

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION

HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
MAY 14, 2024

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

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

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Shawn Buynack, Owner of 216 N. Haddow Ave.
Bobbi Taylor, Warren Johnson Architects for 216 N. Haddow Ave.
Lisa Vandermark, Executive Director for *The Moorings*
Drew Roskos & Jerry Walleck, Perkins Eastman, for *The Moorings*
Scott Freres, Lakota Group, for *The Moorings*
Eric Schmitt, Project Manager for *The Moorings*
Steve Hautzinger, Planning Staff

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FOR APRIL 2, 2024

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 2, 2024. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 1. SINGLE-FAMILY NEW REVIEW**DC#24-030 – 216 N. Haddow Ave.**

Bobbi Taylor, representing *Warren Johnson Architects*, and **Shawn Buynack**, the owner, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to build a new two-story residence with a new two-car detached garage on an existing vacant lot. The project does comply with all of the R-3 zoning requirements. In 2021, a Design Commission application for a different teardown/new house was reviewed and approved by the Design Commission, and the house that was existing on the subject property was subsequently approved for demolition, but construction of the new home never happened, and the lot has remained vacant.

The purpose for the Design Commission review tonight is due to the development of this vacant lot in a sensitive historic neighborhood. Staff feels that overall, this is an excellent design with traditional style that will fit very well with the surrounding context and the overall character of the neighborhood. Having a detached garage is very appropriate in this neighborhood, and the garage is nicely designed to match the house. The placement of the garage on the lot is ideal to keep the house as the focal point on the corner. The design of the house is very nicely done with a nice appearance facing both street frontages on this corner lot. The colors and materials are a classic all white palette with a gray roof. The only comment is that the south elevation looks less interesting than the other three sides, and the petitioner should consider adding a window in the south wall of Bedroom 1 to help break up the blank wall. Overall, Staff feels that this is a very successful design on a challenging corner lot in a sensitive historic neighborhood. Staff commends the owner and architect for their thoughtful planning and architectural design, and recommends approval.

Bobbi Taylor said the proposed design came together nicely, with the owners being very well educated in what they are looking for and want. Taking elements from the surrounding homes and putting it together so the new home fits in nicely with the surrounding neighborhood. It is a traditional design with dormers, a white facade, and grey roof; a clean, basic, straight look. **Shawn Buynack** said this is a family home, he has 2 children, and they are excited to get this project started and make it their forever home, and hopes for approval tonight.

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

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Seyer** said at first glance the home looks really nice, it is nicely designed and will fit in nicely with the surrounding homes.

Commissioner Fitzgerald said it is a very well-designed home and will fit nicely into the neighborhood, which he appreciates. He supported Staff's comment to consider adding a window in the south wall of Bedroom 1, but it is not a requirement for him. He pointed out that the columns on the front porch and the columns on the covered patio are different sizes, and he suggested that they match in size. He had no other comments and said the home is beautiful.

With respect to Staff's suggestion to add a window on the south elevation, **Commissioner Eckhardt** asked what is behind that wall on the second-floor. **Mr. Buynack** replied the master bedroom is located there, with that wall being where the bed will be located. **Commissioner Eckhardt** also asked if landscaping would be added in front of the niche area on the south elevation where the a/c units will be located, and **Mr. Buynack** said yes. **Commissioner Eckhardt** had no further comments and supported Commissioner Fitzgerald's thoughts about the size of the columns; columns can never be big enough for him and they should match. Great design, no issues with the home.

Commissioner Kingsley appreciated the nice submittal and said the home looks nice. She commented that it is interesting that the petitioner decided to face the home north, similar to the adjacent home to the north and the two homes on either side of that home. Although she did not mind that, in a way she preferred the home face Haddow; however, she felt it would not hinder the street as proposed. She wished the home was a little more pedestrian friendly or inviting on the Haddow side, with a partial porch, or a door, or something, because it is the side of the home versus

the front, and there will be no movement. Because the three homes to the south will be facing Haddow, it will be important to have some landscape there to soften it up, and having a door or something on that side might be nice.

