



1200 Wilmette Avenue
Wilmette, IL 60091

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT

(847) 853-7550
Fax (847) 853-7701
TDD (847) 853-7634

**MEETING AGENDA
of the
APPEARANCE REVIEW COMMISSION
OF THE VILLAGE OF WILMETTE**

**Tuesday, June 23, 2020 at 4:00 P.M.
Remote Meeting**

Due to the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic, this meeting will be held remotely by the Appearance Review Commission. The meeting will be broadcast live on YouTube at <https://www.youtube.com/user/villageofwilmette/live> and on Channel 6 and then published on the Village's website at www.wilmette.com. To participate in the meeting, please contact the Community Development Department prior to the meeting at comdev@wilmette.com or (847) 853-7520 for instructions on how to participate by computer. To participate by telephone, call (872) 239-8225 and use code 500 770 769#. Written comments may be submitted to comdev@wilmette.com. Comment may be made during the meeting through YouTube live where comments submitted will be read to the Appearance Review Commission.

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes

Minutes of the Appearance Review Commission of February 3, 2020

III. Review of Remote Meeting Procedures

IV. Public Comment

V. Adjournment

Charles Smith, Chairman



VILLAGE OF WILMETTE

1200 Wilmette Avenue
WILMETTE, ILLINOIS 60091-0040

MEETING MINUTES

APPEARANCE REVIEW COMMISSION

**MONDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2020
7:30 P.M.**

SECOND FLOOR TRAINING ROOM

Members Present: Nada Andric
Richard Brill
Devan Castellano
Doug Johnson, Acting Chairman
Mason Miller
Jeffery Saad

Members Absent: Charles Smith

Guests: George Simoulis, 7555 Keefer, Skokie, IL
Lloyde Nelson, 2244 Beechwood Avenue
Mohammed Najeer, 2704 W. Peterson Ave, Chicago, IL
Pete Louckes, 461 N. Mount Prospect Rd, Mount Prospect, IL
Jon Talty, 600 W. Jackson, Chicago, IL
Dave Schlagetter, 1 Indian Hill Road
Mike Thompson, 1719 Walnut Avenue
Debbie Thompson, 2305 Kenilworth Avenue
Dennis Stonequist, 1100 Laramie Avenue
Jennifer Boyd, 2309 Kenilworth Avenue
Scott Freres, 116 W. Illinois, Chicago, IL

Staff Present: Lucas Sivertsen, Business Development Coordinator

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Johnson called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES; APPEARANCE REVIEW COMMISSION MEETING OF JANUARY 6, 2020.

Mr. Miller moved to approve the January 6, 2020 meeting minutes as submitted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Castellano. Voting yes: Commissioners Andric, Brill, Castellano, Johnson, Miller, and Saad. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

III. CASES

**2019-AR-37
1 Indian Hill Road**

**Indian Hill Club
Appearance Review Certificate**

Mr. Sivertsen described the case as a request for an Appearance Review Certificate to construct two accessory buildings, associated paving, landscaping and fencing. He explained the public hearing history of the project and explained the commission's scope in reviewing the request.

Mr. Jon Talty explained the revisions made since the plans were previously before the Commission. He said two buildings are proposed. One is a maintenance facility to serve the operations of the club and would include offices, conference rooms, and locker rooms. The other building is what they are calling the environmental building which is a pre-engineered building that would be used for cleaning vehicles and storage of fertilizer. That building is taking the place of some of the functions that are being housed in the existing maintenance facility. In addition, storage bins will be added to the site to provide a more organized storage of landscaping materials.

Mr. Johnson asked where the sand would be stored.

Mr. Talty said the sand would be stored in the environmental building. They want to keep the sand clean and protected because it is a very expensive material.

Mr. Talty said there are two primary changes from the previous submittal. They have moved the maintenance facility in towards the property and provided greater setbacks from neighboring properties. They listened to the neighbors and moved the building so that it met required setbacks for the R Zoning District. The building previously had a pitched roof to make it more residential in character. Based on the feedback they received they modified the roof to a flat roof in order to reduce the height and mass of the structure. The sand silo has also been removed from the proposal. Impervious surface has been decreased with the revised site plan because the setbacks have pushed the building closer to the interior of the site.

Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Talty to provide a response to the written comments regarding landscaping included in the case report.

Mr. Talty said the club has had a good relationship with neighbors in addressing concerns including landscaping on the site. It was the club's intent to work with the neighbor at the northeast corner of the site to improve landscaping, however, he did not have a specific plan of how this would be accomplished.

Mr. Miller asked Mr. Talty to explain the use of the paved area on the northeast side of the site.

Mr. Talty said he thought the intended use of the pad was to temporarily store materials and/or store a tractor during the day. Historically, the fence line on the northside of the site had cut-off use of a portion of the property. The revised site plan intends on recapturing the property so that it can be used by the club.

Mr. Saad said one of his requests from the previous meeting was for the applicant to prepare an existing conditions landscape plan so they could better understand how the site is being used and what screening might be removed with the proposed project. He still feels this information is necessary.

Mr. Brill asked for a description of what changes will be made that will impact the views from neighboring properties.

Mr. Talty said the fence along Kenilworth Avenue had been replaced within the past five years. The landscaping has all been provided by the club. He said the proposed buildings will not be visible from Kenilworth Avenue, however, they would be visible from the second story of homes across the street.

Mr. Johnson stated the club would be ceding a portion of their property along Kenilworth Avenue to the Village. He wanted to know who would be responsible for this landscaping going forward.

Mr. Talty said the club had been responsible for it and will continue to be responsible for maintaining it.

Mr. Johnson wanted it on the record that the commission is pointing out the need for there to be an understanding as to who will maintain the property once the property is dedicated to the Village.

Mr. Johnson asked if there would be any site lighting.

Mr. Talty said there would not be any site lighting. The only lighting they were proposing were two lantern fixtures at the entrance to the new maintenance building.

Mr. Brill asked about the dumpster pad shown on the plans.

Mr. Talty said the pads were for dumpsters that are existing on the site. They are currently sitting in the mud and the club would like them to be placed on a more durable and cleanable surface.

Mr. Sivertsen said the dumpsters were proposed to sit below six feet which is the height of the existing fence. There are no code concerns.

Mr. Johnson asked the applicant to explain how the maintenance yard currently operates.

Mr. Talty said the employees begin to arrive around 4-5am. By the middle of the afternoon the operations have largely ceased.

Mr. Miller asked if there were any planting requirements for the property.

Mr. Sivertsen said for the parking lot there were no further requirements since the lot was already screened by a fence. No interior parking lot landscaping is required because the lot is less than 20 spaces.

Ms. Debbie Thompson, 2305 Kenilworth Avenue, asked if there were any employees that stay in the maintenance building. She also said she can see through the gate along Kenilworth Avenue.

Mr. Dave Schlagetter with Indian Hill Club said no one is there overnight, however, there may be times in which he has left his television on during the evening.

Mr. Talty said they will happily repair the fence.

Mr. Nelson, 2244 Beechwood Ave, asked about the parking pad proposed on the north side the property near his property. There were no definitive plans given for the use of that pad.

Mr. Talty said it was not the intention to make it a mystery.

Mr. Nelson said the plan was to remove a large amount of burning bush shrubs to make room for the parking pad. The removal will impact his view greatly.

Ms. Jennifer Boyd, 2309 Kenilworth Avenue, said she lives directly across the street from the subject property. She said if the proposed project were in a vacuum it would be fine, but it is located across the street from single-family homes and that needs to be taken into consideration. Adding the buildings and concrete is going to change her views into the property. The applicant described their intent on providing a more orderly management of the site. She said the current use looks very natural and it blends in. She shared photos of views from the second story of her house with the Commission. She would prefer for the property to remain as is and not add buildings and pavement. The added pavement will also cause further water to go into the Village's overtaxed stormwater system.

Mr. Nelson shared some photos looking out one of his windows. He said they have lived at their current home for 29 years. Dave from the club has been good to work with. Their issue is that the club cannot say what that parking pad will be used for. Trees may help screen the area, however, without a plan it is difficult to say.

