

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
OCTOBER 14, 2025

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

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

Members Absent: Jonathan Kubow

Also Present: Robert Obrzut, Realty Champions for *1500 E. Euclid Ave.*
Brian Carley, Bradford Allen for *Arlington Med*
Steve Hautzinger, Planning Staff

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FOR SEPTEMBER 30, 2025

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2025. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 1. SINGLE-FAMILY TEARDOWN REVIEW**DC# 25-065 – 1500 E. Euclid Ave.**

Robert Obrzut, representing *Realty Champions*, was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to demolish an existing one-and-a-half story home and detached garage to allow construction of a new two-story home with an attached, three-car side load garage. This project complies with the R-3 zoning requirements, and the property is pending Plan Commission review and Village Board approval for subdivision to make the existing lot buildable.

The surrounding context in this location is primarily smaller scale single-story and split-level homes with a mix of attached and detached garages. The proposed two-story home is relatively large, however, the subject property is unusually large, so the spacing between the proposed new house and the adjacent homes is substantial, making the scale of the home less of a concern for Staff.

The proposed architectural design is comprised of primarily traditional forms, materials, and details. However, the overall composition has a busy and somewhat unresolved appearance primarily due to the numerous varying window sizes and window types which lack consistency or regularity. Additionally, the front entrance has an unusual appearance that looks more like a rear covered patio and patio door than a typical front entry design. The applied gable of stone on the front wall of the garage adds to the random appearance of the design and the steep roof pitch appears out of place with the rest of the house.

Per the Single-Family Design Guidelines, the Design Commission should evaluate the logic of the design, the overall composition and balance of the elevation, and the compatibility with the adjacent homes.

Mr. Obrzut said he is here tonight representing the owners of the property. In response to the comments about the windows, they are trying to maximize furniture layouts for interior rooms, and large windows will limit the layout. He has experience with building modern homes and they are trying to adjust to the Village being more traditional. They want to build a home that is sellable because the new home is an investment property that will be for sale. The main entrance has a single door with picture windows to bring light into the home. Smaller windows at the front door will obstruct the inside and the interior staircase would become visible from the front. They feel the proposed design is a nice plan.

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

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Seyer** acknowledged that the new home meets code and no variations are needed; however, the juxtaposition of the garage is odd and the front of the home looks confusing. At first, he could not identify where the front door is. The front elevation needs more embellishment to make it more inviting and to be clear that it is the front of the home. The entry porch columns should be larger and consistent with the columns on the rear elevation, and although it would be nice to change the windows and doors, he would not force a petitioner to do something they do not want to do. He suggested different windows on the stone portion of the garage on the front elevation, or adding two small windows within the siding instead of the stone, letting the stone be what it is. There needs to be a stronger presence at the front entry, and there are a lot of rooflines that could be simpler and cleaner. Seeing the new home in 3-D form would help to understand everything that is going on.

Commissioner Eckhardt asked about the colors and materials, and the petitioner presented samples of the materials and indicated the colors and locations on the elevations. **Commissioner Eckhardt** also asked about the columns on the front elevation, and the petitioner said the columns are wood stained. **Commissioner Eckhardt** agreed with Commissioner Seyer's confusion about where the front door is, and the odd garage details. He was surprised to hear this is a spec home because there are a lot design elements that might not appeal to the general buyer. He questioned the lack of symmetry with the windows, and the small windows on the garage elevation. The south elevation is good and the north elevation has a lot of boxes that come together. He agreed that a 3D perspective of the new home would help to understand the dynamics of the shadow of the setback. This is a unique home and the only way he could support the design is by respecting that this is the design the owner wants to go forward with. The front door needs something more to clarify that is the front door, and he suggested 2 doors instead of one. The columns need to be larger and heavier and have more details to make them beautiful; that area needs work.

Commissioner Fitzgerald was okay with the scale of the home, and he liked the colors being proposed. He agreed with the confusion about which elevation is the front, and felt the wood columns on the front porch are too skinny for the size of the home. He was very surprised that this is a spec home with some of the daring design choices being proposed. He initially looked to see if there were elevation changes within each floor because of all the different window sizes on the front elevation, and he felt there should be more uniformity there. He was not in favor of the blank walls on the front of the garage, and he suggested adding something there, a window or a light fixture. He suggested the windows in the office be transom at the top that line up with the top of the front doors, and he also suggested the front door be solid instead of glass. This could help to clarify that it is the front of the home. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** also did not understand the columns on the back of the home and assumed they were drawn incorrectly. The columns should be simpler and cleaner. Overall, this is an unusual home that he felt would limit the market of buyers.

