



Agenda
Village of Arlington Heights
Design Commission
Community Room, 3rd Floor

Arlington Heights Village Hall
33 S. Arlington Heights Road
Arlington Heights, IL 60005
April 14, 2015
6:30 PM

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. Minutes - 3/31/15

IV. REPORTS

V. OLD BUSINESS

- A. DC#15-016 - Central Park East Apartments - 1551 E. Central Rd. - Sign Variation (continued from 3/10/15)

VI. NEW BUSINESS

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

- A. The Moorings - 811 E. Central Rd. - Preliminary Review

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Persons with disabilities requiring auxiliary aids or services, such as an American Sign Language interpreter or written materials in accessible formats, should contact David Robb, Disability Services Coordinator, at 33 S. Arlington Heights Road, Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005, (847)368-5793 (Voice), (847)368-5980 (Fax) or drobb@vah.com.



Item: Minutes - 3/31/15

Department: Planning & Community Development

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Minutes 3/31/15 DRAFT

Type

Minutes

DRAFT

MINUTES OF
THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING
HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
MARCH 31, 2015

Acting Chair Bombick called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Members Present: Alan Bombick, Acting Chair
John Fitzgerald
Anthony Fasolo
Jonathan Kubow
Ted Eckhardt, Chair

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Keith Neumann, Greenscape Homes for *1805 N. Fernandez Ave.*
Douglas Espinal, Owner of *428 S. Evanston Ave.*
Josh Wohlrreich for *Arlington Downs*
Todd Bellis, Studio3 Design for *Teleflex*
Chad McRoberts, Catalyst GC & Development for *Teleflex*
Brian Murphy, K. Hovnanian Homes for *Christina Court*
Mark Rykovich, K. Hovnanian Homes for *Christina Court*
Randall Wilt, K. Hovnanian Homes for *Christina Court*
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM MARCH 10, 2015

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FASOLO, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 10, 2015. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

1. SINGLE-FAMILY TEARDOWN RE-REVIEW

DC#14-042 – 1805 N. Fernandez Ave.

Mr. Neumann, representing *Greenscape Homes*, was present on behalf of the project.

Acting Chair Bombick asked if there was any public comment on the project and there was no response from the audience.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to demolish an existing single story home to allow the construction of a new two story residence with an attached, three car garage. The project complies with all R-3 zoning requirements. The existing neighborhood consists of primarily single story homes. This project is appearing before the Design Commission due to past concerns in this neighborhood regarding teardown/new construction, and to evaluate the proposed architectural design with the context of the neighborhood. The hipped main roof and single story front porch help the design of the proposed house to fit into the neighborhood. Although this neighborhood is predominantly single story homes, it should be noted that there are a few other similar scale, newer two story homes on the block.

The proposed design is generally nicely done with varying roof lines, varied materials, and good proportions. The hipped main roof helps to diminish the overall height and mass of the proposed home as it relates to the adjacent single story homes. The proposed third car garage is of some concern, but it is set back a few feet from the front of the home, which helps minimize its appearance. The architectural details on the front of the home are continued on the side and rear elevations such as: decorative window grilles in all double hung windows, stone base wall treatment, metal accent roofing, windows on the side of the garage, and continuous horizontal trim bands. The only comment on the design is to provide metal roofing at the bay window on the right side of the home. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Neumann stated that a metal roof was added to the roof on the side bay window in response to Staff's comment.

Commissioner Kubow pointed out that the left and right elevations appear to be mis-labeled. He felt the front elevation was a beautiful design, with a good use of materials, and he liked that the stone was continued on the left and right side elevations. He was fine with the scale of the new home, and pointed out larger two-story homes to the north. He was somewhat concerned about the 3-car garage, which did not exist elsewhere on the block, although he felt the low roof on the third garage space helped the transition to the smaller home next door.

Commissioner Fasolo felt the home was nicely designed. He agreed with Commissioner Kubow that the 3-car garage was a little excessive for this neighborhood, and he suggested centering the transom window above the entry door.

Commissioner Fitzgerald agreed with the comments made by the other commissioners. He liked how the materials were continued around the entire home, and the detailing was nice. He did not have a problem with the 3-car garage, and had more of a problem with the roof being at a different pitch. If the roof were steeper, it would actually fit in better. He was concerned about the loss of a very large tree in the front yard. He suggested adding a couple of new trees to replace this large tree. He also said that it appeared as though a parkway tree located between the street and the lamp post was being removed because of the

new driveway. **Mr. Neumann** replied that it was their intent to replace any trees being removed; however a final landscape plan had not yet been developed. He added that the driveway could possibly be moved to accommodate keeping the existing large tree in the front yard. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** disagreed with moving the driveway because construction would hurt the existing tree anyway. He summarized that he liked the project, with a suggestion to adjust the roof above the garage, and add new trees.

Acting Chair Bombick pointed out that almost every other home in the neighborhood has the garage flush or pushed back, as opposed to the new home with the garage pushed forward, and he did not understand why the new home could not be in front of the garage. He felt it was a very un-neighborly gesture to stick the garage out in front because it obscured the view from the porch and did not present a very friendly face in a neighborhood where front doors face the street.

Chair Eckhardt arrived at the meeting.

Mr. Neumann said that details such as the stone pillars, the stone base, the metal roof and the style of garage doors were added to help make the garage more of an architectural feature. **Acting Chair Bombick** replied that if the garage was located behind the home, the petitioner would not have to work so hard to make the garage something it is not. He reiterated that the garage belongs behind the home, which is a concern the commissioners have expressed many times in the past, and he asked if Staff raised this concern with the petitioner. **Mr. Hautzinger** replied that, in this case, Staff did not raise this issue with the petitioner because Staff felt the proposed garage was not a concern in this neighborhood because of the large amount of existing frontload garages.

Acting Chair Bombick said that good walkable, sustainable and attractive town standards would argue that every home is an opportunity to make a better neighborhood; therefore, every home should have the garage behind the home. This is a wonderful opportunity to make a more walkable, enjoyable neighborhood where people on the porch have interaction with people passing by. He could not support the garage as proposed.

