

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
JUNE 24, 2025

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

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

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Joe Labelle, Rize Properties for *623 N. Beverly Ln.*
Teresa Bateman, Urban Street Group for *Golf Crossing*
Jeff Mulcrone, BSB Design for *Golf Crossing*
Steve Hautzinger, Planning Staff

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FOR MAY 27, 2025

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF MAY 27, 2025. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 1. SINGLE-FAMILY ROOF-MOUNTED MECHANICAL UNITS**DC# 25-043 – 623 N. Beverly Ln.**

Joe Labelle, representing *Rize Properties*, was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner received Design Commission approval for a new (teardown) single-family residence on May 9, 2023. At this time, construction of the home is nearing completion, and the petitioner is in the process of obtaining permit approvals for various as-built changes that were made in the field without permits. One of the as-built changes is the relocation of grade-mounted mechanical equipment to a rooftop location on the back of the house. The design of the house includes a covered patio structure with a gable roof that was modified to incorporate a flat area for the mechanical equipment. A solid knee screen wall facing the rear of the property was constructed, but the side of the mechanical well is currently fully open. A site plan and current aerial photo was presented for reference.

The Village's Design Guidelines require roof mounted mechanical equipment to be completely screened with sound absorbent materials harmonious with the building. The petitioner is proposing a decorative lattice screen to enclose the side of the equipment well. A photo of the current home and drawing were presented.

Placement of the mechanical equipment on the porch roof is unusual, and it raises concerns regarding possible visual and acoustical nuisance to the adjacent property. Mechanical units located on grade can also possibly cause visual and acoustical nuisance to neighbors, but when mechanical equipment is on grade, neighbors have the option to install fencing and/or landscaping to buffer the impact. In this case, the neighbors have no option to screen the units, and since the units are already installed, it puts the neighbors in a difficult position to raise objection.

Staff suggests the following options for the Design Commission's consideration:

1. Approve as submitted with the proposed lattice screen wall.
2. Require a solid screen wall instead of the proposed decorative lattice to fully screen the view of the units as well as to help deflect the sound away from the adjacent property.
3. Flip the location of the rooftop units to the north side of the porch roof (with screening) which would be less impactful to the adjacent properties.
4. Require the units to be relocated to grade as originally approved.

Staff recommends the Design Commission evaluate the as-built rooftop mechanical equipment and proposed screening, with the suggestions given by Staff.

Mr. LaBelle said the homeowners expressed interest in moving the mechanical equipment to the porch roof during the project. He received feedback from Staff during that process with regards to the requirement for screening, and then proceeded to get the work done. Towards completion of the project, they were told that as-builts were required. He believes the Village's main concern is the impact of these units on the neighbor to the south. He spoke with that neighbor during construction and again yesterday to make sure they were okay with it and they were, but they did raise a small concern about the window next to the equipment. The mechanical equipment has a very low decibel rating, similar to a dishwasher, and the existing screen wall to the east has a sloped top to mimic the look of a dormer. With regards to Staff's suggestion to add a solid screen wall, he has concerns with airflow in terms of the equipment working properly, so they are proposing a heavy lattice for the screen wall that will screen nicely while allowing airflow to come through. **Mr. LaBelle** clarified that there are

no zoning concerns with this unique situation to have the units on the rooftop in a residential neighborhood.

Chair Kingsley asked if the petitioner looked into the matter of the units meeting manufacturer clearance requirements, since it appears that the side wall to the east is closer to the unit than the wall to the south. **Mr. LaBelle** said the architect is concerned that adding a solid wall to the side of the unit might not meet manufacturer requirements; however, open screening would.

