

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
JANUARY 28, 2025

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

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

Members Absent: John Fitzgerald

Also Present: Paul Rogner, PAR Craft Ltd for 615 N. Belmont Ave.
John Anstadt, J. Anstadt Architecture for 635 S. Belmont Ave.
Cynthia & Doug Hiskes, Owners of 635 S. Belmont Ave.
Kamil Kapica, K/K Architecture for 923 N. Dunton Ave.
Catherine & James Hommer, Owners of 923 N. Dunton Ave.
John Kramer, AH Park District for Arlington Ridge Center
Maggie Krieger, FGM Architects for Arlington Ridge Center
John Dzarnowski, FGM Architects for Arlington Ridge Center
Steve Hautzinger, Planning Staff

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FOR DECEMBER 10, 2024

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

ITEM 1. SINGLE-FAMILY TEARDOWN REVIEW**DC# 24-082– 615 N. Belmont Ave.**

Paul Rogner, the architect representing *PAR Craft Ltd*, was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments.

The petitioner is proposing to demolish an existing single-story residence and one-car detached garage to build a new two-story residence with an attached two-car garage. The plans comply with all the R-3 zoning requirements.

The existing neighborhood has a mix of older and newer homes with both single-story and two-story massing, and a mix of attached and detached garages. This project is being formally reviewed to evaluate how the proposed design fits with the existing context, as well as due to past concerns from residents in this location regarding other new construction projects. Overall, the front of the proposed new house has a predominantly traditional appearance and composition which will generally fit well in this location. The materials and colors have a nice appearance and are well coordinated. The house has a high level of detail on all sides, which is always encouraged. Staff recommends approval of the new home as submitted.

Paul Rogner said the proposed design is fairly straightforward consisting of twin gables with a small central gable at the front entrance. The client did not want any columns at the front portico, therefore, the gable was brought forward for more prominence on the front. The stone façade is primarily on the front of the home, with siding and trim mostly on the sides and back of the home. They purposely want to avoid a stark white appearance so an off-white color with a little grey in it is being proposed for the home.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mark Silver, who lives at 400 E. Euclid, which is adjacent to the property, asked how far the new home will be located from the property line. **Mr. Hautzinger** said the lot is 60 feet wide, and code requires the side yard setbacks to be a minimum of 10 percent of the lot width, so 6 feet in this case. The new home is proposed to be set back 6.1 feet from the side yard, which complies with code. Mr. Silver has no further questions.

There was no further public comment.

The commissioner summarized their comments. **Commissioner Seyer** said it is a nice design and the home will fit in with the neighborhood. There is nothing that stands out that makes him question the design, and he is in favor of it as submitted.

Commissioner Eckhardt said the proposed home is a newer Scarsdale design-type home; the front elevation is symmetrical and makes sense, and the 2-car garage is not overwhelming. The rear elevation is very exciting with lots of windows and he likes that the design is carried around all 4 sides of the home. The stone on the front is also nice, and he likes the colors being proposed. He asked if there was a lighter siding color available, and **Mr. Rogner** replied that 'Iced White' is an option, but it is a very stark white, and they want to soften the siding color. **Commissioner Eckhardt** asked about the trim color and **Mr. Rogner** said the trim will be the same color as the siding, and it will be the same texture and material as the siding. The window color is black, as well as the front door. **Commissioner**

Eckhardt had no further comments.

Commissioner Kingsley said it is a nicely designed home. She recommended using a stone with mortar, which will look more residential and bring the scale of the façade down. She recommended using smooth trim, which will make the windows pop and better show the difference between the trim and the siding. The box bay on the south elevation with the low pitch roof above it is a little out of context to the rest of the home, which is traditional. Options include a gable on the box bay instead of the shed roof, and siding instead of smooth panels. The door on the right-side elevation should be well detailed and not utilitarian, since it will face the adjacent neighbor. **Commissioner Kingsley** also suggested adding simulated divided lights in the windows. She had no further comments.

Chair Kubow loved the symmetry of the new home, especially the front elevation, and he loved the clean, minimal look of the white and the stone being proposed. He asked about the color and material of the garage door, and **Mr. Rogner** said that a fiberglass door is being considered, in a toned-down black color. **Chair Kubow** said the rear elevation is phenomenal and very cool looking, and he asked about the raised slab of the rear patio. **Mr. Rogner** said there is a grading change going on there, which is something they are working through with regards to the level of the patio and being able to keep up with the grade change in the back yard. **Chair Kubow** had no further comments.

Commissioner Eckhardt questioned how the front entry portico will be structured, especially the left side, which looks to be about a 4-foot projection. **Mr. Roger** said it is not as severe as it looks, and there is a small cantilever that extends out from the home to pick up that corner, which will be hidden within the roof. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said it looks odd and he wants to make sure that visually it does not look unstable, like it will fall down. **Mr. Rogner** said the projection of the portico extends out only enough to pick up the gutter from the other side; it really is minimal so it has a little more prominence.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT TO APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE PROPOSED NEW (TEARDOWN) SINGLE-FAMILY HOME TO BE LOCATED AT 615 N. BELMONT AVENUE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 12/26/24, 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 FOR MORTAR IN THE STONE.
2. A RECOMMENDATION TO CONSIDER RECONFIGURING THE BUMP-OUT ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF THE HOME, SECOND-FLOOR, SUCH AS A GABLE INSTEAD, AND CONSIDER DOING IT IN SIDING.
3. A RECOMMENDATION FOR SMOOTH TRIM AND SIMULATED DIVIDED LITE GRILLES IN THE WINDOWS.
4. THIS REVIEW DEALS WITH ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, NOR REPRESENT ANY TACIT APPROVAL OR SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED LAND USE OR ANY OTHER ZONING AND/OR LAND USE ISSUES OR DECISIONS THAT STEM FROM ZONING, BUILDING, SIGNAGE OR ANY OTHER REVIEWS. IN ADDITION TO THE NORMAL TECHNICAL REVIEW, PERMIT DRAWINGS WILL BE REVIEWED FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE DESIGN COMMISSION AND ANY OTHER COMMISSION OR BOARD APPROVAL CONDITIONS. IT IS THE PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO INCORPORATE ALL REQUIREMENTS LISTED ON THE CERTIFICATE OF 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.

- 5. COMPLIANCE WITH ALL FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES.**

KINGSLEY, AYE; ECKHARDT, AYE; SEYER AYE; KUBOW, AYE.

ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 2. SINGLE-FAMILY TEARDOWN REVIEW**DC#24-102 – 635 S. Belmont Ave.**

John Anstadt, representing *J. Anstadt Architecture*, and the owners, **Cynthia & Doug Hiskes**, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to demolish an existing two-story residence and one-car detached garage to allow construction of a new two-story residence with an attached three-car garage (one car tandem). The proposed house complies with all the R-3 zoning requirements. The subject property is located in the Scarsdale neighborhood. According to tax records, the existing home was built when Scarsdale was originally developed back in 1929. Scarsdale was not included in the Community Preservation Report that was prepared by the School of the Art Institute of Chicago in 2004, but in Staff's assessment, the existing house does contribute to the historic character of the neighborhood. In general, Staff encourages renovation/addition of contributing historic homes, in lieu of teardown, and there is abundant space on the site to update and expand the existing house. 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".

In regards to the proposed new house, Staff feels the design is nicely done with a traditional style, scale, and character that would fit very well with the neighborhood. The materials and detailing are high quality, and the colors are nicely coordinated. Aside from the proposed demolition, Staff has no objections to the design of the proposed new house, and recommends the Design Commission evaluate the proposed teardown.

Chair Kubow asked if Staff was recommending rejection because of the historic nature of the existing home, or recommending evaluation by the Design Commission. **Mr. Hautzinger** said that Staff is not taking a position on the existing home, and is asking the Design Commission to evaluate it for its importance to the neighborhood. Also, the petitioner has not provided plans of the existing home and the condition of the home, which are questions that the commissioners can ask the petitioner.

John Anstadt presented samples of the materials being proposed for the new home, and said that the brick has changed from what was originally submitted. He explained that the brick color in the rendering shows whiter than the sample provided tonight, which is more of a brownish tone to it, a little distressed. He added that the frieze board color will match closely to the brick, and the other elements on the home will be a darker color. **Commissioner Kingsley** asked about the mortar color, and **Mr. Anstadt** said it will be off-white.

Mr. Anstadt showed a photo of the existing home and said the home has not been lived in for the past 2 years; there are broken plumbing pipes in the last year or so, and they feel the home has gone through its useful life. There is water intrusion in the basement, the brick chimney is close to coming down, there are challenges with insulating the plaster and lath walls, the home has a poor layout with the garage located off the back corner of the home, as well as the kitchen, which causes a challenge with a new garage in the back.

Mr. Anstadt said they have gone through a number of iterations with the design of the new home to ensure the clients like it and to make sure that it fits in with the neighborhood. The garage was intentionally set back from the main portion of the home and brick was purposely selected because all the homes on the street are stone and/or brick. They feel the symmetry

of the new home goes really well with the neighboring homes, and will be a nice add to what the existing home is now. There will be a study on the first-floor, right side, and a powder room behind the study, which will be used for a future age-in-place or aging parent situation. This would not be possible with the existing home.

Cynthia Hiskes said they are grateful to be here tonight and extended their sincere thanks to the commissioners for the vital role they play in their community. They are longtime residents of the Village, spending the last 22 years in their home in Scarsdale. Throughout the years, they have raised their 3 children there, carefully renovating and remodeling to meet their evolving needs. The home has been a wonderful foundation for their family. Equally important to them, is the community they have built over the years, forging strong friendships, raising their children together, and celebrating many milestones along the way. Some of those friends are here tonight; thanks for your support. Though their children are ready to begin leaving the nest, they have no intention of leaving Arlington Heights or Scarsdale, so their goal now is to find a larger home with an open concept, one that provides plenty of space to welcome their children, their growing families, and their friends. When they discovered this lot on Belmont, it felt like a natural fit; they moved quickly and made an offer. They have seen Rich's beautiful homes in their area, and the decision to work with him and John was an easy one. After listening to their needs and exploring various styles, John presented them with four different elevations; 2 of them particularly resonated with them, and they were drawn to one with modern features but felt it did not fit with the neighborhood. Instead, they focused on the other option, refining it to create what is being presented tonight. They believe the design captures both traditional and contemporary elements that reflect their values and how they see the neighborhood. Its timeless appeal and unique character are what makes this design and Arlington Heights special to them.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

Tanya Griffin, 631 S. Belmont Ave. Her home is located directly north of the site and her family has lived there for the last 12 ½ years. She knew the previous owner of the existing home, and she spent several days a week in the home helping to care for her. The home was lovely, but is now in disrepair, with the brick crumbling, the basement is not good, there is no full heating system, no air conditioning, one tiny ½ bath on the stairs, and fabric holding the walls together inside. The previous owner lived here alone for a very long time and the home was not kept up, including a leaking ceiling and mold. She said the new home will be a nice addition to the street and the neighborhood.

Collin Korab, 636 S. Burton Place. His home is located behind and kitty-corner to this site. His question is about drainage; there have been new homes built in the past on this block, which has caused flooding in the backyards. The home directly next to his came before this commission a few years ago, and flooded his basement during the construction.

Chair Kubow said that drainage is not under the purview of this commission; however, the residents' comments will become part of the record tonight and provided to the Village Engineering department. The requirement is for Engineering to review the site plan and drawings during the permit process with regards to drainage. He recommended the resident speak with Staff tonight to obtain contact information for Engineering. He acknowledged the drainage problem in this neighborhood because he lives there too, and he understood the concerns. **Mr. Hautzinger** said the comments tonight will be provided to the Village Engineering Department.

Mr. Korab said he attended the review of the new home built next to his a few years ago and was told at that time that the roofline of the new home would line up with his roofline, but that did not happen; the new home is much larger. He asked who is held accountable during the process of building this new home, and if their backyards start to flood. **Chair Kubow** said that building permit plans should match what is being built, which is monitored with inspections during construction. Drainage is reviewed by Engineering, which typically says that an existing flow of drainage can continue, but it cannot increase with a new home. **Commissioner Eckhardt** encouraged the residents to be proactive with Village Engineering about the existing drainage problem, including proof of existing conditions. Contact information can be found on the Village website for the Engineering department.

Robert Stevens, 632 S. Burton Place. He spoke about the terrible flooding that occurred when the new home located behind this site on Burton Place was being built. At that time, he had contacted Engineering to try and get things resolved with the flooding that was happening, but a lot of things with that new home were not done to code, which caused a lot of the problems. These problems included the water being put 3' from the curb, instead of within 10' of the home; and encroaching onto his property when the foundation for the new home was dug, which pulled his property out and down. He reiterated the previous resident's comments about accountability; who comes out to inspect a new home during construction, because that is when they had issues with the previous new home. His concerns are about the whole process with the Village during construction.

