

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION

**ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
APRIL 22, 2025**

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

Members Present: Jonathan Kubow, Chair
Ted Eckhardt
John Fitzgerald

Members Absent: Scott Seyer
Kirsten Kingsley

Also Present: John Anstadt, J. Anstadt Architecture for *448 N. Vail Ave.*
Robert & Corrine Draper, Owners of *448 N. Vail Ave.*
Steve Hautzinger, Planning Staff

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FOR APRIL 8, 2025

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 8, 2025. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 1. SINGLE-FAMILY ADDITION REVIEW**DC#25-021 – 448 S. Vail Ave.**

John Anstadt, representing *J. Anstadt Architecture*, and **Robert & Corrine Draper**, the homeowners, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing a renovation and second floor expansion to an existing one-and-a-half-story house. An existing two-car detached garage will remain. The plans do comply with the R-3 single-family zoning requirements for size and lot coverage, but on April 14, 2025, the project received approval from the Zoning Board of Appeals for a 12-foot variation to allow a deck and pergola with an exterior side yard setback of 5.4-feet, where 17.4 feet is required by code.

The existing house has a charming cottage style that contributes to the historic character of the neighborhood. Staff commends the petitioner for the proposed renovation/addition in lieu of teardown/new construction. Overall, the proposed second floor expansion and new color scheme are nicely designed to maintain and complement the home's existing character. The new dormer on the front elevation is a very nice addition to the façade. The new dormers on the south elevation are also nicely designed, but the mismatched single versus double windows looks out of balance. Staff recommends that both dormers have a single window for a more cohesive appearance.

The Design Commission should also evaluate the appearance of the raised deck along the south wall which faces Park Street. A raised deck such as this is unusual facing the street, and is more common in a backyard. The deck and pergola are nicely designed and detailed, so Staff is not strongly opposed, but an alternative option to consider would be a smaller stoop/portico with steps down to a patio on grade.

Overall, Staff recommends approval of the design for the proposed addition, with the comments and recommendations given for the commissioners' consideration.

John Anstadt said the owners love their home, they love the character of it and everything about it, and they are trying to contain that. The idea is to expand the second-floor to create more usable space, and add the dormers in the second-floor. They are not opposed to a single window on the left dormer as suggested by Staff, if it is determined to be a better feel for the home. With regards to the raised deck, he said the first-floor is relatively small square footage, and the goal is to try to expand the livable space within the existing envelope by having the deck at the same height as the first-floor. Lowering the deck down to grade with a stoop and multiple steps would separate the deck space from the livable home space, and would function completely different than if it were the same level as the first-floor of the home. The posts and other details of the deck were purposely added to keep with the Cottage-style character of the existing home. There is an existing patio on the back side of the home, so they are trying to differentiate from that with the raised deck being proposed.

Mr. Draper said there is not a lot of interior kitchen/dining area, so the raised deck is an attempt to extend that space and make it more easily accessible to the outdoors. The back of the home has bedrooms, which is not conducive to connecting to outdoor space. They are okay with changing both dormers to only one window, but asked if the window could be slightly larger than the single window currently shown. **Mr. Anstadt** clarified that there could be one, 3-foot wide window in each dormer. **Mr. Draper** also said that having a stoop/portico with steps down to a patio instead of the raised deck would increase the amount of permeability and concrete around the home. Ultimately, they want an extended, continuous footprint from the indoor to the outdoor space. **Mr. Anstadt** had no further comments and

welcomed any questions.

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

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Eckhardt** was okay with the two dormers on the south elevation and different size windows in each one as currently shown. He pointed out there is an existing parkway tree on the south elevation that is very large and will help screen the raised deck. He completely agreed with the homeowner's idea to make the outdoor space part of the house circulation, and not detach it with stairs that go down to grade. He said the south elevation is their backyard and faces the park across the street; the raised deck is in the right place. He was in support of the project as submitted.

Commissioner Fitzgerald liked the addition and everything being done. He wanted the two dormers on the south elevation to have matching size windows, because this is a corner home and the three dormers are visible at one time and right now there are 3 different sizes of windows. He was okay with the windows in the dormers being a size decided by the petitioner, but the window size should be the same in each dormer on the south elevation. He loved the pergola and the raised deck, which look like it could have always been there, and is an inviting communication out to the neighborhood; it blends beautifully. He loved the colors chosen for the home and the roof details with adding some metal. This is a really nice project.

Chair Kubow agreed with the comments given by the commissioners. He loved the colors of the existing home, it is very charming, and he loved what is being proposed tonight. He is indifferent to the dormers and was fine as shown. He loved the raised deck, which makes a lot of sense; however, he was concerned about the precedence it might create with other corner homes.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO APPROVE THE DESIGN OF THE PROPOSED RENOVATION/ADDITION TO THE SINGLE-FAMILY HOME LOCATED AT 448 S. VAIL AVENUE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON PLANS RECEIVED 2/27/25, RENDERINGS AND REVISED MATERIAL LIST RECEIVED 4/11/25, 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 WINDOWS IN THE TWO DORMERS ON THE SOUTH ELEVATION BE THE SAME SIZE.**
- 2. THIS REVIEW DEALS WITH ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, NOR REPRESENT ANY TACIT APPROVAL OR SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED LAND USE OR ANY OTHER ZONING AND/OR LAND USE ISSUES OR DECISIONS THAT STEM FROM ZONING, BUILDING, SIGNAGE OR ANY OTHER REVIEWS. IN ADDITION TO THE NORMAL TECHNICAL REVIEW, PERMIT DRAWINGS WILL BE REVIEWED FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE DESIGN COMMISSION AND ANY OTHER COMMISSION OR BOARD APPROVAL CONDITIONS. IT IS THE PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO INCORPORATE ALL REQUIREMENTS LISTED ON THE CERTIFICATE OF 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.**
- 3. COMPLIANCE WITH ALL FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES.**

Commissioner Eckhardt said the ZBA approved this variation, and he felt the Village code for corner lots is very restrictive, especially for homes like this that are built in this era and are on 50' wide lots. It is a real hardship and he is happy that these homeowners are letting this home really work. He did not want to send the message that approving this project is a dangerous situation, because he does not feel that it is. **Mr. Hautzinger** said that a variation was required for the raised deck, and if another resident proposes to do the same thing a variation would be required as well. Variations are reviewed on a case-by-case basis and there must be a hardship or unique circumstance. **Chair Kubow** said that the raised deck works very well with this particular home; he was just saying in general, to be cautious moving forward with these types of projects on a corner lot.

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

ITEM 2. OTHER BUSINESS

Public Comment

There was none.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 6:50 P.M. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.