

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
DECEMBER 16, 2025

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

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

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Keith Ginnodo, KGA Architects for *916 W. Campbell St.*
Jamie & Scott Cassidy, Owners of *916 W. Campbell St.*
Mike Hamman, CD Group for *819 S. Highland Ave.*
Kevin Davis for *Fairfield Homes*
Adrien Binet, Thomas Roszak Architecture for *Arbor House*
Brian Carley, Bradford Allen for *Arbor House*
Charles Witherington-Perkins, PlanGreatCities LLC for *Arbor House*
Steve Hautzinger, Planning Staff

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 18, 2025

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 18, 2025. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 1. SINGLE-FAMILY TEARDOWN REVIEW

DC#25-092 – 916 W. Campbell St.

Keith Ginnodo, representing *Kingsley-Ginnodo Architects*, and **Jamie & Scott Cassidy**, the owners, were present on behalf of the project.

Chairman Kingsley recused herself from the project and left the room for the discussion.

Commissioner Eckhardt made a motion to recommend Commissioner Kubow as Chairman for the review of this project. **Commissioner Seyer** seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to demolish the existing two-story house and detached three-car garage at the corner of Kennicott and Campbell Street, to allow construction of a new two-story home with attached, three-car garage and a detached one-car garage. The front setback faces Campbell Street, which is determined by code as the narrower of the two lot lines. The exterior side setback requirement is based on the average setback of the existing homes on the block and will be approximately 25-feet. The proposed setback is 20.9-feet, which does not meet the minimum requirement; however, there is room on the site to adjust the location of the house to comply with code by sliding the entire home about 5-feet to the east. This has already been discussed with the petitioner. With this adjustment, the plans will comply with all of the R-3 zoning requirements.

The existing house is a Colonial style home that according to the real estate listing was built in 1861. The existing house was not included in the 2004 School of the Art Institute Historic Preservation Report because this part of the neighborhood was not covered in the report. The existing house has a stately presence and charming curb appeal that contributes to the character of the neighborhood. Staff encourages preservation of historic homes with architectural quality, so a renovation/expansion of the existing home is encouraged in lieu of demolition/new construction.

The Design Commission needs to evaluate the proposed demolition per the Municipal Code Chapter 28 (Zoning Regulations), Section 13.7.c, which states, prior to issuance of a Certificate of Approval for demolition and new construction, the Design Commission will need to evaluate if the existing home has "significant architectural, historical, aesthetic, or cultural value".

Mr. Hautzinger noted that a few emails were received by Staff today regarding this project, hard copies of which have been provided for the Design Commissioners. One email is in support of the proposed demolition and new construction, and two of the emails are opposed which both claim that the existing home is one of the original homes built in Arlington Heights and owned by the Kennicott family who were one of the early settlers of Arlington Heights. Aside from its architectural quality, it is possible that the existing home may also have more historical or cultural value in addition to just its appearance.

When the Staff Report was prepared, Staff was evaluating the existing home based on its appearance only, and recommended that the Design Commission evaluate the proposed demolition and new construction. However, in light of this new information about the potential historical connection of this house to being one of the earliest homes in the Village of Arlington Heights, Staff is encouraging the Design Commission to continue this project for re-review to allow Staff time to conduct research to confirm if this is the case or not. Right now, this is just a claim from the public and Staff does not know if it is true. It is Staff's recommendation for the Design Commission to allow Staff to do the necessary research so that the Design

Commission will have all of the information to make an informed decision.

Historic preservation has become a high priority for the Village Board and it is one of their current documented strategic priorities, which Staff will be studying. Staff is concerned that if this home were approved for demolition without researching its history, the Village Board could be very disappointed.

In regards to the proposed new house, overall Staff feels it is nicely designed with a Traditional style and wrap-around porch that will generally fit well with the surrounding context in this location. However, Staff recommends the Design Commission evaluate the following:

1. Evaluate the scale of the proposed new house against the surrounding context.
2. Evaluate the proposed 25.5-foot front setback, where the adjacent homes are setback approximately 39-feet.
3. Evaluate the proposed four garage doors facing Kennicott Avenue which have a prominent appearance and are the closest part of the house to the street. Staff recommends recessing the garages to be in line with, or setback behind, the main wall of the house.
4. Evaluate the design of the proposed detached garage which has a different massing, siding, and detailing from the other garages. Consider matching the attached garage height, massing and siding.
5. Staff recommends continuing the brick base from the main part of the house onto the garages.

With these comments and the recent development of the potential historical significance of the existing home, Staff encouraged the Design Commission to continue this project for re-review in January.

Regardless of any decision tonight, **Acting Chair Kubow** asked if this project will be going before the Village Board, and **Mr. Hautzinger** said no. **Chair Kubow** asked for clarification regarding the Village Board strategic priorities and **Mr. Hautzinger** clarified that studying historic preservation is a current strategic priority of the Village Board for the Village of Arlington Heights. Staff does not know what the outcome of that study will be, but the matter of historic preservation in general has become a big topic in recent years so the Village Board does want it to be studied.

Commissioner Eckhardt asked if there has been any official study, directive, or ordinance about this because the Design Commission has been conducting their business year after year based on the current Design Guidelines, and this seems to be an enhancement that will affect this petition and perhaps others. **Mr. Hautzinger** clarified that Staff is not holding this project to any higher standard than any other project that has been reviewed to date. The historic preservation study has not yet been conducted, and there are no new rules or regulations at this time. The Village Board is not currently aware of this specific project, but there is concern amongst Village Staff leadership, understanding the importance of historic preservation to the Village Board, that this project should be handled carefully, and at the very least Staff is asking for the opportunity to do some historical research on the home.

Commissioner Eckhardt commented that when he reviews projects such as this, he is looking for a valid reason to justify demolition, such as ceilings too low or physical obsolescent structure, some real reason preventing remodeling.

Mr. Hautzinger reiterated the one current code requirement that is applicable and has resulted in the denial of demolition of one home in Arlington Heights, which is Chapter 28 (Zoning Regulations), Section 13.7.c, which states, prior to issuance of a Certificate of Approval for demolition and new construction, the Design Commission will need to evaluate

if the existing home has "significant architectural, historical, aesthetic, or cultural value".

