

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION

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

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

Members Present: Kirsten Kingsley, Chair
Ted Eckhardt
John Fitzgerald

Members Absent: Scott Seyer
Jonathan Kubow

Also Present: Robert Friedman for *608 N. Dunton Ave.*
Casey Lynde, Owner of *608 N. Dunton Ave.*
Thomas Budzik, Thomas Architects for *306 W. Elm St.*
Bill & Lindsay Jurjovec, Owners of *306 W. Elm St.*
Gina Zari for *108 S. Highland Ave.*
Steve Hautzinger, Planning Staff

ITEM 1. SINGLE-FAMILY ADDITION REVIEW**DC#25-024(H) – 608 N. Dunton Ave.**

Robert Friedman, representing *Friedman Architects*, and **Casey Lynde**, the homeowner, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to add a new two-story addition to an existing two-story house. There is an existing driveway for parking, but there is no garage, and no garage is being added as part of this project. The project requires zoning variations from the Zoning Board of Appeal, which will be a separate application and a separate public meeting. These include a variation for front yard setback, floor area ratio, and building height.

The subject property is located in the "Historic Arlington Neighborhood Association" (HANA) area, and the existing house was included in the 2004 Community Preservation Report that was prepared by the School of the Art Institute of Chicago to raise community awareness and promote the preservation of the historic character of certain neighborhoods in Arlington Heights. Homes in the report are rated in order of importance as "Exceptional", "Notable", or "Contributing". The subject house is rated as "Notable" with a National Folk style and estimated construction being pre-1890.

The petitioner is proposing a two-story addition to be located on the rear side of the existing house, as well as an expansion of the existing raised front porch to wrap around and down the side of the house. Overall, the proposed addition is nicely designed to fit with the scale, massing, and style of the existing house. Staff commends the petitioner for thoughtfully improving and maintaining this notable historic home. The proposed wrap around porch is a very nice enhancement to the historic character of the house, as well as visually and physically connecting the new addition with the existing house.

Staff's only comment on the proposed design is that the triple window in the front of the new second-floor bedroom looks cramped and out of character with the existing house. It is recommended to change the proposed triple window to a single window centered above the new door below to better fit with the historic character of the house and neighborhood. With these comments, Staff recommends approval of the proposed addition.

Mr. Lynde agreed with the comment about the triple window in the front of the new second-floor bedroom. They are not opposed to changing it. They are also planning to match the existing siding, which is blue vinyl with white trim.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mary Ann Crosby, 728 N. Dunton Ave. She said the existing home is well maintained and the historic character of the home is also maintained; it fits in very nicely with this historic neighborhood. She fully supports what is being proposed.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said the massing on all four elevations is nicely designed, and increasing the wrap around porch will not substantially change the front elevation because the addition is so far back. He said the triple window on the front elevation is reminiscent of an older home that at one time had a screened porch on the second-floor, which typically had as many windows as possible. He felt the triple window fit and he liked it as proposed. The home is wonderful and he thanked the owners

for maintaining the neighborhood and the home.

Commissioner Fitzgerald did not mind the triple window, although it was the first thing that caught his eye. He was open to it either way. He liked the blue siding, and he suggested adding brick or some type of band at the bottom, to be consistent with the brick foundation on the rest of the home.

Chair Kingsley agreed with the comments made, but felt the triple window on the front elevation should be changed to a two-window opening instead. Those three windows are shifted to the south because of the bay window, but she preferred it to be centered on the wall instead. She agreed with Commissioner Fitzgerald's suggestion to add some kind of base at the bottom of the home, or a belly board with siding below it to break up the rear elevation. She also commented that the drawings do not show any eaves, fascia, or trim up against the eave on the addition, which the existing home has. These details should match what is existing. She loved the blue siding color, and said the existing trim should be used on the windows and corner boards of the addition to match existing.

