

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION

HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
JANUARY 9, 2024

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

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

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Melissa Toops, OKW Architects for *Arlington 425-Parking Garage*
Bruce Adreani, Norwood Builders for *Arlington 425/Campbell Building*
Samuel Pavlovcik, Pavlovcik Architecture for *217 E. Foster St.*
John Timpe, Pavlovcik Architecture for *217 E. Foster St.*
Steve Hautzinger, Planning Staff

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FOR DECEMBER 12, 2023

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF DECEMBER 12, 2023. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 1. CBD COMMERCIAL REVIEW**DC#23-066 – Arlington 425–Parking Garage – 44 S. Highland Ave.**

Melissa Toops, *OKW Architects*, and **Bruce Adreani**, representing *Norwood Builders*, was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger said the petitioner is here tonight seeking approval of the architectural design for the parking garage at the Arlington 425 Planned Unit Development in the Downtown. On December 12, 2023, the Design Commission reviewed proposed exterior design changes to the originally approved 2021 parking garage design. A summary of that review is as follows:

- The body of the parking garage was proposed to be changed from a highly detailed architectural grade precast concrete with brick exterior and decorative metal railings, to a simplified painted precast concrete structure.
- The stair and elevator towers were proposed to be reduced in size. The same materials and detailing from the approved 2021 design would be used, but the glass curtain wall features were proposed to be replaced with simpler single windows. Additionally, the detailing at the top of each tower was only on the two exterior walls, where the existing stair towers have cornice and brick detailing wrapping all four sides.
- The north garage elevation was changed from either a four or five-story design, to a split four and five-story design.
- An enclosed bike room, sprinkler room, and dog wash were added with plain painted precast concrete exterior walls.
- The pedestrian bridge was omitted.
- An exterior generator on grade with metal fence screening was added to the plans.

Staff raised concerns regarding the revised design as follows:

- The proposed painted precast concrete panels would be a downgrade from the previously approved 2021 design, which included architectural grade precast concrete with brick exterior and decorative metal railings throughout to match the existing municipal garage. Staff did not agree with matching the old, dated painted portion of the original 1980's municipal garage, noting that the painted concrete requires significant maintenance.
- The proposed exterior painted precast concrete first floor walls of the enclosed bike room, sprinkler room, and dog wash are prominent, lacking detail, and had a poor appearance.
- The massing of the north elevation looked very awkward with a partial fifth floor, and the massing of the south stair tower was awkwardly narrow.
- The revised simplified stair tower designs needed to be evaluated by the Design Commission, and the two-sided design at the top floor was unacceptable.
- It was recommended that the proposed parking garage design be revised to more closely match the existing municipal garage and the previously approved 2021 design including:
 - o Architectural grade precast concrete walls with brick veneer and decorative metal railings at prominent locations, in lieu of painted precast concrete.
 - o A full five-story façade on the north elevation
 - o Appropriately proportioned and detailed stair towers including four-sided detailing at the top floor.
 - o The exterior walls of the bike room, sprinkler room, and dog wash require further design development.

The Design Commission felt the proposed revised design was not acceptable. They felt that people will walk through the development, and the garage needed to look great on all sides. Concern was raised about the mismatch in quality between the highly detailed stair towers and the painted precast walls of the garage. It was recommended to go back to the previously approved design as close as possible, to look more like a building, and less like a garage. It was commented that the openings on the garage are too large, where the original approved design had smaller openings with a more residential scale, similar to a window.

At that time, the petitioner expressed their desire to make the garage look different from the Village garage so that people will understand that it is not the Village garage. The petitioner also said that they did not want to include

decorative railings on the garage because they felt it had a prison-like appearance. It was suggested by one of the Design Commissioners that a different color brick could be used on the new garage. The commissioners voted to continue the project for re-review.

The petitioner has submitted a revised design for review tonight. The revised design includes the following features:

- Architectural grade precast concrete walls with brick veneer throughout. The brick color has been changed from matching the red brick on the existing municipal parking garage to matching the tan brick that will be used on the new apartment building to face Campbell Street.
- A full five-story façade on the north elevation.
- Nicely proportioned and detailed stair towers including four-sided detailing at the top floor.
- The exterior walls of the bike room, sprinkler room, and dog wash have been enhanced with architectural grade precast concrete, instead of painted precast concrete.
- The metal fence around the generator has been replaced with architectural precast concrete walls.