Chair Kubow said these are serious allegations that should be directed the Village Building department. **Commissioner Eckhardt** encouraged the neighbors to have a pre-construction meeting with the contractor of the new home being reviewed tonight, to talk about the issues that went wrong with the new home that was previously built nearby.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Kingsley** thanked Staff for acknowledging that the existing home is one of the first homes in Scarsdale; it is unique, it is special, and for bringing it to the attention of the commission. This is important throughout the Village because there are many characteristics about the existing home that we all like and are no longer being built. **Commissioner Kingsley** said that although it would be nice to renovate instead of teardown the existing home, the information given about the condition of the home should also be taken into consideration, and no comments were made tonight about anyone being upset about the home being torn down. Because of these things, she was okay with the home being replaced, and she asked if anyone in the audience felt differently, to speak up.

With regards to the design of the new home, **Commissioner Kingsley** said it is a lovely home and probably exactly what the homeowners want. She loved the direction of the earthy brick, and said that a more natural white mortar might be good. She asked if the trim will be smooth, which the petitioner confirmed, and she felt the dark fascia, soffits, and garage door work well. She commented that the exterior lights are shown at different heights on the rendering and the elevations; she felt the lights look better at the same elevation, and she loved that the lights will be gas. **Commissioner Kingsley** felt the dormers on the front elevation might need to be bigger, although she also felt that they did not seem to go with the home. She confirmed that the windows will have either true or simulated divided lights, which she said is mandatory for this home. She loved the back porch and other details shown, the muntins in all the windows, and she suggested looking at the location of the tall window in the center of the right-side elevation with regard to the adjacent home to the south. She had no further comments.

Commissioner Eckhardt said the two dormers on the front elevation are too small, they look unresolved and need some detailing, although he was not opposed to them. He said the

exterior lights are quite large and bring down the scale of the home. The petitioner replied that the windows are 8' tall. **Commissioner Eckhardt** had no further comments and said this is a great home.

Commissioner Seyer agreed and had no attachment to keeping the existing home; it is not noteworthy in his opinion. He liked the design of the new home and the brick, which will look beautiful. The roofline will give the neighbor to the north a bit more sun. He asked if the existing garage is remaining, and **Mr. Hiskes** said it will not. **Commissioner Seyer** also asked if there will be a fence, and if it will be open or solid. **Mr. Hiskes** replied that a fence is required because there will be a pool, but the type of fence has not yet been decided. **Commissioner Seyer** recommended some type of acoustical/screening treatment of the a/c units and generator located adjacent to the neighbor's patio. He concluded that this is a nice home that will fit in well.

Chair Kubow agreed with the suggestion to screen the equipment located on the left side of the home, as well as the other comments made. In this neighborhood there are a lot of different home designs, and the proposed new home has a classic look with a modern touch that will fit in well. He also agreed that the new brick selection is a huge improvement, and he asked about the material for the surround at the front entry. The petitioner said it is wood that will match the color of the garage door, and it will include trim detailing.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE PROPOSED NEW (TEARDOWN) SINGLE-FAMILY HOME TO BE LOCATED AT 635 S. BELMONT AVENUE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 12/31/24, 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 RECOMMENDATION THAT THE 2 DORMERS ON THE FRONT ELEVATION BE STUDIED TO CHECK THE SCALE AND TO ADD MORE DETAIL.
2. A RECOMMENDATION TO REVIEW THE MOUNTING HEIGHT OF THE LIGHTS ON THE FRONT ELEVATION.
3. A REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A SCREENING / ACOUSTIC PLAN FOR THE A / C UNITS AND GENERATOR LOCATED ON THE LEFT SIDE OF THE HOME, FOR STAFF REVIEW AND APPROVAL.
4. AN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT FROM THE PETITIONER THAT A CODE COMPLIANT FENCE WILL BE INSTALLED, WITH A RECOMMENDATION THAT THE FENCE BE A BLACK, WROUGHT IRON FENCE.
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 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.
6. COMPLIANCE WITH ALL FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES.

Chair Kubow had a concern about the requirement for screening because of the close proximity of the property line. **Mr. Hautzinger** replied that a fence and landscaping are allowed up to the property line.

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

ITEM 3. SINGLE-FAMILY ADDITION REVIEW**DC# 24-104(H) – 923 N. Dunton Ave.**

Kamil Kapica, representing *K/K Architecture*, **Catherine & James Hommer**, the owners, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing a full second-floor addition to an existing one-and-a-half-story house. An existing detached garage will remain. The project complies with the R-3 single-family zoning requirements. The subject property is located in the “Historic Arlington Neighborhood Association” (HANA) area, and the existing house was included in the 2004 Community Preservation Report that was prepared by the School of the Art Institute of Chicago to raise community awareness and promote the preservation of the historic character of certain neighborhoods in Arlington Heights. 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.

The petitioner is proposing to remove the existing partial height second-floor to allow a new full second-floor addition. The design includes a steep sloping roofline around the new addition to help maintain the character and massing of the original house which gives the new addition an appearance of dormers. The existing enclosed front porch will also be refurbished with new windows and column detailing. Overall, the proposed design will be a very nice refresh to the existing house, while maintaining its historic character. Staff commends the petitioner for thoughtfully improving and maintaining this notable historic home. Staff’s only comment on the design is that the sides of the new front steps should be enclosed to match the front porch, and a recommendation to paint the stair stringers, risers, and railings white to match the porch.

Mr. Kapica introduced the homeowners who are also here tonight to respond to any questions about the design or the process that led them to it. They are proposing a design that both respects the style of the existing home, while updating its appearance and layout to the owners’ needs. He presented samples of the proposed material.

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 Eckhardt** said the petitioner did an amazing job of remodeling and keeping the existing home. He was curious about why one side of the home has relief with a bump-out, while the other side does not. **Mr. Kapica** explained that the driveway is pretty narrow and there is an easement between this home and the adjacent home; therefore bumping out into the driveway will make it impractical. **Mr. Hautzinger** added that the first-floor bump out on the south elevation is existing. **Commissioner Eckhardt** had nothing further to add and said it is a great home, and he agreed with Staff’s suggestion to paint the front stairs and details to match the porch. **Mr. Kapica** said that he and the owners agree with the suggestion.

Commissioner Seyer applauded the owners for keeping the home and adding on to it, and making the home much nicer in its context. He said the railing looks great and he loved the porch, but he questioned the wood material at the base of the home that appears in poor condition and how it will be replaced. **Mr. Kapica** said the existing brick at the base of the home will remain, and the areas in between the columns and brick will be infilled. **Commissioner Seyer** pointed out that the existing porch has more steps than shown in the rendering. He concluded that the addition looks great and he is in favor of it.

