

# MEETING MINUTES



**Village Of Homewood  
Appearance Commission  
June 6, 2019  
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 Hrymak, Grant, Hayes, Quirke and Chairman Wright were present. Members Burlison and Pohrte were absent. In attendance from the Village was Director of Economic and Community Development Angela Mesaros. There were four people in the audience.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Chairman Wright asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes for May 2, 2019. There being no changes or corrections a motion was made by Member Hrymak to approve the minutes of May 2, 2019; seconded by Member Quirke.

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

NAYES: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: Members Burlison and Pohrte

Motion passed.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** There were no comments from the audience.

## **AGENDA ITEMS:**

**Case No. 19-22, 17951 S. Halsted Street, Shell Station, Zainab, Inc.:** Chairman Wright introduced the case and invited Staff Liaison Mesaros to give a brief overview.

Staff Liaison Mesaros stated that the applicant is Abdul Basit, the owner of the Shell station center at 17951 S. Halsted Street. Zainab, Inc. is the company. He is seeking approval of improvements to the gasoline station including signage. He has submitted exterior elevations and sign detail for the monument sign. Mr. Basit wishes to re-image the electronic sign and canopy. The existing monument sign and canopy are in need of repair. The Village Board directed staff to enforce repair and improvement as part of the Class 8 incentive extension. The Board also asked that the landscaping comply with the *Halsted Landscaping Plan*, which requires ornamental trees and perennial beds along Halsted Street.

Mr. Basit stated that he updated the signs approximately 10 years ago. Currently, a couple of the digits are not working and the signs are outdated. Mr. Basit proposes to reimage the Shell signage and illumination. The numbers would be changed to be uniform. Square footage would remain the same.

Chairman Wright asked if the petitioner is changing anything on the sign, such as the insert. Mr. Basit stated that the number of digits and the square footage would remain the same. Comparison of the

current and new sign is in the Commission packets. Chairman Wright confirmed that the comparison was present in the packet.

Staff Liaison Mesaros requested clarification on whether or not the petitioner is putting up a new sign or are the elements being removed. Mr. Jim Williams stated it would be a new cabinet, so it would slide between the poles. Old cabinet comes out and new cabinet goes in for both the Shell logo and the pricing digits – currently the two are separate cabinets and would continue to be separate cabinets.

Chairman Wright asked if it would be new from the Juul sign up, and the Bank of America insert. Mr. Williams stated that that was correct. The decoration on the poles would be painted. The station is required to update to the new image when it gets out of date and parts are not available.

Chairman Wright asked if the canopy is included or only the poles. Mr. Williams stated that the poles the cabinets slide between would be painted silver and white. They would not be new only painted. Chairman Wright asked about the change with the canopy. Mr. Williams stated that they do not replace the individual channel letters anymore; they do what is called the Shell Pectin on the canopy it draws less voltage/power. The red bar would be the same around the canopy. It would continue to stand at 36". Chairman Wright asked if it is the logo would be placed on the canopy. Chairman Wright asked if it would all be refreshed. Mr. Williams stated yes.

Member Quirke asked if it would be the same colors and position. Mr. Williams stated yes.

Chairman Wright asked about plans for other tenants' signage. Mr. Basit stated not currently, but he could speak to the tenants about putting a new facing over the signs. Chairman Wright stated that it would be nice since the Shell sign would change.

Member Quirke stated that the new sign is a good representation of the company, but the bottom of the sign is the exact opposite. It looks messy and cluttered. Mr. Basit stated that he agreed and would speak to the tenants. Member Quirke stated that incorporating the top of the sign into the bottom of the sign would make it a lot cleaner. Mr. Basit stated that he agreed.

Chairman Wright stated that no landscaping plan is in the packet. Staff Liaison Mesaros asked if the petitioner had plans to do the landscaping around the sign. Mr. Basit stated that they can refresh everything and plant some seasonal flowers. Staff Liaison Mesaros stated that the requirement for *Halsted Street Landscaping Plan* calls for perennials that would come back each year and are easy to maintain. Mr. Basit stated that they would be happy to comply.

Chairman Wright stated that one of the components of the *Halsted Street Landscaping Plan* is the sense of consistency along Halsted Street. The Commission would more than likely proceed with the sign today with an understanding that the petitioner meet with Staff Liaison Mesaros and the Village landscaper with a plan for landscaping around the sign. Mr. Basit agreed.

Member Quirke asked Chairman Wright if around the sign means north down Halsted Street. Staff Liaison Mesaros stated that landscaping improvements should include the entire lot; however, specifically for this case landscaping is required around the sign, as part of the sign proposal. It is required for each face, both on Ridge Road and Halsted Street.

Member Hrymak stated that landscaping is key, because it draws people to the business and it is good for the Village.

