

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION

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

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

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

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Kevin Purdom, JRC Design Build for *1523 N. Fernandez Pl.*
Thomas & Didi Manetti, Owners of *Metropolis Ballroom*
Valentin Marian, Hunzinger Williams for *Metropolis Ballroom*
Rick Cavanaugh, Stoneleigh Companies for *One Arlington Pavilion*
Steve Hautzinger, Planning Staff

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FOR JUNE 24, 2025

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 24, 2025. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FOR JULY 8, 2025

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

ITEM 1. SINGLE-FAMILY TEARDOWN REVIEW**DC#25-046 – 1523 N. Fernandez Pl.**

Kevin Purdom, representing *JRC Design Build*, was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to demolish an existing single-story residence with one-car attached garage to allow construction of a new two-story residence with an attached, two-car garage. This project complies with the R-3 zoning requirements. The existing neighborhood consists of primarily single-story homes with one car attached garages. This project is appearing before the Design Commission due to past concerns in this neighborhood regarding teardown/new construction, as well as to evaluate the proposed architectural design against the context of the neighborhood. Although the neighborhood is predominantly single-story homes, it should be noted that there are numerous other similar teardowns previously completed throughout the neighborhood, including three on this block, and a fourth teardown three lots away at 1515 N. Fernandez that was recently approved by the Design Commission on May 27, 2025.

Overall, the proposed architectural design is nicely done with a traditional style and scale that is generally consistent with other newer homes in the neighborhood. The one-and-a-half story garage wing along with the single-story front porch work well to help fit with the context of the adjacent single-story homes. Normally, a prominent garage projecting out in front of the main entrance is discouraged, however in this case, it works well to fit with the unique lot shape. The natural wood garage doors and natural wood accent details work well to give the color scheme a warm feeling.

The only comments on the design are a recommendation to return the brick down the south side of the garage, and consider a dark bronze standing seam metal roof color instead of black for a slightly softer appearance. With these comments, Staff recommends approval of the proposed design.

Kevin Purdom said the proposed design is a spec home and they are open to the recommendations from Staff. Wrapping the brick to at least the edge around the garage makes sense, and they are open to either exploring a lighter metal roofing, or a dark bronze. The garage projection is due to the site context; most of the garages are on the right side as well, and they trying to match that condition and not have two garages next to each other. The lower massing on the right and at the front were done to accommodate the single-stories that are still there, while also providing the second story for the future owner.

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 Seyer** said the home looks nice and he agreed with Staff's comments; the brick should continue around to the south side along the two windows, otherwise there is a lot of gray and darkness. The design is refreshing from the typical home this commission sees, and he liked the combination of materials being proposed. He was in support of the project.

Commissioner Kubow loved the home, it is one of the better homes the commissioners have seen recently. The board and batten on the right-side elevation is a nice enough material that he would not change it; it is very attractive as is. He liked the dark standing seam roof being proposed, it helps draw more attention to the white brick and wood. He was fine with the design as is. **Commissioner Kubow** asked for clarification about the white brick, which is called out as painted white, but the rendering shows more variation. **Mr. Purdom** said they

are still determining how to treat the brick and are open to other options as well; something like a whitewash with a little more variation than just flat painted white, and **Commissioner Kubow** agreed. **Commissioner Kubow** was in support as proposed.

Commissioner Eckhardt liked the home and the colors being proposed. He supports and appreciates the petitioner agreeing to take the brick around the side of the garage, which will be valuable to that elevation. He asked Staff to clarify the lot width of the front yard, and **Mr. Hautzinger** confirmed that the lot width is 69-feet, and explained that the lot is essentially a rectangular property with the front corner clipped out.

Commissioner Fitzgerald liked the home which is very well designed, and he appreciates that it looks good on all four sides. He liked the option to wrap the brick around the side of the garage, he was okay with the color of the roof, and he was open to either a whitewash brick or an off-white color. He was concerned about the garages being lit better than the front door, and he suggested very low wattage for the 4 lights being shown across the garages.

