

# VILLAGE OF HOMEWOOD



## MEETING MINUTES

DATE OF MEETING:

October 3, 2024

## APPEARANCE COMMISSION

6:00 pm

Village Hall Board Room  
2020 Chestnut Street  
Homewood, IL 60430

## CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Hrymak called the meeting to order at 6:02 pm.

## ROLL CALL:

Members Banks, Quirke, Kluck, Scheffke, and Chair Hrymak were present. Member Kidd was absent. Member Preston arrived at 6:06 PM following roll call.

In attendance from Village staff was Director of Economic and Community Development Angela Mesaros, Assistant Director of Economic, and Community Development Noah Schumerth, Chief Building Inspector Dennis Johnson Jr., and Building Department Secretary Darlene Leonard. There were eight members of the public in the audience, and no members of the public were in attendance at the Zoom virtual meeting.

## APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

Motion for approval of the minutes by Member Banks; seconded by Member Kluck.

AYES: 4 (Members Banks, Quirke, Kluck and Scheffke, Chair Hrymak)

NAYS: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: 2 (Members Preston and Kidd)

## PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None.

## REGULAR BUSINESS:

### CASE 24-34: Sign Variance and Sign Review for Wind Creek Casino and Hotel

Case 24-34 was introduced by Assistant Director Schumerth and stated the submittals to be considered are for the Homewood side of the site and include a welcome sign, directional signs, and information exterior signs. The variance is for the directional signs for the garage as they exceed the size allowed in the code. There are no code requirements for signs that exceed what is covered in the code. Member Preston arrived during the presentation of the case.

Ken Beckbar of Integrity Sign stated they are the installer for the manufacture, LA Sign.

Member Quirke asked if the signage was all internal on the property, how big the sign will be, how far it will be located from the entrance, and if it will be illuminated and if so how.

Mr. Beckbar stated all the signs are internal, the size is for visibility on the site from a distance, it will be about 10 feet from the entrance because of utilities, and it will have a spotlight for illumination on 1 side and will also be reflective for headlights.

Assistant Director Schumerth stated content cannot be regulated and the review is for the overall design.

Member Quirke asked if a strong recommendation can be made with Staff Liaison Mesaros stating yes.

Member Quirke asked about the 2 signs on page 9, one for Homewood and one for East Hazel Crest, and asked how far apart they will be located.

Mr. Beckbar stated the signs will be approximately 600-700 feet apart, both of them will face north, but the 70-foot tall pylon sign will be between them.

Member Quirke stated that a single sign listing both cities would be better as it would be more like a partnership.

Chair Hrymak stated this project needs a lot of clear signage.

Member Quirke asked if the overhead signage for the parking garage are part of the variance.

Assistant Director Schumerth stated the entrance signs meet code because it is measured by the frontage. However, the directional signs don't have a regulation for them because they are larger than the 3 square feet allowed in the code.

Member Quirke stated the signs are over 5 square feet with Staff Liaison Mesaros confirming the size.

Member Quirke asked if there are 20 signs needing the variance.

Staff Liaison Mesaros stated the monument signs comply, but the 3 signs on the garage do not.

Member Quirke asked if the font and lettering size are consistent throughout.

Mr. Beckbar stated yes.

Motion for approval of Case 24-34 Wind Creek Signage Proposal and variation from Section 30-01.b.10 of the Village Code of Ordinance to permit three exterior directional signs that exceed the maximum area of three square feet; seconded by Member Quirke

AYES: 5 (Members Banks, Quirke, Kluck, Preston and Scheffke, and Chair Hrymak)

NAYS: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: 1 (Member Kidd)

### **CASE 24-43: Signage at Essence Salon Suites, 17956 Halsted Street**

Case 24-43 was introduced by Assistant Director Schumerth. He stated the 3 signs in question were approved in April, but the signage varies from what was approved. The renderings were incorrect for the location, but the measurements were the correct sizing by code.

Chair Hrymak asked if they are looking at the signs because what was installed is different than what was proposed and approved.

Assistant Director Schumerth stated yes.

Chair Hrymak asked if the signs are in compliance, but in a different location.

Staff Liaison Mesaros stated the signs don't need a variance, but the Commission has the ability to review any signage submitted. This would have been sent to the commission to review before installation if the renderings were correct.

Mike Abuzir is the owner of the business and stated that he made sure the sign followed the sign code and that it looks different on paper than on the building. He admitted that the rendering was an error on the sign company's part but it was installed and he would like to keep it up.

