



**MINUTES  
VILLAGE OF GLENCOE  
PLAN COMMISSION**

Virtual Meeting – Video Conference  
Wednesday, May 26 24, 2021 – 7:00 p.m.

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The May 26, 2021 meeting of the Plan Commission of the Village of Glencoe, Cook County was called to order virtually at 7:00 p.m. Chairman Huvad provided the legal basis for holding a virtual meeting.

**2. ROLL CALL**

*The following Commissioners were in attendance:*

Bruce Huvad, Chairman, Public-at-Large Representative  
Gail Lissner, Vice Chair, Village Board Representative  
Marc Gale, School District 35 Representative  
Georgia Mihalopoulos, Public-at-Large Representative  
Michael Pope, Glencoe Public Library Representative  
John Satter, Zoning Board of Appeals Representative  
James Thompson, Public-at-Large Representative  
Greg Turner, Public-at-Large Representative  
Peter Van Vechten, Historic Preservation Commission Representative

*The following Village staff were also in attendance:*

Taylor Baxter, Development Services Manager  
Dave Mau, Public Works Director  
Lee Brown, Village Planner  
Stewart Weiss, Village Attorney

**3. CONSIDER THE FEBRUARY MAY 26, 2021 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES**

Commissioner Thompson moved to approve the minutes with a correction that he be included in the record of the vote on page 3 of the minutes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Turner and passed unanimously with abstentions by Commissioners Pope and Gale and Vice Chair Lissner.

Chairman Huvad introduced and welcomed the new members of the Plan Commission. He explained that the previously proposed patio at 668 Vernon. He explained that the previously proposed outdoor patio at 668 Vernon Avenue was withdrawn from consideration, and that this application would just involve rooftop mechanical units. He explained that there would be an opportunity later in the meeting for comments on topics not on the agenda.

**4. CONSIDERATION OF EXTERIOR APPEARANCE REVIEW AT 320 TUDOR COURT**

Taylor Baxter provided background information on the proposed new awning and signage. The storefront currently has window signage that exceeds the area allowed by code, but window signage

does not need a permit or Plan Commission review. The Commission could consider the appearance of the storefront as a whole when considering the awning and awning signage. He mentioned that there are some awnings existing on the block frontage, with some similar awnings being removed further down the block.

Chairman Huvad mentioned that there did not seem to be a lot to discuss other than the color of the awning. He asked if there was anything else on the street that this should be considered as part of. Mr. Baxter answered that there were no requirements that all the awnings need to be the same and that there was quite a bit of discretion given to the Plan Commission.

Commissioner Satter asked if the black awning was part of Compass' branding and said that the guidelines encourage color. He said that encouraging color could be an improvement.

Commissioner Turner asked about what the Village does about window signage that doesn't meet code. Mr. Baxter responded that it would be a code enforcement issue.

Chairman Huvad asked the Plan Commission to consider the Village's design goals along Tudor Court. Lee Brown said that the standards for Tudor Court improvements were more about the quality of materials and maintenance, and not so much about color. The streetlights are black, which would be consistent with the proposed awning.

Mr. Baxter stated that there was not a representative for the applicant present at the meeting.

Commissioner Van Vechten motioned to approve and Commissioner Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>ACCEPTED</b>
<b>AYES:</b>	Huvad, Lissner, Gale, Mihalopoulos, Pope, Satter, Thompson, Turner, Van Vechten (9)
<b>NAYS:</b>	None (0)
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	None (0)
<b>ABSENT:</b>	None (0)

## **6. CONSIDERATION OF EXTERIOR APPEARANCE REVIEW AT 339 PARK AVE**

Taylor Baxter provided background information on the proposed new awning and signage. The applicant is proposing a new awning, awning sign, and window signage. The window signage does not need Plan Commission approval, but the Commission may consider the appearance of the storefront as a whole.

Chairman Huvad asked if the applicant had agreed to make the awnings the same size as adjacent awnings. Applicant Jinyoung Jang responded that it was not but that it could be consistent throughout the façade. Commissioner Gale asked why it is proposed to be smaller in depth. Ms. Jang responded that shadows would not be desirable in the storefront and the smaller awning would reduce the shadows. Commissioner Van Vechten asked how much shallower the awning was proposed to be, and Ms. Jang responded that it would be six inches shallower than the adjacent awning. Commissioner Van Vechten asked about the storefront to the east, and Ms. Jang responded that the awnings do not match in terms of size and that the proposed awning would not be able to match the awnings on each side.

