



VILLAGE OF WILMETTE

1200 Wilmette Avenue
WILMETTE, ILLINOIS 60091-0040

MEETING MINUTES

APPEARANCE REVIEW COMMISSION

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 2016

7:30 P.M.

VILLAGE BOARD CONFERENCE ROOM

Members Present: William Bradford
Dan Collyer
Daniel Elkins
Mason Miller
Carrie Woleben-Meade

Members Absent: Tim Sheridan, Chairman
Craig Phillips

Guests: Jon Talty, 600 W Jackson Blvd, Chicago, IL
Melissa Toops, 600 W Jackson Blvd, Chicago, IL
Mike Fitzgerald, 600 W Jackson Blvd, Chicago, IL
Laura Moss, 1515 Sheridan Rd
Linda Pedian, 1500 Sheridan Rd
Timothy Schoolmaster, 1500 Sheridan Rd
Steve Denemark, 1500 Sheridan Rd
Mark Egmon, 1625 Sheridan Rd

Staff Present: Lucas Sivertsen, Business Development Coordinator

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES; APPEARANCE REVIEW COMMISSION MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 26, 2016.

Ms. Woleben-Meade moved to approve the September 26, 2016 meeting minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elkins. Voting yes: Acting Chairman Bradford, and Commissioners Collyer, Elkins, Miller, Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

III. CONTINUANCES

Mr. Elkins moved to continue Case 2015-AR-45, 930 Greenleaf Avenue, Women’s Club, to the December 5, 2016 meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Woleben-Meade. Voting yes: Acting Chairman Bradford, and Commissioners Collyer, Elkins, Miller, Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

IV. CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Elkins moved to approve an Appearance Review Certificate for Case 2016-AR-43, 1419 Lake Avenue, Terry Animal Hospital. The motion was seconded by Mr. Miller. Voting yes: Acting Chairman Bradford, and Commissioners Collyer, Elkins, Miller, Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

V. CASES

**2016-AR-42
Westmoreland Country Club**

**2601 Old Glenview Road
Preliminary Review**

Mr. Sivertsen called Case 2016-AR-42, 2601 Old Glenview Road, Westmoreland Country Club, requesting a preliminary review of their Appearance Review Certificate request to construct a paddle hut, modify two existing paddle courts and construct an additional two courts. He said they will be attending a Zoning Board of Appeals hearing later in the month for a variation and special use request. Before they attend that meeting they would like a preliminary review of their project.

Mr. Fitzgerald explained Westmoreland’s desire to expand their paddle courts which were originally constructed over 20 years ago. He provided an overview of the plans submitted in the packet. Material samples will be provided at the next meeting. The main club house building and the auxiliary buildings on the site are all of similar vernacular. The proposed paddle hut intends to reflect this vernacular. Clapboard siding is used throughout the campus. He said the lighting fixture cut-sheets will be provided at the next meeting as they haven’t yet selected the fixture.

Ms. Woleben-Meade said the applicant’s submittal was very complete. She noted, the pavers for the viewing deck are concrete, however, most of the campus has bluestone or antique street pavers.

Mr. Fitzgerald said they are still studying that part of the building. There is occupied space below the viewing deck so they need to be sensitive to drainage and how the material will work as a walking surface.

Ms. Woleben-Meade said bluestone works with pedestal systems.

Mr. Bradford asked where the trash containers would be located.

Mr. Fitzgerald said in keeping with the club's policy on trash removal they will be picking up trash daily from the hut with a cart. They will bring the trash to the centralized enclosure for the entire campus next to the principal club house. There will not be a separate trash enclosure for the courts or paddle hut.

Mr. Bradford asked for the location of the a/c units.

Ms. Toops said the a/c units could be found on Sheet A-2 next to the east side of the courts. They are located where the new hicks yew shrubs are proposed.

Mr. Bradford asked about the lower level entry shown on Sheet A-6. He wanted to know the material of the wall.

Mr. Fitzgerald said the wall would be concrete. They would likely put a skim coat over the wall and paint it.

Mr. Miller said the street view of the building looked quite a bit like a church with the cupola and weathervane just above the entrance. He wondered if they considered moving the cupola back towards the center of the building.

Mr. Fitzgerald said the reason they located the cupola towards the front of the building is to provide natural light in the lobby.

Mr. Talty added the club likes to place a lot of emphasis on the entrance to the main club house and ancillary buildings. The cupola helps emphasize the entrance to the paddle hut.

**2016-SZC-02
Plaza del Lago**

**1515 Sheridan Road
Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment**

Mr. Bradford swore in those in attendance who wished to speak on Case 2016-SZC-02.

Mr. Sivertsen called Case 2016-SZC-02, 1515 Sheridan Road, Plaza del Lago, requesting a text amendment to the Plaza del Lago Local Sign Ordinance.