Commissioner Kingsley expressed support for the petitioner keeping the home and adding on to it. She asked if the front porch roof is being raised, and **Mr. Kapica** said it will remain. She also asked where the new columns will be located, and **Mr. Kapica** said they will be at the corners of the porch and at the terminus of the railings. **Commissioner Kingsley** suggested painting the elements that are there now instead of replacing with new columns. She said the pattern of the existing wood vent at the base of the home helps to break down the front facade and is really pretty. She felt something like that should be done instead of the infill being proposed, and said it will be important to have some type of vent on the infill areas being replaced to avoid rot at the porch. **Commissioner Kingsley** also suggested adding trim underneath where the siding meets the fascia, consistent with the existing home, as well making the new brackets similar in design and scale to the existing ones. She further suggested adding a window on the second-floor of the north elevation, or otherwise something to break up that elevation. She reviewed the color palette being proposed and suggested smooth trim.

Chair Kubow agreed with the comments made and Commissioner Kingsley's experience with historic preservation. The design is well done and he commended the petitioner for keeping the existing home. He loved the siding color being proposed for the home, and he asked what will be done with the existing detached garage. **Mr. Kapica** said the siding on the garage will be replaced to match the home, and replacing the garage door on the side entry as well.

Commissioner Eckhardt suggested adding an access panel somewhere to provide access under the porch.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE SINGLE-FAMILY HOME LOCATED AT 923 N. DUNTON AVENUE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 1/21/25, 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 TO CONSIDER PAINTING THE FRONT PORCH STRINGERS, RISERS, AND RAILINGS WHITE, AND KEEP THE TREADS A WOOD MATERIAL.**
- 2. A RECOMMENDATION TO CONSIDER ADDING FENESTRATION ON THE NORTH ELEVATION, POSSIBLY ON THE SECOND-FLOOR.**
- 3. A RECOMMENDATION TO CONSIDER THE SUGGESTIONS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY WITH REGARDS TO KEEPING SOME OF THE HISTORIC DETAILS AND ELEMENTS ON THE FRONT OF THE EXISTING HOME, SUCH AS THE CORNER COLUMNS.**
- 4. THIS REVIEW DEALS WITH ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, NOR REPRESENT ANY TACIT APPROVAL OR SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED LAND USE OR ANY OTHER ZONING AND/OR LAND USE ISSUES OR DECISIONS THAT STEM FROM ZONING, BUILDING, SIGNAGE OR ANY OTHER REVIEWS. IN ADDITION TO THE NORMAL TECHNICAL REVIEW, PERMIT DRAWINGS WILL BE REVIEWED FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE DESIGN COMMISSION AND ANY OTHER COMMISSION OR BOARD APPROVAL CONDITIONS. IT IS THE PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO INCORPORATE ALL REQUIREMENTS LISTED ON THE CERTIFICATE OF 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.**

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

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

ITEM 4. COMMERCIAL REVIEW**DC# 24-089 – Arlington Ridge Center – 660 N. Ridge Ave.**

Maggie Krieger & John Dzarnowski, representing *FGM Architects*, and **John Kramer**, representing *The AH Park District*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The Park District is here tonight seeking approval of the architectural design for an addition to the existing Arlington Ridge Center building. The project requires Plan Commission review and Village Board approval to amend the existing Planned Unit Development, and the Design Commission should review building and signage only.

The petitioner is proposing a new two-story addition to the existing Arlington Ridge Center that is approximately 6,150 sf, with a multipurpose space on the first-floor and a fitness room on the second-floor. Overall, the proposed addition is very nicely designed to fit seamlessly with the existing building, which was recently expanded in 2018. All of the materials and detailing of the proposed addition will match existing. Staff has no concerns about the architectural design being proposed. The new addition includes two new rooftop mechanical units which are required to be screened from view. The two mechanical units are setback on the roof which will minimize their visibility, but they will also have unit mounted screens which will match numerous other mechanical screens that are already on this building.

Staff recommends approval of the design as submitted.

Maggie Krieger said what they are looking to accomplish with this small addition is to give the Park District more flexibility in how they are able to program the Rec Center. The second-floor will be an extension of their fitness classes, and the lower level will allow them some flexibility with after school CAP and other day programs. The intent with the window placement is to translate the windows on the gym to have a seamless addition without taking away from the main entry having too much glass. The entire addition will be brick and curtain wall to match the existing building. The playground will remain in place, the swings relocated within the playground area, and the basketball courts moved to the southwest corner.

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 Kingsley** noted that this building received the Design Commission Design Award in 2020 after the last addition that was completed. She felt the current addition will be great and makes sense with everything being presented. She said the brick shown in the photos looks like 3 different colors, and she pointed to the brick at the north end of the gym space. **Ms. Krieger** clarified that the material at the north end of the gym is painted pre-cast and not brick. **Commissioner Kingsley** referred to the rendering presented and said that it seems like the addition is missing something; either the brick has to continue around, it has to be two different colors of brick, or there has to be a façade change, just to give it a little relief. Otherwise, she felt the addition looked nice.

Commissioner Eckhardt liked the elevation, it looks seamless, and the right side is more monolithic and improved with the three bands of windows; it looks like it has been there all the time. He liked the addition and would not change it.

Commissioner Seyer liked what is being proposed, and he agreed with **Commissioner Kingsley** that the top band can be changed to brick instead of glass. Spandrel glass never looks like glass, and it does not happen anywhere else on the building, other than at the side of the building where it feels more like a complete change between two massings. He felt it would feel more cohesive as a singular mass if this change was made, otherwise the brick wall at the end just feels thin and flimsy. He would make this a recommendation.

Chair Kubow said the addition looks great and is consistent with what is there. With regards to Commissioner Kingsley & Seyer's comments, he said that either way it is very nicely designed, although he was unsure which option he preferred with regards to the spandrel.

Commissioner Eckhardt said the existing building and proposed addition look like two different buildings in the rendering, and he questions if that is okay. The mass on the right with the white surround is a very strong element that holds it all together cohesively with glass panels underneath it; there is a big solid mass on the left side that is existing, with windows that do not go all the way up; and the center portion has 3 vertical window panels that do go all the way up. If the vertical panels were changed to brick, it could be reflective of the white headwall next to it, which may or may not bring the two buildings together. This building is now a collection of different mini buildings, which could be okay. He understood the other commissioner's comments about the masonry over the windows, and he asked the architect to respond to that.

Ms. Krieger referred to the existing photo and explained that the condition where the curtain wall is taken all the way up to the parapet is an existing condition being replicated on the new addition. This language was a continuation of that with the repetition of pulling those lines through the pre-cast wall. The reason the windows at the existing gym do not go all the way up is because of the structural system, and because the addition is steel, they have flexibility with what they can do with the curtain wall and how fenestration can be used as a language and in the materiality of the building. The intent was to not try to fight the interesting metal panel wrapping piece that emphasizes the entrance to the building, but be more of a connection to the language of the curtain wall coming across. **Mr. Dzarnowski** added that they looked at many different concepts including masonry on top of the glass, and it just looked too heavy. The design shown tonight wound up being an elevation that seemed to stand on its own fairly well and not mimic the existing white portion.

