



VILLAGE OF WILMETTE

1200 Wilmette Avenue
WILMETTE, ILLINOIS 60091-0040

MEETING MINUTES

APPEARANCE REVIEW COMMISSION

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2015

7:30 P.M.

SECOND FLOOR TRAINING ROOM

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

Members Absent: None

Guests: Bob Flubacker, 1835 Rohlwing Road, Rolling Meadows, IL
Jordan Aron, 721 Green Bay Road
Alan Aron, 721 Green Bay Road
Donley Klug, 111 Green Bay Road

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 JANUARY 5, 2015.

Mr. Bradford moved the Commission approve the January 5, 2015 meeting minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Phillips. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan, and Commissions Bradford, Collyer, Elkins, Miller, Phillips, Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

III. CONTINUANCES

Mr. Elkins moved to continue Case 2014-AR-32, 905-907 Ridge Road, Newlook Construction to the March 2, 2015 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bradford. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan, and Commissions Bradford, Collyer, Elkins, Miller, Phillips, Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

IV. CASES

**2015-AR-02
Grey Gardenia**

**1177 Wilmette Avenue
Appearance Review Certificate**

Mr. Bradford requested the case be removed from the consent agenda.

Mr. Sivertsen called the case and said the petitioner was not in attendance and that he never received word back from the petitioner to know whether or not they planned on attending.

Mr. Sivertsen said the petitioner's intent is to install an awning covering both storefronts. The awnings spanning the storefront are currently separated by a brick column. The other proposal was to recover the existing awning frame and install a sign on the northernmost awning. This would be their second choice and only proposed in case the other awning was not supported by the Commission. They wanted to make sure at least some type of awning sign was approved at this meeting.

Mr. Bradford said he was not in favor of the proposed awning sign. It is inconsistent with the rest of the building and the awning covering the brick column is a bad detail.

Mrs. Woleben-Meade said the proposed awning didn't bother her. It helps connect both sides of the storefront.

Chairman Sheridan said it makes sense to connect the two awnings until you look closer at the building and how the awning would wrap around the existing column. The two doors are next to each other and open into the same store. It has been this way for years, however, he tends to agree with Mr. Bradford.

Mr. Miller said he agreed with Mr. Bradford as well.

Mr. Elkins asked Mr. Sivertsen if there were any other stores in the building that spanned two storefronts.

Mr. Sivertsen said this was the only store in the building that spanned two storefronts.

Mr. Bradford moved to approve an Appearance Review Certificate for Case 2015-AR-02 to recover the existing awning frames with the material as submitted and to install an awning sign over the northernmost awning. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elkins. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan, and Commissions Bradford, Collyer, Elkins, Miller, Phillips, Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

**2015-AR-04
Imperial Motors**

**721 Green Bay Road
Variations and Appearance Review Certificate**

Mr. Sivertsen called Case 2015-AR-04, 721 Green Bay Road, Imperial Motors, requesting an Appearance Review Certificate to remodel the façade and replace existing signage, a 20.4% wall sign coverage variation, a sign variation to display two additional wall signs, and a roof line design variation.

Robert Flubacker said that Imperial Motors has been a presence on the north shore for a long time. He was the architect who in the late 80s took the composite of a lot of disparate buildings and put them together to create the current facility in the English Tudor style. In the mid-2000s another addition was built and is occupied by a Starbucks.

Jaguar has been going through a re-branding process the last 10 years. He handed out a design package that showed the elements that Jaguar wants dealers to incorporate in the dealership. Everything from floor material, exterior materials, trim material, and signage is all dictated by Jaguar corporate. In mid-2013 they began interfacing with their corporate architect who is based in California. The Jaguar architect took the existing facility information and did a design for Imperial Motors that corporate wanted to see done. The design that came out of Jaguar corporate was at best a flawed attempt. He handed the plans of the corporate design out to the ARC members. He asked the members to turn to page 4 of the packet, it gives a glossy overview of what they wanted to do. They had a number of issues with the corporate design, the most significant being the entry portico at the front door that actually projects over the public sidewalk. They tried to explain to Jaguar that they couldn't do that and corporate just didn't understand. It was back in May of 2013 that the corporate package was put together. They are still awaiting final design approval from Jaguar but felt they were close enough that they felt they could come to The Appearance Review Commission with what they had to seek approval. In synopsis, the exterior elements of the building are pretty much all new. The skin is either replaced or covered with a stucco. All the windows will be removed and replaced. Due to the age of the building a lot of the mechanical systems will be replaced. The entire area with public facing interiors will be gutted and redone. An analysis of the building showed it was better to tear down the showroom section of the building and rebuild. The area that is being rebuilt is shown on the plans as the cross-hatched area. This will be a pretty thorough, complete building renovation. He said instead of walking through the plans it might be easier to take questions from the commissioners than go through the minutiae of the submittal.

