

DESIGN

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF A MEETING  
BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS  
DESIGN COMMISSION

COMMISSION

RE: 16 EAST EUCLID AVENUE – SF/TEARDOWN - DC #25-102  
(CONTINUED FROM 4/14/25)

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of  
Arlington Heights Design Commission taken at the Arlington Heights  
Village Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 3rd Floor, Community Room,  
Arlington Heights, Illinois on the 28th day of April, 2026 at the hour of  
6:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

SCOTT SEYER, Acting Chairperson  
JOHN FITZGERALD  
JONATHAN KUBOW  
TED ECKHARDT  
KIRSTEN KINGSLEY (Not Present)

ALSO PRESENT:

STEVE HAUTZINGER, Design Planner

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Okay, the bewitching hour at 6:30 has passed. Our Chairman, Kirsten Kingsley, is not here this evening. So, it's my duty to make a motion to nominate a substitute Chairman tonight. I nominate Scott Seyer.

Second?

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: I'll second the motion.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: All in favor say aye?

(Chorus of ayes.)

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Okay.

All right, Scott, it's your show.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, I'd like to call the Design Commission to order. Today is Tuesday, April 28th, and we'll call the first item as the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, thank you.

Now, I believe we take the roll call.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Yes.

Commissioner Fitzgerald.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Here.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Kubow.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Here.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Eckhardt.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Here.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Chairperson Kingsley.

(No response.)

MR. HAUTZINGER: And Commissioner Seyer.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Here.

So, next up is the approval of the minutes.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to approve the minutes from 4/14/26.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: I'll second the motion to approve the minutes.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: We have a second. All those in favor say aye?

(Chorus of ayes.)

MR. HAUTZINGER: I guess we do a roll call.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Wait, wait, wait. We want to do a roll call.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Yes.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: So, we'll do a roll call for approval of the minutes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Fitzgerald.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Kubow.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Eckhardt.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: And Acting Chair Seyer.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Yes.

Okay, so the minutes have been approved and we'll move on to the old business that we have, the first item on our agenda, which is 16 East Euclid, DC #25-102.

We'll have Staff begin the report. The Applicant, after that, will be open to make some statements, and then we'll have a discussion.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Okay, the Petitioner is here tonight, proposing to demolish an existing two-story house with a detached two-car garage to allow construction of a new two-story house with an attached three-car garage. The plans do comply with all of the R-3 zoning requirements.

This subject property, I'll pull up the aerial here, is located in the Historic Arlington Neighborhood Association, also known as the HANA neighborhood. The existing home which is proposed to be demolished, it was included in the Community Preservation Report that was prepared for the Village of Arlington Heights by the School of the Art Institute back in 2004. This was a report that was prepared to promote the preservation of historic homes and raise awareness of historic preservation. The goal is to maintain historic character in certain neighborhoods in Arlington Heights such as the HANA neighborhood. Homes in the report are rated in order of importance as contributing, notable, and exceptional. The subject house is rated as contributing.

Let me pull over an image of that house up. So, this is an older Google street view from 2019 that shows basically how the house looks in its context. Per code, prior to issuing a certificate of approval for demolition and new construction, the Design Commission does need to review the existing home to determine if it has "significant architectural, historical, aesthetic or cultural value." In Staff's assessment, as far as a historic home, Staff feels that the home has a little bit of an awkward massing to it. It even questions whether or not the right half of the home was possibly an addition to the left half of the home.

Here's another view, this clearly being a more historic older part. The right side looks a little uncharacteristic of the period for the home, hard to say for sure. But the front porch, you know, meets the bay window at the front of the house in an awkward way, these roof lines look unoriginal. Clearly, the porch design doesn't have much historic character to it. Then, the interior of the house is in pretty poor condition. Here are some images provided by the Petitioner. So, there's really almost nothing of historical significance that will be worth preserving in this home in Staff's assessment.

So, normally, we would encourage renovation and addition of a contributing historic home in lieu of a tear-down and new construction. But in this case, Staff doesn't see any significant architectural value and, so therefore, Staff is not opposed to the proposed demolition. Again, it will be up to the Design Commission to evaluate that, but that's Staff's position on the existing home.

In regards to the proposed new house which is depicted on the bottom of the screen in the center, that's the drawing of the new front elevation between the two existing neighboring homes. Overall, Staff feels this is nicely

designed. It's traditional in style that will generally fit well in this location. You can see on the plan view above, it does have this side-load garage wing out front which can work well to turn the face of the garage doors away from the street. In this case, it fits nicely with the adjacent home to the left which has a similar configuration. The driveways are not shown here, but this is also a side-load garage.

There's one more detail that's unique to this particular site which is kind of unusual. But there is a ComEd transformer, let me zoom in here, there's a ComEd transformer in the front yard and an easement running through the front yard of the house which is very unusual. So, the design of the house kind of fits nicely around it. It does push the house back a little bit further than the other homes, but again, this is an unusual condition that they had to design around.

So, all things considered, Staff is recommending approval as submitted.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Apologies, I was just kind of going through the drawings.

