

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
SEPTEMBER 24, 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: Tom Bassett-Dilley, Tom Bassett-Dilley Architects for *416 N. Lincoln Ln.*
Brian & Lindsay Landwehr, Owners of *416 N. Lincoln Ln.*
David Schwartz, SFP Properties for *East Country Ln. Townhomes*
Steve Hautzinger, Planning Staff

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FOR SEPTEMBER 10, 2024

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 10, 2024. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 1. SINGLE-FAMILY ADDITION REVIEW**DC# 24-059– 416 N. Lincoln Ln.**

Tom Bassett-Dilley, the architect, and **Brian & Lindsay Landwehr**, the owners, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing a new second-floor addition on an existing single-story residence. An existing attached two-car front load garage will remain. The plans do comply the R-3 single-family zoning requirements. The surrounding context in this location is primarily existing single-story homes with similar scale and style as the subject property. However, Staff feels the design of the proposed addition stands out in a negative way, and the proposed design does not comply with the Single-Family Design Guidelines.

Some of the applicable evaluation criteria in the Design Guidelines include:

- Architectural character as it relates to the neighborhood
- Harmony and compatibility to adjacent structures
- Overall composition and balance of the elevation
- Bulk, massing, and volume

The Design Guidelines also state that “new additions will look like they belong and not dominate or change the character of the original building”. Staff feels the proposed addition has an awkward, lopsided, and random appearance. The design does not fit with the character of the existing house or the style and character of the surrounding homes. The massing looks top heavy and feels out of balance with all the weight on the left side. Staff recommends a revision to the design to better fit with the existing house and the surrounding context. A sketch was included in the Staff report that shows a simpler, more conventional approach to a second-floor addition on a house like this, which includes a simple front-to-back gable, and lining up the windows with the windows and door below.

Staff recommends the Design Commission require revisions and re-review the project.

Mr. Bassett-Dilley gave an overview of the project. When they started this project, the objectives were to get more space for the growing family, changing the home from gas to all electric, and adding solar panels on the roof. They recognize the struggles when adding a two-story addition to a one-story home, which will be tall no matter the design. He showed massing studies that were done that included a flat roof option, a shed roof option, and a gable roof option that seemed more top heavy. They eventually settled on a design that is more dynamic, with an element over the front door that says ‘entry’, and the shed portion primarily facing south for solar.

In response to Staff’s sketch suggestion, Mr. Bassett-Dilley said they felt the mass was really large from the side, and reduces the ability to optimize solar on the home. They have now landed on a design that includes a hip roof that is more in keeping with many of the homes in the neighborhood; however, they still like the idea of accentuating the corner with the gable to say ‘entry’ that mostly creates a horizontal line similar to Staff’s sketch, and produces the mass a little better. Although the windows have not changed in the revised design, they understand Staff’s comments and they are okay with changing the front window if necessary. They hope their approach with the revised design is something the commissioners are comfortable with, and he welcomed any questions.

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

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said he appreciates designs that are edgy and different, and he tries to be open about them. The revised design is traditional, and the front gable is accentuated with panels versus the horizontal siding on the rest of the addition. He is not opposed to the revised design, but he also liked the original design submitted for review tonight; however, he agreed with Staff's concerns about the giant, sloping shed roof. It could work without the element above the front door. He had no further comments at this time.

Commissioner Fitzgerald appreciated the revised design presented tonight better than the design originally submitted because the revised design is more compatible with the existing home. He liked the lower roof pitch above the window over the front door, and he liked the roofline better, and he liked the colors. However, it stills looks like an addition, which he is trying to work through. He asked why the addition is not over the garage and the homeowners explained that the garage is not masonry and it angles back to a smaller setback that is very awkward. Keeping the addition over the original body of the home allows for a simpler structure to keep within their budget. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** said he was not opposed to the corner window of the addition, but felt all the windows should look like they belong on the same home. He had no further comments.