There were no further comments.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO APPROVE THE DESIGN OF THE PROPOSED ADDITION AT 608 N. DUNTON AVENUE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON PLANS RECEIVED 6/18/25, 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. A REQUIREMENT TO CHANGE THE TRIPLE WINDOW ON THE FRONT ELEVATION TO A DOUBLE WINDOW.
2. A RECOMMENDATION TO ADD SOME KIND OF BAND ON THE BACK AND SIDE ELEVATION NEAR THE BOTTOM OF THE HOME, TO MATCH THE EXISTING FRONT ELEVATION.
3. A REQUIREMENT TO MATCH THE TRIM OF THE EXISTING HOME ON THE ADDITION.
4. THE ADDITION WILL MATCH THE EXISTING BLUE VINYL SIDING ON THE HOME.
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 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.
6. COMPLIANCE WITH ALL FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES.

Mr. Hautzinger asked if there is an option to change the triple window to a single or double window if the petitioner prefers. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** clarified that this requirement should be reviewed by Staff to ensure that the change in window looks like it belongs, there should not be one big, wide window. **Mr. Hautzinger** clarified for the petitioner that the

requirements will be reviewed on the permit plans submitted, and the recommendations are encouraged but not required.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO AMEND THE MOTION AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. A REQUIREMENT TO CHANGE THE TRIPLE WINDOW ON THE FRONT ELEVATION TO EITHER A DOUBLE OR SINGLE-WINDOW, TO BE REVIEWED BY STAFF TO ENSURE THAT THE WINDOW LOOKS LIKE IT BELONGS AND IS NOT ONE BIG, WIDE, WINDOW.**

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

ITEM 2. SINGLE-FAMILY TEARDOWN REVIEW**DC# 25-038 – 306 W. Elm St.**

Thomas Budzik, representing *Thomas Architects*, and **Bill & Lindsay Jurjovec**, the homeowners, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to demolish an existing single-story residence with an attached two-car garage to build a new two-story house with an attached two-car garage. The project does comply with all R-3 zoning requirements. The existing neighborhood has a variety of homes including single-story, one-and-a-half-story, and two-story homes. There is also a mix of both attached and detached garages. The subject property is a corner lot. The front elevation of the proposed house will face Elm Street on the south, with the two-car attached garage facing Chestnut Avenue on the east.

Overall, the proposed design is nicely done in a traditional style with quality materials that will generally fit well with the character of the neighborhood. However, placement of the garage facing Chestnut Avenue raises concerns. On a corner lot, a house has two street facing elevations, and in general, Staff discourages facing a “garage only” façade to one of the streets.

The Single-Family Design Guidelines encourage the entry of the house to be the focal point. The entry facing Elm Street is very nicely designed as the focal point of the front elevation. However, by placing the garage around the corner, the garage becomes the focal point facing Chestnut Avenue. The Single-Family Design Guidelines state:

- *“Garages which take up a large portion of the front façade should be avoided. The emphasis should be on the entry and home rather than the garage.”*
- *“Is the placement of the garage compatible to the neighborhood?”*
- *“Does the garage take up a large portion of the front elevation?”*

In this neighborhood, the majority of homes on corner lots have their garages located towards the rear of the property, either attached or detached. Therefore, Staff feels the proposed garage placement is out of character in this location, and ideally recommends revising the design to place the garage on the west end of the property, away from the street intersection.

Mr. Budzik detailed the reasoning behind the placement of the garage, and how they came to this design solution for the new home. This corner lot has a unique condition with a corner side yard setback that needs to be the average of the block, which happens to be one other home that is also set back pretty far, similar to the original home. By default, this creates a very deep corner side yard setback, thereby reducing the buildable width of the home and creating a constraint for a garage and an entrance to fit on the same plane. There is also a precedent for this design solution elsewhere in the Village, specifically at 902 N. Vail, 836 N. Dunton, 1002 Chestnut, and 1017 Oakton, all of which have a similar situation with the garage. **Mr. Budzik** also said this is a custom home design that has been designed from the beginning for the homeowners’ needs and goals, which includes a dedicated home office space for the homeowner’s remote work that needs to have audio privacy and needs to be separate from the rest of the home. This space is proposed at the southeast corner of the site. Placing the garage elsewhere or placing the entrance along Chestnut would alter this space and make it less isolated.