Mr. Saad said that goes back to his point, that the deficiency in the proposal is the lack of a landscaping plan.

Mr. Castellano asked if there were noise restrictions.

Mr. Sivertsen said he thought the maximum decibel level at the receiving lot line after 7 pm in a residential district was around 45 decibels and during the day was 65 decibels. That was his recollection, but he would need to confirm.

Ms. Andric said Mr. Talty began the presentation by saying the direction of the project was to provide order and not alter operations. She didn't know if odor or noise would be an issue if they were not proposing to change operations.

Mr. Talty said he understands the neighbors are viewing his explanation as being dodgy, however, that is not his intent. He stated whatever happens in the area of the parking pad it will not be noisy or smelly or visually offensive, because they want to be good neighbors.

Mr. Sivertsen explained the stormwater review that this project will be required to follow upon building permit review.

Mr. Mike Thompson, 2305 Kenilworth Avenue, said his primary concern was the landscaping for the project. He reviewed the preamble of the landscaping section of the Village Code. The club was allowed to construct the existing maintenance building years ago and they have now outgrown the facility. That is by no fault of the neighbors. The club is now wanting to expand a commercial activity in a residential district. He also has concerns over the lack of a lighting plan and lack of landscaping plan.

Mr. Saad also pointed out that landscaping should consider maintaining mature trees as part of the landscape plan. If there was a tree survey the commission could evaluate this standard.

Mr. Johnson said before the Commission deliberates on the request he wanted to state that this case is a non-conforming use in a residential zoning district. While the Appearance Review Commission does not decide on use approvals the ultimate decision of the Village Board will have future implications on future development proposals. Typically the Commission is presented a very detailed landscape plan. He wanted to hear from other commissioners as to whether or not they feel a landscape plan is required before a vote is taken. He feels like the Commission should wait until they see a landscape plan from the applicant.

Mr. Brill thanked the club for lowering the heights of the building and increasing the setbacks. He is in favor of requiring a landscape plan.

Ms. Castellano said since the applicant had already prepared a three-dimensional model of the site it would be helpful for the neighbors to see what the site will look like from their perspective.

Ms. Andric said she always assumed this was not the final plan and that the applicant would be coming up with a landscape. She felt comfortable approving the plan as is with the condition that a landscape plan will still need to be presented and approved.

Mr. Johnson said he would prefer for the landscape plan to be presented before making a vote. The club has been very responsive to the comments made by neighbors and commission. He thinks they should ask to be continued so they can present a complete plan.

Mr. Miller said he thought the applicant did a good job tying in the architecture of the existing club. He said they might get some pushback on the amount of impervious surface proposed since it will impact landscaping.

Mr. Saad he thinks they did a nice job laying out the site in terms of scale, however, there doesn't seem to be enough thought put into how existing conditions and vegetation are impacted by the plan. If there was a tree survey they might be able to save some trees by making some small shifts.

Mr. Johnson asked if the applicant would like a continuance to allow them time to come back with a landscape plan.

Mr. Talty said they will request a continuance. He wanted to know if the landscape plan needed to address the landscaping along Kenilworth Avenue south of the fence.

Mr. Johnson said only the landscaping on their property needed to be shown, however, there is an expectation they will address the ongoing maintenance of that landscaping.

Mr. Sivertsen said if the Zoning Board or Village Board felt the expansion of use required additional landscaping outside the fence and outside their property then the applicant should address landscaping in that area. That direction should come from them. The Appearance Review Commission is not necessarily looking at this project from a use standpoint. However, it is within the Appearance Review Commission's purview to require additional landscaping if they feel it is necessary to screen proposed structures.

Ms. Castellano said landscaping within the site could still help screen the proposed buildings from views on neighboring property's second stories.

Mr. Johnson noted a few other items they should address when they come back including fence repairs, landscaping in winter, site lighting (if proposed), and the parking pad.

