



VILLAGE OF WILMETTE

1200 Wilmette Avenue
WILMETTE, ILLINOIS 60091-0040

MEETING MINUTES

APPEARANCE REVIEW COMMISSION

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2016

7:30 P.M.

SECOND FLOOR TRAINING ROOM

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

Members Absent: Carrie Woleben-Meade

Guests: John Fonseca, 822 Hinman Avenue, #1S, Evanston
Vi Tope, 715 Chicago Avenue, Evanston

Staff Present: Lucas Sivertsen, Business Development Coordinator

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 4, 2016.

Mr. Bradford moved to approve the January 4, 2016 meeting minutes as submitted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Phillips. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan, and Commissioners Bradford, Collyer, Elkins, Miller, Phillips. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

III. CONTINUANCES

Mr. Phillips removed Case 2015-AR-20, 135 Green Bay Road, IL Center for Digestive Health from the list of continuances. Mr. Phillips moved to continue Case 2015-AR-45, 930 Greenleaf Avenue, Women’s Club, to the March 7, 2016 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bradford. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan, and Commissioners Bradford, Collyer, Elkins, Miller, Phillips. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

IV. CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Bradford moved to approve an Appearance Review Certificate for Case 2016-AR-04, 1185 Wilmette Avenue, Rolf Salon. The motion was seconded by Mr. Miller. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan, and Commissioners Bradford, Collyer, Elkins, Miller, Phillips. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

V. CASES

**2016-AR-05
Fonseca Martial Arts**

**1100 Central Avenue, Unit D
Appearance Review Certificate**

Mr. Sivertsen called Case 2016-AR-05, 1100 Central Avenue, Fonseca Martial Arts, for an Appearance Review Certificate to install a wall sign and a preliminary review of a sign variation request.

Mr. John Fonseca, business owner, introduced himself and his business development manager, Vi Tope. He passed around some photos showing their design intent. He said they wished to install clean and simple signs without much verbiage. Part of their program is character development. A large part of their student body is between the ages of 4-12. Their logo is a play on a kanji symbol. The symbols they wish to display for their signage represent the seven virtues of bushido. He understands the amount of signs they wish to display exceed the percent coverage allowed by code. They wish to apply for a sign variation.

Mr. Sivertsen explained the applicant would need a coverage variation for the sign on the front of the building and a variation to display signage not fronting a public street.

Mr. Sheridan said the real estate office located next to Fonseca requested a coverage variation several years ago and was denied. They ultimately modified their request to something that was conforming. He thinks they would be rather upset if the Village granted this request, but denied the earlier request which were very similar.

Mr. Phillips said if they were able to move the signs back at least one foot from the window they would not be regulated by the Village’s sign code.

Mr. Tope said the mats go up to the windows and they feel anything hanging a foot inside the window could be a hazard.

Mr. Tope asked the commission to look at this request in a different light.

Mr. Bradford said he looks at this request a little differently and wouldn't consider the graphics to be signs. While the code calls them signs, he doesn't see them any differently than a fritted pattern on a window. The passageway through the building is also a unique circumstance in the Village.

Mr. Miller said the standards of review need to be applied to this case; otherwise, everyone will requesting a variation for more signage.

Mr. Collyer said he tends to agree with Mr. Bradford in that this is a very unique circumstance. He also agrees with Mr. Miller in that they need to be careful in what they approve. There needs to be reasons given that are consistent with the standards of review.

Mr. Elkins said he likes the way the signs look, but they're also not conforming to code.

Mr. Sheridan said he wanted to clarify in addition to what the Commission had been discussing the applicant also had a conforming wall sign. The wall sign which hangs beneath the overhang can be voted on at this meeting.

Mr. Sheridan recommended when they come back with a formal proposal to discuss the sign variations that they provide accurate dimensions on an elevation drawing.

Mr. Elkins moved to grant an Appearance Review Certificate for Case 2016-AR-05, 1100 Central Avenue, Unit D, to install a conforming wall sign. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bradford. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan, and Commissioners Bradford, Collyer, Elkins, Miller, Phillips. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

VI. ADJOURNMENT

At 8:15 p.m., Mr. Bradford moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elkins. Voting yes: Chairman Sheridan, and Commissioners Bradford, Collyer, Elkins, Miller, Phillips. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**