Member Hayes had no questions.

Member Grant had no questions.

Motion was made by Member Quirke for approval of Case 19-22 proposed Façade Improvements including monument sign and canopy for Shell gasoline station at 17951 S. Halsted Street, in accordance with the submitted plans, with the condition that the property be improved to comply with the *Halsted Street Landscaping Plan*. A landscape plan must be submitted to the Economic Development Director within 60 days. Substitutions may not be made without prior written approval from the Village; Seconded by Member Hrymak.

AYES: Members Grant, Hrymak, Hayes, Quirke, and Chairman Wright

NAYES: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: Members Burlison and Pohrte

Motion passed.

**Case No. 19-12, Continuation, 18101 Martin Ave., Gottschalk House:** Chairman Wright introduced the topic and invited Staff Liaison Mesaros to give an overview.

Staff Liaison Mesaros stated that this case is a continuation from the previous Appearance Commission meeting on May 2, 2019. As the Commission recalls the Gottschalk House is an official landmark and the applicant proposes to replace 44 windows. The Commission requested from the applicant an assessment of each of the windows, which was conducted by the applicant.

Chairman Wright stated that the Gottschalk House is one of two properties that are officially designated as landmarks in Homewood. As part of the ordinance that established the designation the exterior improvements must follow the guidelines of the US Department of Interior, which standards are very stringent. A few items need to be considered, such as the fenestration of the exterior trim. Mr. Ed Urbaniak, Urbaniak Windows and Doors, general contractor for the petitioner stated that the brick mold itself is solid and it has a vertical, rounded chair rail around it. Mr. Urbaniak showed the Commission examples. The bevel has a flare that would be more pronounced when the bevel is pushed against the window and catches the chair rail. It will bring the piece out further, which will give it more of a rounded definition.

Chairman Wright asked if the proposal would be one bevel and as it now has two. Mr. Urbaniak stated that Marvin does not offer rounded panning; their panning is square and made to snap into the same track. The other alternative would be wood, but it requires more labor and constant maintenance. Aluminum has a nice clean appearance and requires minimal to no maintenance. Chairman Wright asked if the Marvin window inserts would be inserted into the pockets. Mr. Urbaniak stated yes, the pocket finish is the identical window.

Chairman Wright stated that if the petitioners were to go before the Historical Commission they would speak on the window area. Mr. Urbaniak commented that window glass space would be lost, because dropping a mainframe in another frame would cause loss of window space. Labor costs can be expensive. Mr. Mike Danaher stated that they have to take into account the possibility of disruption to the inside of the building. Chairman Wright stated that the Commission's purview is not the inside and asked if it is sustainable inside. Mr. Danaher stated that the inside of the building has white windows, so a prefinished white window that pushes in.

Chairman Wright asked if the petitioners deal with the Marvin. Mr. Urbaniak stated that he did not. His supplier out of St. Charles. He has done jobs with Marvin products, but it is a high-end product so it is not his customer base. Mr. Danaher is getting the windows at cost.

Chairman Wright asked Mr. Danaher if it is a phased project. Mr. Danaher stated that the apartment windows would be upgraded with double-paned glass. The plan is to first replace all the windows that are in bad condition, then later replace vinyl windows on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor, windows on the north side with all Marvin windows so that they look uniform. Presently, it is the matter of money; it is estimated at \$45,000.

Member Quirke asked if they had plans for later. Mr. Danaher stated that the timeline is unsure. The owners would also like to fix the outside porch, painting before the wood deteriorates, and other projects like trying to get a TIF grant.

Chairman Wright asked Mr. Urbaniak if he knows how much more money would cost for the exterior trimming around the windows. Mr. Urbaniak stated that he could almost duplicate the sash rails. New windows would fit inside the existing frame on each side would be a 1" or 1.25" of stop that would be seen around the window. Some of that would be covered and some would not. Therefore, about ¾" exposed frame. They are maxing out the size of the window without cramming it in. The brick on the exterior would be slightly narrower because they are eliminating the blind stop holding the storm window, so that is a ½". Brick masonry is traditionally 2" or 2 ½", so the aluminum would only reveal about 2" around all four sides of the window.

Chairman Wright asked whether they would have full screening. Mr. Urbaniak stated that normally a clad window would have a full screen. Chairman Wright asked about the color of the screen. Mr. Urbaniak stated the color of the mainframe of the window.

Member Quirke asked if Mr. Danaher had an idea of cost of the paint. Mr. Danaher stated that he has many different estimates that range from \$15,000- \$25,000. There are some as high as \$45,000. The contractor that seems most knowledgeable is price around \$25,000. At first they considered glazing and cleaning off the paint.

