

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION

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

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

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

Members Absent: Jonathan Kubow, Chair

Also Present: Michael Ciurej, Owner of 1021 N Stratford Rd
John Kramer, Arlington Heights Park District
Susan Rohner, Arlington Heights Park District
Jon Krissoff, Chase Bank for Chase Bank
Matt Pyter, Olympik Signs for Chase Bank
Amer Sassila, The HOH Group Inc. for Qargo Coffee
Steve Hautzinger, Planning Staff

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 12, 2024

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 12, 2024. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 1. SINGLE-FAMILY TEARDOWN REVIEW**DC# 24-075– 1021 N. Stratford Rd.**

Michael Ciurej, Senior Designer at *OKW Architects* and owner of the home, was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to demolish an existing single-story residence and detached garage to build a new two-story residence and a new detached garage. This project is scheduled for review by the Zoning Board of Appeals on January 13, 2025 for the following zoning variations: front yard encroachment, side yard encroachment, and air conditioning units located within the required side yard. The foundation of the existing home is being re-used, which is why the variations are required.

The original homes on this block are predominantly single-story and split-level homes with detached garages. Some of the homes have been expanded, as well as two teardown/new houses previously completed on this block. The proposed design being reviewed tonight has a modern aesthetic and color scheme that should be evaluated against the surrounding context. The traditional massing and detached garage do help the home to fit in this location. The asymmetrical brick on the left side of the front elevation has a bold appearance that looks out of place. To soften the impact, a full brick gable wall is recommended. Staff recommends the commissioners evaluate the proposed design, with the comments and recommendations given.

Mr. Ciurej presented the material samples being proposed. He and his wife bought this home 1-1/2 years ago with the intention of improving and extending it to make it their family home. They like the new construction homes in the area that have a more modern aesthetic, and examples of those homes were provided in the packet. They want to maintain as much of the existing home as possible by keeping the existing foundation, existing basement, steel beams and floor framing, and then add a second-floor and expand the home back about 12-feet. They prefer a more modern aesthetic, but also want to keep it a traditional massing to better fit in the neighborhood. A lot of new homes in the area have this similar color scheme, so they feel the new home will not be out of context in this neighborhood. Materials include grey brick, charcoal vertical Hardiboard siding, shingle main roof with a metal roof at the front entry. The existing garage will also be moved back to create more space between the home and garage, and the new garage will remain roughly the same size.

Acting Chair Eckhardt asked if there was any public comment on the project, and there was no response from those in the audience.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Seyer** acknowledged that this is one of the nicest packets to come through for review, including the three-dimensional images provided that help tremendously in evaluating how things come together within the massing. He said the home looks great, and although the small portion of brick on the front elevation looks a little odd, he understood if the petitioner felt strongly about it. **Mr. Ciurej** was okay with changing it to all brick instead, and he presented an image of what that would look like, which also showed the brick continuing down the side elevation as well. **Commissioner Seyer** liked the color palette and modern aesthetic being proposed, and was instantly drawn to the small portion of asymmetrical brick going up on the front of the home, which he felt was not a deterrent to the neighborhood. He was in favor of what is being proposed, over the two options presented, but wanted to hear how the other commissioners felt. He reiterated that he liked the design of the new home, and the materials and color palette being proposed.

Commissioner Kingsley concurred with everything said by Commissioner Seyer; the presentation is nice, the design is thoughtful and well done. With regards to the small portion of brick on the left side of the front elevation, she preferred to see that area be either all vertical siding or all brick, and wrapping the brick down the side of the home as shown in the option presented tonight by the petitioner would be brighter for the adjacent home; she was okay with either option. She asked about the 'Iron Ore' siding color, and **Mr. Ciurej** said the siding would be painted the Sherwin Williams 'Iron Ore' color, which **Commissioner Kingsley** liked. She had no further comments.

