

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
APRIL 8, 2025

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

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

Members Absent: Scott Seyer

Also Present: Jim Cochran & Kevin Purdom, JRC Design Build for 1006 N. Evergreen Ave.
Corey Dunne, Dunne & Kozlowski for 9 N. Vail Ave.
Meghan Hartnett, DKMO for Arlington Heights Ford Pro
Cassie Smith, Arlington Heights Ford Pro
William Holley, Bright Light Sign Co. for Arlington Heights Ford Pro
Steve Hautzinger, Planning Staff

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FOR MARCH 25, 2025

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 25, 2025. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 1. SINGLE-FAMILY TEARDOWN RE-REVIEW**DC#25-007 – 1006 N. Evergreen Ave.**

Jim Cochran & Kevin Purdom, representing *JRC Design Build*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to demolish an existing single-story residence with attached two-car garage to build a new two-story house with an attached three-car garage. The plans comply with all the R-3 zoning requirements. This project was previously reviewed by the Design Commission on March 25, 2025, at which time the review was continued due to concerns with the proposed design. A summary of issues discussed at that meeting was provided.

Mr. Hautzinger said the petitioner provided revised plans with a change to the bedroom massing above the garage to bring down the scale of the roof line. However, the primary concern of the “garage only” on the first-floor has not been addressed, and the floor plan has not been revised. Staff feels the 3-car garage facing Evergreen is still completely out of character with the context of the neighborhood, and Staff still recommends that the garage be relocated to the west end of the home. Staff acknowledges the petitioner’s driveway concerns about a side load garage in the rear yard, as well as the petitioner’s desire to have the Great Room with a direct connection to the backyard. However, a front load garage located on the west end of the house would work well to preserve the 30-foot rear yard, as well as allow the Great Room to be located directly adjacent to the backyard. The sketches provided in the staff report illustrate two possible options to consider. Staff recommends further revisions to the design.

Mr. Cochran said they have been working with the clients who are in the process of buying the new home for 6 months, and the home has been flipped ten different ways to get everything that the clients want. Their biggest concern is the northwest corner of the home, where the family room, kitchen and backyard are proposed, which is currently the way the clients want it; they do not want to see the driveway or garage. **Mr. Cochran** presented photos of other homes in town that have side garages, and said that this is the only way to do it on a corner lot, unless the garage is put on the front of the home next to the front door. He felt the proposed home with only the front door, and without the garage facing the street, is a better looking home. He said the Design Commission has approved at least 5 new homes that he has built with a sideload garage in the last 5 years. He reiterated that the sideload garage is the client’s preference. **Mr. Cochran** also said they were open to adding a patio with a pergola, and patio doors in the front corner next to the garage on the east elevation to help improve the look of that elevation.

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

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Eckhardt** was sympathetic to the way the new home is currently laid out, and he understood why the buyers want the backyard open. He agreed that the front elevation is attractive without the garage and driveway. He was fine with the revised design.

Commissioner Fitzgerald said that although he struggled with the original design that was presented, he also understands that it is probably the smartest design for the home and how people want to live now. While he appreciated the changes that were made, he was hoping for more; but he liked that the home looks smaller, and the window was removed. He noticed that there are 2 existing street trees on each side of the driveway, which he felt will help

soften the entire facade, and he was okay with additional landscaping on each side of the driveway to soften it more. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** also said the petitioner's idea to add a patio, pergola and French doors on the garage elevation is really cool, and he would be in favor of it.

Commissioner Kingsley said the Design Guidelines should be used as a tool by petitioners when designing a home or addition, and with all the homes facing Evergreen Avenue in this neighborhood, it would be best to have the front door of this new home facing Evergreen. In regards to the examples provided by the petitioner, Commissioner Kingsley noted that there are no examples of a 3-car garage on a corner facing a primary street. She appreciated the petitioner trying to bring the massing down on that side of the home. She reviewed the colors being proposed that appear very chaotic; she preferred the two gable ends and the front entry be the lighter color, the one-story portion and right side garage match in color, and the two ends be the darker color. On the rear of the home, she suggested the center portion be the lighter color, and the two ends be the darker color. She felt this would help a lot with the massing. **Commissioner Kingsley** also said that the master bedroom shed roof eave is higher than the eave of the adjacent gable; she felt these should match or be lower. **Mr. Cochran** agreed that the eave heights should match. **Commissioner Kingsley** also suggested lowering the canopy over the back patio doors, and adding a walkway from the sidewalk to the front door.

