

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION

HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
MARCH 12, 2024

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

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

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Thomas Budzik, Thomas Architects for 124 S. Vail Ave.
Mark Erickson, Four M Builders for 124 S. Vail Ave.
Jennifer Hense, BBA Architects for 1314 N. Harvard Ave.
Nathan & Julie Baylor, Owners of 1314 N. Harvard Ave.
Kevin Purdom, JRC Design Build for 434 S. Dunton Ave.
Paul Loiterstein, Owner of 434 S. Dunton Ave.
Dale Balsitis, Corporate Sign Systems for 44 S. Vail Ave.
Drew Bulson, Ketone Partners for 44 S. Vail Ave.
Steve Hautzinger, Planning Staff

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 27, 2024

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 27, 2024. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 1. SINGLE-FAMILY TEARDOWN REVIEW**DC#24-009 – 124 S. Vail Ave.**

Thomas Budzik, representing *Thomas Architects*, and **Mark Erickson**, representing *Four M Builders*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to demolish an existing one-and-a-half-story residence and detached two-car garage to allow construction of a new two-story residence with a new detached two-car garage. The proposed house and garage comply with all R-3 zoning requirements, but the subject property is located in an R-4 Zoning District, where the minimum required Lot Size is 8,750 sf and the minimum required Lot Width is 70 feet. The subject property is 6,600 sf and 50 feet wide, which does not meet the minimum requirements for a building permit to be issued. Therefore, a zoning variation is required from the Zoning Board of Appeals, which is scheduled for April 8, 2024, to allow the proposed redevelopment of this property.

The subject property is located on the first block south of the Downtown. The existing home (proposed to be demolished) was included in a Community Preservation Report which was prepared by the School of the Art Institute of Chicago in 2004. The report was prepared in an effort to raise community awareness and promote the preservation of the historic character of certain neighborhoods in Arlington Heights, such as the subject “Rec Park” neighborhood. Homes in the report are rated in order of importance as “Exceptional”, “Notable”, or “Contributing”. The subject house is rated as “Notable”, with a Craftsman style and estimated construction between 1910-1930.

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

Mr. Hautzinger said the existing home appears to be in good condition, and the bungalow style with full front porch does contribute to the historic character of the neighborhood. Due to the character and Notable rating of the existing house, Staff encourages a renovation/expansion, while maintaining its historic character, in lieu of teardown/new construction, which the Design Commission should evaluate.

In regards to the proposed new house, it is very nicely designed in a traditional style with detached garage that fits very well with the character of the neighborhood. The only comment on the proposed design is that the gable above the front entry porch has an odd appearance with the double rake detail. It is recommended that the lower rake be omitted for a more traditional look at that entry. Staff recommends the Design Commission's evaluation of the project.

Mr. Budzik said they are here tonight to seek approval for the demolition of the existing home as well as construction of a new 2-story home. The project is scheduled for review by the Zoning Board of Appeals due to the non-conforming lot width and lot area; however, the proposed design fully complies with all code requirements. Initially, when they first were made aware of this project, they looked at the existing home and realized that it does have some nice lines to it, and they looked at what opportunities there were to potentially salvage the home. Once they were made aware that the existing home is listed as Notable in the Community Preservation Report, they looked at the existing home again to determine what they could potentially do with the property. That being said, they did discover there were some significant challenges with the existing home that made it more practical for them to seek to demolish it and build a new structure.

Mr. Budzik talked about the condition of the existing home. The home is 1,300 square feet, a 1-1/2-story massing, unfinished basement, first-floor with 3 small rooms and a small kitchen in a very compartmentalized fashion. The back-half of the house in the center of the mass is the staircase, with 2 bedrooms, a full bath and small bedroom/den on the second-floor. The main face of the home is approximately 23-feet from the front property line, and the porch is about 14-feet from the front property line. The home has horizontal aluminum siding, soffit, fascia and trim, the porch railing is vinyl, the windows are vinyl replacement, and the roof is asphalt shingle.

When they determined the existing home in their opinion is functionally obsolete, considerations were that the existing basement ceiling is approximately 6'-9", there is no bathroom on the main floor, the kitchen is very small, the location of the staircase being in the center mass on the back half of the home would complicate any design to add on the rear, the limited ridge height is a major concern, the first-floor ceiling heights are a little over 8', and a little under 8' on the second-floor, and the ridge line is not particularly high. Any sort of 2-story addition off the back of the home would either be flat roof or low slope, of which would be atypical and really not appropriate for the style, or it would have some awkward condition where the ridge line of the addition would be above the main ridge line of the home that would take away from the look of the original home. As a result, any addition that would seek to maximum what can be done in terms of Floor Area Ratio, would then bump up against limits like maximum impervious. The existing wall framing and roof framing would be very difficult to accommodate compliance with the new energy code requirements. There are some structural concerns as well; the existing foundations are CMU and there are some signs of cracking in the foundation, a lot of signs of water and filtration through the foundation, there is no positive attachment to the columns and the foundation, and there are concerns about the structural condition of the columns. Photos of the interior of the existing home were shown, which included the basement foundation.

Mr. Budzik said that a lot of work has been done to the outside of the existing home in terms of the vinyl siding, the windows, and the porch railing, and a lot of what might have been the original detail and character of the home has long since been stripped away from the home. Outside of just the lines of the home itself, they feel there is no significant contribution to the historical architectural character of the neighborhood. That being said, their approach is to propose a design that would be compatible with the context of the neighborhood. The proposed design is transitional, a 2-story home with a 2-car detached garage, the driveway is on the right side of the home and a large covered front entrance. The material palette includes lap and staggered shake siding, asphalt shingle roofing, white trim, and black windows. The first-floor is raised up 5 steps from grade, which is somewhat common this neighborhood, and the front setback is 20-feet. They average frontyard setback is 17-feet, and they chose 20-feet for the new home because that is the average between the main face of the home to the south and the home to the north. The south side setback was increased to 6-1/2-feet to push the home a bit further away from the home to the south. **Mr. Budzik** welcomed any comments at this time.

