

# MEETING AGENDA



## Appearance Commission

Village of Homewood

March 06, 2025

Meeting Start Time: 6:00 PM

Village Hall Board Room

2020 Chestnut Road, Homewood, IL

*Commission Meetings will be held as in-person meetings. In addition to in-person public comment during the meeting, members of the public may submit written comments by email to [pzc@homewoodil.gov](mailto:pzc@homewoodil.gov) or by placing written comments in the drop box outside Village Hall. Comments submitted before 4:00 p.m. on the meeting date will be distributed to all Commission members prior to the meeting.*

*Please see last page of agenda for virtual meeting information.*

1. Call to Order

2. Roll Call

3. Minutes:

Approve minutes of the November 13, 2024 meeting of the Appearance Commission.

Approve minutes from the February 6, 2025 meeting of the Appearance Commission.

4. Public Comments

5. Regular Business:

A. **Continued - Public Workshop** for Village Sign Code Update

6. Old Business:

7. New Business:

8. Adjourn

---

The public is invited to the meeting using the link below to join Webinar:  
<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/84411188079?pwd=RzFRZzZmeC9RU25CN0ZhYzA0SOV6UT09>

To listen to the Meeting via phone: Dial: 1-312-626-6799  
Webinar ID: 844 1118 8079 Passcode: 170845

---

# VILLAGE OF HOMEWOOD



## MEETING MINUTES

DATE OF MEETING: **November 13, 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 6:03 pm.

### ROLL CALL:

Members Quirke, Kluck, Scheffke, and Chair Hrymak were present. Members Banks, Preston and Kidd were absent.

In attendance from Village staff was Director of Economic and Community Development Angela Mesaros, Assistant Director of Economic, and Community Development Noah Schumerth, and Building Department Secretary Darlene Leonard. There were two 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:

Chair Hrymak asked for any corrections or changes to the minutes from the October 3, 2024 meeting.

Member Quirke stated on page 7 of the minutes, he is listed under the vote for both Aye and Nay. He voted Aye. The Nay should be changed to reflect Member Preston's vote.

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

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

NAYS: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: 3 (Members Banks, Preston, and Kidd)

Chair Hrymak congratulated Angela and Noah on receiving the Healthy and Active Community Award for the Downtown TOD Master Plan.

### PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None.

### REGULAR BUSINESS:

#### CASE 24-45: Appearance Review of 2124 183<sup>rd</sup> Street Redevelopment

Chair Hrymak introduced the case and Assistant Director Schumerth presented staff findings.

Member Quirke asked if the materials in the proposal are existing.

Assistant Director Schumerth stated yes, with the exception of the metal from and composite boards.

Chair Hrymak asked if the “video” room in plans referred to video gaming, and asked about the patio fencing.

Assistant Director Schumerth stated yes, and it would be similar to what is in other businesses. The fence would be the same materials or the brown composite material and metal framing. Assistant Director Schumerth recommended approval conditioned upon the submittal of a photometric plan for the light fixtures, and impactation to the surrounding properties.

Animesh Kumar stated this would second location in Homewood with the first being the Shell station next door. The restaurant menu would be Italian fusion and the first location outside of Florida.

Mr. Kumar stated after the pandemic, people like to dine outside and added that his only concern is the patio would be next to the dumpster enclosure, but they are still working on the location. Mr. Kumar stated they are hoping to go higher with the dumpster enclosure.

Mr. Kumar stated they will have the interior design completed soon, but because it is already November, they probably won't start active construction soon.

Member Quirke asked Staff if they missed the opportunity for TIF incentives.

Staff Liaison Mesaros stated that there was a TIF, but it expired last year.

Member Quirke asked if remediation or vents would be needed, how parking will be handled, if there will be a full bar and if there will be a grease trap.

Mr. Kumar stated the NFR said they cannot do certain things and they cannot do any excavation in the area or leave it dirt the area has to be paved and they don't need vents. There will be 12 designated parking space and is aware it will be a challenge because of the number of anticipated customers. And added, the employees will park next door at the Shell station because there is ample parking there. There will be a full bar and the grease trap will be on the exterior.

Chair Hrymak asked if it is a franchise.