Chair Kubow agreed with the other commissioners' comments and preferred the revised design presented tonight. He liked the changes that were made above the 3-car garage that help to simplify it as well as add visual interest from all sides. Overall, this is a well-designed home, and making the decision that the front of the home is the south elevation is practical.

Commissioner Fitzgerald asked if there will be lights in the eaves of the overhang above the garage doors, or wall mounted light fixtures. **Mr. Cochran** replied that lights in the eaves will probably work better because there is not enough room between the door and the corners to have nice coach lights, and **Commissioner Fitzgerald** agreed.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE NEW (TEARDOWN) SINGLE-FAMILY HOME TO BE LOCATED AT 1006 N. EVERGREEN AVENUE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE REVISED ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 3/31/25, 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 STUDY THE LIGHT AND DARK COLOR COMBINATIONS ON THE REAR ELEVATION, WITH CONSIDERATION TO COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY'S COMMENTS THAT THE CENTER PORTION BE THE LIGHTER COLOR, AND THE TWO ENDS BE THE DARKER COLOR.**
- 2. AN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT FROM THE PETITIONER THAT THE EXTERIOR LIGHTING ON THE GARAGE ELEVATION WILL BE LOCATED IN THE EAVE ABOVE THE GARAGE DOORS.**
- 3. A RECOMMENDATION TO CONSIDER ENHANCING THE FRONT ELEVATION ADJACENT TO THE GARAGE WITH THE ADDITION OF A PERGOLA AND WALK-OUT PATIO AND SITTING AREA.**
- 4. A RECOMMENDATION TO STUDY ADDITIONAL LANDSCAPING ON THE PERIMETER IN THE AREA OF THE GARAGE ON THE SIDE BETWEEN THE FRONT AND THE GARAGE, IF A PERGOLA AND NEW OUTDOOR SPACE IS NOT ADDED THERE.**

5. A RECOMMENDATION TO STUDY THE DOOR ON THE REAR ELEVATION, TO LOWER THE SHED ROOF TO GET IT CLOSER TO THE TOP OF THE DOOR.
6. A RECOMMENDATION TO ALIGN THE EAVE HEIGHT OF THE DORMERS ABOVE THE GARAGE WITH THE EAVE HEIGHT OF THE MAIN HOUSE GABLES.
7. 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 APROPRIATENESS 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.
8. COMPLIANCE WITH ALL FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES.

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

ITEM 2. CBD COMMERCIAL REVIEW**DC#25-017 – 9 N. Vail Ave.**

Corey Dunne, representing *Dunne & Kozlowski*, was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing exterior modifications to an existing office building in the Downtown to accommodate a new restaurant tenant in the first-floor. A summary of the proposed front elevation facade changes are as follows:

- Remove the existing false gables at the top of the façade.
- Add a new decorative metal cornice along the top of the wall.
- Apply new James Hardie Artisan V-Groove fiber cement siding, in a dark “Cast Bronze” color, over the existing brick on the first floor.
- Paint the existing orange brick on the second floor with a white wash of Benjamin Moore “Hazy Skies”, which is a cream color.
- Add new dome shape fabric awnings above the first-floor windows.
- Add new decorative wall sconce light fixtures on the piers between the first-floor windows.
- Add new decorative dark bronze metal lintels above the second-floor windows.
- Convert one existing first floor storefront window to a new restaurant entry door.

The proposed new facade will be a very nice update to the existing building which currently has a relatively unremarkable appearance in this prominent location in the Downtown. Overall, the proposed facade design is very nicely done with a rich and classy appearance. The proposed dark bronze fiber cement siding will add a warm and welcoming appearance to the first-floor storefront. However, the use of fiber cement siding in the Downtown is unusual, where the buildings are predominantly durable masonry construction. The Design Commission should evaluate the proposed use of siding, especially considering that it will cover an existing brick facade that appears to be in very good condition. The only other comment on the design is a recommendation to continue the new decorative cornice on all sides of the building for a more cohesive appearance since the sides of the building are highly visible.

The plans include new rooftop mechanical equipment and ductwork which will be located towards the rear of the existing roof. The existing parapet wall will screen the equipment on all sides of the building as illustrated by the sight line diagrams. At this time, the proposed new restaurant wall sign is schematic. Once the details of the sign have been determined and finalized, a separate Design Commission application for Downtown Signage will need to be submitted for Staff review.

With these comments, Staff recommends approval.