Overall, Staff feels the current design is a significant improvement from the previous proposal that was reviewed on December 12, and Staff appreciates the effort made by the petitioner to address the Design Commission's concerns. Replacing the painted precast walls with architectural precast/brick walls is an important enhancement to the appearance of the garage, as well as eliminating the maintenance concerns associated with a painted exterior. Staff supports the new brick color which will match the new apartment building that the parking garage will be primarily serving. Staff also supports the overall design concept to complement, but not directly copy, the existing municipal garage. Overall, the proposed design is nicely done, but Staff recommends that the following details be evaluated:

- **Decorative Metal Panels.** The design includes decorative metal panels to break up the large openings. The proposed decorative panels are a nice idea to complement the decorative metal coping on the stair towers as well as the decorative metal railings on the existing municipal garage. However, the proposed decorative metal panels are very light in appearance. Staff wonders if the members of the metal panels could be deeper for a more pronounced appearance.
- **Architectural Precast Reveals.** The reveal pattern in the architectural precast panels appears somewhat minimal, especially at the first and second levels. Staff recommends that additional detailing be provided, such as a projected sill profile at all openings, similar to the Village garage. Also, additional reveal detailing at the first floor is recommended, such as varying the width of the reveals, to add more variety and interest to the precast panels, similar to the Village garage.
- **Stair Towers.** Overall, the stair towers look great, but an additional precast concrete band and stone lintels above the windows is recommended to improve the integration with the walls of the garage, as well as to better coordinate with the existing municipal garage.
- **Generator Screen.** The new precast concrete generator screen walls are a nice improvement from the previous metal fence. However, it is recommended that the walls be capped with a more decorative profile, and the height of the walls needs to be confirmed to fully screen the generator.

Overall, Staff recommends approval of the current design, with a recommendation that the commissioners consider the comments and details stated by Staff tonight.

Ms. Toops thanked the commissioners for their comments given at the last review and acknowledged that the design is a big change from the previously approved design. Their goal is to look at this as a campus, a collective group of buildings built together; this project will be primarily serving the multi-family building and it made sense to them to allow that architecture to become complimentary to one another. Every side of the parking garage building will have the same level of finish that continues on from the existing Vail garage. This is an open parking garage and they are working within the limitations of that, but they want to bring down the scale by creating vertical stone elements to try to break out the monotony of the brick, to allow for the individual vertical components of the metal panels to start to create a level of detail that is more hearkening to the multi-family building. They feel that the refinements stated by Staff are all something they can absolutely study; looking at the joint reveals, addressing the nuance of the panels, etc. They

feel confident that this project hopefully addresses the items the commissioners brought to them at the last review.

Mr. Adreani thanked the commissioners for being here tonight and he reiterated that having this building blend in with their new apartment building creates a unison that keeps the Village parking garage apart from theirs. The changes that were made includes almost every item the commissioners talked about at the last review. They are trying to value engineer this building in order to be cost effective and in order to make sure that this project goes along the way they expected it to. These modifications are more expensive, but they are willing to go ahead with what they put back into it to keep it apart from the Village parking garage and make it different than the first design that was brought before this commission a long time ago. They appreciate any comments tonight and the commissioners' faith in their project as they go forward.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jerry Schiffman, 1 S. Highland Ave. He asked where the access will be to get into the parking garage. **Ms. Toops** said the primary access is from inside the campus itself, with another entrance off Highland; predominately, the entrances have not changed from the previously approval. Mr. Schiffman also asked if the entrance on Highland will be gated off for non-access, and **Ms. Toops** said that ground-floor parking is for commercial parking, so it will not be gated; however, there will be a gate to access residential parking above. Mr. Schiffman asked how this will separate it from the current garage, and **Mr. Adreani** said with signage. Mr. Schiffman replied that the design of the garage has no effect on those using it publicly because there will be a sign, but people will ignore the sign and pull into the garage anyway, we already know that. In his opinion, this campus idea in the middle of a downtown area does not really seem like it fits in with the neighborhood design, which is that all the buildings are kind of all inclusive. He was concerned about the panels and asked how wide they are and if they hang vertically. **Ms. Toops** explained and pointed out where the metal panels will span between the pre-cast. The walls will be all structural pre-cast, and the metal panels are just a decorative element to break up the massing. Mr. Schiffman asked if the west elevation is being completed now, because it was stated at the last review that it is not, and **Mr. Adreani** said that all four sides of the garage have now been finished with the current design. Mr. Schiffman said that other than value engineering, this design is more acceptable; however, the compatibility of the different brick color versus the brick color that currently exists is hard to see until the two materials are side by side. He mentioned the depth of the brick, and questioned if it will start to come off. There have been problems with other buildings downtown where panels were applied to concrete and the panels have failed and fallen off the building. He wants to make sure we are looking at something that is going to be easy to maintain and will last a long time. **Mr. Adreani** said yes.