Commissioner Fasolo suggested removing the stairs that lead from the garage into the home and flipping them to the third car stall, and pushing back the entire garage. **Commissioner Kubow** said he would consider the third car garage if it was pushed back approximately 3-4 feet; as close as possible to be flush with the porch.

Acting Bombick clarified that he was simply raising an issue about compatibility in a neighborhood and creating neighborhoods. The commissioners were not here to solve a plan issue on the new home; however, it was up to the commissioners to determine whether or not the porch as he previously described was important on this street.

Mr. Neumann said that they considered a 2-car garage, similar to what is seen elsewhere on the street; however, potential buyers were more interested in a 3-car garage, since the home was not located near the train. Although the slope of the garage roof could be modified as suggested, he felt the existing single-story roof helped with the adjacent home to the right. **Acting Chair Bombick** commented that he was more concerned about the neighbor to the left being in a big shadow.

Commissioner Eckhardt had no comments since he arrived during the discussion.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE DESIGN OF THE PROPOSED NEW SINGLE-FAMILY HOME TO BE LOCATED AT 1805 N. FERNANDEZ AVENUE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS DATED 5/8/14, RECEIVED 5/13/14, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND RESOLUTION OF THE FOLLOWING:

1. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE ROOF OVER THE BAY WINDOW ON THE RIGHT SIDE ELEVATION BE METAL TO MATCH THE OTHER METAL ROOFS.
2. A REQUIREMENT THAT 3 NEW TREES BE PROVIDED ON THE PROPERTY.
3. A RECOMMENDATION TO PUSH BACK THE ENTIRE GARAGE TO BE EVEN WITH THE FRONT OF THE HOME.
4. THIS REVIEW REPRESENTS DESIGN APPROVAL ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, ANY OTHER ZONING AND/OR LAND USE ISSUES OR DECISIONS THAT STEM FROM ZONING, SIGN CODE OR BUILDING OR ANY OTHER REVIEWS.
5. IT IS THE PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO SUBMIT THE APPROPRIATE PERMIT APPLICATION(S) TO THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL PRIOR TO PROCEEDING WITH ANY WORK. IN ADDITION TO THE NORMAL TECHNICAL REVIEW, PERMIT DRAWINGS WILL BE REVIEWED FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE DESIGN COMMISSION AND ANY OTHER COMMISSION OR BOARD APPROVAL CONDITIONS. IT IS THE PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO INCORPORATE ALL REQUIREMENTS LISTED ON THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS INTO THE PERMIT DRAWINGS, AND TO ENSURE THAT BUILDING PERMIT PLANS AND SIGN PERMIT PLANS COMPLY WITH ALL ZONING CODE, BUILDING CODE AND SIGN CODE REQUIREMENTS.

Commissioner Kubow asked how the recommendation to push the garage back would be approved; how will the commissioners know if there is a real effort made by the petitioner to make this happen since it is only a recommendation. **Mr. Hautzinger** replied that a recommendation leaves the option up to the petitioner, since it is not a requirement. **Mr. Neumann** said that they would consider a way to slightly modify the garage without re-creating the plan. **Acting Chair Bombick** reiterated that the elevation did not need and should not look a bit different; that was not his concern, the third garage was not his concern, it is a beautiful home. **Mr. Hautzinger** summarized the options regarding the motion, which include: a recommendation to push the garage back, but if no changes are made, the permit would be approved as currently proposed, or the Design Commission can make it a requirement to push the garage back, which Staff could review at time of permit, or the Design Commission can require revisions to the current design and re-review the plans at a future meeting.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Kubow recommended the petitioner work with Staff to make an adjustment to the 3-car garage to move it back a minimum of 3-feet to be more consistent with the existing neighborhood.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO AMEND THE MOTION TO INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:

6. A RECOMMENDATION THAT THE PETITIONER WORK WITH STAFF TO ADJUST THE 3-CAR

GARAGE TO MOVE IT BACK A MINIMUM OF 3-FEET, TO BE MORE CONSISTENT WITH THE EXISTING NEIGHBORHOOD.

Commissioner Fitzgerald clarified that the amended motion includes a recommendation that the petitioner work with Staff to determine whether the entire garage can be pushed back; however, it was not a requirement. **Commissioner Kubow** agreed. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** felt that if it was a requirement to push the garage back, than the petitioner should return with an entirely new plan. He preferred a recommendation because Staff would still review and approve any changes to the garage.

**FITZGERALD, AYE; FASOLO, AYE; KUBOW, AYE; BOMBICK, AYE; ECKHARDT, ABSTAIN.
THE MOTION CARRIED.**

Acting Chair Bombick felt that the commissioners need to be very cognizant as the economy improves and more additions and teardowns come before the Commission, that while a design may be beautiful and one or two homes may not make a huge difference on a street, when neighborhoods start changing over, all of a sudden the character and the compatibility of the neighborhood is no longer what it was because half the homes now have garages stuck out where there used to be picture windows and front porches and stoops and even flat garages that could be open and give opportunities for human interaction in neighborhoods. The compatibility of these plans is not all aesthetic; it is making sure that walkable, safe, livable neighborhoods are created for future generations.

ITEM 2. SINGLE-FAMILY ADDITION RE-REVIEW

DC#14-120 – 428 S. Evanston Ave.

Mr. Espinal, the owner, was present on behalf of the project.

Acting Chair Bombick asked if there was any public comment on the project and there was no response from the audience.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The project is a second floor and rear addition to an existing single story home and was previously approved on December 9, 2014 with a requirement, "to continue a horizontal trim board at the second floor line around all sides of the home." At this time, the house is under construction and the petitioner is requesting approval to not add the horizontal trim board on the rear addition to the home, as well as omit the horizontal stone trim band on all other sides of the home. The petitioner did not submit any revised plans to Staff prior to this meeting. Although this is a relatively minor detail, since it was a requirement made by the Design Commission, it required Design Commission review. Staff feels that this requirement does help to break up the height of the home to relate to smaller adjacent homes, and also helps to break up the large wall of siding on the rear addition.