Keith Ginnodo appreciated the conversation and sympathized/empathized with the whole discussion. He acknowledged the importance of historical preservation for their architectural firm, which they take very seriously and have worked on several restoration projects in town that are all very important to the context of Arlington Heights. However, this existing home is not of that caliber in terms of its architectural merits. He visited the home again today and believes the home was built in the 1920's to 1940's, and has board-formed concrete, which is not an 1860-type of structure; however, there could be elements inside the home that date back to that period, although buried by subsequent construction and is no longer a viable piece of architecture from that period. Although this is a distinguished, Colonial-style home, he felt it did not rise to the level of historic architectural preservation. He questioned that even if the Kennicott family did own this house, does that justify preservation, which does not make any sense to him. Maybe if Abraham Lincoln had died or slept there, then it would be a very different situation. He wanted to see the project move forward tonight without a continuation.

Mr. Ginnodo said the current owners live in Pioneer Park since 2018, have 4 children, and have done their own research on the existing home, finding nothing that connects the home to the Kennicott family. The existing home is in poor repair and not worth salvaging, with ceilings caving in, walls shedding plaster, and water stains everywhere. Photos were shown of the disrepair. The first-floor ceiling height is 7'7" and the second-floor ceiling height is 7'3"; obviously not to today's building standards. The home has also been added on to several times over the years. The existing 3-car garage is located on the sidewalk and the new garage has been pushed back 25' and will continue to be pushed back as the home is shifted back. They did not build over the garage and they deliberately changed the material of the detached garage so it is a distinct entity not part of the major portion of the home. They are doing everything they can on both sides of the home to engage with the street; the home was pushed back and the open porch brought forward as much as possible; the perception of the home is that it is set back 35-feet. **Mr. Ginnodo** referred to the amount of public in attendance tonight who are friends/neighbors in support of the family and the project, and a letter of support was submitted from the neighbors immediately to the north and to the east.

Mr. Ginnodo said accommodations to the adjacent neighbors were taken with the location of the sunroom being set back 50' from the front yard and behind the adjacent home on Campbell St. Logical design was taken to push the new home to the south and west so the highest portion is on that corner, and then wrap it around the porch to give some relief and activity to that facade. Materials were presented and discussed. Brick with a stone cap is proposed along the bottom of the first-floor windows; however, the owners are now considering stone as the wainscot material, something casual and with some color variation. Brick is also proposed for the sunroom and the chimney, and the one-car detached garage will have shingle siding. **Mr. Ginnodo** reiterated that they are in support of moving the home 5-feet to the east to meet the setback requirements. He welcomed any questions from the commissioners at this time.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

Vivian Menzies, 212 W. Fremont Ave. She lives in the HANA neighborhood and is very involved with historic preservation in the Village. Initially she had no strong opinion about the existing home being torn down because the home does not look like it has any redeeming architectural interest; however, she did not realize the age of the home, and there is now the question of when this home was actually built. The design of the new home is great, but

since the Village is making historic preservation a priority, she felt there should be guidance from an ordinance in the future so that we are not in this situation. Have the facts before we are here to review a project. She felt Staff did a great job of presenting everything they have on the project, and her gut feeling is that the existing home is not worth saving.

Barb Franks, 908 W. Campbell Street. She lives directly east of the site and has lived in her home for 30 years and loves the neighborhood. She was excited to meet the current owners, after talking with the surrounding neighbors, they are all thrilled that they will have a nice, young family who adds so much to the community. She also said that in her 30 years of living here, the previous owner of the existing home did little or nothing to keep the home up, which was visible when she visited the inside of the home at the estate sale that was held. She said it would be a huge improvement to the entire neighborhood to have a new home here that will fit in with the 15 homes on the south side of Campbell Street that replaced the previous ranch homes that was there.

There was no further public comment.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** was torn about supporting a continuation of the project. He said it was a great goal for the Village to study historic preservation, but he felt it was unfair for this moment. The design of the new home looks great, the size is okay, and it looks really interesting from every angle. His only concern was that the driveway to the detached garage is adjacent to the driveway of the attached garage of the home. He asked if a car is intended to be parked in that driveway, and the homeowner said they are unsure about how the detached garage will be used. Their intent is to build a large enough home for their children to come back to in the future and they want to have the detached garage as an option. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** reiterated that he was not opposed to the detached garage; however, he did not like the driveway as shown. With regards to the existing home, he did not see a lot of value with it after seeing photos of the conditions inside and the low ceiling heights. He understood why the home is being torn down.

Commissioner Eckhardt loved the new home that has been very carefully designed. He was initially confused about the detached garage and who it belonged to, especially with the separate driveway, and he was concerned that the garage looks like a different building with different architecture; it is odd. He questioned how important the detached garage is. Otherwise he was in support of the new home.

Commissioner Seyer said that initially he had concerns about the existing home, but with more photos being shown, it is apparent the home has not been cared for. It is extremely costly to repair and renovate older homes like these, as nice as that would be. He advocates that new homes are much more energy efficient, and he was not in favor of arbitrarily saying the existing home must remain, unless the home has some architectural significance, which this home does not. He was in favor of the design of the new home, but felt it strange that a curb cut is being added on Campbell Street; four curb cuts for one home is a lot. Adding an accessory structure to this rear yard that is also a front yard, relatively close to a neighbor's home, feels unnecessary. There is no architect he could recommend more that would preserve historical integrity and do the right thing for a prominent site, but he was struggling with the detached garage. He did not understand why it is needed and why it needs to be so unique and special. The rest of the new home is beautiful and he was in support of the project moving forward tonight.

Acting Chair Kubow agreed with the comments made by the commissioners on both the existing home and the proposed new home. The existing home is attractive but it is not a contributing home with respect to historic preservation, so how can this commission deny the demolition of it based on information that may or may not be correct and comments being

made on social media. The existing home provides no historic value, and he was not opposed to it being torn down. A founding family living in the home is not a reason to keep the home. The design of the new home is beautiful, well executed, and the wrap-around porch that will force the family outside to engage with the neighborhood is everything this commission asks for. However, he agreed with the comments and concerns about the detached garage, and he could not support it. The garage does not feel right with the beautiful new home and being right next to the neighbor. In summary, he supports the demolition of the existing home, the design of the new home, and that the new home should be pushed back slightly to meet the setback requirement; however, he did not support the detached garage.

