

MEETING MINUTES



Village Of Homewood
Appearance Commission
December 1, 2016
6:00 p.m.

Village Hall Board Room
2020 Chestnut Road
Homewood, IL 60430

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman Wright called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Members Pohrte, Hayes, Knoeppel, Grant, Quirke, and Chairman Wright were present. Absent from the meeting was Member Hrymak. In attendance from the Village was Director of Economic and Community Development Tom Vander Woude. There were 3 people in the audience.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Chairman Wright asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes of September 1, 2016. There being none, Member Knoeppel made a motion to approve the minutes of September 1, 2016 as presented; seconded by Member Wright.

AYES: Members Hayes, Pohrte, Knoeppel, Grant, Quirke, and Chairman Wright

NAYES: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: Member Hrymak

Motion passed.

PUBLIC COMMENT: There were no comments from the audience.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Case No. 16-41, 2155 W. 183rd Street – Blueberry Hill: Chairman Wright introduced the case and invited Staff Liaison Vander Woude to give a brief overview.

Staff Liaison Vander Woude stated Blueberry Hill installed an awning over their deck on the southeast corner of their building a couple of months ago. Typically, the Appearance Commission would approve or deny ahead of time, but they did not apply for a building permit, so it never went to the Appearance Commission. They are asking for approval to keep it up. There are some temporary panels that are installed from the deck up to the awning. The panels are removable, but the Building Department is still determining whether or not they can permit those to be in place, because of building code reasons. Blueberry Hill is asking to approve the awning and the temporary panels, contingent to the Building Department ultimately ruling that they can remain in place. The awning itself meets our building standards and it matches the existing window awnings on the building, both in terms of material and color.

George Nikolopoulos, representing Blueberry Hill, stated that he was instructed by the installer to bring the board the materials on the awning in the picture and the rendering of it.

MEETING MINUTES

Member Knoeppel asked if there were clear windows and a door. Mr. Nikolopoulos stated that there are clear windows running all the way up and that there is a door exit.

Member Knoeppel asked if the structure had any interference with the handicap ramp. Mr. Nikolopoulos stated that it does not interfere, because the handicap ramp goes up into the restaurant and then there are two stairs that always go up into the patio. The handicap ramp maintains intact.

Member Hayes asked if it requires a sprinkler system. Mr. Nikolopoulos stated that the Building Department is trying to determine whether it is an enclosed temporary structure or part of the building.

Staff Liaison VanderWoude stated that they are trying to determine what the structure would be; we do not have a definition for this type of building in our code. Staff decided to take it to the Appearance Commission, to determine whether or not they can leave anything up. If they get approval from the Appearance Commission then they will look at it from the building perspective and see what definition it falls under; a tent or permanent building. If it is an actual permanent structure then certain things would have to be in place, such as a sprinkler system. It sits on top of a deck, so it cannot be heated or climate controlled in any way.

Member Knoeppel asked if it can be removed and whether it can be taken down. Mr. Nikolopoulos stated that the whole structure can be removed. It is basically an awning and is bolted to the building and it has struts going down to the deck of the building.

Member Knoeppel asked if the intent is to open it up seasonally. Mr. Nikolopoulos stated that the panels are semi-fixed for the winter, but they will come off for the summer; but it depends on the determination of whether it is a tent, a semi-permanent fixture, or a permanent fixture. We are waiting for the Building Department to figure it out.

Member Pohrte asked if there is a plan to place heaters inside. Mr. Nikolopoulos stated that they are not planning on anything right now.

Chairman Wright asked if it is Blueberry Hill's intent to primarily use it during the inclement months. Mr. Nikolopoulos stated that they did have umbrellas on the patio and those were removed. The intention for the area is to be used during inclement weather, but not to use it during the winter time; it's too cold.

Member Knoeppel asked if it would be left up in the winter time. Mr. Nikolopoulos stated that it would be left up as is now and the panels would come off during the summer time. The top panel would stay on permanently; it is the side panels that would be taken off. Staff Liaison VanderWoude noted that the awning would stay up and the walls could come off.

Member Grant had no questions.

There being no further questions, a motion was made by Member Knoeppel to approve Case 16-41, for the awning design at the building located at 2155 W. 183rd with the understanding that the temporary panels are subject to the Building Department's decision. Seconded by Member Pohrte.

AYES: Members Hayes, Pohrte, Knoeppel, Grant, Quirke, and Chairman Wright

NAYES: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: Member Hrymak

Motion passed.

Case No. 16-43, 17505 S. Halsted Street – KFC Restaurant: Chairman Wright stated that KFC has asked that they be pulled from the agenda and to come back at a later date. Chairman Wright invited Staff Liaison Vander Woude to make any comments regarding KFC.

Staff Liaison Vander Woude stated that KFC had originally planned on doing the façade work that is in the memo, but we have been strongly encouraging all the businesses on Halsted to implement the Halsted Corridor Landscaping plan and KFC has agreed to do a landscaping plan. They weren't able to put that together in time for this meeting, so they asked to be pushed back to January.

KFC has been deferred to the January 5, 2016 Appearance Commission meeting.

Case No. 16-45, 17550 S. Halsted Street – Walmart: Chairman Wright introduced the case and invited Staff Liaison Vander Woude to give a brief overview.

