

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
MAY 13, 2025

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

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

Members Absent: Scott Seyer

Also Present: Brett Kroner & Stefanie Monaco, Owners of 832 N. Forrest Ave.
Marie Jung & Martin Mondragem, Home Services Direct for 832 N. Forrest
Terry Adams, JTS Architects for Slick City
Nancy Lorenz, Brixmor Property Group for Slick City
Steve Hautzinger, Planning Staff

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FOR APRIL 22, 2025

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 22, 2025. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 1. SINGLE-FAMILY ADDITION REVIEW**DC#25-029 – 832 N. Forrest Ave.**

Marie Jung & Martin Mondragen, representing *Home Services Direct*, and **Brett Kroner & Stefanie Monaco**, the homeowners, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing first and second-floor additions to an existing one-and-a-half-story house. An existing two car attached garage will remain. The plans comply with the R-E single-family zoning requirements. This property is on a street of large lots, where the minimum lots size is 20,000 sf and the minimum lot width is 100-feet, which is typical in the R-E zoning district. Many of the original homes on this street have either been expanded with additions or replaced with new larger two-story houses. The scale of the proposed expanded house fits comfortably on the large lot and with the surrounding context. However, the Design Commission should evaluate the massing of the proposed design which is unusual with an off-center dormer above the existing garage and a divided second-floor. The proposed materials and colors for the house are also quite busy, with a combination of white horizontal siding, black vertical siding, white stucco, and buff limestone used on different parts of the house. The trim on the house is specified to be black, which is a bold look with white siding and white gutters. The Design Commission should evaluate the proposed massing and materials, which Staff recommends should be simplified for a more cohesive appearance.

Mr. Hautzinger said the petitioner brought a color rendering tonight that appears to be different than the plans submitted for review tonight. **Mr. Mondragen** clarified that the rendering is very much the same design; the only thing added is cosmetic which are the columns at the front door and the change in roof style above the front door. **Mr. Hautzinger** said the rendering has different colors from the plans in the packet.

Mr. Kroner said they want the proposed addition to accommodate their family with three boys. **Ms. Jung** said the color rendering presented tonight is slightly different at the front entry, the stone and siding have not changed, but the siding color has changed from white to a darker color. There is no change to the black windows or the black trim, but the horizontal siding will be black. The vertical siding and stucco have been eliminated. **Mr. Mondragen** said that they intend to use LP siding on the sides and rear of the house, and real wood siding on the front. **Stefanie Monaco** said they worked with their Architect who pushed them in the direction of all stucco, which matches the homes across the street. They originally liked the white and black color combination; however, it is exactly like their neighbors' home so they decided to go in the direction of cream stone with black siding as shown on the new rendering.

Mr. Hautzinger stated that the siding color on the rendering looks like dark blue, and **Ms. Monaco** clarified that they are proposing black siding. **Mr. Mondragen** said that the front elevation consists of mostly stone, with black cedar wood siding as accents, black metal roofing, and black soffits and fascia. **Ms. Monaco** presented a photo of an all black house with stone accents, which is what they want to do.

Chair Kingsley 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 Fitzgerald** appreciated the new color rendering presented tonight, which he felt ties the design together a bit more than what is in the packet, especially the area over the garage. He liked the revised colors presented, and of the 3 stone samples presented tonight, his least favorite is the smaller one

called Ellis Fischer because it seems a little cool with the other materials. He liked the sophistication of the stone sample that is more buff/cream color. He was still struggling to understand the rooflines; the space in between the two gables on the front looks uncomfortably low for the rest of the home, and he suggested raising it to make it look like it belongs. He was struggling with how all the rooflines will look when traveling south down Forrest Avenue.

Commissioner Eckhardt agreed with Commissioner Fitzgerald on the massing of the front gable. The second floor gable roof adjacent to the front door will look a little odd where it cuts off at the chimney. After seeing the floor plan, he understood why the roofline on the front elevation goes up, down, and back up; however, he is mostly concerned about the massing of the right gable.

Commissioner Kubow appreciated the homeowners' decision to renovate the existing home and not tear it down, and he understood the challenges of adding on to an existing home. He said the proposed rooflines are unique and will provide a lot of visual interest; however, he cautioned that it could cause water intrusion issues down the road. He encouraged the homeowners to work with their contractor and architect to ensure that the elements are properly detailed. **Commissioner Kubow** loved the rendering presented tonight that is more cohesive on the front elevation than the original design, and he loved the revised color palette that is a bit better than the stark white and black combination original proposed. He loved the natural wood material on the front elevation that will be a strong element, and he stressed the importance of what is chosen for the left, right, and rear elevations. Although the rooflines are unique, he had no strong recommendation either way. Overall, this is a great home.

Chair Kingsley appreciated the unique design details and the existing home being renovated and not torn down, and she agreed that the homeowners should make sure they understand all the details being proposed and how everything will look. She preferred the design of the front door entry on the original submittal which is more contemporary and also would not trap water. She recommended that it be studied more closely. She liked the smallness of the garage massing in the original submittal better than the garage in the color rendering that is larger than the entry. She had no issue with the materials being proposed because the front elevation is very sophisticated; however, it is hard to see the details of the columns at the front entry that are shown in the rendering but not the original drawings. The petitioner said the columns are 6x6 stained wood.