Mr. Budzik explained that the homeowners like this corner lot and the big, corner side yard, but also want an intimate, private outdoor space that will seamlessly flow into the open corner side yard space; it is important to them to maintain that relationship. He said they looked at

a variety of options that included a detached garage, but that was quickly discounted because it is one of the homeowners' essential goals to have an attached garage. They looked at different positioning for the garage, and **Mr. Budzik** explained the difficulties with each of those options, which included limiting the use of the side yard as well as the private yard space. He also said that some neighbors have reviewed the plans and are in support of the design, and some are here tonight, including the neighbor directly across the street that will face the new home. He also said there have been slight design changes and revisions made to the design, which include simplifying the material palette to eliminate the brick and replace it with the stone; the two massings on either side of the front entrance were changed to have more of a symmetrical look to them with the stone brought to a belly band that is in between the first and second-floor windows, which results in no reason to extend the porch roof across.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

Heather Malloy, 905 N. Mitchell Avenue. She lives on a corner lot, which feels like you are living in a fish bowl. If the backyard of the new home is on Chestnut, then the homeowners will lose privacy because everyone can see what is going on in the backyard. She understood the decision to have the backyard as currently proposed to allow for more privacy.

Cary Dohman, 905 N. Chestnut Avenue. He lives at the northeast corner of Chestnut and Elm, and his home office will face the garage of the proposed new home, which he has no objection to. He has seen the renderings of the new home and said it is beautiful. He commented that Elm Street dead ends into Dunton, with sidewalks on both sides of the street; whereas Chestnut, Mitchell and some other streets around here do not have sidewalks, so from a public safety and a community standpoint, he strongly supports the garage being located on Chestnut instead of Elm because of the amount of people that walk up and down Elm Street.

Bill Jurjovec (homeowner) said they bought the home at 306 W. Elm Street after looking for a home in the HANA neighborhood for over 7 years and fell in love with this corner lot and are drawn to this family-oriented neighborhood. It is important to find space for their kids to play in a safe way, which will be achieved with the garage being located on Chestnut instead of Elm, and designing the home to have expansive windows facing west so they can see the kids playing outside.

Vivian Menzies, 212 W. Fremont Avenue. She asked if there is an eave overhang at the corner of the home and on the garage side; it appears that some areas have an eave overhang and some do not. She prefers to see larger eaves for this home. Otherwise the new home looks good and it makes total sense to have the garage where it is shown.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** said the home is beautifully designed and he appreciates that all four sides look nice. He liked the stone addition, but really liked the original design that was submitted that he felt is more elegant than the revised design. The garage elevation is very well designed, and landscaping on the north side of the driveway can help keep the garage door down. After visiting the neighborhood and seeing nearby homes with a 3-car garage with no details, and a home with the front door and garage on the same side, he appreciates what the petitioner has done with this new home and felt it will fit in nicely, especially after plants grow.

Commissioner Eckhardt said the revised plan presented tonight corrected his only comment which was regarding the two towers that are now pulled together nicely; your eye now focuses in the middle where the front door is. This is a great design and the garage is exactly where

it should be. Very nicely done and a great presentation.

Chair Kingsley said the design of the home is really nice and well done on all four sides. She did not mind the garage being on Chestnut, which makes sense on this lot, and she liked that the living space is on the west. She liked the original design better than the revised design that she felt needed more design or thought put into how the stone finishes. With the original design, she liked the brick and the stone fireplace, and suggested all horizontal siding instead of the vertical. She liked the colors being proposed, but suggested a roof color that is cooler with some brown in it. With the revised design, she had concerns with how the stone stops and the siding sits on top of it, and suggested larger vents on the eaves.

Commissioner Fitzgerald said that although he did not dislike the revised design, he really liked the original design presented in the packet and how the porch goes all the way across, and the corbels over the big window.

