

# APPROVED

## MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.  
JULY 9, 2024

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

Members Present: Jonathan Kubow, Chair  
John Fitzgerald  
Scott Seyer  
Ted Eckhardt

Members Absent: Kirsten Kingsley

Also Present: John Anstadt, JMB Architects for *101 S. Fernandez Ave.*  
Sean Thompson, Owner of *101 S. Fernandez Ave.*  
Lisa Vandermark, Executive Director for *The Moorings*  
Drew Roskos, Perkins/Eastman for *The Moorings*  
Scott Freres, Lakota Group for *The Moorings*  
Steve Hautzinger, Planning Staff

### REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FOR JUNE 25, 2024

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 25, 2024. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

**ITEM 1. SINGLE-FAMILY TEARDOWN REVIEW****DC#24-038 – 101 S. Fernandez Ave.**

**John Anstadt**, representing *JMB Architects*, and **Sean Thompson**, the homeowner, were present on behalf of the project.

**Mr. Hautzinger** summarized Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to demolish an existing single-story house with attached two-car garage to build a new two-story residence with an attached two-car garage. The proposed design complies with the R-2 zoning requirements. The proposed new house is very nicely designed in a traditional style with quality materials and a tasteful neutral color palette that will fit very well in this location. However, the Design Commission should evaluate the proposed two-story massing in this location which is surrounded predominantly by single-story homes. Also, this property has an existing pool house which is proposed to remain. The pool house has visible frontage along Sigwalt Street on the north. The pool house is built with red brick, which matches the existing house being demolished, but it does not match the new house which is primarily tan. The Design Commission should evaluate the mismatched color scheme between the existing pool house and the proposed new house. With these items, Staff recommends approval.

**Sean Thompson** said he has been a resident for over 55 years, raised his family here, and is now looking to make a significant investment in the neighborhood to continue the tradition. They talked to many of their neighbors and everyone is generally supportive of the project, and they are committed to making the project a good project. He previously went before the ZBA for the pool house, which at that time was to make the pool house look like it fit with the house; that is their commitment here. They will make sure that the pool house and the color scheme matches the new home and fits in the neighborhood.

**Mr. Anstadt** said they spent quite a lot of time on the site, trying to incorporate the new plan to the existing and how it fits within the context of the neighborhood. They specifically designed the one-story element facing Fernandez to provide less impact on what they consider the busier of the two streets. They feel the one-story element also complements the one-story cabana next to it. They purposely designed a 2-car garage versus 3-car, and the existing driveway will remain. With regards to colors, their biggest challenge is that they are not in favor of the existing brick on the cabana, which matches the existing home that is now being torn down. They are hoping to build the new house with a different color palette. The proposed color palette is stone and shingle siding in a very traditional sense, and their goal is to match the existing stone on the cabana to the new home. He presented a sample of what they feel is the closest to that stone, whether it is this blend or a mixture of blends; their goal is to match the existing stone on the cabana. The roofing, window color, fascia, trim, will all match the cabana, where it differs is with the brick. They are proposing to dye the brick on the cabana in a permanent color to match and blend in with the siding on the proposed new home so it all blends. He brought additional photos of the existing cabana to see how much foliage exists and how it is hidden.

**Commissioner Eckhardt** asked if the cabana is a monolithic stucco or face brick, and **Mr. Anstadt** said it is face brick, and **Mr. Thompson** added that it is almost the exact same brick that is on the existing home, and it has texture.

**Chair Kubow** asked if there was any public comment on the project and there was no response from those in the audience.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Seyer** said the new home looks great; it feels more contextual now, and he is in favor of it. If the goal is to match the existing materials of the pool house and do something to blend in and make it look like the new house, he is in support of that. **Commissioner Eckhardt** agreed with Commissioner Seyer's comments and had nothing more to add. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** agreed as well, and said the new home looks better than the existing one-story home because it looks like it could have been here a long time and was added onto over the years. He said this is a great project. **Chair Kubow** also agreed and said this is a unique property that the owner is just doing more with a long-term investment; he fully supports the project.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE PROPOSED NEW (TEARDOWN) SINGLE-FAMILY HOME TO BE LOCATED AT 101 S. FERNANDEZ AVENUE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON THE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 5/8/24, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATION AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING:

