

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
FEBRUARY 11, 2025

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

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

Members Absent: Scott Seyer

Also Present: Sergei Safonov, Forma Nova Architects for *502 E. Haven St.*
Homeowner for *502 E. Haven St.*
Gina Choi for *Golf VX*
Steve Hautzinger, Planning Staff

ITEM 1. SINGLE-FAMILY NEW REVIEW**DC# 24-090– 502 E. Haven St.**

Sergei Safonov, representing *Forma Nova Architects*, and the homeowner, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to build a new two-story residence with a three-car attached garage on an existing vacant lot. The project does comply with all R-3 zoning requirements. The subject property is part of a four-lot subdivision that was approved in 1990. This lot was never developed and has remained vacant.

The proposed design is required to comply with the Single-Family Design Guidelines, which state that the house should fit with the existing context. The subject property is located on a street where all of the existing homes have a consistent appearance with a traditional style, a mix of masonry and siding, and earth tone color palettes. The massing of the proposed design fits very well with the surrounding context, but the materials, colors, and details have a very modern aesthetic that will stand out in this location.

The prominent three-car side load garage is primarily clad in a non-traditional, small format, black color, dry stack stone veneer with a large rooftop balcony and glass railing which overall will have a bold appearance. The main part of the houses is clad with non-traditional smooth limestone panels. The lighter limestone color is more contextual than the black stone, but the smooth, mortar free appearance is quite modern. If the Design Commission does not object to the limestone veneer, then consider changing the cladding on the garage from the black stone to the limestone for a softer appearance at the street frontage. The sides of the house have a horizontal striped appearance with white stucco, oak slat wall, and black stone, with vertical limestone bands at the corners. Overall, the proposed design is quite busy and will have a bold appearance that the Design Commission should evaluate against the surrounding context.

Mr. Safonov presented samples of the materials being proposed for the new home. He said the stone veneer is more of a dry stack, with very small mortar joints. He understood the comments about the bold appearance of the new home compared to the existing homes on the block, and added the client prefers a more modern design.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

Dave Dupree, 490 E. Haven St. He liked the colors being proposed, but had concerns about the big, black garage that sticks out and does not fit the neighborhood. Although the neighborhood is mostly brick homes, this new home is certainly different, but he could live with different.

Eric Mueller, 490 E. Haven St. He is pleased to see a high-end home being built here, but he had concerns about the bold garage and glass element on top of the garage, pointing out that residents in this neighborhood focus their outdoor activities toward the backyard.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Eckhardt** liked the new home and was not discouraged by its modern aesthetic. Homes in the neighborhood are a mix of size, shape, and materials, and although the new home has a different design intent, he had no issue with the new home fitting in. He felt the large black area of garage on the front elevation will be softened with landscaping, and he acknowledged that the outdoor space proposed on top of the garage is unique. He liked the contrast between the different materials being proposed and said the home looks nice and warm in color. He also said the window placement is well laid out. **Commissioner Eckhardt** was okay with the design being proposed, the materials, and the colors.

Commissioner Fitzgerald said it is a nice home with good materials. He pointed out that some homes on this street have a sideload garage that appear to be 2-car, so the proposed 3-car garage is a little large. He asked if the glass railing above the garage will be clear or frosted; he felt that opaque glass would provide some privacy from the neighborhood. The homeowner stated that either type of glass was okay with him. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** had concerns about the bright white color of the stucco siding sample; he preferred the cooler white shown in the rendering, and he preferred the greyer color of the two wood colors presented. He also had concerns about the back of the garage on the side elevation that did not appear to fit with the other 3 sides of the garage; he suggested that the black stone go all the way up on that portion of the garage.