Mr. Budzik said the neighbor to the south reached out to them yesterday with some concerns about the design, and the neighbor submitted a letter to Staff with those concerns. **Mr. Hautzinger** said that letter was received today and added to packet for tonight's review.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

Laurie Turpin-Soderholm, 717 N. Dunton Avenue. She is here tonight to oppose the teardown of 124 S. Vail on the following grounds. First, the home as previously noted was designated as Notable by the School of the Art Institute of Illinois in 2004. Notable is a high achievement in this study, and it means that this home has integrity and strongly contributes to the historic district. In line with the Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 6, this home is important to the character of this block and it exhibits a high quality of architectural design reminiscent of the past. From the outside, this home has been well maintained and it looks to be in good condition. There is simply no reason to tear it down when renovations can achieve the same ultimate goals. In summary, she asks this commission to invoke please, Municipal Code 13.7c, to deny this demolition and ensure that a new family is able to move in and enjoy a wonderful charming home with character and history in a beautiful historic neighborhood. Thank you.

David Percy, 125 S. Vail Avenue, one lot south and across the street from the site. He also opposes the teardown of this beautiful home that survived 100 years and adds to the charm of the neighborhood. When he moved here 7 years ago, one of the things he noticed and was drawn to was the charm of the neighborhood. The combination of some of the older homes and newer homes, it just looks really nice. There are a lot of issues that come along with a teardown; it will destroy a beautiful home, and the neighborhood will be distracted for another summer of construction. He is also concerned about materials inside the home such as asbestos and lead-based paint that will be disrupted during

demolition and are extremely dangerous to the surrounding neighbors; there needs to be a plan.

Commissioner Eckhardt explained there are regulations from Cook County for the demolition of buildings with regards to asbestos, and the professional mitigation required; all of which occurs prior to the Village issuing a permit for demolition. He assured the resident who spoke that there is a high level of safety in place for these concerns. Mr. Percy said the condominium owners directly across the street from this site have the same concerns, and they were not able to attend tonight. He reiterated that the existing home is a beautiful home that adds to the charm and it is important to the Village to keep that mix of old and new. He is opposed to the teardown.

Vivian Menzies, 212 W. Fremont St. She wanted to speak tonight because the increasing number of teardowns is of major concern to her, and the higher price points that they are going at. She felt like we are going to lose a lot of the quality affordable housing in town because of this kind of frenzy to buy up homes and tear them down. A home like this is affordable housing stock; when a home sells under \$400,000 it enables a young family to buy it and over time do renovations and restore it to the quality of home that it was. When developers buy these homes, a lot of times these homes do not even hit the market, they are sold privately before they are ever listed, so there is no opportunity for a young family to buy a home like this. There are many examples throughout the Village of homes of this type that have been purchased in the past, before the teardown craze, and those homes have been updated and modernized and they are highly sought-after homes in these areas that are close to Downtown Arlington Heights. The other piece to this, besides losing affordable housing, is that it really does change the character of the neighborhood. The design of the new home is lovely, but it is not the same. The homes on that particular block, many are in the very similar craftsman style. She drove past there today and there is a nice cohesiveness of the block. Once that is gone you cannot get it back. Another piece of it is that when teardowns start happening in a neighborhood, others neighbors look at that and decide not to improve their own home because they feel their home will end up being a teardown, so why bother improving. Then it becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. She knows this commission is the last resort to stop a teardown from happening and the commission has the ability to do that, and she hopes the commissioners will really consider it for this home, but also take a look at the bigger picture, the long-range picture of how teardowns are impacting the Village. She asked that the commissioners vote no.

There was no further public comment.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Seyer** liked the design of the new home. With respect to the teardown of the existing home, he has been clear about his feelings that unless a home is strongly, historically, intact or has a very unique character, a homeowner should not be restricted from tearing it down. While the existing home might be nice, in his opinion it is not very open to the street. It has a very large deck, but there are no windows and there are only a couple windows on one side. He felt the proposed new home is much more open to the street with more activity that way, either through windows or through the deck. He also felt that the condo building directly across the street completely changes the character of what is being talked about here, and should not limit the demolition and new construction of what he felt is a very nice home. He reiterated that for teardowns, the cost of structural changes, energy performance upgrades, plumbing relocations, and changing ceiling heights to what are today's desirable sizes, are an extremely large premium, and the cost of a remodel on the owner should be taken into account. He felt it was not imperative that the existing home be saved; he is in support of the demolition of the existing home and the current design for the new home, which fits nicely and is one of the more unique, nicely designed homes he has seen recently.

Commissioner Kingsley said the new home being presented is sensitive to the area and there are certain qualities about it that would make it fit with the neighborhood. Although she felt the design is a nice solution, she also felt that it reads better from the front and from the back. From the side, it is a very large home, especially the south elevation that is nicely done with windows and gables. She said the materials are pretty good, and she recommended smooth trim, simulated divided lights, and straight edged shingles instead of the rough edge shown in the photograph on the material sample board. She asked if the new home is a spec home and **Mr. Budzik** replied that it is a spec home; however, there is a prospective buyer already in place, and some design tweaks have been made based on that buyer's input. **Commissioner Kingsley** liked the detached garage, which helps with the rhythm or density of the street.

