

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
SEPTEMBER 10, 2024

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

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

Members Absent: Scott Seyer

Also Present: John Anstadt, JMB Architects for 32 N. Belmont Ave.
Tom Delaney, Burke Construction for 32 N. Belmont Ave.
Steve Zaleski, Compass Real Estate for 32 N. Belmont Ave.
John Haran, EJ Builders for 1627 N. Evergreen Ave.
Steve Gawlik, S.G. Architects for 1627 N. Evergreen Ave.
Steve Hautzinger, Planning Staff

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FOR AUGUST 13, 2024

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

ITEM 1. SINGLE-FAMILY TEARDOWN REVIEW**DC# 24-049(H) – 32 N. Belmont Ave.**

John Anstadt, representing *JMB Architects*, **Tom Delaney**, representing *Burke Construction*, and **Steven Zaleski**, representing *Compass Real Estate*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to demolish an existing two-story residence and detached garage to allow construction of a new two-story residence with an attached two-car garage. The proposed house complies with all single-family zoning requirements; however, in the R-4 Zoning District the minimum required Lot Size is 8,750 sf and the minimum required Lot Width is 70 feet. The subject property is 8,712 sf and 66 feet wide, which does not meet the minimum requirements for a building permit to be issued. Therefore, a zoning variation is required from the Zoning Board of Appeals to allow the proposed redevelopment of this property.

The subject property is located in the Rec Park neighborhood. The existing home (proposed to be demolished) was included in a Community Preservation Report which was prepared by the School of the Art Institute of Chicago in 2004. The report was prepared in an effort to raise community awareness and promote the preservation of the historic character of certain neighborhoods in Arlington Heights, such as the subject “Rec Park” neighborhood. Homes in the report are rated in order of importance as “Exceptional”, “Notable”, or “Contributing”. The subject house is rated as “Contributing”.

Per the municipal code Chapter 28 (Zoning Regulations), Section 13.7.c, prior to issuance of a Certificate of Approval for demolition and new construction, the Design Commission will need to evaluate if the existing home has “significant architectural, historical, aesthetic, or cultural value”.

Based on Google Street View images from 2012, the existing house appeared to be in good, well-maintained condition. The 2012 images also highlight the home’s historic charm and character as it contributed to the character of the neighborhood. However, based on the inspection report provided by the petitioner, the current condition of the home appears to have been neglected allowing roof damage and water infiltration to damage the home inside and out, requiring extensive repairs.

In general, Staff encourages renovation/addition of contributing historic homes, in lieu of teardown, but the Design Commission will need to evaluate the current condition of this property and feasibility for renovation.

Every home on this block is a historic home with a raised front porch and a detached garage. Some of the houses have recently been renovated and expanded. One teardown/new house on this street at 102 N. Belmont was approved by the Design Commission in 2019. In that case, the new house was designed with exemplary character to mimic the original house and fit seamlessly with the surrounding context including features such as a raised first floor, full front porch, one-and-a-half story massing, authentic materials and details, and a detached garage.

In regards to the proposed new house, one of the purposes of the Village of Arlington Heights’ Single-Family Design Guidelines is to evaluate how the proposed home fits with the character of the existing neighborhood. In this case, the proposed new house with prominent front load attached garage and only one step up to the front porch does not fit with the existing context.

Staff recommends that, if the Design Commission does not object to demolition, the proposed new house in this location should be redesigned to better fit with the character of the neighborhood with a more authentic traditional style including a raised front porch and a detached, or recessed attached, garage.

Examples of other similar projects in Arlington Heights are included in the Design Commission packet for reference and include the following:

- 638 S. Highland is a wonderful example of an extensive renovation and expansion of a historic home that was in very poor condition.
- 312 N. Douglas is a house in Rec Park that was renovated and expanded including a recessed attached garage.
- 109 S. Dunton is another example of a teardown/new house designed with authentic style to mimic the original historic house.
- 129 S. Highland is an example of a teardown/new house designed with a raised first floor and detached garage.
- 208 N. Haddow is a teardown/new house in Rec Park that was recently approved by the Design Commission with a raised front porch and a recessed attached garage.

In conclusion, **Mr. Hautzinger** said that if the Design Commission does not object to the demolition of the existing home, Staff recommends the Design Commission require revisions and re-review the proposed design, with consideration of the comments and suggestions provided by Staff.