Chairman Sheridan asked how they arrived at the proposed building heights.

Mr. Flubacker said the showroom section is based on achieving a certain height in the showroom. The owner has another dealership in Lake Bluff that is much newer and that has a much higher showroom height, which results in a more open and inviting display area for the cars. If you look at the size of the windows contained in the design package he handed out earlier, you will see that Jaguar is looking for a showroom height of 16' to 17'. What they are proposing isn't that high. He said that the other heights and elements, some have to do with the heights of the existing portions of the building and some have to do with proportion and relative scale compared to the rest of the building. For example, the curved section adjacent to Starbucks is the height they need to screen the mechanical equipment. The larger square to the left of that is really to keep in height proportion with other elements of the building. He presented a rendering.

Commissioner Woleben-Meade asked if they were proposing to add street trees because the rendering shows more street trees than currently exist.

Mr. Jordan Aron explained that there were additional street trees that died and were recently removed. He asked the Village not to replace the trees until after the renovation of the dealership was complete.

Mr. Flubacker said there are tree wells where all the trees are shown.

Mr. Sivertsen presented the material samples to the commission. He said the samples include the two stuccos, the window glazing and the wing profile.

Mr. Flubacker said the wing, which is the projection near the roof line that is Alucobond, an aluminum composite material. The rest of the beige or off-white colored elements are stucco.

Commissioner Bradford asked if it was going to be true stucco because he saw one note indicating Exterior Insulation Finish System (EIFS).

Mr. Flubacker said if there was an EIFS note that was a mistake because the stucco will be true stucco.

Mr. Aron agreed saying it was true stucco but the color and texture will be the same as the shown EIFS samples.

Commissioner Bradford clarified that it will be true stucco and the EIFS references are just for the colors.

Mr. Flubacker said typically the last coat on a stucco application is a Dryvit or Sto. They have to make sure it is a breathable coating. Chairman Sheridan said that the zoning code doesn't allow Dryvit.

Chairman Sheridan asked if there was a specification for the glazing.

Mr. Flubacker said it was clear glass. He said any areas that had spandrel glass would have frosted glass but he doesn't believe there are any areas of spandrel glass at the Wilmette facility.

Commissioner Phillips said there were a couple of panels of spandrel glass on the south elevation and it is called out as white spandrel glazing.

Mr. Flubacker asked the Commissioners to look at the corporate design where spandrel glazing is shown on the front elevation rendering. This is the area between the showroom and service area. Where the spandrel is on the Imperial Motor's facility is where there are existing offices that will remain.

Commissioner Bradford said are three steps at the main entrance to get in the front door. He asked where the accessible entrance was.

Mr. Flubacker said there was a sidewalk jut to the left of the service drive.

Commissioner Bradford said somebody needing an accessible entry that is visiting the showroom would need to go through the service area.

Mr. Flubacker answered yes and there is another accessible entrance into the curved section by Starbucks, where there is handicapped parking and a curb cut ramp.

Commissioner Elkins asked where the different stucco colors were being used.

Mr. Flubacker said the only change in stucco color is at what they call the portico or curved entrance element where the stucco will be darker than all the rest.

Commissioner Elkins asked if the finishes followed the samples or the rendering.

Mr. Flubacker believed the sample finishes were the same as the rendering.

Mr. Miller said that it appears they may actually be different finishes. He referenced the upper left portion of the last page of the corporate design package.