Mr. Ginnodo appreciated the comments regarding the detached garage and said they would consider an alternative design for it. He added that Village Engineering has an issue with the driveway to the detached garage because of an existing tree, so there are other considerations they need to make for the garage to work in that location. He reiterated that the existing home is not a landmarked building and the Village has no historic preservation office, and the condition of the home is not salvageable. He asked the commissioners for their positive vote on the project tonight. **Commissioner Eckhardt** asked the petitioner about the possibility about relocating the detached garage. **Mr. Ginnodo** said the detached garage is not a component that he and the homeowners want to give up. The detached garage serves multiple purposes; it is an added garage, added storage, an additional parking space that keeps cars off the street, and it is located further back than the existing garage. The design of the garage and the placement of it can be modified to be a good neighbor.

Mr. Hautzinger clarified that the detached garage as proposed is code compliant in this rear yard location, with a minimum 5-foot setback from the rear lot line. It is not allowed to extend out in front of the neighbor's front wall that it is roughly aligned with.

Commissioner Fitzgerald asked if the existing tree that is in the way of the new driveway to the new detached garage will be taken down. **Mr. Ginnodo** replied that leaving the tree in place would be ideal, but it is a huge tree near the property line and it is in poor condition, and the four curb cuts are also in play. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** was not in favor of the driveway proposed to the accessory structure, although he was open to the accessory structure.

Commissioner Seyer asked what other approvals are required for this project besides the Design Commission, and **Mr. Hautzinger** said that a building permit is required which will be reviewed by all Village departments, including Engineering with regards to the curb cuts and the existing parkway tree. **Commissioner Seyer** asked if the accessory structure in the rear yard setback required separate approval from tonight, and **Mr. Hautzinger** said the structure is code compliant as shown, and normally architectural design review is not required for accessory structures, but it is being reviewed in this case because it is part of the overall development proposal for this lot.

Commissioner Eckhardt asked if there are limits on the size of accessory structures. **Mr. Hautzinger** said that sheds are limited to 300 sf, but detached garages can be up to 720 sf.

Commissioner Seyer was in favor of the demolition of the existing home and the design of the new home. However, he was not in favor of the curb cut, and if the accessory structure was to remain, it would need to at least be set back. Right now it does not know where to fit in with the rest of the context between a very large home and a small home, it is right in the middle and it looks like a playhouse. He could not support the structure purely from setting a precedent of a very important frontage. It has to be set back in any approval. Other than that, everything is beautiful.

312 sf

Commissioner Eckhardt asked if the accessory structure could be made to work with access from the 3-car garage curb cut, and **Mr. Ginnodo** said it looks pretty difficult to do so, but they can look at that.

Commissioner Fitzgerald noted that the new home is being shifted over, which will include the accessory structure, and he asked how far. **Mr. Ginnodo** said both the home and the accessory structure can be moved about 5-feet from where they are now, which **Commissioner Fitzgerald** said would look better and like it belongs with the home.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO APPROVE THE DESIGN OF THE PROPOSED NEW (TEARDOWN) SINGLE-FAMILY HOME TO BE LOCATED AT 916 W. CAMPBELL STREET. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON ARCHITECTURAL PLANS/RENDERINGS/MATERIALS RECEIVED ON 11/14/25, REVISED SITE PLAN RECEIVED 12/8/25, 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. THAT THE HOME WILL BE SHIFTED APPROXIMATELY 5-FEET TO THE EAST, AS STATED BY THE PETITIONER, AND THE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE BE SHIFTED ALONG WITH IT.
2. THAT THE DRIVEWAY AND CURB CUT FOR THE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE ARE PROHIBITED.
3. THIS REVIEW DEALS WITH ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, NOR REPRESENT ANY TACIT APPROVAL OR SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED LAND USE OR ANY OTHER ZONING AND/OR LAND USE ISSUES OR DECISIONS THAT STEM FROM ZONING, BUILDING, SIGNAGE OR ANY OTHER REVIEWS. IN ADDITION TO THE NORMAL TECHNICAL REVIEW, PERMIT DRAWINGS WILL BE REVIEWED FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE DESIGN COMMISSION AND ANY OTHER COMMISSION OR BOARD APPROVAL CONDITIONS. IT IS THE PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO INCORPORATE ALL REQUIREMENTS LISTED ON THE CERTIFICATE OF APROPRIATENESS INTO THE PERMIT DRAWINGS, AND TO ENSURE THAT BUILDING PERMIT PLANS AND SIGN PERMIT PLANS COMPLY WITH ALL ZONING CODE, BUILDING CODE AND SIGN CODE REQUIREMENTS.
4. COMPLIANCE WITH ALL FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES.

Commissioner Eckhardt suggested adding an option to require concrete pavers that grow grass for the driveway to the accessory structure. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** was not in favor of that because of the large existing tree; when roots disintegrate after removing a large tree, in 5 to 10 years the new driveway will be 2-feet below where it is set, and if the existing tree stays, then the new driveway will not work. **Commissioner Eckhardt** made a motion to amend the motion as follows:

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

1. A REQUIREMENT THAT A DRIVEWAY AND CURB CUT BE PERMITTED TO THE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE, BUT THAT IT BE CONSTRUCTED OF A HARD SURFACE THAT PROVIDES FOR GRASS TO GROW THROUGH PAVERS FOR THE APPEARANCE

OF A LAWN. THERE CAN BE SUBTLE CHANGES TO THE CURB CUT LAYOUT TO KEEP THE EXISTING TREE IF POSSIBLE, AND THE PETITIONER MUST SUBMIT ADDITIONAL PLANS TO SHOW THAT CONFIGURATION WITH THE TREE AND HOW BOTH THE TREE AND THE DRIVEWAY COULD BE MAINTAINED.

THERE WAS NO SECOND TO THE AMENDED MOTION. THE MOTION FAILED.

Commissioner Seyer reiterated that he could not support 4 curb cuts and he did not understand why the driveway to the accessory structure could not shift slightly to eliminate the need for a fourth curb cut. **Acting Chair Kubow** said he could not support a motion to allow a detached garage there. **Mr. Hautzinger** said that if the commission prohibits the accessory structure as part of this redevelopment plan approval, then the petitioner would not be allowed to come back later and get a permit for it; it would be prohibited. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said an amended motion could be made that states the accessory structure is not approved at this time, but he wanted to leave the door open for the petitioner to return in the future for an accessory structure. **Commissioner Seyer** said he supports the accessory structure because it is allowed by code, but he did not support a fourth curb cut.