So, is the Petitioner present?

MR. HAUTZINGER: I believe so.

MR. AUGELLO: We are.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Would you like to speak and remark on Staff's comments?

MR. AUGELLO: Yes, I can, absolutely. So, my name is Joe Augello, President of New Construction for Icon Building Group.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Do you mind coming up here?  
Sorry.

MR. AUGELLO: No, not at all.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: And just state your name and your address if that's okay again?

MR. AUGELLO: Absolutely. My name is Joe Augello, President of New Construction of Icon Building Group. Tonight with me is Jeremy Murphy, Director of Business Development. We're located at 106 Roman Lane, and the address here for tonight is 16 East Euclid.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, anything to add to Staff's report as far as comments you agree with or disagree with of any kind?

MR. AUGELLO: Yes. To be honest, Steve did a wonderful job explaining that. Our client is, you know, very eager and excited to be in Arlington Heights. I think Steve depicted the current condition of the home very well. It does look like it's kind of been, for lack of a better word, pieced together. So, I don't think that we are losing any characteristics that is part of the HANA program if you will.

I think that the new custom home that we will be bringing to that location will enlighten the area and complement the existing neighbors, especially with the side-load as Steve pointed out, an addition to the elevation that we have designed I think will complement the area very nicely.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, thank you very much.

MR. AUGELLO: Thank you, guys.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Is there anybody from the public

that would like to speak on this matter?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, nobody's there.

So, we'll move to discussion on the Commission. I will go to my left here.

Commissioner Eckhardt?

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I don't have much to say. I think it's a nicely designed elevation. The use of materials is diverse. The one thing that we usually look at and talk about are covers over exterior doors. We've got one on the right-side elevation. We look for small roofs for drip lines. I would suggest when the motion comes, that that be either a requirement or a recommendation. We'll have to see which way the wind blows on that; otherwise, I'm good with it.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Kubow?

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: I agree with Commissioner Eckhardt. I think when we evaluate homes in the HANA District, context is important. So, we have to look around to see what's happening, both east and west or north and south, and I see a lack of consistency architecturally to the homes around them. So, I'm fine with a tear-down.

Then, for the existing home, there's nothing notable about it. It lacks, just it's a mismatch of architecture. So, there should be no issue with this being a tear-down.

As for the architecture of the proposed home, I think it's wonderfully designed. I think it's going to fit in with the neighborhood considering the house to the west, and I like the material palette as well.

So, overall, I approve as proposed.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, thank you.

And Commissioner Fitzgerald?

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: I agree with what's already been said. Regarding the covers over the door, the side door and back door, I would say a recommendation would be fine. That's it.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, thank you.

I really don't have anything much to add to it as I'm really in agreement with the other Commissioners that the house, you know, has no historic value in a sense and I think the new house is quite nicely designed. So, I'm in favor of this.

Does anybody want to make a recommendation, or I'm sorry, a motion?

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: I'd be happy to. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move to approve.

**A motion to approve the proposed new (tear-down) single-family residence located at 16 East Euclid Avenue based on the architectural plans received 4/15/26, site engineering plan received 2/19/26, materials/colors received 12/18/25, and a recommendation that a small roof structure over the rear four-**

**door elevation and the side-door single elevation be included, just a small drip line to keep water from driving into the doors when they open.**

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: I'll second.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, thank you.

Second is by Commissioner Fitzgerald.

I would say to the Applicant, you're familiar with recommendation versus requirement. Recommendations are something that we recommend you do, you're not required to, but it's in the best interest of our feelings that you should evaluate this and it would be a strong recommendation I would say to propose this additional element to the design, but otherwise, it looks like it's approved as noted. So, we'd like to do a roll call vote for approval.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Fitzgerald.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Kubow.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Eckhardt.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: And Acting Chair Seyer.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Yes.

It's approved, thank you very much.

MR. AUGELLO: Understood. Thank you, gentlemen.

(Whereupon, the meeting on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 6:44 p.m.)

DESIGN

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF A MEETING  
BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS  
DESIGN COMMISSION

COMMISSION

RE: 510 WEST SIGWALT STREET – SF/TEARDOWN - DC #26-024

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of  
Arlington Heights Design Commission taken at the Arlington Heights  
Village Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 3rd Floor, Community Room,  
Arlington Heights, Illinois on the 28th day of April, 2026 at the hour of  
6:44 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

SCOTT SEYER, Acting Chairperson  
JOHN FITZGERALD  
JONATHAN KUBOW  
TED ECKHARDT  
KIRSTEN KINGSLEY (Not Present)

ALSO PRESENT:

STEVE HAUTZINGER, Design Planner

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: We will now move on to new business. The first one will be 510 West Sigwalt Street. We will repeat the process, so Staff will give a report, and the Petitioner will have a chance to come up and speak on behalf of their application.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Okay, the Petitioner is proposing to demolish an existing single-story house with an attached two-car garage to allow construction of a new single-story residence with an attached three-car side-load garage. These plans also comply with all of the R-3 zoning requirements.