Chairman Huvard asked if staff felt that the proposed awning would still be acceptable along the street frontage, given the differences in size. Mr. Baxter responded that it would not be possible to exactly match both awnings and that staff's recommendation was that the Commission consider the options for potentially matching one of the awning. Chairman Huvard asked if the color would more closely match the awning to the left or the right, and Ms. Jang responded that it would more closely match the awning to the left. Chairman Huvard asked about lettering style, and Ms. Jang responded that it would be a skinner Arial font. Commissioner Thompson said that he visited the site and that if you look closely you can see that each awning is slightly different and that there is not a lot of consistency. Ms. Jang responded that there are different color awnings along the block frontage. Chairman Huvard asked which awning staff's recommendation would have the awning match, and Mr. Baxter responded that the recommendation was for the Commission to consider the awning in relation to the neighboring awnings, rather than a recommendation to match one or the other.

Mr. Brown added that the awning spanning the entire window and the location of the sign above the door were positive aspects of the proposed awning. Chairman Huvard added that without an overall awning plan, he did not see a reason for making the awning match other awnings on the block, which could change at any time.

Commissioner Turner motioned to approve and Commissioner Gale seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>ACCEPTED</b>
<b>AYES:</b>	Huvard, Lissner, Gale, Mihalopoulos, Pope, Satter, Thompson, Turner, Van Vechten (9)
<b>NAYS:</b>	None (0)
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	None (0)
<b>ABSENT:</b>	None (0)

**5. CONSIDERATION OF EXTERIOR APPEARANCE REVIEW AT 668 VERNON AVE.**

Taylor Baxter provided background information on the proposal, which only included the rooftop mechanical unit (RTU) screens. The previous proposal for a rear patio and exterior changes to the north side of the building were being withdrawn from consideration. The project previously came before the Plan Commission in March 2021 for approval of the front façade. He clarified that any future proposals for the rear patio that included the need for a building permit would need to return to the Plan Commission at a later time. The proposed screening would be dark brown corrugated metal.

Chairman Huvard asked what the intent of mechanical screens would be. Mr. Baxter responded that it was for aesthetic purposes and that the Design Guidelines provide some guidance. The Guidelines state that brown metal would be appropriate in this location. Chairman Huvard asked if the material had been used elsewhere in the Village. Mr. Brown responded that he was unaware of it being used elsewhere, as most RTUs pre-date the design guidelines or are screened by parapet walls or other parts of the building.

Hallie Ervin, applicant's representative, stated that instead of trying to modify the existing parapet, which is historic in nature, the intent was to provide a screen with a color and material that would be an appropriate accent. Chairman Huvard asked how transmissible light would be through the material and Ms. Ervin responded that it presents as a solid material.

Vice Chair Lissner asked about the choice of colors. Ms. Ervin said that the front façade brown would be similar in color to the screens.

Commissioner Van Vechten asked for clarity about what was being considered. Mr. Baxter responded that nothing else was being proposed, including the removal of the paint from the façade.

Chairman Huvad asked about the durability of the screens. Ms. Ervin responded that it was a powder coated material, which adds to its durability.

Commissioner Mihalopoulos asked if there was not other option to locate the units on the roof that would be less visible from the street. Ms. Ervin responded that the location chosen was best for the needs of the RTUs.

Brooke Wharton, who lives directly behind the subject property, asked about the visibility of the units from the homes to the west. Mr. Brown stated that screening was around each of the units and that the units would be screened from homes to the west and would make them look more like part of the building, rather than mechanical boxes.

Commissioner Van Vechten asked if the RTUs are all for air conditioning or if they served other purposes. Ms. Ervin responded that they're all for heating and cooling and that the cooking exhaust is inside the building with a fan on the roof that isn't visible from the public right-of-way.

Commissioner Turner motioned to approve and Commissioner Pope seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>ACCEPTED</b>
<b>AYES:</b>	Huvad, Lissner, Gale, Mihalopoulos, Satter, Thompson, Turner, Van Vechten (9)
<b>NAYS:</b>	None (0)
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	None (0)
<b>ABSENT:</b>	None (0)

## **7. COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

There were no comments on non-agenda items.

## **8. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Commissioner Satter stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals had a new Chairman and that a rezoning request would come to the Zoning Commission in the near future.

Commissioner Van Vechten stated that Village Board approved Certified Landmark status for St. Paul's AME Church, which brings the total number of Certified Landmarks in the Village to 11. This status carries more significant protections and incentives. This is the first house of worship to receive this designation in Glencoe.

Commissioner Gale gave an update on new School Board members. He said that students were back with public health modifications that would likely continue into the fall. South School had a geothermal project in progress.

## **9. ADJOURNMENT**

The next Plan Commission meeting was scheduled for June 23, 2021. Mr. Baxter said that there may be more exterior appearance review, but no applications had been received. Chairman Huvad said that the format of the next meeting was yet to be determined.

Following a motion by Commissioner Turner and a second by Commissioner Thompson the meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.