Mr. Hautzinger clarified for everyone that the concern being discussed is that the side of the new second-story gable roof does not go all the way to the back of the house, but instead it stops at the chimney. This massing will read more like a tower feature than a continuous gable, which is a little unusual in the massing of a home. **Mr. Hautzinger** also pointed out that the left gable shown in the new rendering is inaccurate; it does not show the revision that was done to avoid encroaching into the required 10-foot side setback, as shown on the drawings in the packet. **Ms. Monaco** said the rendering is not meant to replace the drawings that were previously submitted, it is only meant to give an idea of color and style.

Commissioner Fitzgerald questioned whether 6x6 posts are too small for the large size of the home; he felt the posts could be heavier and he questioned if it was necessary to have the little stone bases at the bottom of the posts. His main issue is that he was still struggling with the low height of the roof between the two gables. **Chair Kingsley** said although she liked the revised color palette, she was confused about what design is actually being proposed tonight. The changes shown in the rendering are not detailed enough for her to make a decision.

Mr. Hautzinger said if the homeowners want to pursue the design as shown in the rendering,

it would require a variation through the Zoning Board of Appeals for the side yard setback encroachment, which was identified during the initial design review with the petitioner. That is when the petitioner revised the plans to meet code and avoid a variation; those plans are included in the packet for tonight's review. The homeowners confirmed that they do not want to pursue the variation, so the proposed design is as shown in the meeting packet, not the rendering. However, the petitioner said their preference is for the revised gable roof at the front entry and the revised materials and colors that as shown in the color rendering.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized that the proposed design is as shown on the plans in the packet, with the entry feature changed to the gable as shown on the new rendering, and that all of the materials and colors on the home will be black, except for the stone.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE DESIGN OF THE PROPOSED ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR AN ADDITION TO THE EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY HOME LOCATED AT 832 N. FORREST AVENUE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON PLANS RECEIVED 4/18/25, 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. AN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE CONCEPT RENDERING SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER TONIGHT WHICH REPRESENTS MODIFICATIONS ONLY TO THE EXTERIOR COLORS AND SOME MATERIALS, AND MODIFICATIONS TO THE FRONT DOOR ENTRY DESIGN.**
- 2. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PETITIONER SUBMIT A DETAILED DRAWING OF THE NEW FRONT ENTRY DESIGN INCLUDING DIMENSIONED DETAILS OF THE COLUMNS.**
- 3. A REQUIREMENT FOR STAFF TO REVIEW ANY MODIFICATIONS TO THE SOUTH END OF THE GARAGE FOR ZONING CODE COMPLIANCE.**
- 4. A RECOMMENDATION TO CONSIDER OMITTING THE LOW STONE BASE ON THE RIGHT GABLE.**
- 5. A RECOMMENDATION TO KEEP THE FRONT DOOR DESIGN AS SHOWN IN THE PACKET, IN LIEU OF THE FRONT DOOR DESIGN AS SHOWN IN THE COLOR RENDERING.**
- 6. A RECOMMENDATION THAT THE PETITIONER WORK WITH THEIR ARCHITECT TO BETTER UNDERSTAND THE 3-DIMENSIONS OF THE RIGHT SIDE OF THE 2-STORY ADDITION WHERE IT STOPS AT THE FIREPLACE, TO ENSURE THAT THE HOMEOWNERS ARE HAPPY WITH THE DESIGN.**
- 7. A RECOMMENDATION TO USE THE BUFF COLORED STONE MATERIAL.**
- 8. 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.**
- 9. COMPLIANCE WITH ALL FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES.**

Chair Kingsley said the style of windows in the original drawings are different than those in the rendering presented. She suggested that the petitioner revisit the windows on the home, such as will the windows have muntins or not, and will there be circular windows or not. Also, consider making them larger or a different style for a better view of the backyard, and submit to Staff for review.

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

- 10. THE PETITIONER REVIEW THE WINDOW SIZES AND STYLE FOR A COHESIVE APPEARANCE.**
- 11. A REQUIREMENT THAT STAFF REVIEW THE FINAL DESIGN FOR APPROVAL, OR BRING THE PROJECT BACK TO THE DESIGN COMMISSION FOR RE-REVIEW IF DETERMINED NECESSARY BY STAFF.**

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD SECONDED THE AMENDED MOTION.

Mr. Hautzinger reiterated that the new rendering does not accurately depict the proposed color scheme for the home because based on tonight's discussion, the home is proposed to have an all black exterior with stone accents. **Mr. Hautzinger** wanted to confirm that this is the Design Commission understanding, which **Commissioner Eckhardt** confirmed.