Commissioner Kingsley appreciated the design process the petitioner went through to get to this design, and she understood this is not an easy solution for the homeowners. She agreed that the revised design is somewhat more compatible with the neighborhood, and she liked the corner window that speaks to the existing aesthetic of the home; however, she questioned if it made more sense to change some of the existing elements of the home that are being kept, such as the windows on the first-floor that could relate better to the rest of the windows. She was concerned that the left side of the home looks like a different style than the right side; there are two conflicting designs on the front elevation, and she felt something better could be done to bring it all into one cohesive aesthetic. She understood why the addition is being proposed on the east side, but said that the existing east wall does not line up with the east wall of the addition, and she asked if the wall is cantilevered. **Mr. Bassett-Dilley** said that the wall does hang over by about 1-foot. **Commissioner Kingsley** clarified that the overhang in the back meets the face of the second-floor addition; the fascia of the one-story in the rear matches the elevation on the second-floor, and although she did not mind it this way, she felt the roof on the front might need to change somehow so it hides that overhang a bit more. **Mr. Bassett-Dilley** acknowledged it is a tricky intersection, which is why the fascia was brought up in line with the existing facade there. **Commissioner Kingsley** pointed out that this is visible because of the curve of the street, and she suggested making the porch deeper, adding a small overhang on the roof, or removing the muntins. She loved the proposed colors for the materials; however, if the windows are going to be replaced and most of the gutters, downspouts and fascia as well, then consider a non-white color that is more similar to the colors chosen for the home. She also asked about the material of the columns, and **Mr. Bassett-Dilley** said the columns will be painted the same color as the trim. **Commissioner Kingsley** also suggested tying in the columns to the aesthetic of the home, and eliminating the railings.

Chair Kubow liked the original design submitted for review tonight, which has some playfulness to it and is an attractive design. He said the surrounding neighborhood has a mix of different types of homes, and although this is not a conventional design being proposed, he felt it would be fun to see as a neighbor; it has some pop to it. With a little clean-up in response to the commissioners' comments, he felt the design could get there. He appreciated the re-design in response to Staff's comments, which he felt was successful, but he liked the

original design better because it is more visually interesting to him. He also commended the homeowners for going to an all-electric home, and for adding on to the existing home that is challenging to build on top of.

Commissioner Eckhardt pointed out that the existing small hip roof over the front door is being removed and transferred up to the second-floor addition, which sort of disconnects it from the first-floor; there is not much tying the addition to the lower level of the home. He questioned the idea of considering something similar to Staff's sketch, and the petitioner said that they did consider that design earlier but felt it was competing with the lower level of the home.

Commissioner Eckhardt asked the homeowners which design they preferred. **Mr. Landwehr** replied a combination of the two designs. He explained that the budget does not allow for replacing all the windows at this time; however, they hope to make future renovations and would absolutely remove the existing muntin style windows at that time. Currently, they are trying to find a transitional style that will work with the original home, while not locking them into a style for the future. He explained that part of what drove the unusually steep roof pitch of the addition is that they are trying to maintain the ability to put shingles on the roof at a 3/12 pitch, without raising up the eave. He likes the asymmetry and what can be done with solar on the south roof, and that the home can get to zero energy with efficient heat pumps and solar. He preferred a lower roof slope to allow the gable to be brought down, which has more harmony with the rest of the slopes on the home; however, that would mean going with a membrane roof, which can be done but is more expensive.

Commissioner Kingsley asked if the gable end on the second-floor will be the same color as the siding, and **Mr. Bassett-Dilley** replied that the panel color of the gable is slightly darker than the siding color. **Commissioner Kingsley** was not in love with the gable in the shed or the gable in the hip; it feels like there could be another solution to that without having to add that gable, which could be a nod to the other neighbors. She understood the emphasis on the entry, but felt they are so disconnected that it could be done with materials. She preferred the petitioner consider the comments made tonight by the commissioners and come back with a design they really like. She was only recommending that all the windows be replaced, but consider changing the two windows in the front.

Commissioner Eckhardt was hesitant to send the project back for Staff to resolve with the petitioner because there were a lot of issues and concerns given tonight that should come back to the commissioners to review. He could go with either design at this time; he liked the originally proposed design, but also like the revised design presented tonight, with some changes that were suggested tonight.

Chair Kubow presented the option to continue the project to the next meeting. **Mr. Hautzinger** commented on the quick turnaround time needed to make the next meeting in two weeks. The petitioner said it was good to hear feedback from the commissioners, which helps them, and they can come back with something much more cogent, possibly by the end of the week. **Mr. Hautzinger** said that allowing more time for the petitioner to work on the design and review the minutes from this meeting, as well allow Staff to review a revised design is recommended. **Commissioner Eckhardt** suggested the petitioner submit to Staff a rough sketch of a revised design for initial feedback, to help with the project timeline. The petitioner preferred to carry it through with more than a rough sketch.

