



# VILLAGE OF WILMETTE

1200 Wilmette Avenue  
WILMETTE, ILLINOIS 60091-0040

## MEETING MINUTES

### APPEARANCE REVIEW COMMISSION

MONDAY, OCTOBER 2, 2017

7:30 P.M.

SECOND FLOOR TRAINING ROOM

---

Members Present: William Bradford, Chairman  
Nada Andric  
Daniel Elkins  
Mason Miller  
Carrie Woleben-Meade

Members Absent: Craig Phillips

Guests: Werner Brisske, 2610 Lake Cook Road, Suite 280, Riverwoods, IL  
Chris Wallace, 522 Forest Avenue  
Martina Stoycheva, 620 W. Belmont, Chicago, IL

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 SEPTEMBER 11, 2017.**

Mr. Miller moved to approve the September 11, 2017 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Woleben-Meade. Voting yes: Chairman Bradford and Commissioners Andric, Elkins, Miller, and Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

### III. CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Elkins moved to grant an Appearance Review Certificate for Case 2017-AR-30, 1157 Wilmette Avenue, The Actors Training Center, Awning Sign. The motion was seconded by Mr. Miller. Voting yes: Chairman Bradford and Commissioners Andric, Elkins, Miller, and Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

### IV. CASES

**2017-AR-10**

**St. Francis Xavier**

**808 Linden Avenue**

**Appearance Review Certificate and Variation**

Mr. Sivertsen called Case 2017-AR-10, 808 Linden Avenue, St. Francis Xavier School, for an Appearance Review Certificate to construct a two-story addition and install landscaping, and a buffer yard landscape variation. He said the project had previously received a negative recommendation from the Zoning Board of Appeals. The Village Board referred the case back to the Zoning Board after the applicant had offered to make modifications to address some of the concerns. The applicant had not yet been back to the Zoning Board. That meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, October 4, 2017.

Mr. Bradford said depending on how their review goes the Appearance Review Commission can provide a conditional approval tonight. The final approval would not come until after the case had been before the Zoning Board in case there are any plan revisions requested at that time.

Mr. Sivertsen explain the landscape variation for the buffer yard would be a recommendation from the Appearance Review Commission to the Village Board. The Village Board is the body making the decision whether or not to grant the variation. In contrast, an Appearance Review Certificate can be granted by the Appearance Review Commission and does not need to go before the Village Board for approval.

Mr. Bradford swore in the audience.

Mr. Chris Wallace said they made some revisions to the plan based off the preliminary feedback given by the Commission as well as input received at the Zoning Board hearing. They focused on neighborhood engagement to help work through some of the concerns. They held 34 separate meetings with neighbors to help understand their concerns. A neighborhood relations committee was formed consisting of parishioners and non-parishioners in the immediate neighborhood. The building setback along the east property line has been increased to make it conforming.

Mr. Bradford said during the preliminary review the applicant clearly demonstrated the need for the building expansion. The Commission is more concerned with how it looks.

Ms. Andric asked what the major concerns were of the neighbors.

Mr. Wallace said a lot of the concerns were related to existing conditions like traffic flow and student safety. Another item was the non-conforming nature of the eastern wall of the addition. That was mainly a concern by the two most effected neighbors.

Ms. Martina Stoycheva presented the evolution of the elevation design. They added more brick inlay to the precast concrete panels. The eastern wall was moved back so that it didn't encroach into the setback.

Mr. Werner Brisske said the lighter part of the precast panels will be a sandblasted cement finish.

Ms. Stoycheva said the pitched roof over the atrium will be a battened seamed metal roof. The roof, coping, and roof top screen will all be the same color. The window frame will be clear anodized with a light green tinted glass to match what is currently on the building.

Mr. Sivertsen asked about the color of the roof top screen.

Mr. Brisske said the sample is actually different than what was stated in the submittal. It will be the khaki color. He explained where on the roof they will be located. The screen will hang approximately 3 feet off the sides of the roof top units.

Ms. Andric asked if they will be adding any limestone to the building.

Ms. Stoycheva said they were adding limestone on the front of the building for the smoke stack and elevator shaft penetration, and at two planters that will wrap the corners of the addition. The existing façade along Greenleaf will remain.

Mr. Brisske said a new transformer will be installed on the west side of the building and two new a/c units will be installed on east side of the existing building's roof. The unit's won't be any larger than 3 ton units.

Mr. Sivertsen asked about the joints of the inlaid brick on the precast panels.

Mr. Brisske said the bricks will be cast-in. The color of the precast actually shows between the bricks. They are not pointed after the brick is inlaid. There are brick returns at the windows.

Mr. Elkins asked about the decision to use clear anodized window frames. He felt it would look cold against the brick. A darker color might be better.

Mr. Brisske said it was being done to match some of the existing window framing on the back of the existing building facing the courtyard. The framing on wall facing Greenleaf is more of a champagne color.

