

# APPROVED

## MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.  
SEPTEMBER 30, 2025

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

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

Members Absent: Scott Seyer

Also Present: Thomas Budzik, Thomas Architects for *Tasty Breads*  
Brian Huft & Jasenko Badic, Zimmerman Weintraub Associates for  
*Courtyard by Marriott*  
Steve Hautzinger, Planning Staff

### REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FOR SEPTEMBER 9, 2025

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 9, 2025. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

**ITEM 1. COMMERCIAL REVIEW****DC#25-049 – Tasty Breads – 600 W. University Dr.**

**Thomas Budzik**, representing *Thomas Architects*, was present on behalf of the project.

**Mr. Hautzinger** summarized Staff comments. The petitioner is seeking approval of the proposed design for a building addition to an existing manufacturing facility. This project does require Plan Commission review and Village Board approval, and the purview of the Design Commission is for building and signage only. Tasty Breads is a food processor business that produces dough which is then frozen and packaged for wholesale. Tasty Breads is currently in the final steps of obtaining Village approval for a Land Use Variation to allow their business to operate in this location. As a second phase of Village zoning review, Tasty Breads is seeking approval for a 13,260 square foot freezer addition to be located on the east end of the existing building which requires a PUD amendment. The subject property is approximately 4.5 acres and the existing building is approximately 81,000 square feet.

The existing building exterior is made up of tan metal siding and stucco with a continuous brick base on the front and side elevations. The surrounding context in this location is the majority of buildings on the street have primarily brick exteriors on all sides. The proposed addition is large and highly visible. Overall, the design of the proposed addition is nicely done to comply with these guidelines. The front elevation has a continuous brick base with tan metal panel above, which aligns with the existing brick wall. The brick base is returned down the side wall for approximately 50-feet before transitioning to a brown tone metal siding which works well to maintain the color scheme.

However, there are two concerns with the proposed design for the Design Commission to evaluate. The Design Commission should review the proposed materials and colors to confirm that they adequately match the existing building. In the photo provided, the proposed “Sandstone” panel siding color does not appear to match the existing tan siding. Staff feels that an exact match is important to avoid a mismatched appearance.

The proposed addition includes a continuous gutter and downspouts along the entire side wall which is undesirable due to the lack of a continuous parapet wall. Staff encouraged the petitioner to incorporate internal roof drains or draining the new addition roof onto the existing roof, both of which the petitioner had concerns with. Another option to consider could be a parapet wall with scuppers instead of the continuous gutter. The Design Commission should evaluate this detail. The petitioner has reported that there will be no rooftop mechanical equipment on the new addition.

Overall, Staff recommends approval of the proposed design, with the comments stated.

**Mr. Budzik** said the building was recently purchased by Tasty Breads, and the majority of the building interior is reserved for two of their process lines, with room for 2 additional process lines. The process includes making the dough, packaging the dough, and freezing the dough. No baking will take place in the building. The building addition will store the frozen dough that is best kept in its own freezing building, versus in a freezer within the building, which was looked at but becomes very costly. He presented samples of the materials and colors being proposed for the addition, which are intended to be consistent with the existing building. The brick is the same size and an excellent color match to the brick on the existing building.

**Mr. Budzik** also responded to Staff's comments about the gutter and downspouts. He explained that this project requires stormwater detention that will be located under the drive

aisle directly to the east of the addition, which makes it logical that the downspouts connect directly into that stormwater detention. Also, roof drains are not possible on the building addition because little or no penetrations through the roof system are necessary to ensure the freezer equipment runs as efficiently as possible. He welcomed any questions from the commissioners.

**Commissioner Eckhardt** asked for clarification about no refrigeration on the roof of the addition. **Mr. Budzik** explained there will be an engine room within the building addition that will house the majority of the equipment, with some equipment located either outside behind the building or possibly on top of the existing building. This is still being finalized. **Chair Kingsley** asked about the color of the gutters/downspouts and if the storm water will run across the driveway. **Mr. Budzik** said the downspouts will connect directly to the stormwater system at the ground, and the color will match the dark bronze of the other metal trim.

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

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Charles Wilk, 932 S. Evergreen Ave. asked if the bread process will involve the bread rising because that will produce ethanol and the need for ethanol mitigation. **Mr. Budzik** said the dough is mixed before freezing, but there is no odor system required for the process.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Kubow** had initial concerns about the beige siding color being proposed; the color shown in the photo does not match the existing siding color. However, the material sample shown tonight appears to be a much closer match to the existing siding color, which is he okay with. **Mr. Budzik** acknowledged that the sample color photo submitted in the drawings looks different than the actual sample. **Commissioner Kubow** had no other comments.

**Commissioner Eckhardt** said the siding color match is good enough for him, the gutters make perfect sense because of the function of the refrigeration area, and the petitioner's response to Staff's concerns are sufficient. He had no concerns with the project.