Mr. Brill moved to continue Case 2019-AR-37, 1 Indian Hill Road, Indian Hill Club to the March Appearance Review Commission hearing. The motion was seconded by Mr. Saad. Voting yes: Commissioners Andric, Brill, Castellano, Johnson, Miller, and Saad. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

**2018-AR-03
399 Ridge Road**

**Shell
Appearance Review Certificate**

Mr. Sivertsen described the case as a request for an Appearance Review Certificate to install two wall signs and a ground sign.

Mr. George Simoulis, stated he was the architect for the project. The proposed ground sign will be a monument sign rather than a pole mounted sign. He believes the sign will be a great improvement to the intersection.

Mr. Brill said he lives very close to that intersection. He thinks it's a great improvement from the pole mounted sign. He said the gas signs that he has seen have the price in very large font and the words "cash" in very small print next to the price indicating the price is only if you are paying with cash. He feels it is kind of a bait and switch to display the price if you are paying with cash.

Mr. Simoulis said he didn't know if this was something that corporate BP would have an issue with.

Mr. Saad asked if there was anything non-conforming that the Commission should be aware of as they review the proposal.

Mr. Sivertsen said the current proposal was conforming. The applicant had made several changes to make sure the sign was conforming including reducing the size of both the ground sign and two wall signs.

Mr. Sivertsen said the copy on the sign is not something the Village can regulate. They can however, regulate the size or color of the sign.

Ms. Castellano asked what type of landscaping will be used at the base of the sign.

Mr. Simoulis said he did not know what type of landscaping was proposed.

Ms. Castellano said it would be nice if there were some greenery around the sign.

Mr. Johnson said it is important to look at the safety of the ground sign as they can block visibility.

Mr. Sivertsen said when the monument sign was proposed he reviewed with the Village Engineer. Because the intersection is a controlled intersection, meaning traffic is controlled by traffic signals, there are no specific sight line requirements in the Village Code.

Mr. Miller said the notes in the plan say the brick on the sign is to match the brick on the building however the brick on the building is painted.

Mr. Simoulis said it would be the color of the brick in the color rendering.

Mr. Saad moved to grant an Appearance Review Certificate for Case 2018-AR-03, 399 Ridge Road, as submitted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Miller. Voting yes: Commissioners Andric, Castellano, Johnson, Miller, and Saad. Voting no: none. Abstain: Brill. **The motion carried.**

1100 Laramie Avenue

Loyola Academy Preliminary Review

Mr. Sivertsen provided a background of the recent zoning and appearance approvals for Loyola Academy. The current project is phase two of their campus master plan after their parking lot expansion and the natatorium addition. The proposal has not yet been to the Zoning Board and will need to come back to the Appearance Review Commission for formal review.

Mr. Dennis Stonequist introduced himself as the Executive Vice President at Loyola Academy.

Mr. Scott Freres said his firm had led Loyola's Campus Master Plan. He said the campus master plan is the guide for physical development on the property. Every improvement made to the campus is a special use and will require its own Zoning Board approval request. He reviewed the master plan with the Commission for their reference. The proposed theatre would hold approximately 550 seats. The theater would hold musical performances, art galleries, and gatherings. The theater will be connected to the existing school through classroom space. They had originally proposed the theater to be located south of the school in the parking lot. They learned that by placing the theater in the parking lot it would disrupt the parking circulation and so they chose to move the theater to the north side of the campus. They will be removing 60 parking spaces and 12 trees to accommodate the new theater building. The loss of these 60 spaces was taken into considering as part of the overall master plan and will not impact the long-term goal for parking.

The building is broken down into three boxes to help break up the massing of the building. The fly tower is the tallest component to the building and is located in the middle box.

Ms. Andric asked if they will be wanting to put signage on the north side of the building.

Mr. Saad said it is interesting that the aquatics center opened the building to the community, but that originally were thinking it would be screened by the theater. Now you are creating another bookend on the north side of the building with the new theater however, the north façade of the theater is a solid wall that closes itself off to the community. The architects for this project are great so Loyola is in good hands, but he's interested to hear their thoughts for the design of the north elevation.