Mr. Anstadt said they presented Staff with a previous elevation that is different than what is being reviewed tonight; it had more modern elements which in their opinion, have now been toned down, going in a more traditional direction. He said the garage was previously all stone, which was removed, with siding added instead, along with some roof details to bring down some of the massing. He introduced Tom Delaney with Burke Construction, who responded to Staff comments.

Mr. Delaney said he is the owner of 32 N. Belmont and is proposing the construction of the new home. He grew up in Rec Park and now lives in Scarsdale, and he is very familiar with the neighborhood and has a lot of history, memories, and respect for Rec Park. When he first looked at 32 N. Belmont, he considered renovating the existing home; however, unfortunately, the inspection report shows that the home cannot be renovated. He then looked at constructing a new home and felt the design being presented tonight is a nice home that fits in with the neighborhood. It addresses the current prerequisites of the market for young families such as an attached garage for convenience and safety, and a front porch that overlooks the park and fits with the neighborhood. He recognizes that the originally proposed stone detail was a bit much and he looked at reducing it, and he considered the comments from Staff about pushing the garage back and readjusting the floor plan, which they tried their best with and ultimately decided to go with the design presented tonight. **Mr. Delaney** concluded that he wants to be a good neighbor and build homes that fit the neighborhood and that attract good families, so his goal is to work with everyone here to obtain approval as quick as possible and move forward.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

Joe Perry, 38 N. Belmont. He lives on the right side of the existing home and has seen the dilapidation of the property. He referenced the comments made about Rec Park, and said

there are a few newer homes in the neighborhood that are similar, and he is happy to see the new home being proposed that will be a great addition to the neighborhood because the existing home is beyond repair. He felt the design is a great start and had no issue with it whatsoever.

Walter Redmon, 23 N. Pine Avenue, which is directly behind the subject property. He is here tonight to hear about what is being proposed, and said it is true that the existing home needs some work. He is looking forward to the property being upgraded and he is fine with the design being presented. He did have some concern about the fence between his property and the new home.

Tony Callero, 501 N. Arlington Heights Road. He lives off Fremont in the Rec Park neighborhood and felt the new home will be a great improvement to the neighborhood for everyone. With everything that is going to be happening in Rec Park, he felt a new home at this location would be a great representation of Arlington Heights.

Susan Skrudland, 735 N. Vail Avenue. She is not familiar with the condition of the existing home, she has been past it and certainly understands that it is in bad shape and that it may warrant a teardown and new build. She appreciates the report put together by Staff and agrees with their comments about the design being proposed, and she also appreciates the rigor that was done in finding examples of renovated homes that are very contextual to the neighbor, as well as new homes, because it shows that a new home can be very contextual and fit with the character of the neighborhood. She felt the new home is not in character with the Rec Park neighborhood directly around it; it is a nice home but it does not fit as well as a different style of new home in that neighborhood.

Joe Reynolds, 416 N. Pine Avenue. He walks through this area all the time and having lived here since 2015 he has seen some progressions of homes that have been rebuilt, and while there are many that do conform to the context, there are many that do not, and he felt that did not take away from the overall rebuild of this area, which brings a lot of young families to the neighborhood. With the busy park across the street, he felt the proposed attached garage was a good idea for the safety of a young family. Overall, he felt it was a great proposal and he looks forward to having it in the neighborhood. He referenced a home around the corner that has some of the same high arches and a similar layout, which he felt was very comparable to the design being proposed for this new home.

Kurt Skrudland, 735 N. Vail Avenue. He is an Architect and designs single-family homes. He has seen the proposed design dozens of times around the neighborhood, or very similar character wise, and you can tell when it was built. He felt the arch design over the entrance looked odd. He said that the large peak over the garage is the strongest element which catches your eye, and he wondered if it could be a different color to down play it. The rest of the home is very complicated with all the roof structures that will funnel water to the entrance between the garage, which will be a maintenance issue. This is a complicated build as proposed which could be simplified to make more of a statement aside from the garage by simplifying the roof shapes.

There was no further public comment.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** said it is a nicely designed home, but he is worried about it in this location. He had concerns about the arch over the front door, which is similar to a home located just north of Euclid that has an arch that he felt is a little forced; this element should be looked at. He was okay that the new home is not built higher like the rest of the homes on the block, but felt the garage could be pushed back, which is something this commission frequently asks for. **Commissioner**

Fitzgerald said that no material samples were provided tonight and he is unsure about the brown metal with the grey roof being proposed. He also had concerns about the noise and visibility of the three a/c compressors located in the backyard, and he suggested building a wall off to the side of the porch to screen them.

