

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
OCTOBER 22, 2024

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

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

Members Absent: John Fitzgerald

Also Present: Denny Burke, Tom Bassett-Dilley Architects for 416 N. Lincoln Ln.
Denise Reyes, representing *Full Circle Communities*
Therese Thompson & Zubair Ahamed, Cordogan Clark for *Full Circle*
Terron Wright, The Architects Partnership Ltd. for *Chase Bank*
Mayor Thomas Hayes, Village of Arlington Heights
Trustee Tom Schwingbeck
Steve Hautzinger, Planning Staff

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FOR SEPTEMBER 24, 2024

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 24, 2024. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 1. AWARD PRESENTATION**2024 Alan F. Bombick Excellence in Design Award**

Mayor Hayes thanked the commissioners for the invitation to join them tonight and for their dedication and commitment to keeping this community looking aesthetically pleasing over the years. Tonight is a special occasion and he is pleased to present the annual Alan F. Bombick award for excellence in design. He personally knew Alan, who was a founding member of the Design Commission, serving on the Commission for 21 years, from 1995 to 2016. In memory of Alan's passing in June of 2016 and in honor of his contributions to the aesthetic growth of Arlington Heights, the annual Alan F. Bombick award for excellence in design was established. This award is intended to promote and celebrate outstanding architectural design contributions in the Village of Arlington Heights, and it is awarded each year to one single-family project and one commercial or multi-family project.

Commissioner Eckhardt thanked Mayor Hayes for his kind words tonight, which mean a lot to this commission. He also thanked Trustee Schwingbeck for being here tonight, and the other members of the Design Commission and Steve Hautzinger for their on-going work and dedication to the community. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said he and Alan Bombick were founding members of the Design Commission since 1995, and in the 7.5 years and 100+ meetings since Alan's passing, there have been many times that he has sat here and wondered what Alan would say about a project. Alan was very special to this commission and a great colleague. He thanked Alan's family for being here tonight, which included Alan's wife Diane, and his children and grandchildren.

Chair Kubow presented the annual award for the single-family category; 129 S. Vail Avenue, the Ericksen residence; Thom Budzik, architect, and Mark Ericksen, owner and builder. **Chair Kubow** said this project was chosen because it takes to heart the Village Design Guidelines, which this commission encourages architects to use as a guide when designing homes and additions. This new home follows context, the materiality is simplistic but very attractive, the detached garage fits context, and the front porch is very welcoming. The award was presented to the recipients present.

Chair Kubow presented the annual award for the commercial category, which is a unique award this year because it includes multiple commercial renovations completed by the by the same owner/general contractor, Joe Zivoli, and his architect, Julio Rufo. The project locations include 500-550 W. Northwest Highway; 1005-1015 S. Arlington Heights Road; 1050 S. Arlington Heights Road; and 1141 S. Arlington Heights Road. The award was presented to the recipients. **Mr. Zivoli** thanked the commission for the award, as well as Steve Hautzinger for his help in getting started with these projects, and his architect, Julio Rufo. **Mr. Zivoli** said that as a result of the renovations, all four of these projects have almost no vacancy, and the quality of tenants has improved. He hopes to do this one more time in the future, this is his passion. **Mr. Rufo** appreciated the award and said that he has been collaborating with Joe on projects like these for more than 25 years, and he enjoys giving old buildings new life, instead of tearing them down.

Diane Bombick-Murray spoke about how she remembers how Alan would prepare for Design Commission meetings by reviewing the packet of drawings that would come in advance of the meetings. He really enjoyed those collegial relationships and his service to the community, and would share some of those projects with her when they walked or drove through the community. She thanked the Design Commission and Mayor for these awards.

ITEM 2. SINGLE-FAMILY ADDITION RE-REVIEW**DC# 24-059– 416 N. Lincoln Ln.**

Denny Burke, representing *Tom Bassett-Dilley Architects* was 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. This project was previously reviewed by the Design Commission on September 24, 2024, at which time it was CONTINUED due to concerns regarding the proposed design. A summary of issues discussed at that meeting is as follows:

Staff raised concerns that the design of the proposed addition stood out in a negative way, primarily due to the lopsided massing and random appearance. Staff felt that the design did not fit with the character of the existing house or the neighborhood, and did not comply with the Single-Family Design Guidelines. Staff recommended revising and simplifying the design to better fit with the style and character of the existing house and the neighborhood.