This property is located on a street that is made up of older, traditional style homes. Those homes have characteristics such as a raised first floor, one-and-a-half-story or a two-story massing, and detached garages. The existing house that's proposed to be demolished is actually a single-story house with an attached front-load garage which is actually, you could argue, is out of context with the existing character on the street.

Let me zoom in on these photos just a little bit. So, this is the existing home proposed to be demolished. It's really kind of the oddball on the block. The other homes along the north, at the north side of Sigwalt Street here are all, have more of a historic traditional character to them.

Ideally, a new home in this location will be designed with a traditional style and massing and, possibly, ideally, a detached garage or maybe an attached garage that's recessed back from the front of the house to be less prominent, which would complement the character of the homes on the block and could be a nice improvement replacing the existing home, again which looks out of place. The proposed new home, however, does have more of a contemporary appearance. So, it's something that we're looking for the Design Commission to evaluate the architectural design tonight.

So, up on the screen, this is the context elevation showing the existing home here in the middle with the neighboring home to the right, neighboring home to the left, and then the proposed new home on the bottom elevation in the middle, again next to the existing homes for context and scale.

Per the Arlington Heights Single-Family Design Guidelines, the Design Commission should evaluate the following concerns that Staff has outlined regarding the proposed new design.

First is the architectural style, basically just evaluating the proposed contemporary style against the surrounding more traditional character.

Second item is the garage wing. This home, too, is proposing a side-load garage, three-car side-load garage. So, the site plan up on the screen, you can see the garage wing out in front. In this case, it pushes the main body of the house back and, again in this case, it's nearly behind the adjacent home to the, north is turned on this plan, so to the east around the top of this page here, which is something that we watch for to avoid a potential negative impact on the adjacent property.

Third issue that we were looking at is the front setback. In this case, they're actually exceeding the minimum required front setback which is 17.9 feet, which is based on the average setback of the homes on the block. So, that's the dashed line that's shown here on the site plan, but the house is actually set

back to the front of the garage at 32.8 feet. So, that's allowed, that complies with code. They're exceeding the minimum requirement, but it does kind of exaggerate or add to the concern that Staff has as far as breaking the context on the street and pushing the home too far back on its lot, which again could have a negative impact on the adjacent side.

The design of the home also creates a relatively long side wall along the west side here, which, with the garage wing out in front, then the main body of the house, and then there's, I believe it's a bedroom wing on the back of the home, all those together add up to a relatively long wall. Here is the architectural elevation of that wall. That being said, the architect did do a nice job of alternating the materials. They kind of jog the floor plan in and out, changed the roof forms a bit, so, nice job to try to work with a relatively long wall and break it up so that it doesn't feel just like a big, straight, flat wall. But, again, something for the Design Commission to look at.

Finally is the color scheme. The proposed material palette for the siding is probably the most unique detail which is a stained composite, tongue-and-groove siding. So, I believe it will be a flush installation as opposed to like a more traditional lap siding. With the stained wood color combined with the darker windows and darker trim, again, it's just going to have a bit more of a contemporary appearance as compared to the more traditional homes around it for the Design Commission to consider.

So, one last comment we wanted to make is just in the Staff report, you know, we always kind of look for with, given these concerns raised by Staff, what would we recommend doing instead. So, in the Staff report, and we have a couple of images here, and I just wanted to explain these images are cut and paste, totally generic from the Internet. This is nothing in Arlington Heights. They're just random images to help illustrate a potential different arrangement for the garage. It's a little hard to put that into words, so sometimes a picture is worth a thousand words.

You know, what a scheme like this could do is to bring the front wall of the house closer to the setback line along the street for a more continuous street scape. Then, instead of having that long garage wing out in front, around the side of the house here would be two of the three cars, and then the third car could potentially be a front-load that's recessed back to minimize the impact on the neighbors to the west. So, again, this isn't intended to dictate any architectural style or design for the project, but just wanted to share those, that example as a potential other direction.

So, those are our comments and we're just recommending the Design Commission evaluate this design proposal.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, thank you very much.

Is there anybody from the Applicant that would like to speak?

MR. LOSSELYOUNG: Yes.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: If you don't mind, again, just state your name and address.

MR. LOSSELYOUNG: Yes.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Thank you very much.

Appreciate you coming up.

MR. LOSSELYOUNG: So, I'm Rob Losselyoung with Tinaglia Architects. We're here on behalf of our client, Marla and John Kopke. They are long-time Arlington Heights residents living in the north side of town. They want to, you know, raise the family and now looking to build a new home to age in place. They found this lot on Sigwalt and fell in love with it because of its size and significance near to the downtown. You know, John has a career of a residential home inspector, and so the man has more knowledge than I could ever have, how things are built and, you know, efficiencies and insulation and different systems.

So, you know, he had already had an opinion of the home he wanted to design and build, came to us with, you know, some preliminary drawings and layouts. What we've done is tried to adopt those to fit within what we felt was the appropriate design for the street scape and also try and maintain as much of their hopes and dreams and wishes for this home as they could have.