Mr. Espinal said that his wife does not like the horizontal trim board at the second floor around all four sides of the home, which is a requirement of the previous approval. He showed a picture of another home in the neighborhood that is similar to his home at 206 S. Waterman that does not have a horizontal trim band. He also showed the commissioners a revised rendering of the front elevation on his iPad.

Commissioner Eckhardt pointed out that the revised rendering has a slightly different dimension for the bay windows, than what was shown at the previous review. Because of this change in dimension, he had no problem with eliminating the horizontal trim board, previously required.

Acting Chair Bombick said that he was not at the last review; however, he felt the rendering was much better than the elevation previously approved. However, he had concerns about compliance, and whether or not what is being shown tonight in the revised rendering actually gets built, with regards to the window dimension. A revised dimensioned elevation should be submitted by the petitioner.

Commissioner Fitzgerald felt the revised rendering presented tonight was quite nice, with the assurance that the top of the bay window treatment does in fact go as high as what is being shown. With the side elevations being half brick and half siding, he still wanted to see some type of horizontal trim board around the area that looks like the addition in the back. Specifically, the line on the side elevation over the garage where the brick meets the siding; he still wanted to see a line of some sort to continue around the 3 sides of what he is calling the addition.

Commissioner Kubow concurred with Commissioners Fitzgerald and Eckhardt; the revised elevation looks fantastic, as long as the new window dimensions are built as shown. He also agreed that some type of horizontal banding would help the separation on the side and rear elevations.

Commissioner Fasolo liked the revised front elevation presented tonight.

Acting Chair Bombick felt the rear elevation would look fine without a horizontal board, although it would look even better if the top frame of the patio doors was taller. He did not have a problem with eliminating the horizontal trim board on the side elevations; however, he would suggest the motion include a requirement to add a flat band.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO APPROVE THE REVISED DESIGN OF THE PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY HOME LOCATED AT 428 S. EVANSTON AVENUE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE REVISED ARCHITECTURAL RENDERING RECEIVED 3/31/15, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND RESOLUTION OF THE FOLLOWING:

1. THAT THE FRONT ELEVATION BE ALTERED EXACTLY AS DEPICTED IN THE RENDERING PRESENTED TONIGHT, AND THE PETITIONER IS REQUIRED TO SUBMIT A REVISED DRAWING THAT IS COMPATIBLE WITH CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS.
2. A RECOMMENDATION THAT A HORIZONTAL TRIM BOARD BE ADDED ON THE REAR ADDITION.
3. THIS REVIEW REPRESENTS DESIGN APPROVAL ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, ANY OTHER ZONING AND/OR LAND USE ISSUES OR DECISIONS THAT STEM FROM ZONING, SIGN CODE OR BUILDING OR ANY OTHER REVIEWS.
4. IT IS THE PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO SUBMIT THE APPROPRIATE PERMIT APPLICATION(S) TO THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL PRIOR TO PROCEEDING WITH ANY WORK. IN ADDITION TO THE NORMAL TECHNICAL REVIEW, PERMIT DRAWINGS WILL BE REVIEWED FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE DESIGN COMMISSION AND ANY OTHER COMMISSION OR BOARD APPROVAL CONDITIONS. IT IS THE PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO INCORPORATE ALL REQUIREMENTS LISTED ON THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS INTO THE PERMIT DRAWINGS, AND TO ENSURE THAT BUILDING PERMIT PLANS AND SIGN PERMIT PLANS COMPLY WITH ALL ZONING CODE, BUILDING CODE AND SIGN CODE REQUIREMENTS.

Acting Chair Bombick felt the side elevations of the rear addition would look more complete if the height of the trim above the first-floor windows was consistent with the size of trim above the second-floor windows.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO AMEND THE MOTION TO ADD THE FOLLOWING:

1. A RECOMMENDATION TO REVISE THE HEAD TRIM ON THE FIRST-FLOOR WINDOWS TO MATCH THE HEIGHT OF THE HEAD TRIM ON THE SECOND-FLOOR WINDOWS.

Mr. Hautzinger asked for clarification about the recommendation to add a trim board across the rear addition, which **Commissioner Eckhardt** explained.

**FITZGERALD, AYE; FASOLO, AYE; KUBOW, AYE; BOMBICK, AYE; ECKHARDT, AYE.
ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.**

ITEM 3. SIGN VARIATION RE-REVIEW (continued from 2/24/15)

DC#15-001 – Patton Elementary School – 1616 N. Patton Ave.

Mr. Hautzinger stated that the petitioner has requested to continue the review of their request to the June 9, 2015 Design Commission meeting.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FASOLO, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO CONTINUE THE SIGN VARIATION REQUEST FOR PATTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (DC#15-001) TO THE JUNE 9, 2015 DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING.

**FASOLO, AYE; FITZGERALD, AYE; KUBOW, AYE; ECKHARDT, AYE; BOMBICK, AYE.
ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.**

Commissioner Eckhardt asked if the petitioner has contacted Staff regarding the probability of the sign mock-up that was encouraged by the commissioners. **Mr. Hautzinger** replied that the petitioner requested a continuation until June so they can see if any additional funds become available at the end of the current school year, with the intent to potentially purchase a full color LED sign, as opposed to the red/amber display originally proposed. The full color LED sign will allow the ability to display white letters on a black background.

ITEM 4. MIXED-USE RE-REVIEW

DC#11-112 – Arlington Downs – 3400 W. Euclid Ave.

Mr. Josh Wohlreich, representing *Arlington Downs*, was present on behalf of the project.

Commissioner Fasolo recused himself because of his involvement with the project, and left the room.