Commissioner Kingsley agreed with Staff about adding fenestration on the south elevation, and she suggested adding a window on the first-floor where there is shelving on either side of the fireplace in the great room, as well as adding a window in the mud room. She felt it would be more beneficial on the first-floor rather than the second-floor. She referred to the dormers with false windows on the front elevation and said the home would look better without them; she was in support of eliminating the dormers. She also said that the two different roof pitches on the east elevation makes it appear like two different homes, and she suggested raising the pitch on the left and lowering the pitch on the right, which currently looks too tall for the neighborhood. **Commissioner Kingsley** loved the window shutters that she felt are an appropriate size, and asked what color they will be. **Mr. Buynack** said the color is undetermined at this time, either white or black, in a traditional colonial style. **Commissioner Kingsley** suggested researching historical references to see if the bottom shutters should be as tall as the transoms. She also asked if the windows have grilles between the glass or simulated divided lights, and **Ms. Taylor** said they have not discussed that yet. **Commissioner Kingsley** strongly suggested using windows with simulated divided lights, it will look much nicer and fit more in the neighborhood that has older windows with true divided lights. She also recommended the trim on the house be smooth, and **Mr. Buynack** said that it is.

Chair Kubow said there were a lot of great comments and he did not have much more to add. In reference to the shutters, typically shutters go the entire height of the window; however, he appreciates this approach of being a little different. He suggested the petitioner play with both shutter size options and both color options. What is currently proposed is unique and a little different on a very classical home. He agreed that the home is beautiful, and he appreciates the petitioner designing within the context of the neighborhood and addressing Eastman Avenue; however, he agreed with Commissioner Kingsley's comment that it would have been nice to see something wrap around and address Haddow too. **Chair Kubow** concluded that this is a very nicely designed home in somewhat of a historic neighborhood.

Someone from the audience asked if he could make a comment, and **Chair Kubow** opened up for public comment.

Myles Whitebloom, 203 N. Haddow Avenue, lives just south of the site. He loved the design of the new home and wanted to reiterate the comments made about the south elevation. Representing all the neighbors that live to the south, especially next door at 212 N. Haddow, he agreed with the suggestion to add either real windows or false windows on the first-floor of the east elevation; the more the better so it takes away from the big wall. He hopes that will be highly suggested for the home. **Mr. Buynack** said he is planning to add a tree in the corner there to block that part of the home, and nice landscaping all the way across.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE PROPOSED NEW SINGLE-FAMILY HOME TO BE LOCATED AT 216 N. HADDOW AVENUE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 4/2/24, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATION AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING:

1. A RECOMMENDATION THAT ALL COLUMNS ON THE HOME MATCH IN SIZE.
2. A RECOMMENDATION TO CONSIDER ADDING AN APPROPRIATE WINDOW ON THE FIRST-FLOOR OF THE SOUTH ELEVATION.
3. A RECOMMENDATION TO CONSIDER INCREASING THE 6/12 ROOF PITCH ON THE EAST ELEVATION.
4. AN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT THAT THE SITE PLAN PROVIDES A 22-FOOT SETBACK WITH PLENTY OF SPACE FOR SUBSTANTIAL LANDSCAPING THAT WILL HELP COVER THE LARGE SOUTH WALL.
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 reiterated her comments about the windows having simulated divided lights, and eliminating the dormers on the front elevation. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said that was not included in the motion because muntins are currently shown, and requiring a petitioner to go with divided lights is very costly. **Commissioner Kingsley** clarified that she is talking about false divided lights on the outside and inside of the windows, not in between the glass. **Commissioner Eckhardt** was in support of adding a recommendation but not a requirement. **Chair Kubow** said the level of comments about this issue is already part of the record and a recommendation from the commissioners, which will be noted in the minutes but not part of the motion. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** said that simulated divided lights will make a big difference in this neighborhood on this home, and he encouraged the petitioner to do what they can. He added that he likes the 3 dormers on the front of the home, but the home will also look good without them.

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

ITEM 2. INSTITUTIONAL PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The Moorings – Independent Living Expansion – 811 E. Central Rd.