We have worked with Steve as he mentioned. Initially, there was a four-car garage that's tucked on a little bit further, we would have needed 12 feet of that, and turned it down to a three-car garage. A little bit of history, or a context I guess as to why we're placing the home on the site where we are, we're going to try and maintain and save the existing foundation of the home that's there. The reason for that is we're going to use it as a geothermal bunker to utilize, you know, the heating and cooling for the house. Again, John knows way more about that than I do.

But what we tried to do, and if I can walk up to the screen real quick, it's hard to see, but there's a dashed line in there which represents the existing home footprint. So, what we're going to try and do is take this part where the main basement of the existing home is and cover up as much of that as we can per code with our driveway in order for them to utilize that as this basin for this geothermal system. So, that forced us then and that kind of dictated where we wanted to place the home. So, the driveway sits right to the rear of that and then it comes forward and covers over that, which actually worked out perfectly for us. There is some work we need to do obviously with the new garage over that existing foundation but, you know, we'll get into that with the construction of it.

The second item I think is, being on Sigwalt, there's no parking allowed on Sigwalt. So, they wanted to be able to have a nice sized driveway, again within code, so that they can be able to park family, friends. You know, the way that the house is laid out is it's got the design of the garage and then the bedrooms along the west elevation abutting the six rear yards. We felt that was the most comfortable spot to put that which allowed the main area of the home to be centered and have direct access to the large rear yard.

Another reason for the driveway and the way we have it is there's going to be a handicap ramp. Again, they'll be aging in place and they wanted to have a handicap ramp directly accessible from the driveway. So, that's indicated on there as well.

In terms of the style, you know, we're looking at, I agree with Steve, it is a little modern, we would consider it a modern craftsman style or an arts and crafts style. You know, we worked on a color palette that we felt would work

well within the street scape, nice, warm colors, even though it is tending to be a little bit more on the modern side of the design. With a clear story section in the middle, there's a lot of homes in that area that have dormers or second floors that pop up through the roof line. So, we were just trying, again with this design, to kind of mimic some of the existing elements that are on that street scape.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, thank you very much; appreciate that.

Is there anybody from the public that would like to speak on this application? Please come forward. Sorry to repeat myself, but if you could state your name and address; that would be great.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: His name is Klondike Matisse.

MR. McCASKEY: So, my name is Kevin McCaskey, life-long resident of Arlington Heights. I own 422 Sigwalt which is two houses over. I also owned 510 Sigwalt for two years before selling it to the current owners.

I'm here in support of the request to move the setback of the new construction home farther back from the street. From my personal experience of living there, the current placement of the home creates real limitations, particularly with the driveway depth. On a street where parking isn't permitted, vehicles on the driveway often extend over the sidewalk which then raises both safety and aesthetic concerns.

Given the unusual depth of this lot, it's over 300 feet I believe compared to the standard 132 feet, moving a home back is a practical solution. It doesn't change the character of the neighborhood. It simply allows the property to function as it should.

I also wanted to share that I do trust the Kopkes. When I chose to sell this home, it mattered to me they would not only become the new owners, but also my new neighbors. I strongly believe they will contribute positively to the community, and everything I've seen since meeting them has confirmed that. They have approached this project with care and attention to detail and that's an understatement.

For that reason, as their neighbor, I fully support and hope you'll offer our new neighbors your support.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Thank you very much.

I'll turn to the Design Commission, and I'll start to the right now.

Commissioner Fitzgerald, please.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: All right, thank you.

I like the house. Actually, interesting that I did not think of it as a contemporary house as much as I thought more of an updated prairie style house. So, I like it coming in. I also am okay with the long wall because it is broken up and has so much interest on it. I'm okay with the three-car garage, and we just passed one in the house before this, and I think that looks good.

The geothermal is cool. The colors are very nice; I like the colors. I really appreciate that you brought them in because, according to what I saw in the packet, I didn't like it. So, the real tone is very nice.

I definitely appreciate that the house looks good on all four

sides. So, I'm in favor.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Thank you very much.  
Commissioner Kubow.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Okay, so I'm going to break this up into three parts, so bear with me, because I think this is a very dynamic and interesting home in an interesting location.

So, first, starting with the architecture, I think it's very cool. I think it's a little bit of a cross between a prairie style and a little bit of a contemporary pop. I think it's a very well-designed house. As Commissioner Fitzgerald mentioned, you focused on 360-degree architecture which we all appreciate, meaning you're taking design care to all four sides of the building. So, that's great to see.

But then as I evaluate, like I mentioned before in the previous petition, context, especially considering kind of what's happening around this with the other homes and, you know, when I first looked at this, like, well, it does feel a little out of place. It is really far set back and, you know, I might struggle to approve it based on a lack of design context. That's where I get to this third part.

I appreciate you coming up and explaining the design decisions, because I also want to take that into context again from my role in here, explaining the geothermal system that you are going to utilize. I commend that. I think that's a really smart approach and I love the idea behind it.

