



VILLAGE OF WILMETTE

1200 Wilmette Avenue
WILMETTE, ILLINOIS 60091-0040

MEETING MINUTES

APPEARANCE REVIEW COMMISSION

MONDAY, AUGUST 7, 2017

7:30 P.M.

SECOND FLOOR TRAINING ROOM

Members Present: William Bradford, Chairman
Nada Andric
Daniel Elkins
Craig Phillips

Members Absent: Mason Miller
Carrie Woleben-Meade

Guests: Bill Mercer, 911 Ridge Road
Damon Wilson, 1135 Wilmette Avenue
Mark Goeden, 350 W. Hubbard Street, Chicago, IL
Jana Langston, 350 N. LaSalle, Chicago, IL
Ray Montez, 350 Ridge Road
Joseph LaJeune, 601 Green Bay Road

Staff Present: Lucas Sivertsen, Business Development Coordinator

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES; APPEARANCE REVIEW COMMISSION MEETING OF JULY 10, 2017.

Mr. Elkins moved to approve the July 10, 2017 meeting minutes as submitted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Phillips. Voting yes: Chairman Bradford and Commissioners Andric, Elkins, Phillips. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

III. CONTINUANCES

Mr. Elkins moved to continue Case 2017-AR-10, 808 Linden Avenue to the October 2, 2017 Appearance Review Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Phillips. Voting yes: Chairman Bradford and Commissioners Andric, Elkins, Phillips. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

IV. CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Phillips asked for Case 2017-AR-21, 350 Ridge Road, Tenant Directory Sign to be removed from the consent agenda.

Mr. Elkins moved to grant an Appearance Review Certificate for Case 2017-AR-19, 1201 Green Bay Road, Heart Certified Auto Care, Wall Sign; and Case 2017-AR-22, 1222 Washington Court, Share Wilmette, Awning Sign. The motion was seconded by Ms. Andric. Voting yes: Chairman Bradford and Commissioners Andric, Elkins, Phillips. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

V. CASES

**2017-AR-21
Hyun**

**350 Ridge Road
Appearance Review Certificate**

Mr. Sivertsen called Case 2017-AR-21, 350 Ridge Road, requesting an Appearance Review Certificate to install replacement panels on an existing tenant directory sign.

Mr. Phillips said there were more tenants in the building than sign panels. He wanted to make sure they weren't leaving someone out that would want a panel in the future.

Mr. Sivertsen said he asked the sign contractor if any additional tenants would want signs in the future. They were told by ownership that no additional tenants were interested in displaying signs on the tenant directory sign.

Mr. Ray Montez, said he owns the Domino's franchise located in the shopping center. He spoke to all of the tenants. No other tenants wanted a sign on the directory sign. In addition he has been in talks with the landlord to lease the last remaining vacant space.

Mr. Elkins moved to approve Case 2017-AR-21, 350 Ridge, requesting an Appearance Review Certificate to install replacement panels on an existing tenant directory sign. The motion was seconded by Mr. Phillips. Voting yes: Chairman Bradford and Commissioners Andric, Elkins, Phillips. Voting no: none.

**2017-AR-17
Treasure Island**

**911 Ridge Road
Appearance Review Certificate**

Mr. Sivertsen called Case 2017-AR-17, 911 Ridge Road, requesting an Appearance Review Certificate to resurface the parking lot, install landscaping, and repair a stone pier.

Mr. Bill Mercer, said some of the stone on the pier was starting to bulge so they decided to remove the damaged stone rather than try and repair. There was no specific reason for the pier to be as large as it is, so they thought removing the damaged portion was the most logical solution.

Mr. Bradford asked Mr. Mercer if the existing stone planter on the north end of the parking lot was going to be removed and replaced with a concrete planter.

Mr. Mercer said that was correct. They were proposing to remove it and replace it with concrete.

Mr. Mercer said the proposed plan shows a tree going in the northernmost planter. His team wasn't sure if that was a good idea. There is not a tree in the existing planter.

Mr. Elkins said he wasn't sure if the size of the planter was large enough to sustain a tree. He asked Mr. Sivertsen if the current zoning requirements required additional planting islands.

Mr. Sivertsen said when a parking lot is being replaced the landscape requirements are applied, however, some areas can be exempt if they reduce parking below the required amount, thereby creating a non-conformity. In this case, staff was only requiring additional landscaping in areas where there was no existing parking. The lot is already under parked so they didn't want to require any additional islands, which would further reduce the parking.

Mr. Elkins wanted to know if wheel stops would be installed. He recommended wheel stops be installed along the northernmost parking aisle to help prevent vehicles from driving through a storefront. He wanted to know if the existing pole mounted fixtures were to remain.

Mr. Mercer said they were not proposing to replace the fixtures.

Mr. Elkins asked how the benches would be installed.