Corey Dunne said the appearance and perception of the existing building will change to reflect the new restaurant being brought into the first-floor. They want to make the existing facade look less corporate by neutralizing the existing orange brick and creating a visual break between the first and second-floor; the second-floor will continue to be an office use. They want the facade to be more inviting and interactive, as well as complement the surrounding buildings. **Mr. Dunne** said he previously worked on other Downtown Arlington Heights restaurants such as Passero, Hey Nonny, and Mago, so he is very familiar with the Downtown area. They are proposing to whitewash the brick on the front facade with an off-white, ivory color, which complements the stucco and masonry on other buildings on this block. The addition of wood cladding at the first-floor will bring in a European vibe and old-school storefront feel. Because of climate and maintenance issues, they ultimately decided on using fiber cement siding, which will allow for a painted finish while giving the warmth and texture

they are trying to achieve. In order to make the facade more inviting, striped canvas awnings are being added over the existing arch windows, sconce lights will be added between each of the bays, and planters placed between them to help soften it up. **Mr. Dunne** also said the current entrance to the building is at the south end of the front facade; however, they want to move the restaurant entrance to the north end of the front facade so it will be separate from the entrance to the second-floor.

Mr. Dunne presented samples of the materials being proposed. The Hardie siding is a flat panel with a V-groove profile in a charcoal color; an off-white ivory paint color for the whitewash going over the existing orange brick; striped fabric for the awnings; the metal coping will be a shade darker than the brick color; the existing storefront material to match; and a stained wood entry door for more warmth and prominence. **Mr. Dunne** understood that signage will be a separate submittal, but he presented a sample of a pre-finished metal for the sign that will have reverse channel lit letters; something soft and respectable. **Mr. Hautzinger** said that if the commissioners are in support of the design and materials being presented tonight for the wall sign, then a separate Design Commission application for the signage would not be needed.

Commissioner Eckhardt liked the smooth siding being proposed, and asked about the detail on the arch above the awnings. **Mr. Dunne** explained that there is an existing detail on the brick that they want to keep the shape of, and add a solid trim board to follow it, giving the horizontal siding a little bit of additional detail.

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

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Kingsley** said it is an exciting update for this property. She reviewed the material samples presented, and said she is not opposed to having the Hardie Artisan wood siding in the Downtown, it is a high-quality material. The stripe in the awning fabric is extremely fun, and she loved the dark base with a light entrance door. She liked the attempt to differentiate between the first and second-floor on the front facade, but wanted to see the same material continue and wrap onto the sides of the building as well. She suggested wrapping it to the cornice at a minimum, because stopping it at the corner lacks integrity. Doing this will make it look like the entire building was built that way, and the proposed 'Hazy Skies' color is similar to the split face block color that exists. **Commissioner Kingsley** also had concerns about the details of how the front windows will be wrapped with trim. **Mr. Dunne** said the trim around the arch top might be better served in a break metal for a cleaner look. **Commissioner Kingsley** said most of the surrounding buildings have a different material where it attaches to the ground, and the material being used below the Hardie siding is going to really matter. **Mr. Dunne** said that these details have not been fully worked out yet, waiting for the commissioners' feedback tonight, and they will take this comment into consideration.

Commissioner Kingsley also had concerns about how the existing mortar that appears to be similar in color to the existing red brick, will be treated when the brick is whitewashed. **Mr. Dunne** said their intent is to try to keep some of the existing modeling, keep a little of that color variation. **Mr. Hautzinger** asked for clarification about the method being used to paint over the existing orange brick. Whitewashing sounds semi-transparent, but the rendering shows an even monochromatic appearance. **Mr. Dunne** explained that they do not want to see any of the existing orange brick; however, they do not want the brick to look painted, they want to see some tonal difference, so they are still determining the level of transparency they want to achieve in the process of staining the brick. **Commissioner Kingsley** said that staining the brick while allowing it to be breathable is very important, and because the top of the front facade will be warm, she would suggest a slightly lighter color.

Mr. Dunne presented an alternate color that is more in the brown family. He also said that they studied turning the corner with the new siding on the building, and because of costs and logistics of the close proximity of the adjacent property (Cortland's Garage), they decided on turning the corner only 2-feet. **Commissioner Kingsley** had no further comments.

Commissioner Fitzgerald was excited about the project, which he said was fantastic. The colors are dramatic and not warm, and he liked the awning color. He liked the idea of bringing the cornice around at least onto the two sides of the building because of the visibility from Cortland's and from the north. He asked if the planters shown up high on the front facade will match the planters on the ground, and **Mr. Dunne** said yes. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** said the higher planters are unusual, especially the design of the plants that are shown. He liked the wall sign shown on the rendering, but he was also very open to new signage and variations to create something exciting with signage if the petitioner chooses to do so. **Mr. Dunne** appreciated the comments about the signage.