Also the parking, which I didn't realize, now I understand why the building is set back, because you have to accommodate for parking because there is none on Sigwalt. So, I mean, that makes sense.

Then, also, it's a single-story, you want to accommodate for life-long residents who want to age in place. That makes sense. But then also, with the life-long residents as well, they don't want to leave, you guys want to stay in Arlington Heights and that's appreciated.

So, when I first looked at this, I thought I was going to struggle based on, not the design, but the overall massing and how it sits. It felt a little awkward, but based on your design decisions and walking us through all of that, now I understand. So, I'm in full support now.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, thank you very much.  
Commissioner Eckhardt.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Thank you. Full disclosure, I lived at 422 West Sigwalt 42 years ago. I think I've been gone long enough to not show any favoritism so I am not going to recuse myself.

At any rate, I love the neighborhood. This neighborhood is unique because of the depth of the lots. All of us that owned those four or five houses in a row there pick up half of the interior portion of half of the city block, and that's why they're so deep. So, I don't have any issue with the setbacks because the lots are so deep. So, I know how my family always enjoyed the depth of lot and the pool that Mr. McCaskey has maintained, thank you for that.

At any rate, the only subject which I'd be very respectful of Staff's comments is the long wall. You know, the long wall to me is okay because it backs up to six single-family homes and that's a lot of backyards. It's, you know,

the area is pretty well planted and I don't expect there to be a problem. I actually endorse the fact that they dropped the brick wainscot and, you know, at three locations and not all the way down. They've varied it and I think that's very nicely done.

So, I support the house. I think, I'm not going to try to classify the architecture other than it's an architect-designed house. It has unique characteristics that seem personal and seem intentional, and I appreciate it for that. In all of our neighborhoods with a bunch of traditional and expected house designs, there's always one or two here or there that stand out to be different, and I applaud that. So, I am all in favor.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Great, thank you.

I also agree that it's a nice design. Actually, seeing it placed on the site, it makes perfect sense and I appreciate how it actually responds to the site with a little deeper area on one side, and that's where the home kind of expands to. I think, yes, with respect to design, it is a bit contemporary. I don't know if I can go there, I agree with the prairie style, it's almost prairie style meets craftsman.

I think the layout is nice. I agree with the parking. Let's see. I think it's very important to have supportive neighbors. So, we've had many of these types of reviews where the neighbors may not be supportive, and so we really take that seriously, both positive and negative. So, thank you for coming today and showing your support. We love it when there's people, real residents that are going to be using the house, so that's fantastic, too. So, it's hard to really say no.

There's two comments I'd like to say. You know, it's got some modern elements to it, particularly the dark windows, which I love. I feel the siding is, that particular color is a bit dated. That's my only interpretation, that's why I would never make a requirement to change it, I just take a look at it.

The one thing I would say, I cannot believe there's not a colored elevation or any illustration of this home, especially considering who the architect is. I have made a very strong, I'm a strong advocate that there should be three-dimensional drawings or at least a colored elevation when we're talking about design. I'm disappointed that this particular architect didn't do any of that.

I could put on my phone with the programs that are out there right now and have a colored elevation and you could look at it and say do you like this or not. I think you should do that. I don't think you're going to like, at the end of the day, how this all blends together. It's going to be a bit of modern and a bit of datedness, and I implore you, please have some colored material to review this so that you can really look at the actual materiality because the tools we have right now as architects is off the charts easy and it really should be done.

I do want it noted, I'm just disappointed that there wasn't a three-dimensional drawing, because when I first saw the elevation, I thought it was actually a symmetrical home. It takes a while to look at this and go, oh, my God, there's a depth change, there's a completely different, there's, you know, 20-30 feet of one on the left side versus the right side. It's really hard to tell that from a 2D elevation for people who aren't trained architects. Please, next time, bring some three-dimensional or at least colored elevations so that you can kind of see the

materiality.

Hard for me to say anything negative considering the name on the stamp there, so I just really would implore you. It makes it so much more successful of a review when you have those kinds of exhibits, so please do that.

With that said, I have no strong objections to this. I really think wrapping stone around the sides, that long wall, perfectly understandable and reasonable. The windows, the entire shape is very homogeneous I will say, and I like the materiality as far as extending some nicer brick along all of those, or stone along all the base. So, no major issues other than what I mentioned before. So, thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Let me just make one --

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Two comments. One, I agree with having the three-dimensional renderings, especially when you're proposing something like this with the setback and it really goes against kind of the existing fabric. That would have helped, but after reviewing and hearing kind of the explanation, it kind of helped me understand the why.

But two, I want to commend Steve, our design liaison, who always does a tremendous job with his Staff report, doing his own evaluation, and also referencing design guidelines and everything that he does. It's always a great job. Also, when you're kind of not necessarily accepting of a design, you come up with a proposed design, so I think that's always extremely helpful and especially for us to see. So, thank you.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: I agree. Thank you very much, Steve, for your efforts on that. Again, it's kind of hard, to reiterate what Commissioner Kubow said, and now I'm just repeating myself, but it's hard to take a three-dimensional drawing of something you give us and compare it to a black and white 2D. It's a little difficult. So, I would implore as the process continues on that there is a bit more of a standard on how we can evaluate these designs so that there's a bit of apples to apples and not trying to imagine something from just a straight 2D elevation, but that's just, you know, that's in the future.