With regards to the existing home, **Commissioner Kingsley** said there are elements of the new home that are similar to it, which she is happy to see, because she is a proponent of keeping existing homes when possible. She pointed out that the windows are not original, the railings are not original, and there are a lot of things in the existing home that have been replaced. That being said, she felt the existing home could be saved and restored to its glory. She also said the design of the new home is nice and there is no reason why she would say no to the teardown, even though she would really like to say yes, knowing that the basement height is only 6'7" and it is CMU block, and there is already a prospective buyer. With a heavy heart, **Commissioner Kingsley** said it is okay to tear down the existing home, but the new home has some good proportions to it and it will be okay. She also agreed with Staff's comments about the double/nested gable in the front.

Commissioner Eckhardt said the new home is nicely designed and in character with the homes on this street. The detached garage is a statement and a commitment to the front elevation, and the double or nested gable at the front entry is intriguing and a little modern, although it might be a little too busy. The exterior has some very simple and contemporary lines to it, and real attention has been paid to the layout of the windows, which he likes. He asked if the double gable at the front entry will be painted all one color or two different colors, and **Mr. Budzik** replied that it will be all white. **Commissioner Eckhardt** asked the petitioner about the design intent for the double gable, and **Mr. Budzik** said the original concept was more of a wraparound porch where the entire facade was less centered on the entrance itself; however, the prospective buyer wanted a front entry element with more prominence, so it is very intentional.

Commissioner Eckhardt pointed out the nice deck design on the rear of the home and asked if a front porch was originally proposed, similar to other homes on the street. He asked if the front porch was eliminated by the potential buyer of the home. **Mr. Budzik** said a front porch was eliminated because of the condominium building directly across the street and the prospective buyer's concerns about privacy. **Commissioner Eckhardt** supported the suggestion to use smooth trim, and he felt the petitioner's explanation about the condition of the existing home is important in this case. It was also said that this commission has the final decision on single-family teardowns, unless a petitioner wants to appeal the commission's decision to the Village Board. **Commissioner Eckhardt** felt the evidence about the existing home is significant and the existing footprint would require a significant addition to bring the home up to compliance and to today's standards. He is convinced by the evidence presented tonight that this location is better suited with a new home. He wanted to hear the other commissioners' comments about the front pediment, but the rest of the home he found to be well designed and respectful to the homes along the street.

Commissioner Fitzgerald was okay with the teardown of the existing home, with the reasons stated by the other commissioners. He said a lot of detail has gone into the details of the new home to make it fit, and it looks like a home that has been here and was rehabbed to today's standards. He did have an issue with the front porch and the double facade, and felt the second gable should be eliminated in order to keep it looking original; two posts instead of 4 should also be considered. He liked the colors being proposed, and he liked the idea of the smooth trim and the straight edged shake siding at the top.

Chair Kubow did not have much more to add to the comments already given by the commissioners. When he looks at a home to be torn down that is considered Notable, it is important that what is replacing it is thoughtful and contextual, and for him the new home is a textbook of all of that. He approved of the new home as proposed.

Commissioner Seyer said his initial instinct is to see more front porch on the new home, until he realized there is a driveway across the street that is for the condominium building where cars will come in and out of at night with lights going right at the new home; therefore, he abandoned the idea for a larger front porch. He was in favor of the current design with any modifications the other commissioners might want to see. He was comfortable with the size of the home.

Commissioner Eckhardt appreciated Commissioner Fitzgerald's comments about the front eave, which he felt was unnecessarily tricked up, and because of the scale of the front of the home, the four columns are pretty overbearing and heavy-handed. He wanted a motion that requires the petitioner to submit an alternate design of this element, for

Staff to review and approve, going in the direction of a single, bigger column, and a single pediment with crown that is appropriate in scale. He appreciated that the side of the front porch is open, but it felt a little heavy from the front, but the height is great as shown.

Commissioner Kingsley was opposed to possibly having only one column in this situation, unless the petitioner could make one column work. She explained that what works right now with the two columns is that the arch spring point lands fully on a column, and so does the edge beam; so both of those columns are necessary in order for the width of the arch and where that side beam is. Eliminating the double gable can happen, but in this situation she felt that the two porch columns are necessary. She felt the Architect was trying to express the rafter tails, to make it look a little bit more craftsman-like, which is not on the rest of the building, and in a way, she likes that because the rest of the building is just how buildings are now built all the time. She liked elements of the front porch and she would hate for all of that detail to go away, and for it to just look like the major gable on the left.

Commissioner Eckhardt referred to the drawing elevation that shows the radius of the porch ceiling arch at 4'-2", and he completely agreed with Commissioner Kingsley that the spring point must come from the pediment of the column, which could be heavier than what is there now; however, if redesigned, that radius could be increased and the column made bigger, and it would still spring from the column. He felt this element needs some attention and needs to be redesigned. **Mr. Budzik** said they are definitely open to presenting alternate solutions for the front entrance.