Commissioner Eckhardt acknowledged the extremely small setback on the south side of the building, and said he was okay with just the 2' of cornice wrapping being proposed on both sides of the building. He was in full support of the dark color being proposed for the front facade, and had concerns about the signage for the second-floor tenant in conjunction with signage for the first-floor restaurant. **Mr. Dunne** said that signage for the second-floor tenant will probably be a placard at their entrance door to the second-floor. **Commissioner Eckhardt** suggested the petitioner consider staining the first story of split face block going down the alley side of the building the same dark color on the front façade because that corner of the building is very visible from a walking perspective. He liked the solid body stain being proposed, which should be monolithic as shown in the rendering with no bleed-through. He loved the project and had no further comments.

Chair Kubow was very excited about the project and loved the design. He cautioned the commissioners about the motion including a requirement for anything that is outside of the property line, which is not under the petitioner's control. Overall, he supports the current design. **Mr. Hautzinger** commented that based on the Plat of Survey, there is only about 2.2 inches of setback at the southwest corner of the building, which gets slightly larger going east, and he agreed that the motion should not include a requirement for any detailing beyond the property line. There is an option for a 2" deep cornice detail along the south wall.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS TO THE EXISTING BUILDING AT 9 N. VAIL AVENUE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON THE PLANS DATED 3/25/25, 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 REQUIREMENT THAT THE DETAILS OF THE MATERIAL ON THE FRONT FACADE AROUND THE WINDOWS, SUCH AS HOW THE ARTISAN SIDING FINISHES INTO THE TRIM AND HOW IT SITS ON THE GROUND, ARE ALL BROUGHT TO STAFF FOR REVIEW, PRIOR TO FINALIZING THE DESIGN.**
- 2. THAT THE PROPOSED BLACK COLOR AS SUBMITTED ON THE FRONT FACADE IS ACCEPTED, AS WELL AS AN OPTION FOR A SHADE THAT IS SLIGHTLY LESS DARK, TO BE REVIEWED BY STAFF.**
- 3. A REQUIREMENT TO FURTHER STUDY THE MASONRY STAINING TO UNDERSTAND HOW IT IS GOING TO WORK, AND SUBMIT TO STAFF FOR REVIEW.**
- 4. AN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT THAT THE EXISTING SMALL TOP OF WALL COPING ON THE SIDE ELEVATIONS WILL BE THE SAME COLOR AS THE NEW FRONT CORNICE.**

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.

Mr. Hautzinger clarified that the commissioners are okay with the black stain color proposed for the front facade, and are also open to a dark grey color, but not a brown color.

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

ITEM 3. COMMERCIAL REVIEW & SIGN VARIATION REVIEW**DC#25-018 & DC#24-072 – Arlington Heights Ford Pro – 3456 N. Ridge Ave.**

Meghan Hartnett, representing *DKMO Law*, **Cassie Smith**, General Manager at *Arlington Heights Ford*, and **William Holley**, representing *Bright Light Sign Co.*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. Ford Pro is the commercial vehicle branch of the Ford Motor Company. The existing Arlington Heights Ford dealership located at 801 W. Dundee Road recently purchased an existing 110,207 square foot office/light industrial building located directly south of their existing dealership to open a new Ford Pro service and repair center for commercial vehicles. The existing building has four tenant spaces, two in the front and two in the rear, and Arlington Heights Ford combined the front two tenant spaces to create the new Ford Pro service facility.

This project has been reviewed by the Plan Commission and approved by the Village Board for a Land Use Variation Special Use to allow Motor Vehicle Repair, Major within the M-1 Zoning District. Because this project was reviewed by the Plan Commission, the role of the Design Commission is limited to building and signage only.

The plans for the new Ford Pro facility include exterior facade changes consisting of painting the entire brick exterior and all exterior doors in a dark 'Gauntlet Gray' color, adding light gray horizontal metal siding to accent the business entrance, and adding new exterior wall signs. The proposed wall signs do not comply with code, so a sign variation request has also been submitted for review tonight. Design Commission approval is required for all substantial changes to the facade of commercial buildings. However, the existing building has already been painted, and the sheathing for the new metal siding has also already been installed. Photos of the existing building as well as photos of the recently updated building were provided.

