

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION

HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
FEBRUARY 27, 2024

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

Members Present: John Fitzgerald, Acting Chair
Kirsten Kingsley
Ted Eckhardt

Members Absent: Jonathan Kubow, Chair
Scott Seyer

Also Present: Kevin Purdom, JRC Design Build for *1010 N. Wilshire Ln. & 1138 N. Chestnut Ave.*
Jakob Evans & Thomas Durdella, ADA Architects for *Burlington*
Steve Hautzinger, Planning Staff

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 13, 2024

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 13, 2024. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

Acting Chair Fitzgerald explained that with only 3 of the 5 commissioners here tonight, a unanimous vote is required for a motion to pass. The petitioner has the option to continue the review of their project to a future meeting where more commissioners are in attendance.

ITEM 1. SINGLE-FAMILY ADDITION REVIEW**DC#24-001 – 1010 N. Wilshire Ln.**

Kevin Purdom, representing *JRC Design Build*, and **Jonathan & Brittany Zielke**, the homeowners, were 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 to create a new expanded two-story house. An existing attached two-car garage will be expanded with a third tandem parking space. The project does comply with the R-3 single-family zoning requirements. The surrounding context in this location is primarily single-story houses. Although, there are a few split-level homes on the block, as well as one teardown/new house completed across the street that was approved by the Design Commission in 2013.

Overall, Staff feels the proposed design, materials, and colors do not fit with the existing context of the block. The tall steep pitched roofs are a harsh contrast to the adjacent low sloped roofs. Staff recommends a revised simpler design with low pitched roofs and a more earth tone color palette is encouraged to better fit with the existing context of the block.

Mr. Purdom said he is the architect for the project and the owners currently live in the area and want to stay in the neighborhood. Instead of a full teardown and rebuild, his clients want to use as much of the existing home as possible, and the existing brick and stone will remain, with plans to paint it. The proposed color scheme is white with brown trim; however, the owners are open to changing it to more of a cream or taupe color, something more earth tone that is not vastly different from the surrounding neighborhood. The two peaks on the front of the home are similar to the house directly across the street, and the left side will not extend up the full two-stories so the roofline is not so high. The home is below all the maximum heights required and it meets all other zoning requirements. He welcomed any comments or questions.

Acting Chair Fitzgerald asked if there were any public comments on the project and there was no response from those in the audience.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said that the home is very attractive and well designed. He did not dispute Staff's comments about the roof pitches, and said they are the trend of new homes today. He felt the transformation from the existing home to this home is quite remarkable, and he did not know if he would discourage changing the rooflines. In terms of the material selections, he felt the white is a little bright, and he was interested in hearing more from the petitioner about possibly changing the color. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said the mix of the natural wood, the natural columns, and the white is very attractive, and he was glad to see that the garage door is not black. He had no other comments at this time.

Commissioner Kingsley concurred with the suggestion for a more earth tone color palette, such as the crème/taupe color suggested. Because this is one of the first homes on this side of the block that is going to be a full 2-story home, and all of that side of the block is a muted color, she wanted to see the color change if possible. She said that often times the commissioners see a white and black color scheme, which has such a high contrast; however, a taupe, bronze, or dark brown color will almost look black but will feel warmer. She was more in favor of something like that. **Commissioner Kingsley** also said the roof pitches are a bit steep, especially the one on the left side of the home, and she suggested bringing down the gable by either reducing the pitch or by lowering the eaves to be more friendly with the neighbor. She also commented about the size of the front door and suggested a taller front door, similar to the head height of the windows to the left of it; either have a transom above the door or increase the height of the front door. She also felt something was missing on the back wall of the front entry; it is shown as all brick, but something else needs to happen back there such as the eyebrow being thicker. She commented that the front door is slightly off-center from the columns, and maybe the column on the right can be moved to make it look more centered around the front door. **Commissioner Kingsley** liked the vents in the gable ends, but felt the left one should be larger and higher,

more in keeping with that gable. The eyebrow roof over the sliding doors on the back of the home is unique; however, she suggested projecting it into the yard with an overhang to be sure it provides enough protection from the elements. She agreed with Staff's comments about the proposed colors and suggested the roof color be more of a darker bronze similar to Weathered Wood, the brick and siding color be more cream, and the standing metal seam roof changed to bronze. **Commissioner Kingsley** also suggested the trim be smooth, which will contrast nicely with the shingles.