1. THE PETITIONER TESTIFIED THAT THEY INTEND TO MATCH THE TEXTURE AND COLORS ON THE EXISTING POOL HOUSE AS CLOSE AS POSSIBLE TO THE COLORS OF THE NEW HOUSE.
2. THIS REVIEW DEALS WITH ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, NOR REPRESENT ANY TACIT APPROVAL OR SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED LAND USE OR ANY OTHER ZONING AND/OR LAND USE ISSUES OR DECISIONS THAT STEM FROM ZONING, BUILDING, SIGNAGE OR ANY OTHER REVIEWS. 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; ECKHARDT, AYE; SEYER, AYE; KUBOW, AYE.  
ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

## ITEM 2. INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW

### DC#24-041 – The Moorings/Independent Living Expansion – 811 E. Central Rd.

**Lisa Vandermark**, Executive Director for *The Moorings*, **Drew Roskos**, representing *Perkins/Eastman*, and **Scott Freres**, representing *Lakota Group*, were present on behalf of the project.

**Mr. Hautzinger** summarized Staff comments. This project requires Plan Commission review and Village Board approval for amendment of an existing Planned Unit Development (PUD). Because this project is going to the Plan Commission, the role of the Design Commission is limited to building and signage only. The Moorings is an existing 41-acre senior living community that was originally approved as a Planned Unit Development in 1985. At this time, the Moorings is proposing to build a new 5-story independent living building within the existing campus, with a total of 70 dwelling units on floors one through five, and 73 parking spaces below grade in the basement level.

This project received a preliminary Design Commission review on May 14, 2024. During the preliminary review, the petitioner presented three exterior design options. All of the options were received favorably by the Design Commission with mixed feedback regarding preferences and detailing. The petitioner has provided a detailed written response to the feedback received at the preliminary review, noting that they have incorporated many of the Design Commission's suggestions by modifying Option 1 with elements from Option 2.

As noted above, the current design being presented tonight is a revised version of Option 1, incorporating some of the elements from Option 2. The result is a highly detailed and thoughtful modern design which will bring a fresh look to the Mooring's campus, while still complementing the existing buildings with similar massing, materials, and colors.

Overall, Staff feels the proposed design is very nicely done, with only a couple of comments that the Design Commission should evaluate:

- The red brick portion of the building at the north corner has a somewhat massive and heavy appearance as compared to the rest of the design. Consider breaking up the amount of brick with more accent material, possibly grouping some of the windows horizontally, vertically, or both.
- The design of the west wall is a large, flat, and blank wall of the metal panel or fiber cement accent material. This large blank wall looks out of place with the rest of the highly detailed design. The west wall will be visible from other buildings on the campus, and it is recommended that the design of the west wall be revised to include a mix of materials and colors to break up the blank wall to add interest to the appearance.

All mechanical equipment and utility meters are required to be screened from view. The proposed design includes numerous rooftop mechanical units. The plans include a continuous louver screen to fully enclose all of the mechanical equipment. The proposed screen looks quite tall, but it is setback from the perimeter, so the appearance should be diminished.

The petitioner is proposing numerous new ground signs as follows:

- a new main entrance sign facing Central Road.
- an internal "identity signage element" located at the fork in the main entry drive.
- approximately three internal Wayfinding signs.

Per code, one 80 sf ground sign is allowed to face Central Road, and all internal directional ground signs are limited to 6 sf maximum size and three feet maximum height. At this time, the signage plans are being considered conceptual due to a lack of detailed information, but there appears to be a number of code issues with the proposed signage in regards to size and quantity. The Design Commission can provide general feedback on the aesthetics of the conceptual signage, but Staff will need to work with the petitioner on revisions to comply with code. The Moorings currently has three ground signs at the main entrance facing Central Road. The petitioner needs to clarify if the existing signs are intended to remain or be removed.

**Commissioner Eckhardt** asked if Staff did an analysis of code compliant signage versus a potential sign variation, and **Mr. Hautzinger** reiterated that code allows one 80 sf ground sign facing Central Road and all internal signage is limited to only 6 sf in size and 3-feet in height. **Chair Kubow** asked about the location of the wayfinding signs being shown, which **Mr. Hautzinger** indicated and added that the petitioner can elaborate on those locations.