Commissioner Eckhardt liked the complicated aspect of the front elevation with the twin gables and the third large gable; it is big and it is tall, and he could support a larger window above the garage. He agreed with Commissioner Fitzgerald's concerns about the colors being proposed; the Musket Brown metal and the Oyster Gray roof shingles. **Mr. Delaney** presented a sample of the roof shingle material, but said he was unable to obtain a sample of the metal, which is a dark brown, almost a bronze tone. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said the rear elevation is the least remarkable, but it is the rear of the home and he is okay with that. The side elevations have sufficient detail, the windows are located where they need to be, and the tall space is broken up with a belly band at the top of the pediment. The scale of the new home is comparable to others on the block, and adding the garage onto the home allows for a larger backyard which he felt was important because of all the activity that will occur at the park across the street from this home. Therefore, he supports the front load garage, and pointed out that the front of the porch is in line with the garage. **Commissioner Eckhardt** was okay to approve the design as currently proposed.

Commissioner Kingsley thanked those in attendance from the public and for expressing their thoughts about the new home, which helps the commissioners. She also pointed out that three public comment emails were also received and added to the meeting packet prior to tonight's meeting. She knew the existing home was in poor shape prior to it being up for sale, and after seeing the photos from the inspection report, it is apparent that the existing home is probably not savable. Someone could probably go in and do the work to save the home, but it would take quite a bit after seeing the interior pictures provided. That being said, knowing this home was 'Contributing' in the Community Preservation Report from the School of the Art Institute of Chicago, she felt that whatever goes back here has to be contributing as well, and while she felt the proposed new home is nice, it did not fit the context of Rec Park. She understands that the owner designed the new home for the current market; however, the homeowners around this home have been there for a long time and this neighborhood does have a character that is different than a lot of other neighborhoods. The one-step-up porch across the entire front elevation is a really nice idea, but having it raised up as suggested by Staff would make it more like the neighborhood. **Commissioner Kingsley** said that although there are some 2-car attached garages in this neighborhood, there are very few, especially on an interior lot and not a corner lot. A corner lot is not a front load garage, so the white home around the corner, and the new home on Belmont are not a front load garage. The gable end above the garage is the largest element on the home and is the main thing you see. She felt the triple gable on the front elevation is not quite in keeping with Rec Park, where the homes are more farmhouse stly. She suggested a doing design more similar to 102 N. Belmont, just north of Miner, that was also a teardown/new construction, but it looks like a farm house. As required by the Design Guidelines, she felt the design of the proposed new home needs to be more contextual. Although an attached garage might be a current need of homebuyers, she felt that a detached garage also appeals to buyers and it also allows more light into a home. She said that a handful of the residents who spoke tonight have detached garages, and there are pros and cons to attached vs detached. She felt a detached garage at this location is better and she recommended the home be re-designed. She had no issue with the materials or colors, but agreed with Staff's comments about the proposed design.

Chair Kubow said he did not often disagree with Staff's comments, but this time he does. He always looks at context for homes in historic neighborhoods, and in this neighborhood, besides a few bungalows and that the majority of homes have detached garages, there is not

a lot of consistency. He referenced a white and black farmhouse that the commission approved a few years ago in the area, and felt that this new home is much more attractive, has warmer color and a softer look; it is a beautiful home. He agreed with the suggestion to push back the garage, but also felt the garage is really well designed, it is a strong look and he did not mind it being pushed up. He was in support of the design as proposed.

Commissioner Fitzgerald wanted to see the garage pushed back, he felt it was a fair compromise that it be pushed back a bit, like the commission almost always insists. **Commissioner Kingsley** agreed and still felt the home needed to go back for a re-design. She said there are some two car front loaded garages in Rec Park, and all but one is pushed back. In terms of context, she said the aerial presented by Staff shows that every single home between Wing, Belmont, and Pine, has a detached garage, and farther north, the only two homes that have attached garages, are the two homes reference tonight that were built in the last few years. Someone from the audience stated that further up into the neighborhood, there are plenty of homes along the way with a lot of variability, and there has been a lot of changeover since he has moved in that he felt does not detract from the neighborhood. **Commissioner Kingsley** understood the comments and said that her concern is the rhythm of the front elevation and having it look welcoming, versus the garage being the first thing you see. She preferred to see the garage detached, but if not, she would like to see it be pushed back and the porch be the first thing that you see.