Chair Kubow preferred not to continue to deliberate on a very small detail, and he felt the motion should recommend or require the petitioner to submit multiple options to Staff for review and approval.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT TO APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE PROPOSED NEW (TEARDOWN) SINGLE-FAMILY HOME TO BE LOCATED AT 124 S. VAIL AVENUE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 2/19/24, 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 ALTERNATE DESIGN SKETCHES TO RESOLVE THE FRONT ENTRANCE, TO PROVIDE FOR A STANDARD PEDIMENT SIMILAR TO THE SENIOR PEDIMENT OF THE BAY ON THE LEFT AND INCLUDE EITHER ONE COLUMN OR TWO COLUMNS, TO BE SUBMITTED TO STAFF FOR FINAL APPROVAL. IF STAFF CANNOT SELECT AN ALTERNATE DESIGN, THEN THE PROJECT SHALL RETURN TO THE DESIGN COMMISSION.**
- 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.**

Commissioner Kingsley said she did not want it to look like the other gable end, which the Architect should understand, and she wanted that removed from the motion. She also wanted the motion to include a requirement for smooth trim, and a recommendation for simulated divided lights in the windows and straight edge shake siding. **Commissioner Eckhardt** asked for clarification about the simulated divided lights, and **Mr. Budzik** said that black mullions in between the panes of glass are currently proposed.

Commissioner Eckhardt said that he could amend the motion to remove any language about replicating the other senior pediment at the front entrance, and add a requirement that the petitioner use smooth trim. **Commissioner Kingsley** said she wanted the simulated divided lights in the windows to be a requirement on a home like this that is taking the place of a home in a historic neighborhood that had muntins in windows that were always expressed on the outside. She said the petitioner is proposing to use Pella windows, aluminum clad, wood, double-hung windows, and Pella makes simulated divided lights. **Mr. Budzik** replied that the windows are vinyl clad aluminum, and the material list is incorrect. **Commissioner Eckhardt** was hesitant to make this a requirement that specifically puts a hardship on the builder to upgrade the windows by 20% to provide that look.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT TO APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE PROPOSED NEW (TEARDOWN) SINGLE-FAMILY HOME TO BE LOCATED AT 124 S. VAIL AVENUE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 2/19/24, 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 ALTERNATE DESIGN SKETCHES TO RESOLVE THE FRONT ENTRANCE, TO BE SUBMITTED TO STAFF FOR FINAL APPROVAL. IF STAFF CANNOT SELECT AN ALTERNATE DESIGN, THEN THE PROJECT SHALL RETURN TO THE DESIGN COMMISSION.**
- 2. A REQUIREMENT TO USE SMOOTH TRIM.**
- 3. A REQUIREMENT THAT STRAIGHT EDGE SHINGLE SIDING BE USED IN THE FRONT PEDIMENT, INSTEAD OF STAGGERED.**
- 4. A RECOMMENDATION THAT THE PETITIONER CONSIDER A WINDOW MULLION THAT IS EXPRESSED ON THE OUTSIDE AND THE INSIDE, TO CREATE A MORE AUTHENTIC APPEARANCE TO THE HOME.**
- 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 SEYER SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

ITEM 2. SINGLE-FAMILY TEARDOWN REVIEW**DC#24-014 – 1314 N. Harvard Ave.**

Jennifer Hense, representing *BBA Architects*, and **Nathan & Julie Baylor**, the homeowners, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to demolish an existing single-story residence with a two-car attached garage, to build a new two-story residence with an attached three-car garage. The proposed house does comply with the R-1 zoning requirements. The subject property is located in the Sherwood neighborhood which is zoned R-1, where the minimum lot size requirement is 20,000 square feet. The context of the neighborhood is a mix of older and newer single-story and two-story homes with attached garages, with a primarily traditional style.

The proposed house is a unique design with a transitional style that has a traditional form and massing, but it is distinctly modern in its materials, colors and detailing. The house fits comfortably on the large lot with abundant space between neighboring houses. Overall, the proposed design is very nicely done, with just one concern about the south elevation which is relatively tall, flat, and lacking detail as compared to the rest of the house. Further design development of the south elevation is recommended to break up the wall and add more interest to the side of the house. Consider partially bumping out the garage with a small single-story roof, and possibly a change of material, similar to the north elevation. With these comments, Staff recommends approval.

Ms. Hense said they were hired by the homeowners to design a new 2-story single-family home to replace the one-story home located on a very large lot. The side yard and front yard setback will be greater than the home that exists today, to give distance from the neighbors and the street. She referred to the site plan and the tree located at the south entry to the driveway that is in pretty fair condition according to their arborist. This tree straddles the property line and the parkway; however, a slight modification was made to the driveway to save this tree. In terms of materials, the front facade is primarily brick veneer, modular in size, soft color in character, with a sample presented. The roof material is unique and manufactured by Tesla; it is a complete solar roofing system, with a sample presented as well as a photo of another home with this type of roof. **Ms. Hense** also explained how the roofing system works, including comments that water sheds off the top of the roof with a vent underneath, because of heat build-up an additional air baffle was created to provide for more air flow underneath. Windows on the home are dark grey, mostly casement, aluminum clad wood with simulated divided lights. There are also small areas of stucco on the south elevation, the north elevation, and some key components that transition from the center portion of the home to the main north and south gables; a light color tone pulling from the tones in the brick. Flashing, gutters and downspouts all come from the Tesla system, and will be dark to match the roof. There is some composite trim in a matte finish on the home, at the bay windows near the garage, near the kitchen bay, the screened porch on the rear of the home, and between the vertical orientation of windows in the front. Limestone in a blue/grey color is proposed at the base of the home on the front.

Commissioner Kingsley asked about a ridge vent, since there are no overhangs and all the fascia and soffit are the dark color. **Ms. Hense** said there will be a ridge vent under the Tesla roofing that will not be seen. **Chair Kubow** asked the petitioner to respond to Staff's suggestion to add detail to the south elevation, and **Ms. Hense** replied that there will be a large electric meter on the south side of the home, as well as an air conditioner, a window well, and a fence to the property line because there is a pool in the backyard. So less of the south facade is apparent from the front, and it felt unneeded with all the other utilitarian functions that happen on the south elevation.