Commissioner Fitzgerald reiterated some of the things he sees with the current design; on the north elevation, the second-floor addition seems very tall and abrupt, especially on the right side. He said that the street curves when approaching the home, and on the west elevation, the second-floor seems even bigger in the original design. The roof is taller than

the roof on the first-floor, and the walls are taller towards the front of the home to where it is on the first-floor. It seems like there is more roof and more wall when moving to the front of the home, which he wanted to see softened. **Mr. Landwehr** said this is the first time they are seeing the hip roof design, and they have not really talked about it. He agreed to continue working on the design and return to the commission in a month.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO CONTINUE THE REVIEW OF 416 N. LINCOLN LANE (DC#24-059) TO THE DESIGN COMMISSIONER MEETING ON OCTOBER 22, 2024.

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

ITEM 2. MULTI-FAMILY REVIEW**DC#24-058 – East Country Lane Townhomes – 3310 N. Old Arlington Heights Rad.**

David Schwartz, representing *SFP Properties*, was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing a new 24-unit townhome development on an existing vacant lot located at the northwest corner of Old Arlington Heights Road and East Country Lane. This project requires Plan Commission review and Village Board approval for Subdivision, Rezoning, PUD (Planned Unit Development), and a Density Variation. Because this project is going to the Plan Commission, the role of the Design Commission is limited to review of the architectural design only.

The proposed development will consist of four identical, three-story buildings, each with 6-units. The subject property is approximately 1.84 acres (80,150 square feet). To the south of the property are the Lexington Heritage townhomes consisting of nine buildings, which was approved by the Design Commission in 2016.

Overall, Staff feels the proposed design is nicely done. The massing, colors, and materials fit well with the context of the existing Lexington Heritage Townhomes across the street. The front and rear elevations are nicely designed and detailed with a variety of siding types that add interest to the design without being busy. However, there are two concerns for the Design Commission to evaluate. The main concern is the side (end) elevations which look monotonous with too much board & batten siding. It is recommended to raise the stone base to align with the rear elevation across the first-floor, which will help to break down the scale of the wall. Another item to evaluate is the proposed asymmetrical layout. Staff suggests moving the side-by-side entry doors to the center of the building to create a symmetrical and balanced appearance instead of the proposed asymmetrical composition. A Symmetry Study of this suggestion was provided in the Staff report. Staff recommends approval of the proposed design, with consideration of the two items for the commissioners to evaluate.

Mr. Schwartz was receptive to Staff's suggestions, which he felt looked better, as well as the idea to wrap the stone onto the side elevations. He said the buildings were designed with the neighborhood context in mind, but with a slightly more modern design approach. He had no further comments.

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 that overall, the petitioner has done a nice job with the design, making the buildings somewhat different than the surrounding developments. With regards to the entries, she asked if it will be a zero barrier entry, and **Mr. Schwartz** said that final grading has not been worked out but the intent is for a stoop at the front entry, but not a half flight of stairs. **Commissioner Kingsley** agreed with Staff's suggestion for symmetry across the building, and she asked the petitioner to clarify his comment about stone on the sides of the buildings. **Mr. Schwartz** said that stone could wrap around the side elevations up to the first-floor level, similar to the rear elevation, which **Commissioner Kingsley** supported. **Commissioner Kingsley** also asked if there will be any affordable units in the development, and **Mr. Schwartz** said there will be one affordable unit within the 24 total units. **Commissioner Kingsley** reviewed the colors and materials presented, and suggested the materials be simplified, with a suggestion to eliminate the horizontal siding on the front elevation.

Commissioner Eckhardt liked the design being proposed. He said the stone pilasters below

the six windows are nicely detailed, but the U-shaped stone pilasters that go up to the top of the second-floor windows feel awkward. On the side elevations, the spacing of the reveal strips on the center portion of the elevation should be revised to somehow tie in to the sill of the windows, bringing it all together. He liked the bay window bump out on the sides of the building, and had no concerns with the rest of the design. **Mr. Schwartz** agreed with the suggestions.