Colin Dwyer, 418 E Jules St. He is a life scout going for Eagle Scout in Troup 34, and he is trying to get his communication merit badge. He asked how many spots there will be for bike parking in this new update for the parking garage. **Ms. Toops** said there will be 64 bike parking spaces, which is in excess of the minimum requirement per the zoning code. **Chair Kubow** asked how the ratio of bike parking in multi-family is determined, and **Ms. Toops** said it is a metric of the unit count and the number of commercial parking spaces. **Mr. Hautzinger** said that requiring bike parking at all new developments is a relatively new requirement that was added to the Municipal code. It was clarified by **Ms. Toops** that these bike parking spaces are for residents of the development, not the public; however, there will also be public bike parking spaces per the previously approved landscape plan for this development.

In response to public comment, **Ms. Toops** said the intent is that the pre-cast panels be cast with the brick in place, so it should be a more predictable material, and the intent of the brick color is to compliment the previously approved multi-family color; to match and/or complement the existing brick color to the best of their ability.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Eckhardt** thanked the petitioner for responding to all the commissioners' previous comments and concerns, at an additional expense. With regards to issues brought forward by Staff, he felt the decorative grills between the mid-spans of the open-air portion of the garage are really attractive, especially from a pedestrian standpoint; however, he questioned if they should be beefed up to make them more visible from farther away. He suggested infilling the top two and the bottom two with a heavy screen that still

allows air, but shows a little darker; however, he supports the grills the way they are currently shown as a piece of art that should stay black. With regards to the reveals, he questioned why the horizontal reveals are about 1 to 1-1/2" high and the vertical reveals are very very slight; are those just pre-cast joints or are they also cast reveals. He leaned towards a wider reveal. He questioned if the lack of a stone lintel at the top of the stair tower windows was a drafting error because it cannot be only brick at the top; there should be something up there. He wanted to hear comments from the petitioner about the generator screening, which he was in favor of putting a top cap on, even if it was just another reveal in the pre-cast and not an actual cap. Other than these four items, he liked the design as presented.

Commissioner Kingsley thanked the petitioner for addressing some of the commissioners' comments from the last review. She explained that two comments made at the last review were that the commissioners wanted the parking garage to look more like a building than a parking garage, and that the large openings be made smaller so it did not look like a parking garage. However, when she looks at the current design in general, it has pretty much the same openings that the previous design had, and she felt the current design did not respond well to those two comments, which are the two comments she thought were the significant changes between the originally approved garage design and these last two submittals. She referenced the originally approved design. She said she has no issue with the corner tower elements; however she felt that the proposed design looks like a parking garage, where the originally approved design looked like a building and not a garage. That is where she felt the current design is unsuccessful. Because the corner towers are so different than the space in between, she felt the brick should come all the way down and be almost like four corner pieces, with infill in between; however, the stone material being proposed is fine. **Commissioner Kingsley** felt the brick color should either match the existing or match the 425 building. The color of all the metal on the 425 building is proposed to be black, and she asked about the metal color on the Village parking garage. **Mr. Hautzinger** said the metal color on the existing village garage is a dark charcoal color. **Commissioner Kingsley** suggested a slightly different metal color on the parking garage, perhaps a charcoal or a dark grey color, and she felt that extending the pre-cast columns through the top of the building made it look more like a parking garage. Lastly, she liked the decorative metal panels located in between the openings of the garage, but said they are just decoration that you will look straight through and not see the breakdown of the big openings, and although it will allow for air movement, it will also allow everyone to see the ceiling of the parking garage and all the lighting. She is not in favor of the decorative metal panels, they do not adequately do the job that the commissioners had previously asked for.