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

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** loved the new home, he felt it was traditional, modern, unique, yet it still fits in. He really liked the materials and said that he has read about and seen the Tesla roofing in pictures, but it is much more beautiful after seeing a sample tonight, and it is almost reminiscent of slate. He agreed with Staff about the garage on the south elevation; the garage and the two light fixtures will be on the

outside of that fence, so additional detailing is needed.

Commissioner Eckhardt agreed with the comments from Commissioner Fitzgerald. So much care and attention has been given to the new home, it is fantastic. He said the materials are wonderful and it is important that the south elevation be brought up to the same level as the other elevations; he agreed with Staff's comments and suggestions about the south elevation.

Commissioner Kingsley appreciated the care and detail put into the new home and said it is nice to see different materials being used, such as the brick from Denmark and the technologic Tesla roof system. In regards to the garage, looking at the north elevation, she likes that the garage is its own element and does not have the stucco on either side. Looking at the south elevation, she was unsure what detail there is around the stucco for that door, but maybe there is some element of the north elevation that can be brought onto the south elevation on that. She asked for confirmation that the petitioner previously stated the windows will be Marvin and have simulated divided lights, which **Ms. Hense** confirmed.

Commissioner Seyer said this is a very unique design, which he applauds. He has not seen a home like this in this area and it looks really nice. He agreed that the south elevation needed more attention, and if the petitioner is willing to pay attention to that, he supports approval of the project.

Chair Kubow agreed with the comments from the other commissioners. He said the home is dynamic, unusual, special, and not seen very often. He is excited to see this home be built and he appreciated the investment being made in the community. He also agreed with the comments about the south elevation needing more detail and the suggestion to add something more there, to be consistent with the other elevations. **Mr. Hautzinger** said the depth of the garage space on the south elevation looks small, and bumping it out might serve to better fit a car and increase the functionality of the space. **Ms. Hense** confirmed that the garage space on the south elevation is only 18'-8".

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE PROPOSED NEW SINGLE-FAMILY HOME TO BE LOCATED AT 1314 N. HARVARD AVENUE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 2/8/24, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATION AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING:

- 1. A RECOMMENDATION THAT THE PETITIONER REVIEW THE SOUTH ELEVATION AROUND THE GARAGE DOOR TO MAKE IT A MORE CELEBRATED ENTRY.**
- 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.**

Commissioner Seyer felt it should be a requirement that the depth of the garage on the south elevation be bumped out, which Staff can review and approve. **Commissioner Kingsley** was only in favor of making it a requirement to do something that the petitioner feels is correct on the south elevation, which Staff can review. She is okay with the depth of the garage as currently proposed.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY TO AMEND THE MOTION AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PETITIONER REVIEW THE SOUTH ELEVATION AROUND THE GARAGE DOOR TO MAKE IT A MORE CELEBRATED ENTRY.**

COMMISSIONER SEYER SECONDED THE AMENDED MOTION.

Commissioner Eckhardt said his initial concern about changing the south elevation is that the massing of the home has been designed that there is a block and a center, and he has concerns about taking that block on that side and manipulating it; however, he noticed on the opposite end there is some articulation at the upper top portion, so it should not hurt the massing of the home if the garage on the south elevation was bumped out a little, and then the façade goes back in. He felt the requirement in the motion was not a horrible hardship.

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

ITEM 3. SINGLE-FAMILY ADDITION REVIEW**DC#24-018 – 434 S. Dunton Ave.**

Kevin Purdom, representing *JRC Design Build*, and **Paul Loiterstein**, the owner, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing a complete renovation and addition to an existing one-and-a-half story house to create a new expanded two-story house. The existing house has no garage, and the new addition includes a new attached one-car garage. The total floor area requires a minor adjustment, but otherwise the project complies with the R-3 single-family zoning requirements.

The subject property is located in a neighborhood of predominantly older homes. The homes vary in style and size, including single-story, one-and-a-half story, and two-story homes. There is a mix of attached and detached garages, with the majority being detached.

Overall, the proposed design is a nice refresh and update to the existing house, while maintaining a similar character and style as the original house. However, the proposed placement of the new garage in the basement level located below the front porch with a sloping driveway and retaining walls has a poor appearance that is not compatible with homes of this vintage or the neighborhood. The proposed garage arrangement is very unusual, especially for a traditional bungalow style home, which the Design Commission should evaluate. A more traditional arrangement would be a new detached garage located in the rear yard. For reference, in 2023, this petitioner submitted a different plan for this project with a detached garage that was administratively approved by Staff, which Staff still recommends as a better design.

Mr. Purdom said he is the Architect for this project and the homeowner is doing all the work himself because he is in the trades. The homeowner originally bought the existing home with a plan to renovate and sell it; however, as he started working on the home, he decided it could be his family's forever home, and they decided to stay in the area. He does not want to tear down and rebuild the existing home, but instead take what he can from the home and stay within the character of the neighborhood. **Mr. Purdom** said they originally received approval through design review and permit and the owner started working on the home with the plans for a detached garage in the rear. As he continued to work on it, he reconsidered the detached garage since they did not plan to use it for car storage, and an attached garage on the side was done, similar to the home directly to the left that the owner shares a gravel driveway with. The owner then decided to shift the driveway to the other side so he could have his own driveway, and as he continued to work on the inside of the home, he saw across the street there was an existing drop-down to a basement garage, which is shown in the photos submitted. It is a different style but feel it matches the homes in the neighborhood, and will not take up any yard space and the existing basement can be used. Because the homeowner is doing all the work, he is prepared to handle the engineering and work with the Village on this. **Mr. Purdom** said the homeowner can also speak to why he wants the drop-down driveway as opposed a detached, attached, or no garage at all.