Chair Kingsley agreed with most of the other commissioners' comments. This is a really nice property that can handle the size of the new home, and the setbacks will be good for the neighbors. The materials are good as well. Overall, the way the front of the new home meets Euclid Avenue is missing the mark, compared to some other homes on Euclid that are on a large lot that are grand and make a statement. She felt the front door should be where the stone gable is on the garage because that is where your attention first goes. She agreed with the comments about the four panel front door and suggested setting the interior stairs back to not look so commercial, and increasing the head height of the four door panels to be higher than the head height of the windows in the office. The front door should be more accentuated. The windows and shed roof above the front entry look clunky and like an addition. She suggested lowering that roof pitch and having the eaves continuous and the windows lower. She also asked what the panels were below the gliders on the front elevation and the 2 windows on the north elevation, and the petitioner replied that those are windows. **Chair Kingsley** reiterated that the front elevation is missing the mark. This is a big piece of property and the new home has very small windows, and large windows is what will sell this home. What the home looks like from the front and what is seen out the windows is going to sell this home. She felt the petitioner should go back and look at the design, look at the windows and have more order with them, and look at the columns and the front entry.

Commissioner Seyer had concerns about the patio on the west elevation that continues all the way around the corner but the roof does not, which seems like a weird correlation between the two. **Mr. Obrzut** replied that there is a small section of roof over the patio door on the west elevation. He also said that they will sit down and talk about the comments given tonight and try to make everyone happy with the new home. He asked if there would be another meeting or if they can proceed with approval tonight and bring the changes to Staff, because

time is of the essence. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** felt there were enough issues that the project should come back for another review with the commissioners, and a specific date for that review could be made tonight. **Chair Kingsley** said that updated drawings and elevations would need to be submitted to Staff the week prior to the meeting.

Commissioner Eckhardt asked if the petitioner is willing to make any changes to the design, or preferred a vote be taken tonight. **Mr. Obrzut** and his team left the room for a few minutes for a brief discussion.

During this time, Mark Barringer (1616 E. Euclid Avenue), asked about the height of the new home compared to the height of the current home on the site. **Mr. Hautzinger** referred to the context exhibit that shows the existing home and the proposed home, which is used to determine if the size and scale of the new home fits in with the adjacent homes. It was stated that the height of the new home meets code.

The petitioner and his team returned to the room. **Chair Kingsley** said that while they were out of the room, Mr. Barringer mentioned the Plan Commission review for this project, and asked the petitioner for a summary. **Mr. Obrzut** said they received Plan Commission approval last week to subdivide the property into one lot, and a variation for lot width in the R-3 district. **Chair Kingsley** referred to the site plan and asked about the setback of the new home, and **Mr. Obrzut** said the setback will be 57-feet, which is about 36-feet closer to Euclid than the existing home on the lot.

Mr. Obrzut said based on the comments given tonight, they will make changes to the front elevation, the windows, the columns, and make the entrance grander. **Mr. Hautzinger** said that revised plans must be submitted to Staff by end of day Monday in order to stay on track for Design Commission re-review October 28. If more time is needed, the next meeting will be on November 18. **Mr. Obrzut** said he will keep Staff informed of their progress with the revisions.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO CONTINUE THE REVIEW OF 1500 E. EUCLID AVENUE (DC25-065) TO THE DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING ON OCTOBER 28, 2025.

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

Mark Barringer (1616 E. Euclid Avenue) pointed out his home on the aerial image, which is located directly behind 1500 E. Euclid. He said his property is a very unusual lot configuration and his home looks directly at the back of the home at 1500 E. Euclid, and although he did not have any huge concerns with the new home, he wants to make sure the commissioners take this into consideration when reviewing the project. **Chair Kingsley** said the back of the new home is relatively the same distance as the existing home since the front of the home is moving 36-feet closer to Euclid, but the height of the new home will be taller because it is a full 2-story. The new home meets all code requirements with a height of 25-feet to the middle of the roof. There will no longer be a detached garage. The commissioners appreciated the comments and encouraged the neighbor to come back on October 28.

ITEM 2. SIGN VARIATION REVIEW**DC#25-073 – Arlington Med - 155 E. Algonquin Rd.**

Brian Carley, representing Bradford Allen was present of behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. The subject property is the former Daily Herald office building which has been vacant for many years. The petitioner is working on renovating the building to become a new medical office building. An aerial was presented.