**Mr. Hautzinger** said that overall, Staff recommends approval of the proposed design of the new Independent Living expansion with the following:

1. Consider breaking up the red brick portion of the design at the north corner of the building with more accent material, possibly grouping some of the windows horizontally, vertically, or both.
2. A recommendation to revise the design of the west wall to include a mix of materials and colors to break up the blank wall and add interest to the appearance.

**Ms. Vandermark** said she has been Executive Director at The Moorings since May 2016, and she introduced the team here tonight on behalf of the project.

**Mr. Roskos** said the revisions that were made after the preliminary review in May were based on feedback from the commissioners as well as their own internal feedback. They brought together all the elements of Option 2 into Option 1, making Option 1 their preferred option. The materials were balanced, both in terms of their usage and proportions, and different size windows were introduced to suggest a more residential quality. He presented three different versions of how to address the blank west wall, looking at how the materials might wrap around. He explained that the west wall is a service wall consisting of an elevator, a fire stair, a trash chute, and there are no apartments that abut this wall. He said they agreed with Staff that the west wall needs some attention, and he reviewed each of the 3 options presented, reiterating their preference for Option 1.

**Chair Kubow** asked about the vehicular circulation in the area of the west wall and **Mr. Roskos** replied that it is primarily back-of-house service, with parking on the left and storage and maintenance on the right. He also indicated where pedestrian traffic will occur with people entering and exiting the building.

**Mr. Roskos** referred to the northeast corner of the building with regards to the change of materials. He explained that they feel this area has a good design and they like that the front feels like an anchor and that there is a mix of materials that come off of that; however, they are open to doing more there if necessary. The west end of the building is where the main loading dock is located and it faces the healthcare building, so even if units were put there, they could not market them, which is why that area became a service area of the building.

**Commissioner Eckhardt** asked about the accuracy of colors being shown in the image of the existing single-story service areas, and **Mr. Roskos** clarified that the one-story area is a white brick material.

**Mr. Freres** commented on signage stating that it is currently difficult to locate the Moorings site based on the existing signage which runs parallel to the road, which is why they chose to address the signage at the main entrance at this time. Since they are making a change to the building, they feel now is the time to re-invent their signage, re-think the lettering, and re-work how they are going to package their brand. The site is currently very cluttered in terms of signage, and the existing signs are not really needed. One new perpendicular sign with 2 sign faces will be more effective and easier to read when traveling in either direction. They recognize that the scale, the height, and the materials chosen for signage needs to reflect the architectural character and style of the new building, and they put together three different signs as part of tonight's review, although they will probably re-think all signage on the campus at some point to have more of a holistic wayfinding signage program. The three signs being shown tonight include one monument sign at the main entrance measuring 18-feet in length with a 2-sided sign face of about 30 sf on each side. The other two signs being presented are to provide clear identifiers for people to maneuver throughout the site. They anticipate lighting the sign at the main entrance and the sign at the main intersection, as well as possibly lighting the wayfinding signs.

**Chair Kubow** asked if there was any public comment on the project and there was no response from those in the

audience.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** liked the project a lot, he found all sides of the building interesting, he liked the colors and how all the materials work together. He felt the area at the north end was fine as shown, but something more needed to be done on the west wall to encourage people to walk the property. He liked Option 1, with Option 2 being his second choice. With regards to signage, he supported the direction and style of the signs being presented tonight; he agreed that the existing signage needs to be updated, and he liked that the signs are being located where people will notice them.

With regards to the blank end of the building, **Commissioner Eckhardt** commented that the white brick accent pieces are small, light, and framing in nature on the other rendered elevations; he did not see big, solid portions of the lighter color; however, Option 1 has a big, heavy white element on the corner of the building. Although he felt that Option 1 is the best design of the 3 options presented, in terms of breaking down a big wall and the geometry and the massing of the end of the building, he questioned the design motif of Option 1 with the bracketing details at the corner. **Commissioner Eckhardt** asked if the coloration of the light-colored brick is similar to the color of the barn, and **Mr. Roskos** replied that the barn is bright white and the brick color will be a white that is not as bright. **Commissioner Eckhardt** concluded that this is a great project, and he agreed with Commissioner Fitzgerald's comments.