Commissioner Fitzgerald liked the home overall and said it is very well designed and he appreciates that all four sides of the home and the garage are also well designed. He loved the garage door and felt the rear elevation is one of the more interesting parts of the home. He had concerns about the small portion of brick on the left side of the front elevation and how it will look in 20 years; whether it will wear and age well. He said it would look better if it was all brick. He said he was not aware that the revised option presented by the petitioner tonight would bring the brick all the way down the side of the home, which is very nice; however, he was open to all brick only on the front elevation. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** also said that wrapping the windows on the right side of the front elevation around the side of the home is a really cool detail, and simplifying the left side of the front elevation brings that out; he recommended all brick for the left side of the front elevation.

Mr. Ciurej was okay with either version for the left side of the front elevation. He felt that wrapping brick all the way down the side of the home will help the home look cohesive throughout, and maintenance of brick is easier than siding, although siding is more cost efficient.

Acting Chair Eckhardt agreed with the comments from the other commissioners. He had concerns about the small portion of brick proposed on the left side of the front elevation, and was in support of it being all brick instead. He liked the brick as proposed on the rear elevation because brick is predominant on the back of the home, and he supported the revised option of all brick on the left side of the front elevation that is carried down the side elevation.

The commissioners had no further comments.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE PROPOSED NEW (TEARDOWN) SINGLE-FAMILY HOME LOCATED AT 1021 N. STRATFORD ROAD. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 10/28/24, 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 LEFT FRONT GABLE AND NORTH SIDE ELEVATION BE CHANGED FROM SIDING TO BRICK.**
- 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**

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

ITEM 2. SIGN VARIATION REVIEW**DC# 24-069 – Arlington Heights Park District – 750 W. Northwest Hwy.**

John Kramer, Director of Parks and Planning, and **Susan Rohner**, Park Planner, representing the *Arlington Heights Park District*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The Arlington Heights Park District is seeking approval to build a new electronic message sign to be located at the intersection of Northwest Highway and Euclid Avenue. The sign is proposed to be the same design and size as the existing Village of Arlington Heights electronic civic events sign which is located at the intersection of Arlington Heights Road and Northwest Highway. The new Park District sign will be used to deliver community messages regarding Park District events and information.

The subject site is currently zoned B-2, General Business Zoning District, and it was occupied by a small office building. The Park District recently purchased the property, demolished the office building, and they are currently pursuing zoning approval through the Plan Commission and Village Board to rezone the property to P-L Public Lands District and consolidate it with the adjacent Arlington Ridge Center site, which requires an amendment of the existing Planned Unit Development (PUD).

In 2017, Chapter 30 Sign Code was amended to allow electronic message signs along certain major arterial commercial corridors, away from residential zoning districts. The subject property is in a location where electronic message signs are not permitted, therefore a variation is required. Additionally, the proposed sign requires variations for size, height, separation distance from the existing Arlington Ridge Center ground sign, and separation distance from the single-family residential property to the north. A complete code summary is provided in Table 1 of the Staff Report.

Additionally, per Chapter 30, Section 30-705.h, the operation of an electronic message sign is required to abide by the following restrictions, to which the petitioner has provided written agreement:

1. The electronic display shall be static displays only with no scrolling, fading, flashing, animation, video, or sound.
2. Messages must be displayed for a minimum of 10 seconds.
3. Auto-dimming photocell technology is required to automatically adjust the display brightness to .3 footcandles maximum above ambient lighting conditions.
4. Off-premises advertising is not allowed.
5. Only permitted to be illuminated the same hours that the business is open.

The petitioner submitted a detailed letter addressing the conditional review criteria for the electronic message sign as well as the sign variation criteria. In summary, the Park District feels there is a valid need for the proposed sign to provide beneficial information to the public regarding park district events and classes, especially to those who are not on social media including seniors and low-income families. They feel that the sign's quality materials and design including extensive landscaping and green space around the sign will be an enhancement to this location, not a negative impact. The design of the sign fits the character of the locality by matching the Village sign and serving as a western gateway feature into Downtown Arlington Heights.

The petitioner also felt that the variation for an electronic sign in this location is needed in lieu of a manual change sign which would be too limiting for sharing current and up to date information to the public. The variations for size, height, and placement of the sign are

necessary for it to be adequately visible and readable from cars at the intersection.