Acting Chair Fitzgerald liked the white color, but also liked the suggestion of a taupe color and warming it up a bit. To him, the home almost looks like it could have been there a long time and was just updated, and the other homes were then built. He liked that the home is not trying to be super modern, and a warmer tone would make it look better within the neighborhood. He really appreciated that the home looks good on all four sides, and he was okay with the tall peak; however, bringing it down could make everyone happy. He asked about the detailing above the front door and if it was a ledge, and **Mr. Purdom** replied that the line shown is just a shadow and that it will be flush across the top of the door. **Acting Chair Fitzgerald** agreed that either the front door should be taller or a transom added above it, it looks a little undersized as shown and it is a very nice entrance. He liked the idea of the left vent being larger and higher as suggested by Commissioner Kingsley, and he is okay either way with the covering above the back patio door. He also said that smooth trim is a nice idea.

Commissioner Eckhardt asked the petitioner if there is a barrel vault with metal on top above the front door, and **Mr. Purdom** replied that it is.

Acting Chair Fitzgerald asked if the petitioner had a response to the comments made by the commissioners. **Mr. Purdom** said that his clients are willing to change the color to more of a taupe or natural tone, but he will need to discuss with them the overhang above the patio doors. With regards to the front gable, he commented that they did not go as high as they could have and landed at halfway through the windows to not mess with the ratios, and he will talk with the homeowners about the possibility of lowering it. He agreed with the suggestion to add a transom over the front door, increase the size of the vent in the gable, and use smooth trim throughout the home. The biggest issue is lowering the height of the left gable, which he needs to discuss with the homeowners. **Acting Chair Fitzgerald** said he could see it going a little bit lower, but he preferred the two gables not be even; he liked that they are different.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY HOME LOCATED AT 1010 N. WILSHIRE LANE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE REVISED ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 2/2/24, 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 REQUIREMENT THAT THE COLOR SCHEME CHANGE TO CREAM OR TAUPE, UNDERSTANDING THAT THE WINDOWS WILL MOST LIKELY REMAIN WHITE, AND THE BLACK COLOR CHANGED TO A DARK BROWN OR MORE EARTH TONE COLOR, WITH THE FINAL COLORS TO BE SUBMITTED TO STAFF FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL.
2. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE FRONT DOOR BE A TALLER HEIGHT OR A TRANSOM WINDOW ADDED ABOVE IT.
3. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE GABLE ROOF ON THE LEFT SIDE OF THE HOME BE STUDIED TO POSSIBLY LOWER IT, WITH A PREFERENCE THAT THERE BE A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO GABLES WITHOUT LOWERING IT ALL THE WAY, TO BE SUBMITTED TO STAFF FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL.
4. A REQUIREMENT FOR SMOOTH TRIM.
5. A RECOMMENDATION THAT THE BACK PATIO DOORS HAVE A COVERING OVER IT.
6. 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.

Mr. Hautzinger asked for clarification about the color scheme. He said that all siding colors are currently white, so changing to a cream or taupe color will apply to the brick paint, the shake siding, and the board and batten siding, and the standing seam metal roof that is currently black and the asphalt shingle roofing should change to a dark bronze or brown color. **Commissioner Kingsley** concurred.

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

ITEM 2. SINGLE-FAMILY TEARDOWN REVIEW**DC#24-006 – 1138 N. Chestnut Ave.**

Kevin Purdom, representing *JRC Design Build*, was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to demolish an existing single-story residence which has no garage, to build a new two-story residence with an attached two-car garage. The proposed house will have 3,548 square feet, and it does comply with the R-3 zoning requirements. The existing neighborhood has a variety of homes including single-story and two-story homes with a mix of attached and detached garages. The subject property is located on a block which is primarily original single-story homes, although there have been seven previous teardown/new homes completed on this block.