Mr. Mercer said they were considering installing a metal bench on a concrete base or a stone bench inset into the proposed stone planter.

Mr. Elkins asked if accessible parking spaces were going to be installed.

Mr. Mercer said he thought it made the most sense to install one on the northeast corner of the lot and the other on the southeast corner of the lot closest to the grocery store entrance.

Mr. Phillips said he would suggest eliminating any sharp corners in the planters as they would become a maintenance issue in the future.

Ms. Andric said she also had a concern over the proposed metal bench and recommended the stone bench instead. It should match the stone of the planter.

Mr. Phillips asked how they were proposing to cap the stone pier.

Mr. Mercer said it would be concrete with a metal cap like the existing.

Mr. Elkins moved to approve Case 2017-AR-17, 911 Ridge Road, Treasure Island, for an Appearance Review Certificate to resurface the parking lot, install landscaping, and repair a stone pier with the conditions that wheel stops will be installed in front of the parking stalls along the north and south edge of the parking lot, that accessible parking spaces be provided at the northeast and southeast corners of the lot adjacent to the buildings, that the benches proposed will be either steel as shown or as a stone bench set on a foundation, and the remaining stone pier will have a metal cap in a color similar to the existing stone coping. The motion was seconded by Ms. Andric. Voting yes: Chairman Bradford and Commissioners Andric, Elkins, Phillips. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

**2017-AR-24
Gates Manor**

**1135 Wilmette Avenue
Preliminary Review**

Mr. Sivertsen called Case 2017-AR-24, 1135 Wilmette Avenue, Gates Manor, requesting a preliminary review of an Appearance Review Certificate to replace a vestibule and fence.

Mr. Mark Goeden said his company acquired the property a few years ago and have been in the process of making improvements to the building. Their remodeling budget included some contingencies which were not entirely used. They decided to use some of that remaining money and put it towards remodeling the entrance to the building.

Mr. Damon Wilson said they are matching the existing dimensions in a lot of ways, however, the canopy is wider and deeper than the existing. The aluminum window frames will match the frames of the windows that were recently installed.

Mr. Bradford said the plans are a very attractive solution to upgrading the entrance. Some of the things he would like to see when they return are finish samples for the storefront aluminum and wood underside, flashing details, scupper, and door actuator.

Mr. Elkins said he thought the design looked great. He wondered if the bench was part of the submittal. If they decide to go the route of installing a downspout he suggested having the window installer fabricate a downspout to match the window framing.

Ms. Andric asked if there was any proposed signage.

Mr. Goeden said signage was not part of this proposal. He thanked the Commission for their preliminary comments.

2016-AR-18
Mona Lisa

601 Green Bay Road
Appearance Review Certificate

Mr. Sivertsen called Case 2016-AR-18, 601 Green Bay Road, requesting an amendment to their previously approved Appearance Review Certificate to address outstanding conditions of the permit.

Mr. Sivertsen said some of the remaining items were the trash enclosure, steel trim at the edge of the tile at the corner of the building, drip edge underneath the cornice and parge applied to the south elevation of the building.

Mr. Bradford added the issue of cabling that was on the exterior of the building and guardrail on the back of the building.

Mr. Sivertsen said the guardrail was installed.

Mr. Bradford said to require the petitioner to install the drip edge at this point did not make any sense. That being said he thinks the petitioner made a mistake in not installing a drip edge at the cornice.

Mr. Elkins said he found it frustrating that the approved plans were not followed. These were specific conditions that the petitioner ignored.

Mr. Phillips asked what the Commission was supposed to approve.

Mr. Sivertsen said the Commission would either need to approve the changes, or staff would need to seek enforcement of the work done without a permit.

Mr. Bradford said while the solution of installing the parge was not a bad solution, it was the way it was done that created the problem. There is a noticeable difference in color from one side to the other. The parge looks like it was mixed in separate batches resulting in a noticeable color variation.

Mr. Joseph Lageune said once they removed the wood siding from the building they discovered the brick to be in poor shape. Some bricks were painted. When they tried to remove the paint not all of the bricks could be cleaned. They wanted to place the parge on the brick so they had a consistent color along the wall. The exposed brick was made up of different colored brick, some painted some not. They wanted to place a neutral color on the wall until their long term goal of painting a mural was realized.

Mr. Elkins expressed concern for the way in which the work was done without prior approval. It didn't seem right to give them approval after the fact.

Mr. Bradford said while the applicant didn't follow the approval he did take a building in bad shape and help to make it better. While the parge was installed he thinks it should be painted so there's a consistent color across the entire wall.

Mr. Lageune said he wanted to get away from painting the building. He thought the parge was the easiest and best process to maintain the original feel of the building.

Mr. Bradford said the applicant made a decision on their own to move forward with the parge without consulting the Appearance Review Commission.

Mr. Phillips understands why he wanted to parge the building, but he thinks painting the building will help take out some of the inconsistencies in color.