**Commissioner Fitzgerald** was okay with the project and agreed with the comments from the other commissioners.

**Chair Kingsley** had no other comments and said the petitioner was being sensitive to the existing building and addressed Staff comments.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN OF THE BUILDING ADDITION AT 600 W. UNIVERSITY DRIVE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON PLANS RECEIVED 9/3/25, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING:**

- 1. 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.**

- 2. COMPLIANCE WITH ALL FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES.**

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

**ITEM 2. COMMERCIAL REVIEW****DC#25-074 – Courtyard Marriott – 100 W. Algonquin Rd.**

**Brian Huft & Jasenko Badic**, representing *Zimmerman Weintraub Associates*, were present of behalf of the project.

**Mr. Hautzinger** summarized Staff comments. The petitioner is seeking approval of the proposed design for exterior facade modifications to the existing Courtyard Marriott hotel. The existing hotel was originally approved in 1985. The scope of the current project includes demolition of the existing porte cochere, construction of a new porte cochere, entry facade enhancements, and a new paint color scheme for the entire building.

The existing building exterior does not appear to have been updated since its original construction in the mid 1980's, so the proposed exterior modifications will be a very welcome update. The new flat roof porte cochere design has a clean and modern appearance that sets the tone for the updated building entrance. The proposed 2" x 4" aluminum battens applied to the existing front walls is a very unique and creative detail that is very effective to elevate the building's curb appeal with a modern aesthetic. The new color scheme using three shades of gray completes the updated look. Overall, the proposed exterior materials, details, and color scheme are nicely done and well-coordinated.

The existing trash storage area is located behind a solid wing wall in the loading dock at the southeast corner of the building. However, the east end of this area is currently open and exposed to view. The current plans include the addition of an opaque fence gate to fully enclose the space and conceal the trash from view.

The existing landscaping around the front of the building is in nice condition with a variety of decorative flowers, shrubs, and grasses. However, landscaping around the sides and rear of the building is lacking. At a minimum, per code, all landscape islands in the parking area around the building perimeter are required to have shade trees, which are mostly missing at this time. Additionally, code requires a continuous landscape hedge along the front property line to screen the parking areas and drive aisles, which is also missing. At this time, the petitioner has not provided landscape drawings for review due to schedule constraints to complete the exterior building improvements this Fall. However, they are in agreement with the required landscape improvements and have committed to working with Staff to address all of the landscape deficiencies in the Spring of 2026.

The property currently has one ground sign facing Algonquin Road and no wall signs. A sign variation was approved in the original 1985 Ordinance to allow a 20-foot tall ground sign where 16'-6" is the maximum allowed height per code. The petitioner has indicated their intention to replace the existing ground with a new updated design, as well as to add an illuminated wall sign as depicted in the proposed front rendering. The petitioner has also agreed to work with Staff to implement the signage improvements in the Spring of 2026.

Overall, Staff recommends approval of the proposed design for the exterior facade modifications to the existing hotel, with encouragement for the requirements to implement the landscape deficiencies and signage in the Spring.

**Mr. Badic** said this hotel is a first generation Marriott Courtyard design that has a courtyard shape and an internal courtyard. The changes being proposed are part of a Marriott-wide re-imaging initiative to bring generational courtyard buildings into the 21<sup>st</sup> century, and to compete with the later generation and the new build hotels. The proposed design elements have to be site adapted to respond to existing building and context. The new porte cochere

makes a big first impression at the front of the building, and is now a more simple, elegant, flat roof design that is very open and very airy. It ties into a new awning that brings you into the building. There will be a batten design system on the front of the building that consists of aluminum profiles in a wood-look finish that will not fade or need to be repainted. A material sample of the profile system and color was presented. This batten design is meant to have a high visual impact but a low impact on the overall building structure. **Mr. Badic** said the remainder of the building will be painted in a warm grey tone called Intellectual Gray, and the new porte cochere will be a darker color called Urbane Bronze. The three existing bay windows at the front of the building will be flattened out to create more of an open storefront look to bring in a clean, modern aesthetic.

**Commissioner Eckhardt** asked about the material proposed for the underside of the new porte cochere. **Mr. Badic** said that 6 to 8-inch wide planks are proposed for the underside of the new porte cochere. The ceiling will be flush and there will be recessed can lights. There will also be wall sconces on the new porte cochere. **Chair Kingsley** asked for clarification on the paint colors with respect to the rest of the building, and whether or not the roof is being replaced. **Mr. Badic** said the foreground of the building will be the lighter color, and the recessed surfaces will be the darker color. Replacing the roof is not part of Marriott's re-imaging and is up to the discretion of the owner. **Commissioner Eckhardt** asked if the existing roof color will change when the roof is eventually replaced, and **Mr. Badic** said that Marriott does not mandate a specific roof color. **Chair Kingsley** had concerns about the roof color and felt it should be reviewed for compatibility with the other building colors at the time it is replaced in the future. **Mr. Badic** agreed.