Commissioner Kingsley asked if the petitioner looked at a solution with just masonry in the top six spandrel panels. **Mr. Dzarnowski** said that was one of the concepts they considered, but it looked very heavy, and when it was taken around the corner, it started looking odd. **Commissioner Seyer** presented a sketch rendering that he created to illustrate this option. **Commissioner Eckhardt** preferred the original design being proposed; however, he liked the rendering created by Commissioner Seyer.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR ARLINGTON RIDGE CENTER LOCATED AT 660 N. RIDGE AVENUE, AS SUBMITTED. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 12/6/24, SITE PLAN RECEIVED 12/13/24, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATION AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING:

- 1. 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.

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

ITEM 5. COMMERCIAL REVIEW**DC#24-101 – Recreation Park Bathhouse & Community Building – 500 E. Miner St.**

Maggie Krieger & John Dzarnowski, representing *FGM Architects*, and **John Kramer**, representing *The AH Park District*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger said this project is actually two projects in one, and should be discussed simultaneously. The Arlington Heights Park District is seeking approval of the proposed architectural design for a new Bathhouse Building and an addition to the existing Community Building at Recreation Park. The new Bathhouse Building will replace the existing Bathhouse Building in the same location. The renovation of the existing Community Building will include the replacement of all windows and a new vestibule and elevator addition on the east side of the building. This project requires Plan Commission review and Village Board approval to amend the existing Planned Unit Development (PUD), and the Design Commission review is limited to the building and signage. For anyone here tonight that is interested in this project, only the architectural design for the building will be discussed tonight, and any concerns, comments, or questions about the site planning or zoning will be discussed at the upcoming Plan Commission hearing that has not yet been scheduled, but will mostly likely occur in March, with separate public notification for that hearing.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments.

Bathhouse: The petitioner has indicated that the design inspiration for the proposed new bathhouse was taken from the existing mid-century modern bathhouse that is being replaced. Staff feels that the existing bathhouse building is unremarkable and starkly mismatched with the existing historic Community Building. The proposed design has a similar scale and massing as the existing building with a long single-story flat roof massing. In general, Staff disagrees with this design direction, and recommends the new bathhouse building be designed with a more traditional massing to match or complement the existing traditional style Community Building, as well as the existing baseball field Storage Building, with pitched roofs and traditional detailing. Staff feels that this is an opportunity to create a cohesive traditional design theme for Recreation Park to be shared by all three buildings.

Staff provided a schematic sketch in the Staff Report that was created by the Planning Department to illustrate the potential for a more cohesive traditional design theme for the bathhouse. This design direction would be Staff's recommendation.

If the Design Commission disagrees with Staff's recommendation, and does not object to the proposed flat roof design submitted by the petitioner, then the following issues should be evaluated:

- a) Composition. Overall, the proposed design feels out of balance and unrefined.
 - i) The Multi-Purpose Room on the south end looks large, and the Concessions Space on the north end looks small.
 - ii) The brick box mass towards the south end of the building is tall and narrow, whereas the other brick areas are low and wide.
 - iii) The columns on the east end of the Multi-purpose Room look random, unnecessary, and out of balance.
 - iv) The canopy at the main entry has a minimal overhang as compared to the dramatic inspiration image.
- b) Rooftop Equipment Screening. The design includes two separate mechanical equipment screens made of staggered ribbed panels. The screens are highly visible

and they stand out in a negative way. Per the Village's Design Guidelines, rooftop equipment screening shall be "*harmonious with the building*" and "*whenever possible, the screen should be designed as an architectural component of the structure such as but not limited to increasing the height of parapet walls*". Staff feels that the rooftop screening has been poorly coordinated with the design, and for a new building, parapet walls should be used in lieu of a separate screening system.

c) Materials and Details:

- i) In general, the entire building is lacking detail and design interest.
- ii) The large expanses of dark bronze siding read as big dark voids. Staff recommends brick for the entire body of the building.
- iii) The large rolling gate at the main entrance has a poor appearance. Staff recommends that other more aesthetically pleasing access control options be explored.

d) Signage. Per code, signage within residential neighborhoods is limited and subdued. Wall signage for a park building is allowed up to 45 sf maximum size, and shall be comprised of non-internally illuminated individual letters. The proposed sign on the rolling gate is not allowed, and it is overly large at approximately 112 sf. Staff recommends designing a code-compliant wall mounted sign in lieu of the proposed gate sign. Recreation Park also has an existing small ground sign facing Miner Street.

e) Trash and Transformer Enclosure. The plans include a trash enclosure and a transformer enclosure in front of the new bathhouse. The enclosures are proposed to be made of solid Trex composite fencing. The Design Commission should evaluate the appearance of these enclosures.

Community Building: The existing Community Building was included in a Community Preservation Report which was prepared for the Village of Arlington Heights 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 in Arlington Heights. Properties in the report are rated in order of importance as "Exceptional", "Notable", or "Contributing". The Community Building is rated "Exceptional", and is noted to have a Tudor Revival style with estimated construction between 1930-1950.

Overall, the proposed improvements to the existing Community Building are nicely done, and the Planning Department is excited that this important building is being maintained and improved. The Design Commission should evaluate the following:

- a) Window Replacement. The petitioner is proposing to replace all of the existing windows with new aluminum clad wood windows. They intend to match the building's original window designs, as close as possible, based on historical photos. The petitioner will need to provide details of the built-up mullions within the large window openings, but overall Staff has no objections.
- b) Vestibule and Elevator Addition. Typically, Staff encourages new additions be designed to blend as seamlessly as possible with existing buildings. However, another approach is to design an addition that is purposefully distinct from the original building. This approach can be particularly applicable with a historic building to visually separate the original building from the new addition. The petitioner is taking this approach with the proposed addition. Overall, Staff does not object to the proposed design which has a light and transparent appearance that does not overwhelm or dominate the existing original building. However, depending on the outcome of the bathhouse building design, the proposed addition may require revisions to coordinate.