Commissioner Fitzgerald also appreciated the work that was done on the current design. With regards to the new brick color and the brick color on the existing parking garage, he wanted samples of both colors to be submitted to Staff for review and approval. He agreed with Staff comments about the generator screen; however, he just wanted to see it dressed up and not redesigned. He agreed with the suggestion that the decorative metal panels be a little stronger, more thick or dense so they stand out more. He was okay with the precast panels and the detail of the panels, and he was 50/50 with the details at the top of the windows of the towers, however he did not like the idea of bringing the horizontal stone panels through the towers because he liked the look of the beautiful brick wall. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** agreed with Commissioner Kingsley's comment that the openings are big, and the previous design made it look more like a building; now it looks like a parking garage.

Commissioner Seyer thanked the petitioner for the changes that were made since the last review. He was pretty much in agreement with most of the commissioners' comments. He said the brick color is great, he likes it and it is all going to be earth tones, but he agreed with Commissioner Fitzgerald that a sample should be submitted to Staff for review and approval; however, he felt very confident that it will look good. He said the commissioners previously asked for better materials, which he felt the petitioner came back with, and although the current design can continue to be harped on and further designed, overall it looks much better. The more that is added to it, the more cost is added, and he would rather see that cost go into the other buildings. **Commissioner Seyer** liked the current design, it's clean and it's much better than what was shown at the last review, and he agreed that the generator screen wall could use a cap at the top. He liked the details as shown and acknowledged the difficulty in reading the metal grills in the rendering, which he felt would look nice. He also liked how the columns come up beyond the top parapet. He liked everything being shown tonight and had no reason to vote against it, with the exception of a couple minor comments and the material sample submission for the brick.

Chair Kubow was in agreement with the other commissioners, the changes that were made are subtle but impactful. He also agreed with Commissioner Kingsley, although he struggles to provide the direction needed to get it back to what the design once was, and he understood the position the petitioner is in. He also agreed with Commissioner Seyer about a preference to see the capital put towards the buildings and not the parking garage, but this design is still a substantial deviation from the originally approved design, and he did not currently see how to get closer to that without a pretty significant change that goes against what a majority of the commissioners had previously recommended. He said the petitioner did a good job with the commissioners' comments, while also keeping costs in mind, which he respects. In general, he approves of what is being proposed tonight, with the recommendations from Staff.

Commissioner Eckhardt asked the petitioner about the reveals. **Ms. Toops** gave an explanation about the pre-cast panels and the wall columns with regards to the reveals, and added that the elevations are not necessarily the truest representation of the vertical reveal line. The horizontal reveal lines were studied for variation, thickness, depth, and height, to try to create differentiations between the vertical columns and the base. They are currently scaled at 1-inch, and the depth is around 1/4" to 1/2". **Commissioner Eckhardt** referred to the drafted elevations and asked about the width of the vertical reveal that is not part of the column, and **Ms. Toops** said that is probably closer to 1/2" or 3/4", purposely made a little smaller than the horizontal reveals. **Commissioner Eckhardt** also asked about the details at the top of the stair tower window, he was looking for something with visual weight up there, which could be a brick detail or another piece of stone or a little black panel; he would leave this up to Staff to review. **Ms. Toops** said that having heard comments tonight, she would like to study the replacement of a stone lintel above there, this was something they struggled with as well.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED DESIGN REVISIONS FOR THE ARLINGTON 425 PARKING GARAGE AT 26 S. HIGHLAND AVENUE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON THE REVISED DRAWINGS AND MATERIAL LIST DATED AND RECEIVED 1/3/24, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES REGULATIONS AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING:

1. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PETITIONER PROVIDE EXPANDED EXHIBITS TO IDENTIFY THE REVEAL DIMENSIONS ON THE ELEVATIONS.
2. THAT THE BRICK OF THE GARAGE CAN MATCH THE BUILDING THAT IT IS COMPLEMENTARY TO, NOT THE EXISTING PARKING GARAGE, WITH A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PETITIONER PROVIDE BRICK SAMPLES TO STAFF FOR FINAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL.
3. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE GENERATOR SURROUND HAVE ADDED DETAIL AT THE TOP IN PARTICULAR, TO BE REVIEWED BY STAFF.
4. IN GENERAL, THE DECORATIVE METAL PANELS ARE ACCEPTED AS DESIGNED, BUT FURTHER STUDY IS REQUIRED ON HOW THE GRILLS MIGHT BE MODIFIED TO GIVE THEM MORE PRESENCE, FOR STAFF REVIEW.
5. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PETITIONER PROVIDE A LINTEL DETAIL OR STONE BAND OR OTHER ARCHITECTURAL DETAIL AT THE HEAD OF THE TOP OF THE HIGHEST WINDOW IN THE STAIR TOWER, TO BE REVIEWED BY STAFF.
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, ANY OTHER ZONING AND/OR LAND USE ISSUES OR DECISIONS THAT STEM FROM ZONING, SIGN CODE OR BUILDING 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/OWNER/BUILDER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO COMPLY WITH THE DESIGN COMMISSION APPROVAL AND ENSURE THAT BUILDING PERMIT PLANS AND SIGN PERMIT PLANS COMPLY WITH ALL ZONING CODE, BUILDING CODE AND SIGN CODE REQUIREMENTS.

Mr. Hautzinger asked if the comments made about the detail of adding a projected sill at the precast concrete openings was intentionally left out of the motion or an oversight. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said he intentionally left that out.

Commissioner Kingsley asked for clarification on which items are requirements and that Staff would review, which **Commissioner Eckhardt** clarified. **Commissioner Kingsley** also commented that a lighter black color should be considered for the color of the metal, with Staff to review and approve.

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

- 7. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE METAL COLOR BE A LIGHTER BLACK COLOR, TO BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY STAFF.**

**SEYER, AYE; FITZGERALD, AYE; ECKHARDT, AYE; KUBOW, AYE; KINGSLEY, NAY.
MOTION CARRIED.**

ITEM 2. SINGLE-FAMILY NEW REVIEW**DC#23-062 – 217 E. Foster St.**

Samuel Pavlovcik & John Timpe, representing *Pavlovcik Architecture*, was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to build a new two-story residence with a two-car attached garage on an existing vacant lot. The property does comply with all R-3 zoning requirements. The subject property is part of a subdivision that was approved in 2004; however, this lot was never developed and has remained vacant.

The proposed design is required to comply with the Single-Family Design Guidelines, which state that the house should fit with the existing context. The subject property is on a street where all of the existing homes have a very consistent appearance with a traditional style, a mix of masonry and siding, and earth tone color palettes. The proposed design has a non-traditional appearance with large format fiber cement siding panels, plain casement windows without grids, and a contemporary black & gray color palette. The low hipped roof looks out of place with the scale and proportion of the other homes on the street. The large amount of wall space above the windows and below the eaves has an odd appearance, which is especially prominent on the second story. The joint pattern in the siding is not centered horizontally or vertically on any of the walls, which looks random and unrefined.

A design with a more traditional appearance to better complement the character of the existing homes on the block is recommended in this location. If a contemporary design is the goal, it is recommended that the design be revised to more closely match the scale, proportions, colors and materials used on the existing homes. Staff feels this project requires revisions and a re-review.

Mr. Pavlovcik said the proposed new home will be the owner's primary residence for his family, and they want to maintain a more contemporary design. With that, they want to proceed forward in terms of still respecting the character of the neighborhood and taking into consideration this commission's comments to find a way to come to a successful solution with the design. In response to staff comments and after discussions with the homeowners, they are definitely amenable to different color options from the black and grey; however, the Hardie panels are preferred instead of any other type of siding, as well as stone instead of brick. Material samples were brought tonight to show what is currently being proposed for the new home. In response to Staff comments, the low hipped roofs were a design decision to try to keep more of a Prairie style yet contemporary look, without completely ignoring the neighbors by doing a flat roof or parapet wall construction; keeping some form of pitched roof similar to the neighbors. The heights were based on the mid-points of neighborhood roofs to determine the most-fitting, and a few projections were incorporated in the front facade without it being too square or too plain, similar to the size and scale of some of the neighboring properties. The homeowner had specific ideas about the floor plan, specifically the second-floor primary suite, which resulted in smaller windows in the bathroom on the front façade that are symmetrical; however, there could be some opportunity for potentially raising those windows, although increasing them in size could become difficult, but they are open to some of those modifications as well. A double-hung window would not work in the application of the second-floor, and the homeowner wants to avoid window grids. **Mr. Pavlovcik** said that right now the joint pattern noted on the elevation is just an infill of a CAD hatch pattern to represent the material of Hardie panels as well as the stone on the bottom. Based on the color chosen for the panels, the Hardie panel size will be 48" x 120", which allows further refinement with the design and thoughtful placement of seams to ensure that it will look proper on the elevations.