Staff agrees that replicating the Village's electronic sign design will work well to create a western gateway feature into Downtown Arlington Heights, and that the Park District's use of the sign will serve a similar civic events function as the Village's sign for the benefit of the community. The placement of the sign is appropriate to maximize visibility, and the landscaping around the sign is abundant and nicely designed. The size of the sign is consistent with the Village's electronic message sign that is appropriate for visibility at the street intersection.

In regards to having an electronic message sign in this location, Staff does have concerns about electronic signs located on corridors not specified in the ordinance. However, in 2017, when the Village-wide matter of electronic signage was studied, one option that was considered was to allow electronic signage for unique uses. However, the Design Commission and Village Board decided that it would be better to review such unique requests on a case-by-case basis as sign variations. Staff feels that the Park District is an appropriate example of a unique use where an electronic sign is appropriate.

Staff recommends the Design Commission approve the sign variation requests, contingent upon obtaining Village zoning approval for rezoning the property to P-L, Public Lands District, and consolidation with the adjacent Arlington Ridge Center site, which requires amendment of the existing PUD.

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

John Kramer said the Park District very much wants to put a sign at this location, but also wants to emulate the Village's electronic message sign to have the same continuity throughout, and the Village recommended they follow down that path. He said that Steve did a great job explaining the variations being requested, and he offered to add anything further if needed.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** was in favor of the new electronic sign; the quality of the materials, the landscaping, the busyness of this intersection, and the fact that the homes are fairly far away from the sign. This type of information from the Park District he felt could be helpful and will also look like a gateway into the Village. He was okay with the request.

Commissioner Kingsley said the new sign is a great idea and she is not opposed to having an electronic sign at this location. With regards to the design of the masonry on the sign, she felt it might be more appropriate to be slightly different than the Village's electronic sign. She was glad to see the limestone and other true materials being proposed for the sign, but felt that the shape of the sign as shown in the renderings make the sign look like a mausoleum. **Susan Rohner** explained that the software used for the color renderings did not have the capability to make a curve on the top of the sign wall; the renderings incorrectly show a straight edge across the top of the sign. **Commissioner Kingsley** reiterated that she is in support of the new electronic sign and did not mind how big it is; however, she just questions the aesthetics. She asked if the message screen on the new sign has the quality to allow for a photograph, as shown in the drawings. She pointed out that the Village's electronic sign is older. **Mr. Hautzinger** replied that the Village's electronic sign was built and installed 15+ years ago, but the message screen was updated within the last 5 years to allow for high resolution and full color, similar to the new Park District sign being reviewed tonight.

Commissioner Kingsley questioned whether the 6,500K color temperature of the LED message screen could be reduced, and **Mr. Kramer** replied that 6,500K is the maximum color temperature for the sign, but it could be adjusted and reduced if necessary.

Commissioner Seyer was in favor of the new electronic sign and the materials; it bookends the entry into this part of the Village. He understood the concern about the temperature of the LED sign, which is generally for more of a static lighting condition; however, he did not understand the orientation of the sign, and he referred to the aerial showing the placement of the sign with the red color visibility diagram. He questioned why the sign is not rotated more towards the corner, like the sign at the east side of the Village where it is rotated towards the corner, to get the traffic going along Northwest Highway towards the west, and from Arlington Heights Road going to the north. He felt that traffic coming from the west, going east on Euclid, will not be able to see the sign. He asked if the placement of the sign is open to discussion tonight.

Mr. Hautzinger said he initially felt the same way when the petition was submitted and he questioned what the proper orientation should be for the new sign; he originally envisioned it in a similar manner as the Village's sign that faces the street intersection. However, he explained that the Village sign is located at Arlington Heights Road and Northwest Highway where the streets intersect at an acute angle, versus an obtuse angle at the street intersection where the Park District sign is proposed, so facing the sign towards the street intersection would provide very limited visibility. The goal with this new sign is for people who are stopped at the intersection to be able to see it, and the exhibit shows cars that are stopped on Northwest Highway traveling northwest would have the opportunity to view the sign, same as for cars traveling west on Euclid, and for cars traveling southeast on Northwest Highway. He felt there was no perfect angle for the new sign. The petitioner had a concept where the sign was perpendicular to Euclid, which Staff reviewed and discussed and ultimately suggested that it be more perpendicular to Northwest Hwy which seems like the best orientation for visibility, but it is not perfect.

