size of a permitted sign which presents a practical difficulty in displaying a sign that is readily visible from the street. The sign would also not negatively affect the health, safety, and welfare of the district.

Decision

Mr. Elkins moved to recommend a 13.1% wall sign coverage variation for Case 2014-AR-22, based on the plans submitted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bradford. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan and Commissioners Bradford, Collyer, Elkins, Phillips, and Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

Mr. Bradford moved to authorize the Chairman to prepare the report from the Appearance Review Commission for Case 2014-AR-22. The motion was seconded by Mr. Phillips. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan and Commissioners Bradford, Collyer, Elkins, Phillips, and Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

**2014-AR-25
IBJI**

**521 Green Bay Road
Sign Variation**

Mr. Sivertsen called Case 2014-AR-25, 521 Green Bay Road, requesting an amendment to a previously granted variation to install a sign not fronting a street.

Mr. Kosich apologized to the Commission and said the sign should have been installed by now. The previous contractor who was coordinating installation of the sign had left the company. Mr. Kosich said, as the developer, he is now picking up where the previous contractor left off. He said the amendment is requested because they wish to install the sign within the existing stairwell. If they installed the sign where it was previously approved, the structural support needed to install the sign would enter into the tenant space.

Mr. Bradford asked Mr. Sivertsen if that was the only amendment they were requesting to the existing variation.

Mr. Sivertsen said that was correct. They were only requesting an amendment to move the sign closer to the front façade. The previous approval was specifically granted with the condition that the sign would be placed 32 inches from the northeast corner of the building. By moving the sign to make sure the support doesn't encroach into the tenant space the sign would need to move closer to the northeast corner of the building.

Mr. Phillips asked if the lack of a sign on the north façade caused patients to have difficulty finding the building.

Mr. Kosich said they had a lot of issues and heard regularly that customers were instead parking in the Jewel parking lot.

Mr. Bradford said the sign panel should tie back into the steel support rather than the masonry wall. A bolt should go from the sign panel through the wall and have a back plate on the other side of the lateral steel support.

Mr. Phillips asked about matching the color of the sign panel with the color of the brick.

Mr. Bradford recalled at the previous meeting they decided to not match the brick color because they wouldn't be able to match a painted metal with the finish and color of brick. It was better to use a color that provided some contrast.

Findings of Fact

The Commission found the requested amendment was consistent with the previously granted variation and other signs along Green Bay Road.

Decision

Mr. Elkins moved to recommend granting an amended sign variation for Case 2014-AR-25, 521 Green Bay Road, to install a sign not fronting a street with the condition that the sign box be anchored through the masonry to the horizontal structural steel behind the

masonry. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bradford. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan and Commissioners Bradford, Collyer, Elkins, Phillips, and Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

Mr. Bradford moved to authorize the Chairman to prepare the report from the Appearance Review Commission for Case 2014-AR-25. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elkins. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan and Commissioners Bradford, Collyer, Elkins, Phillips, and Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

**2014-AR-27
Wilmette Commons**

**50-126 Skokie Boulevard
Appearance Review Certificate**

Mr. Sivertsen called Case 2014-AR-27, Wilmette Commons, for the preliminary review of an Appearance Review Certificate to replace the existing roof with a modified color and material of shingles.

Mr. Brooker said they are proposing the replace the existing roof. The existing shingles are approximately 25 years old. There has been patchwork that has been done over time. They were now proposing the replace the entire roof. The proposed shingle was a slate colored architectural shingle. He would also like to replace the existing sheet metal flashing and fascia with slate blue metal sheeting.

Mr. Sheridan said the slate blue metal sheeting wouldn't work well with the color of the existing brick.

The Commission agreed the slate blue wasn't a good choice and reviewed other color options with the applicant. The style and color of the shingles was fine, but they encouraged the applicant to consider using a color similar to the existing sheet metal which was tan and worked well with the existing brick. More thought needed to be put towards the color combination.

Mr. Brooker said he would go back to the owner and suggest they stick with a color similar to the existing sheet metal. If the owner wants to do something else, they would need to come back to the Commission and present the alternative.

V. NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Sivertsen said the Village owned property at 611 Green Bay Road had a tentative redevelopment agreement. The developer could be coming to the Commission as early as November.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:30 p.m., Mr. Phillips moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bradford. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan and Commissioners Bradford, Collyer, Elkins, Phillips, and Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**