Mr. Lageune said he doesn't see the benefit in painting the wall, but he does agree there is some noticeable color variation. He asked if what color the Commission would approve if he painted the wall.

Mr. Bradford said he doesn't have an issue of the color of the parge, but rather than noticeable variation from one side to another. They could paint is a color similar to the parge.

Mr. Elkins said if they were proposing a color to match the existing gray then he wouldn't need to see a color sample.

Mr. Phillips moved to approve Case 2016-AR-18, 601 Green Bay Road, requesting an amendment to their previously approved Appearance Review Certificate with the conditions that 1) the required steel trim be remove from the approval, 2) the required drip edge be removed from the approval, and 3) the existing variable colored parge on the south elevation be painted a similar gray color. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elkins. Voting yes: Chairman Bradford and Commissioners Andric, Elkins, Phillips. Voting no: none.

The motion carried.

VI. SPECIAL ZONING COMMITTEE HEARING

**2017-SZC-04
Westlake Plaza**

**3207-3223 Lake Avenue
Text Amendment**

Mr. Bradford opened the Special Zoning Committee meeting.

Mr. Sivertsen called Case 2017-SZC-04, 3207-3223 Lake Avenue, for a text amendment to the Westlake Plaza local sign ordinance to permit the display of two multi-tenant directory signs.

Ms. Jana Langston said they were requesting approval for monument signage. There are only two shopping center identification signs. Neither sign has tenant identification on them. It's really difficult to see some of the tenants from the street. There are 26 tenants with 42,000 square feet of leasable area. One of the spaces at the end has little exposure and has been vacant for over 4 years.

Mr. Bradford had a question about the monument sign on the west side (Type 2). He asked if the sign had signage on both sides.

Ms. Langston said it would have signage on both sides.

Mr. Phillips asked why the sign was parallel to Lake Avenue rather than perpendicular.

Ms. Langston said she didn't know if it would fit in that existing island if it were turned perpendicular and they didn't want to lose any parking spaces to expand the island.

Mr. Elkins said he agreed with Mr. Phillips and thought you would get more people viewing the sign if it were turned perpendicular to Lake Avenue.

Ms. Andric thought the letters looked crowded on the sign panel making the sign difficult to read. It would be more legible if the lettering was reduced. In many signs like this the signage reflects the corporate logo of the company. You can immediately recognize the sign even without reading the lettering. There is also no hierarchy in letter size.

Mr. Bradford said the only thing he can think of that might be a problem with that solution is the proportion of the logo to lettering may require the lettering to be too small to easily read.

Mr. Elkins said he agrees with Ms. Andric, but thought by incorporating the red accent color from the building into the sign it may not read very well alongside the corporate color of each business. He is thinking the colors of the Dunkin Donuts would clash with the red background.

Ms. Langston said maybe they would all be white lettering, but vary the font to match the corporate branding.

Mr. Phillips said it would be helpful to differentiate the name of the shopping center from the tenants. Right now they are the same font and color. He also thinks it would help to have the actual names of the businesses inserted into the sign rendering.

Ms. Langston said some of the tenant leases specified which tenants were allowed signage if a tenant directory sign were installed. Not all of the tenants will get a panel on the monument sign. There's just not enough room.

Ms. Andric asked about the height of the buildings compared to the size of the proposed signs.

The applicant and commissioners weren't sure about the height of the existing building.

Mr. Elkins said given the speed of traffic at that intersection he had no problem with the proposed height of 17 feet.

Mr. Elkins asked how the panels would be attached. As tenants change they will need to be replaced.

Ms. Langston thought the sides of the sign were removable allowing for the sign panels to be slid out and replaced with new panels.

Mr. Elkins asked if they would eventually be approving the signage and landscaping or would the landscaping be reviewed at a separate meeting.

Mr. Sivertsen said the landscaping could be voted on at the same meeting, but they would do it as two separate votes. The signage would be a recommendation to the Village Board and the landscaping would be an Appearance Review Certificate approval.

Mr. Elkins moved to continue Case 2017-SZC-04, 3207-3223 Lake Avenue, Westlake Plaza to the September 11, 2017 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Phillips. Voting yes: Chairman Bradford and Commissioners Andric, Elkins, Phillips. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

Mr. Bradford adjourned the Special Zoning Committee meeting.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no additional public comments.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Andric asked about the proposed project at Wil-Ridge Plaza.

Mr. Sivertsen said they will be requesting approval for a planned unit development. It won't necessarily be required to be reviewed by the Appearance Review Commission, however, the Plan Commission or Village Board may request the project go before the Appearance Review Commission.

Mr. Sivertsen provided the Commission with construction status of previously reviewed projects.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:15 p.m., Mr. Elkins moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Phillips. Voting yes: Chairman Bradford and Commissioners Andric, Elkins, Phillips. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**