Mr. Freres said interior functions of the space are what guided that facade. They are looking at ways to soften the wall. He understands Mr. Saad's comment and thinks it's a valid point.

Mr. Miller said he thinks the building will be beautiful, but agrees there can be more done to the north façade.

Mr. Freres said Ms. Andric brings up a good point on signage. He wonders what the Commission's thoughts are on adding signage to the north side of the campus.

Mr. Andric said Loyola Academy has a unique circumstance in that they have cars traveling past at 60 miles per hour, but also pedestrians walking by. There is a need to acknowledge the different modes of travel.

Mr. Saad said he thinks the building is a sign in of itself.

Mr. Freres said they haven't thought about adding signage, but he was curious what the Commission thought.

Mr. Sivertsen asked what finish materials will be used on the exterior.

Mr. Freres said they will be precast concrete panels and manufactured stone. They will have details when they come back for a formal review.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no additional public comments.

V. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:55 p.m., Mr. Miller moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Brill. Voting yes: Commissioners Andric, Castellano, Johnson, Miller, and Saad. Voting no: none. Abstain: Brill. **The motion carried.**



1200 WILMETTE AVENUE
WILMETTE, ILLINOIS 60091-0040

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT

(847) 853-7550
FAX (847) 853-7701
TDD (847) 853-7634
EMAIL comdev@wilmette.com

June 19, 2020

To: Chairman Smith and the Appearance Review Commission

From: Lucas Sivertsen, AICP
Business Development Coordinator

Subject: Remote Meeting Procedures and Rules

The Village Attorney has prepared public hearing procedures and rules that all boards and commissions must follow when conducting a hearing. Please review the following prior to our meeting on Tuesday, June 23, 2020. I will review these procedures with you during our meeting, but it will help you to follow along if you've already had time to review. Feel free to contact me before, during or after the meeting with any questions.

Virtual Public Hearing Procedures & Rules

Prior to the meeting/public hearing

- A. An application as required by the Village Code and any accompanying exhibits that were previously submitted to the Village shall be identified and made part of the record and shall be the same version that is presented at the electronic public hearing. Any amendments to the said application or any exhibits that the Applicant wishes to make part of its presentation must be submitted 72 hours in advance of the public hearing. The Village's Community Development Director shall determine if a new notice for a public hearing must be submitted prior to a hearing being held if an amended application is submitted. The public body holding the public hearing will not accept new or amended exhibits or amended applications during the public hearing and will continue the matter to supplement the record to another meeting in the future.
- B. A fully executed Unconditional Agreement and Consent to Conduct Electronic Public Hearings must have been submitted to the Community Development Director at least

72 hours in advance of the electronic public hearing. If that Agreement has not been submitted, the Application will be continued to a new meeting.

Conduct during Electronic Public Meeting and Public Hearing

- A. Call to order and roll call.
- B. Chair reads off items on the agenda.
- C. Chair or Village staff liaison explains how members of the public can participate in the electronic public hearings.
- D. The Chair opens the electronic public hearing for the application(s).
- E. The Chair swears in those wishing to give testimony. Those individuals wishing to give testimony as a guest of the meeting (either through video or audio conferencing) will be required to be sworn in. There will be a presumption that an affirmative response was provided by each individual wishing to testify. If it is determined that an individual was not sworn in prior to testimony, then the statements made during the electronic public hearing will not be considered.

NOTE: The Chair will open the public hearing which will follow the order of testimony provided below. At the designated time, the Chair will ask each non-applicant individual that has previously been sworn that is attending the meeting through a computer, mobile device, or conference dial-in to identify themselves by name. The Chair, in the Chair's discretion, will then call on each individual identified to provide their testimony. Once everyone has had an opportunity to provide their testimony, the Chair will close the live testimony portion of the public hearing. At that time, the Chair will read or direct the Village staff to read the previously submitted emails and YouTube Chat comments in the record.

All persons offering testimony at a public hearing shall testify under oath. An attorney shall be sworn if he/she offers testimony, but not if he/she is questioning a witness, summarizing witness testimony, or addressing the body conducting the hearing on procedural issues. All persons wishing to testify at the public hearing shall state for the record his/her name and address.