Ms. Moss stated she had submitted drawings that were included in the case report that were intended to show only the size of the sign they were wishing to install and were not intended to depict a specific design or copy. When she began looking into displaying a

wall sign on the Sheridan Road side of No Man's Land Pizza she realized the sign was very small. When she had seen the proposals for both No Man's Land and Runner's Edge she felt they were both smaller than what would typically be displayed by a business. She said she had learned that the Village was allowing blade signs in other commercial districts and so she wanted blade signs to be allowed in Plaza del Lago to keep up with the rest of the Village.

Ms. Woleben-Meade asked for clarification on the text amendment request.

Ms. Moss said she was not looking for an approval of a particular sign for No Man's Land. She just wanted the ordinance to be amended so that a sign larger than what is currently permitted could be displayed in the future by either No Man's Land or a future tenant. She might not even decide to display another wall sign for No Man's Land.

Mr. Elkins asked for clarification that if the ordinance was amended to allow a larger wall sign the Commission wouldn't necessarily be able to review that sign before it was issued a permit. They wouldn't be able to review it to determine whether or not it was in keeping with the design originally envisioned.

Mr. Sivertsen said Mr. Elkins was correct. Signs permitted under the local sign ordinance do not require further review by the Appearance Review Commission.

Mr. Elkins said he was not clear what was being requested by reading through the case report. It seemed like they were asking for a larger sign to be permitted in space #1 where No Man's Land is currently located. That sign could cover up to 30% of the signable area. In addition, they could choose to display a projecting sign in lieu of a wall sign that would follow the same regulations as other projecting signs in the Village. He didn't necessarily have a problem with the projecting signs. They're visible when driving down the street and are more elegant than internally illuminated signs. He asked if the sign for the Runner's Edge storefront was asking to cover 30% or 37% of the signable area.

Mr. Sivertsen said they were asking to be allowed a sign that covers 37% of the signable area.

Ms. Woleben-Meade asked if they should review each of these requests separately and not amend the local sign ordinance.

Mr. Bradford said the Commission has historically asked the management of Plaza del Lago to come in to amend the ordinance rather than request individual variations.

Mr. Bradford invited members of the audience to ask questions if they would like.

Ms. Linda Pedian said she lived at 1500 Sheridan Road across from Plaza del Lago. She said the space where No Man's Land is located is different than some other parts of the shopping center because of its close proximity to residential condos across the street. Other areas across from the shopping center like Westerfield Drive and 10th Street which are

more single-family residences don't allow illuminated signs across from them. The building at 1500 Sheridan wants to be good neighbors and support the vibrancy of Plaza del Lago, but light pollution can be very distressing. She prefers a softer light. The businesses where Starbucks is located have a different setting across from the residents. While the signs are vivid they are setback further from the residents on Sheridan. She recommends the request for No Man's Land is modified so that the lighting is made softer.

Mr. Schoolmaster said he lives at 1500 Sheridan Road. He said they are not objecting to the blade signs. The notice that was sent seemed to suggest the wall sign would be much larger. The current ordinance that limits illuminated signs on Westerfield and 10th Street seem to do so because of the residences across the street. He feels the residents at 1500 Sheridan are being denied the equal protection that those areas are given.

Ms. Moss said No Man's Land is allowed an illuminated sign under the current ordinance. The only change that is being requested is the size of the sign. While No Man's Land is close to Sheridan Road there are no residences directly across from the restaurant. Directly across is a parking lot and further down the street are the residences. She said that she doesn't know if No Man's Land will ever come in with a request to display a wall sign. She's coming from the perspective of the landlord.

Ms. Pedian said she can't find in the ordinance where it says signs along Sheridan are allowed to be illuminated.

Mr. Sivertsen said all signs are assumed to be allowed to be illuminated unless they are specifically prohibited, such as in the case of Westerfield and 10th Street.

Mr. Bradford said the ordinance specifically prohibits types of illuminated signs in the case of box signs. He thought the sign in the rendering for No Man's Land looked like a box sign which might be further confusing the discussion.

Mr. Steve Denmark said while the residences might not be directly across from No Man's Land they can see No Man's Land from their windows. He said Plaza del Lago is currently esthetically pleasant. He prefers smaller signs.

Mr. Mark Egmon asked if there were any limits of lumens in the Village.

Mr. Bradford said there are limits.

Ms. Woleben-Meade said she supported the projecting signs. The illuminated sign at Runner's Edge seems reasonable since Fannie May and Starbucks are already allowed large illuminated signs.

Mr. Bradford said the existing regulations for Runner's Edge limits wall signs to 20 square feet, while the request limits the sign by its coverage.

There was discussion of the proposal and how it related to the draft text amendment. Mr. Sivertsen clarified how the draft text amendment could be modified so as to allow the proposed size of signs.

Mr. Bradford said if everyone is comfortable with the sign for Runner's Edge and the sign is larger than what's permitted then the language needs to be amended.

Mr. Elkins said he wasn't sure if he was comfortable with the proposed size for Runner's Edge. There were no dimensions on the rendering, but it looked to be about 80 square feet.

Mr. Sivertsen said the outline depicting the proposed size of Runner's Edge was 27 square feet.