Lisa Vandermark, representing The Moorings, **Drew Roskos** and **Jerry Walleck**, representing *Perkins Eastman*, **Scott Freres**, representing *Lakota Group*, and **Eric Schmitt**, Project Manager at *The Moorings*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger said that because this is a preliminary review, there is no staff report. The petitioner will walk through the project and welcome any feedback from the commissioners at this stage of design.

Lisa Vandermark, Executive Director of the Moorings, introduced the team of architects here tonight and the project manager from the Moorings.

Drew Roskos said he is an architect and a gerontologist that specializes in senior living. He presented a visual presentation that includes the expansion of the campus at the Moorings to provide more independent living than there is there now. The proposed scope of work includes the area shown as 'A', which includes a new independent living building that is being called the Embrace because the footprint of the building essentially wraps around the existing barn. Additionally, the area shown as 'B', where there is existing parking, will be renovated and expanded. A sun study, a site plan with an angled entry approach, a building section showing the proposed building height, and three building sections were presented. The first-floor plan shows the proposed 70 units, each with a balcony, as well as an art room and maintenance and storage on the west side of the building, which is one-story.

The facade design strategies were presented. **Mr. Roskos** said the existing campus has a smattering of architectural styles and palettes, and they are using the best of what is available and what is immediately adjacent to the site. The main five-story building that is immediately adjacent consists of concrete and brick and a flat roof; it is located immediately across from the proposed new building. Examples of previous Perkins Eastman projects were shown, which illustrate the reduction in scale they are trying to achieve with the facades, how outdoor living is being created, and use of materiality and texture. The proposed building footprint and how it turns and how it relates to the edges of the existing building; they are trying to create a rhythm in the courtyards and create a response to the points of the existing buildings. The scale of the new building is brought down on the side near the round barn and the side near the 2-story structure to the west. Two different massing and material studies were created; they prefer Option 2 where each facade at the bend relates to the immediate surrounding context, colors, and scales. The existing material palette and the proposed materials were shown, which includes a predominantly brick building, glass, and another secondary material such as metal panel, fiber cement, or other. **Mr. Roskos** also presented the different ways they investigated how to break down the edge of the building, and the three building design schemes being considered at this time, Option 1, Option 2, Option 2A, and Option 3.

Chair Kubow asked about the color of the existing barn and **Mr. Roskos** said it is white with a grey shingle roof.

Mr. Roskos commented that when designing senior living, so much of a resident's identity is in where or how they live, so a lot of effort was put into the design to give residents an identity of what unit is theirs. They are currently leaning towards Option 1, which they think is very successful in all ways.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Eckhardt** appreciated the petitioner's great presentation that included sketches and building concepts, it is very successful. His preference is for Option 2. He felt there has been a lot of effort to jumble up the elevations with all kinds of different colors and shapes, which is a little too much for him. All the different design options are much more powerful than the surrounding buildings, which does concern him. He did not like the big, white square with the dark balconies in Option 1; he liked the open feeling of the balconies in the corner that open up. He pointed to the elevation that will be seen when entering the property, and commented that the back of the building is broken down in sections, which is successful and he supports. In terms of colors, he felt there is too much white and it is too bright, based on there being not much white elsewhere in this

community. He liked the 2-tone colors on Option 2, it breaks down the mass on the end of the building and there is interest on both sides. All of the options are successful in their own way, but he is leaning towards Option 2.

Commissioner Fitzgerald said that all 3 options are very nice, but he liked Option 1. He liked the white on Option 1 because it ties into the nearby barn structure which is kind of a focal point, and it ties to the building and makes it look like the barn is original and belongs there. He also liked the 'boxes' that do not go all the way to the top on Option 1; it makes the building appear shorter, even though it is not, and he liked the way that it is broken up. Some of the other designs look taller because the vertical pieces go taller. He reiterated that all three options are really nice.