Mr. Hautzinger said it is Staff's understanding that the new dark gray wall color is intended to coordinate with the existing silver/gray color scheme of the adjacent Arlington Heights Ford dealership, as well as to comply with Ford Motor Company's global brand standards for Ford Pro. In general, Staff typically has hesitation about painting brick buildings which creates the need for life-long maintenance; however considering that the building has already been painted, and given the unique situation to coordinate with the adjacent dealership and brand standards, Staff does not object to the new wall color. The proposed metal siding and signage works well to highlight the entrance, and overall, the new color scheme and siding provide a fresh update to the building appearance. Staff recommends approval of the facade changes.

Mr. Hautzinger said the proposed signage plans include a total of four wall signs with two on the front (east) elevation facing Ridge Avenue, and two on the side (north) elevation. Per code, only one wall sign is allowed per street frontage, so variations are required to allow the additional three signs. Also, per code, 153 square feet is the maximum allowed size for a wall sign on a building that is setback 153 feet from the front property line, so additional variations are required for the size of the signs.

The petitioner has submitted a letter stating that the proposed wall signage is required by Ford Motor Company's global design standards to create continuity across all Ford Pro service centers. The petitioner states that the proposed signs on the north wall will provide visibility from Dundee Road (across the existing Ford dealership property) to help guide customers to the Ford Pro service center.

Staff acknowledged that this new Ford Pro service center is required to comply with Ford Motor Company's global design signage standards. The proposed signs on the east elevation are large, but they do not look excessive due to the large size of the building. Staff would not be in favor of similar wall signs of this size and quantity on other businesses throughout this commercial area, but Staff does not object to the proposed signs on the east elevation due to the unique use as well as the unique need to be identified in association with the adjacent Ford dealership. However, Staff does question the need for the proposed wall signs on the north elevation. The visibility of the north wall from Dundee Road, across the existing Ford dealership property, is extremely limited. Due to the lack of visibility, Staff feels that the proposed signs on the north wall are unnecessary and excessive.

Staff recommends approval of the following sign variations:

1. A variation from Chapter 30, Section 30-402.a, Number, to allow two wall signs on the East Elevation facing Ridge Avenue, where only one wall sign is allowed.
2. A variation from Chapter 30, section 30-403.a Dimensions, to allow a 280 sf wall sign on the East Elevation facing Ridge Avenue, where 153 sf is the maximum allowed.
3. A variation from Chapter 30, section 30-403.a Dimensions, to allow a 175 sf wall sign on the East Elevation facing Ridge Avenue, where 0 sf is allowed.

Staff recommends denial of the following sign variations:

4. A variation from Chapter 30, Section 30-402.a, Number, to allow two wall signs on the North Elevation, where no wall signs are allowed.
5. A variation from Chapter 30, section 30-403.a Dimensions, to allow a 280 sf wall sign on the North Elevation, where 0 sf is allowed.
6. A variation from Chapter 30, section 30-403.a Dimensions, to allow a 185 sf wall sign on the North Elevation, where 0 sf is allowed.

Ms. Hartnett said she is here tonight on behalf of Arlington Heights Ford for the approval of the application for the facade improvements to the facade of the commercial-use building. The color scheme is the dark grey and Ford blue colors, staying consistent with Ford's global marketing and keeping continuous with the existing Ford dealership next door.

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

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** was okay with the changes to the building and said it looks better. **Commissioner Eckhardt** was in support of the paint colors and the building design. **Commissioner Kingsley** said the changes look good. **Chair Kubow** agreed, and said it is a big improvement to the building.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED ARCHITECTURAL FACADE DESIGN FOR ARLINGTON HEIGHTS FORD PRO LOCATED AT 3456 N. RIDGE AVENUE, AS SUBMITTED. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS AND RENDERINGS RECEIVED 2/20/25, ELECTRONIC MATERIAL SAMPLES RECEIVED 3/17/25, 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. **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 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.

2. ALL SIGNAGE MUST MEET CODE, CHAPTER 30 OR APPROVED SIGN VARIATIONS.

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

With regards to the sign variation request, **Mr. Holley** said the building has a 153-foot setback from Ridge Avenue and there is an existing tree line there impacting visibility of the building. Arlington Heights Ford Pro is looking for some visibility from Dundee Road, which is the purpose for signage on the north elevation. They want customers to see that there is a building located there. **Ms. Smith** added that the angle taken in the photo by Staff does not show the direct view of the top of the building visible from across Dundee Road. **Mr. Holley** presented renderings taken from Google that show an overhead bird's eye view of the building, as well as a straight-on view. **Ms. Smith** added that because there is a sign in front of the building previously permitted for the main dealership building, there is no opportunity to add signage for Ford Pro; this wall sign is the answer for that.