- c) **Raised Deck.** The proposed design includes a large raised deck on the south side of the building facing the pool. The walls of the raised deck are proposed to be concrete with a stone pattern cast into the concrete. The example image provided by the petitioner has a nice appearance, but the Design Commission should evaluate the appearance. Additionally, the petitioner should clarify the detailing and materials of the exterior stair that connects the raised deck to the pool deck, including the exterior finish, interior finish, and cap of the stair walls.
- d) **Rooftop Mechanical Screen.** The existing building has rooftop mechanical equipment located on a flat roof area on the south side of the building. The petitioner is proposing to add a brown color corrugated metal screen to conceal the equipment from view. Equipment screening is required, but Staff objects to the proposed screening design which does not fit with the character of the building. Staff recommends that other screening solutions be explored. This area of the building has a partial parapet wall with sections of open metal railings. The petitioner should explore the possibility of replacing the open railings with solid decorative panels to screen the equipment in a more architecturally compatible way.

Mr. Hautzinger said that based on these concerns, Staff's recommendation is for the Design Commission to require revisions and re-review the project. Staff's comments are summarized at the end of the Staff report.

Mr. Dzarnowski explained that this project has gone through a long public input process, consisting of eight meetings with Rec Park neighbors to review what is proposed. They have gone through quite a few iterations before arriving at what is being presented tonight, including what the bathhouse might want to look like. They considered if they should replicate the Community building with the design of the bathhouse or provide something that was offset from that and did not detract from the visual impact that the Community building has. Through that process, it was decided that they did not want to look at a bathhouse building that replicated the design or the era of the Community building. This was partially because the floor plan of the bathhouse is so large, it was starting to overwhelm the Community building that they want to highlight. They are trying to downplay the aesthetics of the bathhouse similar to the existing bathhouse.

Beginning with the Bathhouse, **Mr. Dzarnowski** said the center gray portion of the building is for pool mechanical and storage; there are no windows and quite a few doors that face the street. The salmon-colored portion of the building is the locker room area, where the windows are placed high up for privacy and to provide for natural light. Early in their review process, they were proposing all brick for the bathhouse, and they were told that the building looked too monolithic, and it was suggested that the center portion of the building be more of a wood material to replicate the existing bathhouse. Another inspiration is that the roundhouse on the existing bathhouse brings a lot of light to the neighborhood at night, which the Board felt was important to replicate, which is why there is glass at the concession area on the north end of the building that will also be lit to highlight that same roundhouse effect. The south end of the building where the multi-purpose room is located, will have a similar effect. **Mr. Dzarnowski** also explained that there are three locations proposed for rooftop screening. The area over the concession area at the north end of the building, and the area over the center of the building will both have metal panels, and the roofline over the concession area has been raised to minimize some of the height of the metal panels behind. The third location for rooftop screening is screened by the larger masonry mass; which is brought up higher to screen the mechanical units behind it. The rolling gate across the front of the building will be open when the building is open, and patrons can come and go fairly easily. It is a cantilevered metal gate with plexiglass signage or graphics along the gate, instead of metal vertical

pickets; this will add a lot of pop and color to the front of the building. The image for that signage or graphic has not yet been designed; however, if this is not allowed, they will use the metal picket instead. **Ms. Krieger** explained that the transformer is new and in a similar location to where the existing transformer is that is currently not screened. **Mr. Dzarnowski** added that their intent is to match the siding behind it, so from farther away it blends, and it will be the same material being used further out for the trash enclosure.

Mr. Dzarnowski responded to Staff comments regarding the Community Building. He presented a sample of the Pella window being proposed, which is Pella's most historically authentic line of wood windows. **Ms. Krieger** said they are proposing a bronze cladding and stained wood to match the interior, and a medium to dark wood trim. **Mr. Dzarnowski** said they do not have a detail for the built-up mullions, but their intent is to make it look similar to what it would have looked like originally. The existing windows on the Community building are replacement windows, and their intent is to match the pattern of the original windows, which they still have the drawings for. All the windows on the Community building are being replaced. The concrete wall being proposed for the rear of the building will be a form liner, so the concrete will look more like a stone wall than concrete, with a cap on top of the wall. **Ms. Krieger** added that with regards to the stairs all exposed faces will have the same stone pattern form liner. **Mr. Dzarnowski** said they are trying to replicate some of the detailing on the front stairs, but the material will be stone instead of brick. The actual stair and railing details will match what is being done in front of the building.

Commissioner Eckhardt asked about the material for the treads of the stairs and **Mr. Dzarnowski** replied that it will probably be poured concrete. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said the front of the building is currently concrete, and he asked if the petitioner considered upgrading it to stone. **Mr. Dzarnowski** said the existing concrete at the front of the building is falling and dangerous to walk on, and they want a slip resistant surface and more stable material than stone for patrons with wet feet. With regards to the rooftop mechanical screening, they are trying to keep the intent and look of the existing railing up there now with the columns next to it, and they intend on locating the rooftop screening back from that, so it will be behind and hidden. They are considering changing the proposed corrugated metal to a smooth Hardi-board plank panel, painted a similar color to the wood at the top of the gable ends.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

Bill Kragh, 505 E. St. James St. He has lived in front of Rec Park for 35 years and frequents the park often. He was only aware of one public meeting about this project. He said the Community building is beautiful and a great attraction, but the Bathhouse seems very out of place. He was very much in favor of seeing a re-design to something that fits more with the neighborhood, and upgrade from what is currently there.

Janet Meinheit, 409 E. Euclid Ave. She lives in this neighborhood and has attended a few of the Park District meetings about this project, so she has seen a couple renditions. She asked about a ramp from the terrace down to the pool level, and if there are any single stall toilets in the new bathhouse. **Mr. Dzarnowski** replied to her questions. Ms. Meinheit also asked if there are concerns about the south end not being connected to the north end of the building. **Mr. Dzarnowski** said the multi-purpose room at the south end of the building is the only portion of the building to be used year-round; it is not associated as much with the pool.

Myles Whitebloom, 203 N. Haddow Ave. He has lived across street from Rec Park for 22 years

and attended several of the meetings for this project, but this is the first time he has seen a picture of the Bathhouse. Last he heard was that the main building was going to be redone as the Bathhouse, and he was curious to know why that changed. He asked about traffic and parking concerns and was told those items are part of the Plan Commission review. Mr. Whitebloom said the existing Rec Park building is an amazing building that should be used as an example for the new Bathhouse; it is a huge mistake to use the existing Bathhouse building as an example. He hoped for another chance to give input on a different design, a design that replicates the Community building. This is the time to do it right.

John Supplitt, 714 S. Ridge Ave. He is a commissioner of the Arlington Heights Park District Board. He explained that considerable time was spent working with the architects and the residents of Rec Park to arrive at the designs being presented tonight. Multiple community meetings were held, town hall meetings were held on the property, and open sessions at their Board meetings were well attended by 40 to 50 members of the Rec Park community. This is a community park for residents of that community, and they want to make sure it has the programming that will serve the needs of the community. Initially, the original Bathhouse was going to remain, which would have taken all of the programming away; however, the architects were able to maintain the integrity of the Community center as a program area for residents, allowing them to walk there, have after school play programs there, and maintain the basketball court. The important point is that they are maintaining the integrity of Rec Park as a community park.