Mr. Hautzinger read back the original motion made by Commissioner Fitzgerald, and commented that the petitioner acknowledged that without a driveway, the accessory structure is no longer a garage but a shed, and 300 square feet is the maximum allowed for a shed, so the proposed accessory structure would need to be reduced 12 square feet.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD TO AMEND THE MOTION AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. THAT IF THE SIZE OF THE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE CHANGES, IT SHOULD BE REVIEWED BY STAFF.**
- 2. THAT THERE IS THE OPTION TO NOT BUILD THE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE.**

COMMISSIONER SEYER SECONDED THE AMENDED MOTION.

Acting Chair Kubow said that after hearing all the facts about the accessory structure, he feels differently about it.

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

ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

Chair Kingsley returned to the room for the rest of the meeting.

ITEM 2. SINGLE-FAMILY ADDITION REVIEW

DC#25-094 – 819 S. Highland Ave.

Mike Hamman, representing *CD Group*, was present on behalf of the project.

Commissioner Eckhardt recused himself from the project and left the room for the discussion.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing a second-story addition to an existing single-story home, and an existing one-car attached garage will be converted to a two-car attached garage. The proposed plans comply with the R-3 single-family zoning requirements. This project is appearing before the Design Commission due to the proposed second-floor addition on a block where all of the surrounding homes are single-story.

Overall, the proposed second-floor addition is nicely designed to fit with the existing house and the surrounding context. The hipped roof works well to complement the character of the surrounding homes as well as to keep the height of the side walls down and diminish the mass of the new addition. The only minor comments on the proposed design are that the new front porch columns look too thin and the Craftsman style front door does not fit with the character of the house. Staff recommends wider porch columns and a simpler Colonial-style front door to better fit with the scale and style of the house. Overall, the design is nicely done and Staff recommends approval.

Mike Hamman said the existing home is non-compliant on the south side, which is why the second-floor addition is set back. There is no additional square footage to the existing footprint of the home. They are not opposed to Staff's suggestion to widen the columns and change the style of the front door.

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

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** said it is a very nicely designed home and he agreed with the suggestions about the columns and the front door. He suggested eliminating the eave above the window over the garage door so the focus is more on the front door and not the garage, unless it impacts that interior space. He had no further comments.

Commissioner Kubow agreed with the comments from Commissioner Fitzgerald. It is a nicely designed home and he appreciated that the precedent image of the home on Park Ave. was included, which is a very attractive home and in the same design as this home. He also agreed with the suggestion to change the style of the front door, which does not look cohesive with the rest of the home.

Commissioner Seyer agreed with everything said and had nothing further to add. **Chair Kingsley** had no additional comments other than a suggestion to add a covering over the door on the back of the home.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO APPROVE THE DESIGN OF THE PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY HOME LOCATED AT 819 S. HIGHLAND AVENUE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED ON 11/18/25, 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. A REQUIREMENT TO WIDEN THE PORCH COLUMNS, TO BE APPROVED BY STAFF.
2. A RECOMMENDATION TO CHANGE THE FRONT DOOR STYLE FROM CRAFTSMAN TO A SIMPLE COLONIAL.
3. A RECOMMENDATION TO ADD SOME TYPE OF SMALL OVERHANG ABOVE THE BACK DOOR.
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 was in support of the suggestion to eliminate the eave above the window above the garage, if the petitioner decides to do so.

**SEYER, AYE; KUBOW, AYE; FITZGERALD, AYE; KINGSLEY, AYE; ECKHARDT,
RECUSE.
MOTION CARRIED.**

Commissioner Eckhardt returned to the room for the rest of the meeting.

ITEM 3. COMMERCIAL REVIEW**DC#25-053 – Fairfield Homes – 526 S. Arthur Ave.**

Kevin Davis, representing *Fairfield Homes*, was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. Fairfield Homes, a local home builder and remodeler business, is proposing interior and exterior modifications to an existing commercial building to create a new office and showroom. All of the brick, stone, and windows on the existing front elevation will be completely removed to allow installation of a totally new facade. The new facade will be clad with white vertical board & batten siding and trim made of engineered wood. The design includes new large storefront windows with black frames as well as black canvas fabric awnings above the windows.

The scope of the project also includes improvements to the existing site including repaving and restriping the existing parking lot, patching and infilling the parking lot perimeter concrete curbs, and installation of new landscaping. Per code, all off-street parking areas containing more than four parking spaces are required to be screened along the public way. Such screening is generally accomplished with three-foot tall densely planted shrubs, except for within 12-feet of the driveway where the landscaping cannot exceed 18-inches in height to prevent blocking visibility. There is an existing landscape bed along Arthur Avenue that currently only has grass. The petitioner is proposing a continuous staggered row of three-foot tall Karl Forester grasses, which Staff agrees with as a very good salt tolerant option along the harsh roadway. However, within twelve feet of the driveway, instead of trying to maintain the Karl Forester grasses at 18-inches in height, it is recommended to provide an alternate hardy plant, such as Daylilies, which will not require trimming.

The petitioner is also proposing evergreen shrubs in the planting beds along the base of the storefront. Staff agrees with a row of evergreen shrubs in this location, but has concerns about the proposed Junipers which require full sun, where the east elevation will only allow partial sun. A continuous row of Hicks Yew shrubs is recommended instead.

Overall, the proposed improvements are welcome updates to the existing dated building. The new large storefront windows will work very well to highlight the new showroom interior. The awnings above the window will add nice depth to the facade, and the raised parapet will work well to screen the existing rooftop mechanical equipment. The proposed exterior design with wood siding and trim has a nice appearance and a residential feel that fits with the character of the petitioner's home construction and remodeling business. However, per the Village's Commercial Design Guidelines:

- *Materials and their color shall be selected for continuous harmony and aesthetic quality with adjacent buildings.*
- *Materials shall be of durable quality, such as stone and brick. Weather resistant wood is for trim only.*

All of the buildings on Arthur Avenue are earth-toned masonry construction, so the Design Commission should evaluate the proposed bright white all wood front façade. An alternative option to consider could be a painted brick exterior to achieve a similar appearance while providing the long-term durability of masonry.

Another detail to evaluate is the roof scupper and downspout locations, which look unresolved with the new facade design due to the jogging downspout across the front wall. It is recommended to relocate the scuppers to each side of the storefront windows for a more coordinated appearance.