Mr. Delaney replied to the comments about pushing the garage back or detached, which they looked at but decided that is not what they want to deliver here; however, they did consider the prominence of the home on the block. The average setback is about 18', and the new home is being pushed back to almost 24', so it is already coming off the street much further than the other homes, and although the garage is in line with the porch, it is set back on the lot already. **Commissioner Kingsley** appreciated that being done, but still felt that the garage is the first thing seen; the front door cannot be seen until you are south of the garage.

Mr. Anstadt referred to the 3D rendering and elevation and said they are aware that the garage is the most front element; however, some of the elements put on the garage were to address that. Because the garage is in front of the porch, they have the ability to add the gable which adds a lot to the character of the garage, and the two roofs were added on that element as well to make it feel cozier and less like a big blank wall. Pushing the garage back behind the house, the gable element will be lost.

Commissioner Fitzgerald said he was suggesting pushing the garage back a couple of feet, and asked if that was doable with the design being presented. **Mr. Anstadt** said not with the gable that is there. The commissioners asked if the porch can be brought forward a little bit, and **Mr. Anstadt** said the porch is approximately 5-feet deep and could be brought forward, however, he is concerned about what happens at the detail where the shed roof is now part of that area. He liked that the gable is seen proud, but if that is a resolution, he is willing to work with everything to make it happen.

Chair Kubow said that three positive votes are needed tonight for an approval of the project, and without going back and making some adjustments to the design, he was unsure if that will happen. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said that everything is working together with the way the elevation is currently designed with the shed roof over the garage door; however, if the porch comes forward, it will create a weird detail, and if it is pushed back, it all comes apart and the front porch roof just does not connect. He was unsure if there was a way to separate the top of the pediment and push the garage back a bit. He felt there might not be enough positive votes tonight for approval of the current design, unless some changes were made. **Commissioner Eckhardt** reiterated that he likes the design of the home the way it is, and

acknowledged that the neighboring homes are older and all built with detached garages, not many new homes are built with detached garages.

Commissioner Fitzgerald heard everything being said by the petitioner in response to pushing back the garage and asked if changing the window above the garage into something that looks more like part of the home and not just an attic space is an option. **Commissioner Eckhardt** felt that would help. **Mr. Anstadt** replied that bumping it out with brackets to support it would be acceptable, and **Mr. Delaney** agreed. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** was open to this idea, for Staff to review and approve. **Commissioner Kingsley** said that a bump-out may be too much, and it might be better to just have a window sized for a human, versus a bump-out with more brackets; leave it open for the petitioner to make the decision on this solution. **Mr. Hautzinger** clarified and confirmed that the goal is to make the gable look more like a bedroom and not an attic space, and the petitioner can study the best solution for that, to be approved by Staff.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE PROPOSED NEW (TEARDOWN) SINGLE-FAMILY HOME TO BE AT 32 N. BELMONT AVENUE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 8/7/24, MATERIAL LIST AND SAMPLE BOARD RECEIVED 7/2/24, 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. THAT THE PETITIONER PROVIDE FOR A DECORATIVE FENCE OR OTHER APPROPRIATE SCREENING FOR THE MECHANICAL UNITS LOCATED IN THE SIDE YARD, FOR STAFF REVIEW AND APPROVAL.**
- 2. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PETITIONER SUBMIT A REVISED DESIGN SKETCH SHOWING A DIFFERENT WINDOW CONFIGURATION OVER THE GARAGE DOOR THAT WILL GIVE A STRONG RESEMBLANCE TO THE ADJACENT TWIN GABLE ENDS, AND GIVE THE DEFINITE APPEARANCE OF A LIVABLE SPACE ABOVE THE GARAGE, FOR STAFF REVIEW AND APPROVAL.**
- 3. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PETITIONER SUBMIT THE EXACT COLOR SAMPLES FOR FINAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL BY STAFF, ON THE QUESTION OF THE COMPATIBILITY OF THE BROWN METAL COLOR WITH THE GRAY ROOF SHINGLES.**
- 4. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PETITIONER SUBMIT A DESIGN STUDY TO LOOK AT THE EYEBROW ENTRANCE, AND CONSIDER SOMETHING MORE OF A GABLE OR SOMETHING MORE MAJESTIC AND PRONOUNCED, FOR STAFF REVIEW AND APPROVAL.**
- 5. 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.**

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

ITEM 2. SINGLE-FAMILY TEARDOWN REVIEW**DC# 24-055 – 1627 N. Evergreen Ave.**

John Haran, representing *E & J Builders*, and **Steve Gawlik**, representing *S.G. Architects*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to demolish an existing one-and-a-half story residence with attached one-car garage to allow construction of a new two-story residence with an attached, three-car garage. The plans do comply with the R-E zoning requirements. The subject property is located in an R-E zoning district, where the minimum lot size is 20,000 sf. There have been numerous other similar teardowns/new construction homes previously completed in the neighborhood. This street has a mix of older and newer homes, ranging from single-story to two-stories. Garage configurations vary including detached, attached, front load, and side load.