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** was intrigued by the idea of raising the units off the ground because of the noise they generate between the homes when they are on the ground. He had concerns about the units increasing in noise as they age, and if a new owner moves into the home to the south, which could be a problem. He was in favor of a more solid screening instead of the lattice being proposed, because a solid screening will direct the sound up instead of out. He also asked how many units are on the roof, and **Mr. LaBelle** said there are 2 units as well as the cooling system for the garage. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** pointed out that theoretically this could result in 3 units running at the same time. He was in favor of Staff reviewing and approving a more solid screening for the units, or screening with the same siding as the home.

Commissioner Eckhardt felt the current situation was open enough for air to get through; however, a louver made of siding would knock the sound down and still let air get in. Lattice is a different material than the aesthetic of the home and there are maintenance issues to consider. He agreed with Commissioner Fitzgerald's suggestion for a more solid screening instead of the lattice.

Commissioner Kubow asked what drove the change in the location for the units, and **Mr. LaBelle** said there were concerns about the placement and sound of the units with regards to the covered patio and the backyard. **Commissioner Kubow** did not like being put in a position like this, and although he appreciated Staff's comments, he was not in favor anything open to the south, lattice or otherwise; it would have to be to the north. He asked if the petitioner has anything in writing from the neighbor to the south stating this is okay with them and **Mr. LaBelle** said he did not, but he could likely get something from them.

Commissioner Seyer said this is an unusual situation for the commissioners to review, and no details are being given about the lattice being proposed, which will deteriorate in a year. He suggested louvers if anything, or moving the units to the north side of the home. He felt both the homeowner and the neighbor will be unhappy if lattice is added for screening. The bottom line is trying to be a good neighbor. A solid screening wall will have problems because of the number of units up there, but louvers will definitely help with both sound and aesthetics.

Chair Kingsley agreed that something more permanent needs to be done to screen the units. She is in favor of screening the units, although ideally it would have been better if the units were on the north side. She agreed that sound is important and pointed out that the patio roof under the units has been insulated to mitigate sound below, but the neighbor also needs to be protected from that noise. At a minimum, a solid wall or a louvered wall needs to happen here. She added that it appears that the wall adjacent to the units is white, and the home is grey. **Mr. LaBelle** confirmed that the wall is off-white.

Mr. Hautzinger said if the commissioners feel it is important to have a solid wall on the south, another option to improve airflow might be to eliminate the existing knee wall that

faces east.

Mr. LaBelle appreciated the feedback and said they are open to a screen wall of lap siding and providing louvers for airflow. Their preference is not to take down the wall to the east.

Commissioner Seyer said required screening of mechanical units on a rooftop for all other uses is that the units not be seen, and with the proposed lattice on this home, it will still be seen.

There were no further comments.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO APPROVE THE AS-BUILT ARCHITECTURAL PLANS FOR 623 N. BEVERLY LANE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON PLANS DATED 4/2/25, RECEIVED ON 6/6/25, 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 PETITIONER PROVIDE LOUVER SCREENING WITH CONFIGURATIONS SIMILAR TO THE CLAPBOARD SIDING SO THAT IT LOOKS LIKE THE SIDING, AND THAT THE LOUVER BE SUBSTANTIAL AND HAVE ENOUGH DEPTH THAT IT WILL DEFLECT SOUND AS WELL AS ALLOW AIRFLOW. THIS SHOULD BE SUBMITTED TO STAFF FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL, AND INCLUDE A CUT SHEET OF COLOR AND DETAILS FOR THE LOUVER.**
- 2. IF LOUVER SCREENING DOES NOT WORK, THEN THE SECOND OPTION IS A REQUIREMENT TO BUILD A SOLID SCREENING WALL.**
- 3. 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.**
- 4. COMPLIANCE WITH ALL FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES.**

Mr. Hautzinger asked for clarification about the louver material, and **Commissioner Eckhardt** said his intent is for a commercial grade metal louver that will be more effective for knocking down sound, which can be trimmed out. **Mr. LaBelle** understood. **Chair Kingsley** suggested the solid wall as Option 1, and the louver screening as Option 2. **Commissioner Eckhardt** felt a solid wall would catch everything inside of it with no airflow; it is not the best solution.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO AMEND THE MOTION TO REMOVE #2, THE OPTION TO PROVIDE A SOLID SCREEN WALL.