In response to Staff's comments, the petitioner presented a revised design with a hip roof instead of the asymmetrical gable. The Design Commission generally agreed with Staff's concerns, and they felt that the revised hip roof design was more compatible with the existing house. However, additional design concerns were discussed:

- **Massing.** Despite the revised hip roof design, there was still concern expressed about the addition looking tall and abrupt.
- **Windows.** There was discussion about the random windows sizes and styles, and it was encouraged that all of the windows should look like they belong together.
- **Porch Roof.** There was discussion about the awkward massing of the porch roof return down the side of the house, and it was encouraged to be studied and refined to better tie in with the cantilevered second floor addition.
- **Porch Columns and Railing.** It was encouraged to detail the new porch columns to fit with the aesthetic of the home, and to consider eliminating the short porch railings

Mr. Hautzinger said that the petitioner has resubmitted the same hip roof design that was reviewed at the last meeting with the following minor changes:

- **Massing.** The massing does not appear to have been changed.
- **Windows.** The decorative grids have been removed from the first-floor windows and entry door on the front elevation.
- **Porch Roof.** The porch roof has not been changed.
- **Porch Columns and Railing.** The porch columns look slightly modified with a vertical joint up the center of each column, and the existing porch railing has been removed.

Overall, Staff feels the hip roof massing is a big improvement from the original asymmetrical gable. In regards to the other details, Staff recommends revising the second-floor windows on the front elevation to align with the existing windows below for a more cohesive appearance. It is also recommended to add a gable end to the side of the front porch to give a balanced appearance to the front elevation and to resolve the awkward tiny roof return with the second-floor cantilever. The sketch in the Staff report illustrates how this would look. Staff recommends the Design Commission approve the revised design, with consideration to requiring the suggestions given by Staff.

Denny Burke said that comments from the last review were taken back for discussion, and a few more massing ideas were studied for the volume over the door, and after talking with the homeowners, they ultimately decided they like the hip roof with the gable accent the best. Changes include eliminating the existing porch railing, bringing down the columns so the beam now rests on top of the columns and introducing a ½-inch reveal underneath the beam on top of the columns, which also runs vertically in each column so the column width could be bulked up to give more presence. With respect to the windows, because the street is angled, the home is often viewed askew, not as a straight-on facade; therefore, the angled window and the hipped porch roof around to the corner speak to that. They are also playing up to the existing asymmetry with the home. With regards to the rebuilt porch roof returning around the side, they studied that quite a bit, and where they ultimately landed in this regard is the function of current setbacks and the desire to keep the massing on that side facade from feeling too massive. Their concern with gabling that returned roof is that it gets quite high, and there is some cladding there that is a bit orphaned from the rest of the home and not really tied into anything. The idea of a continuous eave and gutter is more aesthetically pleasing to them. They hope these changes are responsive to the previous comments that were made, and welcomed any comments at this time.

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

The commissioner summarized their comments. **Commissioner Seyer** said he was not at the previous review of this project, but he agreed that this is an improvement based on the original submittal and he likes where it is headed. He felt the windows are still a bit odd, but if that is the corner expression that the homeowners want, then he would not make them do something different. He did not see anything else that appears problematic. He likes the recommended revised design that Staff presented in their report, but understood if the homeowners don't agree. He wants to push the homeowners in a direction that they are comfortable with, and he wanted to hear the other commissioners' comments.

Commissioner Eckhardt reviewed the proposed materials and asked about the color of the columns, which **Mr. Burke** said will be white. **Commissioner Eckhardt** had concerns about the lack of a base and capital on the porch columns; there is no beam expressed, and it needs something more. He liked that the columns are being articulated with the reveal, which will create some shadow, and he appreciated the changes made to the front elevation and agreed with Commissioner Seyer's comments. The home wants to be a little modern with some of the elements being proposed, and that is okay. Staff's recommended design is sort of predictable and typical, which is not what the homeowners want; therefore he could support the elevation and roofline being shown tonight. He reiterated his concerns about the columns, and had no other concerns.

Commissioner Kingsley appreciated the consideration given to the previous comments from the commissioners. The design being presented tonight is a benefit to the home and the homeowners will like it much more than the previous. She liked the revised design and agreed with Commissioner Eckhardt's concerns about the columns. Having something on the top and base of the columns, and having it hit the beam at the right spot also helps quite a bit; that detail has to be looked at. She also suggested no vertical line on the columns. **Commissioner Kingsley** said she is okay with the corner window as proposed on the front elevation, and she preferred raising up something on the side porch, because she was not a fan of the little triangle piece of siding on the east elevation. She liked the proposed colors, and recommended looking at the details of the vertical panels on the front and as they wrap. She had no further comments.

Chair Kubow agreed with the comments made by the other commissioners. He liked the original design, it was playful and fun and a bit unusual; however, he understood the other commissioners' comments and he felt that long term, maybe this current design is better. He also appreciated Staff's suggested drawing, but what the petitioner is presenting tonight is a very good compromise. He had no other comments.