Acting Chair Eckhardt asked if a triangular sign was considered by the petitioner, which he sketched out for consideration. **Mr. Kramer** said they did not consider that, but could look into it. **Acting Chair Eckhardt** said a triangular sign would point directly at the traffic, with the same orientation as currently shown; the side that faces west would turn more to face the street and not the sidewalk. **Commissioner Seyer** assumed the new sign was studied and analyzed appropriately, but he questioned whether the current placement/orientation of the sign will get the attention that it should, as shown on the aerial diagram with the red color viewing angle. **Mr. Hautzinger** said the exhibit was prepared by Aurora sign Co., and he asked the petitioner about what conversations they had with them about their recommendation for placement of the sign. **Mr. Kramer** said they started with just a two-sided sign with masonry and never looked at the V-concept; however, they can go back and ask the sign company whether or not that would make this exhibit any different from their perspective, and also see where that is on cost. **Commissioner Seyer** was in favor of the petitioner doing that, as well as Staff reviewing that change. He wanted to be sure that the new sign gets the most bang for the buck.

Acting Chair Eckhardt agreed with the comments from the other commissioners. He supports the new electronic sign, but asked the commissioners and Staff to consider thinking again about the schools in town and their interest in an electronic sign. He said that technology is here and it should be used, because getting information out is important.

Mr. Hautzinger asked if the commissioners are encouraging the petitioner to re-design as a V-shape sign to turn the visibility triangles. **Commissioner Seyer** felt the sign should be rotated about 15 degrees counter-clockwise to capture more visibility from the road than is

currently shown on the red aerial; however, he is not a sign designer and the orientation should be studied by an expert. He was okay with Staff reviewing any change made to the orientation of the sign.

Acting Chair Eckhardt commented that there is a large amount of traffic on Northwest Highway and less traffic on the other side. He was unsure how readable the sign will be as currently placed from cars going westbound. **Commissioner Seyer** reiterated that he wants the petitioner to determine the best orientation for the sign. **Mr. Hautzinger** said that orienting a ground sign perpendicular to the road is generally a default, so cars driving each way can see the sign, which is basically what the petitioner is proposing with the new sign along Northwest Highway; however, he agreed that the placement of the sign feels a bit removed because of the geometry of this intersection, the cars are a bit far away.

Commissioner Kingsley said the east side of the sign could be perpendicular to Northwest Highway, and the west side of the sign could be perpendicular to Euclid; this will end up with the red visibility triangle in the exhibit being rotated slightly farther south to improve visibility from the west.

Acting Chair Eckhardt recommended a motion to approve the proposed new sign with a requirement that the petitioner study with their sign contractor an alternate orientation of the sign, and submit to Staff for review.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO RECOMMEND TO THE VILLAGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING SIGN VARIATIONS FOR THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS PARK DISTRICT AT 750 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY:

1. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-701 ELECTRONIC MESSAGE SIGNS, TO ALLOW AN ELECTRONIC MESSAGE SIGN FACING NORTHWEST HIGHWAY, WHERE ELECTRONIC MESSAGE SIGNS MAY ONLY BE PERMITTED AT DESIGNATED MAJOR ARTERIAL COMMERCIAL CORRIDORS.
2. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-302.A, TO ALLOW A GROUND SIGN WITH A 665-FOOT SEPARATION BETWEEN GROUND SIGNS, WHERE 800 FEET MINIMUM IS REQUIRED.
3. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-203.B, TO ALLOW A 10'-5 1/4" TALL GROUND SIGN, WHERE SIX FEET IS THE MAXIMUM ALLOWED HEIGHT.
4. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-203.B, TO ALLOW A 36.2 SF GROUND SIGN, WHERE 25 SQUARE FEET IS THE MAXIMUM ALLOWED SIZE.
5. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-705.C, TO ALLOW A 32.2 SQUARE FOOT ELECTRONIC MESSAGE SIGN THAT IS 89% OF THE TOTAL GROUND SIGN SIZE, WHERE 33% OF THE ALLOWABLE GROUND SIGN SIZE (8.25 SF) IS THE MAXIMUM ALLOWED.
6. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-705.F, TO ALLOW AN ELECTRONIC MESSAGE SIGN TO BE 232 FEET FROM A RESIDENTIAL USE, WHERE 300 FEET IS THE MINIMUM REQUIRED SEPARATION.

THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE PLANS RECEIVED 11/18/24, FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES, AND THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING:

1. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE ORIENTATION OF THE SIGN BE STUDIED TO CONFIRM OPTIMAL VISIBILITY WITH CONSIDERATION TO CHANGE THE SIGN LAYOUT TO A V-SHAPED SIGN, TO BE REVIEWED BY STAFF.

2. A RECOMMENDATION THAT IF THE SIGN IS CHANGED TO A V-SHAPE, THEN THE PETITIONER COULD CONSIDER SIMPLIFYING THE AESTHETICS OF THE SIGN, SUCH AS ELIMINATING THE ARCHED TOP, FOR STAFF REVIEW.
3. THE SIGN VARIATION APPROVALS ARE CONTINGENT UPON OBTAINING VILLAGE ZONING APPROVAL FOR REZONING THE PROPERTY TO P-L PUBLIC LANDS DISTRICT, AND CONSOLIDATION WITH THE ADJACENT ARLINGTON RIDGE CENTER SITE, WHICH REQUIRES AMENDMENT OF THE EXISTING PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD).
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, 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.

Mr. Hautzinger asked if the recommendation regarding the aesthetics is to change the sign design to match the Arlington Ridge Center? **Commissioner Kingsley** clarified that it is just a recommendation to simplify the shape because there are no curves on most of the park district buildings, but she was also okay with keeping the design to match the Village sign exactly. **Mr. Hautzinger** asked then if this motion passes and the petitioner studies the sign with their sign contractor and they ultimately decide that the V-shape does work better and the aesthetics of the sign are simplified, the changes can be reviewed and approved by Staff; however, would significant design changes require re-review by the Design Commission? **Acting Chair Eckhardt** said that Staff can determine if the changes need to be reviewed again by the Design Commission; he was okay with either sign layout.

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

Commissioner Seyer felt the question of orientation could come up at the Village Board review of the project, and having a secondary orientation study will be beneficial for that meeting and for the petitioner.

ITEM 3. SIGN VARIATION REVIEW**DC# 24-071 – Chase Bank – 585 E. Palatine Rd.**

Jon Krissoff, representing *Chase Bank*, and **Matt Pyter**, representing *Olympik Signs*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. Chase Bank is planning to construct a new bank building at the former location of the AT&T store at the corner of Palatine Road and Rand Road at the Town & Country Shopping Center. The property is located in a B-2, General Business Zoning District. The new building is proposed to have a total of four wall signs. Per code, one wall sign is allowed per street frontage, so only two wall signs are allowed in this location. Two wall signs are proposed on the north elevation, one facing each street, and two wall signs are proposed on the building entry tower which is located on the south side of the building, facing the parking area. Chase Bank will also have one code-compliant ground sign facing Rand Road. The petitioner is seeking a sign variation to allow four wall signs where only two wall signs are allowed.

1. A variation from Chapter 30, Section 30-402.a, Number, to allow four wall signs where only two wall signs are allowed.
2. A variation from Chapter 30, section 30-403.a Dimensions, to allow a 29.7 sf wall sign on the west wall of the building, where 0 sf is allowed.
3. A variation from Chapter 30, section 30-403.a Dimensions, to allow a 29.7 sf wall sign on the south wall of the building, where 0 sf is allowed.

The petitioner submitted a letter stating the proposal for four wall signs is due to the building's unique architectural design and orientation, with the main entrance on the west without street frontage, and the south entrance facing the parking lot approach to the building. The petitioner feels the four wall signs are needed to help customers find their location due to the outlot location within the shopping center. They also noted that the previous AT&T store in this location had a total of five wall signs.