Lindsay Jurjovec (homeowner) said they have gone back and forth with the painted brick, the stone, and whether to keep the overhang in the middle or continue it to the left. She was open to either one.

Commissioner Eckhardt said he could support either design. While the original design has a lot of really subtle character, especially the eave going over the two brackets over the triple windows, and looks like the home has had additions and has been around a long time and really comes together; while the revised design looks like it is an original home because everything matches.

Lindsay Jurjovec asked if they could get approval for elements of both designs, as they are trying to move the process along. **Chair Kingsley** said it is hard to give the petitioner permission to tweak the design because that is what this commission is here for; however, the commission does not want to approve something the owners are not happy with. She asked why the change to stone was made, and **Ms. Jurjovec** replied they have seen other homes with this stone that is very light and similar to brick. **Mr. Jurjovec** added that the grout color is also very light to match the stone and give the look of brick. They want a classic white brick, but in order to get the look they want, the brick has to be painted and they are concerned about the longevity of doing that.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE NEW (TEARDOWN) SINGLE-FAMILY HOME TO BE LOCATED AT 306 W. ELM ST. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON PLANS RECEIVED ON 6/10/25 (SCHEME A), 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. THE HOMEOWNER SHALL SELECT EITHER SCHEME A (ORIGINAL DESIGN) OR SCHEME B (REVISED DESIGN PRESENTED ON 7/8/25), SO THERE IS NO REDESIGNING OF THE HOME.**
- 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 Fitzgerald agreed with the comment to make sure the roof color is in keeping with the other colors, and that any change be approved by Staff. **Commissioner Eckhardt** added that to the motion as follows:

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

4. THAT THE ROOF COLOR BE EVALUATED AND POSSIBLY CHANGED TO A COOLER COLOR THAT IS IN KEEPING WITH THE OTHER COLORS ON THE HOME, TO BE REVIEWED BY STAFF.

Chair Kingsley commented that allowing the homeowners to choose either Scheme A or Scheme B for the primary elevation, it is understood that the masonry and the stone will wrap around to the east side. However, if Scheme B is chosen, then the belly board that transitions between the stone and the vertical siding should be looked at in detail; there is something missing there. This needs to be in the motion in order for her to support the motion. **Mr. Hautzinger** commented that an earlier scheme was presented to Staff showing the stone going up the sill of the second-floor windows, which might be an option to address this concern. **Chair Kingsley** reiterated that she prefers Scheme A over Scheme B, but wants to give the homeowners the opportunity to choose between the two.

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

5. IF SCHEME 'B' IS CHOSEN, THEN A REQUIREMENT TO FURTHER DETAIL HOW THE TOP OF THE STONE AND THE LIMESTONE SILL MEET BETWEEN THE FIRST AND SECOND-FLOOR, AND DETAILS OF THE VERTICAL SIDING AND HOW IT COMES DOWN ON THAT BE SUBMITTED TO STAFF FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL.

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

Commissioner Fitzgerald said there is a fairly new home at 624 N. Haddow Avenue that has the painted brick with the limestone, similar to Scheme A, and it is a beautiful home.

ITEM 3. SINGLE-FAMILY NEW REVIEW**DC#25-044 – 108 S. Highland Ave.**

Gina Zari representing 108 S. Highland was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to build a new two-story residence with a detached two-car garage on an existing vacant lot. This project received approval from the Zoning Board of Appeals on May 12, 2025 for the following zoning variations: To allow an existing substandard lot to be buildable (6,978 sf lot size, where 8,750 sf minimum is required. 50-foot lot width, where 70-feet minimum is required); and to allow 4,352 sf of Impervious Surface Coverage, where 3,489 sf is the maximum allowed. This property is located just south of the Downtown, where the character of the neighborhood is primarily traditional and historic, with one-and-a-half story bungalows and two-story homes with detached garages.