The commissioners' concerns about the columns were discussed. **Mr. Burke** explained that the column does stick proud of the beam, which is set inboard from the fascia about 14-inches. The roof overhangs the beam by 14-16-inches, there is the fascia, some soffit, it steps back to the beam, and the columns are about 7-inches by 7-inches, where the beam is roughly 6 x 10. With regards to the capital, there is a little reveal (1/2-inch) between top of column, underside of beam, and the same type of detail on the bottom of the post, about 1-inch standoff. He was not opposed to amplifying that a little bit more with extra trim or flat stock. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said that after seeing the enlarged drawing, he can now see the reveals, which he likes and is comfortable with; however, it could be made slightly bigger.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY HOME LOCATED AT 416 N. LINCOLN LANE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE REVISED ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 10/9/24, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATION AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING:

- 1. THAT THE PETITIONER ACKNOWLEDGES THAT THE COLUMNS ON THE FRONT ELEVATION WILL HAVE REVEALS AT THE TOP AND BOTTOM, AND THEY WILL BE DETAILED APPROPRIATELY TO CREATE THE INTENDED SHADOW LINE AS SHOWN.**
- 2. THIS REVIEW DEALS WITH ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, NOR REPRESENT ANY TACIT APPROVAL OR SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED LAND USE OR ANY OTHER ZONING AND/OR LAND USE ISSUES OR DECISIONS THAT STEM FROM ZONING, BUILDING, SIGNAGE OR ANY OTHER REVIEWS. IN ADDITION TO THE NORMAL TECHNICAL REVIEW, PERMIT DRAWINGS WILL BE REVIEWED FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE DESIGN COMMISSION AND ANY OTHER COMMISSION OR BOARD APPROVAL CONDITIONS. IT IS THE PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO INCORPORATE ALL REQUIREMENTS LISTED ON THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS INTO THE PERMIT DRAWINGS, AND TO ENSURE THAT BUILDING PERMIT PLANS AND SIGN PERMIT PLANS COMPLY WITH ALL ZONING CODE, BUILDING CODE AND SIGN CODE REQUIREMENTS.**
- 3. COMPLIANCE WITH ALL FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES.**

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

ITEM 3. INSTITUTIONAL RE-REVIEW 2**DC#23-029 – Full Circle Communities/Grace Terrace – 1519-1625 S. Arlington Heights Rd.**

Denise Reyes, representing *Full Circle Communities*, **Therese Thompson**, and **Zubair Ahamed**, representing *Cordogan Clark*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. The petitioner is seeking approval of the architectural design for a new two-story supportive housing development with 25 residential apartment units. The scope of the Design Commission's purview tonight is to review the new architectural design of the building; the colors of the brick, the detailing, trim, and features that establish the way the building looks. All matters related to zoning, such as the use of the building, the site design, site lighting, parking, traffic, the building size and height, the number of stories, the orientation, are not under the purview of the Design Commission and have already been discussed by the Plan Commission and Village Board. After tonight's meeting, there will be an ordinance drafted that will go before the Village Board for their final consideration.

Mr. Hautzinger provided background regarding the previous Design Commission review of the project. This project was originally designed as a three-story building with the main entrance and parking area on the east side of the building. The architectural design of the three-story building was approved by the Design Commission on November 28, 2023. The project was reviewed by the Village Board on December 4, 2023, and as a result of that meeting, the petitioner was directed to explore a revised two-story design with the parking and main entrance located on the west side of the building, facing Arlington Heights Road. A conceptual two-story schematic site plan was presented to the Village Board on August 19, 2024, but the design of the two-story building was not prepared or presented at that meeting, and the Village Board directed the petitioner to go back to the Design Commission for a re-review of the new design, prior to consideration of an Ordinance by the Village Board.

Key design changes to the previous design include:

- Building re-orientated so the front faces Arlington Heights Rd
- Building changed from 3-story to 2-story
- Building length increased
- Staggered façade, per Staff's request

The proposed new two-story architectural design is essentially a modified version of the previously approved three-story design. The new front entry canopy has good scale and proportions, and the symmetrical facade has a well-balanced appearance. All of the same materials and colors are being used, with the exception of one siding color change from "Cobblestone" to a very similar "Pearl Gray", and a new small amount of "Iron Gray" siding as an accent material. The massing of the building includes a jog in the floor plan which works very well to break up the new longer building wall, adding interest to the design. Overall, the proposed design is nicely done.

Staff's only comment on the design noted in the Staff Report is that the roof plan includes two small notches along the front of the building which seem awkwardly narrow and unresolved. However, the petitioner has explained to Staff that this building is using a finned rainwater disbursement system in lieu of a traditional gutters and downspouts, but the two small notches will have a custom gutter detail with a dedicated downspout in the corner of the recess. After speaking with the petitioner about this detail, Staff is no longer concerned about it, and Staff recommends approval of the building design as submitted.