Mr. Kumar stated “yes but no.” The parent company does not do franchises, but he knows the owner of the existing restaurant concept and was given “free rein” to operate, as long as he doesn't change the menu. They can even change the name, if desired.

Chair Hrymak asked about the sign location and if there will only be the one sign.

Mr. Kumar stated the sign in the renderings is not the sign that is to be constructed; it's just a placeholder for the sign location. The signs in the drawings show sign location on the building. There will be another sign by the patio. They will change the sign from the one at the Florida location because the colors are dark.

Chair Hrymak asked Staff if the Appearance Commission will review the sign.

Staff Liaison Mesaros stated only if the sign needs a variance.

Chair Hrymak stated the owner flow parking would be in the neighborhood, and suggested that signage be installed directing people to the public lot by Blueberry Hill.

Mr. Kumar stated they did a traffic study on a Friday and Saturday and they expect 8-9 customers at any given time. But for handling more people, parking will be available at the Shell. Kumar stated he has bought the property behind this one that will be used for managers housing and parking.

Member Scheffke suggested the dumpster be placed at the neighboring property.

Mr. Kumar stated if such placement is allowed, he will locate the dumpster there.

Member Quirke stated the applicant will have to watch for people parking on the site and going across the street to Lassen's Tap.

Motion for approval of Case 24-45 Appearance Review, 2124 W 183<sup>rd</sup> Street Redevelopment as proposed on the drawings submitted by J. Scott McKay, Architect, dated September 27, 2024, subject to the condition of a photometric plan submittal by Member Kluck; seconded by Member Scheffke

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

NAYS: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: 3 (Members Banks, Preston, and Kidd)

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

Chair Hrymak introduced the case and Assistant Director Schumerth presented it staff findings.

Member Quirke asked if it was 3 signs or 3 signs and the monument sign.

Assistant Director Schumerth stated it is wall signs and a monument sign. There is a need for 39.7 square feet of additional signage. Staff recommends approval of the variance for the additional 39.7 square feet of signage.

Katie Pino stated Dave's Hot Chicken is one of top growing fast casual restaurants and there is one opening in Orland Park in the next 30 days.

Member Scheffke asked if the building would be painted white.

Assistant Director Schumerth stated after discussions with staff on the color of the building, the applicant came back with white walls and a red roof.

Ms. Pino stated that is the proposal.

Member Quirke asked what the rest of the colors are in the renderings and stated they feel like signage.

Ms. Pino stated they are drawings or murals on the sides of the building that look like a peeling back of the wall, similar to peeling brick. They are unique graphics created on site with the Dave's colors.

Ms. Pino stated she would agree to remove the sign on the side of the building, but would like to keep the one on the rear of the building.

Member Kluck stated the colors are more something of interest like bricks showing though similar to a Mexican restaurant, and that it is not signage. The colors just create interest. Member Kluck added there is a lot of landscaping in front and he is in favor of the signage.

Ms. Pino stated that when being so far back from the street is it important to be seen.

Chair Hrymak stated he is not thrilled about a variance for more signage or how bright it is with the new color; he is not sold on the white. Chair Hrymak added that he is aware that Mod Pizza wasn't there long in part because it couldn't be seen and that they have no say in the paint, just the signage.

Ms. Pino stated they can remove the sign on the south side, but would like to retain the sign on the back.

Chair Hrymak asked staff if it is considered signage if it's in the window.

Staff Liaison Mesaros stated it is.

Chair Hrymak stated he would be okay with the variance if the one on the side is removed. Chair Hrymak reiterated that he is "not a fan" of concept #1 on the provided table, and that he prefers #3, which matches the existing building.

Member Kluck stated a neon sign could potentially be installed in the window.

Ms. Pino stated such a sign would still be considered signage if it has the logo. They would tie the neon interior with the area and what it is known for. The rear signage is much more valuable for people to see as they go by to Target.

Member Scheffke stated the contrast between the colors and the white is very striking.

Member Quirke stated he has strong reservations about the entire proposal as the problem doesn't present a hardship and the code is very clear about what a hardship is. Quirke stated that the proposal bends all the rules too many times.

Ms. Pino stated the property is pulled back off Halsted, and the building is not noticeable because it is set back further from the street.

Staff Liaison Mesaros stated the KFC is currently white and red, similar to what is proposed.