In 2022, the petitioner was granted a sign variation to allow two oversized leasing banners, 420 sf and 840 sf for a total of 1,260 sf, where the total square footage for temporary signs is not allowed to exceed 64 sf, with no individual sign exceeding 32 sf. The variation was approved with a condition that the temporary banners would be removed in two years or upon 50% leasing of the property, whichever is sooner. The sign variation ordinance was approved on October 17, 2022, thereby requiring removal by October 17, 2024.

The banners were installed in late 2022 and they are currently still on the building. The Village recently notified the petitioner that the deadline for removal has passed, which in turn prompted the current extension request to allow the existing banners to remain for an additional 18 months. If the Design Commission and Village Board approve the requested extension, the anticipated Ordinance approval date will be approximately mid-December. Therefore, Staff is interpreting the requested 18-month extension to be removal no later than June 15, 2027.

Since 2022, Bradford Allen has reported diligent efforts to prepare the office building for leasing activity. In summary, the following key activities have taken place:

- The parking garage adjacent to the building was structurally compromised and has been demolished.
- The building interior, including the lobby entrance, has been demolished.
- A medical office vignette was fully built as a medical office model to promote the property to medical office users.
- Office Real Estate brokers have been actively marketing the property and touring the space with prospective tenants.
- A medical office marketing brochure was developed by the petitioner and has been actively distributed.
- A Broker open house was held at the property on June 4, 2025.
- Architects and Engineers have been retained and are working through schematic designs.

In 2022, Staff acknowledged that the subject property is a unique situation since it does not have frontage on Algonquin or Arlington Heights Road, and is only visible from the I-90 tollway. Staff also acknowledged that the site grade is much lower than I-90 making a typical ground-mounted lease sign not visible from the road. Staff also noted that this building is located within the South Arlington Heights Road corridor, where the South Arlington Heights Road Corridor Plan has been adopted to promote new development in this area, and that leasing of this vacant building can contribute to this goal of revitalizing this area. Due to these unique circumstances, Staff felt that the oversized temporary banners were justified and recommended approval.

With regards to the current extension request, Staff supports the success of the proposed development and feels that significant progress has been made towards the goal of revitalizing

this property. Therefore, Staff has no objections to the requested 18-month extension.

Mr. Carley said they have been working with their architects for the last year on the idea of re-dressing the exterior of the building, and he welcomed the commissioners to visit the vignette that they have built on site as a medical office model. The extension of the existing sign banners will help garner attention for new tenants in the building. **Chair Kingsley** asked if 18 months is long enough and **Mr. Carley** said he hopes so. They are looking for an anchor tenant before moving forward with the smaller tenants that have shown interest.

The commissioners were in unanimous support of the extension request for the sign banners on the building. **Mr. Hautzinger** noted that the proposed exterior modifications to the building facade will require a separate Design Commission approval. **Mr. Carley** was aware of this and said they are currently starting that process.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

Keith Moens said that doing anything to support the building getting leased out is a good move.

Mr. Hautzinger suggested that the petitioner discuss with their team whether or not the 18-month time extension is adequate, and let Staff know if they feel more time is needed, before this request moves forward to the Village Board for final approval. **Mr. Carley** appreciated the suggestion.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO APPROVE THE FOLLOWING SIGN VARIATION AMENDMENT FOR ARLINGTON MED AT 155 E. ALGONQUIN ROAD:

- 1. AN AMENDMENT TO SIGN VARIATION ORDINANCE 22-057, SECTION 3, CONDITION B, 'DURATION OF TEMPORARY SIGNAGE' TO ALLOW THE EXISTING TEMPORARY SIGNS TO REMAIN FOR AN ADDITIONAL 18 MONTHS, WHERE REMOVAL IN TWO YEARS (FROM THE ORIGINAL ORDINANCE APPROVAL DATE ON OCTOBER 17, 2022) OR UPON 50% LEASING OF THE PROPERTY IS REQUIRED.**

THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH SIGN VARIATION ORDINANCE 22-057, FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. THE TEMPORARY LEASING BANNERS SHALL BE REMOVED NO LATER THAN JUNE 15, 2027.**
- 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**

DC 10/14/25

DRAWINGS, AND TO ENSURE THAT BUILDING PERMIT PLANS AND SIGN PERMIT PLANS COMPLY WITH ALL ZONING CODE, BUILDING CODE AND SIGN CODE REQUIREMENTS.

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

ITEM 3. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no public comment.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:35 P.M. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.