Mr. Hautzinger said that Staff agrees that this site and the building orientation are unique, with no driveways directly into the site and all vehicular access routed through the main shopping center parking lot. The wall signs on the west and south walls of the building entrance will help to guide customers that are approaching through the parking lot from different directions. For these same reasons, the former AT&T store in this location received variations to allow five wall signs, and the adjacent Verizon store recently received variations to allow four wall signs.

Overall, the proposed wall signs for Chase Bank are nicely designed and work well with the architectural design of the building. Staff does not object to the requested variations and recommends approval as submitted.

Jon Krissoff said that Staff did a tremendous job with the presentation, and he was here to answer any questions the commissioners may have.

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

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Seyer** understood the need for the signage and he asked for clarification about the monument signs included in the packet. **Mr. Hautzinger** clarified that in addition to the wall signs, the petitioner is proposing a new ground sign facing Rand Road and small directional signs at the driveways into the

parking lot, which are all code compliant and do not require variations. **Commissioner Seyer** agreed that this site and building are unique, and that clarity of the signage will only help vehicular circulation in this area. He felt the signs are tasteful and he is in favor of the signs. **Commissioners Kingsley and Fitzgerald** agreed as well. **Acting Chair Eckhardt** had nothing more to add and completely agreed with the signs.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO RECOMMEND TO THE VILLAGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING SIGN VARIATIONS FOR CHASE BANK AT 585 E. PALATINE ROAD, AS SUBMITTED:

- 1. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-402.A, NUMBER, TO ALLOW FOUR WALL SIGNS WHERE ONLY TWO WALL SIGNS ARE ALLOWED.**
- 2. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-403.A DIMENSIONS, TO ALLOW A 29.7 SF WALL SIGN ON THE WEST WALL OF THE BUILDING, WHERE 0 SF IS ALLOWED.**
- 3. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-403.A DIMENSIONS, TO ALLOW A 29.7 SF WALL SIGN ON THE SOUTH WALL OF THE BUILDING, WHERE 0 SF IS ALLOWED.**

THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE PLANS DATED 11/27/24 AND RECEIVED ON 12/3/24, FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES, AND THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING:

- 1. 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.**

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

ITEM 4. COMMERCIAL REVIEW**DC# 24-076 – Qargo Coffee – 4 W. Rand Rd.**

Amer Sassila, representing *The HOH Group Inc*, was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing exterior modifications to an existing free-standing retail building at the Arlington Plaza Shopping Center. The building was previously occupied by Olson Rug & Flooring, but it is currently vacant. Qargo Coffee is proposing interior tenant improvements and exterior facade modifications. The property is zoned B-2, General Business District.

The scope of the proposed facade renovation is primarily a new painted color scheme on the existing upper EIFS facade on all four sides of the building. The existing tan/red brick and dark bronze storefront windows will remain. The current color scheme matches the rest of the Arlington Plaza shopping center, so the Design Commission should evaluate this change. Staff feels the new color scheme is nicely designed and will be a nice refresh for the building. The mismatch with the rest of the shopping center is not a concern due to this being a freestanding building.

All rooftop mechanical equipment is required to be screened from view. There is one existing rooftop mechanical unit that will remain which is fully screened by the existing parapet walls on all four sides of the building.

Per code, only one wall sign is allowed per street frontage. Since this building only has frontage on Rand Road, only one wall sign is allowed. The drawings currently show three wall signs, which is not allowed. The plans will either need to be revised to comply with code, or seek sign variations. Sign variations are based on unique circumstances and hardship. Other similar freestanding restaurants in Arlington Heights have obtained a variation to allow a second wall sign, which is typically smaller and placed above the main entrance doors on the side of the building, but three wall signs would be excessive and considered a competitive advantage over similar businesses.

With regards to drive-through signage, the drawings and renderings are not fully detailed at this time, but it should be noted that fully electronic drive-through menu boards are not currently allowed in Arlington Heights. Code allows printed menu boards with a smaller electronic order screen. A variation would be required to allow fully electronic menu boards.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed design for the existing building, as submitted.