Overall, the proposed design is nicely done with a nice level of detailing on all sides of the house. The petitioner has previously built this same design in another neighborhood at 1702 N. Verde, which was approved in 2018, photos of which have been provided in the packet for reference tonight. The proposed new house is tall and large, but it fits comfortably on the large lot. However, the Design Commission should evaluate the prominent appearance of the proposed three-car front load garage. A better garage placement would be in line with, or recessed behind, the front wall of the house to diminish the garage and make the main house the focal point. A side load garage configuration would also be recommended, which generally works well on wide lots such as this. An additional concern is the proposed dark color scheme for the house which is all black and dark gray, except for the bluish gray stone. The dark monochromatic look has a unique appearance that the Design Commission should evaluate against the context of the neighborhood. **Mr. Hautzinger** reviewed internet examples with similar color schemes, which were included in the packet. However, the petitioner provided photos this afternoon of a different house that he has built with a lighter gray siding.

Staff recommends the Design Commission evaluate the prominent appearance of the 3-car frontload garage, and the dark monochromatic color scheme against the context of the neighborhood.

Mr. Haran provided material samples and said that they changed the siding color to Pewter Gray, which is a lighter color than the previous Iron Gray. The trim color will stay Iron Gray, and the roof color is Weathered Wood. The stone shown in the photos presented is the exact 'Barnwood Blue' color being proposed. **Mr. Gawlik** replied to Staff's comments about the prominent appearance of the garage and said that this design was done previously on Verde Avenue, although a different color scheme, and the gable on the garage is slightly lower than the two upper gables because the roof was dropped in line with the porch. They looked at doing a side load garage, but the turning radius required for that would mean pushing the home 25+ feet off the lot line. Directly across the street from this property is a new home under construction that has the garage pulled forward almost identical to the depth of what they are proposing for this home. **Mr. Haran** added that there are several other homes in the neighborhood that have a 3-car garage on the front.

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 Kingsley** said she felt differently about garages in this neighborhood because this neighborhood has mostly attached garages, most of which are frontload, and many of them have the same setback being

proposed for this new home, so it is not as apparent or not as close to the home so it does not seem as tall. She agreed with Staff's suggestion to push the third car stall back a little; she prefers accentuating the home more than the garage. She asked about the space above the garage, and **Mr. Gawlik** replied there is a bonus room above the 2-car garage, but there is nothing above the one-car garage. **Commissioner Kingsley** preferred the garage not be as tall and proud, and that it be lowered or pushed back. This is a tall home, but it is set back, and she felt that a 12/12 roof pitch would be fine, versus the proposed 16/12. She understood if that is what the petitioner was going for, and it seems to hold together on the south elevation, but the stone being proposed does not seem to make sense, especially at the front door. Otherwise, she felt there needed to be different detailing around it. **Mr. Gawlik** clarified that the front door is recessed back 12-inches from the vertical board and batten at the entry. **Commissioner Kingsley** said that visually, the stone continuing all the way up to the top of the gable is a little odd, something about that does not make sense architecturally. She also had concerns about the window in the gable above the garage; she suggested lowering the gable so the bracket would be closer to the window, and changing the proportion of the window to be consistent with the windows to the south of it. She asked if the columns and brackets will be stained wood, and the petitioner said yes, which would be the only stained wood on the home.

Commissioner Kingsley also asked about exterior lights on the second-floor of the front elevation, similar to the other home built by the petitioner, which she was not in favor of. She suggested adding a covering over the door on the rear elevation, and had concerns about the rear elevation in general. She felt that the bump-out area on the rear elevation for the breakfast area needs more detail evaluation, and she questioned the 12/4 pitch being proposed. She also commented that the casement windows to the right of that area do not go with the other windows; some of the windows should be re-evaluated so all the windows are more similar in scale and division. She reiterated that the garage should be pushed back a little, and she was not keen on the really dark soffits; however, if the soffits, fascia, and trim all match, it might be okay. She also pointed out that the porch ceiling appears to be dark as well, and it should be lighter.