Chair Hrymak asked if the 40% is accurate.

Assistant Director Schumerth stated this business gets 40% or approximately 300 square feet of all signage for the entire building and there is a letter of approval from the landlord.

Member Kluck asked who did the design work in April as it isn't scaled to the space, Member Kluck asked if the leaf design is allowed because, on the east side, it is sitting on the architectural part of the building.

Mr. Abuzir stated the top of the sign is about 4" away and the bottom clears it.

Member Kluck stated the picture shows the sign spread out more and Assistant Director Schumerth stated the drawing of the 48 square foot sign is a third version.

Mr. Abuzir stated they wanted the sign on top of the glass.

Chair Hrymak stated he was at the location today and would like to see the sign spread out because currently it is squished together and there is a lot of empty space and he would like to see it spread out and the sign on the south side is too large, but the font and colors look good.

Member Preston asked if it is the company logo.

Mr. Abuzir stated yes.

Chair Hrymak stated they are not trying to change the logo, but it needs to be centered and asked how it's lit.

Mr. Abuzir stated the signs have a solar sensor.

Member Scheffke asked what was approved initially

Chair Hrymak stated it was approved by Staff.

Assistant Director Schumerth stated the dimensions match, but the sale and the drawings don't match what was installed.

Staff Liaison Mesaros stated it would have been sent to the Commission instead of being approved if the renderings matched what was installed.

Member Scheffke asked if the sign can be resized or moved.

Mr. Abuzir stated the sign on the east side can be moved over.

Chair Hrymak asked if it was an error by the sign company.

Mr. Abuzir stated just the visuals.

Chair Hrymak asked if the sign is okay structurally butting up against the structure.

Assistant Director Schumerth stated there is nothing in the sign code, but the in the appearance code it is discouraged to detract from the structure.

Mr. Abuzir stated the sign on Halsted (the east side) can be centered and the side on the south side can make "salon suites" & the leaflets smaller and leave "Essence" the same size and shift it down.

Member Scheffke stated, regarding the signage on the south side, be a smaller scale and cut the gold bar in half and pull away from the structure.

Mr. Abuzir stated he can get new renderings done and submitted for approval.

Member Quirke asked if the black metal sign was approved in the submittal as it seems out of sync with everything else. It cannot be seen from afar and doesn't advertise the business and it seems more like a poster.

Chair Hrymak stated that it is tough to read, and asked if it is screwed in.

Member Scheffke (regarding the black sign) asked if it is illuminated.

Mr. Abuzir stated no.

Chair Hrymak stated the 2 proposals are to lower "essence" and reduce the size of "salon suites" on the south side and to stretch out the sign on the east side and the other is to all of that and to remove the black sign. And asked if the proposals should be 2 separate votes.

Staff Liaison Mesaros stated it depends on if the vote is approved, but it makes sense to have 2 votes.

Member Scheffke asked if the revised drawings should be provided before the vote.

Chair Hrymak stated the business owner stated he is willing to do that.

Member Kluck asked when they are planning on opening.

Mr. Abuzir stated a month to a month-and-a-half.

Staff Liaison Mesaros stated it could be disruptive to the business because they would have to take the sign down since it is already up.

Member Kluck asked if the sign is in non-compliance because of the architectural details.

Assistant Director Schumerth stated the architectural details have to do with the appearance plan and what is suitable for the space, not what was approved by staff.

Chair Hrymak asked what would occur with the plans that are submitted if they are consistent with what is being proposed.

Staff Liaison Mesaros stated they can be sent out individually and get the approval individually otherwise there would have to be another meeting.

Motion for approval of Case 24-43 signage at Essence Salon Suites at 17956 Halsted Street to center the east side signage, reduce the size of “salon suites” and the leaflets and move “Essence” down on the south side signage, and the removal of the black sign made by Member Quirke; seconded by Member Kluck

Ayes: 4 (Members Banks, Scheffke, Preston, Quirke, and Kluck)

NAYES: 1 (Chair Hrymak)

ABESTENTIONS: None

Absent: 1 (Member Kidd)

**CASE 24-44 Appearance Review, Apparel Redefined 1313-1351 175<sup>th</sup> Street:**

Case 24-44 was introduced by Assistant Director Schumerth and stated the project has been reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission with the recommendation to the Village Board to approve it.