Acting Chair Bombick asked if there was any public comment on the project and there was no response from the audience.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. Tower One of the Arlington Downs mixed use development is a new luxury rental apartment building that was converted from the old Sheraton hotel building. The design received Design Commission approval on August 13, 2013. At this time, the petitioner is seeking approval to add exterior architectural lighting to the top and sides of the building. The proposed exterior lighting is called "Neon-Flex". It is a flexible plastic rope containing LED lights spaced at approximately every 1/2" on center, resulting in the appearance of a continuous line of light. The petitioner is proposing to install the "Neon-Flex" lighting continuously around the top of the building parapet wall and with two lines running up each side of the building.

The issue with the proposed lighting is that, as proposed, the actual strip light will be exposed to direct view creating a crisp, bright line. The Village's Design Guidelines state that, "(Lighting) fixtures, standards and all exposed accessories shall be concealed..." Similar proposals in the past have been consistently required to conceal the light source from direct view, but the light can wash the building wall. It is recommended that the proposed installation details be revised to create a recess for the strip lighting to conceal the actual light source, while allowing the light to wash and highlight the building walls. However, since this is a tall building, glare from the exposed fixture is less of a concern than it would be for a similar proposal on a building at street level.

Mr. Wohlreich presented a mock-up sample of the lighting being proposed. He explained that the lighting is already shielded by virtue of its construction. A bulbous edge will extend out and be mounted into the aluminum channel that will then be attached to the parapet.

Acting Chair Bombick said that the light source is concealed by diffusers. He explained that the LEDs are inside, down at the edge of the plastic, with a white translucent tube that is applied over the LEDs as a diffuser. In fact, it is no different than adding a bunch of fluorescent tubes with a white signage panel over it, only smaller. Instead of having a series of 4' by 1" fluorescent tubes with a white panel over them, which is code compliant, there is a strip of LEDs the size of peas lined up with a translucent cap that diffuses the light, 1/2- inch thick. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said it was impressive that the lighting is so seamless. **Acting Chair Bombick** said he is a big proponent of the proposed lighting. **Commissioner Eckhardt** agreed. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** felt the new lighting will add a great detail to the building, and in general, he felt the building turned out fantastic.

Mr. Wohlreich clarified that the proposed lighting will follow the parapet line around the entire building, with the exception of the stair tower where the lighting will end. **Mr. Hautzinger** added that the lighting will also come down the sides of the building down to the ground. **Commissioner Eckhardt** cautioned the petitioner to look into the possibility of the 'white' lighting changing color over time, which sometimes

happens with less expensive LED lighting. **Commissioner Eckhardt** felt the proposed exterior lighting was a great idea.

Acting Chair Bombick reiterated that the light source is concealed by diffusers and should not be considered an exposed neon light; there is a light source and a diffuser. **Commissioner Eckhardt** agreed and considered the LED a light fixture.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED EXTERIOR LIGHTING FOR TOWER ONE OF THE ARLINGTON DOWNS MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT LOCATED AT 3400 W. EUCLID AVENUE, AS SUBMITTED. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE PLANS RECEIVED 3/05/15, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND RESOLUTION OF THE FOLLOWING:

- 1. THIS REVIEW REPRESENTS DESIGN APPROVAL ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED**
- 2. TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, ANY OTHER ZONING AND/OR LAND USE ISSUES OR DECISIONS THAT STEM FROM ZONING, SIGN CODE OR BUILDING OR ANY OTHER REVIEWS.**
- 3. IT IS THE PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO SUBMIT THE APPROPRIATE PERMIT APPLICATION(S) TO THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL PRIOR TO PROCEEDING WITH ANY WORK. IN ADDITION TO THE NORMAL TECHNICAL REVIEW, PERMIT DRAWINGS WILL BE REVIEWED FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE DESIGN COMMISSION AND ANY OTHER COMMISSION OR BOARD APPROVAL CONDITIONS. IT IS THE PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO INCORPORATE ALL REQUIREMENTS LISTED ON THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS INTO THE PERMIT DRAWINGS, AND TO ENSURE THAT BUILDING PERMIT PLANS AND SIGN PERMIT PLANS COMPLY WITH ALL ZONING CODE, BUILDING CODE AND SIGN CODE REQUIREMENTS.**

**FITZGERALD, AYE; KUBOW, AYE; ECKHARDT, AYE; BOMBICK, AYE; FASOLO, RECUSE.
THE MOTION CARRIED.**

Mr. Wohlreich asked the Design Commission how they would feel if the lighting had full color changing capability. He clarified that the proposed fixture does not have color capability, but wondered if they would be allowed to change the fixture in the future to have full color changing capability. **Commissioner Eckhardt** replied that he has no issue if the light color changed as long as it is not morphing in a constant state of color change. He stated that if the petitioner wants to change to a full color fixture, then they should return to the Design Commission for review.

ITEM 5. COMMERCIAL REVIEW

DC#15-020 – Teleflex – 900 W. University Dr.

Mr. Chad McRoberts, representing *Catalyst GC & Development*, and **Mr. Todd Bellis**, representing *Studio3 Design*, were present on behalf of the project.

Acting Chair Bombick asked if there was any public comment on the project and there was no response from the audience.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing a 7,113 sf two story addition to the front of the existing 87,856 sf manufacturing facility. Teleflex is a global provider of medical supplies and equipment. This facility produces pure water for use in medical respirators. Construction of the existing building was completed in 1976. The scope of the project includes the building addition, new driveway, and corresponding landscape restoration and improvements. The proposed addition complies with the M-1 zoning setback and floor area requirements.

The proposed addition will be constructed with precast concrete exterior walls, whereas the existing manufacturing building is corrugated metal siding. However, the proposed addition will be painted to match the same color scheme used on the existing building which will help to tie the new and existing portions of the building together. The proposed addition will fill in the southeast corner of the overall rectangular building footprint, but it will be recessed from the one story office area, leaving the office area as the focal point of the design. Overall, the proposed addition is appropriately designed for the M-1 zoning district. Photos of the existing building were presented. Staff recommends approval of the proposed architectural design for the addition.