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

ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 2. MULTI-FAMILY REVIEW**DC#25-036 – Golf Crossing – International Plaza Redevelopment – 388 E. Golf Rd.**

Teresa Bateman, *Urban Street Group*, and **Jeff Mulcrone**, representing *BSB Design*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. The petitioner is seeking approval of the proposed architectural design for seven new multi-family buildings and corresponding accessory structures. This project requires Plan Commission review and Village Board approval for Rezoning, Subdivision, PUD approval, and zoning variations. Matters related to zoning, including building height, setbacks, traffic, and parking, will be discussed at the Plan Commission meeting which is yet to be scheduled but will include separate public notification for. This project will also be reviewed by the Housing Commission. The role of the Design Commission tonight is to review the architectural design of the buildings and signage only. There is very limited signage information in tonight's submittal, but it will be discussed.

The subject property is approximately 17.5 acres and is located just east of Arlington Heights Road along the north side of Golf Road. The site was formerly occupied by the International Plaza shopping center, which has recently been demolished, creating a vacant site. The petitioner is proposing to redevelop the property as a mixed-use development with seven new four-story multi-family apartment buildings (Lots 1 & 2) and commercial uses along Golf Road (lots 3 & 4). The multi-family portion of the site will include the following accessory structures: seven, eight-bay single-story garage buildings, a pool house, pergolas and a gazebo. At this time, only the multi-family portion of the proposed development is being reviewed. This project will return to the Design Commission for review of the commercial building designs on Lots 3 & 4 at a future meeting to be determined.

Commissioner Eckhardt asked if a parking analysis was done to determine if there is adequate parking on this site, which could impact the site planning for the residential portion being reviewed tonight. **Mr. Hautzinger** clarified that this project will not proceed to the Plan Commission until the petitioner has provided both the residential and commercial portions allowing for a complete review including matters such as a parking analysis.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized the comments by Staff and the Design Commission when this project received a preliminary Design Commission review on August 23, 2022. The key rendering provided at that time was presented. Based on the feedback received at the preliminary review, the petitioner made the following changes to the proposed design:

- Added “Aged Pewter” siding to break up the amount of black siding.
- Increased the amount of brick, and added more variation to the brick height around the building.
- Added “natural” color cast stone sills and banding.
- Added more variation to the parapet height at the top of the building.

Overall, Staff feels the petitioner did a very good job in addressing the Design Commission's preliminary comments. The new “Aged Pewter” siding color adds nice variety and relief to the previous all black siding scheme. The additional brick adds more quality and variety to the design. Also, the new accessory garage structures and pool house are both nicely designed to match the apartment buildings.

However, Staff does have the following comments regarding some of the details of the current design:

- The black corner boards in the areas of gray siding stand out like black stripes. Gray corner boards are recommended with the gray siding.
- The bright white stone banding stands out in a negative way. The stone color should be dark gray as shown on the pool house and garage renderings.
- The brick detail on the right side of the rear elevation of Building 1 is out of place with the rest of the design. Staff recommends that it be changed to all brick to match the left side.
- The brick base on the accessory garages should be continued across the back wall.
- Mechanical vents for items such as laundry dryers and kitchen hoods should be required to be vented up through the roof, and should not be allowed through the exterior walls.
- If possible, provide internal roof drains instead of the exterior downspouts.
- Materials and details for the accessory pergolas and gazebo should be provided for review.
- Actual material samples should be reviewed to confirm that all of the materials and colors work well together.

All mechanical equipment, utility equipment, utility meters, and trash storage is required to be screened from public view. The plans do not indicate any rooftop mechanical equipment, however the petitioner should confirm and provide screening if needed. The plans do indicate the location of exterior electric meters, which will be clustered on the end walls of the buildings and screened with tall evergreen landscaping. All trash will be stored inside the buildings, so separate trash corral screening is not required.