Mr. Sivertsen said that he believed they are labeled as being different finishes, although the difference is pretty subtle. Chairman Sheridan agreed saying while they call them out as different, they don't articulate what they are.

Commissioner Miller said there is very little variation in color so the building is very bland. He understands that we are dealing with prototypes but the building looks more like it belongs in Phoenix.

Mr. Flubacker said he didn't disagree with Commissioner's assessment. He said that he had a lot of Jaguar dealer customers who weren't happy because the existing design was supposed to be a lifetime building and they are now covering brick and architectural elements that were not supposed to be gone this early in age. He mentioned the turret that had expensive cut limestone and that is now proposed to be removed.

Commissioner Woleben-Meade said a number of other buildings have picked up on the Tudor styling. There is a relationship there with buildings such as Walgreen and Norm's Car Wash across the tracks. Her concern is the overall context of the proposed remodeling.

Chairman Sheridan said they also have the requirement of the Zoning Ordinance that requires some articulation in the roof. He read Section 10.7.A.4 and Section 10.7.A.4.a. Section 10.7.A.4 requires building articulation to avoid the appearance of large, blank walls. Section 10.7.A.4.a requires that for every twenty-five (25) linear feet of building length, roof lines must either be varied with a change in height or the incorporation of a major focal feature such as a dormer, gable or projected wall feature. He recognized the existing building doesn't conform and that the Village is not making existing buildings change to meet that requirement. But he said that section is important and that some variation is being done at the entrances and curved elements and providing even larger windows than before, which is not bad especially when you are trying to sell cars.

Chairman Sheridan said they still have the zoning issue and they will talk about the sign later.

Mr. Aron said if you look at the initial rendering done by Jaguar's corporate architect and how bland that was and you compare it to what

Mr. Flubacker has done with the building, the presented proposal is a much better designed building.

Mr. Aron asked the Commission to keep in mind they have gone back and forth with Jaguar corporate for about a year and a half, with multiple (6-7) designs that got rejected by Jaguar. The presented plan has actually been approved and **by contract** they could not present it to the ARC until after Jaguar approved the plans. He said that Jaguar dictates very strongly so he thinks what Mr. Flubacker came up with has a lot of variation. Getting the portico to fit was challenging because it had to be recessed since it couldn't project out and they need all that space for the showroom.

Mr. Flubacker asked if the ARC was looking at three areas in particular, the fronts of the showrooms on either side of the portico and on front of the used car showroom which is to the right of the service drive. Chairman Sheridan answered yes but he would just break them up as the new car area and pre-owned area. He felt there was enough going on with the pre-owned area that there are fewer issues with that portion of the building.

Mr. Aron pointed out that the service drive is setback.

Chairman Sheridan said he has been looking at the building for a number of years while waiting for the train so he is familiar how the building elevations by just looking at it, there are round elements that break back and forth so that part of the complex is great. But it is a large jump from existing to proposed.

Mr. Flubacker agreed that the proposal is a pretty dramatic change. He said it was interesting that Phoenix was mentioned because there is a multi-brand dealership that has been done to the corporate Jaguar standards. The other brands there are Bentley, Maserati, Land Rover and Porsche, and the Jaguar element of it is really just the portico entry and it really comes off poorly. The Maserati is a stone tile façade that is really elegant. They are really hamstrung by corporate and have been given very little to work with. It was a battle just keeping the 1.5' stone band along the front of the building down at sidewalk level. That area this time of year takes a beating and Jaguar wanted the stucco to go all the way down to the sidewalk.

Mr. Aron said in Lake Bluff they were made to remove the stone by Jaguar. He showed Jaguar a picture of the snow against the building to convince them to allow it to remain in Wilmette.

Mr. Flubacker believes they were allowed to keep the stone because the design standard is the stucco goes down to the floor level of the showroom and in their case, floor level is raised above the sidewalk level.

Commissioner Woleben-Meade asked if the front stairs were concrete and Mr. Flubacker answered yes.

Chairman Sheridan asked for comments from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Bradford sympathized with the position the applicant was in but the design is really awkward. It belongs in Schaumburg or along a frontage road, but it doesn't belong on Green Bay Road in the Village Center.