The petitioner had no comments at this time.

Commissioner Fitzgerald felt the proposed addition fit in nicely with the existing architecture, and the proposed landscaping was a great selection of plants that will soften the addition and make it feel like it belongs. **Commissioner Eckhardt** concurred with Commissioner Fitzgerald. **Commissioner Fasolo** felt the proposed addition fit well with the existing building. **Commissioner Kubow** agreed.

Acting Chair Bombick felt the proposed addition was done well, although he wished it was more adventurous; however, it will fit in just fine.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR AN ADDITION TO THE TELEFLEX BUILDING LOCATED AT 900 W. UNIVERSITY DRIVE, AS SUBMITTED. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE PLANS DATED 2/17/15, RECEIVED 2/23/15, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND RESOLUTION OF THE FOLLOWING:

1. THIS REVIEW REPRESENTS DESIGN APPROVAL ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, ANY OTHER ZONING AND/OR LAND USE ISSUES OR DECISIONS THAT STEM FROM ZONING, SIGN CODE OR BUILDING OR ANY OTHER REVIEWS.
2. IT IS THE PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO SUBMIT THE APPROPRIATE PERMIT APPLICATION(S) TO THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL PRIOR TO PROCEEDING WITH ANY WORK. IN ADDITION TO THE NORMAL TECHNICAL REVIEW, PERMIT DRAWINGS WILL BE REVIEWED FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE DESIGN COMMISSION AND ANY OTHER COMMISSION OR BOARD APPROVAL CONDITIONS. IT IS THE PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO INCORPORATE ALL REQUIREMENTS LISTED ON THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS INTO THE PERMIT DRAWINGS, AND TO ENSURE THAT BUILDING PERMIT PLANS AND SIGN PERMIT PLANS COMPLY WITH ALL ZONING CODE, BUILDING CODE AND SIGN CODE REQUIREMENTS.
3. THE PETITIONER IS REQUIRED TO MEET ALL LANDSCAPING AND PARKING REQUIREMENTS PER CHAPTER 28.
4. ALL SIGNAGE MUST MEET CODE, PER CHAPTER 30.

FITZGERALD, AYE; KUBOW, AYE; ECKHARDT, AYE; BOMBICK, AYE; FASOLO, AYE.
ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 6. SINGLE-FAMILY NEW REVIEW

DC#15-025 – Christina Court Subdivision – 1306/1310 E. Olive St.

Mr. Brian Murphy, Mr. Mark Rykovich, and Mr. Randall Wilt, representing *K. Hovnanian Homes*, were present on behalf of the project.

Commissioner Eckhardt recused himself because of his working relationship with the petitioner to assist in the initial planning of the project, and he left the meeting.

Acting Chair Bombick asked if there was any public comment on the project and there was response from the audience.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. Christina Court is a proposed 14 lot subdivision to be located on East Olive Street in an R-3 One Family Dwelling District. The petitioner is proposing a series of 4 different single family residential floor plans with a total of 11 exterior elevations. All plans will be required to comply with the R-3 zoning requirements. The petitioner is seeking approval for the general architectural designs and exterior material packages for the single-family residences, and if the Design Commission concurs, then each individual lot will be submitted and reviewed for Administrative Approval by Staff as the plans, options, and material package for each lot are selected and finalized. The Christina Court Subdivision is pending Plan Commission review and Village Board approval, with no date scheduled as of yet.

With regards to landscaping, the site is currently heavily wooded and the petitioner is proposing to clear all of the existing trees to provide a clean slate for development. Staff has visited the site to evaluate the condition of the existing landscaping, and due to the low quality of the exiting trees as well as grading issues, Staff agrees with the petitioner's proposal to clear the site. As part of the Subdivision approval process, Staff is recommending improving the landscaping around the perimeter of the storm water detention area in the southeast corner of the site, as well as along the proposed retaining wall along the north. The petitioner has recently responded to these suggestions with an updated landscape plan.

In regards to front yard landscaping, the Design Commission should consider if landscaping in the front yards should be required as part of the Design Commission approval, or if front yard landscaping should be left up to the new homeowners. Staff recommends the petitioner provide landscaping in the front of each home in order to ensure a cohesive appearance throughout the new subdivision. Plans for the front yard landscaping could include curving landscape beds along the front elevation and adjacent to the hardscape areas, with an abundant mix of trees, shrubs, and perennials.

The proposed subdivision will be required to comply with the monotony requirements per Chapter 28, Section 28-6.4 which states that houses of the same floor plan shall be separated by two or more lots, and may not be erected directly across the street from each other.

In regards to the architectural designs, overall, Staff feels that the proposed set of plans and elevations will work well together to create a cohesive new subdivision. However, there are various concerns that need to be addressed as recommended below:

1. Brick and stone shown on the front elevations should be returned down the side elevations to a

- natural break point, or approximately 3' minimum, to be approved by Staff.
2. Windows should be added to the side garage walls, typical for all plans. At least one window shall be added for standard garages, and at least two separate windows shall be added for tandem garages.
 3. Window trim, shutters, and grilles provided on the front elevation should also be provided on the side and rear elevations to match, unless not practical as approved by Staff.
 4. The optional side bay windows are not allowed to project into the required side yard setbacks.
 5. Victoria & Morton models. Consider adding a covered portico above the rear patio door to break up the large flat rear walls.
 6. Morton F & G. Adjust the porch column spacing so that the windows are centered between the columns.
 7. Memphis H. The blank wall space above the garage doors looks odd. Explore options to break up the flat empty wall.
 8. Boulder model. The optional garage door facing the side yard should be omitted.

Mr. Hautzinger explained that a large amount of exterior color/material palettes are being proposed. The petitioner is proposing that all vinyl windows, steel garage doors, engineered wood trim, aluminum soffits, fascia, and gutters will have a white finish on all homes. The white components will be paired with 23 different exterior material packages having varied colors of engineered wood siding, clay brick, cultured stone, asphalt shingle roofing, and accents. It is difficult to assess the proposed material packages without color renderings, photos of completed projects, or actual material samples, but overall the packages appear to be nicely coordinated. The only two items of concern are the "Prairie Wheat" siding color in package #6 which looks very yellow, and the "Evergreen" siding color in package #NR01 which looks quite bold. It is recommended that these two packages be revised or omitted.