Mr. Loiterstein said this home became an evolution of love since they first bought it. As he started working on the home and began to meet the neighbors, he noticed that the driveway and garage of the adjacent home at 438 S. Dunton are right on the property line, and the neighbor parks all their cars in their driveway. Initially, his home had no driveway on the south side, just gravel, and adding a driveway and detached garage on that side would result in a lot of cars parked there and look like a parking lot. The two homes already share a driveway apron, and two driveways there would be only 3-feet apart. He pointed out that none of the 6 homes surrounding his property have detached garages, all the homes have an attached garage, and if a large garage is added in the rear yard of his home, it will ruin the open view that currently exists there, as well as shrink his yard. They decided to eliminate the detached garage and add a wrap-around porch that will fill in the area on the south, and extend the kitchen over. It worked out that the existing tree on the right side of the parkway was dead, so they decided to move the driveway over there. He then noticed the neighbor directly across the street has a driveway that goes below grade, which he felt was a great idea for his home.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

Kevin Hayek, 430 S. Dunton Avenue, lives directly north of the home. He did not oppose the sloping driveway with a garden-level garage, but he had concerns about the retaining wall. He referred to the site plan and said it appears that the retaining wall is uncontained, whereas many of the other homes in the area, including the home across the street have their retaining walls contained within the structure line of the property. The site plan shows what appears to be a 5' or 6' drop on that corner, which is within 3-feet of the property line where he has an immediate walkway with access to his gate to his backyard. He felt this was a potential hazard. He also referred to the elevation where there is no fencing shown there, and he questioned how that might impact the 27' building line.

Mr. Loiterstein said the original deck on the front of the home that was removed, projected out almost 8-feet, which left another 8-feet to the building line, which is where he could theoretically put a fence or railing so that steep drop gets eliminated. He had the same concern as the neighbor, and based on the building line, there is enough room to add a decorative railing going down the retaining wall to create a safe environment. **Commissioner Eckhardt** replied that there is a code requirement for a railing on a deck surface above a certain height, and he agreed that this is a hazard. **Commissioner Kingsley** commented that a 3-foot fence is allowed in the front yard.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said the recessed driveway is not a new element on this street and he felt it was a great solution for this home. He was unsure about the zoning issues related to the location of the retaining wall, which is not this commission's purview. He liked the colors being proposed, he said the home is simple, and the wrap-around porch is perfect for this street. He was fine with the home as proposed.

Commissioner Kingsley had concerns about water issues with a recessed garage, but she was okay approving it because it is for a homeowner and not for a spec home. She said the width of the new driveway at the front of the garage is 17', and she asked why it needs to be that wide. **Mr. Loiterstein** said that it will give a little extra room to get around another car. **Commissioner Kingsley** said that 17' is big and wide and the retaining wall is going to be really important, and she was concerned about garbage cans being stored in the driveway, similar to the home across the street. She would rather see the driveway be 14' wide, which is the width of the home and more in line with the home, because the material of the driveway is going to be important. **Mr. Loiterstein** said the inside of the garage is actually the size of a 2-car garage, 17' x 23', so there will be more than enough room to store all the bikes and trash cans inside the garage. The reason for the 17' wide driveway was not for garbage cans.

Commissioner Seyer agreed with the other commissioners' comments and added that logistically, a recessed driveway is not easy to deal with in regards to water and drainage; he cautioned the petitioner. **Mr. Loiterstein** said there is an existing functional drain in the basement, but because the home was built in 1925, he is unsure if that drain is part of the rain drain or part of the sewer. **Commissioner Seyer** completely understood the reasoning and is supportive of there not being a detached garage; the homes on both sides do not have one and Google earth shows four cars piled in the adjacent driveway. He was in favor of less density of vehicles and a little more design integrity, and he was in favor of the addition as unusual as it is, it is not unprecedented on this street. **Commissioner Seyer** also applauded the effort to re-use the existing infrastructure of the home.

Commissioner Fitzgerald was okay with the design of the driveway and garage, and asked what the retaining walls will be made of. **Mr. Loiterstein** said the wall will most likely be concrete, with something decorative on the front, but he hoped to find a way to make the wall look like wood. **Commissioner Eckhardt** suggested using a form liner as an option. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** wanted the material of the retaining wall to be reviewed and approved by Staff, and any railing added along the retaining wall should not be cedar, it should match the roof. He asked if the garage door, front door and railings will all be cedar, as shown in the rendering, and **Mr. Loiterstein** said they are thinking of switching out the wood railings in the front to wrought iron, so it opens it up and is more cohesive with their neighbor. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** asked the petitioner to clarify the materials he wants the commission to vote on tonight. **Mr. Loiterstein** said the railings can change to wrought iron, he was thinking of making the doors red, staining the beams, and changing the white siding to a cream color. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** liked the idea of less cedar than

what is shown in the rendering, and felt that all exterior colors should be reviewed and approved by Staff once the petitioner makes a decision. He was okay with the recessed driveway and garage, and said that the retaining wall material should also be approved by Staff.

Chair Kubow felt the petitioner solved a unique problem with the existing home that is on a very challenging lot, and he appreciated the thought that went into it. He also appreciated that the homeowner wants to live in the existing home and maintain what is there instead of tearing it down and starting over. He agreed with Commissioner Fitzgerald's comments about all the cedar material and was glad to hear a different material was being considered. He was okay with the rest of the home.