Ms. Reyes said that since they were before the Design Commission a year ago, there have been several commission meetings with the Plan Commission and Village Board, and they have continued to receive feedback regarding the orientation of the building and the height of the building. They have taken that feedback and re-designed the building as seen here tonight for a 2-story building. They are here tonight to present those changes, and she introduced Zubair Ahamed who reviewed the changes that were made.

Mr. Ahamed said that after feedback from the community and the Village Board, they have thoughtfully and creatively implemented the following design modifications. In terms of design adjustment, since the last review by the Design Commission, the building and the parking lot layout has been re-oriented. Based on input from the adjacent neighbors regarding privacy concerns, sound, and building height, the design has been changed from 3-story to 2-story design, while maintaining all of the project's key features. In collaboration with Staff, a staggered facade has been introduced to break up the building mass to avoid a monolithic appearance and create a more engaging street presence. To preserve the same functionality and unit count, the building footprint has been expanded to ensure they still meet the housing need, while respecting the scale and context of the area. The eave has been proportionately increased to align with the revised 2-story structure, which enhances the building aesthetics and complements its length. The 2-story design features a proportionately greater amount of face brick compared to the original 3-story design, adding a sense of permanence and enhancing the building's architecture. Overall, they have maintained the Design Commission's earlier comments, ensuring that the revision upholds the original design intent and architectural quality. The same materials and colors as previously proposed are being used, with the addition of two new colors to enhance the west facade. This color adjustment emphasizes the standard design and adds depth to the building's exterior. A lighter color called "Pearl Gray" will be used in the foreground to create a clear and welcoming appearance, whereas a darker tone color "Iron Grey" will be used in the background, which is strategically used to reinforce the sense of depth and dimensionality within the facade. These changes not only respond to all the feedback they have received, but also elevate the overall architectural expression of the project, ensuring it aligns with the community's vision.

Chair Kubow asked if there was any public comment on the project and there was response from those in the audience. He also reiterated that the focus tonight is on the architecture of the building.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Anna Schmitz, a resident who lives about 1500 feet from the project. She said that there are no first-floor windows at the north end on the front of the building, which is not symmetrical with the south end. She asked what is in that area. **Mr. Hautzinger** replied that there is a mechanical room located in that area, which is the same as the previous 3-story design. Ms. Schmitz asked if that could be moved so it looks symmetrical and not so much like an eastern bloc building.

Therese Thompson said that all mechanicals, electrical, and all utility functions are located in approximately the same area as originally proposed. It was probably not as noticeable on the north end of the building when it was a 3-story building and there were 2-stories of units above it because there were more windows above that blank area on the first-floor. There is no practical way to change the current plan, from a functional standpoint, all the utility spaces belong together for ease of maintenance because several of them are accessed by the drive-in and the service door on the first-floor. Mechanical access to outdoor maintenance equipment and trash collection is all at that end of the building and needs to all remain at the same end of the building. She did not see a way to distribute those utility spaces throughout

the building.

Linda Dustin, 404 E. Parkview Circle. She lives about a block from the project. From the last meeting when the elevation was showed, and even though this says a 2-story building, this is being built about 12-feet higher than her neighbors' yards. So technically for her, it will seem like it is a 3-story in terms of shading, lighting, etc. coming from the west. She wants to emphasize that, if that has anything to do with what the design looks like, and she does not like that. **Chair Kubow** said this is a good comment, but it comes down to the purview of the Village Board with respect to zoning, and he encouraged the resident to express those concerns to them. He reiterated that this commission only focuses on the architecture.

Commissioner Kingsley commented that according to the drawings, the eave height on the revised 2-story design is approximately 10-feet less than the previous 3-story design.

Keith Moens, a resident, said that the aesthetics of the building at 2-stories fits very well where it is at now. It looks well balanced, and the appearance across the building with all the lines and massing works to break up the new longer building including the jog that was put in. It looks very well done and designed by the petitioner. He asked that the commission approve this design as submitted.

Mayur Shah, a resident who lives a block away on Haven Street, wanted to talk about the aesthetic consistency of the building and how it fits with the other non-residential buildings surrounding it on the south and on the north. He presented a context exhibit that he prepared that shows how the proposed 2-story building will look with the surrounding non-residential, one-story buildings, and he said that the 2-story building being proposed for this site is not aesthetically consistent. The neighbors previously gave reasons why this project should not be on this site; however, they are putting all that behind them and now saying that there is a vulnerable population that needs this building to be here, and they understand that. In their passion to try to bring all the facts that they would have expected the Village to bring in but never did, they did their due diligence to bring in all the facts, present details to the Village Board, but it went nowhere, and instead, it painted a wrong picture of the neighbors as being insensitive, and also demonized them in the eyes of the families who want their loved ones to be here. So they went back and tried to figure out what went wrong and whether they can persuade and come up with some compromise. The compromise that the neighbors painstakingly came up with is the following: Can this be a one-story building, where it still fits the needs of those families who need their loved ones to be here, fits aesthetically, reduces the density that they are worried about, and for all the other reasons that he won't talk about here tonight. This site abuts single-family homes behind it, and this is what he wants to bring here tonight.

