

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION

**HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
APRIL 2, 2024**

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

Members Present: John Kubow, Chair
John Fitzgerald
Ted Eckhardt

Members Absent: Scott Seyer
Kirsten Kingsley

Also Present: Francesco Valenzano, Owner of *1114 N. Race Ave.*
Thomas Roszak, Thomas Roszak Architecture for *Arlington Gateway Development*
Steve Hautzinger, Planning Staff

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FOR MARCH 12, 2024

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO
APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 12, 2024. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.**

ITEM 1. SINGLE-FAMILY ADDITION REVIEW**DC#24-019 – 1114 N. Race Ave.**

Francesco Valenzano, the owner, was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing a complete renovation and addition to an existing single-story house with no garage, to create a new expanded single-story house with an attached two-car garage. The project requires review by the Zoning Board of Appeals, which is scheduled for April 8, for the following zoning variations:

- Side Yard Setbacks. 4.8' and 5.5' proposed, where 8.1' is required
- Driveway Width. 26.4' wide driveway proposed, where 22' is the maximum allowed
- Building Lot Coverage. 3,415 sf proposed, where 3,165 sf is the maximum allowed

The subject property is located in a neighborhood where there have been numerous completed teardowns that are primarily new two-story homes with attached garages. Despite being a single-story residence, the scale of the proposed house looks massive and out of place with the surrounding newer homes. To improve the scale relationship to the adjacent homes, it is recommended that the eave height be lowered about one foot. Another concern with the proposed design is the awkward twin tower features on the front elevation which looks out of balance. It is recommended to change the bedroom window tower feature to a more typical bay window, and add two dormers to the roof for a more balanced appearance. A drawing illustrating this recommended change to the front elevation is shown in the Staff report.

Staff recommends the Design Commission evaluate the design of the proposed addition with a recommendation to lower the eave line about one foot to improve the scale relationship to the adjacent homes, and a recommendation to change the bedroom tower to a more typical bay window, and add dormers above for a more balanced appearance.

Mr. Valenzano thanked everyone for their time and Staff for their suggestions. He said that lowering the eave as suggested by Staff would essentially be in line with the adjacent properties; however, the home would then be majority roof. Since the home is one-story, there is not a lot of dimension for the second-story, so they want to raise the eave to show the character of the home rather than just some roofing, as well as allow for higher ceilings in the home. They also want to add some characteristics of the stone, similar to other homes.

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

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** was okay with the height of the home as proposed, which proportionately looks fine, and he was okay with lowering the height one foot; it is a good looking home. He was split on whether the second tower bay should be there or not; he liked the sketch from Staff, but he did not dislike what is being proposed, and he liked the petitioner's explanation of how they want to soften the roof. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** appreciated that all four sides of the home look nice, which the commissioners do not always see, and he really liked the colors being proposed for the home, particularly the choice of bronze instead of the typical black. The bronze color with the stone and the stucco are a nice combination, compared to the sharpness of going with black, and the stucco with the stone looks very nice. He had no further comments.

Commissioner Eckhardt asked the petitioner to explain the design intent for the two tower features on the front elevation and the two doors being proposed; he was curious to know the story behind that. **Mr. Valenzano** said they want to be able to incorporate the stone from the 4-foot border all the way through the roof, and it has been difficult to work with the existing front entrance with respect to the garage, because the front entrance cannot be right on center without having awkward space on both sides. Therefore, they decided to carry the theme with the smaller, shorter tower, which allows the home to flow from left to right, and the main center portion of the home will be emphasized with landscaping and the sidewalk. The second tower feature will be behind landscaping so it is not as much of a centerpiece as shown in the drawing. They don't want it to be just the front entry and then the eave, and having a bay

window instead of the small tower gave the impression that the house is more smooshed than they want, whereas having both of the towers gives the impression of height, while keeping the eave a reasonable height. **Commissioner Eckhardt** understood that explanation, and he asked about the space on the second-floor, and **Mr. Valenzano** said that the second-floor is all attic space. **Commissioner Eckhardt** had no further questions.