The proposed design is done in a traditional style that will generally fit well in this location. The single-story front porch and garage roof help the scale of the house relate and transition to the adjacent single-story houses. The left (south) side of the roof is partially hipped, but it is recommended to fully hip the roof to bring down the height of the side wall to coordinate with the right (north) elevation. An all-siding exterior is proposed for the new home, but most of the houses on this block have some masonry incorporated in the design, which the proposed design lacks. The color rendering provided shows the house with gray siding, white trim, and white windows. However, the sample board indicates all white siding with black trim, black roofing, black windows, and black gutters and downspouts. The proposed black and white color scheme in this location will stand out in harsh contrast to the existing adjacent homes. A more neutral earth tone color palette, such as tan or taupe siding, with white trim, brown roofing, white windows, white gutters and downspouts, and brick or stone accents is recommended to better fit with the context of the adjacent homes. Staff recommends the Design Commission evaluate the proposed new home, with the comments given by Staff.

Mr. Purdom said the proposed new home is a spec home, and although they originally proposed all white as shown in the material samples, they now prefer the colors shown in the rendering. The material sample board was not updated to show this change. They are open to changing the color to either a cream, taupe or light grey as shown in the rendering, and they are definitely amenable to changing the left (south) side roof to a full hip roof to be respectful to the single-story homes next door. **Mr. Purdom** said they want to keep this home simple with siding throughout, instead of a mix of stone and siding, and changing the siding color will help connect to the rest of the neighborhood. They want to avoid using stone for costs and labor reasons; however, if a client is found early enough in the construction process who wants stone, they are not opposed to adding it with the siding. They built two homes across the street, both without stone, and they feel that those homes still connect with the neighborhood.

Acting Chair Fitzgerald 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 Kingsley** appreciated the rendering presented and asked if it reflected more of the color palette now being considered. **Mr. Purdom** said that it did, with the color palette now being light grey, but they are open to changing it. The roof color will remain black. **Commissioner Kingsley** agreed with Staff's suggestion to fully hip the left (south) side elevation, which she felt will be beneficial to the front of the home. She was confused about the drawings that show the east and north elevations, and **Mr. Purdom** clarified that the drawings are incorrectly labeled. **Commissioner Kingsley** suggested a full hip roof on the west (back) elevation of the home, as well as on the north elevation. **Mr. Purdom** said they were open to those changes. **Commissioner Kingsley** also suggested eliminating the horizontal muntins in the transom windows instead of the "plus sign" design that looks a little busy, adding a plus or some kind of muntin to the front door to be more similar to the windows, making the divisions on the sliding doors on the back elevation be more similar to the windows, and adding a canopy or covering above the back door for protection. She was not compelled to add brick or stone to the home, but she felt that using smooth trim is important. She also said that because of where the space above the front door is located, there is a material change, and she felt it would look most cohesive and celebrate the front door if that

was all one material, with the vertical board and batten continuing all the way up underneath the entry gable. Lastly, **Commissioner Kingsley** wanted to see the entire horizontal line of the first floor, the height of the porch, brought down 10 to 12-inches. It just lowers where the roof starts on the front elevation, gives a little more breathing room under the windows, and then lowers that eave to be more similar to the eaves of the homes on either side. Because that roof does not continue around on the sides, there should be no issue doing that; she wanted the first-floor eave on the front facade to be moved down.