So, with that said, does anybody have a motion?

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: I'll make a motion to approve 510 West Sigwalt, DC #26-024, with no comments, approved as proposed.

**A motion to approve the design of the proposed new (tear-down) single-family residence located at 510 West Sigwalt, DC #26-024, based on the architectural plans received 4/17/26.**

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Approved as proposed.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: I will second.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, we have a second from Commissioner Fitzgerald. We have a comment from Commissioner Eckhardt.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Yes. I agree a 100 percent with what Commissioner Seyer is saying. Steve, I think when these things come in; I

think we need to encourage these petitioners. I don't think we want to go so far as to make it a requirement, you know. We have certain requirements that are on the drawings, but I think the strongest presentations are the ones that have three-dimensions, or models as Mr. Eckhardt does it old school. But the point is it's important, not only for us, it helps us, but for the audience to see the massing.

So, I think, we could discuss it later, but I think it's important, it's a good call on this. We do see in three-dimensions, but it's harder for us to see it sometimes until we really study the site plan, the elevations and realize there's a lot of things going on these slide elevations are illustrating, you know, because it looks like it's one big, flat piece of building when in fact it's not. It sets back and so on.

So, that's my only comment.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Thank you very much.

Any other discussion from anyone?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, so we're there, but I believe we have a motion and we have a second. So, we can take a vote via roll call for approved as noted, or approved as submitted.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Yes.

Commissioner Fitzgerald.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Kubow.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Eckhardt.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Acting Chair Seyer.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Yes.

Thank you very much.

MR. LOSSELYOUNG: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Congrats, and appreciate you letting us speak.

(Whereupon, the meeting on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 7:11 p.m.)

DESIGN

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF A MEETING  
BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS  
DESIGN COMMISSION

COMMISSION

RE: 6 SOUTH VAIL AVENUE – METROPOLIS BALLROOM - SIGN VARIATION  
DC #25-081

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of  
Arlington Heights Design Commission taken at the Arlington Heights  
Village Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 3rd Floor, Community Room,  
Arlington Heights, Illinois on the 28th day of April, 2026 at the hour of  
7:11 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

SCOTT SEYER, Acting Chairperson  
JOHN FITZGERALD  
JONATHAN KUBOW  
TED ECKHARDT  
KIRSTEN KINGSLEY (Not Present)

ALSO PRESENT:

STEVE HAUTZINGER, Design Planner

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, so we now move on to the next item, which is, I just want to double check to make sure I got my order correct, but it should be the DC #25-081, Sign Variation for 6 South Vail at Metropolis Ballroom.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Correct.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: We'll take a little time here to get the materials off from the previous submittal. Thank you.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Okay, as you mentioned, this is, the next item is regarding the Metropolis Ballroom and it's regarding signage. There's three matters for review as part of this proposal tonight. The first two are just in regards to design and obtaining design approval. Since these are signs in the downtown, Design Commission approval is required, even for code-compliant signage, but the third item is a variation for the signage that's being proposed as well. So, I'll go through each item.

First, just a quick summary and background. You can see on the aerial, the subject property is highlighted, you know, southwest corner of Vail and Campbell. The ballroom business occupies the entire second floor, and here is a floor plan showing how it's laid out. Main entrance in the center off of Vail, you come in up the stairs, turn to the left to the main ballroom, excuse me, with an outdoor veranda out front facing Vail Avenue. To the right are three smaller banquet rooms supported by a kitchen and restrooms, so, just to get everybody oriented to the business that the signage is regarding. Again, the ballroom is above Hey Nonny, the other smaller banquet rooms and kitchen are above Armand's Pizza, just from our point of reference.

Petitioner is proposing to add three new types of signage to enhance their visibility. The first is a retractable awning which would be above the outdoor terrace. Those are shown here on the floor plan, these four red rectangles. They'd be mounted to the front wall of the building in a closed position, and then when open they would extend out to cover the entire veranda.

The second signage is just an update to the existing street level canopy that goes out over the public sidewalk. Currently, it's a black fabric. They're simply looking to reface that with a new blue fabric, same signage with the business name on it. So, that's a pretty straight-forward update.

Then, the third is new wall-mounted fabric banner signs. Those are shown here on the floor plan as well. There's three on the east wall facing Vail, and three on the north wall facing Campbell Street.

Taking one step back, many of you probably recall, this project was previously reviewed by the Design Commission last year in July. At that time, the Petitioner was proposing the same retractable awnings above the terrace, the same update to the entrance, but they had different signage at the north end of the building. So, let me actually just scroll forward quickly and I'd also like to show where we were and then what the updates are.