Staff Liaison Vander Woude stated when a business applies for a sign, if meets the ordinance then it does not go before the Appearance Commission. If they are requesting a variance in size or if its part of an overall package or planned unit development it does have to go before the Appearance Commission. In this case, a package of signs for the Walmart stores and fuel center on Halsted was approved by this board. Walmart has requested an additional sign on the façade for the Subway Restaurant, which is inside the building. This would be a minor change in the PUD, which could be approved at the staff level pending the judgment of the Appearance Commission. It is a fairly small addition to the overall signage, but Walmart had already received a variance for 683 sq. ft. of sign area, so they already received the substantial variance and it identifies another business within the store. From an economic development standpoint, it does make sense that we would allow a business to advertise and certainly the intent of the sign ordinance is not to have a situation where multiple businesses were within one building and one of them not be able to advertise that they are there.

David McSwiggan, representing Subway, stated that that they relocated with the Walmart and are trying to put up the same sign that they had in Glenwood.

Member Grant had no questions.

Member Pohrte had no questions.

Member Knoeppel asked if this sign would fall under the sign regulation for a standard Subway Restaurant. Staff Liaison Vander Woude stated that there if there was a façade for Subway, it would be two and a half times the width of the building façade; however, there is no façade specific to Subway, so there is a maximum of 500 sq. ft. for a commercial façade. But the overall size is comparable to other restaurant signs in the corridor.

Member Wright noted that in reference to Subway, the façade is so wide it does not appear terribly over signed. Staff Liaison Vander Woude stated that two of the reasons why Walmart was given that

MEETING MINUTES

huge variance are because it is so far from Halsted a small sign could not be seen and because the façade is so wide that the 500 sq. ft maximum would make for a disproportionately small sign.

Member Hayes stated that it was uncertain why it was not originally part of Walmart's original request. Mr. McSwiggan stated that they did not know we were moving with them.

Member Quirke asked if the beige part is considered sign. Staff Liaison Vander Woude stated that it is just the letters. All the signs on the building: pharmacy, grocery, the Walmart sign itself, the pole sign out front on Halsted are all added up; and the gas station was calculated separately.

Member Quirke asked if this request would open them up to asking for a road sign for Subway. Staff Liaison Vander Woude stated that if they wanted they could ask for it, but approving this does not set a precedent that would require us to approve a pole sign or something similar. Mr. McSwiggan added that there was no intention to ask for additional signage.

Staff Liaison Vander Woude stated that the majority of the Subway customers at the Walmart Subway are just Walmart shoppers, who happen to want a sandwich. Subway is not trying to pull people off of Halsted specifically to come to Subway. Mr. McSwiggan stated that they are just trying to make Walmart shoppers aware that there is a Subway inside the Walmart.

Chairman Wright stated that there was commentary from staff on the exterior outlining of the sign. Staff Liaison Vander Woude stated that it has come to light that they are moving the existing Glenwood sign over to the Homewood store.

There being no further questions, a motion was made by Member Pohrte to approve Case 16-45, for the 234 sq. ft Subway sign as part the of the minor PUD changes at Super Walmaart at 17950 Halsted Street. Seconded by Member Hayes.

AYES: Members Hayes, Pohrte, Knoeppel, Grant, Quirke, and Chairman Wright

NAYES: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: Member Hrymak

Motion passed.

Case No. 16-46, 950 W. 175th Street– Carl Buddig & Company: Chairman Wright stated that there was no representation for Carl Buddig tonight and invited Staff Liaison Vander Woude to give a brief overview.

Staff Liaison Vander Woude stated that Carl Buddig applied for a fence permit so that they could fence a corner of their lot. They have had some situations, now that Walmart has opened, where people who live in the neighborhood are cutting through as they are walking to Walmart. On the northwest corner, there is a little sitting area where some of the women who work at Carl Budding eat lunch and at one point somebody was walking past and there was some cat calling and some exchange of words, which made them feel uncomfortable. They wanted to put the fence on the western edge of their property, but then they thought, since we are doing that then why don't we just bring it around the south edge of the parking lot and just fence the whole thing off. Six foot fences are not encouraged, especially in front yards; however, they are permitted in the business district. A 6 ft fence gives a closed off feeling, so they agreed to put it along the western edge and see if that remedies the situation; and, if it does not then they will come back and ask if they can do

MEETING MINUTES

it in the front yard too. The type of fence is a aluminum fence, but it looks like wrought iron. It is similar to the type of fence that was put in at Portillo's.

There being no questions, a motion was made by Member Hayes to approve Case 16-46, to approve 6 ft. black aluminum, wrought iron style commercial fence along the west property line at 950 W 175th Street. Seconded by Member Grant.

AYES: Members Pohrte, Hayes, Knoeppel, Grant, Quirke, and Chairman Wright

NAYES: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: Member Hrymak

Motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS: There was no new business discussed.

OLD BUSINESS: There was no old business discussed.

A motion was made by Member Knoeppel to adjourn the meeting at 6:43 p.m.; seconded by Member Hayes. All in favor; none opposed. Motion passed.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas Vander Woude
Staff Liaison