Celina Micho, 125 E. Emerson St, lives directly behind the site. She asked about the location of the air conditioning units and had concerns about how the units will look, the noise from the units, and lighting from the building onto her property. She also had concerns about the adequate landscaping along the rear property line, her home is located 16' feet from the rear property line. The petitioner replied that the a/c units will all be on the roof and will be screened. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said that the building will be located about 100' from the rear property line, and there are code requirements for screening of the rooftop units on the roof, which will help reduce sound. The sound concerns can be further discussed with the Village Board.

Arlen Gould, 502 E. Burr Oak. In his opinion, this new building is not in a residential area, it is on Arlington Heights Road, which is a major industrial street. He said it is a great looking building and a terrific contribution to the Village of Arlington Heights. The concept works, it helps people with disabilities to live a normal life, that is the purpose of the building. He

thanked the commissioners for listening and for their previous vote on the project, which he hopes will be the same tonight. He also pointed out that there are massive trees and bushes located around the property to help mitigate sound and contribute to the good look of the building.

Anna Schmitz said that the trees being added will not be 30' tall, but rather 8' tall trees that will take 10 to 15 years to grow to that height, and there are homes located across Arlington Heights Road and right behind this site; this is a residential neighborhood and she has lived here for 40 years. Celina Micho said she remembers this area when it was all single-family homes, and then the zoning changed to allow office buildings.

Chair Kubow closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Kingsley** appreciated the petitioner revising the design and listening to what the community had to say about the project. The change from a 3-story to a 2-story building helps quite a bit, as does the parking now being on the west side. She liked the longer building and larger overhangs, and commented about the two red doors on the front, which should be painted the same color as the siding because the only red on the facade is the brick. In regards to the two narrow notches in the roof plan, she cautioned that the color of the downspouts should be chosen wisely to hide them since they are the only ones. **Commissioner Kingsley** also commented about the siding colors that were chosen, which are darker than the previous submittal. **Mr. Ahamed** clarified that there are 2 additional colors being proposed, a lighter tone and a darker tone, but the darker one is just used in the recesses. **Commissioner Kingsley** did not mind the intensity of the colors, but felt the Cobblestone and Pearl Gray were not compatible because one is warm and the other is cool; she suggested the petitioner reconsider the Pearl Gray color.

Commissioner Eckhardt agreed with Commissioner Kingsley about the red color of the doors on the west elevation; the color should be dark to match the wall color. With regards to the concerns about the two new colors not being compatible, he suggested the petitioner create a mock-up of the colors for Staff to review. However, he was okay either way with the new colors. He liked the revised design being presented tonight and felt a lot of things have been resolved; it is a better building at 2-stories. In terms of 2-story buildings, this building is not as tall as it could be either, it is modest and the height is close to being code complaint for a single-family home. He liked the design.

Commissioner Seyer agreed with Commissioner Kingsley's concerns that the Pearl Gray color and the Cobblestone color do not work together; something needs to change if they are going to be adjacent to each other. He also agreed that the red doors should be changed to a darker gray color to what is adjacent to them. He felt the building design has gotten better and the materiality could use some improvement, which he felt Staff could approve.

Chair Kubow agreed with the comments from the other commissioners, and he commended the petitioner on the changes that were made; reducing the height of the building and maintaining the aesthetic. He had no other comments.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED DESIGN FOR GRACE TERRACE TO BE LOCATED AT 1519-1625 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS ROAD. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON AND SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE REVISED TWO-STORY ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 10/3/24, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATION AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL

REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING:

1. A REQUIREMENT THAT EITHER THE 'COBBLESTONE' OR THE 'PEARL GRAY' COLOR BE REVISED TO ENSURE THAT BOTH COLORS ARE EITHER WARM OR COOL, TO BE REVIEWED BY STAFF.
2. A REQUIREMENT TO REVISE THE FOUR PAINTED DOORS ON THE FIRST-FLOOR TO BE ONE OF THE GRAY COLORS THAT ARE ADJACENT, TO BE REVIEWED BY STAFF.
3. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE COLOR OF THE ROOFTOP UNIT SCREENING WALLS MATCH THE COLOR OF THE ROOF, TO BE REVIEWED BY STAFF.
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.
5. COMPLIANCE WITH ALL FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES.