Commissioner Eckhardt substantially agreed with everything said by Commissioner Kingsley; however, he pointed out that there appears to be a drafting error on the drawings with regards to lowering the roof/gutter line on the first-floor where the roof meets the second floor window sills, and **Mr. Purdom** confirmed that there is an error on the drawing. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said that lowering the roof/gutter line over the garage door will work, but there does not appear to be enough space to lower it at the living room. **Commissioner Kingsley** said for her, lowering it is important because there are so many other homes that are exactly the same height along that side of the street, and lowering the height a little would be beneficial. **Commissioner Eckhardt** reiterated the lack of space there because of the flat soffit underneath, and if it was brought down then the soffit will be right on top of the window trim, which to him is odd. To him, the rendering looks fine. **Mr. Purdom** said that there is sufficient room to lower the roof/gutter line which will allow the porch ceiling to be at the top of the window trim.

Acting Chair Fitzgerald appreciated the small exposure of the concrete front stoop and commented that it appears that the entire home is low, and if the roofline was brought down, it will make the top look too heavy. He liked the home as designed because the floor of the first-floor is closer to ground level. He liked the idea of changing the hip roof on the left side, but was unsure about removing the hip roof above the window over the garage. He liked that there is no masonry on the home, which is different than what is typically seen on a lot of homes, and he really liked that the home will not be white; his preference is for cream, taupe, or grey. He appreciated that all four sides of the home are interesting, and he agreed with the suggestions to remove the horizontal muntins in the transoms, add muntins to the front door, and have less muntins in the sliding door on the rear elevation. He also liked the idea of siding within the front porch detail all being the same. **Acting Chair Fitzgerald** said it is a nice home that is traditional and updated, and he was not opposed to removing the clipped gable above the window over the garage so that all of the peaks from the street will look the same. **Commissioner Eckhardt** agreed that all the peaks on the front should look the same. **Commissioner Kingsley** agreed as well and added that the gable over the garage should have the same vertical board and batten as the two gables on the right side of the front elevation.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE PROPOSED NEW SINGLE-FAMILY HOME TO BE LOCATED AT 1138 N. CHESTNUT AVENUE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 1/18/24, 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 REQUIREMENT THAT THE FRONT DORMER ABOVE THE GARAGE BE CHANGED TO A GABLE, WITH VERTICAL BOARD AND BATTEN SIDING.
2. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE SIDE AND REAR CLIPPED GABLES BE CHANGED TO FULL HIP ROOFS.
3. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE COLOR SCHEME BE CLOSER TO THE RENDERING PRESENTED, WITH EITHER A LIGHT GRAY SIDING WITH A CHARCOAL ROOF, OR A TAN OR TAUPE SIDING WITH MORE OF A DARK BROWNISH ROOF.
4. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE SIDING UNDERNEATH THE PORCH ENTRY GABLE CONTINUE ALL THE WAY UP TO THE UNDERSIDE OF THE CEILING SO THERE IS ONLY ONE MATERIAL THERE.
5. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PETITIONER STUDY THE MUNTINS, POSSIBLY ELIMINATING THE HORIZONTALS IN THE TRANSOMS, ADDING SOME IN THE FRONT DOOR, AND CHANGING THEM IN THE PATIO DOORS ON THE REAR, FOR STAFF REVIEW.
6. A RECOMMENDATION TO ADD A CANOPY OR SOME TYPE OF COVERING OVER THE BACK DOOR.
7. A RECOMMENDATION TO LOWER THE EAVE LINE OF THE FRONT PORCH ROOF.

8. 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 Eckhardt said that the sconce lights being shown are appropriate in size for the elevation, and the petitioner should go with a light fixture of that scale.

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

ITEM 3. COMMERCIAL REVIEW**DC#23-070 – Burlington – 601 E. Palatine Rd.**

Jakob Evans and **Thomas Durdella**, representing *ADA Architects*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing exterior modifications to an existing multi-tenant retail building within the Town & Country retail center to create a new storefront facade for the Burlington retail store. Burlington is planning to occupy the former Marshalls tenant space, most recently being used by Dick's Sporting Goods for warehouse sales. The existing Town & Country retail center was reviewed by the Plan Commission and approved by the Village Board as a Planned Unit Development. Since the development of this property required Plan Commission review, the role of the Design Commission is limited to review of the building design and signage only.