**Chair Kingsley** asked about the design and material for the trash screening gate. **Mr. Huft** said the design is shown in the elevation drawings; it will be a solid, vinyl fence in a color to match the lighter wall color. **Mr. Badic** said they just received a signage package and are able to present it at any time. **Mr. Hautzinger** said that Staff can work with the petitioner on reviewing the details of the new signage for the hotel, unless Staff determines there are concerns with the signage and it needs to be reviewed by the Design Commission. **Mr. Badic** said the new signage is very simple, elegant, and modern.

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

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Charles Wilk, 932 S. Evergreen Ave. asked if there was clearance height requirement for the porte cochere. It is currently proposed at 13'6". The petitioner replied that the proposed height is at the request of the Village Building Department. Marriott originally proposed a height of 12-feet.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** liked the project and said it will make a big difference. He loved the vertical batten elements, the new porte cochere, that the railings are being painted, the entire building is being refreshed, and the bay windows are being replaced. He had concerns about the existing roof color that seems to have a lot of red in it; however, the color sample presented for the wood battens appears to help with that. He is in support of the project.

**Commissioner Eckhardt** agreed with the comments from Commissioner Fitzgerald. He also felt the roof color is very important and when the roof is changed in the future, one or two color options should be submitted to Staff for review to determine that the color is compatible. Otherwise he supports the colors and updates being done to the building, as well as Staff's comments about signage.

**Commissioner Kubow** agreed with the comments from the other commissioners. This is a fantastic refresh to the building, one of the best the commissioners have seen and very much needed on this visible site. He agreed that the existing roof color has a bit of red in it, but he felt it was relatively similar to the color shown in the renderings, and with the choice to go with more of a walnut finish for the battens which has some red tones to it, he felt much better about the roof color. He also agreed with Commissioner Eckhardt's suggestion to provide guidelines about the future roof color.

**Commissioner Kubow** asked for clarification about the landscaping improvements. **Mr. Hautzinger** said that minimum code requirements for landscaping were discussed with the petitioner with regards to shade trees in the parking islands and screening across the front of the property, and Staff will follow-up with the petitioner in the Spring to ensure that these improvements are made. **Mr. Badic** said that landscape improvements are part of Marriott's requirements and will be completed as required. **Commissioner Kubow** suggested the landscape improvements be tied to the Certificate of Occupancy, or a bond in place for these improvements. **Mr. Badic** said this is a phased renovation to the hotel, and interior improvements are scheduled for Spring, which could provide an opportunity to include landscaping at that time.

**Chair Kingsley** agreed with the comments from the other commissioners, and said the entire project will be great.

**Mr. Hautzinger** commented that the lighter wood color shown in the batten sample provided tonight against the dark paint color has a nice contrast and looks like what is shown in the rendering, compared to the dark walnut color sample against the dark paint color. **Mr. Badic** said the dark walnut color is Marriott's preferred color and this has been implemented at numerous other locations. **Chair Kingsley** said that once there is a large amount of the walnut color and there is reflection, it will end up looking lighter than it looks here tonight with the sample provided. The brown of the canopy will be more similar to the walnut color. **Commissioner Kubow** felt the dark walnut color will look better.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE EXTERIOR FAÇADE MODIFICATIONS AT THE COURTYARD MARRIOTT LOCATED AT 100 W. ALGONQUIN ROAD. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON PLANS RECEIVED 9/5/25, 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 SUBMIT COLOR OPTIONS NOW FOR THE FUTURE ROOF REPLACEMENT, FOR STAFF APPROVAL.**
- 2. A REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A LANDSCAPE PLAN FOR THE ENTIRE SITE NO LATER THAN THE FIRST WEEK OF JANUARY 2026, FOR STAFF REVIEW. THE LANDSCAPE PLAN SHALL INCLUDE ALL OF MARRIOTT'S MANDATED DECORATIVE LANDSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS AS WELL AS VILLAGE CODE REQUIRED LANDSCAPING, INCLUDING ISLAND SHADE TREES AND PARKING SCREENING.**
- 3. A REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT ALL NEW EXTERIOR SIGNAGE FOR STAFF DESIGN APPROVAL.**
- 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.**

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



**ITEM 3. OTHER BUSINESS**

**Chair Kingsley** asked Staff to check into the matter brought up by the resident tonight during the review of the first project with regards to possible ethanol mitigation associated with the bread rising process.

**Public Comment**

A resident asked if a previous sign variation approval carries over to new signage at the same location. **Mr. Hautzinger** said that in general, if new signage is substantially compliant with the original signage, then previous sign variations will apply. Staff reviews new signage for substantial compliance with the original design.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:40 P.M. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.**