Commissioner Eckhardt suggested including language in the motion to assist the neighbors on their mechanical equipment noise concerns; language that includes attention to sound deadening board on the inside of the rooftop mechanical screen wall and an effort to knock down potential sound coming from the HVAC units on the roof. He wanted to see that this issue was addressed by the commissioners because it is important for the neighbors who live behind the site. **Mr. Hautzinger** stated that the Village's Design Guidelines do require rooftop equipment to be screened with sound absorbing materials. **Commissioner Eckhardt** wanted to emphasize the fact that the Design Commission is aware of this requirement and that this might be an instance to pay particular attention to it. **Chair Kubow** said it has been noted as part of the Design Guidelines and the minutes tonight.

COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY AMENDED THE MOTION TO ADD THE FOLLOWING:

6. THAT THE PETITIONER SUBMIT TO THE VILLAGE HOW THEY INTEND TO INCORPORATE SOUND DEADENING MATERIALS TO MEET THE VILLAGE REQUIREMENTS FOR RTU SCREENING.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT SECONDED THE AMENDED MOTION.

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

ITEM 4. COMMERCIAL REVIEW**DC# 24-051 – Chase Bank – 1 N. Dunton Ave.**

Terron Wright, representing *The Architects Partnership Ltd*, was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing exterior modifications to the existing Chase Bank building in the Downtown. The primary change is to convert all of the existing turquoise-colored elements on the building to a dark nickel color. The existing turquoise metal fascia panels and white metal coping will be replaced with new dark nickel aluminum composite metal panels and coping. Three existing turquoise metal entrance canopies will be replaced with new dark nickel metal panels, and all of the existing turquoise metal columns will be painted dark nickel to match the new metal panels. The existing orange brick and white winds/storefronts are proposed to remain.

The subject property is in a prominent highly visible Downtown location. The existing turquoise color and geometric patterned fascia on the building have a dated appearance. Overall, the proposed new metal panels and color scheme work well with the existing brick and storefront, and the new color scheme would be a nice refresh and update for the building. Staff does not object to the design of the proposed refresh, but Staff does have other concerns that should be addressed:

1. **Existing Drive-Through.** The existing bank drive-through takes up a significant amount of space along Campbell Street, which is not the best use of valuable Downtown street level space. The petitioner was encouraged to eliminate and infill the drive-through with new usable storefront space. The petitioner could also consider relocating their business to a new location to allow the subject property to be redeveloped to a higher and better use.
2. **Blank South Wall.** Another concern with the existing building is the large blank brick wall along Campbell Street which is not pedestrian friendly. The petitioner was encouraged to open up the brick wall with new storefront windows to enhance the appearance along the sidewalk.
3. **Rooftop Mechanical Screening.** Exterior mechanical equipment is required to be screened from public view. The existing building does not have a parapet wall, and there are numerous rooftop mechanical units which have no screening. The mechanical units are particularly visible from Evergreen and Dunton Avenue. The petitioner was encouraged to add a continuous screen around the perimeter of the roof to fully screen all of the units.

Mr. Hautzinger stated that the petitioner was not agreeable to address any of the above issues, which the Design Commission should discuss and evaluate. It was noted that since this project does not require Plan Commission review and approval, the Design Commission can look at other elements of the project, such as landscaping.

The petitioner is proposing to keep all of the existing landscaping, which overall is in good condition, except for the removal of 16 'Black Chokeberry' shrubs along the parking lot which are in poor condition. It is recommended that those removed shrubs be replaced with new shrubs, as well as infilling existing gaps, to provide a continuous row of shrubs along the parking lot. Additionally, per code, all parking areas are required to be screened along the street frontage. There is a small existing empty landscaping bed on the west end of the property adjacent to the parking lot driveway. It is recommended that the existing bed be planted with Daylilies. There is an existing fenced trash enclosure that will remain, and there

are no changes to the existing signage proposed at this time.

Overall, Staff is asking the Design Commission to evaluate the proposal, keeping in mind staff's suggestions as summarized in the staff report.

Mr. Wright said Chase Bank is looking to bring this building into the 21st century, it is long overdue for an update. They looked at Staff's comments about rooftop screening and landscaping, in addition to adding glazing on Campbell Street, but this is a budgetary concern that needs to be discussed internally with Chase Bank on how or if those recommendations can be incorporated into the project.