Commissioner Elkins isn't sure how he will vote. He agrees with Mr. Bradford that the design is out of place here but sympathizes with the applicant having himself dealt with corporate architecture for a different car company, he knows that car makers are unbending because they want to sell cars and if you don't conform to their standard you will not be looked upon favorably. He felt that Mr. Flubacker did a nice job working with the corporate design and his design is a lot more appealing than corporate's design, which was a box with a portico and an overhang for the service bay. In that regard the applicant has done as good of a job as they can but he still doesn't know where he will land on this. It is a huge change from what is there, which he doesn't necessarily have a problem with. The applicant did a nice job with the massing to make it look better than the corporate design.

Commissioner Bradford said it is really unfortunate that what you have now is a very attractive facility.

Commissioner Elkins said as another commissioner pointed out, a number of other Village Center buildings picked up on the same motif as the existing building. He felt that what has been proposed will be out of character of most everything else along Green Bay Road in the Village of Wilmette.

Mr. Bradford said it will be out of characteristic with everything from Evanston to Winnetka.

Mr. Flubacker said it is kind of a mitigating circumstance that this building doesn't connect to other buildings in the Village Center. He said if you go a block to the south you have a lot of multi-tenant connected buildings that create a street front and an identity. This will be kind of a standalone building with the bank at the corner that is a 60-70s modern facility. In that regard there isn't a direct connection with the historic flavor of a lot of the central business district.

Commissioner Bradford said unfortunately this is Wilmette's front door being right across from the Metra Station where thousands of people see this facility every day.

Chairman Sheridan said that by having to negotiate with Jaguar and them being unbending; they have effectively hamstrung the ARC from being able to negotiate with the applicant. The Commission can't hash out the details. He isn't a super fan of the Tudor look of the current building because when you look at the Tudor that was done 100 years ago in the Village Center you can see the details. You can tell they did a good job of incorporating that detail in the existing facility. If the applicant was going to update the building to try and get close to Jaguar's standards he could see that because the forms would be there, the pitched roof would be there.

Mr. Flubacker said they tried that.

Mr. Flubacker gave a microcosm of the ideas discussed. They began by trying to remodel as little as possible. They tried remodeling just the showroom. That failed. There are particular standards for certain square footage of space and a lot of the reduced options didn't meet those requirements. They looked at tearing the building down and having Jaguar as tenant in a new building. A developer analyzed. They tried doing a more contemporary metal roof. It is a real conundrum for his client, the impact of not being able to bring the facility up to Jaguar standards is pretty dramatic and they would probably need to leave town. The owner has been a citizen here a long, long time and they want to remain a citizen for a long, long time but there is this outside entity that is not being flexible.

Chairman Sheridan said he couldn't support it either as the ramifications of this change will ripple through town.

Commissioner Woleben-Meade said it doesn't seem like a long term look and that in another 10 years they will be changing again as this is a very trendy look.

Mr. Aron said that may be, but unfortunately this appears to be the trend in the car business. They come up with a new design and there are financial and product issues if you don't do it. For what it is worth they have shown the rendering to a number of residents and everybody has said it looks beautiful. He said that he hated to say but he agrees with the ARC, he isn't a big fan of the design. It was very painful to go through this process to design this building. They have two facilities that look very similar that

Mr. Flubacker designed and it is their brand and now they are being made to look like everybody else. He mentioned a residential neighbor immediately east that thought the new design was very nice looking. The new look has gotten positive reviews generally.

Commissioner Collyer asked how Jaguar was dealing with other dealerships in other small communities like Wilmette, where similar requests are made to maintain the character of their towns.

Mr. Aron said that 94 Jaguar dealership projects are underway and they are getting done.

Mr. Flubacker said the dealerships are typically in more affluent communities, so it is probably an issue for every owner going through this process.

Chairman Sheridan said that the other Imperial Motors facility is in a more open, yet industrial area. Mr. Aron said that dealership is on the highway.

Mr. Aron said they have investigated a move closer to the highway but there are not many available properties properly sized for this use.

Chairman Sheridan said that the ARC will need to vote on the appearance review certificate and sign variations. He asked if there were any additional comments before closing the appearance review certificate portion of the hearing. There were no additional comments.