Assistant Director Schumerth stated the signs are red, white, and yellow. The areas are not considered signs because they do not reference the company.

Chair Hrymak stated his preference is to keep the square footage at 119.85. He is not willing to do the variance as he thinks this will be noticeable with all the colors.

Motion for approval of Case 24-52 sign variance, Dave's Hot Chicken at 17631 Halsted Street, to permit an increase in the maximum sign area from 119.8 square feet to 159.5 square feet made by Member Scheffke; seconded by Member Kluck

Ayes: 2 (Members Scheffke and Kluck)

NAYES: 2 (Member Quirke and Chair Hrymak)

ABESTENTIONS: None

Absent: 3 (Members Banks, Preston, and Kidd)

Chair Hrymak stated it did not pass and the signs will have to meet the 119.8 square footage.

Ms. Pino asked if the rear sign is reduced to 20.5 square feet and if they remove the side sign could it be approved. It would reduce the request by approximately 29 square feet.

Staff Liaison Mesaros stated it would cut the variance proposed in half.

Assistant Director Schumerth stated it would be an increase in sign area of 14.2 square feet. Chair Hrymak stated it would go from the existing 119.8 to 134 square feet.

Assistant Director Schumerth stated it would be an increase of 11% instead of the 33%.

Motion to approve Case 24-52 sign variance, Dave's Hot Chicken at 17631 Halsted Street, with a change to 19.8 to 134 square feet and removal of the side sign and reduce the rear sign by 9.5 square feet for a variance of 14.2 square feet as proposed in the drawings by member Scheffke, seconded by Member Kluck.

Member Quirke asked about the colors.

Chair Hrymak stated they are not under their purview.

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

NAYES: None

ABESTENTIONS: None

Absent: 3 (Members Banks, Preston, and Kidd)

Member Kluck asked the timeframe to open and if the patio will remain.

Ms. Pino stated she wasn't sure, but was hoping by the end of the year. Pino stated that the patio will remain, as a majority of the chain's locations have them.

## **OLD BUSINESS:**

Chair Hrymak stated he didn't see any change to the Essence Suites signage, the sign at Saint Joe's is done but the yellow doesn't go, the Gottschalk house is done, the Casino is open, and the mural by Stoney Point is interesting and not what was expected. And asked if it was complete.

Staff Liaison Mesaros stated the mural is complete.

Chair Hrymak stated it is very creative. Chair Hrymak said that the mural is very simplistic yet nice, and the word Homewood is hidden in the mural somewhere.

Member Kluck observed there are train tracks running through it.

Chair Hrymak asked if there is a landscape plan for the western entrance.

Staff Liaison Mesaros stated there is nothing yet.

### **NEW BUSINESS:**

Chair Hrymak asked can something be added to the new ordinance when the painting on the building is not harmonious with the area.

Member Quirke stated the ordinance says harmonious and the Dave's proposal is not.

Member Scheffke said if the building is being painted, it is part of the corporate identity and then the whole building could be considered as a sign.

Assistant Director Schumerth stating it is a challenge to regulate color. A permit is not needed nor is the contractor needed to register. There is no clear trigger with the Village to lead to a review.

Building Department Secretary Leonard stated a change in the Municipal Code would be required in order to require permits and have contractors register for painting and that would need to be discussed to the Village Attorney and the Village Manager.

Assistant Director Schumerth stated they can look at when color could constitute a sign when addressing the new Sign Code. Schumerth said if there is something that has commercial messaging within it, it can be looked at it and reviewed as a sign. Schumerth said that the Village doesn't want to call things signs when they aren't and not call things signs that are, and that this discussion will have to continue with the Village Attorney.

Chair Hrymak asked if signage would be approved by Staff or if it would go in front of the Appearance Commission for approval.

Member Scheffke stated if the signage meets code then it would be judgmental and is too subjective.

Member Quirke stated he thinks they are getting too close to having too many allowances and stretching so much they won't be able to get back to the ordinance in sign reviews.

Member Scheffke stated the rules don't change because of the stretch.

Staff Liaison Mesaros stated they are looking at a new Appearance Plan and Sign Code. The Commission has the ability to look at every sign and they did so in the past. Mesaros stated that it was a lot of signs to review, and it became too much to effectively look at. Mesaros stated that staff can always send signs over to the Commission to review.