The site plan includes three ground signs, with one facing Arlington Heights Road, one facing Golf Road, and one located internal to the site at the south end of the residential zone. At this time, detailed sign drawings have not been provided for review so code compliance cannot be confirmed. However, in general, code does allow identification signs for residential developments with one sign allowed on each side of the point of ingress into the development. Such signs are limited to 25 square feet in area and six feet in height. Conceptually, the two "Entrance Signs" shown on the site plan should be allowed. Code also allows ground signs for commercial properties, so conceptually the proposed "Monument Sign" shown on the site plan should be allowed. Wall Signs are not allowed, and the wall sign shown during the preliminary design review has been omitted. When detailed sign plans are provided, Staff will review the sign designs for code compliance and compatibility with the overall development, and Staff reserves the right to require Design Commission review of the sign designs if determined to be necessary. If the proposed signs are determined to not comply with code, the petitioner will have the option to seek a sign variation.

Mr. Hautzinger said that Staff recommends approval of the proposed architectural designs for the seven multi-family apartment buildings and corresponding accessory structures for the proposed Golf Crossing development, with the comments and suggestions given tonight and included in the Staff Report.

Teresa Bateman said this mixed-use project includes both residential and retail operations, and they are currently working with a retail outfit who will come before the Design Commission collectively, and architecturally will be coordinated between different materials. This project consists of 7 residential buildings and include both market rate buildings and a senior affordable building. The new site plan and building structure designs have been revised based on the feedback from this commission, Village Staff, and resident comments received through Staff. The buildings have been adjusted to be more aligned with more open space, giving all buildings visual site lines to courtyards and pedestrian landscape walkways. This property

has one major access at Golf Road where there will be a monument sign that will include different aspects for both the residential and the retail, as well as a monument sign at the northern end of the site. The sign package they submit will also include wayfinding and directional signage for the property. As a master developer, they require all 7 buildings to look and operate similar for exterior elements and the amenity offerings. She introduced the architect, Jeff Mulcrone to review the architectural details.

Mr. Mulcrone presented and reviewed updated building elevations which address many of the comments from Staff. The site will include 7 residential buildings, 6 detached garages, a pool house, gazebo structure, and trellises around the pool. Some of the updates to the buildings include changing the sills to a charcoal color, changing the trim boards around the Aged Pewter siding to the same gray color as the siding, and replacing all the dark corner boards with lighter corner boards. The material sample board was presented that included the deep warm red brick, the charcoal cast stone, black vinyl windows and doors, the Aged Pewter and Anchor Black fiber cement panels, black metal railings, and black coping. **Mr. Mulcrone** said the building roof is designed for scuppers, with approximately 6 metal scuppers per building, which was done to reduce the roof height and keep water from being in the middle of the building. Internal roof drains would result in roof penetrations and a taller roof with the parapets needing to be raised around the building. All residential buildings will have elevators, each apartment will have its own laundry, and exterior dryer vents will be painted to match the siding. Mechanical units will be located on the exterior wall adjacent to the balconies, with metal louvers painted to match the material they are on. The size of the pool house was reduced, and the trim colors were changed. The facade and trim on the garages were lightened up, and the brick returns were brought down the sides of the garage elevations. A pergola structure is proposed for the gazebo located in the courtyard between Buildings 2,3 and 4, which will match the metals on the building.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

Robert Schmidt suggested adding solar panels on the detached garages, adding a second swimming pool for the 3 buildings to the east, and adding native plants, rain barrels, and recycling options for the residents.