Chairman Sheridan said he understands that there are two additional signs that the applicant will be requesting at a later date but because of a noticing issue, those signs could not be reviewed this evening

Mr. Aron said they want to also replace the ground sign to the south and add a wall sign on the curved section of the facility near the Starbucks.

Mr. Sivertsen said the 2 additional signs were submitted about 2 weeks ago. Because those signs require variations and because they were submitted after the required notice deadline the 2 signs can't be voted upon at this meeting.

Mr. Aron said because you can't see the current wall signage from any real distance, they discussed installing signage on the curved section of the building facing north and moving the existing north totem sign to the south or having both a totem sign to the north and south. Chairman Sheridan said because of the traffic and the way the building and street works, he would look favorably upon one additional sign. He felt that the curved wall sign and the north totem are redundant so they should pick one or the other.

Mr. Flubacker said one of the things that went into their consideration on the north elevation (sheet A3) is that it does not have a sign on it and that is a very strong entry element on that particular part of the building. That is where the new proposed wall sign is and he felt that there was some type of signage needed there, whether entrance signage or other type of signage. That particular portion of the building is the pre-owned showroom.

Mr. Bradford asked if the proposed Jaguar pre-owned sign along Green Bay Road could be relocated to the north curved section, closer to the pre-owned entrance.

Mr. Aron didn't know if they had the needed height over there.

Mr. Flubacker felt that would hurt the aesthetics of that facade.

Commissioner Bradford clarified that he was talking about moving the proposed wall sign along Green Bay to the curved wall section, in lieu of the ground sign.

Commissioner Elkins said he preferred keeping the wall sign over the entrance at the northeast corner and take the pylon sign and move it down to the south and keep the other signage.

Commissioner Elkins asked if the service sign over the service entrance was another variation.

Mr. Sivertsen said the sign would require another variation, and that it was not considered directional signage.

Commissioner Elkins asked if one of the signs (not sure which one) was backlit.

Mr. Sivertsen said it was.

Chairman Sheridan asked for clarification on what the variations are.

Mr. Elkins said there are two wall signs, with the service entrance being the third wall sign. This doesn't include some other signs not being presented tonight that are at the northeast entrance.

Commissioner Woleben-Meade said this is where there is likely to be an issue with the commission because they have already set a precedent for the number of signs they are willing to grant variations for.

Chairman Sheridan agreed.

Mr. Elkins said the service bay is set back and that sign is really for way finding; it not branding, it's generic wording. This building is longer and takes up a lot more street frontage than the other building. He said he was okay with eventually moving the pylon sign down to the southeast corner and keep the signage on the rendering of the building.

Chairman Sheridan clarified that the pre-owned sign, because of the signable area, meets the requirements. It's the front entrance sign that is too big.

Mr. Sivertsen said that was correct. The sign over the main entrance is smaller than the sign for the pre-owned showroom; it's a function of the size of the wall.

Commission Elkins asked if the sign over the northeast entrance is the same size as the sign over the main entrance.

Mr. Flubacker said the sign that says Jaguar with the cat is a smaller version of the front entry sign.

Mr. Sivertsen said he didn't have dimensions but it appears smaller on the renderings.

Commissioner Woleben-Meade asked if the Commission would ask that the signs be of equal size.

Chairman Sheridan said that typically when the commission sees signs of this nature, the commission will ask to have them all the same size.

Mr. Aron said they couldn't make the pre-owned sign or the entry sign smaller to match.

Chairman Sheridan asked why.

Mr. Flubacker said it was the corporate standard.

Mr. Flubacker said that the applicants don't have any feeling for what Jaguar will do if the request is rejected. Their position has always been, this is what you need to do, do it. The commission has their position on behalf of the residents and the community. He doesn't know if that will have any leverage on corporate.

Commissioner Elkins said it would likely have no impact on corporate.

Mr. Flubacker said that may not be the case.

Chairman Sheridan said the process for an Appearance Review Certificate and variations is that a) the commission votes on it and b) it is then passed on to the trustees and then they vote on it. If the ARC votes unfavorably for the project, the applicant will have the opportunity to make their case to the trustees as well.