**Commissioner Seyer** was in favor of the project, it looks great. With respect to the west end of the building that is clearly a concern, he felt that Option 1 is by far the best design because it breaks down the heavy massing of it all. However, he had concerns about the windows in the stairwell at the end of the building, with regards to the lighting in the stairwell that might have different emergency lighting (cool temperate light) that will be on all the time, which could be problematic from the outside. **Commissioner Seyer** also liked the materials wrapped on the corner. He reiterated that he liked Option 1, but was unsure about the windows in the stairwell; even though he wants windows there, what will the end result be with the lighting? That is his only concern about the project. The rest of the project is really nice, the massing and the materiality is very well proportioned. He agreed that the proposed new signage will look vastly improved and he would be in favor of it, assuming the 3 existing signs that are set back from the road will be removed, which the petitioner confirmed. **Commissioner Seyer** asked the other commissioners for their opinion about the windows in the stairwell with regards to lighting, as well as the petitioner.

**Chair Kubow** said it is a wonderfully designed project, he loved the contemporary architecture being proposed and he supports Option 1 for the west wall. He was in favor of the northwest corner of the building and would not change anything, it is very modern and he loved the punched openings and the very small cornice that gives a sense of pop and differentiation from the other sides of the building. He was not opposed to removing the windows in the stairwell at the west end of the building, and he agreed that the current signage needs a refresh. **Chair Kubow** asked if the existing tree at the front entry will be removed, and **Mr. Freres** replied that some landscape improvements are proposed for the site to open up the visibility at the entrance; however, their intent is to not remove any big trees if possible. **Chair Kubow** was in favor of everything presented, with Option 1 being his preferred option, and he appreciated the summary that the petitioner provided regarding previous comments from the commissioners.

The commissioners responded to Commissioner Seyer's concerns about lighting from the stairwell windows at the end of the building. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** agreed with the concerns about the lighting from these windows; it should not stand out in a bad way. **Commissioner Eckhardt** agreed as well and suggested adding something to the windows to make them look like the residential windows, in color and in temperature. Super bright white lighting will be a disappointment. **Mr. Roskos** presented two solutions with regards to the windows on the west facade; changing the color and temperature of the light itself, which will be around 2,700 kelvin, or putting a film on the windows that will allow daylight in but soften the glow out. **Commissioner Seyer** was unsure how that would look, but he reiterated that he does like the windows there. **Chair Kubow** added that it is nice having natural light in the stairwell. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said that a combination of changing the temperature of the lights and adding either blinds or film to the windows is the way to go.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN OF THE NEW INDEPENDENT LIVING EXPANSION AT *THE MOORINGS* LOCATED AT 811 E. CENTRAL ROAD. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE PLANS RECEIVED 6/27/24, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATION AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING:

1. APPROVAL OF OPTION 1, PRESENTED TONIGHT, FOR THE WEST WALL.
2. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PETITIONER STUDY AND RESOLVE THE POTENTIAL DIFFERENTIATION OF LIGHTING COLOR FROM THE WEST WALL STAIRWELL WINDOWS, AS COMPARED TO THE RESIDENTIAL UNITS, SO THAT THE OVERALL EXTERIOR APPEARANCE IS SIMILAR.
3. THAT THE NEW SIGNAGE PRESENTED TONIGHT IS FOR PRELIMINARY REVIEW ONLY, AND AN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT THAT NEW SIGNAGE WILL BE RESUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER IN THE FUTURE.
4. THIS REVIEW DEALS WITH ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, NOR REPRESENT ANY TACIT APPROVAL OR SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED LAND USE OR ANY OTHER ZONING AND/OR LAND USE ISSUES OR DECISIONS THAT STEM FROM ZONING, BUILDING, SIGNAGE OR ANY OTHER REVIEWS. 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 Seyer** said it is hard to mandate the color temperature of lights in a stairwell that he believed are an emergency path that requires a bolder, brighter light. He encouraged the petitioner to make it look nice from the outside with the appropriate color temperature and film. He suggested eliminating the window on the top floor in the metal panel area, and add blinds in the other 3 windows so it is not so bright.

FITZGERALD, AYE; ECKHARDT, AYE; SEYER, AYE; KUBOW, AYE.  
ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

**ITEM 3. OTHER BUSINESS**

**Public Comment**

There was none.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO  
ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:20 P.M. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.**