Keith Moens said the petitioner signed a Memorandum of Understanding in November 2023 that states the petitioner plans to outsource Building 7 to a third party to develop and segregate all the affordable units into one building. This is a violation to our Inclusionary Housing Ordinance. He said that no rendering of Building 7 was presented tonight. The MOU also states that it can take years to develop Building 7, which is also a violation of the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance. He is concerned that the third party will not be able to make Building 7 look like the other 6 buildings. The uniformity, the conformity, the timing, and the segregation, all violate our IHO. In his opinion, there are two options tonight: postpone this application entirely until a third party comes in here to show how Building 7 will match the other buildings, or; make Building 7 a separate project from the rest of the residential buildings. **Mr. Moen** also had concerns about the amount of affordable housing units proposed for this development, which falls short of the 64 units required.

Chair Kingsley clarified that a rendering of Building #7 was presented tonight. **Commissioner Kubow** said that Building 7 appears to be included in tonight's review, and if approved by this commission, it will move forward to the Plan Commission and Village Board. Once approved, it cannot change without this review process starting over. He did not see an issue with this. He appreciated the comments and encouraged Mr. Moens to continue to speak at each step of the way to make sure his comments are heard and the

petitioner follows through with their proposal. **Chair Kingsley** asked the petitioner if they intend to build all 7 buildings, and **Ms. Bateman** replied that they will be building in alignment; there are 2 different builders for this project, with one that specializes in senior housing who they have been working with, and also using the same architectural firm, which is why Building 7 is being presented tonight. It is a requirement for them as the master developer, that it must meet and match the rest of their other holdings.

Peg Lane said she is a retired special ed teacher and community organizer, and it makes her sad that there are separate discussions of the population of people who need affordable housing, and that Building 7 is located off in the corner of the site near Arlington Heights Road, and the swimming pool is a long walk for residents of Building 7 who may use a walker or a wheelchair. She would love a more integrated discussion about Building 7, including whether or not the amenities mentioned will be provided in Building 7. She did not like this segregation. It seems like a satire on the whole idea of inclusion, with Building 7 being out in the corner of the site; it shows that there is a concept that those people are different and not like us. That is not a good feeling.

Teresa Bateman said the units in Building 7 will be similar in size to market rate, and offer the same finishes, layout, interior laundry, etc. as the other buildings. They want to provide the residents in Building 7 with the same amenities as the other buildings, and they are working with the developer of that building to make sure they address the individuals who will be living there.

Chair Kingsley advised the resident that her comments have been noted, but her concerns are not under the purview of this commission and can be presented as part of the Plan Commission review.

Argie Karafotias said his restaurant is located across the street from the site and he welcomes this new development. He is happy to see the former International Plaza site being redeveloped, as well as the Gateway project at Algonquin & Arlington Heights Road. Let us do something for the south side of the Village. He said this petitioner worked well with the Village of Schaumburg with their development at Algonquin & Meacham Road, and he encouraged the commissioners and the residents here tonight to learn about it.

Linda Waycie said Building 7 is not needed because the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance states that all affordable units need to be dispersed among the buildings, so this is a violation, and there does not appear to be any interior parking for Building 7. **Ms. Bateman** said the exterior parking garages have only 6 or 8 spaces, and the majority of the parking for the entire property is surface parking. **Linda Waycie** asked about an outdoor play area, and **Ms. Bateman** said that based on their market research, that amenity is not available at this time.

Leroy Allala said he lives adjacent to this property. He asked if there are plans to help with water management for the site in terms of placement or green areas. He asked about fencing to separate the adjacent homes behind the site, style and size details. He also asked if there will be access to the site through the entry to Golf Terrace, or will it be closed off and landscaped to create privacy for those properties and to discourage pass-thru. He commented that the site has had issues with homeless and vandalism behind structures, and he is concerned that the rear of the garages along the property lines could become problematic. Lighting and cameras in those areas, that are accessible by the Police Department, could help as well.

Ms. Bateman said new fencing is proposed to separate the northern residences and the property itself, and the buildings were pulled further away from the fence line than previously shown at the preliminary review. Golf Road Terrace will be fully improved and become an

access road to the property, per Village requirements. Storm water management is important and there will be underground vault systems under the parking lots per Village Engineering requirements, which have been sized to handle the necessary volume that this property will take on.