Chair Kubow was in agreement with the other commissioners and appreciated Staff's report and recommendations. He said the petitioner is taking an existing home and creating a pretty bold addition, which he really appreciates, and trying to visualize the elevation in three dimension helps to break it down, especially if the color palette was rendered. He was in support of what is being proposed, it looks fantastic.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY HOME LOCATED AT 1114 N. RACE AVENUE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 2/26/24, 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. A RECOMMENDATION TO REVIEW AND STUDY LOWERING THE EAVE LINE APPROXIMATELY 12-INCHES.**
- 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; KUBOW, AYE.
ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.**

ITEM 2. SIGN VARIATION REVIEW**DC#24-005 – Arlington Gateway Development – 2355 S. Arlington Heights Rd & 1, 15, 111 E. Algonquin Rd.**

Thomas Roszak, representing *Thomas Roszak Architecture*, was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. The petitioner is requesting a sign variation to allow temporary signage (beyond code-compliant sizes and amount) to be mounted on the construction fence around the new Arlington Gateway Development construction site located at the intersection of Arlington Heights Road and Algonquin Road. The construction fence will include a total of approximately 141 chain link fence panels covered in blue netting. The fence will be supported by concrete jersey barriers located at every other fence panel. The proposed signage will be printed on reinforced vinyl and attached to the blue netting. The signage will be primarily located at the three main corners of the site, and will cover 31 of the 141 fence panels. Table 2 in the Staff report includes a complete summary of the proposed temporary signage. The following sign variation is being requested:

1. A variation from Chapter 30, Section 30-601a, to allow a total of **1,864 square feet** of temporary signage where 64 square feet is the maximum total allowed, and to allow individual temporary signs up to 72 square feet where 32 square feet is the maximum allowed size for an individual temporary sign.

Commissioner Eckhardt asked for clarification that the total square footage being requested is the combined total of only the panels that have text or artwork on them. **Mr. Hautzinger** confirmed this and said the total of those sign panels is the 1,864 square feet being proposed; however, code only allows a total of 64 square feet, with an individual sign not to exceed 32 square feet. **Chair Kubow** said the sign code should be looked at with regards to the total square footage allowed for temporary signage being proportionate to the size of the lot. **Commissioner Eckhardt** asked how many of the graphic images shown will repeat on each elevation, and **Mr. Hautzinger** referred to the site plan submitted by the petitioner which has colored note tags denoting where each sign will be located, with a grouping of the sign panels located at the three main corners of the site. Image C (Clark Construction) is proposed incrementally on the stretches of the fence around each side of the site. The petitioner also provided a photo from one of their past projects that shows the concrete barrier with the chain link fence and the blue netting, a fabric sample of the sign panel, and perspective renderings showing the proposed construction fence and signage with the existing buildings, post demo, the new building with the fence, and then the completed new building with the fence removed.

Mr. Hautzinger further stated that the petitioner submitted a letter addressing the criteria for granting a sign variation, stating that the proposed signage is needed to advertise the development in an attractive and effective way. The petitioner also states that community outreach and communication is vital to the success of the development, as is creating a sense of anticipation, and the proposed construction fence signage is part of an overall comprehensive marketing program. The petitioner feels the signage helps to break up the monotony of the construction fence, while providing the public with information on the development under construction. The petitioner feels that the code allowance for temporary signage is inadequate considering the adjacent high traffic roads and the size and number of parcels that make up the site.

Mr. Hautzinger said that Staff acknowledges that the construction fence is required for safety, and that construction fences are typically not very attractive. Staff agrees that the proposed signage is professionally and tasteful designed, and it does improve the appearance of the construction fencing. Staff agrees that the signage serves a valid purpose to market the new development and show what is planned for the site. 1,864 sf of signage sounds like an excessive amount of signage, but considering the overall size of the construction fence, the proposed signage only covers about 22% of the panels. Staff also acknowledges that the signage needs to be large and clear for visibility across many lanes of traffic. Staff acknowledges that the Prairie Grass signs are artistic in nature, but they are technically signs, and therefore contribute to the total signage square footage.

Staff's only concern is that (14) "Clark Construction" signs seems excessive, and Staff feels that a maximum of (6) "Clark Construction" signs should be adequate, which would reduce the total amount of signage from 1,864 sf to 1,288 sf.