Member Quirke asked about the estimated schedule. Mr. Danaher stated that currently there is no schedule for painting. He has presented the plans and quotes on fixing the porch to the owners.

Chairman Wright asked the petitioner to confirm that he considered re-glazing. Mr. Danaher stated yes, most of the windows would need de-glazing, but a few that do not. However, for the majority about 50% of glazing is gone. Some of the windows fall straight down when they are raised. Several windows are held together with drywall screws. Pictures in the Commissioner's packet show wood that has actually fallen, and locks into which your finger could reach down about ¾". Moisture over the years has contributed to the deterioration of the windows.

Member Hrymak stated that it has to be considered that the cost is a huge factor, but it needs to be as close to the original as possible. It seems aluminum is a good alternative, but is certainly not the original; however, the bevel is good. Member Hrymak expressed concern that he is unsure if it is Department of Interior compliant. Mr. Danaher stated that the report given to the Commission shows that some of the same windows have been used in historical buildings around Chicago. They are architectural series windows, which are top of the line for Marvin.

## MEETING MINUTES

Chairman Wright stated that his main concern is with the brick mold. Mr. Danaher stated that the top two are going to be done and the stained glass windows would be left untouched, along with the fixed larger windows. Chairman Wright stated that since the larger windows have been undercover the wood should not be bad. Mr. Danaher stated that they would put Plexiglas over them. And one of the stained glass windows has Plexiglas over it, because there is a small amount of deterioration inside. Chairman Wright stated that some of the dormers are add-ons.

Member Hrymak stated that he hopes that Phase 2 does not take years. Mr. Danaher stated that he does not believe that the owners want to approach it in that manner.

Staff Liaison Mesaros asked Chairman Wright if the Sage green is the original color. Chairman Wright stated that typically nothing at the time of construction of this building would have been painted white. Staff Liaison Mesaros stated that she feels that the white is going to be very stark and bright. Chairman Wright asked the petitioners if they are using a white that is mimicking the cream color. Mr. Urbaniak stated yes; the window swatch is the cream, instead of the white.

Chairman Wright asked if the petitioners plan is to mimic. Mr. Danaher stated that it is the same color, but thought that a brighter green would work since it is currently dull. Mr. Danaher asked if they would like to stay with the same colors, because they seem quite faded. Chairman Wright stated that they might seem faded because of time. Mr. Danaher suggested Forest Green or something more that stands out. Chairman Wright asked if they came up with the color swatches. Mr. Urbaniak stated that the Sierra White was going to be the window; the colors of the green on the house right now are different, close to the colors shown to the Commission. Chairman Wright stated that his personal opinion would be just to keep the colors consistent with the existing shade of green. Mr. Danaher stated that they would use the lighter green, Hampton Sage.

Member Quirke asked about the scrolling on top of the building. Mr. Danaher stated that the painters think they could recreate the color. May not be able to get it exactly, but close too. Member Quirke asked if the scrolling was there in its original form. Chairman Wright stated yes.

Member Hayes had no questions.

Member Hrymak had no questions.

Member Grant asked if when someone buys a historical property if there are requirements to restore the building to the original state, and was that ever given any consideration in this particular case. Mr. Danaher stated yes, they started with new construction windows, but then thought about cost and the disruption to the inside of the house. In order to do that it is cost prohibitive. He did try to get someone to repair the windows that would be recreating the pieces of wood that are rotted, getting the pallets working on the sides, getting the windows open and closed properly. Over the years, people have overpaid to do windows, they have put drywall screws into them, and some windows the whole windows would have had to be recreated. One of the contractors was interested, but then backed out due to cost.

Member Grant asked if there are specific requirements. Chairman Wright stated that some of that was in the materials in the packet and referred to the video from Marvin that described the process.

Chairman Wright reiterated that his concern is with recreating the brick mold. Mr. Urbaniak stated that he could fabricate on-site and have the Commissioners look before they place it on the house.

## MEETING MINUTES

He further stated that over the years as the old acrylic caulk would crack, more was added resulting in the paint line coming out further.

Motion was made by Member Grant for approval of Case 19-12 proposed façade improvements for historic landmark property, Gottschalk House, at 18101 Martin Avenue, in accordance with the submitted plans and specifications, and information provided at the June 6, 2019 meeting. Substitutions may not be made without prior written approval from the Village; Seconded by Member Hrymak.

AYES: Members Grant, Hrymak, Hayes, and Quirke

NAYES: Chairman Wright

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: Members Burlison and Pohrte

Motion passed.

**NEW BUSINESS:** None

**OLD BUSINESS:** None

A motion was made by Member Quirke to adjourn the meeting at 7:05 p.m.; seconded by Member Hrymak. All in favor, none opposed. Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

*Angela Mesaros*

Angela M. Mesaros  
Staff Liaison