Overall, the proposed design is very nicely done with a unique style that will have a modern appearance while still fitting in nicely with the traditional character of the neighborhood. The detached garage located in the rear yard and the covered front porch are important features contributing to the character in this location. The proposed exterior materials and colors are very attractive and nicely coordinated, including a composite shake cedar roof that will elevate the home's curb appeal. Staff recommends approval of the home as submitted.

Ms. Zari said when designing the home, they tried to keep it very contextual with the neighborhood. The lot is smaller and they are building a smaller home to meet the zoning requirements, and the siting of the home, and the location of the garage in the back.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

Gabriela Rojek, 104 S. Highland Avenue. She lives adjacent to this property on the north and was at the Zoning Board meeting where variations were approved for the new home that include an almost 25% increase in impervious surface allowed. This approval came with a requirement that a specific paving material be used, and she asked the Zoning Board at that time what assurances she had that that specific paving material would actually be used, and nobody could answer her question. She is here tonight asking her question again.

Mr. Hautzinger asked the petitioner if the zoning approval was contingent upon using permeable pavers, and **Ms. Zari** said the minutes from the ZBA hearing did not say that the approval was based on using permeable pavers; however, their intent is to use permeable pavers and not substitute a different product. **Mr. Hautzinger** asked if the plans submitted to the Zoning Board stated that permeable pavers would be used, and **Ms. Zari** said yes. **Mr. Hautzinger** said that in general, variations that exceed maximum impervious surface coverage are sensitive because of potential flooding concerns, and the Zoning Board typically only approves this type of variation when a properly engineered pervious paving system is used as a justification for it. **Ms. Rojek** said that Staff did not recommend approval of the zoning variances, and after a long discussion, the Zoning Board's final decision was to approve them.

Chair Kingsley said that a Zoning Board approval is attached to the plans submitted for the variation request, and the petitioner stated tonight that the drawings they submitted for the variations included permeable pavers. **Mr. Hautzinger** added that when the petitioner submits plans for building permit, the plans will be required to include permeable pavers in

order to get approval of the permit, and the inspector will be looking for the permeable pavers to be installed during construction of the home.

Ms. Zari said she wrote a report in response to a comment from the Village Engineering Department and they gave her instructions for what to include for permit, so the Village is aware and are definitely going to be looking for it. **Chair Kingsley** suggested that the neighbor can reach out to the Village Engineering Department with her concerns regarding this matter.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** loved the design of the new home and was really excited to see that all four sides are nicely detailed. He initially thought the siding color was an off-white, but it is actually white, but he preferred a warmer off-white color.

Commissioner Eckhardt said it is a really cool and unique home, the siting of the home is creative, and the window configurations and aesthetic is different. He agreed with Commissioner Fitzgerald's comment that the siding color should be a softer white. He also commented about the west elevation; the details of the peak of the roof that wraps around the chimney is a little odd.

Chair Kingsley said it is a nicely designed home that is unique, she did not mind the chimney detail shown on the west elevation, the materials are very nice, and she liked that corner boards are not being used. **Mr. Zari** confirmed that there are no corner boards. **Chair Kingsley** also agreed with the comments that the siding should be a creamier white color, and she asked about the materials of the column and the rafter tails in the front. **Ms. Zari** said that column details have not yet been determined, but the hope is that they are solid and painted white. **Chair Kingsley** said the drawings show a post column with no details, which **Ms. Zari** confirmed. **Chair Kingsley** asked about the detached garage that appears to be attached, and **Ms. Zari** said the garage is not attached, it has a walkway between the two buildings and it is pulled away from the home. **Mr. Hautzinger** said that although there is a small roof that connects the home to the garage, it is an outdoor space, so the garage is still considered a detached garage. **Commissioner Eckhardt** commented that the proposed blue topaz shutters are beautiful.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE NEW SINGLE-FAMILY HOME TO BE LOCATED AT 108 S. HIGHLAND AVE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON THE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED ON 6/9/25, 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 ARCTIC WHITE SIDING COLOR AND CONSIDER A SOFTER WHITE COLOR INSTEAD.**
- 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.**

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

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 7:45 P.M. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.