With regards to signage, the rendering illustrates one wall sign on the front elevation located above the main entrance. The proposed wall sign looks nicely designed, and appears to be code compliant. The façade design works well to accommodate the wall sign and highlight the showroom entrance. The plans also indicate a conceptual ground sign. A low monument style ground sign, in lieu of a tall pole-mounted sign is a very nice design direction for the ground sign. Since the sign is not taller than 6-feet, there is no setback requirement. The sign is not shown on the Site Plan, but it will presumably be placed in the landscape bed along the front property line. There is flexibility on the exact location, but it is required to be located at least 12-feet away from the driveway to avoid blocking visibility. Separate sign permit applications along with detailed and dimensioned sign drawings are required for each sign. The petitioner intends to use trash bins which will be stored inside the building, so exterior trash screening is not required. With these comments, Staff recommends approval of the project.

Kevin Davis questioned the longevity of painting the brick versus the wood being proposed for the front facade. He was not in favor of moving the scuppers because it is a costly change to make, and because cars speed so fast down Arthur Avenue, cars can barely see his sign much less a scupper.

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** was in support of the proposed changes to the building and said it did not have to blend in with its surroundings; the building is set back enough, and it just needs to look nice. However, the other elevations are not shown and he did not understand what happens when the corners turn with regards to the materials. **Mr. Davis** said there is a typo on the drawing; there is no 'thin cut brick veneer' on the front elevation. The sides and rear of the building are existing masonry to remain and painted white to match the front. **Commissioner Seyer** said he could be in support of the design if the brick wrapped around both front corners of the building. He reiterated that he is favor of the design aesthetic and the materials, but he needs to see how it ties in with the rest of the building.

Commissioner Kubow agreed with those comments. He had no problem with the white color being proposed that will add pop to the building, he was fine with the sign, and he agreed with Staff's comments on the landscaping.

Commissioner Eckhardt was fine with the proposed changes, and he liked the white color being proposed because the building is set back. He had concerns about the durability of a white overhead garage door and suggested painting the door black instead. He loved the colors being proposed and agreed with the concerns about the corners of the building that should be wrapped on to the side elevations, approximately 1-foot. **Mr. Davis** understood.

Commissioner Fitzgerald agreed with everything said by the commissioners and added a comment that the low windows on the front elevation will make landscaping extremely limited. He cautioned the petitioner about knowing the full height of the new plants being added there. **Chair Kingsley** said plantings should also be drought resistant because of the awnings above. She also asked about the material behind the gooseneck lamps above the front door and how the material turns. **Mr. Davis** said the material is the same as the panel siding. **Chair Kingsley** asked how far the metal canopy below the signage above the front door will project, and **Mr. Davis** said not far, about 2-feet, and it will be painted black. **Chair Kingsley** was concerned about how that panel system will work with the goosenecks and the lighting. She asked the petitioner to provide that information to Staff for review. She also agreed with the

comments that the material on the front elevation should turn the corners at least 1-foot, including the parapet. She asked about the glass and **Mr. Davis** said it is clear.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS TO THE EXISTING BUILDING AT 526 S. ARTHUR AVENUE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 6/25/25, SITE/LANDSCAPE PLAN RECEIVED 11/23/25, COLOR RENDERING RECEIVED 12/8/25, 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. **A RECOMMENDATION TO CONSIDER PAINTING THE OVERHEAD GARAGE DOOR BLACK.**
2. **A RECOMMENATION TO BE COGNIZANT OF THE HEIGHT AND DROUGHT TOLERANCE OF THE PLANT MATERIAL BEING ADDED ALONG THE WINDOWS ON THE FRONT ELEVATION.**
3. **A REQUIREMENT TO WRAP THE FRONT FASCIA AND SIDING DOWN THE SIDES APPROXIMATELEY 1-FOOT.**
4. **A REQUIREMENT THAT THE REST OF THE BUILDING BE PAINTED WHITE.**
5. **AN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT THAT THE CANOPY ABOVE THE FRONT DOOR WILL PROJECT APPROXIMATLEY 2-FEET OUT FOR PROTECTION, THE WALL MATERIAL BEHIND THE WALL SIGN WILL BE THE SAME WHITE SIDING BEING USED ON THE BUILDING, AND THE STOREFRONT GLASS WILL BE CLEAR.**
6. **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 RESPONSIBILTY 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.**
7. **COMPLIANCE WITH ALL FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES.**

Chair Kingsley clarified that the petitioner previously stated the material above the front door will be panels in the same material as the board and batten.

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

5. **AN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT THAT THE CANOPY ABOVE THE FRONT DOOR WILL PROJECT APPROXIMATLEY 2-FEET OUT FOR PROTECTION, AND THE WALL MATERIAL BEHIND THE WALL SIGN WILL BE PANELS OF THE SAME WHITE SIDING BEING USED ON THE BUILDING, AND THE STOREFRONT GLASS WILL BE CLEAR.**

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

ITEM 4. SIGN VARIATION REVIEW**DC#25-088 – Arbor House – 25 E. Algonquin Rd.**

Adrien Binet representing *Thomas Roszak Architecture*, **Brian Carley**, representing *Bradford Allen*, and **Charles Witherington-Perkins**, representing *PlanGreatCities LLC*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. “Arbor House” (formerly known as the Arlington Gateway Development) is a new mixed-use development currently under construction at the southeast corner of Arlington Heights Road and Algonquin Road. The petitioner is requesting sign variations for five ground signs and four wall signs at the development.

Per code, two ground signs maximum are allowed (one per street frontage) with a requirement for a minimum 800-feet of separation between the signs (measured along the property lines). Therefore, a variation is required to allow the proposed five ground signs with separation distances of 293’, 26’, 275’, and 306’. Three of the proposed ground signs will be multi-tenant signs displaying the “Arbor House” name along with tenant panels for future commercial tenants. The three multi-tenant signs will be located at the three main access drives into the site: the southwest corner driveway from Arlington Heights Road, the central entrance driveway from Algonquin Road, and at the Tonne Drive street intersection. Two of the signs (Sign 1 at the southwest corner, and Sign 2 at Tonne Drive) are also proposed to include tenant panels for the proposed “Arlington Med” medical office building redevelopment which is located at 155 E. Algonquin Road. Since Arlington Med is not located on the subject property, an additional variation is required because code prohibits advertisement of a business that is not located on the same property as the sign. The two remaining ground signs (Signs 4 & 5) will only display the “Arbor House” name and they are proposed to be located at the northwest corner of the development, flanking the circular plaza facing Arlington Heights Road and Algonquin Road. All five of the signs are less than the maximum allowed ground sign size and height per code.