Chair Kingsley said it is a nicely designed home and she agreed that brick should be carried down the south side of the garage, especially since that portion of the garage is prominent. She reviewed the materials and colors: the sample board includes Aged Pewter or a grey color, which should be a warm grey and not charcoal. Both the vertical siding and the soffit and fascia that match will be Slate Grey or a grey color, and she asked if the gutters and downspouts will match that. **Mr. Purdom** said yes. **Chair Kingsley** commented that the only true black on the home is the standing seam metal and the windows, and she is okay with the black roof. She liked the color palette, which is a little different than the list shown on the Drawing Sheet A5. She also agreed that the brick should be either whitewash or a warmer white color.

Chair Kingsley asked about the three small slit details over the garage; are they recessed in the masonry, or are they vents. **Mr. Purdom** said they are recessed. **Chair Kingsley** asked if the previously approved home referenced by Staff is adjacent to this home, and **Mr. Hautzinger** said it is located 3 lots away to the south at 1515 S. Fernandez. **Chair Kingsley** said that this is a new two-story home, and the Design Guidelines state that the density/height of a new home/addition should be kept down when there are homes on either side of it that are one-story, which is the situation here. She likes to see homes that are more in scale with the existing, if possible.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO APPROVE THE DESIGN OF THE PROPOSED NEW (TEARDOWN) SINGLE-FAMILY HOME TO BE LOCATED AT 1523 N. FERNANDEZ PLACE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON PLANS RECEIVED 6/12/25, 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 BRICK BE RETURNED DOWN THE SOUTH SIDE OF THE WALL OF THE GARAGE, TO A DISTANCE AS APPROVED BY STAFF.
2. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE WHITE COLOR FOR THE BRICK BE EITHER A WHITE WASH, AN OFF-WHITE OR SOMETHING THAT IS MODULATED AND WARM.
3. A RECOMMENDATION TO USE LOW WATTAGE LIGHTING IN THE FOUR LIGHTS ABOVE THE GARAGE DOOR, OR CONSIDER REDUCING THE QUANTITY OF LIGHTS.
4. 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.

5. COMPLIANCE WITH ALL FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES.

Chair Kingsley wanted to see the masonry continued down the entire length of the garage to the recessed doorway, past the two windows.

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

1. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE BRICK CONTINUE DOWN THE ENTIRE LENGTH OF THE SOUTH SIDE OF THE GARAGE WALL TO THE RECESSED DOORWAY.

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

ITEM 2. CBD AWNING REVIEW**DC#25-027 – 6 S. Vail Ave. – Metropolis Ballroom**

Tom & Didi Manetti, Owners of *Metropolis Ballroom*, and **Valentin Marian**, representing *Hunzinger Williams*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. The petitioner is seeking approval of the proposed design for new exterior awnings at the Metropolis Ballroom main entrance, outdoor terrace, and second-floor windows. The Metropolis Ballroom occupies the entire second floor of the building located at the southwest corner of Vail Avenue and Campbell Street in the Downtown. The main ballroom is located on the south end of the building, above Hey Nonny, which includes an outdoor roof terrace facing Vail Avenue. The north end, located above Armand's Pizzeria, includes three smaller banquet rooms and a kitchen.

At this time, the petitioner is proposing to add three types of awnings to the building: retractable awnings above the outdoor roof terrace, an update to the existing main entrance canopy, and new awnings on the remainder of the second-floor windows. This building is a condominium, so the petitioner is required to obtain condo board approval for the proposed awnings from the other business owners in the association.

Chapter 30, Section 30-201.h.2 outlines Design Standards, which state that the major consideration in selecting sign materials is compatibility with the architecture of the building, and awnings should be compatible with the architecture of the building.

Retractable Awnings:

The proposed retractable awnings are intended to be mounted on the wall above the outdoor roof terrace at the main ballroom. They are proposed to be mounted with a staggered height and overlapped to provide continuous coverage over the roof terrace. It is unclear based on the plans received if the existing fixed awnings are intended to remain or be removed. Either way, Staff objects to the appearance of the proposed retractable awnings in this prominent downtown location.