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 Seyer** said that every home does not need to have the same roof pitch; there is a certain contextual relationship, but some homes stand out a little more than others. In his opinion, there are a few homes on this street that do look the same, and he fine with a little bit of variety. The proposed new home is not ultra-modern and it fits in. He pointed out that the rendering does not show the stone aligned with the base of the windows; however, the elevations do show them aligned, which he is in favor of. He said

that the Hardie fiber cement panels being proposed are being used more and more, and it is better when at least one vertical seam lines up with an edge of a window, as opposed to no relationship. He felt these were minor comments and was interested in what the other commissioners have to say. **Commissioner Seyer** said he is in favor of going forward with the design, but asked about the dark color of the window frames with regards to the Hardie board. **Mr. Pavlovcik** said right now it is planned to be black or dark bronze to match the aluminum. **Commissioner Seyer** was concerned about the black garage door that will really pop with the other light colors being proposed on the home. He likes the design and the scale, but felt the stone should align with the window sills, and he wanted to hear the other commissioners' opinion on the materiality of the garage as well as the other materiality as far as the colors.

Commissioner Fitzgerald said he was surprised when he first saw the design of the new home, but he did not have a problem with the way it fits into the neighborhood, different is good. This is a fairly traditional design, it is updated and modern, but there is nothing crazy about it. His first comment is that the new home feels inexpensive, although he is not sure what is making it feel that way. He is a little concerned about the panels, the composite around the windows, and the look of the stone in the rendering; he suggested a bigger more pronounced cap on the stone. He said that bigger light fixtures that really fit the scale of the home are needed. He referred to the material samples and asked if the color of the stone is a blend of the two colors shown, which he has never seen anything like before. **Mr. Timpe** referenced a home on N. Pine that his client used as reference with regards to the stone. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** said the stone colors look checkered to him, and he preferred something more simplified. He concluded that he is frustrated because he does not love the design, but he cannot explain why not.

Commissioner Kingsley said that although she has some reservations about the home, she was not completely opposed to it and had questions about the detailing. With regard to the Hardie panel system, she asked if there will be hardware in between the smooth panels, and what that material will be. **Mr. Timpe** said it is a butt seam, with no reveal at the seam; there should not be anything on the front where the two panels meet. **Commissioner Kingsley** also asked how the corners of the panels will be finished, because the panels cannot be mitered. She suggested adding hardware made for these Hardie panels that cover the ends and finishes it. She said the panel system could look really nice, but the location of the seams is really important because of their visibility. **Commissioner Kingsley** also asked about the ceiling heights and the window and door heights. The petitioner replied that the first-floor ceiling height is 10-feet and the second-floor is 9-feet, and the height of the doors and windows on the first and second-floor are the standard 6'8".

Commissioner Kingsley understood that the owners want to design a home that is different and more Prairie style, which she felt the design was not; however, she felt the design was missing things such as raising the head height to help the elevation. **Mr. Timpe** replied that the door heights were originally designed at 8', but in discussions with the owners they decided to bring them down to a standard height so they were easier to purchase and less expensive. **Commissioner Kingsley** replied to then bring the soffit down so the head height between the top of the door and the underside of the soffit is reduced. She also commented that the second-floor windows in the primary closet, primary bath, and stairwell are inoperable, and could be an issue with light and ventilation code requirements, and the first-floor windows in the two front rooms are also inoperable. The petitioner said the owners are amenable to changing the style of the first-floor windows on the front of the home; however, one of those windows is in a storage room and the other is in the office that has operable windows on the side. **Commissioner Kingsley** wanted to see further study of the four large windows on the front elevation, to break down the scale to be more like the windows on the sides of the home. Lastly, she agreed with the comments about the stone color, and suggested the two colors be more similar. She was not completely sold on the 'Weather Cliff' color for the siding panels that is a little warm compared to the other cool colors being proposed, and she was not completely sold on the black soffit. For her, the black garage door is not as big of a deal as the soffit, which is going to be a hard line on the building.