So, this was the submittal from last year, and these are just a few views of the existing ballroom and the existing awnings that are above the terrace. This was their proposal last year with the retractable awnings. They were proposing to mount those above the windows of the ballroom and they wanted to

stagger the height and overlap them to get complete coverage for weather protection, again at that time.

Here are some examples that they had included in their submittal for the retractable awnings, some different applications. Here's a view of that entrance canopy that will be updated from black to blue. Then, finally, what they had proposed last year, these are their windows across the entire second floor facing Campbell and Vail, and they were proposing individual awnings with the Metropolis Ballroom name at each window.

Staff raised concerns at that time about the appearance of the retractable awnings, raising concerns that, one, these awnings didn't align with the columns on the building or the windows, the banks of windows below where, you know, the current awnings are mounted directly above each window, which is of course very typical. You can see Hey Nonny on the first floor, they have their awnings all lined up with the window. Obviously, that's a typical application for an awning. So, that was one concern, that these four awnings did not align with the building architecture. Then, also the staggered awning height felt a little makeshift and that was definitely a concern from the standpoint of aesthetics.

There was no concern about the update to the building entrance. This is again very straight-forward.

But there was also a concern about the aesthetics of the awnings above the windows. The comments were that it just looked a little busy with the black awnings below, the blue awnings on the second floor, the green mansard roof, all the brackets, the red brick, it was just a little too busy.

Those were Staff's concerns. The Design Commission agreed with those concerns. The project was continued for a re-review, and that's what we're doing here tonight.

One suggestion that Staff had made, again last July, was looking next door to the Metropolis Ballroom building is the Metropolis Theater building, which has these very large banners that are mounted on these banner arms perpendicular on the piers of the second and third floor. The suggestion was could you do something like that maybe for the ballroom that would fit on the piers between the window, obviously, smaller scale, but maybe that will be a creative solution, kind of acknowledging the challenge with that particular building to come up with a good signage solution.

So, the update tonight is that, in response to the feedback that the Petitioner received from the Design Commission, they have made changes. They are still proposing the retractable awnings, but they have now lined them up. So, this is a new rendering and it shows the four awnings here across that front wall, and definitely a big improvement that they're no longer staggered and overlapped. They are now horizontally lined which is definitely an improvement. However, it is still a concern that they do not align with the windows below, again, kind of a default arrangement when it comes to windows and awnings. This is more about getting four equally-sized awnings to cover the entire outdoor terrace from the inside corner here all the way to the exterior side.

So, this is how it would look in the closed position, and then this is how it would look in the open position. The awnings would have a bit of

signage just on the apron out front. So, their goal with that is functional for weather protection, have flexibility depending on weather, as well as a bit of signage to enhance their appearance.

The entrance canopy, no change there. Still just proposing the blue, that's straight-forward.

So, the third item is the wall-mounted banners, and this is the one that requires a sign variation. So, this is a new application that's coming through as a sign variation. Here is their rendering showing the proposal for the banners on the building. Again, you've got three banners facing Campbell, three facing Vail, it has the Metropolis Ballroom logo, it will have the Metropolis Ballroom name on the top, and then weddings, brunch, events, some supplemental message incorporated. Again, these will be vinyl banners mounted on fixed metal banner arms.

Again, this is a unique signage proposal, a unique signage solution. Staff does feel this is, you know, a good solution. It does require a variation, unfortunately, only because code doesn't even acknowledge this type of signage. The banners that are around the Metropolis Theater next door also had variations years ago. So, a unique solution to a unique signage problem that does require a variation.

I did just want to read quickly, you know, their sign variation criteria, which is the Petitioner's opportunity to explain, you know, why they need this variation, why can't they comply with code. So, I just wanted to quickly read through what I had written in the Staff report summarized from their letter to the Village.

The Petitioner stated the need to improve their identity so that everyone knows that the second-floor space belongs to them. They're trying to improve their visual street presence which they feel is being forgotten and swallowed out by everything around them, especially during the outdoor dining season. The proposed retractable awnings and wall-mounted banners are intended to clarify that the second-floor space belongs to the Metropolis Ballroom. They feel that they deserve a fair chance to update their look and have a better street appearance. They considered many signage options for the building, but the length of the building with two street frontages is difficult to find a signage solution for with limited options to work with.

So, they are asking for the same opportunity as other businesses to create an identity for the ballroom through the use of awnings and signage. I just wanted to communicate that.

So, now, last comments that I have are Staff's comments on these updated designs. The retractable awning --

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Steve, very sorry to interrupt.

MR. HAUTZINGER: That's okay.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: I want to pause there. What was Staff's recommendation on the banners? You flashed an image of the vertical Metropolis banner.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Was there anything, did you have a

recommendation for what you would propose here?

MR. HAUTZINGER: This is in line with what we had in mind, just a smaller version of the larger banners that are at the theater building next door. The one comment, I'll skip to that one in light of your question, is that, you know, we do support this design direction. We do support the variation. The one comment that we have is, is there really justification for six of these banners? Our recommendation would be four instead of six.