This type of retractable awning is more appropriate for a backyard patio, and it does not fit with the architecture of the existing building or the character of the Downtown. Additionally, the proposed staggered height and overlapping layout will have a poor makeshift appearance. The ballroom has five window openings with five existing fixed awnings centered above each window. The proposal for four retractable awnings that are not aligned with the windows is not compatible with the architecture of the building. If coverage above the outdoor terrace is desired for weather protection, then a custom designed permanent decorative canopy is recommended. The canopy should be designed to be architecturally compatible with the existing building using permanent building materials such as glass, brick, stone, wood and/or metal.

Mr. Hautzinger noted that upon reviewing this proposal, a new CMU wall extension above the existing brick wall at the roof terrace was observed. The CMU wall is unfinished and has a poor appearance. This wall was constructed without a permit. The petitioner should clarify why this wall was built and how it will be finished. A permit application showing how the wall was built, and how the wall will be architecturally finished needs to be submitted for approval.

Entrance Canopy:

The existing entrance canopy above the sidewalk along Vail Avenue was approved by sign variation back in 2001. At this time, the petitioner is proposing to simply replace the existing black fabric with new blue fabric. The existing signage on the front and sides of the canopy

will be replicated on the new fabric.

Staff encouraged the petitioner to consider a more permanent new entrance canopy to better highlight the entrance to the Metropolis Ballroom, but Staff does not object to maintaining the existing fabric entrance canopy. The only comment is that the proposed new blue color is very close to the blue awnings of Hey Nonny, which could be confusing.

Fixed Awnings:

The petitioner is proposing to add individual fixed awnings to all of the second-floor windows located above Armand's Pizzeria. It is unclear based on the plans received if the awnings will be inset mounted to the window frames, or outside mounted to the brick wall. Either way, Staff has concerns about the appearance of the awnings. The proposed blue awnings combined with the existing black awnings below and green mansard roof above looks quite busy with too many colors. The three different colors do not work well together. Additionally, it is odd that the proposed awnings cover the majority of the windows that they are mounted on, blocking the view.

Staff recommends that alternative options for signage be explored such as small vertical banners mounted to the brick wall between the windows, similar to the existing vertical banners at the Metropolis Theater building next door. This would require a variation, but it would be a better and more creative design solution that Staff would support.

In summary, Staff recommends denial of the retractable awnings, with the comments provided tonight, and that the Design Commission evaluate the design proposal for the entrance canopy and fixed awnings.

Didi Manetti said one of the reasons for their current proposal is for functionality to provide some coverage of the outdoor veranda space to protect it from the elements and for increased visual street presence for the Ballroom, which is being swallowed by everything around it, especially during the outdoor dining season. This will help clarify that the second-floor space belongs to the Metropolis Ballroom and not Hey Nonny. They are trying to improve their identity without being a distraction to the existing street. She presented handouts to the commissioners and Staff, which included photos of the existing Ralph Lauren store on Michigan Avenue that has similar blue awnings with gold accents. The idea for the retractable awning was found during their travels to Europe where many 5-star hotels and outdoor cafes and verandas have retractable awnings. She disagreed that this type of awning is for a residential backyard; it is something widely used in Downtown Chicago Gold Coast by a lot of restaurants with outdoor dining. The existing fixed awnings will be removed and the new retractable awnings will be located in almost the exact same location. Staggering the awnings will provide continuous coverage across the entire veranda, with only a couple of inches overlapping between the awnings. The reason for the new CMU wall is because the veranda extends all the way to the corner, but the wall height is different. They intend to paint this wall a lighter color consistent with the surrounding wall once they receive approval for the new awnings. The blue awning color is different than the green/greyish blue color of the Hey Nonny awnings, and the blue color is consistent with the awnings at their headquarters building on S. Clearbrook drive, as well as their logo for the parent company to the Metropolis Ballroom, Elegant Cuisine and Corky's Catering, businesses that they brought to Arlington Heights from other communities. **Ms. Manetti** said they deserve a fair chance to update their outdoor look to have a better street appearance and not be swallowed by other restaurants. They bring in a lot of business to the other businesses. She welcomed any questions from the commissioners.