Based on Staff comments and the ten (10) recommendations listed in the Staff report, Staff recommends approval of the project.

Mr. Rykovich presented a handout of revised elevations and explained that these elevations were identical to the original application submitted; however, the height of the roof ridge has been lowered on a number of the elevations to comply with the height ordinance. **Mr. Hautzinger** added that Staff is seeing these revisions for the first time tonight. **Acting Chair Bombick** asked the petitioner to limit discussion to general information about the site, and comments in response to the concerns stated by Staff.

Mr. Rykovich referred to the revised elevations and explained that the height of the Victoria model was lowered to meet code, approximately 12-inches. The proposed exterior materials include LP siding, trim, and columns, which is a composite siding similar to cement board but without cementitious material; aluminum soffit, fascia and gutters; and vinyl windows. The last page of the revised handout shows a photo of a completed house with the proposed 'Prairie Wheat' color, which they are not opposed to eliminating from the options if necessary.

Mr. Rykovich responded to Staff comments as follows:

- #3 - Each home will include a landscape package that includes a tree and full sod in the front and rear yards.
- #4 - Brick and stone on the front elevation will be returned down the side elevations 2' instead of the suggested 3'.

- #5 - Agree with the requirement to add windows to the side garage walls, add at least one window for standard garages, and add at least 2 separate windows for tandem garages.
- #6 – Agree to wrap all windows with trim, and to match whatever front window design a homebuyer chooses on all windows for all elevations on all sides. However, adding shutters to side and rear windows can create a clustered and awkward look, especially with some windows close to corners and close together.
- #7 – They feel most buyers will choose at least one of the options offered on the rear elevation such as extended family rooms, breakfast nooks, fireplaces, and bay windows, to help break up the rear elevation.
- #8 – Agree with the requirement to adjust the porch column spacing on 'Morton F & G', so that the windows are centered between the columns.
- #9 - Agree to explore options to break up the flat empty wall above the garage doors on 'Memphis H'. An 8' garage door (in lieu of a standard 7' garage door) will take up some of the empty space above the doors.
- #10 – Agree to the requirement to omit the optional garage door facing the side yard, to be replaced with a man door if necessary.

Mr. Rykovich also stated that 3 floor plans were presented at the neighborhood meeting previously held; however, a fourth plan, the Victoria, was added in response to the monotony code.

Acting Chair Bombick asked why composite siding material was being proposed instead of a cementitious product. **Mr. Rykovich** replied that LP siding creates a heavier texture and cedar look to the home without having the maintenance of cedar, and is virtually maintenance free. They feel it is a better product than typical vinyl siding and will add architectural detail to the homes that they prefer in this neighborhood and price point.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. James Malik, 1119 E. Olive Street, located just west of the proposed new subdivision. He asked about the retention wall that was referenced earlier; what is being retained? **Mr. Rykovich** replied that 2 retaining walls are being proposed; one around the detention basin to hold the stormwater before it releases off-site; the other across the top of the site, which is a grade change between this site and the adjacent site. **Mr. Malik** was concerned that Lot 1 was not large enough to accommodate the possibility of Olive Street being widened in the future. **Acting Chair Bombick** encouraged the resident to address this concern with the Engineering Department, since it was not under the purview of the Design Commission. He also pointed out that the aerial exhibit being shown tonight was not to scale. **Mr. Rykovich** added that Lot 1 would have a larger side yard setback from the property line, plus the right-of-way of Olive Street.

Mr. Russell Hill, 1041 E. Talbot Street, located at the end of the cul-de-sac on Talbot Street, directly west of the retention basin. He found it rather ironic to hear discussion about moving columns 1' or 2' on the homes, yet all of the existing trees on the site were being removed. He said that the entire existing wetland natural preserve, which was actually promised to them when they purchased their lot and built their home, would be ruined, and there is tremendous wildlife located there. Cutting down all the trees would destroy what was built by the builder, what was preserved by the Army Corp of Engineers for a number of years, and what is now being preserved by the Village. He was interested in further commentary on this.

Acting Chair Bombick suggested the resident obtain and provide any documentation he had regarding a

promise to preserve the existing trees. He also reiterated that the purview of the Design Commission is to review only the architectural designs for the new homes and to have a compatibility discussion of how the homes will fit in with the surrounding neighborhood. He encouraged the resident to discuss his concerns during the Plan Commission review. **Mr. Hautzinger** added that the petitioner has submitted a tree survey of all existing trees on the site along with a proposed landscape plan that will be reviewed as part of the Plan Commission review for approval of the Subdivision.

Mr. Andy Kinastowski, 1317 E. Olive Street, located directly across the street from the proposed retention area. His concern is with keeping the current homogenous look of the neighborhood, specifically the setbacks that currently exist for homes on the north side of Olive Street. He said that Lot 1 was too close to Olive Street, which would be a problem if and when Olive Street is widened. **Mr. Hautzinger** reiterated that any setback issues fall under the purview of the Plan Commission review; however, he clarified that the petitioner is proposing to comply with all R-3 zoning requirements for the new lots. The south (exterior side yard) setback on Lot 1 will be based on the average front yard setback of the existing homes on the block. It was pointed out by a resident that the 7 or 8 newer existing homes on Olive Street were all granted a variance for setback, and located closer to the road.