Mr. Flubacker said that he couldn't believe as a corporation they wouldn't want to be good neighbors.

Commissioner Phillips said in particular in a downtown, CBD area. He is familiar with the dealership in Scottsdale. That and others, like the new Audi dealership on Golf, are designed to stand alone, all lit up. That's what Jaguar is trying to do with this concept. That does not fit a CBD model.

Mr. Flubacker said those are designed to be appealing to cars going by at 60 miles an hour. Here, a vehicle is moving at 20 miles an hour.

Chairman Sheridan said there needs to be consensus regarding signage. The applicant is not in a position to negotiate signage size. If the applicant wants to do the signage on the quarter-round portion of the building, the commission would like to see the pylon sign move to the south end of the property. He asked Mr. Bradford about his thoughts to move the pre-owned signage.

Commissioner Bradford said it was just a suggestion as a way to move the signage closer to the entrance and perhaps eliminate the second sign over the entrance. He appreciates the argument of wanting to have the south ground sign on Green Bay so someone who's northbound would see it.

Mr. Flubacker said the Commission can just act on what has been presented to them. The other variations requests can be discussed later.

Chairman Sheridan asked if the commissioners had a feeling on how they wanted to vote.

Chairman Sheridan asked the applicants if they were prepared, if the vote is negative, to go on to the trustees for their vote.

Mr. Flubacker said yes.

Mr. Aron said time is of the essence and they have to finish this project by the end of this year.

Commissioner Phillips said they had been working on this for a year and a half already.

Mr. Aron said they had been fighting doing it. They preferred to keep the building as it was, but now they need to have it done by the end of the year.

Mr. Flubacker said “fighting doing it” isn’t the right term, it’s fighting doing it the way they want it done. They have lost that battle with some minor victories along the way. They want the entire facility re-done.

Commissioner Woleben-Meade said they appreciate their efforts to bring the plan more in line with what’s existing. The Village appreciates their business in downtown Wilmette and that is what makes this proposal so hard.

Commissioner Elkins said the applicant has fought to keep this more like it is rather than what Jaguar is forcing them to do. It sounds like there are severe penalties if they don’t comply. He thought he heard them say that they may have to leave if they can’t do this plan. If it is denied, this could lead to the departure of a business from downtown Wilmette.

Mr. Bradford said that is a decision of the trustees.

Commissioner Phillips said they have to judge the request on its merits.

Chairman Sheridan said the commission does a good job of not spending people’s money and being mindful of the impact of their decisions, but ultimately, we have to focus on the appearance issue as it impacts the village. If they get mad and leave, the Village has a building that fits the community. If they do the project, then leave after five years, the Village is stuck with a building that doesn’t fit in. From a reuse perspective, how does it look in town? The commission has to think about what is right visually. The Village Board will have to look at the long-term impacts.

Chairman Sheridan asked if the variation and the certificate should be voted on separately.

Mr. Sivertsen said the request consisted of the certificate for the signage and exterior changes, a variation for the roofline, and the sign variations.

Mr. Flubacker said the signage is moot without the building improvements.

Chairman Sheridan agreed but said it still needed to be voted on. The most significant part of the request is the variation regarding the roofline. That will set the biggest precedent.

Mr. Aron asked Chairman Sheridan to explain that.

Chairman Sheridan said the zoning code includes design guidelines for all Village Center buildings. One of the requirements is the roofline to have some variation to it. He read the code: “Every 25’ of building length, the rooflines must either be varied with a change in height,” which the applicants approached but that part of the building is too long, “or within the incorporation of a major focal point feature such as a dormer, gable or projected wall feature.”

Mr. Aron asked if the wing element counted as a projected wall feature.

Chairman Sheridan said no, it was not acting that way; instead it was acting as a cornice, it doesn't break up the façade, it actually ties the building together.

Mr. Flubacker said if the two corner sets of windows were dropped, they might be able to get that through Jaguar.

Chairman Sheridan clarified the suggestion was to remove the upper panels of the windows.

Mr. Flubacker confirmed.

Chairman Sheridan said he wasn't sure that he would like that any better.

Commissioner Elkins said the three masses are the issue. There was agreement.