Tom Manetti said the original entrance of the ballroom was blue and the existing black was installed temporarily to cover holes in the original awning. He started this process thinking approval was not needed because he was just replacing and expanding, but the work was stopped once they were told it needed approval, which put them behind schedule 4 months. He was not trying to do anything to detract from the existing ballroom or the Downtown area. They looked at many options to cover the veranda, from doing a permanent structure or a glass structure, and he listened to feedback from his customers who said they like the open experience of the balcony during events. That is why they are proposing retractable awnings across the veranda space. He said that he does events all over Chicago and the Metropolis Ballroom is a very unique venue that people look at for ideas, and the concepts being proposed tonight are really good concepts. **Ms. Manetti** added that the small window awnings do not cover that much of the window as shown in the rendering, they are mostly for decoration.

Valentin Marian said the new awnings will be the exact same material as the awnings on the other side, and the frame color will match as well. He apologized for the poor design renderings that are not to scale. The retractable awnings are commercial grade, fully enclosed, no front valance, with remote-control flexibility to control them one at a time, more than one at a time, or all at the same time. The fixed awnings are intended to be open to allow the valance to have the Ballroom name and allows for a lot of natural light, and go about half way down on the windows. **Mr. Manetti** added that morning and afternoon events would now have some shade from the sun.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

Rick Cavanaugh said he supports the Ballroom and the new awnings to help improve the image and presentation of the Ballroom that is limited on the streetscape.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Eckhardt** asked for clarification on the color of the front edge of the awning; it is shown in white and in blue. **Mr. Marian** said the white is intended to blend in with the existing wall color. **Mr. Manetti** added that when the awning is against the wall, the awnings will blend with the coloring of the building. **Commissioner Eckhardt** had concerns with the white edge color and preferred that it be blue. He appreciated the clarification about the awning offset, which is very important for complete coverage, but he preferred there be 5 awnings instead of 4. The rhythm of the existing awnings align with the rhythm of the columns on the building, which makes sense, as opposed to the up and down of the proposed new awnings. He also had concerns about the 13'2" span of the retractable awning. He had no concerns with the blue color of the entrance canopy, or the blue awnings on the second-floor above Armand's.

Commissioner Fitzgerald understood the reason for retractable awnings over the balcony, but preferred 5 awnings instead of 4, which is more architecturally consistent with the building. He was okay with the canopy at the Ballroom entrance on the east elevation, but felt the blue awnings on the second-floor and the existing black awnings for Armand's and the green roof, look very busy. The Ralph Lauren example provided by the petitioner shows all the awnings matching and symmetrical, which looks fantastic on that building; however, that is not the case with this building. He was really struggling with all that is being proposed for this building and was opposed to the awnings being blue on the Armand's side of the building. **Mr. Manetti** clarified that when they extend the building to build over the dock area to the south, there will be a fifth retractable awning above that space.

Commissioner Fitzgerald said his issue is with the architecture of the existing building and the 5 banks of windows, with the proposed awnings randomly placed above them. He wanted it to look more purposeful and make sense with the architecture of the building. **Mr. Hautzinger** asked if there will be awning coverage from the edge of the ballroom all the way into the corner of the veranda, and **Mr. Manetti** said yes. **Mr. Hautzinger** agreed with the commissioners' comments that the awnings need to align with the architecture of the building, which could mean a sixth awning above the inside corner.

Commissioner Seyer said the confusion is that there is no plan. There needs to be a plan to show how the awnings align with the existing openings because right now it looks haphazard because it does not show how short of the wall the awnings will be. He could not support this because the awnings appear too up and down, and the further the awnings go out they will need space to move up and down with the wind. He has never seen awnings overlap and he questioned what the manufacturer's recommendations are for doing that. He wants to do everything he can to give the Ballroom all the signage they need for success, but he does not want to do something that will look not look nice. The awnings should relate to the piers, the posts, and the module of the building wall; it will look much cleaner if they align with the vertical posts in that wall. **Commissioner Seyer** was okay with the blue entrance canopy on the east elevation, and agreed with the concerns that the blue awnings on the north elevation with the existing black awnings and green roof detract from the beautiful building. He had concerns that the awnings on the north elevation will limit the amount of natural light and feel dark. He felt this was a mistake and the petitioner will not be happy with the results. He encouraged the petitioner to re-think this design and change the module on the retractable awnings and either change the color and/or change the size; they are too big on the second-floor at the main ballroom.