With regards to the Bathhouse, Mr. Supplitt said that in a perfect world, there is no doubt that the schematic design suggested by Staff would be their choice; however, that design is completely cost prohibitive for this public project. He is coming to this commission as a steward of the Park District representing your interests for the purpose of this project, and he asked for some collaboration between the Village and the Park District in order to achieve something they can afford. They are trying to be as responsible as they can to maintain the integrity of the Community building, to maintain the integrity of Rec as community park, while upgrading to the best of their ability the current Bathhouse, which they agree is unacceptable in its present form. After working on this project for the better part of 2 years and meeting with the residents of the community many times, this is where they have arrived. He asked the commissioners to be gentle, because their decision will have serious ramifications with respect to advancing this project.

Myles Whitebloom asked again when the decision was made to build a new Bathhouse, because he was not aware of any public meeting about that. Ms. Krieger said that the change was made last August. Mr. Whitebloom believed this change was not presented to the community until tonight, because there would be 50 people from Rec Park here right now if they knew about this change. Mr. Supplitt said the change was presented to the community and there were 50 people there. **Chair Kubow** stated that the focus tonight is on architecture, and confirmation of community meetings is a separate matter.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Kingsley** thanked those here tonight from the neighborhood and for speaking, and she commended the Park District for listening to the community and deciding to restore the Rec Park building and that there will be a separate Bathhouse. She said that in later meetings, the Park District asked what the community liked about the existing Bathhouse, and the community said it is the light that comes from the north end of the Bathhouse into the community. That was taken into consideration, which is why the concession stand is where it is. **Commissioner Kingsley** said she attended many of the meetings that were held about this project, and felt the Park District and the architects have done a lot to respond to some of the neighborhood comments. She felt the inspiration taken from the existing Bathhouse was partially because some residents liked the round portion of the building, and designs were created that looked like

the round building, although those were scrapped. In the end, what came out of those meetings is to build a building that works well with the Rec Park building but does not mimic it; this is probably the best solution. The Rec Park building can never be replicated, the details will be different. From her perspective, she liked seeing something different, and the images presented were contemporary and more current to where we live now. In general, **Commissioner Kingsley** liked the direction everything is going in.

Commissioner Kingsley had the following comments about the Bathhouse building. She liked the inspiration of the building, and hoped the brick will match the Community building, otherwise the brick should be different. She liked that masonry is being brought into the Bathhouse and that it matches, but there is no limestone on the building, and she suggested adding limestone coping on the walls or sills. She was concerned about the solar gain at both ends of the building, mostly the south end, and she suggested looking at how some of the sun glare can be addressed. She had concerns about the long run of brown fiber cement because it looks like what it used to be; there needs to be more attention to that so it does not look like the back end of the building when it is the front of the building. She liked that the brown is being brought in from the Tudor on the Community building, but there are no masses of it on that building. The overhangs at the north and south end of the building, at the Community room and at the concession stand, should be thinner to make them look lighter in proportion, especially the one at the concession stand. She said the rolling gate is aesthetically pleasing and a good solution if it functions well, and the wall behind the gate could be used as a fun wall as well.

Commissioner Kingsley had the following comments about the Community building. She liked that the windows will match those on the historic portion of the building, which include very thick mullions, and she asked if the intent is to match the mullions. The petitioner said yes, as much as possible. **Commissioner Kingsley** liked that the vestibule addition looks different, it does not detract from the Community building. She also said the solar heat gain and how that will work and the glare should be studied, she suggested a thinner roof overhang projection, and making the coping on the top of the masonry wall limestone instead. She agreed with the resident who spoke about the raised deck in the back being brick or limestone, and the black railings should be brown to match the rest of the building. With regards to the rooftop mechanical screening, she was not in favor of removing the railings, she liked something behind the railings in a material that looks more like wood. She again thanked the Park District and the architects for all their hard work, and added that it is unfortunate that some residents were not aware of all the meetings that were held, which she happened to find out about and was appreciative of.

Commissioner Eckhardt said it was a wonderful presentation and he thanked Steve for his input, which is a logical design direction. He said this is probably one of the most remarkable buildings in town, and with the Park District's beautiful building behind it, these buildings are both real jewels. He reiterated the purview of this commission, which is not about economics, and he acknowledged the comment that the Park District cannot afford to build what they want to build, which he understood. However, without a schematic sketch and pricing, the costs are actually unknown to the petitioner.

With regards to the new Bathhouse, **Commissioner Eckhardt** asked for clarification about the floor plan of the north end, and **Mr. Dzarnowski** reviewed the floor plans. **Commissioner Eckhardt** felt there was an opportunity to do something more remarkable at the front entry to the Bathhouse, and he suggested designing an arch at the entrance that is similar to the main building, to tie them together. He had concerns about the darkness and lack of interest on the center portion of the east elevation of the Bathhouse, it looks like 3 buildings pushed together, and he was not in favor of the massing. He also had concerns about the lack of shade from the Bathhouse building that faces the pool; there is a lost

function of that entire wall of the Bathhouse being used facing the pool. **Mr. Dzarnowski** replied that this area near the building is intended as circulation, and includes 2 exits to the locker rooms. With regards to the new addition to the existing Community building, **Commissioner Eckhardt** had concerns about how the canopy on the top of the addition just slams into the building; it should return back and leave a void, and then return to the building. Otherwise, the addition with the glass is very elegant and he had no issue with it.

With regards to the pool area, **Commissioner Eckhardt** cautioned using formliners that still require big construction seams and look fake, and the reflection off the white wall from the south will be brutal. He suggested it be brick instead, or pre-cast with brick cast into the pre-cast, and that pre-cast can be the retaining wall. The rooftop screening is well designed, and he was not opposed to keeping the existing railing. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said he initially agreed with the design schematic suggested by Staff, but he was also okay with the contemporary design direction being presented by the petitioner, although the coloring is a little dark.