Commissioner Eckhardt said when he first saw the design he did not like the front elevation in the rendering. He is okay with the materials, but his concern is with the grid system of the Hardie panels. He has experience with panelized homes and has designed Japanese homes that are on a specific module. He explained that working with these Hardie panels is difficult, the panels are not successful when the ends butt together because the panels never come to the job site perfect and the edges of the panels get dented the minute they are handled. He had concerns that the homeowner

would not be happy with the edges of the panels once they are installed. He pointed out the size and arrangement of the panels, referring to the east elevation that shows a smaller panel at the right end of the elevation and a larger panel at the left side of the elevation. The joints need to be drawn to be aesthetically connected to the window openings, which takes a lot of study to do, but needs to be done. **Commissioner Eckhardt** also commented about the amount of waste with the type of panels, trying to get the joints to be exactly where you want them, and the need for backers behind each joint; these panels are not a typical 16-inch on center module. It takes a lot of skill and care to build a home like this. The porthole windows in the bathrooms and the long, thin windows look good in the panels, but there is something wrong with the panel system. He cautioned the petitioner to pay close attention to the ventilation requirements with regards to the inoperable second-floor windows, as previously commented by Commissioner Kingsley.

Commissioner Eckhardt said the home needs to be re-designed, and if the panel system stays, then it has to marry to the windows and the location, the windows need to fit into the panels properly, and the panels need to be what they are, real panels with reveals. The mix of the stone colors is too different, and he felt a light grey and a dark grey color would be more successful. He liked the color of the Hardie panels. He said the home has the potential to be okay, but it needs to come together right and needs further study, especially with the joints and the reveals. He would like to see the project continued so the petitioner can work out these details and return for another review.

Chair Kubow liked the massing of the home, and the warmer color palette that is consistent with this neighborhood. He liked the design and said there are a lot of little things that can be done to it while maintaining the massing and some of the overall architecture to get the home to the right place for everyone. A lot of comments were given tonight for the petitioner to digest and he felt the design was not that far off. He would have a tough time approving the design as shown tonight, and felt that additional studies were needed.

Commissioner Fitzgerald commented about the function of the proposed wood deck on the back of the home, which appears very small for a home of this size. He encouraged the petitioner to think about how the deck will be used and how it will work now and in the future.

Commissioner Seyer said that a few commissioners have talked about the outside corner trim, and he noted that Hardie makes an outside corner trim that is meant for these architectural panels, so he is not concerned about the panels. He sees a lot of images tonight that show a very monolithic, large format, nice corner, and as long as that is called out as such, he had no concerns. He agreed with Chair Kubow's comment that this design is not that far away, and that just a few notes, details, or even a sample would really help. **Commissioner Kingsley** added that Hardie also makes trim for in between the panels.

Chair Kubow summarized that if appears the commissioners prefer to continue the project to allow the petitioner time to potentially revise the design and come back for another review. He asked the petitioner about their timeline and the petitioner said it is not an issue for them to come back to the next meeting in two weeks; however, the homeowner is out of the country but is available to participate remotely if necessary. The petitioner also asked if there is an opportunity for this review to continue as they progress into the permit level of drawings, possibly administratively. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said that if the project remains with the panelize system, he could not support the project until he sees where the joints are. **Chair Kubow** encouraged the petitioner to focus on the design drawings for their next review, before starting on permit level drawings. **Mr. Hautzinger** added that revised drawings are needed by early next week for the project to be scheduled for the next meeting in two weeks, otherwise the next meeting date is February 13, with revised drawings needed a minimum of a week prior. The petitioner said they would target the first meeting in February. **Mr. Hautzinger** said that sign posting is not required if the meeting is continued to a specific date.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO CONTINUE THE REVIEW OF 217 E. FOSTER ST. (DC#23-062) TO THE FEBRUARY 13, 2024 DESIGN COMMISSIONER MEETING, WITH THE FOLLOWING:

1. A SUGGESTION THAT THE PETITIONER CONSIDER ALL OF THE COMMENTS GIVEN TONIGHT, NOT ONLY ABOUT THE REVEALS AND PANELS.

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

ITEM 3. OTHER BUSINESS

Public Comment

There was no comment.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:55 P.M. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.