Mr. Kinastowski asked the petitioner to further explain the retention/retaining wall. **Mr. Rykovich** replied that the retention wall would be a moderate drop-off from 3-feet at the sidewalk to approximately 5-feet in the middle, with landscaping around the wall. He pointed out that the exhibit shown tonight only shows the outlot/detention area; the retaining wall is actually shown on the engineering plan to be reviewed by the Engineering Department, and shows the location and height of the proposed retaining wall. **Acting Chair Bombick** suggested the petitioner better delineate the lines shown on the drawings for the detention area, prior to the Plan Commission review. **Mr. Hautzinger** clarified that the proposed retaining wall will have an approximately 3-foot drop down into the detention area, which will be reviewed in more detail as part of the Plan Commission review. At this time, Staff's recommendation for Plan Commission review is to omit the proposed retaining wall and create a gradual slope into the detention area instead, although this recommendation has not yet been finalized. **Acting Chair Bombick** questioned why the new homes did not just terrace downhill at the north end of the property, and **Mr. Hautzinger** replied that this relates to managing storm water and the new detention area.

The public comment portion of the meeting was closed. The commissioners commented on the recommendations made in the Staff report.

Commissioner Kubow wanted to make a statement, in order to avoid this from happening in the future; that the Design Commission should clarify what they are here to do, instead of having an hour long question and answer session about Plan Commission and Engineering issues. What the petitioner provided tonight is exactly what is expected for a Design Commission review. He wanted to make it very clear so that neighbors do not waste their time, that this is strictly an architectural review tonight and not a PUD related review, which will be done by the Plan Commission. **Acting Chair Bombick** felt that the residents want to be heard and need to be directed to the appropriate department. It is important that the Design Commission listen to their concerns and make sure the residents understand that there is another official hearing where these issues will be dealt with.

Commissioner Kubow really liked what was being proposed by the petitioner. He felt the focus tonight should be on the recommendations and requirements from Staff, instead of going through each home individually. He felt Staff did a great job with their recommendations and requirements, which he agreed

with, and he appreciated that the petitioner already took into account some of the requirements and recommendations, which he agreed with as well. His only comment was about requirement #8 in the Staff report regarding respacing of porch columns which he felt were fine as proposed. Otherwise, he was in support of approving the project as proposed, with the recommendations made by Staff.

Commissioner Fasolo felt that Memphis, Elevation H had too many shutters and not enough wall space and appeared cluttered. He agreed with all of the recommendations and requirements in the Staff report; however, he disagreed with the requirement to continue the shutters on the side and rear elevations (#6). He especially agreed with the concern about the flat empty wall space above the garage, and he suggested lowering the roofline above the garage and increasing the height of the garage doors. He liked the color palettes being proposed, with the exception of the 'Prairie Wheat' siding color. **Commissioner Kubow** felt the 'Prairie Wheat' siding color was a bit much; however, he really liked the "Evergreen" siding color.

Commissioner Fitzgerald said that the existing wetlands to the west of the site is an unbelievably beautiful area, and although he could not tell from the plans being shown tonight, he hoped that Village Staff (Planning & Engineering) did not allow this area to be ruined because it really is fantastic and a hidden gem. He agreed with much of what Staff has recommended and required, and he specifically agreed with #7, to add either a covered portico above the rear patio door or a fireplace to help break up the large flat rear elevation walls. He felt the side elevations looked weak, and all the expense was being put on the front elevations. He was okay with the "Prairie Wheat" siding color as well as the "Evergreen" siding color; however, he was not in favor of the "Evergreen" siding color being used in combination with the "Hartford Green" metal roof.

Commissioner Fitzgerald reviewed the list of trees being removed, and although he understood the neighbors' concerns, he pointed out the existing trees were realistically scrub trees. However, he wanted to see more than just one tree added in the front and rear yards of each new home, and he was very concerned about taking a wooded area down to nothing. He felt that the petitioner should be required to beef up the site with big trees. He was also concerned about the perimeter landscaping; the proposed 2-1/2" caliper trees and the 6" evergreens were fairly small going in, and he felt really sad for the residents who live on the east side of Williams Way who face the site and will be staring at the back of the new homes. He reiterated that the back of the new homes were very unattractive and did not fit the neighborhood at all; therefore, something needed to change with the rear elevations or with the landscaping, otherwise the homes would look like low-end homes when driving down Williams Way. He was uncomfortable with the way the rear elevations were currently proposed and he wanted Staff to be aware of these concerns when reviewing each home individually for administrative approval.

Acting Chair Bombick agreed with Commissioner Fitzgerald's concerns about the rear elevations, which would be wide open to Williams Way, and he felt the expense of adding more details to the rear elevations would be minimal and not ruin the pricing structure being considered by the petitioner. He felt that in general, how the new homes were planned was well done and addressed all of the things he complained about earlier in the meeting. Although he did not know what was on the tree survey in the area located directly east of the existing nature preserve and detention area, he felt it was worth a close look to try to preserve something, especially at the edge of the property, 5 to 7-feet at the back of the rear yards, which would greatly improve how the new subdivision fit in its context.

Acting Chair Bombick felt the plans and elevations looked fine with proposed siding; however, when the siding changed to brick, it appeared pasted on, and he felt that more thought needed to go into how the

returns complete themselves. He felt the side elevations were pretty plain, although the trim pieces would help; however, adding details on the rear elevations that are not flat would be a much better solution. He was also not in favor of shutters on all four elevations. He liked the bold colors being proposed for the new homes, and felt that homeowners should have a choice in whatever color they liked. He also referenced the Astoria Place subdivision on Hintz Road, that had rear elevations facing Arlington Heights Road that were nice, simple and had relief.