Amer Sassila said they are willing to work with the Village with regards to signage and revise anything on the facade if necessary. In terms of the architecture, they are maintaining as much existing as possible, with little cosmetic adjustments, mostly paint. He had no further comments.

Acting Chair Eckhardt asked if the color along the lower portion of the building facade is the existing brick, and **Mr. Sassila** said that it is. **Mr. Hautzinger** clarified that the rendering shows the brick in all one color, but the piers are actually a different color, which the elevations show. He explained that the knee wall is a light brick color, and the piers are a red brick color. **Mr. Sassila** clarified that the piers will be stained a darker color for contrast. They do not want to alter the existing building too much.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** was not opposed to having this building look different than the rest of the center, but without real

colors, he is struggling with whether the colors go with both of the bricks; he could not make that determination. The gray color being proposed has to be the perfect color to blend with both of the brick colors; samples would really help tonight. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** said that regardless of what is said tonight, Staff should have to approve the colors on site or something.

Commissioner Kingsley was excited to see the changes being proposed to the existing building, and agreed with Commissioner Fitzgerald with regards to the colors. She liked the idea of using cool colors, but felt the colors being proposed did not go with the warm color of the brick, although keeping the existing brick is a good idea. Studying the grey color to be warmer might help, and she asked if the blue accent color is also being used for the coping and top of the corners. The petitioner replied that the coping and the cap on the pier at the corner will be black.

Mr. Hautzinger asked if the colors being proposed are standard prototype colors for Qargo Coffee, and **Mr. Sassila** replied that they are required to match the blue color of the company logo, but have flexibility with the other colors. **Commissioner Kingsley** said there are 3 different grey colors being shown; a dark grey for the trim, the medium grey behind the sign, and the light grey for the field. She felt that making all the grey colors a tone warmer would help with the brick, and she pointed out that there is no medium grey color behind the sign in the renderings, and she liked that there be a distinction between that. **Commissioner Kingsley** also suggested painting the utility door a color to match the grey, instead of a color to match the brick, and she suggested the petitioner study the shadow from the letters of the wall sign, so it did not confuse the sign letters beneath it. **Mr. Sassila** said they could look into that to confirm.

Commissioner Seyer said that he wants the project to be successful, but he had concerns about the project because no materials or paint color samples were provided tonight. There are different elevations of colors being shown and some uncertainty with the rendering. The grey colors being proposed are cool and the brick is warm, and if the grey colors being shown tonight cannot be changed, then he could not support the project. However, if the petitioner is open to changing the grey colors, then he would suggest a warmer grey. He felt it was in the petitioner's best interest to make sure this is done right so everyone is proud of it. He wants to see the colors revised and presented with chips next to the brick color selection, which Staff can review and approve. He also agreed with Commissioner Kingsley's comments about the paint color of the utility door.

Acting Chair Eckhardt agreed with Commissioner Seyer regarding all the colors and that the colors need to be warmer tones. He was okay with the design being proposed.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR QARGO COFFEE LOCATED AT 4 W. RAND ROAD. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 10/31/24, 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 NEW COLORS BE SUBMITTED TO STAFF FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL.**
- 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 PROPRIATENESS 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.

2. COMPLIANCE WITH ALL FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES.

Commissioner Seyer said that the paint colors need to be selected with the final brick colors, which is the only way to see them. **Commissioner Kingsley** said that if the brick colors are not changing, then the colors need to be coordinated with the red and buff brick colors. **Commissioner Seyer** said the petitioner can take a picture of the paint sample next to the brick, showing they are the same color, along with the other paint colors, and submit to Staff for review. He wanted to add a requirement to the motion that any solid doors within the brick wall be shown to be painted the accent color, not a color to match the brick.

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

3. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PAINT COLOR FOR THE SOLID DOORS WITHIN THE BRICK FAÇADE NEEDS TO BE APPROVED BY STAFF, AND THEY DO NOT NEED TO MATCH THE BRICK.

COMMISSIONER SEYER SECONDED THE AMENDED MOTION.

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

ITEM 5. OTHER BUSINESS

Public Comment

There were no comments.

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