Chair Kubow asked if there was any public comment on the sign variation request, and there was no response from the audience.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Eckhardt** felt it was helpful to have signage on the north elevation of the Ford Pro building, especially when traveling east to west on Dundee, because the building is located behind the main car dealership building. He asked if the 2 tenants in the back portion of the building have any signage and **Ms. Smith** said there is a ground sign on Ridge Avenue with multi-tenant signage. **Commissioner Eckhardt** asked if Ford Pro signage would be added to the ground sign on Ridge Avenue, and **Ms. Smith** said not at this time.

Commissioner Fitzgerald was in support of signage on the east side of the Ford Pro building. He said the north side of the building is visible from Dundee Road, so signage there is important to help people find the Ford Pro building and not confuse it with the Ford dealership building. He said the north side of the building has no architectural interest, and the wall sign will make it look better. He was in favor of the signs.

Commissioner Kingsley had no issue with the signage proposed on the east and the north elevation; however, she had concerns with the placement of the sign on the north elevation, and she suggested moving the sign further west for improved visibility. **Mr. Holley** acknowledged that the sign on the north elevation is located behind the Ford building when traveling east to west on Dundee Road; however, traveling west to east, the current location of the sign is the most visible. **Commissioner Kingsley** said she could support the sign on the north elevation if it was moved further west on the building, and she added that the 'Elite Commercial Service' portion of the sign will always be behind the Ford building and only visible from the parking lot. **Mr. Hautzinger** had doubts that the sign on the north elevation will be seen from Dundee Road and he asked the petitioner if the sign serves any other purpose. **Mr. Holley** said the idea is to have the sign visible from both Dundee Road and from the existing dealership parking lot. **Ms. Smith** referred to the photo and pointed the internal

driveway connection from the Ford dealership lot that connects to the north drive of the Ford Pro building. When Ford Pro customers pull up to the normal service center, a porter drives the vehicle through to the Ford Pro building. **Commissioner Kingsley** reiterated that the blue vertical Ford Pro sign on the north elevation could be really important and should be moved to the west for better visibility.

Chair Kubow was fine with both wall signs being proposed, the building is so far set back and he understood the hardship, and he did not see this detracting from anything else in the area. If the petitioner thinks this signage will help, then he had no problem with it. He strongly agreed with the suggestion to slide the wall sign on the north elevation over to the west.

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 ARLINGTON HEIGHTS FORD PRO AT 3456 N. KENNICOTT AVENUE:

1. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-402.A, *NUMBER*, TO ALLOW TWO WALL SIGNS ON THE EAST ELEVATION FACING RIDGE AVENUE, WHERE ONLY ONE WALL SIGN IS ALLOWED.
2. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-403.A, *DIMENSIONS*, TO ALLOW A 280 SF WALL SIGN ON THE EAST ELEVATION FACING RIDGE AVENUE, WHERE 153 SF IS THE MAXIMUM ALLOWED.
3. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-403A, *DIMENSIONS*, TO ALLOW A 175 SF WALL SIGN ON THE EAST ELEVATION FACING RIDGE AVENUE, WHERE 0 SF IS ALLOWED.
4. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-402A, *NUMBER*, TO ALLOW TWO WALL SIGNS ON THE NORTH ELEVATION, WHERE NO WALL SIGNS ARE ALLOWED.
5. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-403A, *DIMENSIONS*, TO ALLOW A 280 SF WALL SIGN ON THE NORTH ELEVATION, WHERE 0 SF IS ALLOWED.
6. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-403A, *DIMENSIONS*, TO ALLOW A 185 SF WALL SIGN ON THE NORTH ELEVATION, 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. A RECOMMENDATION THAT THE WALL SIGN ON THE NORTH ELEVATION BE STUDIED TO POSSIBLY MOVE THE SIGN TO ACHIEVE BETTER VISIBILITY, BUT THAT THE SIZE, COLOR, AND GRAPHICS OF THE SIGN ARE ACCEPTABLE.
2. THIS REVIEW DEALS WITH ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, 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 clarified for the petitioner that the building facade changes are approved tonight; however, the sign variation approval is a recommendation to the Village Board, who will make the final decision on the sign variations.

ITEM 4. OTHER BUSINESS

Public Comment

There was none.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:40 P.M. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.