The scope of the project includes interior tenant improvements and exterior façade modifications. There are no site or landscaping improvements being proposed. The property is zoned B-2, General Business District.

The scope of the proposed facade renovation includes:

- Replacing the existing dark bronze aluminum storefront with a new clear anodized aluminum storefront.
- Cladding the existing wall above the main entrance with new red Nichiha fiber cement panels.
- Adding a new clear anodized cantilevered canopy eyebrow feature.
- Fresh paint on all of the remaining tan and off-white EIFS to match the existing storefront and retail center.
- New exterior wall sign.
- Replacing rooftop mechanical equipment.

Mr. Hautzinger said that overall, the proposed facade improvements are a welcome update to the existing storefront. The proposed red wall adds a fresh pop of color which has a nice modern appearance. The red wall fits well with other similar storefront features in the Town & Country retail center such as at Best Buy and Dick's Sporting Goods.

Although Staff welcomes the proposed improvements, Staff encouraged the petitioner at the time of submittal to take the design further with a more extensive update to the facade, such as upgrading the canopy columns, or possibly eliminating the canopy in exchange for a totally new and more modern facade. However, the petitioner reported that the existing canopy extends past the lease line of Burlington's proposed space, and in instances such as this, it is Burlington's preference to leave existing canopies and weave them into the new facade. Staff acknowledges the constraints of working with the existing conditions, and does not oppose Burlington's approach to this design.

The proposed new white wall sign looks nice against the red wall, which is consistent with Burlington's brand standards. However, per code, the size of wall signs shall not exceed 25% of the wall area that they are mounted on, and the proposed sign is approximately 29% of the wall area, which exceeds the maximum allowed. The petitioner has acknowledged this requirement and will be revising the size of the sign to comply with code. All rooftop mechanical equipment is required to be screened from view. The existing rooftop mechanical units are setback and screened by the existing parapet wall, and it is expected that the new replacement mechanical units will also be screened by the existing parapet walls. However, if any of the new units are visible, then individual unit screens may be required as needed. Staff recommends approval of the facade design being proposed.

Acting Chair Fitzgerald clarified that the wall sign being shown is not part of any motion made tonight, and **Mr. Hautzinger** confirmed this.

Mr. Evans thanked Staff and the commissioners for their time reviewing the changes being proposed for the building facade. He referred to the full rendering and explained that the red panel will wrap around all 3 sides of the façade. However, the eyebrow feature will only be on the front of the facade because the smaller portion of the canopy goes

all the way across and cannot wrap all the way around. Most of the existing framework will be re-used. Burlington is only using a portion of the existing Dick's warehouse space, and the landlord will take back the space on the right side and leave it vacant for the time being, which is part of the reason why the existing canopy cannot be eliminated. **Mr. Evans** showed the panel joint detail of the Nichiha panels and clarified that the joint color will be red and not gray as shown in the color rendering; it is a shiplap joint that cannot be seen where the panels come together, they just create that small reveal. He also referred to photos of three different Burlington projects that they recently completed, with the photo at the top right being most similar to the what is being proposed and presented tonight.

At this time, the tornado siren went off and **Acting Chair Fitzgerald** asked about procedure. **Mr. Hautzinger** said the meeting can be stopped temporarily while everyone goes to the basement of Village Hall. The commissioners said they were ready to make a motion for the changes proposed for the facade, not including the signage.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL FACADE DESIGN FOR BURLINGTON TO BE LOCATED AT 601 E. PALATINE ROAD, AS SUBMITTED. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE FRONT ELEVATION AND MATERIAL LIST RECEIVED 2/20/24, SIDE ELEVATION RECEIVED 2/9/24, 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. 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 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.**
- 2. ALL SIGNAGE MUST MEET CODE, CHAPTER 30.**

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

ITEM 4. OTHER BUSINESS

Public Comment

There was none.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO
ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:25 P.M. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.**