Commissioner Eckhardt said this commission is looking at the architectural design of the project, and questions regarding landscaping and storm water detention are important matters that will be discussed at the Plan Commission review.

Cole Enterline said he lives adjacent to this site. He pointed out discrepancies on the updated drawings with regards to the consistency of the brick on the front and rear elevations of the buildings. He also had concerns about their residential R-1 lots that are adjacent to this site and the high-density buildings that will tower over their homes and invade their privacy, especially when people are out on the balconies. He asked about the sight lines from the balconies and the option to remove some of the balconies that are not recessed. He also had concerns about losing the existing, very large, mature trees which would help with privacy.

Robert Schmidt asked that garbage disposals not be put in the units because it is a nightmare for the person living below.

Jeff Behrens said he lives just north of Building 4. He asked if the height of the buildings was driven by economics, because he was not expecting to have 4-story buildings adjacent to his home, and he shares the concerns about privacy. **Chair Kingsley** said the project does not require any variations from the zoning code. **Mr. Behrens** also asked if brick goes around the entire garage, because he will be looking at it every day from his home. The petitioner said there will be a new 6' fence around the site.

There was no further public comment.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Seyer** said it has been 2 years since the preliminary review of this project when the commissioners generally gave positive feedback on the project, and he felt it was unfair to now give the petitioner an entirely new set of rules about the aesthetics of the project. At the preliminary review, the commissioners directed the petitioner to find more contrast with the materials and not make it look as heavy as it did then, and he felt the petitioner did that, and it looks nice. He replied to the comments made about the one odd brick detail; the brick comes all the way down on one end of the building because there are no doors below, and if the bricks came all the way down in the two areas, then the doors would be eliminated, and that would not work. He was okay with what is currently proposed. He liked the darker stone caps, although he could have gone either way on those, and he liked the darker corner trim that adds more detail. He felt the petitioner succeeded in what the commissioners asked them to do at the preliminary review of the project. He acknowledged the comments made about the sight line concerns, but reiterated that the petitioner is doing things that meet code and within the rights of this property, which is all he can speak to that issue. **Commissioner Seyer** was in support of the project moving forward.

Commissioner Kubow said he was not at the preliminary review of the project, but he looked at what was previously presented then and now and he liked the changes that were made. Initially he had concerns that the colors were too dark, but compared to the other projects completed by the petitioner in Schaumburg and Buffalo Grove, he felt this project is better than those and has more of a contemporary, loft feel similar to Fulton Market, and he supports all the brick being used. He felt the petitioner went out of their way to detail the buildings very well on all four sides. He was okay with the mechanical vents not being internal,

but felt that the louvers should match whatever material it is up against. In general, he supports the project as proposed, with some of the requirements from Staff.

Commissioner Eckhardt agreed that the corner boards should be the same color, the dark stone cap is fine, the corners of Building 1 should all be masonry instead of masonry on top of cement board, and he was okay with the colors and the scuppers as proposed.

Commissioner Fitzgerald liked the project when it was reviewed 2 years ago, and he liked the changes that were presented tonight even more. He asked for clarification that a new fence will be on the north and the east property line, and **Ms. Bateman** said yes. She added that a fence on the west side is also being proposed, but still being addressed with the Village. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** did not see adequate landscaping on the north side of the garages adjacent to the homes, and he suggested the brick go around all four sides of the garages, except for the garage on the east side, and if there is a fence, then also not on the garage west of Building 6.

Chair Kingsley said she was at the preliminary review and had commented about the dark colors, but felt the buildings have now been brightened up, which she supports. She liked that more brick is being used, but wanted there to be more full brick elements. She also reiterated comments she made at the preliminary review that she did not support the crenulated brick, and that sustainability should be incorporated into the project. **Ms. Bateman** replied that sustainability is important to them and there will be energy efficient lighting throughout the property including motion sensors, paints with limited VOCs, and other things that will be better defined as they develop their specifications. **Chair Kingsley** encouraged the petitioner to present their sustainability elements at the Plan Commission review.