Commissioner Kingsley acknowledged all the nice materials; the limestone to such extent makes sense, and all the black stone. She said it is a bold look and a little busy because there are 5 different materials being proposed, including the fascia and soffit. The petitioner said the fascia and soffit will be aluminum and match the Hardie stucco color. **Commissioner Kingsley** asked about the stucco panels, and **Mr. Safonov** said the panels will be 4 x 8, with minimally visible occasional seams. **Commissioner Kingsley** liked some of the proposed colors, but felt the 'Crisp White' Hardie panels are not the best solution because the panel joints will be seen; the layout of the joints should be part of the design. She also had concerns about the aluminum proposed for the soffit and fascia that will reflect light and show as shiny, as opposed to almost everything else on the home, especially the dark stone that will absorb the light. Reconsidering that material is important to her. **Commissioner Kingsley** also had concerns about the black stack stone, and said that choosing the right mortar is really important. **Mr. Safonov** clarified that the stack stone will have minimal mortar. **Commissioner Kingsley** was okay with either color sample presented for the siding, although she preferred the wood color option. She said the garage is a little severe on the front elevation, and she would rather see the home in line with the other two homes. Detailing around the garage is important, and the color of the fascia at the top of the garage. She suggested a warmer color to go with the limestone.

Chair Kubow generally concurred with the other commissioners' comments, especially those from Commissioner Kingsley. He had concerns about the glass railing on top of the garage that he felt took away from the dynamic of the architecture and the other quality materials being proposed on the home. He asked if the petitioner considered materials other than glass, such as a wood slat fence.

The homeowner said the space above the garage is an attempt to minimize the massing of the garage from the street. It will provide usable outdoor space that will make-up for the loss of backyard space that resulted from the entire home being pushed back to accommodate the sideload garage. Using wood instead of glass will look more like a fence and increase the massing of the garage. He envisions the garage roof space to be a green roof with a garden and planters that will become more of the focal point than the glass, especially on the side elevation that faces the neighbor.

Commissioner Eckhardt agreed with Commissioner Fitzgerald's comments about the white color for the stucco and that it will have a really strong appearance. He could support a softer color tone similar to the grey shown in the rendering. He had concerns about the backside of the garage that will face the adjacent neighbor, and said he was okay with leaving it stucco as proposed, or changing it to all stone with landscaping as suggested by Commissioner Kingsley. He also questioned if the stone corners on the front elevation should also be on the garage, and he preferred that the glass above the garage roof is clear, which will allow the planters and any other greenery on the roof to be visible.

Commissioner Fitzgerald agreed with Commissioner Kingsley that the color of the siding and the fascia should be changed, but he felt it should be more in line with the limestone sample presented tonight, and not the grey that is shown in the rendering. He asked for clarification on whether the glass railing will be clear or frosted, and the homeowner said it did not matter to him. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** preferred the glass be frosted to provide more privacy for the homeowners and to screen furniture that might be put up there. He liked how unique the garage is on the front of the home, but he suggested carrying the stone on the garage all the way around. He pointed out that the garage and the home are not in line with each other.

Commissioner Kingsley agreed that the stone on the garage should continue on all sides. Aside from her concerns about the color of the stucco, she also had concerns with the Hardie panels; she suggested that the fascia be Hardie as well, instead of aluminum. She reiterated her concerns about the layout of the Hardie panels and the visibility of the seams; she felt this layout should be submitted to Staff for review prior to final approval. **Commissioner Eckhardt** agreed with these concerns and said that adding vertical joints that are sympathetic to the massing of the home will not harm it, but they need to be shown on the elevations. He also referred to the slat board sample presented and asked what color is preferred. The petitioner said the warmer look is okay, but if the stucco color changes, then a softer color is preferred.

Mr. Hautzinger asked Commissioner Kingsley to clarify her previous comments about the limestone color compared to the stucco color. **Commissioner Kingsley** explained that instead of the stucco panels being a cool color, she felt they should be a warmer color more similar to the limestone than the black stone. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said the fascia and soffit should be Hardie board in the same color as the trim board, instead of aluminum. **Commissioner Kingsley** asked if the wood look Nichiha is being used for the soffits, and **Mr. Safonov** said it is being considered by the homeowner. **Commissioner Eckhardt** was in support of the wood Nichiha.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE PROPOSED NEW SINGLE-FAMILY HOME TO BE LOCATED AT 502 E. HAVEN STREET. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE SITE PLAN & ELEVATIONS RECEIVED 1/14/25, FLOOR PLANS RECEIVED 1/7/25, MATERIAL LIST & SAMPLES RECEIVED 12/9/24, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATION AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING:

- 1. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE WHITE SIDING AND SOFFITS BE CHANGED TO A WARMER TONE TO MATCH THE LIMESTONE, TO BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY STAFF.**
- 2. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE WEST SIDE OF THE GARAGE AND THE BACK (NORTH) CORNER OF THE GARAGE BE THE GREY STONE MATERIAL ALL THE WAY TO THE**

TOP, AS IT IS ON THE OTHER 2 SIDES.

3. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE LAYOUT OF THE SIDING SEAMS BE DETERMINED AND SUBMITTED TO STAFF FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL.
4. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE COLOR OF THE NICHHA SIDING PRODUCT BE APPROVED BY STAFF.
5. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE GLASS SURROUND ON TOP OF THE GARAGE ROOF BE OPAQUE OR FROSTED GLASS.
6. 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.
7. COMPLIANCE WITH ALL FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES.

Mr. Hautzinger asked for clarification on the color decision for the Nichiha, that it pertains to the two options presented for the wood-look siding product, which the commissioners confirmed.

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

ITEM 2. SIGN VARIATION REVIEW**DC# 24-092 – Golf VX – 644 E. Rand Rd.**

Gina Choi, representing *Golf VX*, was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is seeking a sign variation to allow three wall signs where only two wall signs are allowed.

1. A variation from Chapter 30, Section 30-402.a, Number, to allow three wall signs where only two wall signs are allowed.
2. A variation from Chapter 30, section 30-403.a Dimensions, to allow a 44.54 sf wall sign on the west wall of the building, where 0 sf is allowed.

Golf VX is an indoor golf simulator business located in the Southpoint Shopping Center. The business has two street frontages facing Rand Road and Palatine Road. Per code, one wall sign is allowed per street frontage, and the business currently has two code-complaint wall signs. One existing wall sign is on the south wall, and the other existing wall sign is above the main entrance at the southwest corner of the building. A third wall sign is proposed on the west wall, which will match the existing sign on the south.

The petitioner has submitted a letter stating that the proposal for the third wall sign is due to a specific hardship related to visibility and customer access, particularly from Palatine Road. The petitioner stated that the building appears vacant for customers approaching from Palatine Road due to limited visibility. They feel the third sign is essential for their business to function, and the new wall sign will integrate seamlessly with the aesthetics of the building and the context.

Chair Kubow asked if there is an existing monument sign on Palatine Road, and **Mr. Hautzinger** said there is a multi-tenant shopping center sign at the entrance on Palatine Road, and two along Rand Road, one at each driveway. **Ms. Choi** said that they have tenant panels in two of the three existing multi-tenant monument signs.

Mr. Hautzinger said that Staff agrees that the business has limited visibility for customers approaching from Palatine Road, and the need for the third wall sign is justified due to the unique location in the middle of the shopping center. Additionally, the unique angled entrance creates an arrangement where three wall signs make sense for visibility from the different approaches to the business, as well as to highlight the front entry doors. Staff agrees that the design of the proposed sign fits seamlessly with the building, and the overall composition looks out of balance without it. The three wall signs are not excessive or overly large, and Staff has no objections, and recommends approval as submitted.

Ms. Choi had no comments at this time.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Kingsley** had no issue with the third wall sign, and asked if the yellow stripe across the windows shown in the rendering will be added to the elevation. **Ms. Choi** said they are still working on exactly what they will do, but they do want to add something to the windows. **Commissioner Kingsley** stated that she liked the yellow stripe and thought that it worked well to tie the design together.

Commissioner Fitzgerald had no issue with the third wall sign. **Commissioner Eckhardt** was in support of the third wall sign as well, and pointed out the unique visibility issue with this shopping center. **Chair Kubow** agreed as well.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO RECOMMEND TO THE VILLAGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING SIGN VARIATIONS FOR THE GOLF VX LOCATED AT 644 E. RAND ROAD:

1. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-402.A, *NUMBER*, TO ALLOW THREE WALL SIGNS WHERE ONLY TWO WALL SIGNS ARE ALLOWED.
2. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-403.A, *DIMENSIONS*, TO ALLOW A 44.54 SF WALL SIGN ON THE WEST WALL OF THE BUILDING, WHERE 0 SF IS ALLOWED.

THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE PLANS DATED 9/6/24, RECEIVED 1/13/25, FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES, AND THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

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.

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

Mr. Hautzinger said this approval is a recommendation for approval to the Village Board, and he will work with the petitioner to schedule that meeting.

ITEM 3. OTHER BUSINESS

Public Comment

There was none.

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