In addition to the ground signs, the petitioner is proposing four “AH” wall signs to be located at the top of the building at the northwest and southwest corners. Per code, two wall signs maximum are allowed at the top of the building (one per street frontage). Code also limits the size of the signs to 25% of the signable wall area. Two of the proposed wall signs are less than 25% of the signable wall area, but the other two signs are greater than 25%. Two of the wall signs comply with code, but the other two wall signs require variations for the number of signs as well as the size of the signs.

The petitioner has submitted a letter addressing the sign variation criteria, which in summary states that the additional ground signs are needed for wayfinding and safety due to the scale of the site with multiple access drives and traffic approaching from several directions. The off-premise medical office tenant panels are needed for wayfinding due to the office building having no street frontage. The petitioner did not address all of the criteria for the proposed wall signs, but states that the wall signs are modest in scale relative to the very large facades.

Staff does not object to the three multi-tenant ground signs which make sense to be located at each of the main entry drives for wayfinding. However, Staff does not believe that the two “ARBOR HOUSE” signs at the northwest corner are necessary and believes that five multi-tenant ground signs for this development is excessive. While Staff acknowledges that all of the ground signs are tastefully designed, and are less than the maximum allowed size and height, due to the location and visual prominence of the development, Staff does not feel that the additional ground signs are warranted.

In regards to the three multi-tenant ground signs, there are some unique issues regarding Ground Sign 3 which require unique conditions for approval. This ground sign is proposed to be located at the southwest corner of Algonquin Road and Tonne Drive and is within an easement that is outside of the property boundary. The location of the sign within the easement requires approval from the existing adjacent Lincoln Atrium Condo Association office complex. Therefore, if the requested sign variation is approved, a sign permit still cannot be issued without the Condo Association approval. Additionally, the existing Tonne Drive is proposed for possible widening to accommodate a new left turn lane. As shown on the plans, if/when the road is widened, the proposed sign will become abnormally close to the street curb. Therefore, Staff is recommending a condition to require the possible relocation of this ground sign to create a greater setback from the street curb for visibility if/when the Tonne Drive widening is implemented.

In regards to the proposed off-premise "Arlington Med" tenant panels, Staff has no objection due to the unique circumstance of the building having no street frontage and the need for additional wayfinding.

In regards to the proposed wall signs, Staff feels the "AH" wall sign message is vague, and encouraged the petitioner to consider changing the signs to read "ARBOR HOUSE", which would be a clear message for the name of the building. However, the petitioner did not want to explore that option due to difficulties with integrating the sign with the building design. Staff still feels that "ARBOR HOUSE" wall signs would be more effective, but Staff is not opposed to the proposed "AH" signs. However, Staff does not agree with the need for four wall signs. Despite the wall signs being relatively small compared to the size of the building, there is no hardship to justify the need for four wall signs. Staff recommends two code-compliant wall signs, keeping the sign on the south wall and the sign on the north end of the west wall, and omitting the other two wall signs.

Staff recommends the Design Commission evaluate the sign variation request to allow five ground signs with separation distances as proposed, where only two ground signs are allowed. Staff recommends approval for the sign variation request to allow two 5.78 sf off-premise tenant panels for Arlington Med. Staff recommends denial of the sign variation request to allow four wall signs at the top of the multi-story building.

Adrien Binet referred to the aerial site plan and said this phase of the large development is just under 4 acres, and the ground signs being proposed, including the main sign at the northeast corner of the site, are important to show both the retail presence and the building presence. These ground signs will create a better presence for the entire building that can be seen from both the north and the west. The sign at the southwest corner of the site is mostly for the retailers, with a small Arbor House sign at the top of the sign to show the entrance to the parking, as well as signage for the Arlington Med medical building to the south which has no street frontage. No large retail signs are proposed, and there will be no retail signage on the east and south frontages. The overall square footage for the five proposed ground signs is less than what is allowed by Village code for two large signs on the two frontages. The four AH wall signs at the top of the building are for visibility, and the faceted design helps break up the facade and break down the massing of the building, as opposed to having signage across the elevation. They feel the number of signs being proposed relates to the number of surrounding streets and roads, including the south access road. The four wall signs help identify this gateway into the Village and Arbor House, as well as help overall wayfinding for the site.

Charles Witherington-Perkins provided a summary comparing the proposed signage to what is allowed by code, which includes the size of the signs, double versus single-sided signs,

and total square footage. With regards to hardship, the angle of Algonquin Road makes for challenges, and there is only one full access entrance to the site which is at Tonne Road. The ground sign proposed at the driveway on the south can only be accessed from northbound Arlington Heights Road, and the site can only be accessed from eastbound Algonquin Road. The two Arbor House ground signs at the northwest corner of the site will provide visibility for north/south traffic that cannot see the other ground signs being proposed. Traffic from the west passing Tonne Road will need to turn around and come back to the site from the east.

Commissioner Eckhardt asked if Guitar Center is part of this new development, and how traffic going south on Arlington Height Road will access the site. **Brian Carley** replied that they now own Guitar Center, which will be part of a future phase of development. There is currently a median along Arlington Heights Road that does not allow for a left turn into the site when going south. This is a challenging site so the corner of the site is clearly marked with two 'Arbor House' ground signs as well as the 'AH' wall signs on the building, along with an additional 26 acres to the north that will add more buildings in the future for additional visibility of the site. The main entrance to the building is tucked underneath the building, midway on Algonquin Road. **Mr. Binet** pointed out the two driveways that go under the building that can be accessed from both Algonquin Road and from the entry off Arlington Heights Road.

Charles Witherington-Perkins said the four proposed wall signs are intended to be subtle and modest, with the idea that coming west on the tollway or coming west on Algonquin Road will promote both the development and the community. Having the wall sign on just the south side of the building will not provide visibility from the tollway that having a sign on the west side from Arlington Heights Road as well. They recognize that the four wall signs total 84 sf versus 194 sf allowed by code. This development is the largest development built along this corridor, with 300 units and 30 affordable units, which is the most affordable units built by a private developer in Arlington Heights to date, as well as 26,000 square feet of commercial space, which is the largest commercial development built since Mitsuwa was built in 1991 along this corridor. This development will be a catalyst for this corridor and the thought is that while these variations are needed, the proposed signs are modest in nature and the unique shape of the site and access justify them.