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

ITEM 2. COMMERCIAL REVIEW**DC#25-022 – Slick City – 780 W. Dundee Rd.**

Terry Adams, representing *JTS Architects* and **Nancy Lorenz**, representing *Brixmor Property Group*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is here tonight seeking approval of the proposed architectural design for a facade renovation to an existing retail building. This project does require Plan Commission review and Village Board approval for a PUD Amendment and a Special Use to allow a large amusement facility in the B-2 zoning district. The Design Commissions' review is limited to building and signage only.

The project includes modifications to an existing free-standing retail building at the Ridge Plaza Shopping Center. The building is approximately 30,000 square feet. The petitioner, Slick City, is proposing a new indoor amusement facility with indoor slides, sport courts, and climbing attractions. To accommodate the indoor space requirements for the proposed use, the roof and walls of the existing building are being raised, adding approximately twelve feet of height to the exterior appearance. The wall height extension is proposed to be a tan EIFS on top of the existing brown brick on all four sides of the building. The main entrance wall is proposed to be painted blue, and will include a new black metal canopy to highlight the entry doors. Yellow fabric awnings are proposed above the storefront windows to further enhance the design. Overall, Staff feels that the appearance of the proposed wall extension fits well with the existing building, and the proposed colorful façade design is nicely done and appropriate to highlight this unique amusement type business.

All rooftop mechanical equipment is required to be screened from view. The new parapet walls are sufficiently tall to provide full screening of all rooftop equipment on all sides of the building. With regards to signage, Code allows one wall sign per street frontage. The maximum size of the sign is limited to 25% of the wall area on which the sign is mounted. A separate sign permit application is required to verify that the size of the sign is code compliance, but overall the proposed sign design works very well with the colorful facade.

Overall, Staff recommends approval with the one comment to review the actual color samples provided tonight to confirm the color selections.

Mr. Adams presented samples of the colors being proposed, which include the existing brick color, existing entry color, proposed blue accent color, proposed awning color to match the existing, and the proposed EIFS color. **Mr. Hautzinger** clarified that the EIFS color has been changed from the "Pearl Gray" shown on the drawings to "Mocha Cream", which **Mr. Adams** confirmed and added that the coping on top of the EIFS will be dark bronze to match the existing coping on the building, and the metal awning will be black with black coping. **Mr. Adams** commented that the colors shown in the drawings/renderings are not completely accurate to how they will look in the outdoors.

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

The commissioners reviewed the colors and materials being proposed, and summarized their comments. **Commissioner Eckhardt** loved the contrast of colors being proposed, he loved the yellow and the blue. He completely supported the project. **Commissioner Kubow** said the building looks great, but he felt a lighter color for the EIFS for the wall extension would help with the contrast from the top to the bottom; less of the beige and a little of a cooler color will help contrast in his opinion. **Mr. Hautzinger** presented a color study based on a

google street view snapshot of the existing building with a rough mock-up of the colors being proposed, to show a visual for how it will look. He felt that the lighter EIFS color looked too light and a darker EIFS color more similar to the existing brick had a better appearance. After seeing the color mock-up, **Commissioner Kubow** agreed that a darker EIFS color works better. He approves as proposed. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** asked if the dark bronze coping at the top of the building is very close to the color of the EIFS, and **Mr. Adams** said it is closer to the color of the brick. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** had concerns about the 3 different colors of metal on the building. Other than that, he liked the building and said the yellow and blue colors are fun. **Commissioner Eckhardt** asked what the intention is for painting the pair of service doors on the front elevation that appear to be white, and **Mr. Adams** said those metal doors will be painted to match the brick color. **Chair Kingsley** agreed that the proposed "Mocha Cream" EIFS color should be okay and blend in with the brick. With regards to the 3 different colors of metal being proposed, **Chair Kingsley** was okay with the bronze coping color at the top of the building if the service doors on the front elevation are painted bronze, and the same with the back doors. She also asked how the height of the parapet walls were determined, and **Mr. Adams** explained that the slides inside the building need a certain clearance. He added that the new wall will fully screen the rooftop mechanical equipment whereas the existing parapet does not completely screen the equipment. **Chair Kingsley** had no further comments.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE DESIGN OF THE PROPOSED ARCHITECTURAL FAÇADE FOR SLICK CITY LOCATED AT 780 W. DUNDEE ROAD. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON PLANS RECEIVED 3/4/25, COLOR RENDERING RECEIVED 4/7/25, 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. THAT THE EIFS COLOR FOR THE WALL EXTENSION SHALL BE 'MOCHA CREAM'.**
- 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.**

Commissioner Eckhardt acknowledged that the petitioner stated that the pair of service doors on the front of the building will be painted a color to match the brick.

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

- 3. THAT THE DOUBLE DOORS ON THE FRONT ELEVATION SHALL MATCH IN COLOR TO THE BRICK.**

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD SECONDED THE AMENDED MOTION.

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

ITEM 3. OTHER BUSINESS

Public Comment

Keith Moens clarified the process of amending a motion, which can include 2 votes. One vote on the proposed amendment, and if it passes, then a second vote on the original motion as amended.

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