Based on the size of the site, the size of the adjacent roadways, and given that the construction fence and signage are temporary, Staff does not object to the modified variation for 1,288 sf of signage. Staff recommends approval of the requested sign variation subject to a time limit being established for the removal of the signage. The petitioner anticipates completing construction in February 2026, so it is recommended that the requested temporary signage be removed in two years from the date of approval, or upon completion of construction, whichever is sooner.

Mr. Roszak said that based on the almost 4-acre site, they feel it is a little difficult to be able to communicate everything they want, so they concentrated the key communication signs on the three main areas shown. He said the 'C' signs for Clark Construction are not so much for the public, but for deliveries and trucks visiting the site. Per code, they are allowed a total of 64 sf of temporary signage, which they would do by installing four, 16 sf temporary signs very soon, without approval. He reiterated that these signs are just providing basic information about the site, with a lot of calls already coming in about what is happening here, and they plan to have a website that contains basic information about the project where people can sign up for a VIP list and for affordable housing. It is a way to capture the names of those interested, and also provide some information about the site. **Mr. Roszak** said that demolition has already begun on the site, and the construction fence, the barriers, and the blue panels are already up. He welcomed any questions from the commissioners.

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

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Eckhardt** supported Staff's recommendation to reduce the amount of 'C' (Clark Construction) signs for the construction company from 14 to 6. He preferred to see more signs about the development, such as QR codes, in lieu of some of the 'C' signs. He suggested adding a couple more locations for actual project development information, which to him is more meaningful than an advertisement for a construction company.

Commissioner Fitzgerald said that given the size of the project, bigger signs at all the corners of the site is really nice, and he agreed with Staff's recommendation to reduce the amount of 'C' signs; however, he was not in favor of switching those signs out to something else.

Chair Kubow said these signs are temporary, so he was fine with what is being proposed.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO RECOMMEND TO THE VILLAGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING SIGN VARIATION FOR THE ARLINGTON GATEWAY DEVELOPMENT, LOCATED AT 2355 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD, 1, 15 & 111 E. ALGONQUIN ROAD:

1. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-601a, TO ALLOW A TOTAL OF 1,288 SQUARE FEET OF TEMPORARY SIGNAGE WHERE 64 SQUARE FEET IS THE MAXIMUM TOTAL ALLOWED, AND TO ALLOW INDIVIDUAL TEMPORARY SIGNS UP TO 72 SQUARE FEET WHERE 32 SQUARE FEET IS THE MAXIMUM ALLOWED SIZE FOR AN INDIVIDUAL TEMPORARY SIGN.

THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE PLANS DATED 3/14/24 AND RECEIVED ON 3/19/24, FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES, AND THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. THIS REVIEW DEALS WITH ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN 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, 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 ARCHITECT/HOMEOWNER/BUILDER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO COMPLY WITH THE DESIGN COMMISSION APPROVAL AND ENSURE THAT BUILDING PERMIT PLANS COMPLY WITH ALL ZONING CODE, BUILDING PERMIT AND SIGNAGE REQUIREMENTS.

Mr. Hautzinger clarified that in addition to the reduction in the total square footage, Staff is recommending that the temporary signs be removed from the fence in two years from the date of approval, or upon completion of construction, whichever is sooner. He added that this is based on the petitioner's anticipated construction schedule for completion in February of 2026. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** did not agree with the suggestion to remove the temporary signage in two years from the date of approval if that is sooner than completion of construction. This was not part of the motion he made, and he wanted to allow the temporary signs to remain until the project is built. **Mr. Hautzinger** asked if the commission wanted to include any timeframe for removal of the temporary signs, and **Commissioner Fitzgerald** reiterated his support for the temporary signs to remain until completion of construction, and the other commissioners agreed.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD TO AMEND THE MOTION TO ADD THE FOLLOWING CONDITION:

2. THAT THE TEMPORARY SIGNAGE SHALL BE REMOVED UPON COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT SECONDED THE AMENDED MOTION.

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

Mr. Hautzinger reminded the petitioner that sign variations require Village Board approval, and the approval tonight is a recommendation to the Village Board.

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 7:06 P.M. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.**