Commissioner Kubow appreciated the presentation and exhibits provided, as well as the passion from the owners, which is important to him because this is a prominent corner in the Downtown and the Ballroom is a huge amenity for the Village. He wants to work with the petitioner to try and get more visibility for the Ballroom, but he agreed with the commissioners' concerns. The existing east elevation is very clean and simple, and the staggered awnings throw things off, and it is hard to visualize with the renderings presented. He suggested replacing the 5 existing fixed awnings with what is being proposed, but staying with the modular style this is already in place with the existing awnings, and then adding a sixth awning in the corner. **Commissioner Kubow** understood there will be a gap between the awnings, but said the manufacturer had to have a way to introduce a flap or something to cover the gap. He felt the staggered awnings add chaos to the elevation, which right now is very clean and attractive. The existing unfinished CMU wall extension that was done without a permit should be painted to match a component of the brick, and he was fine with the entrance canopy as proposed.

Commissioner Kubow asked the petitioner if signage and exposure are the reasons why the awnings are being added above Armand's, and **Mr. Manetti** replied that it is really about identifying the Ballroom when people look up to the second-floor, and he wants about half of what is shown in the cut/paste renderings. **Commissioner Kubow** said he could not get on board with that because there is just too much going on with all the awnings, and it will not look good. If more signage is needed, he would suggest a variation to add tasteful signage to the second-floor to identify that it is part of the Metropolis Ballroom.

Chair Kingsley concurred with the comments from the commissioners. In essence, these are two different buildings with one function, which she felt is the disconnect. The newer building with the Ballroom and Hey Nonny has blonde brick, and the historic old Hagenbring building at the corner has red brick and a green tile roof. She was not opposed to the awnings at the veranda being retractable, but felt more information was needed, such as how far apart

the housing will be. The awnings need to fit architecturally with the buildings, and providing examples of overlapped awnings would help. She suggested that the awnings over the outdoor balcony space be a cream color instead of blue, which will match the wall and make the awning disappear on the wall, become part of the wall when extended, and the edge will disappear. **Chair Kingsley** was okay with the entrance canopy being proposed, but felt that signage was really needed there, and the height of the sign letters on the entrance canopy is limited by the size of the canopy. She suggested adding signage above the entrance canopy as well. She also felt that signage was needed at the corner above the Armand's sign. She was opposed to the blue awnings on the north elevation. The blue color on the bronze windows and the green roof do not go together. If signage is needed there, then signage should be proposed, maybe a blade sign.

Commissioner Eckhardt asked about rain run-off from the retractable canopies if the 13'2" extends out over the edge of the balcony. **Mr. Manetti** said the 13'2" projection is at an angle and will still cover the balcony space, with the water run-off being collected by the deck drains.

Mr. Marian said that wind can create service issues and potential hazards with the retractable awnings, so they are trying to reduce those issues by overlapping them. He has worked with overlapping awnings in a residential setting, with a 6-inch offset between awnings. **Chair Kingsley** asked how high above the windows the awnings will be mounted and **Mr. Marian** said they will be at the same location as the existing awnings. He did not have the exact measurements tonight. **Mr. Manetti** said the existing awnings are approximately 8-inches below the gutter line, with room to go a little higher and a little lower for the offset that is needed; they will be mounted as high as possible. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said it would be helpful to see photographic images of the overlapping application of these awnings, from a few different angles.

Mr. Hautzinger asked for clarification on the intended mounting height of the awnings; will they be the same height as the bottom of the existing awnings, which is just above the window, or will they be as high as possible on the wall? He pointed out that the bottom of the existing awning frames are aligned with the top of the window. **Mr. Manetti** clarified that the awnings are proposed to be mounted at the top of the existing awnings, and the angle of the awning can be adjusted.

Chair Kingsley asked that the petitioner to take into consideration the commissioner's comments and if they want to move forward, then come back with more information about the awnings, such as size, angle, etc. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** wanted to know exactly where the awnings will be attached to the building, with scale drawings provided to show exactly what is being proposed. **Commissioner Eckhardt** asked for a wall section showing in/out and where the awning is in relation to the front of the parapet wall. **Commissioner Kubow** said the project can be tabled tonight and the commissioner can review the comments made tonight and come back at a later date.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO CONTINUE THE REVIEW OF THE METROPOLIS BALLROOM AWNINGS LOCATED AT 6 N. VAIL AVE. (DC25-027) TO A DATE ACCEPTABLE TO PETITIONER IN THE FUTURE.