Mr. Hautzinger explained that Staff shares the same landscape concerns expressed by the commissioners tonight, and those concerns will be made part of Staff's recommendations for the Plan Commission review, specifically, to add 30 to 40 more replacement trees to the site, and increase the caliper of the new trees. He suggested the motion include a similar recommendation, which would then go forward to the Plan Commission and reinforce the concerns expressed by Staff. He also explained that the revised packet submitted tonight was provided only to illustrate the slight height adjustment that was required on the roof pitch of some of the new homes in order to comply with code, and that the motion should focus on what was originally submitted by the petitioner.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FASOLO, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED GENERAL ARCHITECTURAL DESIGNS AND MATERIAL PACKAGES FOR THE NEW SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES FOR CHRISTINA COURT TO BE LOCATED AT 1306 & 1310 E. OLIVE STREET. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS DATED 3/6/15 AND RECEIVED 3/9/15, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND RESOLUTION OF THE FOLLOWING:

1. **A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PETITIONER SEEK FINAL DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL FOR EACH INDIVIDUAL HOME THROUGH THE ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL PROCESS.**
2. **A REQUIREMENT TO COMPLY WITH MONOTONY RESTRICTIONS, PER CHAPTER 28, SECTION 28-6.4.**
3. **A RECOMMENDATION TO PROVIDE CURVING LANDSCAPE BEDS ALONG THE FRONT ELEVATION OF EACH HOME AND ADJACENT TO THE HARDSCAPE AREAS, WITH AN ABUNDANT MIX OF TREES, SHRUBS, AND PERENNIALS.**
4. **A REQUIREMENT THAT BRICK AND STONE SHOWN ON THE FRONT ELEVATIONS BE RETURNED DOWN THE SIDE ELEVATIONS 2', AND SOFTENED WITH LANDSCAPING.**
5. **A REQUIREMENT THAT WINDOWS BE ADDED TO THE SIDE GARAGE WALLS, TYPICAL FOR ALL PLANS. AT LEAST ONE WINDOW IS ADDED FOR STANDARD GARAGES, AND AT LEAST 2 SEPARATE WINDOWS BE ADDED FOR TANDEM GARAGES.**
6. **A REQUIREMENT THAT WINDOW TRIM AND GRILLES PROVIDED ON THE FRONT ELEVATION ALSO BE PROVIDED ON THE SIDE AND REAR ELEVATIONS TO MATCH, AND A FINAL DECISION ABOUT SHUTTERS ON ALL SIDE AND REAR ELEVATIONS BE MADE BY STAFF.**
7. **A REQUIREMENT TO ADD ONE ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENT ON THE BACK OF EACH HOME TO BREAK UP THE FLAT WALL, WHETHER IT IS A PLAN OPTION, FIREPLACE, PORTICO OR BAY WINDOW, TO BE APPROVED BY STAFF.**
8. **MOTION F & G: A REQUIREMENT TO ADJUST THE PORCH COLUMN SPACING SO THAT THE WINDOWS ARE CENTERED BETWEEN THE COLUMNS.**
9. **MEMPHIS H: A RECOMMENDATION TO EXPLORE OPTIONS TO BREAK UP THE FLAT EMPTY WALL ABOVE THE GARAGE DOORS.**

10. BOULDER MODEL: A REQUIREMENT TO OMIT THE OPTION GARAGE DOOR FACING THE SIDE YARD.
11. AN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT THAT THE ROOF PITCHES ON SOME OF THE HOMES WILL BE ADJUSTED TO COMPLY WITH THE HEIGHT REQUIREMENT OF CODE.
12. A STRONG RECOMMENDATION THAT MORE TREES BE ADDED ON EACH PROPERTY.
13. A STRONG RECOMMENDATION FOR LARGER AND MORE PLANT MATERIAL ON THE EAST SIDE OF THE DEVELOPMENT, AS WELL AS ON THE WEST SIDE, ALSO WITH A CONSIDERATION TO LEAVE A 5' BUFFER OF WHAT IS THERE NOW.
14. A RECOMMENDATION TO NOT PAIR THE EVERGREEN SIDING COLOR WITH THE HARTFORD GREEN METAL ROOF IN MATERIAL PACKAGE #NR07.
15. THIS REVIEW REPRESENTS DESIGN APPROVAL ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, ANY OTHER ZONING AND/OR LAND USE ISSUES OR DECISIONS THAT STEM FROM ZONING, SIGN CODE OR BUILDING OR ANY OTHER REVIEWS.
16. IT IS THE PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO SUBMIT THE APPROPRIATE PERMIT APPLICATION(S) TO THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL PRIOR TO PROCEEDING WITH ANY WORK. IN ADDITION TO THE NORMAL TECHNICAL REVIEW, PERMIT DRAWINGS WILL BE REVIEWED FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE DESIGN COMMISSION AND ANY OTHER COMMISSION OR BOARD APPROVAL CONDITIONS. IT IS THE PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO INCORPORATE ALL REQUIREMENTS LISTED ON THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS INTO THE PERMIT DRAWINGS, AND TO ENSURE THAT BUILDING PERMIT PLANS AND SIGN PERMIT PLANS COMPLY WITH ALL ZONING CODE, BUILDING CODE AND SIGN CODE REQUIREMENTS.

Commissioner Fasolo asked if adding something on the rear elevations was a requirement, and **Commissioner Fitzgerald** replied that it was. With regards to #3 in the motion, **Mr. Hautzinger** explained that the petitioner indicated that it is their intent to provide a landscape package, which was not submitted tonight. The petitioner explained that each model of home would have a landscape package, which was not yet designed.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FASOLO, TO AMEND THE MOTION AS FOLLOWS:

8. A REQUIREMENT THAT STAFF REVIEW THE PROPOSED LANDSCAPE PACKAGE FOR EACH MODEL OF HOME.

FASOLO, AYE; KUBOW, AYE; FITZGERALD, AYE; BOMBICK, AYE; ECKHARDT, RECUSE.
THE MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 7. GENERAL MEETING

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:00 P.M. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.



Item: DC#15-016 - Central Park East Apartments - 1551 E. Central Rd. - Sign Variation

Department: Planning & Community Development

On March 10, 2015, the Design Commission reviewed a sign variation request for Central Park East Apartments to allow an additional ground sign to be placed in the middle of the property facing Central Road. At that time, the Design Commission decided to defer action and continue the request to April 14, 2015 to allow time for the petitioner to revise the proposed sign design based on feedback from the Design Commission.

At this time, the petitioner is requesting to continue the review of their request to the April 28, 2015 Design Commission meeting.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type
--------------------	-------------

No Attachments Available