Commissioner Eckhardt referred to the small shed dormer located between the twin gables on the front elevation, and asked for clarification on what is going on behind this element. **Mr. Gawlik** said this is attic space, and **Commissioner Eckhardt** questioned if that dormer element is necessary. He liked the color scheme being presented tonight, which is much better than what was originally proposed. He supported Commissioner Kingsley's comment that the front porch ceiling should be lighter to reflect more light, and a covering should be added over the back patio doors. He liked the garage offset as is so that there is not as much stone on the side.

Commissioner Fitzgerald liked the home as designed on the front, and he really liked the dark colors that were originally proposed for the home, although he was okay with the revised colors presented tonight as well. He agreed that the front porch ceiling needs to be different, but he preferred more of a wood tone instead of white. He was unsure about adding a covering over the patio doors on the back of the home, and felt it should be a recommendation and not a requirement.

Chair Kubow really liked the updated material palette, and that the stone helps to soften the darker tones. He agreed with the concerns about the lack of consistency with the windows, and he recommended trying to align them better. He also said that the front entry feels a little off with the stone going all the way up, and he suggested only going up to the sill height (42 or 48-inches), to make it feel more natural.

There were no further comments from the commissioners.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE PROPOSED NEW (TEARDOWN) SINGLE-FAMILY HOME TO BE LOCATED AT 1627 N. EVERGREEN AVENUE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 7/30/24, 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 THAT THE PETITIONER EVALUATE THE WINDOWS ON THE SIDE ELEVATIONS, AND CONSIDER A SINGLE THEME OF WINDOW STYLE, TO SUBMIT TO STAFF FOR FINAL REVIEW.
2. A RECOMMENDATION THAT THE PETITIONER STUDY THE WINDOW SIZE OVER THE GARAGE DOOR, AND CONSIDER MAKING IT TALLER TO TIE IT CLOSER TO THE BRACKET ON THE TOP.
3. A RECOMMENDATION THAT LANDSCAPING BE PROVIDED TO SCREEN THE A/C UNITS ON THE SIDE OF THE HOME TO MITIGATE NOISE TO THE ADJACENT NEIGHBOR.
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 Kingsley suggested adding a recommendation that the ceiling of the front porch be a lighter stain, and a recommendation to add a covering over the back door.

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

5. A RECOMMENDATION THAT THE PETITIONER PROVIDE FOR A LIGHTER MATERIAL SUCH AS WOOD FOR THE CEILING OF THE FRONT PORCH.
6. A RECOMMENDATION TO CONSIDER ADDING A COVERING FOR PROTECTION OVER THE BACK SLIDING DOOR.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

ITEM 3. OTHER BUSINESS**Public Comment**

There was no public comment from those in the audience.

Commissioner Kingsley asked the commissioners for their thoughts about reconsidering the requirement for Design Commission approval of a single-family home prior to approval of a demolition permit of that home. She suggested requiring a building permit be obtained for the new home, prior to approval of the demo permit for the existing home. She explained that in some neighborhoods such as Rec Park, there are holes in the neighborhood because homes are torn down and then construction of the new home falls through and the existing home, which may have been historic, is just lost.

Mr. Hautzinger said that he does receive requests to tear down a home without a redevelopment plan for a new home, at which time he responds that, per code, Design Commission approval of the new home is required prior to approval of a demolition permit. He felt that the current requirement for Design Commission approval is effective to get some level of assurance that the project will proceed through construction to avoid vacant lots. He was unsure of when this requirement was created, but it is a code requirement that a demolition permit is not issued until Design Commission approval is obtained, which could be an administrative Staff approval as well.

Commissioner Kingsley wanted to hear any pros or cons about this from the commissioners, and whether this is something the commission should think about. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said that things are already pretty difficult for residents and he did not want to make things more difficult. **Commissioner Kingsley** said she did not want to make it difficult on the residents either, but it is not necessarily the residents; she wanted to make sure that whoever is investing in a property and tearing it down, and then may not continue to get a building permit, and then that home is lost, which has happened. **Mr. Hautzinger** asked the commissioners from their professional experience if they are aware of any other communities that require redevelopment approval prior to receiving a demo permit for a single-family home. The commissioners were not aware of any.

Mr. Hautzinger said he could bring this matter to the Planning Staff for discussion and report back to the commission, but he felt that requiring a building permit prior to a demolition permit would likely cause a lot of frustration among builders, regardless of whether they are spec or custom home builders.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:05 P.M. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.