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

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Eckhardt** was glad to see updates being proposed for this building. When he initially looked at the project, he questioned why the white spandrel panels were not being eliminated, which would make the entire building more of an international grade building. The white and the dark nickel colors are a nice contrast and help to accentuate the middle floor, the top floor, and the cap at the top. He asked about the artwork shown in the windows on the north elevation and the petitioner said it is marketing material on the inside of the glass, which **Commissioner Eckhardt** was against. **Mr. Hautzinger** stated that this window signage is not code compliant and should be removed; window signage cannot exceed 20% window coverage in the Downtown. **Commissioner Eckhardt** liked the changes being proposed for the building, and said that it is not this commissions' position to make a petitioner do more work than they want to do. This building has been here a long time, it is what it is, and the drive-thru is important and should not be eliminated. He liked the rhythm of the reveals, with the heavier panel on the bottom and smaller one on top.

Commissioner Seyer was happy to see the existing turquoise color go away so he was in favor of the project and giving a nice, fresh look to a prominent building in the Downtown. He wanted to keep as many of the existing hedges as possible, because they help to shield the drive-through on the parking side. He also wanted to see them replaced if they are dead, which is a minor cost.

Commissioner Kingsley said she is probably the only one that likes the turquoise color and the existing dentil details on the top of the building; however, she understood that the building is being updated. She loved the dark color chosen for the building that is very classic; however, the color will come off as being warm black. This dark color in contrast with the white color will make the white appear very stark, and she suggested either toning down the dark color or bringing up the white to be a light grey. She asked if the fascia at the top of the building is getting taller, and **Mr. Wright** said it is not. **Commissioner Kingsley** also said there were too many joints on the fascia, and she preferred there be less joints for a more horizontal than vertical look. **Mr. Wright** said this could be taken into consideration as they move forward with the project.

Commissioner Kingsley further stated that the step up on the roof behind the fascia looks grey or black in the renderings, but it appears to be white in the aerial. **Mr. Wright** was unsure if this will be visible or not without drawing a wall section and a site line study to verify; it does appear from grade that the step up will be visible, and this could be addressed further as the project moves forward. **Commissioner Kingsley** said it might be okay that it stays white, but it should be studied.

Commissioner Eckhardt asked Staff if the scope of the project is substantial enough to

require rooftop mechanical screening, because screening will not change the visibility of the roof from the taller, surrounding buildings. He liked the sleek lines shown in the drawing, but it did not resolve the matter that screening may be required for the rooftop mechanical equipment, and if the rooftop equipment is screened, it will change the proportions of the entire building. **Mr. Wright** replied that they are concerned about wind load and what needs to be done with the existing roof membrane to allow for rooftop screening. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said that individual unit screens could be a nightmare, and **Commissioner Kingsley** added that individual unit screens could look worse than no screens. **Commissioner Eckhardt** reiterated that it will be up to Staff to determine if adding rooftop mechanical screens will be required or not, and he is sympathetic to not doing too much because the building has been there for so long and the petitioner is making a big improvement to the building. **Mr. Wright** said that screening would probably add another 10-feet, and **Commissioner Eckhardt** said that adding even just 4-feet will be a significant expense.

Commissioner Kingsley was in support of Staff's suggestion to add windows on the south elevation along Campbell Street to improve pedestrian friendliness there and brighten it up. Keeping the hedges along the parking lot and maintaining them is also really important. She had concerns about how the proposed Dark Nickel color works as a background to the Chase wall sign on the north elevation, and the visual interference of the dark columns. She suggested that the dark colored panel be a different color such as keeping it white, and **Mr. Wright** replied that this is something they can talk to the Chase signage team about because he agreed that the dark color does tone down the Chase sign letters. **Commissioner Kingsley** asked about the lighting wall packs facing the parking lot and **Mr. Wright** said that the lights shine down, with a little bit of cast that comes out. **Commissioner Kingsley** said this is an opportunity to look at those light fixtures to bring the fixtures up to date and ensure the lights are pedestrian friendly. She had no further comments.

Chair Kubow loved the changes being proposed for the building, especially on the north elevation; it reminds him of McCormick Place in Chicago. He felt the existing brick on the south elevation detracts from the changes being proposed, and although he was not suggesting the brick be painted, he agreed that adding window openings on that elevation would help improve the facade. Overall, he felt the proposed changes to the building are a huge improvement and a welcome change to a building that does feel a little dated. Although he agreed with Staff's idea to remove the drive-thru and add some retail into the space, he did not want to push the petitioner to the point where the budget prevents doing any improvements on the building.

Mr. Hautzinger clarified that Staff's comments about changing the drive-thru, adding new storefront windows, and adding screening for the rooftop units, are not something that Staff is requiring, but certainly encouraging, and for this project, Staff is leaving those decisions up to the discretion of the Design Commission.

Commissioner Kingsley asked about eliminating some of the vertical joints on the fascia to make the panels more horizontal. **Mr. Wright** said the detailing could be looked at, and he clarified that the actual reveals are maybe ½-inch, so they look more pronounced in the rendering than in actuality.