Commissioner Seyer thanked the residents in attendance and applauded the efforts of what is being presented tonight and the great exhibits. He said there are some great buildings in this neighborhood and throughout the Village, but he could not in good conscience say yes to the design being presented for the Bathhouse; with all due respect, it does not look good. He loved the entire outdoor area, which will be wonderful along with the addition. The Community building reads as one building, it has some nice details and a lot of historic elements. The Bathhouse building is smaller, it is a background building that is trying too hard, it is trying to be so many different things; trying to be this monumental gateway, trying to be these beautiful beacons of light at the north and south ends, and trying to house mechanical equipment. Just let it be what it is. **Commissioner Seyer** said it would be nice to bring some components of the existing Community building into the new Bathhouse, but it is okay if that is not possible. The current design is trying too hard, and in the end, it is competing with a very nice Community building. It has no rhythm or dialogue from an elevational standpoint, and the massing feels like there are 7 different things happening, which does not need to be. With regards to costs, he questioned the clerestory windows in the mechanical room, locker rooms, and bathrooms; are they necessary or can they be used somewhere else. He preferred to have a monumental front entry that draws people in and is exciting. The Bathhouse does not feel integrated, it feels very disjointed, and is a missed opportunity right now, but it can be made much better. It is a simple building, and when it is made a simple building, it will look really nice. There is nothing holding it all together right now, it is actually forcing everything to be its own series of parts. **Commissioner Seyer** also had concerns about the rooftop equipment and screening, which are different metals than the other metals and will look different, and along with the glass, brick, fiber cement, and wood being proposed, there is too much going on. The height of the screening on top of the glass space below it could end up being taller than what is currently shown in the rendering. He felt this could be so much better and should be re-done. He suggested making the north end of the building brick, with bigger openings, and moving the mechanical equipment further back. Overall, he said the Bathhouse design needs more time to be developed, it is not yet there.

With regards to the addition to the Community building, **Commissioner Seyer** said that it looks completely tacked on and very foreign to the existing building. He questioned the size being proposed, which only serves the requirement to add the elevator component to meet ADA requirements. He reiterated that the project needs more time, and although there have been a lot of meetings held by the Park District, this is the first time the commissioners are seeing it and the design is just not there. He reiterated that he could not support the project as currently proposed.

Chair Kubow said that the more he looks at the Bathhouse design, the more he struggles with it. Initially, he loved the contemporary nature of the building, and some of the inconsistency in the massing, but then he looks at what is next to it. He does not want to be too consistent or matchy-matchy, he wants the design to be complimentary, but also a big step forward, which the petitioner has attempted to do here. He agreed with Commissioner Seyer that there is more work to be done. **Chair Kubow** said he is struggling with the question of whether or not the Bathhouse building needs to be contemporary or a happy median between the design being presented tonight and the existing Community building, and he apologized for not providing a clear direction to the petitioner.

Mr. Hautzinger said it seems clear that there is no interest from the Design Commissioners to redesign the Bathhouse building to be a replica of the Community building which would be cost prohibitive, but he liked the option suggested by Chairman Kubow to find a middle ground between the proposed design and the existing Community building. He suggested introducing some pitched roof forms, which do not need to be detailed to the high level of the existing Community Building, but something that will complement without competing, would fit in better. He also agreed that a building with a pitched roof is not necessarily more expensive than the current design proposed, and he encouraged the petitioner to find a middle ground that could potentially be the same budget. He recommended a design with a massing that complements the existing Rec Park buildings better, to establish a more cohesive theme for Rec Park, but it could be a simpler more modern version.

Commissioner Seyer reiterated that it is really difficult to try to replicate a building that was done a very long time ago; it will look like you tried and missed. He is trying to avoid a missed opportunity here to do something nice. He is fine with a direction that is more modern, but the current design is not it, and it should not replicate the previous Bathhouse building. **Commissioner Kingsley** said that in general, she felt all the commissioners would be okay with what Commissioner Seyer stated; give the petitioner the ability to look at the design again, without stating that certain elements have to be included. **Commissioner Eckhardt** was okay with the direction that the Bathhouse building not be a clone of the Community building, and he is not completely convinced that it has to be flat roofs everywhere; the 2 end caps could be pitched roofs, with volume space inside, but the design needs to be studied. He agreed with Commissioner Seyer that the current design is too much right now, too complicated, and the different elements are not tied together well enough. He would support something in the massing that would pay homage to the Community building, or not, and he reiterated his suggestion for a more remarkable front entry. **Commissioner Seyer** added that the Bathhouse building is only 18' tall at its tallest point, and screening the rooftop mechanical equipment is very important; do not underestimate how the mechanical equipment will look on the building. Both the new Bathhouse and the addition to the Community building should be complimentary to the overall site.

The petitioner was advised of their option to take a vote tonight on the project, continue the project to a date specific, or table the project until such time as the petitioner is ready to return for another review. The petitioner decided to table the project at this time to a future meeting date, to be determined.

Mr. Hautzinger asked the petitioner to communicate with Staff to determine when they will be ready to return to the Design Commission. The posted public meeting signs can remain, and the meeting date should be updated on the signs once the petitioner has confirmed the date with Staff. **Chair Kubow** asked Staff about an option of a preliminary review of a revised conceptual design concept, prior to a formal re-review, and **Mr. Hautzinger** said that an intermediate informal review with the commissioners could be an option, with no vote taken. **Mr. Dzarnowski** said that would be their preference, because they heard a lot of different concepts from the commissioners tonight.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO CONTINUE THE REVIEW OF DC#24-101, THE PROPOSED ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR A NEW BATHHOUSE BUILDING AND AN ADDITION TO THE EXISTING COMMUNITY BUILDING AT RECREATION PARK, TO A FUTURE DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING, PER THE PETITIONER'S REQUEST.

1. URGE THE PETITIONER TO PREPARE CONCEPT SKETCHES TO IDENTIFY THE DIRECTION THAT THEY WANT TO GO, OR KEEP THE SAME SCHEME WITH SMALL CHANGES TO THE MASSING AND COLORATION OF THE BUILDING.
2. ALLOW A SPECIAL MEETING IF NECESSARY TO AVOID DELAYS.

Commissioner Seyer stated that he felt that the Design Commissioners were all in agreement that the Bathhouse design does not need to be a replica of the existing Community Building. **Chairman Kubow** concurred. **Commissioner Seyer** continued saying that if the petitioner wants it to be a smaller, non-descript building, but simple doesn't mean boring, it just means cleaner. The current design has too many parts and is trying to be too many things. It can be pitched roof or flat, whatever works, but it must be cleaner, and do not underestimate the importance of screening the mechanical units. **Commissioner Eckhardt** concurred.

Mr. Dzarnowski stated that based on these comments, they have a clear direction.

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

ITEM 6. OTHER BUSINESS

Public Comment

Keith Moens made a procedural comment about a category on the agenda that he said should be removed, and parliamentary procedural rules about motions, amendments, and continuing projects. He also said that although teardowns appear to have subsided over the last year, he suggested implementing a policy on teardowns, to include neighborhood fit, drainage, height, preservation, and single-family additions that are almost a teardown.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:45 P.M. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.