Chairman Sheridan said the code has certain requirements but some of them are extremely formulaic. This is the first request to have the code applied. If it's formulaic, he'd rather have something that looks better rather than just meeting the formula. The windows being tall are one of the things he likes about it. He'd prefer to have the tall windows and still have the peaked roof. He's inclined to grant these requests rather than simply apply the code.

Chairman Sheridan said three motions were needed, one for appearance review certificate, one for a variance for Section 10.7.A.4.a for façade articulation, and the sign variation.

Decision #1

Ms. Woleben-Meade moved to recommend granting the appearance review certificate for Case 2015-AR-04, 721 Green Bay Road in accordance with the plans submitted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bradford. Voting yes: none. Voting no: Chairman Sheridan and Commissioners Bradford, Collyer, Elkins, Miller, Phillips, Woleben-Meade. **The motion failed.**

Findings

The Commission found the remodeling did not fit in with the context of the surrounding area. The materials, massing and articulation was more consistent with a highway or industrial area than of a central business district.

Decision #2

Mr. Elkins moved to recommend granting a variation for the roofline for Case 2015-AR-04, 721 Green Bay Road in accordance with the plans submitted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bradford. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan and Commissioners Bradford, Elkins. Voting no: Commissioners Collyer, Miller, Phillips, Woleben-Meade. **The motion failed.**

Findings

The Commission found the variation would alter the character of the neighborhood. The variation also conflicts with the goals set forth in the comprehensive plan specifically contained in the Village Center Master Plan.

Decision #3

Mr. Bradford moved to recommend granting a 20.4% wall sign coverage variation and a sign variation to display two addition wall signs for Case 2015-AR-04, 721 Green Bay Road in accordance with the plans submitted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Phillips. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan and Commissioners Bradford, Collyer, Elkins, Miller. Voting no: Commissioners Phillips, Woleben-Meade. **The motion carried.**

Findings

The Commission found the wall sign coverage variation was in keeping with the size and scale as other signs in the area. The wall signs were largely replacing the existing signage and would not alter the character of the building. One of the signs seeking a variation was more directional signage rather than advertising. Granting the variation would assist customer to navigate to the service entrance.

Mr. Bradford moved to authorize Chairman Sheridan to prepare the report and recommendation for Case 2015-AR-04. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elkins. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan and Commissioners Bradford, Collyer, Elkins, Miller, Phillips, Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

Chairman Sheridan thanked the applicants for their effort with the application.

Mr. Flubacker thanked the commission for their comments and thoughtful deliberation.

Mr. Alan Aron said he is the owner of the property. For almost 60 years, he had always followed the philosophy of improvement. He has appeared before the commission before and it was always hard work to get through, but they would get there in the end and it worked out well. He always wanted this to be the most beautiful building in the Village and he believes it has been. With the situation now, they are going through hell with the manufacturer. He hopes they will find a way to get it done. It will be good for the Village. He thanked the commission for their time.

**2014-AR-21
Firefly Kitchen**

**111 Green Bay Road
Appearance Review Certificate**

Ms. Klug said she was looking for approval to not screen the roof-top mechanical units. She said the second floor roof top unit had been removed from the scope of work due to costs and they were only replacing units on the first floor roof. She said you won't be able to see the units from the street or alley.

Mr. Sheridan said there are two residential homes across the alley that will be able to see the new roof-top units once installed. He said they will need to be screened per the standards of review.

Mr. Bradford added the new units are much taller than the existing units.

Ms. Klug said the residential homes are already looking at the back of commercial buildings.

Mr. Bradford said the existing units are much smaller than what is proposed.

Mr. Sheridan said he understands the applicant's plight, but the Commission cannot use financial hardship as a reason to not apply the standards of review.

Mr. Elkins read the standards of review explaining all sides of the building required equal design consideration.

Mr. Bradford moved to continue Case 2014-AR-21 to the next meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Woleben-Meade. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan and Commissioners Bradford, Collyer, Elkins, Miller, Phillips, Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

V. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:00 p.m., Mr. Elkins moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bradford. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan and Commissioners Bradford, Collyer, Elkins, Miller, Phillips, Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**