Chair Kingsley asked if future development of the site will also be called Arbor House, and the petitioner said that each building will get its own name. She asked about the difference in lighting between the wall signs and the ground signs. The petitioner said the wall signs will be backlit from behind the letters, possibly color changing; the small Arbor House ground signs will not be lit; and the three tenant ground signs will be backlit except for the 'Arbor House' at the top of the signs will not be lit.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jack Tse, a resident of Arlington Heights, said he is also a representative of Path Construction on behalf of the adjacent property owner at 125 E. Algonquin, and a member of the Lincoln Atrium Association that is the adjacent property. He spoke about Ground Sign 3 proposed at the northeast corner of the site at Tonne Road. This sign is located outside the site boundary which requires approval from the Association. An easement request has been submitted and is still under consideration by the Association. He was concerned about the new ground sign and the obelisk being proposed there, because there is an existing sign that the Association has in that same location that would be effectively blocked by the new sign. The wedge is Association property and they have not reached an agreement with the petitioner on the terms of that easement which he wanted to be noted for the record. The Association has

requested information from the petitioner for the exact definition of ownership and the easement rights on that property, as well as the future expansion of the turning lane onto Tonne Road, which are questions they would like to have addressed. He would like future development plans discussed.

Brian Carley asked Mr. Tse who he represents, and Mr. Tse responded that he speaks for Path Construction, but the points that he raised tonight are the views of the Association.

Mr. Hautzinger said the plan being presented tonight shows the petitioner's plans for the northeast corner of the site, which includes the new ground sign, obelisk, plaza, and removal of the existing sign. The review tonight will move the sign variation request through the approval process and onto the Village Board, but the variation approval will include a condition that requires written approval from the Lincoln Condo Association, as well as a condition to potentially require relocation of that ground sign if the road is widened in the future. No permit will be issued for the sign until the conditions are met.

The commissioners summarized their comments.

Commissioner Eckhardt was not opposed to the variations for any of the signs being proposed. Signage at the northeast corner of the site is very important and there should be a sign there; however, the petitioner should understand the process if that ground sign needs to be relocated if the road is widened. He was initially confused by the 'AH' wall signs and whether they meant Arbor House or Arlington Heights, and he asked if the signs are placeholders until the rest of the site is developed. He asked if the development has an official logo. The petitioner said there is no logo developed yet for the site, and the wall signs shown are intended to be permanent. **Commissioner Eckhardt** was in support of the wall signs shown on both sides at both corners of the building, and in general, the number of signs being proposed are modest despite what code allows, as shown in the petitioner's summary presented. Signage for the medical building is very important as well. He was in favor of the sign variations being requested tonight.

Commissioner Fitzgerald said the project as a whole is really nice and it's exciting to see this tonight. He was okay with all the locations of the ground signs; the 'AH' wall signs are unusual and he was unsure if he liked that; he liked the locations of the wall signs because of the building, and the size of the wall signs look like they belong architecturally. The two ground signs at the corner of the site look really cool, and he was in support of the variations.

Commissioner Seyer said the project looks really nice but he was confused about the signage because there is no street address on any of the signs. He asked if there are more signs to come that will include the address of the building. This seems like a lot of signs that state 'Arbor House' and he asked why. **Mr. Binet** said there will be additional wayfinding/directional signs within the site that have addresses for each building and each retail space, or the name of the retail space, and each retail door entrance will have an address on it.

Commissioner Seyer was confused about why the ground signs show the retail names and not the address of the building. He did not understand the need for that. He was not opposed to the number of signs being requested, or the size of the signs; he was just confused about why the address of the building is not on the ground signs, especially the two signs at the corner. He also questioned why signage is needed at the top of a residential building because the four 'AH' wall signs scream hotel to him, and he was concerned about setting a precedent where every building has signage at the top no matter where it is. He said the details of the wall signs are not as clean as perhaps what is being shown. There is an entire metal structure that is holding the 'AH' wall signs, and it will be framed in metal. He did not want to force

this through and then the signs look terrible or not as nice as everything else coming together here, and then a precedent has been set.

Commissioner Kubow said the design of the 'AH' wall signs are clean and playful, and he was not bothered by four signs; however, he agreed with the concerns about setting a precedent here. This is a unique location and we want it to be successful, it is a gateway, so there is a little more leniency for him. He was not bothered by the lack of addresses on the ground signs because the building is very large and obvious, with nothing around it; people will know where they are when they see it. He asked for clarification of the materials behind the wall signs, and **Mr. Binet** referred to the specification drawings for the wall signs and explained the structural materials. **Commissioner Kubow** questioned the need for two ground signs facing west, although he was not overly concerned about that. Overall, he was okay with everything being proposed and wants to be supportive because of the importance of the success of this project, but he also does not want to set a poor precedent.

Chair Kingsley said the overall signage package is really good. She supports the ground signs with tenant names that are very useful and very important. She asked where the ground sign at the northeast corner of the site would move to if the Association did not give their approval. **Mr. Binet** said there is a plan to move the obelisk and the ground sign to the west, if the Association does not approve their request. **Chair Kingsley** also said the Arbor House ground signs at the corner of Arlington Heights Road and Algonquin Road work well with the plaza design proposed for that corner, but she questioned why those signs are not illuminated. She acknowledged that the obelisk will be lit and had concerns about it being dark-sky compliant. She felt Commissioner Seyer made a good point that there is no address on the signs, and that the residential area is being named. **Mr. Binet** said that with two street frontages, the retailers will have addresses on both Algonquin Road and Arlington Heights Road.

Mr. Hautzinger agreed that lighting is important for the two 'Arbor House' ground signs at the corner of Arlington Heights Road and Algonquin Road. If the signs are not illuminated, the signs could get lost and be ineffective. He suggested that the petitioner consider a push-through style lettering which would be a tasteful and subtle way to light the signs. **Mr. Binet** said they did not specifically consider that type of sign; they do not want to overwhelm this area with lighting because the obelisk has 3 lights within each fin on the outside, pointing just at the obelisk. They also studied the dark sky compliance and the obelisk lights are rated to have a specified fall off distance.

Chair Kingsley was unsure about the 'AH' wall signs on the building. She understood Staff's opinion that 4 wall signs are a lot, and whether 2 wall signs are needed at each corner. She also understood why the petitioner wants the four wall signs, which visually anchor the corner of the building. She agreed with the concerns about the mounting details of the wall signs, and asked if there will be shadows around the box of the sign that will be seen.

Commissioner Eckhardt asked if the Village Fire Department had any concerns about this building not having signage with an address. **Mr. Binet** said the Fire Department has reviewed all the exterior wayfinding signs for the building itself, including fire hydrant locations and connections, but the signs presented tonight have not been part of that conversation.