Chair Kingsley said that changes to the garages include removing the black corner boards, and she asked if the trim around the black windows was changed to grey. **Mr. Mulcrone** confirmed that all the black trim around the garage doors and corner boards was changed to grey (Aged Pewter), but the garage doors are still dark. **Chair Kingsley** said the material sample board submitted included a black stone, but for the record, grey stone will be used for all the sills; there will be no black stone, which **Mr. Mulcrone** confirmed.

Commissioner Kubow spoke about density as it relates to the resident who spoke about losing privacy with the height of the buildings and the projected balconies. He asked if the balconies on the roof-facing elevations of Buildings 4 & 5 are recessed or projected, and **Mr. Mulcrone** said a combination of both. **Commissioner Kubow** said the petitioner should consider recessing the 3 projected balconies on that side of the buildings to reduce the exposure to the neighbors to the north.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW , SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED ARCHITECTURAL DESIGNS FOR THE SEVEN MULTI-FAMILY APARTMENT BUILDINGS AND CORRESPONDING ACCESSORY STRUCTURES FOR THE PROPOSED GOLF CROSSING DEVELOPMENT LOCATED AT 388 E. GOLF ROAD. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON AND SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE PLANS DATED 5/10/25 AND RECEIVED ON 5/16/25, 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 BLACK CORNER BOARDS BE REMOVED IN THE AREAS**

OF GRAY SIDING AND REPLACED WITH GRAY TRIM TO MATCH THE GRAY SIDING, AS SHOWN ON THE REVISED DRAWINGS PRESENTED BY THE PETITIONER AT THE DC MEETING TONIGHT.

2. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE BRIGHT WHITE STONE BANDING BE REMOVED AND REPLACED WITH GRAY STONE, AS SHOWN ON THE REVISED DRAWINGS PRESENTED AT THE DC MEETING TONIGHT.
3. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE BRICK DETAIL ON THE RIGHT SIDE OF THE REAR ELEVATION OF BUILDING #1 BE CHANGED TO MATCH THE REVISED DRAWINGS PRESENTED AT THE DC MEETING TONIGHT.
4. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE BRICK CONTINUE AROUND THE BASE OF ALL FOUR SIDES OF ALL THE DETACHED GARAGES.
5. THAT THE MECHANICAL VENTS CAN BE HORIZONTALLY EXHAUSTED FROM THE BUILDING, AS LONG AS EACH ONE IS PAINTED TO MATCH THE MATERIAL THAT IT IS ADJACENT TO.
6. THAT THE ROOF DRAINS GOING TO THE EXTERIOR OF THE BUILDING AS SHOWN ARE ACCEPTABLE AS SHOWN IN THE DRAWINGS.
7. THAT THE MATERIALS AND DETAILS FOR THE PERGOLAS AND GAZEBO ARE ACCEPTABLE AS PRESENTED.
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.

Mr. Hautzinger asked for clarification about the brick continuing on the detached garages. He explained that the revised drawings presented by the petitioner tonight show a change that was made to extend the brick down the sides of the garages, but not across the back. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** reiterated his previous suggestion to extend the brick across the full rear elevations of the detached garages on the north side of the site, as well as the detached garage to the west of Building 6 if there is not a fence there. **Commissioner Kubow** said he would maintain the requirement for brick on all four sides of all of the garages as stated in his motion.

Mr. Hautzinger clarified that the petitioner did not provide details on the pergolas, only the one gazebo structure, and **Ms. Bateman** said that details of the pergolas around the pool area have not yet been defined. **Commissioner Kubow** was okay with Staff reviewing and approving the details of the pergolas around the pool area.