All interested parties may appear for themselves or be represented by a person of their choosing. Written statements, including any electronically submitted statements, will be accepted prior to the hearing to be entered into the public hearing record.

Any person may appear at a hearing and submit evidence, upon receiving recognition from the Chair of the body conducting the hearing. Any person may ask relevant questions of other witnesses, but only through the Chair and at the discretion of the Chair. All persons shall state his/her name for the record before submitting evidence or questioning a witness at the public hearing. All testimony or questions shall be directed to the Chair.

- F. The order of testimony shall be as follows:
 - a. Applicant's Presentation
 - i. Applicant's introduction of all their witnesses;
 - ii. Chair enters Application and accompanying exhibits into the record;
 - iii. Applicant presents application;
 - b. Questions from members of the public body holding the public hearing;
 - c. Responses to questions from Applicants;
 - d. Public testimony:
 - i. Chair identifies all witnesses attending remotely through Microsoft Teams (both as guests and as conference call-ins);
 - ii. Chair calls on those previously sworn individuals to provide comments;
 - iii. Chair then reads or directs Village staff to read comments previously submitted to the designated email address into the record;
 - iv. Chair closes public comment portion of the hearing;
 - e. Response to questions from public;
 - f. Follow-up questions from the members of the public body holding the public hearing.
- G. Deliberation
- H. Motion to Approve and/or Motion to Continue
 - a. The Chair, with approval of the body conducting the hearing, may continue the public hearing. In order to reopen the hearing, no new notice shall be required if a hearing is continued to a date specified, provided that a public announcement of the future date, time, and place of the continued hearing is made at the hearing and placed in the minutes. If the hearing is adjourned, rather than continued to a date specified, in order to reopen the hearing all notices must be given that would have been required for the initial public hearing.

Ways to for Public to Participate in a Public Hearing/Public Meeting

A. Joining a meeting:

Meeting guests have 3 options to join our public meetings, computer (PC or Mac), smart device (Phone or tablet) or dial-in by telephone. It is recommended that guests join by computer or mobile device for the best experience.

Computer and mobile device users may join a meeting by using the free Microsoft Teams app. Instructions on how to obtain the software and join a meeting may be found here:

- a. Join from a computer:
<https://support.office.com/en-us/article/join-a-meeting-in-teams-1613bb53-f3fa-431e-85a9-d6a91e3468c9#ID0EAABAAA=Desktop>
- b. Join from a mobile device:
<https://support.office.com/en-us/article/join-a-meeting-in-teams-1613bb53-f3fa-431e-85a9-d6a91e3468c9#ID0EAABAAA=Mobile>

The link to join a meeting is available on the Village's website and through the Village's social media platforms.

- c. Join via conference call
If joining by computer or mobile device is not possible, audio conference dial-in capability exists. To join by telephone dial-in just dial the Village's Conference bridge number 872-239-8225 and when prompted, enter the Conference ID for the meeting you wish to join. The Conference ID is unique for each meeting and may be obtained from the public meeting notice. Those who wish to join by telephone audio conference are advised that the caller ID information provided by their device or telephone company will be displayed during the meeting.

B. Providing testimony during a public hearing:

The Chair will open the public hearing which will contain a specific time for those other than the applicants or their representatives to testify. At that time, the Chair will ask each non-applicant individual that has previously been sworn in that is attending the meeting through a computer, mobile device, or conference dial-in to identify themselves by name. The Chair, in the Chair's discretion, will then call on each individual identified to provide their testimony. Once everyone has had an opportunity to provide their testimony, the Chair will close the live testimony portion of the public hearing. At that time, the Chair will read or direct the Village staff to reach the previously submitted emails and YouTube Chat comments in the record.

If an individual wishing to provide testimony at an Appearance Review Commission hearing is unable to provide live testimony in the meeting due to technical difficulties or some other reason, they may still testify by emailing comdev@wilmette.com at any time or by submitting comments during the meeting at the Village's YouTube livestream which is located at <http://www.youtube.com/user/villageofwilmette/live>.