Mr. Binet explained that the wall sign letters are not as far off the building as shown in the drawing, and there will be a horizontal white tube behind the letters that is currently not shown on the drawings. With the building complete, they looked at different options to get the sign structure to stand off from the building, such as going over the parapets, or going into the slab edges. The tubes can be underneath and above the letters instead of directly

behind the letters, but it is hard to get away from a frame to hold up the letters. **Chair Kingsley** suggested doing a mock-up of the wall sign system, that could be provided to Staff. **Commissioner Seyer** stressed the importance of knowing how the details of the back-up structure of the wall signs will look to ensure that the signs will look as good as what is being shown tonight. He questioned whether the letters themselves should be illuminated in the front, with dark metal on the sides. He had concerns about the size of the metal frame and the close proximity they are to each other and how much of the frame will be visible.

Commissioner Kubow was fine with the overall look of all the signs being proposed, but he agreed with the concerns that there is not enough information tonight about the details of the wall signs. **Chair Kingsley** agreed with those concerns, and said she was leaning towards having only 2 wall signs, as recommended by Staff. She also was in favor of the two 'Arbor House' ground signs being lit in some way. **Commissioner Eckhardt** agreed with the concerns that details of the wall signs are needed to ensure the signs will look as shown tonight. He felt the petitioner understood these concerns and could provide details drawings to Staff for review, which could be included in a motion. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** was open to the comments given by the other commissioners.

Mr. Hautzinger said the petitioner has done an outstanding job on this development and felt that they have the knowledge and skill to address the comments and concerns made by the commissioners tonight regarding the wall sign mounting details. **Commissioner Seyer** asked if coloring of the sign lighting was allowed by code. **Mr. Hautzinger** said that the plans as submitted show the sign lighting to be white. Code prohibits strobing, blinking, and changing lights. He asked the petitioner what their intention is in regards to sign lighting color. **Mr. Binet** said they have not finalized if the wall sign lighting would change color, and LED lights offer many color options. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said it could be fun to change the color for holidays, but the lights cannot be fast moving or distracting, and the petitioner understood. **Mr. Hautzinger** stated that the proposed signs are being reviewed based on the plans submitted, which indicate all lighting to be white with no mention of color changing.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO RECOMMEND TO THE VILLAGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, APPROVE THE FOLLOWING SIGN VARIATIONS FOR ARBOR HOUSE LOCATED AT 25 E. ALGONQUIN ROAD:

GROUND SIGNS

1. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-302.A NUMBER, TO ALLOW FIVE GROUND SIGNS WITH SEPARATION DISTANCES OF 293', 26', 275', AND 306', WHERE ONLY TWO GROUND SIGNS ARE ALLOWED (ONE PER STREET FRONTAGE) WITH A MINIMUM REQUIRED SEPARATION DISTANCE OF 800 FEET.
2. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-120.F PROHIBITED SIGNS, TO ALLOW TWO 5.78 SF OFF-PREMISE TENANT PANELS FOR ARLINGTON MED (LOCATED AT 155 E. ALGONQUIN ROAD) ON GROUND SIGNS #1 & 3, WHERE IT IS PROHIBITED TO ADVERTISE A BUSINESS WHICH IS NOT LOCATED ON THE SAME PROPERTY AS THE SIGN.

WALL SIGNS:

3. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-402.B NUMBER, TO ALLOW FOUR WALL SIGNS AT THE TOP OF A MULTI-STORY BUILDING, WHERE ONLY TWO WALL SIGNS ARE ALLOWED (ONE PER STREET FRONTAGE).
4. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-403.A DIMENSIONS, TO ALLOW A 21 SF WALL SIGN ON THE WEST WALL OF THE BUILDING, WHERE 0 SF IS ALLOWED.
5. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-403.A DIMENSIONS, TO ALLOW

A 21 SF WALL SIGN ON THE NORTH WALL OF THE BUILDING, WHERE 0 SF IS ALLOWED.

THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON PLANS RECEIVED 10/24/25, FEDERAL, STATE AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING:

1. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE MOUNTING DETAILS FOR THE 'AH' WALL SIGNS BE FURTHER DETAILED AND SUBMITTED TO STAFF FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT.
2. A REQUIREMENT TO RESOLVE THE EASTERN GROUND SIGN EASEMENT ISSUE WITH THE LINCOLN ATRIUM CONDO ASSOCIATION AS SOON AS POSSIBLE WITH LEGAL DOCUMENTATION APPROVING GROUND SIGN #3 IN THE PROPOSED LOCATION.
3. A REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE ALTERNATE SITE PLANS TO SHOW WHERE THE SIGN WILL BE LOCATED IF TONNE ROAD IS WIDENED, OR IF APPROVAL FROM THE ADJACENT CONDO BOARD ASSOCIATION IS NEVER OBTAINED.
4. A REQUIREMENT TO LIGHT THE 'ARBOR HOUSE' LETTERING ON GROUND SIGNS #4 & #5 WITH AN ACCEPTABLE METHOD OF ILLUMINATION.
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.

Commissioner Kubow commented about requiring dark-sky compliance for the obelisk. **Mr. Hautzinger** said the design and illumination of the obelisks were reviewed at the time of the building design.

Mr. Hautzinger asked the petitioner if they will be able to provide the site plans showing the alternate ground sign locations to include for the Village Board review. **Mr. Binet** said that they are happy to provide more exhibits to show other location options for moving the sign and obelisk at the northeast corner of the site, prior to Village Board review.

Commissioner Eckhardt asked about the purpose of the easement and when it was established. **Mr. Perkins** said the easement was established when the lots were platted in 1982 or 1983. Lincoln Atrium and the Daily Herald building were part of one planning and development with a cross-access easement coming through there, and the two dilapidated signs that are there now were approved with a variation around that same time. The easement allows signage for all the neighbors, including the office building which has no visibility. **Mr. Carley** said the easement is no longer relevant and they are seeking to vacate it.

Chair Kingsley asked if the commissioners were okay with having 4 wall signs, versus only 2 as recommended by Staff. **Commissioner Kubow** preferred 3 wall signs, but was okay with the motion as it stands.

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

ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

Mr. Hautzinger said the next Village Board meeting is January 20, 2026 and he will be in contact with the petitioner to confirm.

ITEM 5. OTHER BUSINESS

Public Comment

Keith Moens commented that the motion made tonight for the teardown project was well structured and transparent.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:40 P.M. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.