Commissioner Seyer said it was a nice presentation and all three options are quite nice. The white element on Option 3 (2A) makes it feel like it is really special, but maybe not in the way that it needs to be; it is just jumping out as a unique part and he would rather it feel more cohesive with the rest of it, so he is veering towards Option 2. The frame on Option 1 feels very, very modern and he agreed with Commissioner Eckhardt about the column that he was unsure if it was needed for structural reasons, but then he sees how it is floating above the ground so it is not really necessary. He felt the open balconies are nicer in Option 2. That being said, he applauds the efforts to make all the designs feel a little bit more special and not just a long block of a bland facade. Option 2 keeps the same materiality at the end that it does for the entire bar, so it feels more cohesive and not a different element at the end, and the way the petitioner explained the shape and the form makes a lot of sense.

Commissioner Kingsley agreed with most of the comments. She liked Option 2 because of the color and the material. She liked parts of Option 1, but the end of the building on the front looks like an office building with all windows, versus the other side of the building where there is all masonry. As a gerontologist, she asked the petitioner how people of the age who will live in these buildings feel about open balconies. **Mr. Roskos** said they discussed that a lot; the balconies are actually ½ in, ½ out, and the exterior wall is pushed in 3-feet and then projects out another 3-feet. The balconies were pushed out intentionally so that residents can feel rooted in one spot and have refuge, rather than be cantilevered out. **Commissioner Kingsley** agreed with that and said that is partly why she likes the massing of Option 1 on the corner with the column, because it gives a little more solidity to the balcony space, but she does not like the material change there. What she also likes about Option 1 on that corner is the roof that looks sleeker, and is one level, as opposed to it stepping in on Option 2 and 3. She really appreciates the roof profile in Option 1.

The petitioner stated that as buildings for senior living have evolved over the past 10-12 years, they make sure the balconies are a good size and can be used as outdoor rooms, they do not gang them, so each balcony has a certain amount of privacy. There is a lot of effort that goes into the unit plans making sure there are no balconies that are side by side, allowing the balconies to be 8 x 10 or 10 x 12, so residents can have a table, chairs and chaise out there and have a connection to the outdoors, which has become very important for seniors. They do not just attach balconies to buildings for seniors or any age resident.

Commissioner Eckhardt asked about the age and cognitive level of the residents anticipated for this new building. **Ms. Vandermark** replied that this will be an independent living building with an average age range of late 60's to mid-80's, and they have an assessment screening process for all new residents because they promise a guarantee of continued residence should a resident outlive their resources. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said the balcony is a really important element on the building, considering the age of the residents, as well as the detailing and thickness of the railing; it should not be architecturally delicate and light that it makes a resident feel uncomfortable.

Chair Kubow commended The Moorings and the ownership group for allowing the architect to push the envelope in terms of architecture for the new building. He loved all three options being presented tonight, and he loved the presentation and walking through the concept and the design progression. Architecturally, he liked Option 1 the most; it is modern and feels a bit more multi-family to him, which is okay. He liked Option 2 from a user experience standpoint, at least from the view being presented tonight; it feels more welcoming, and the colors are warmer. He liked that the glass facade extends two floors in Option 2, compared to the other options because it helps break up the mass that is a major lantern entry point. He said that in that regard, Option 2 is the most successful. He really loved all three options; architecturally, Option 1 is his favorite, but Option 2 makes the most sense.

Mr. Hautzinger said that when he first received the design options from the petitioner, he felt Option 1 was the most successful and interesting in terms of massing and composition. It breaks down the height without actually being shorter because the middle of the building does not have the features rising all the way to the top. However, he would love to see how Option 1 would look with the materials and colors of Option 2. He likes the splash of the lighter masonry by the barn, but maybe it is a bit much at the outside corner.

Chair Kubow said that overall, very successful architecture is being presented in all three options, and something fantastic will result. **Commissioner Kingsley** referred to the petitioner's comments about the material examples being considered, and she suggested incorporating elements that bring in texture without changing the material. She added that depending on the black metal panel material being shown, and what the two other materials not indicated are, she may have a comment about that; the material has to look nice with the brick and not look cheap and wear well.

The petitioner said they plan to submit later this month for their first formal submission and meet with this commission again in June. He thanked the commissioners and staff for their comments.

ITEM 3. OTHER BUSINESS

Public Comment

There was none.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO
ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:30 P.M. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.**