Commissioner Kubow said there is a lot to take in here and some real work needs to be done by the petitioner in order for the commissioners to approve the project. He encouraged the petitioner not rush to come back and to make sure everything is right before returning for another review. **Mr. Hautzinger** said an architectural drawing of the building elevation that shows the exact awning placement on the building wall, with dimensions, is needed for

the next review. Also, a building section view showing the mounting height and how far the angle comes down and projects out across the terrace. **Chair Kingsley** said that the finish of the concrete block wall will also help the commissioners make their decision. **Mr. Hautzinger** added that most of the commissioners expressed concerns about the individual awnings above Armand's, and that they are not the right solution for signage. There was a suggestion to take advantage of the corner of the building by adding signage in lieu of signage in all the windows. **Mr. Hautzinger** wanted the petitioner to understand that it is not just a matter of providing scale drawings for those awnings, but instead, totally different options need to be studied and proposed.

Didi Manetti said they considered many options for the building but the length of the building and the scale of turning the corner is very difficult to find signage for. They are asking for the same opportunity as Armand's and Hey Nonny to create a footprint for the Ballroom with awnings and signage, and what was presented tonight is the only thing they came up with that will stay consistent with the building and other awnings. Their choices are very limited, and they are behind the mark because everyone has already marked their territory and they are being forgotten. They cannot agree to a different color because blue is their brand color, and a different color will not make a difference because either going with black awnings or doing no awnings will look like the space belongs to Armand's or Hey Nonny. They have been a good player for the community and they have lost a lot of business because of supporting other businesses in the community, and they are asking for identity so everyone knows that the second-floor space belongs to the Ballroom. She is okay with providing more accurate drawings, and the individual awnings can be mounted higher to cover less of the windows.

Chair Kingsley said the commissioners are here to review the design of the project, they heard the comments made and they want to support the project; however, they feel that what is being presented tonight is not quite it and can be better. The minutes from this meeting will be provided to the petitioner for their review. She reiterated that if signage is the problem, then signage should be proposed, because the commissioners want the business to succeed. **Ms. Manetti** understood and said they feel the new awnings are consistent with the awnings being used by other businesses, and they are kind of having trouble finding solutions for signage that will cover the perimeter of the building, but that is something they can think more about. This is not something they take lightly and have thought about a lot of options to come up with what is being proposed. She asked the commissioners to reconsider and be more openminded with the individual awnings. **Chair Kingsley** encouraged the petitioner to work with Staff on any changes they are considering.

Mr. Hautzinger said that Staff encouraged the petitioner to consider a more permanent new entrance canopy to better highlight the main entrance of the Ballroom. In light of the feedback given tonight, he suggested the petitioner consider a new canopy with prominent signage at the front door. He encouraged the petitioner to find the right creative design solution and then Staff can evaluate how it relates to code.

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

ITEM 3. MULTI-FAMILY PERGOLA REVIEW**DC#25-040 – One Arlington Pavilion – 3400 W. Stonegate Blvd.**

Rick Cavanaugh representing *Stoneleigh Companies* was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. The petitioner is seeking approval of the proposed architectural design for two new pergola structures as part of an existing multi-family apartment building within the Arlington Downs PUD. Since this development was reviewed by the Plan Commission, the role of the Design Commission is limited to building and signage only.

The existing One Arlington apartment building is part of the Arlington Downs PUD (Planned Unit Development). As part of the original PUD approval, Design Guidelines were prepared to establish a cohesive design theme for the development. As stated in the Design Guidelines, *“The focal point of the site is a gathering place at the midpoint of the arterial road in front of the Zone A residential tower including a covered pavilion, landscaped lawn, and benches for residents, shoppers, and guests to the site.”* The Design Guidelines also include a conceptual pavilion design with a solid standing seam metal roof, decorative cupola, decorative steel support columns, and stone column bases. Foundations for the pavilion were constructed at the time of the apartment building renovation, but the pavilion was never constructed. At this time, the petitioner is proposing to use the existing foundations to construct two separate wood pergolas, instead of the single larger pavilion as envisioned in the Design Guidelines.