Mr. Elkins said there seem to be too many moving parts to the proposal and since the commission doesn't have an actual dimensioned proposal it is hard for him to vote at this time.

Ms. Moss said from a landlord perspective it is easier to establish a percentage coverage allowed rather than an exact dimension. She doesn't want to see a sign for Runner's Edge be dwarfed by the signage for Fannie May and Starbucks which are quite large.

Mr. Sivertsen explained that the signable area for Runner's Edge is quite small compared to most storefronts. It is limited by the medallions on either side of the spandrel.

Ms. Moss said the owner of Runner's Edge hasn't told her yet exactly the size and type of sign he would like. The sign in the proposal is something he was considering.

Mr. Bradford said his preference would be to define a percent coverage allowed rather than establish a prescriptive x and y dimension.

Mr. Elkins said after hearing Mr. Sivertsen's explanation of the signable area for Runner's Edge he agreed that 20 square feet may be small, but he still wasn't sure how much larger it should be.

Mr. Bradford said he would like to see a graphic depiction of the sign currently permitted and of the sign proposed. Without having dimensions of the signage, it is hard to determine which size is appropriate.

Mr. Miller said if the ordinance was changed from an exact dimension to a percent coverage what about the other storefronts where an exact dimension is proposed.

Mr. Bradford said each building is so unique that you have to tailor the regulations to each storefront.

Ms. Woleben-Meade asked if there was enough information to make a recommendation at this time.

Ms. Moss said she's not sure at this point what she wants, but she is sure that 30% is big enough for No Man's Land.

Ms. Moss asked if she would need to re-notice if the meeting were continued.

Mr. Bradford said re-noticing would not be required if the case were continued.

Mr. Elkins said he wanted to make sure the projecting signs were following the same regulations as other projecting signs in the Village.

Mr. Sivertsen said the reference will be included in the text amendment.

Ms. Moss said No Man's Land signage was proposed to cover 30% because that is what is consistently permitted in most other parts of the Village.

Ms. Woleben-Meade asked if a blade sign might be more effective for people driving on Sheridan Road.

Ms. Moss said it's hard for traffic on Sheridan Road to see a 6 square foot projecting sign, but she liked projecting signs. She has been told by many people that they never noticed their sign at the corner.

Mr. Elkins said he doesn't have an issue with the 30% coverage proposed, but does understand the concern of the residents regarding the illumination. There's also regulations as to the amount of illumination and the time at which the signs may be illuminated. He thought a properly illuminated blade sign could be effective.

Ms. Woleben-Meade said they should be able to illuminate the sign, otherwise it is useless during the winter months. The Plunkett sign is externally illuminated and is attractive.

Mr. Bradford said he thinks he is comfortable with the 30%, but thinks there could be some qualifiers placed upon the wall sign. They could specify the way it is illuminated and the type of copy on the sign.

Ms. Moss said she is familiar with back-lit signs because they installed them for the shopping center signage. That type of sign would be cost prohibitive for No Man's Land.

Mr. Sivertsen said they could also propose an externally illuminated sign as previously suggested by Ms. Woleben-Meade.

Mr. Miller suggested they might want to go with a back-lit sign to match what they already have to provide a cohesive look.

Ms. Moss said she didn't think the back-lit sign they had was very readable.

Ms. Woleben-Meade asked the commission if given their goal of consistency in signage among the same storefront if the existing back-lit sign would affect what gets approved for the Sheridan Road frontage.

Ms. Moss asked what would happen if the French bakery at Central and 11th wanted to come in and propose two different style signs on each of their storefronts.

Ms. Woleben-Meade said the commission would pull the case off the consent agenda and discuss.

Mr. Elkins said they don't have that ability with someone covered by local sign regulations. That is why they are being so careful in their consideration. It's their last chance to provide their input.

Mr. Bradford said this typically comes up when the adjacent elevations and signs are essentially the same, but because of the signable area being slightly different the signs are not the same size. In those cases the commission has required the signs to be the same size. In the case of No Man's Land the angled front is radically different than the other elevation.

Mr. Bradford said he thinks there's some consensus. Most people are comfortable with 30% coverage for space 36 rather than a strict dimension. On building A, space 1, people are starting to feel comfortable with 30% coverage, but maybe would like to see the copy limited to the business name. However, he doesn't feel there's consensus on the lighting.

Mr. Elkins feels the sign needs to be illuminated, it's just how it's illuminated.

Ms. Woleben-Meade thought a sign like the one Starbucks had would be too bright for the No Man's Land storefront.

Mr. Bradford said his preference is to continue the case and get all of the information requested so that there is a clear understanding of the request.

Mr. Elkins moved to continue Case 2016-SZC-02 to the December meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Woleben-Meade. Voting yes: Acting Chairman Bradford, and Commissioners Collyer, Elkins, Miller, Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:25 p.m., Mr. Elkins moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Woleben-Meade. Voting yes: Acting Chairman Bradford, and Commissioners Collyer, Elkins, Miller, Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**