Commissioner Eckhardt said he worked on a similar project on Golf Road where black channels with grey panels were used, and it is really attractive; instead of using the panel color on the reveals, black was used. He asked how wide the panels are, and **Mr. Wright** said they took the height of the existing extruded turquoise metal panel and split the joint in half, which is roughly 4' wide by 2-1/2' tall.

Commissioner Eckhardt was okay with approving the project as proposed. He could also support a recommendation to add windows on the south elevation, although that solid wall does serve a purpose for privacy inside the bank. He reiterated that the drive-thru is extremely important to the bank and he was against removing it.

Commissioner Seyer liked the changes being proposed for the building; however, he was bothered by the dark panel behind the existing wall sign on the north elevation. He suggested that the panel remain white, how it currently exists. Doing so will better connect the white panels from the side of the building that wrap around to the north side of the building. He felt this would be a real improvement and will make the signage stronger. **Mr. Wright** did not disagree, but said his responsibility is for the building, and Chase has a different department that deals with signage. **Commissioner Eckhardt** agreed with Commissioner Seyer's comments.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS TO THE EXISTING CHASE BANK BUILDING LOCATED AT 1 N. DUNTON AVENUE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON THE REVISED PLANS RECEIVED 9/18/24, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATION AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING:

1. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PETITIONER PREPARE EXHIBITS SHOWING THE PANEL BEHIND THE WALL SIGN ON THE NORTH ELEVATION KEEPING THE EXISTING WHITE COLOR, AND REMOVE THE EXISTING WINDOW SIGNAGE BELOW IT THAT DOES NOT MEET CODE, TO BE SUBMITTED AND REVIEWED BY STAFF TO DECIDE AND APPROVE, OR OTHERWISE RETURN TO THE DESIGN COMMISSION FOR ANOTHER REVIEW.
2. A REQUIREMENT TO MAINTAIN THE EXISTING LANDSCAPE HEDGE LINE ALONG THE SOUTH END OF THE EXISTING PARKING LOT.
3. A RECOMMENDATION THAT EITHER COLORATION OR WINDOWS BE PLACED ON THE SOUTH ELEVATION, UNDERSTANDING THAT THERE MAY BE PRIVACY ISSUES WITH INTERNAL FUNCTIONS OF THE BANK.
4. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PETITIONER REVIEW THE EXISTING LIGHTING FOR ITS APPEARANCE AND ITS PHOTOMETRICS IN THE PARKING LOT, TO ENSURE COMPATIBILITY WITH THE UPDATED CONTEMPORARY APPEARANCE OF THE BUILDING.
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.
6. COMPLIANCE WITH ALL FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES.

Commissioner Kingsley wanted to add a recommendation to the motion that the petitioner study the roof color above the fascia, to be sure the petitioner is okay with the white step.

She also wanted to add a recommendation that the petitioner look at other solutions for the reveals on the fascia because she feels there are too many, also to be sure the petitioner is okay with how it will look. And add a recommendation that the petitioner look at the color of the white and the dark nickel color to ensure that the petitioner is okay with the strong contrast.

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

- 7. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PETITIONER SUBMIT TO STAFF, A SMALL-SCALE MOCK-UP OF THE PANEL AND THE REVEAL PUT TOGETHER, FOR STAFF TO PHOTOGRAPH AND SEND TO THE COMMISSIONERS FOR ANY COMMENTS.**
- 8. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PETITIONER SUBMIT TO STAFF, A STUDY ON THE EXISTING RAISED PARAPET ROOFLINE (POP-UP) THAT SETS BACK FROM THE FASCIA AT THE TOP OF THE BUILDING, AND THAT IT BE THE SAME DARK METAL PANEL MATERIAL AS THE FASCIA, OR IF IT IS NOT POSSIBLE TO BE THE SAME MATERIAL, THEN IT SHALL BE THE SAME COLOR AS THE FASCIA.**

COMMISSIONER SEYER SECONDED THE AMENDED MOTION.

Commissioner Seyer was concerned that the thickness/gauge of the grey metal panel being shown in the drawings will be something less than what is shown, and he encouraged the petitioner to call out this detail in the specs to avoid a wave throughout the entire panel. **Mr. Wright** confirmed that a composite panel is being proposed, which is used on almost every Chase branch, and there have never been any issues with that material.

Mr. Hautzinger asked for clarification of the mock-up required to submit to Staff. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said that a sample of the metal and the trim being proposed for the reveal, should be created as a mock-up and submitted to Staff. The detailing of the joining of that system is very important. **Mr. Wright** understood the request.

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

ITEM 5. OTHER BUSINESS

Public Comment

There was no public comment from those in the audience.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:50 P.M. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.