Commissioner Kingsley said the hip roof over the wrap-around porch on the south elevation that goes to a flat roof is not in keeping with the rest of the home, since the rest of the home is gable and a shed roof, and she had concerns about water issues in this area. She wanted to require the petitioner to look at a different form of that roof and eliminate the flat roof, and submit to Staff for review and approval. She suggested a shed roof instead.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE ADDITION TO THE EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY HOME LOCATED AT 434 S. DUNTON AVENUE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 2/22/24, 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 FINAL COLOR SCHEME FOR THE RAILING, FRONT DOOR, GARAGE DOOR, AND COLORATION OF THE RETAINING WALL BE SUBMITTED TO STAFF FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL, AND IF THE FINAL SELECTION IS TOO DIFFERENT FROM WHAT IS PRESENTED TONIGHT, THEN THE PROJECT RETURN TO THE DESIGN COMMISSION.
2. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PETITIONER PROVIDE A TEXTURAL DESIGN FOR THE RETAINING WALL SUCH AS A CONCRETE FORM LINER.
3. THIS REVIEW DEALS WITH ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, NOR REPRESENT ANY TACIT APPROVAL OR SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED LAND USE OR ANY OTHER ZONING AND/OR LAND USE ISSUES OR DECISIONS THAT STEM FROM ZONING, BUILDING, SIGNAGE OR ANY OTHER REVIEWS. IN ADDITION TO THE NORMAL TECHNICAL REVIEW, PERMIT DRAWINGS WILL BE REVIEWED FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE DESIGN COMMISSION AND ANY OTHER COMMISSION OR BOARD APPROVAL CONDITIONS. IT IS THE PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO INCORPORATE ALL REQUIREMENTS LISTED ON THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS INTO THE PERMIT DRAWINGS, AND TO ENSURE THAT BUILDING PERMIT PLANS AND SIGN PERMIT PLANS COMPLY WITH ALL ZONING CODE, BUILDING CODE AND SIGN CODE REQUIREMENTS.

Commissioner Kingsley suggested the requirement for the final color scheme include all the materials being proposed, including the siding color. **Commissioner Eckhardt** wanted there to be some flexibility in the requirement. **Mr. Hautzinger** said he would expect the petitioner to submit a revised color rendering with the final color selections showing all of the materials together.

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

ITEM 4. SIGN VARIATION REVIEW**DC#24-008 – 44 S. Vail Ave.**

Dale Balsitis, representing *Corporate Sign Systems*, and **Drew Bulson**, representing *Ketone Partners*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Balsitis said he is petitioning for Ketone Partners to have a multi-tenant business sign in front of 44 S. Vail. A variation is needed for the 20-foot setback required from the property line, and the 6-foot clearance required from the building. The parking lot entry at the north side of Vail has an existing Permit Parking Only sign, so this was the only allowable location for the new ground sign. Their intent is to have a multi-business ground sign that will be the most impactful and visible for customers and clients coming into the building, and the sign will be to the right of the main entry in the grass area. Key things to point out with the placement of the sign; it was moved back another 1' closer to the building, so at this point there are no issues with visibility for foot traffic or vehicle traffic on both Vail and Sigwalt, as well as coming out of the parking lot. They also took into consideration being far enough from the building so there are no issues with the Fire Department connections. The sign structure is very contained with a simplistic, rectangular box with all-black paneling and only the lettering illuminated. **Mr. Balsitis** said they are pursuing the variation to provide visibility for all of the businesses that occupy space in this building.

Chair Kubow asked Staff about the variation request. **Mr. Hautzinger** said that ground signs are allowed in the Downtown, however, there are a number of requirements for them. Per the sign code, the parcel must have an area with a 20-foot setback to accommodate ground sign placement, such as at the Jewel grocery store for example, and in this case there is only a 7-foot setback. Ground signs are also required to maintain a minimum 6-feet of separation from any building or other structure, and the proposed ground sign will be within 5-feet of the building wall to allow space between the sidewalk and the sign. These are the two variations required, otherwise the proposed ground sign complies with all other code requirements.

1. A variation from Chapter 30, Section 30-201.h.5.b, to allow a ground sign to be located in an area with a 7-foot setback, where the parcel must have an area with a 20-foot setback for ground sign placement.
2. A variation from Chapter 30, Section 30-301.d, to allow a ground sign to be located 5-feet from the building wall, where no ground sign shall be closer than 6-feet from any building or other structure.

Mr. Hautzinger clarified that the petitioner is requesting a variation for a 5-foot separation between the back of the ground sign and the building wall, where 6-feet is required, however Staff is suggesting the ground sign be moved 12-inches further away from the sidewalk, reducing that separation from the building to only 4-feet, which will give more relief from the edge of the sidewalk and allow for landscaping around the front of the sign. This would change the variation from 5-feet clearance where 6-feet is required, to 4-feet clearance where 6-feet is required.

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

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** saw the need for a sign and was not opposed to a variation for it, and he definitely agreed that the sign should be pushed back another 12-inches. He liked the color and the material of the sign, but was also open to a different sign altogether. He suggested the sign be low and long, possibly centered on the window to the right of it, making the sign feel a little sleeker. He said this building is one of his favorite rehabs that he has seen in years, and although the proposed ground sign is not bad, he questioned if it could be better for this building.