John LaRoy of Apparel Redefined stated the renderings were done about 1 year ago and the displays were done about 1 week ago. The Building will have 36” wide vertical installed panels with the dark color going about 22 feet up, the red stripe roughly 18”-22” across the middle, and the ash gray the remaining part of the wall. The front of the building will be flat with the sides and rear being corrugated metal and they hope to expand the building in 3-4 years.

There will be an outside seating area for employees in front of the 2-story walkway. The existing building will either be clad with the same steel or painted with the same colors.

Member Quirke asked if the garage doors in the rendering would be what will be installed.

Mr. Leroy stated the garage doors will be what is installed and they will be for inbound, shipping, and receiving.

Member Scheffke asked if the sign on the building would be flush, why they would be painting the brick on the existing building, and the life expectancy of the paint.

Mr. LaRoy stated the sign will be 3-D raised letters and back lit with LED. He stated the signs are mesh black during the day and lit up at night. The existing building is being painted to have a more cohesive look for the neighbors and the community. Bruce stated it is not paint, but a penetrating stain. It will maintain the texture and still look like brick.

Member Scheffke asked how thick the panels are.

Mr. LaRoy stated they are 16 or 18 gauge. Bruce stated it will be like Costco with flat panels in front giving the impression of precast and will be factory painted.

Member Quirke asked which gray color is the upper color.

Mr. LaRoy stated the light gray on the top and on the sides and rear.

Member Quirke commented that materials deteriorate overtime and is concerned they won't stand up over time.

Chari Hrymak asked if this has to be approved by the Village Board and if it would come back to the Commission if it's not approved.

Staff Liaison Mesaros stated yes the Board has to approve it, but is unsure as the Board will take the Planning and Zoning Commission's recommendation as a whole. If they don't approve it, it will come back eventually.

Member Quirke asked if the east and west sides can be clad like the front and what the cost would be.

Mr. LaRoy stated it would be 30% more per panel and they are looking at expanding to the west. The east wall wouldn't well seen because of the 2-story walkway.

Chair Hrymak stated they monument sign wasn't discussed and stated that if the brick portion would be painted not clad.

Member Banks stated that whatever is done to the sign it should match the house.

Motion for approval of Case 24-44, Appearance Review for Apparel Redefined at 1313-1351 175<sup>th</sup> Street, site plan, floor plans, elevations, landscape plan, and renderings submitted by Bruce F. Roth, Architect, and Metz and Company Landscape Architects, submitted August 21, 2024 made by Member Preston; seconded by Member Banks.

AYES: 5 (Members Banks, Kluck, Preston and Scheffke, and Chair Hrymak)

NAYS: 0

ABSTENTIONS: Quirke

ABSENT: 1 (Member Kidd)

Chair Hrymak stated that commission members were unsure or unclear about the wording of the vote for Case 24-43 and they will go back and revote, and asked for a motion to revote. Motion by Member Kluck; seconded by Member Preston. The motion to approve must be made by those that approved the previous approval.

Motion for approval of Case 24-43 signage at Essence Salon Suites at 17956 Halsted Street to center the east side signage, reduce the size of "salon suites" and the leaflets and move "Essence" down on the south side signage, and removal of the black sign made by Member Quirke; seconded by Member Scheffke

Ayes: 3 (Members Banks, Quirke, and Kluck)

NAYES: 3 (Members Scheffke and Preston, Chair Hrymak)

ABESTENTIONS: None

Absent: 1 (Member Kidd)

Motion for approval of Case 24-43 signage at Essence Salon Suites at 17956 Halsted Street to center the east side signage, reduce the size of "salon suites" and the leaflets and move "Essence" down on the south side signage, and retain the black sign made by Member Quirke; seconded by Member Scheffke

Ayes: 5 (Members Banks, Scheffke, Preston and Kluck, and Chair Hrymak)

NAYES: 1 (Member Quirke)

ABESTENTIONS: None

Absent: (Member Kidd)

#### **NEW BUSINESS:**

None

#### **OLD BUSINESS:**

None

**ADJOURN:**

A motion was made for adjourning the meeting by Member Preston; second by Member Banks.

AYES: 6 (Members Banks, Scheffke, Preston, Quirke, Kluck, and Chair Hrymak)

NAYS: 0

ABSTENTIONS: 0

ABSENT: 1 (Member Kidd)

The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

*Darlene Leonard*

**Darlene Leonard**

Building Department Secretary