Member Quirke stated they don't want to look at every sign, but wants to look at every plan.

Member Scheffke stated he would like to see every sign.

Assistant Director Schumerth stated they can make a condition to require signage to be reviewed when it's a new development package and they can require signage plans for multi-tenant buildings.

Member Scheffke asked is a permit is required for every sign.

Building Department Secretary stated no. If a panel of an existing sign was broken and needs replacing a permit is not required. But one is required if it is a new business or the sign is changing.

Chair Hrymak asked if the next meeting will be about the new sign code.

Assistant Director Schumerth stated that is the plan.

Chair Hrymak asked if directional signage can be regulated, especially on the interior of a location and asked about the gateway signage.

Staff Liaison Mesaros stated regulating directional signage can be looked into and any gateway signage will come before the Commission.

Member Quirke stated landscaping should be looked at carefully including the initial review and enforcement.

Staff Liaison Mesaros stated landscaping is very aggressive in the new Zoning Code and the enforcement is through Code Enforcement.

## **ADJOURN:**

A motion was made for adjourning the meeting by Member Kluck; second by Member Scheffke.

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

NAYS: 0

ABSTENTIONS: 0

ABSENT: 3 (Members, Banks, Preston, and Kidd)

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

*Darlene Leonard*

**Darlene Leonard**, Building Department Secretary

**Meeting Minutes** | November 13, 2024

7 of 7

Last Revised: 02/28/2025

# VILLAGE OF HOMEWOOD



## MEETING MINUTES

DATE OF MEETING: **January 16, 2025**

### 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 6:05 pm.

### ROLL CALL:

Members Banks, Kluck, Scheffke, Preston, and Chair Hrymak were present. Member Quirke was absent.

In attendance from Village staff were Angela Mearos, Director of Economic and Community Development; and Noah Schumerth, Assistant Director of Economic and Community Development. There were no 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:

Chair Hrymak stated that Member Quirke will need to be present to approve the November 13, 2024 meeting minutes. The Commission declined to make a motion on the minutes from November 13, 2024.

Chair Hrymak asked for corrections from the January 16, 2025 meeting minutes. No changes were requested.

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

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

NAYS: 0

ABSTENTIONS: 0

ABSENT: 1 (Members Quirke)

### PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None.

### REGULAR BUSINESS:

#### 25-01 SIGN CODE UPDATE - CONTINUED

Chair Hrymak introduced the workshop presentation to be conducted by Village staff. Chair Hrymak invited Noah Schumerth, Assistant Director of Economic and Community Development, to come forward to present the workshop on proposed sign code amendments.

Chair Hrymak requested that the workshop be presented by individual section, with opportunities for comments in between each presented section. Assistant Director Schumerth noted that staff planned to present the workshop by individual section.

Assistant Director Schumerth introduced the proposed code updates. Schumerth provided an agenda for the workshop.

Assistant Director Schumerth presented key goals of the project. Schumerth stated a need for improved organization, potential legal issues which impact sign regulations, and the need for improved regulation of signs in multi-tenant commercial centers.

Assistant Director Schumerth presented the outline for the new sign code and explained that sign regulations would be moved from Section 30 of the Village Code of Ordinances to the Zoning Ordinance in Section 44 of the Code of Ordinances.

Assistant Director Schumerth presented the purpose and applicability sections of the proposed ordinance and asked for feedback.

Assistant Director Schumerth presented proposed sign prohibitions.

Member Scheffke asked what types of features would fall into the category of “illuminated signs” and if “Open” signs would be included in the category.

- **Schumerth noted that staff wished to discuss “Open” signs and decorative neon window signs which may be desirable in the community.**

Staff Liaison Mesaros noted that the Village wishes to allow “Open” signs and similar types of signs, and staff may need to discuss illuminated sign requirements. Mesaros noted that sign regulation must be “content-neutral;” the Village could not ban all illuminated signs except signs which say “Open.”