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

ITEM 3. OTHER BUSINESS**Public Comment**

Commissioner Fitzgerald asked how and why the new “ARLINGTON HEIGHTS” sign letters that were recently installed by the clock tower on Northwest Highway were not reviewed by the Design Commission. This is a major change of aesthetics in the Downtown area, and he felt it should have come before the Design Commission. **Commissioner Eckhardt** agreed and said he would have liked to have seen this new signage and he was surprised when it appeared. He was most concerned with the bright white color of it; he would have suggested a softer color like bronze. **Mr. Hautzinger** said the signage was part of a package reviewed and approved by the Village Board, who were looking for more gateway identification. He appreciated the commissioners’ comments about not being part of the review process, and would forward that feedback.

Commissioner Eckhardt asked about a home on Burton with a porch that was added across the front elevation, and why it was not brought before the Design Commission for review. **Mr. Hautzinger** said he did not recall if the home received either an administrative Design Commission approval or a small project approval. He explained that many projects are approved by Staff administratively or as a small project. These include rear single-story sunrooms, covered porches, covered patios, family room bump-outs, dormers, entry porticos, and front porches.

Chair Kingsley recommended the Design Commission look at the Design Guidelines and make any needed updates so that applicants can better use them. She is concerned that the Guidelines may have a dated appearance, and as a result, petitioners assume they are old documents with old examples, and are therefore irrelevant. **Mr. Hautzinger** clarified that the Village has two sets of Design Guidelines, Single-Family and Village-wide. He felt that the Single-Family Design Guidelines are relatively current, but the Village-wide Guidelines do have a dated appearance. **Chair Kingsley** suggested first looking at the Single-Family Design Guidelines, since there is a lot of talk right now about raising the maximum height of a single-family home. She felt this is something that developers are pushing for because they want to max out the land, but she felt the Village should look at more than what other communities allow, because historic preservation should also be taken into consideration during a discussion about height. She suggested that the maximum allowed height be established by neighborhood, or by the Design Guidelines; coming up with something in the Design Guidelines that might include factoring in the height of the homes on the block, similar to the average front yard setback calculation, that might allow an increase in height, but not granted for every home.

Commissioner Eckhardt said one of the difficulties is that Village code states the height of a home is not measured from the ridge, it is measured from the mid-point a 25’, and that ridge is moving up and down based on the slope of the roof. He pointed out that many historic homes have very steep pitches that they could not achieve because of the current height requirement. He said the Park Ridge has a maximum height to the top, which is easy to monitor. **Chair Kingsley** suggested a height survey be required at the time of rough framing for all single-family homes.

Mr. Hautzinger explained that the Building Department hosts quarterly meetings with local developers and architects to discuss topics of interest with regards to building in the Village. The subject of raising the building height was expressed by those attending these meetings who said that their clients want higher first-floor and second-floor ceiling heights. This is something that Staff did some preliminary research of, but decided that a change in building height is not warranted at this time; the issue has not been raised by enough people and

there have not been zoning variations for height issues in new homes. **Mr. Hautzinger** agreed with Commissioner Kingsley's comments that just looking at other communities with regards to maximum height is not the only approach to take. He also noted that he is an advocate of measuring to the mid-point of a roof, instead of the high-point, because it allows for some creativity, as opposed to all houses being the same exact height. A maximum height could also be abused in a negative way with very tall walls and a squatty low roof. **Chair Kingsley** asked that Staff keep the commissioners informed of any updates on this matter. **Mr. Hautzinger** said that if a full study is done, it would be complex and would definitely involve the Design Commission.

Commissioner Eckhardt acknowledged it has been a long time since the commissioners have look at the Design Guidelines. **Mr. Hautzinger** agreed and said he has been making notes over the years with recurring things that have come up during Design Commission reviews that are either not in the current guidelines, or are in the guidelines but need to be amended.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:45 P.M. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.