Mr. Bradford said they could use the clear anodized for the portion that will extend up from the existing north wall and then use champagne for the rest of the window framing on the addition.

Mr. Brisske said he had no problem with that.

Mr. Elkins had a question about the header detail on design revision #1 for the north elevation. It appears to be an arched shape over the window opening.

Mr. Brisske said it would be a precast inset setback a half inch to create a reveal line.

Mr. Elkins asked about the thin beige horizontal bands running along the second floor and halfway up the second floor.

Mr. Brisske said those were flush sandblasted concrete. They would not have a reveal.

Ms. Woleben-Meade asked if the existing bramble located on the east side of the building near the bay window would be removed. If those are removed the neighbor is going to be more exposed.

Mr. Brisske said those would not need to be removed for construction, however, the principal ask they be removed and replaced. They are not proposing to remove that landscaping during this project.

Mr. Sivertsen asked who owns the fence along the south end of the east property line.

Mr. Brisske said they are not touching that fence. Also, the fence along the north end of the east property line will remain at the neighbor's request.

Ms. Andric asked for the architect to describe the hardscaping proposed in this project.

Ms. Stoycheva said they are increasing the amount of pervious, non-paved, areas by 2,000 square feet. A lot of that is coming from the demolition of the existing building and gymnasium and moving the new gymnasium further west. They will be adding a walkway from the building out to the playground so students don't have to walk through the parking lot.

Mr. Woleben-Meade asked if they were proposing any bollards to separate the parking lot from the sidewalk.

Ms. Stoycheva said they are proposing to keep the existing bollards.

Ms. Andric asked if they were proposing to keep the mosaic wall.

Mr. Briske said they were proposing to relocate the mosaic to the atrium. They aren't sure how it was built so they're not sure if they will be able to move it, but it is their intent to move it to the atrium.

Mr. Bradford said while out of the purview of the Commission they should make sure the stage is accessible.

Mr. Briske said that was their intention. He thought they would either install a lift or ramp.

Mr. Bradford referred to the east and north elevations. He said a precast panel is drawn below some of the smaller second story windows but not in the middle bay of windows. He recommended they include the panel below the center bay of windows as well. There looks to be a panel joint between each two windows. He would like to see a vertical reveal between each window so that they are broken down.

Mr. Elkins said he didn't want to get carried away with too many reveals, but he thinks the size of the wall is big enough to accommodate some extra reveals and help make it look more like stone. At the base there are 10 feet between joints. They could probably add some additional reveals in between the 10 foot spans. Reveals on 5 foot centers made sense.

Mr. Sivertsen said if it is a conditional approval it will give the architect time to study the design further before a final approval is given.

Mr. Bradford said the plans are a vast improvement over what they reviewed the first time.

Mr. Sivertsen asked Ms. Woleben-Meade if there was any specific distance the columnar maple trees should be planted away from the building.

Ms. Woleben-Meade said they are columnar trees, but they can still reach 15 feet in width. She said 6 feet off the building as drawn could be a little tight.

Mr. Briske said they could make the planting area a little larger without encroaching on the playground.

Ms. Woleben-Meade moved to approved Case 2017-AR-10, 808 Linden Avenue, St. Francis Xavier, for a conditional Appearance Review Certificate to construct a two-story addition and install landscaping with the following amendments: 1) window frames will have a champagne color finish except for the ones at the atrium, 2) add precast concrete finish panels under the north and east elevation windows, 3) add reveals per the sketch documented at the meeting including reveals at 5 foot on center at the water table and in between each second story window on the north and east elevations. The motion was seconded by Mr. Miller. Voting yes: Chairman Bradford and Commissioners Andric, Elkins, Miller, and Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

**Findings of Fact**

The Commission found the variation will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. Additional landscaping will be provided while maintaining the playground equipment in the same location.

**Decision**

Mr. Elkins moved to recommend granting a buffer yard landscape variation for the northeast corner of the property. The motion was seconded by Ms. Woleben-Meade. Voting yes: Chairman Bradford and Commissioners Andric, Elkins, Miller, and Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

Ms. Woleben-Meade moved to authorize Chairman Bradford to prepare the Appearance Review Commission case report for Case 2017-AR-10. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elkins. Voting yes: Chairman Bradford and Commissioners Andric, Elkins, Miller, and Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

Mr. Sivertsen said the case should be continued to the November 6, 2017 Commission meeting so that any modifications made at either the Zoning Board of Appeals or Village Board meetings in October can be reviewed at the next meeting.

Mr. Elkins moved to continue Case 2017-AR-10, 808 Linden Avenue, to the November 6, 2017 Appearance Review Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Miller. Voting yes: Chairman Bradford and Commissioners Andric, Elkins, Miller, and Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

**V. PUBLIC COMMENT**

There were no additional public comments.

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

At 8:45 p.m., Mr. Elkins moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Miller. Voting yes: Chairman Bradford and Commissioners Andric, Elkins, Miller, and Woleben-Meade. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**