Member Scheffke asked if signs with ambient lighting, created with neon or illuminated tubing behind sign letters, would be permitted.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth said yes, though it is dependent on the sign design. The tubing must not be visible.**

Member Scheffke asked why illuminated tubing is prohibited.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth stated that public feedback was against seeing exposed tube lighting, string lighting, and similar lights.**

Member Banks asked what would be done about certain buildings being from a historical period where signs with illuminated fixtures were more common.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth noted that the landmark process, which is proposed to be revised to include signs, would be used to allow these historical sign types. Schumerth noted that a comprehensive sign plan could be approved to allow signs which do not meet code but mimic a historic building type.**

Chair Hrymak noted that the comprehensive sign plan process could be a lot of work for a tenant to preserve a certain sign.

Member Preston asked if age-restricted activities (such as vaping) could be restricted from having signs.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth noted that this would violate content neutrality laws. Schumerth stated that the Village would need to restrict the use or activity and then prohibit off-premise advertising.**

Assistant Director Schumerth noted that any signs which wish to have modifications from standards would need to demonstrate public purpose and adherence to community standards in the Comprehensive Sign Program process.

Chair Hrymak asked for clarification on what would constitute a sign mounted to a fence, and whether residential “slow down” signs would be included.

- **Staff Liaison Mesaros noted that the signage would likely be exempt on residential property, and the sign would likely be classified as exempt from sign regulations and temporarily allowed on private property, similar to political signs.**

Member Scheffke asked if contractor signs are included as a fence sign.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth noted that some contractor signs are required by Village ordinance and exempt from sign regulations, and others are allowed as a temporary banner. Schumerth noted that the Chief Building Inspector was consulting on temporary sign allowances in the proposed code.**

Schumerth introduced a section detailing sign measurements. Schumerth said that Houseal-Lavigne will be creating graphics for the new Sign Code, most of which will be in this section.

Member Scheffke asked for clarification on how lot frontage will be defined in the new sign code.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth explained that lot frontage will be measured as property boundaries adjacent to public right-of-way. Staff Liaison Mesaros added that staff can look at zoning definitions to clarify definitions in the new sign code.**

Member Scheffke asked for clarification on how height will be measured for signs, since height can measure the height from grade or the height of the sign itself.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth said that height in most instances is measured from grade. The height of the sign itself is only measured for certain sign types.**

Assistant Director Schumerth explained new requirements for non-commercial signage. Schumerth also introduced amendments to the Village’s landmark policy to include signage as eligible for designation.

Chair Hrymak asked how signs will be deemed historical.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth noted that any landmark sign requires review and a recommendation for approval by the Appearance Commission, as well as approval from the Village Board.**

Assistant Director Schumerth introduced commercial sign types proposed to be added to the ordinance, and explained the organization of the ordinance by zoning district and type of review required.

Chair Hrymak asked for clarification about which signs will be included as an instructional sign in the new code.

Member Scheffke asked if window signs require a permit.

- **Staff Liaison Mesaros said that window signs require a permit, though some businesses place signs without permits. Mesaros noted that Economic and Community Development staff should be contacted so enforcement can occur for unpermitted signs.**

Chair Hrymak asked if window signs should require Appearance Review to improve enforcement.

- **Staff Liaison Mesaros noted that the issue is many businesses do not apply for window sign permits at all.**

Assistant Director Schumerth explained window signage requirements, including new proposed requirements.

Assistant Director Schumerth introduced requirements for wall signs and projecting signs.

Chair Hrymak asked how high the LoulouBelle projecting sign is.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth said the height is approximately 10-12'.**

Chair Hrymak said that 15' is a generous height allowance for projecting signs and businesses do not need signs this high.

Staff Liaison Mesaros commented that these signs are important to business owners because they are clearly visible for people downtown.

Assistant Director Schumerth introduced proposed regulations for monument signs.

Staff Liaison Mesaros asked if the monument sign example shown, at Buffalo Wild Wings, was allowed by variance.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth said it did not come up in reviewing variances, though staff could look at permit records.**

Chair Hrymak asked if it was standard in other communities to have a 5' height limit in downtown areas and 8' in other areas.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth said he was unsure whether 5' maximum height was standard for downtown areas. Schumerth said the 8' height allowance is standard for monument signs in many suburban communities. Schumerth noted that cities sometimes allow increased height based on location or vehicle speed.**

Chair Hrymak expressed concerns about whether 8' was enough height for many businesses, such as in large shopping centers.