Commissioner Fitzgerald liked the project and said it is very nice overall. He agreed with the comments about the U-shaped stone on the front elevation, which he felt was a bit awkward; however, he would not vote against it as shown, and he was unsure how to improve it. He liked the faux wood siding underneath the windows on the front elevation, and he liked the color; it is interesting and adds another element, and he liked the idea that one color is being brought out of the design. He also liked the idea of adding more stone on the side elevations; however, he was bothered by how the gables on the rear elevation end in the middle of a window. He suggested changing the pitch on the rear gables to make the gable look like it is over the section of the two windows, which he acknowledged would be different than the gable on the front elevation. **Mr. Schwartz** commented that this would complicate the front-to-back roof structure, but he was not opposed to the idea. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** had no further comments and said this is a beautiful project.

Chair Kubow agreed with the comments given. It is a very beautiful and attractive building design that compliments the adjacent Lexington Heritage townhomes, but is a much improved, more current design. He agreed with both of Staff's comments, and he pointed out that it appears as though 'Monterey Taupe' is being used for all five materials in the 3D rendering, versus the 2D rendering that seems more consistent and focused on 'Aged Pewter'; there is definitely a different color between the 3D and the 2D renderings. **Mr. Schwartz** acknowledged this and said the intent is to keep it to just one color, and he liked the idea to use only one type of panel material, rather than the horizontal siding. He might introduce some panel siding on the rear elevations, instead of either the board and batten or the horizontal siding. **Chair Kubow** said he liked U-shaped stone detail on the front elevation, and **Commissioner Eckhardt** said he was okay with it as proposed.

Mr. Hautzinger asked for clarification on what was decided about the siding colors. The petitioner agreed to omit the Monterey Taupe color.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE EAST COUNTRY LANE TOWNHOMES TO BE LOCATED AT 3310 N. OLD ARLINGTON HEIGHTS ROAD. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON AND SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 8/13/24, 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 TO STUDY THE REAR ELEVATION END UNIT ROOF PITCH, TO PROVIDE FOR A GUTTER LINE THAT DOES NOT SIT ABOVE A WINDOW, TO BE SUBMITTED TO STAFF FOR REVIEW AND FINAL APPROVAL, OR RETURN TO THE DESIGN COMMISSION.**
- 2. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE 'MONTEREY TAUPE' COLOR BE ELIMINATED FROM THE COLOR/MATERIAL PALETTE.**
- 3. A REQUIREMENT TO ADD STONE ON THE SIDE ELEVATIONS TO BE AT THE SAME HEIGHT AS THE REAR ELEVATION.**
- 4. A RECOMMENDATION TO STUDY THE SIDE ELEVATION REVEAL JOINTS TO**

DETERMINE A PATTERN THAT IS MORE IN KEEPING WITH THE RYTHYM OF THE WINDOWS, THE WINDOW HEADS AND THE SILLS, TO BE SUBMITTED TO STAFF FOR REVIEW AND FINAL 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.

Commissioner Kingsley clarified that the board and batten reveals on the side elevation should turn and be on the rear elevation as well. She also said the motion did not include the elimination of the lap siding on the two outside bays on the front elevation, which the petitioner stated he would do. She suggested this be a recommendation in the motion and left up to the petitioner to determine whether to keep the lap siding as proposed or eliminate it.

Commissioner Eckhardt liked the lap siding as currently shown, but was not opposed to a recommendation that the petitioner consider replacing the horizontal siding on the two end units with the larger panels that are shown in the four interior elevations between the rooflines.

Mr. Hautzinger said that the revised configuration of the units to make a symmetrical front elevation was not included in the motion. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said the petitioner previously stated his support for this change, and he amended the motion as follows:

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

6. A REQUIREMENT TO CHANGE THE DOOR CONFIGURATION ON THE FRONT ELEVATION TO MOVE THE DOUBLE DOORS TO THE MIDDLE OF THE BUILDING TO CREATE A SYMMETRICAL APPEARANCE.

Mr. Schwartz said he was good with this change, but asked that it be a recommendation instead of a requirement because there might be a reason why the Architect designed the door configuration as shown. **Commissioner Eckhart** said the amendment can be modified as follows:

6. A REQUIREMENT TO CHANGE THE DOOR CONFIGURATION ON THE FRONT ELEVATION TO MOVE THE DOUBLE DOORS TO THE MIDDLE OF THE BUILDING TO CREATE A SYMMETRICAL APPEARANCE, UNLESS THE PLAN DOES NOT ALLOW FOR THAT CHANGE.

COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY SECONDED THE AMENDED 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.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:45 P.M. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.