Overall, Staff feels the current proposal for traditional style simple wood pergolas has a random appearance that is not consistent with the intent of the Design Guidelines. Understanding that the original theme of the overall development has changed a few times since the Design Guidelines were approved in 2013, and also considering that the final retail portion of the development is unknown at this time, it is Staff’s recommendation that the proposed pergolas be redesigned with a more contemporary and substantial appearance to complement the existing One Arlington apartment building. Staff is not opposed to having two separate pergolas instead of one larger roofed pavilion, however Staff recommends that the pergola structures be redesigned with a steel frame inspired by the steel frame entry canopy feature at the One Arlington apartment building. A steel frame pergola would provide a more cohesive design them, and it may also allow the added benefit to eliminate the midspan columns, thereby allowing a more flexible and usable space under each pergola. The rafters and purlins within the steel frame could still be stained wood or a composite wood product, similar to the steel/wood pergola structures at the adjacent Payton Place apartment building. Staff feels that pergolas redesigned with a combination of steel and wood will result in a pavilion design that will complement both of the existing apartment buildings, fit with the overall development once completed, and will meet the intent of the Design Guidelines.

Staff recommends the Design Commission require revisions to the pergola design, with a recommendation to redesign the proposed traditional wood pergolas using a more contemporary steel frame to complement the entry canopy feature on the existing One Arlington apartment building as well the pergola feature on the existing adjacent Payton Place apartment building.

Mr. Cavanaugh said he was part of the team that did the original renovation of the One Arlington project, and he is the last remaining member of that team. He understood Staff’s comments on the proposed structure. The original Design Guidelines were all about the adjacent racetrack and the intent to play off the track, with the original pavilion concept to come off the center of the tower with a wide landscape plaza that would go to the corner, and the two retail buildings to the side. However, the racetrack is now gone and the future

development on the site has changed. The new concept includes a new hotel, gas station/retail building, and a couple of outlot buildings. He explained that Cook County standards for stormwater detention has also changed and the access points of where these come in are different than what was shown on the original plan. The site has gone from two owners to eight owners of the different lots, and the site plan for the project has changed. The retail buildings at the front of the site are intended to be two 5,000 to 6,000 square foot restaurants with outdoor dining that will include wooden pergolas in front of the restaurants as well as pergolas through to the plaza.

Mr. Cavanaugh said the wood pergolas proposed for the One Arlington building are 14 to 15 feet tall and are residential in nature because this is a residential building. He builds apartments in different parts of the country and one of the most popular things they have done in the last few years is build these wooden pergolas with swingolas, which are swings that hang inside the pergolas. These can be used by residents, and once the retail buildings at the front of the site are built, this plaza will no longer be a focal point on the site. Having a consistent theme with how these pergolas will work together with those of the future development on site is intended; however, he did not know when the remaining buildings would be built. **Mr. Cavanaugh** said there are currently very few outdoor amenities at the One Arlington building and he wants to give the residents more outdoor space. Residents love the wood pergolas they have added to their other properties. Cost is an issue with the pergolas, with preliminary pricing for steel about \$8000 more than wood. He reiterated that this area of the site will no longer be a focal point in the overall development once the remaining site is developed. He acknowledged the steel at the front of the building as well as at the front of the Peyton Place building, but steel is not as comfortable and warm as wood. At the end of the day, he wants to provide something for the existing residents to use outdoors and to energize this space in the near term and eventually in the long term. This space has been neglected for long enough and he can do the wood structures now; however, if a steel structure is going to be required, he will most likely let this project go until the retail component of the site gets developed, whenever that might be.

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

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Kubow** said that the steel pergolas at the adjacent Peyton Place apartments are a nice potential compromise for this project, but they are not consistent with the more modern, contemporary, white and grey One Arlington building. The wood material of the pergolas is softer and more comfortable, but feels out of place and unfinished.

Commissioner Seyer agreed that wood pergolas do not feel appropriate for the One Arlington building, although he understood the cost issues of using steel. This proposal feels very wrong to him, in scale and design, but if everyone wants to move forward with this, he would not stand in the way of there being something here for the residents to have.