Member Preston noted that the smaller sign at Wal-Mart gets lost in other signage. Assistant Director Schumerth provided sign sizes for various monument signs existing in Homewood. Chair Hrymak stated that 8' was not sufficient for height along Halsted Street. Assistant Director Schumerth noted that Homewood would not be the first community to allow signs larger than 8' in height.

Staff Liaison Mesaros noted that staff should look at other communities more closely for height allowances.

Chair Hrymak called for a 5-minute recess.

Assistant Director Schumerth introduced proposed regulations for electronic changing messaging (ECM) board signs.

Chair Hrymak noted that the requirement "image duration should not exceed 8 seconds" should be changed to "image duration shall be a minimum of 8 seconds."

Assistant Director Schumerth introduced proposed regulations for pylon signs.

Staff Liaison Mesaros noted that there are numerous pylon signs which also have electronic changing message boards installed within them. Assistant Director Schumerth noted that the proposed regulations would prohibit electronic message boards installed into pylon signs. Mesaros said that some gas station signs have electronic message boards which were previously allowed to be built.

Chair Hrymak asked how tall the former Brunswick Zone pylon sign is.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth said that the sign is approximately 20' in height.**

Chair Hrymak said that the sign is an appropriate height. Staff Liaison Mesaros noted that the current code allows signs up to 28' for centers with over 250,000 square feet in floor area. Chair Hrymak said he believed that 25' was appropriate for visibility.

Member Scheffke said he was fine with electronic changing message displays, but wished to regulate the area of such message displays. Chair Hrymak expressed concerns that too many signs could look bad along Halsted Street.

Staff Liaison Mesaros said that staff could consult other communities for ideas on how to regulate electronic message boards in pylon signs.

Chair Hrymak asked if standards should be written for landscape maintenance in the ordinance.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth said that more detail can be added to maintenance standards in the proposed code to ensure landscape maintenance can be regulated.**

Assistant Director Schumerth introduced proposed regulations for canopy signs.

Chair Hrymak asked why a business would install a canopy sign on a building in the M-1 zone.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth noted that there are industrial buildings in the area, including one on 194<sup>th</sup> Street in Glenwood, which have canopy signs.**

Chair Hrymak expressed that there could be situations where canopy signs could help with visibility for some uses.

Assistant Director Schumerth introduced proposed regulations for gas station canopy signs.

Member Kluck asked if signs above the canopy would be allowed.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth noted that no signs would be allowed to be above the height of the canopy structure itself.**

Member Kluck asked how signs would be regulated for gas stations with more than one canopy structure.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth said that the proposed code does not restrict signs on multiple canopies, but there is a maximum of four signs on each canopy structure. Schumerth offered to revise the allowed number if desired.**

Assistant Director Schumerth introduced proposed regulations for awning signs and marquee signs.

Staff Liaison Mesaros asked if Grady's on Harwood has a sign.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth noted that Grady's does not have a marquee but has other signs which a unique design.**

Chair Hrymak expressed a desire to see a business come in and construct a marquee sign in Homewood.

Staff Liaison Mesaros asked if the example from Milwaukee on the screen was flush to the building.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth said yes, and it is an example of what the proposed code may allow.**

Staff Liaison Mesaros said that marquee signs may look better when not fully flush to the building. Mesaros also commented that 15' is a low height for marquee signs and that extending beyond the roof line can be appropriate.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth said that the recommended changes can be made.**

Chair Hrymak asked where other marquee signs are installed in the area.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth noted that many communities outlaw marquees entirely, and many of the proposed regulations come from other communities with strict form standards on marquees.**

Assistant Director Schumerth introduced regulations for painted wall signs.

Member Preston asked if Dave’s Hot Chicken would be considered to have a painted wall sign.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth noted that the painting is just the color of the building; it would become a painted wall sign with commercial messaging.**

Member Scheffke noted the poor paint quality on Dave’s Hot Chicken. Chair Hrymak noted that code enforcement is needed to control the quality of wall color and painted wall signs.

Member Scheffke asked about vinyl lettering on buildings and how those letters would be classified.

- **Assistant Director Schumerth said that if vinyl letters are affixed to a window, they are considered window signage; if affixed to a metal panel, they are likely to be considered as part of a wall sign.**

Chair Hrymak asked for clarification on the regulation restricting painted wall signs from moving between wall planes. Hrymak said that signs moving across wall planes can be creative.