Commissioner Eckhardt was fine with the ground sign as proposed, and suggested smooth lava rocks or some type of hard landscape element instead of vegetation in front of the sign to allow visibility of the two bottom sign panels. He said Commissioner Fitzgerald's idea is intriguing and he liked the idea of making the sign long and sleek and becoming part of the architecture of the building, sitting between the two brick pilasters in front of the windows. **Commissioner Eckhardt** also said he was surprised that the Fire Department was okay with the sign visually covering up their

connection on the building, and **Mr. Bulson** replied that the plan is to install an FDC sign on the wall above it. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said he could support the sign being proposed, but also thought Commissioner Fitzgerald's idea was pretty cool.

Commissioner Kingsley agreed with Commissioner Fitzgerald's suggestion for a horizontal ground sign, and that the black color of the sign be consistent with the black color on the building. The petitioner confirmed that it will all be the same black color. **Commissioner Kingsley** also said the 5-foot tall ground sign will block light from the fixture on the building behind it, and a horizontal sign would be nicer. She questioned the width of the brick pier behind the sign, and **Mr. Balsitis** said that it is about 60-inches.

Commissioner Seyer was in favor of the ground sign as proposed, as opposed to something more horizontal as suggested. Turning the sign on its side would have twice as many business names at the bottom of the sign that are going to be hard to read, and it will overlap with everything. Looking at the overall picture of the building, right now the sign looks very similar in scale to the center panel within the opening, and it almost feels like the same scale. Taking that center panel and making it a little smaller in between the two sets of doors is probably 3-feet wide, and he was in favor of it. He commented that once things are put horizontal, it will result in more space for people to put things on top of when walking by the building. He felt the ground sign is successful as proposed, with the location requested. He asked about any code requirements with regards to the interior illumination and lighting color of the sign, because this is a beautiful building and he would love to see the sign lighting come into a warmer more neutral tone, to the point where it would match the coloration of the lights on the building. **Commissioner Seyer** reiterated that he liked the ground sign the way it is.

Chair Kubow loved the updates that were done to this building and appreciated the thought that went into the design, and he hoped for continued success in getting tenants for the building. He was fine with the ground sign as proposed, it's clean and simple, and it fits with the existing building. He liked the idea of a more monument horizontal sign, but he was concerned about the overall execution of that, so he is in support of the ground sign as proposed.

Mr. Bulson appreciated all the comments and said for them it is important that the sign is very intentional and matches the existing aesthetic. His only comment about a horizontal sign is that they are actively marketing that front tenant space for a coffee shop, café, or similar use, and any sort of disturbance to the window line and the views could be a detriment to the leasing of that space. Also, the existing windows allow the potential to add an exterior door directly into that space, as opposed to entering through the lobby.

Commissioner Kingsley encouraged the petitioner to look at the location of the ground sign to ensure it is far enough away from the entry canopy to eliminate the potential for anyone to climb up on it.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO RECOMMEND TO THE VILLAGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING SIGN VARIATIONS FOR 44 S. VAIL AVENUE, AS SUBMITTED.

1. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-201.H.5.B, TO ALLOW A GROUND SIGN TO BE LOCATED IN AN AREA WITH A 7-FOOT SETBACK, WHERE THE PARCEL MUST HAVE AN AREA WITH A 20-FOOT SETBACK FOR GROUND SIGN PLACEMENT.
2. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-301.D, TO ALLOW A GROUND SIGN TO BE LOCATED 4- FEET FROM THE BUILDING WALL, WHERE NO GROUND SIGN SHALL BE CLOSER THAN 6- FEET FROM ANY BUILDING OR OTHER STRUCTURE.

THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE PLANS RECEIVED 1/31/24, FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES, AND THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. A RECOMMENDATION THAT THE PETITIONER REVIEW THE LANDSCAPE MATERIALS LOCATED

DIRECTLY IN FRONT OF THE GROUND SIGN, SO AS NOT TO CREATE VEGETATION THAT WILL GROW AND HIDE THE SIGN.

2. A RECOMMENDATION THAT THE PETITIONER REVIEW THE COLOR TEMPERATURE OF THE LIGHTS INSIDE THE GROUND SIGN, SO THEY ARE NOT THE BRIGHT WHITE DAYLIGHT BUT A SOFTER COLOR.
3. THIS REVIEW DEALS WITH ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, ANY OTHER ZONING AND/OR LAND USE ISSUES OR DECISIONS THAT STEM FROM ZONING, 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 ARCHITECT/HOMEOWNER/BUILDER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO COMPLY WITH THE DESIGN COMMISSION APPROVAL AND ENSURE THAT BUILDING PERMIT PLANS COMPLY WITH ALL ZONING CODE, BUILDING PERMIT AND SIGNAGE REQUIREMENTS.

Commissioner Kingsley asked about moving the sign back 1-foot as suggested by Staff. **Mr. Hautzinger** clarified that the current variation is to allow the sign to be located 5-feet from the building wall, and he asked if the motion was intended to approve a variation to allow the sign to be located 4-feet from the building and **Commissioner Eckhardt** said yes. **Mr. Hautzinger** also said that the Staff report includes a recommendation that the Design Commission consider including a condition to prohibit wall signs on the south and west walls of the building, in exchange for approval of this new ground sign. He explained that this building has 3 street frontages, and code allows for wall signs at each frontage. **Commissioner Eckhardt** was opposed to adding that condition to the motion, and said it is hard enough to lease space now in the Downtown. **Commissioner Kingsley** agreed.

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

Mr. Hautzinger clarified for the petitioner that the Design Commission is a recommending body to the Village Board for sign variations, so a final review by the Village Board is required for approval of the ground sign.

ITEM 5. OTHER BUSINESS

Public Comment

There was none.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO
ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:45 P.M. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.**