Commissioner Fitzgerald asked about the distance between the two pergolas, and **Mr. Cavanaugh** said the columns are evenly spaced on the deck 23' center to center. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** was not opposed to the pergolas being wood, especially since the future development of this site is unknown. He said the 'Smoke' stain color of the pergola posts looks cold, and he suggested a darker color pulled from the building, like the railing color. He suggested connecting the two pergolas and having one large pergola, which would look more dramatic and appropriate for this large deck space.

Commissioner Eckhardt was torn on the colors and said the details of the wood pergolas are wimpy, both visually and with the major members being very small in scale. The

construction drawings show 2 x 6 beams, which are much smaller than what is being shown in the perspective rendering. These structures are successful when they have some beef to them in terms of the structural design, and he pointed out that the earlier design presented for this space was a pavilion with a roof. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said he could support the project if it is not natural wood and if it had some structural integrity to the design; it needs to be heavier.

Chair Kingsley said that having this outdoor space is important and she understands why it is being proposed. This outdoor space and pergolas could help set the tone for the future buildings at the corner of the site. She agreed with the other commissioners that it needs to fit with the rest of the site. The wood pergolas being proposed look pre-made and just put there; they do not go with the surrounding buildings. She preferred the pergolas be steel to match the other buildings and be more in keeping with the scale of the building. She agreed with the suggestion of one large pergola structure in steel, which would be more in keeping with the large One Arlington building behind it. She did not like that four of the columns are clad in stone, and 5 of the columns are not. At a minimum, all the columns should match, and there might not be enough room for all the columns to have a stone base. **Chair Kingsley** felt that some of the details on the pergolas had to change, and if wood is used, then a darker stain is preferred, and the stone base should be more a natural stone that is the size of a brick or larger, rather than thin stone.

Commissioner Fitzgerald said if the pergolas are heading in this direction, would it be better to remove the pillars that are there and just cut the concrete and put in fittings so it looks like the wood goes all the way to the ground, so they are not different. **Mr. Cavanaugh** wished that could be done, but said that it is a structural concrete deck 14 to 16-inches thick with a parking garage below. **Commissioner Kubow** was okay with a color that was not a wood tone, a color that still feels warm. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** preferred a grey tone or a blacker tone; white will look too traditional. It was noted that the existing concrete planter wall beyond the deck space is painted gray.

Mr. Cavanaugh agreed with the comments for a darker color and he agreed that the size of the structure members need to be larger than what is shown on the construction drawings. He also felt the pergolas should relate to the residents that will be using them, and to what is seen from the corner or driving down Euclid Avenue. **Commissioner Eckhardt** asked what the long-term plan is for the wood pergolas with regards to the possible future development on the site. **Mr. Cavanaugh** said that he wants this to be a long-term structure, with 7 to 10 years before a refinish is needed. **Commissioner Seyer** said the structure should be able to span 20-feet, and right now there is a column every 10-feet. **Mr. Cavanaugh** appreciated the feedback and said he could come back with something that fits with the comments given.

Commissioner Eckhardt said he is okay with a wood structure, but it needs to be looked at to make sure it has the structural integrity needed. He supports either painting or staining the wood, with darker columns to contrast the grey building, and the concrete piers remaining bare concrete or painted to match the adjacent planters. The other commissioners felt the project should come back for another review after the petitioner reviews the comments given tonight, and the drawings are looked at for accuracy with regards to the structural integrity of the pergolas.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO CONTINUE THE REVIEW OF ONE ARLINGTON PAVILION AT 3400 W. STONEGATE BLVD. (DC25-040) TO A FUTURE DATE TO BE DETERMINED BY THE PETITIONER AND STAFF.

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

DC 7/22/25

ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 5. OTHER BUSINESS

2025 Alan F. Bombick Award Nominations Discussion

Staff presented and reviewed possible residential and commercial projects to be considered for the award this year. **Commissioner Eckhardt** asked that the new Chase Bank project at Rand/Palatine Road be added to the nominations. The commissioners said they will visit these project sites and provide discussion at the next meeting.

Public Comment

There was none.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:00 P.M. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.