Staff Liaison Mesaros noted that if painted wall signs are required to go to the Appearance Commission, these signs can be reviewed on a case by case basis with less regulations included in the sign code.

Assistant Director Schumerth presented proposed requirements for window signs and instructional signs. Chair Hrymak praised the proposed regulations of instructional signs.

Assistant Director Schumerth thanked the Commission for input. Chair Hrymak complimented the work done by staff.

Chair Hrymak recommended continuing the remainder of the workshop presentation to the March 6, 2025 meeting.

#### **OLD BUSINESS:**

None.

#### **NEW BUSINESS:**

None.

**ADJOURN:**

A motion was made for adjourning the meeting by Member Scheffke, second by Member Preston.

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

NAYS: 0

ABSTENTIONS: 0

ABSENT: 1 (Member Quirke)

The meeting was adjourned at 8:05pm.

Respectfully submitted,

*Noah Schumerth*

**Noah Schumerth**, Assistant Director of Economic and Community Development

# VILLAGE OF HOMEWOOD



## MEMORANDUM

DATE OF MEETING: March 6, 2025

**To:** Appearance Commission

**From:** Noah Schumerth, Assistant Director of Economic and Community Development

**Through:** Angela Mesaros, Director of Economic and Community Development

**Topic:** Case 25-01: Sign Code Update – Appearance Commission Workshop

## DOCUMENTS FOR REVIEW

Title	Pages	Prepared by	Date
Workshop Slide Deck – Remaining Slides		Economic and Community Development (ECD) Department	02/27/2025

## PROJECT INTRODUCTION

The Village Sign Code, Section 30 of the Village Code of Ordinances, is the Village’s set of regulations for any property owner seeking to install signage within Village limits. The regulations dictate sign form and construction requirements and define Village procedures related to the approval and regulation of signs.

The Village initiated the process to overhaul the Village Sign Code in late 2022. The last major amendment to the Village Sign Code was completed in 1997, with another set of minor amendments completed in 2004. The Sign Code predates the Appearance Commission (established in 1998). The Commission reviews and approves sign variances, and the Appearance Plan (also established in 1998). The Appearance Plan provides additional design guidelines for signage in the Village.

The Sign Code predates the recently adopted new zoning ordinance by 26 years. Since the adoption of the original Sign Code in 1997, many broad changes to design and review of signs have occurred including changes in signage and lighting technology and shifts in legal precedent of sign regulation and protecting (or limiting) constitutional rights. Additionally, Homewood has seen significant changes in the built environment since the adoption of the current Village Sign Code. These changes include development in the Downtown area and in the Village’s other commercial corridors. The new Sign Code will modernize local regulations to meet the current legal, technological, and aesthetic challenges surrounding signage in Homewood.

## DISCUSSION

At the Appearance Commission meeting on January 16, 2025, Commissioners received an initial introduction to the Sign Code Update project, including a draft document. At the meeting on February 6, 2025, Staff presented the first half of the Sign Code amendments. At this meeting, Staff will present the second (final) portion of proposed changes to the Sign Code.

***This agenda item is continued from previous meetings. Please refer to packet materials January 16, 2025 and February 6, 2025 for information previously provided, including information on project goals and a summary of all sign code changes proposed.***

**TIMELINE**

This workshop meeting for the proposed Sign Code Update will conclude the scheduled public workshops for the Sign Code Update. A timeline is provided below with details on the remaining steps towards Village Board approval of the sign ordinance. This proposed ordinance update requires recommendations from the Appearance Commission, the Planning and Zoning Commission, with final approval by the Village Board.

**Table 1. Project Schedule**

Review	Date
Appearance Commission Workshop #3	March 6, 2025
Appearance Commission Public Meeting	April 3, 2025
Planning and Zoning Commission Public Hearing	April 10, 2025
Village Board of Trustees Public Meeting	April 22, 2025

*All dates subject to change during review of draft Sign Code Update.*

**RECOMMENDED APPEARANCE COMMISSION ACTION**

This agenda item is a continuation of the in-depth review of sign regulation updates. The final version of the proposed Village Sign Code will be reviewed for a formal recommendation at a future public meeting of the Appearance Commission.

No motion required.