Let me rewind to the floor plan that they provided. Again, this is the Petitioner's floor plan. You can see these three rectangles here and on this side illustrate the proposed banner locations. Our recommendation is to omit the ones in the middle and just go with four.

We also have a recommendation about the awnings above the terrace. Staff just can't support the aesthetic appearance of these awnings not lining up with the architecture of the building. It's sort of a fundamental thing that we look for. It's outlined in our code and our design guidelines that signage needs to work with the architecture of the building, and having those awnings unaligned with no regard for the building design below just doesn't seem to work.

So, our recommendation when it comes to the retractable awnings, as we had recommended last year and we reiterate it again, if they really want weather protection above this entire balcony, they should really consider a more permanent structure that's designed to fit with this building. Maybe there's post signage on these piers, some sort of structure, it could be very decorative. I don't know what that design looks like, but it could be really nice.

The other option is to just stay with what they've got, do an update to the fixed awnings that are there, maybe they can be enlarged a little bit. The awnings that are there, they're only using a portion of the wall. If they were to extend these full height to the gutter line and come out, you know, you can get a little bit more coverage. I know it's not the full coverage over the terrace that they're looking for, but there is an opportunity to enlarge these a bit. It just looks much better with the architecture of the building. So, that would be our recommendation on the retractable awnings.

Again, the canopy below, no issue.

I have included two different options here. One is just to simply omit one of the banner signs on each wall, leaving the two near the corner and then one at each end. It just kind of sends the message, hey, we're from here to here and we're from here to here, this is all us. Another option, the piers in the middle, if they want it a little bit more balanced on that wall, this is another layout.

So, you know, Staff feels that these wall-mounted banners, they are similar to a blade sign, and blade signs are allowed in the downtown. But there's only one allowed per street frontage, and they're limited to six square feet in size. So, having six of these almost blade signs, you know, similar to a blade sign, seems a little, I don't know if that can be justified. But two per side for a total of four, Staff would support and recommend approval of.

So, in summary, we're recommending denial of the design for the retractable awnings, approval of the design for the new color on the street level entrance canopy, deny the variation for the six banners, but recommend approval

of a variation for these four banners. Those are our comments.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, thank you very much.

Would the Applicant, are they here? Yes.

MRS. MANETTI: Hello. Didi Manetti from Metropolis Ballroom.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: I'm sorry, your name?

MRS. MANETTI: Didi Manetti from Metropolis Ballroom.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay.

MRS. MANETTI: Let's start with the awnings. I always thought the question is the four awnings versus six, not no awning or with awning. The fact is that doing business around Arlington Heights and dealing with everything surrounding us, we have found that it's extremely important for us to have some optional coverage for the veranda for the clients that come through. We've explored many options, and to be honest, on the market, there are not a lot of options for us and we have exhausted all of them financially, the ones that we can afford and the things that can work with the architecture of the building.

If Steve remembers, we submitted an initial plan with something more permanent with posts on the side of the building or the walls of the building, but it was considered by the Staff to be too utility looking. That's more permanent and it's really going to break the look and the integrity of the building. So, this we believe is something that will not only look better, but it will improve the facade of the building for our, you know, in our opinion, and we really cannot find another option. So, I would say that we really ask the Committee to consider not to deny having this awning because we really need it.

Another thing, the four versus six, we have the awning company, Allison is here and will be able to explain it further. We have, the projection of the awning needs to be at least 12 feet, and when you reduce, we increased to six of them to align with the architecture of the windows, there's not the amount of width for the awning to project out enough to cover the entire veranda, so it's not going to work functionality-wise.

Also, why you'd have four instead of six, you have three gaps, since we have already changed our initial design so it's not on the same level, it's not staggered anymore, so there will be a gap between, a small gap between each awning. We've reduced the gaps from five to three and we improved the safety issues on the veranda in case it rains and it may get slippery or things like that. We had I think something like a plant box, it was something on these three areas in order to have a full coverage of the veranda.

Also, why we do six? A lot of the architecture, our entrance to the veranda from the ballroom will be right under a gap, which is extremely dangerous. It's not safe enough. So, when you put all these together, I mean also the awning when it's out, it will have about a 105-degree slope. We are on the second level, when the awning is entirely open, when you're on the street level, you are not going to see the entire window structure. So, you're really not going to see this discrepancy of something is not aligned with something.

I think, you know, nothing is perfect, but from the functionality, from the safety, from the appearance, this is the best choice for us, and at this point it's the only choice for us. So, we really want to request approval as submitted.

Really, there's no other choice for us.

To tie that in with the banner signs, actually initially before, that didn't go to the Committee. Initially, we proposed some banner flat signs on the front of the veranda wall as well, because as you can see, we look like we're the second floor of Hey Nonny. If you, you know, I'm not being mean or anything, but if you want to say if there's anything that does not go with this architecture or the appearance of the building is the Hey Nonny sign. It's an ugly sign, but I'm not going to go there.

But the thing is we have to be able to tell people we are not the second floor of Hey Nonny or Armand's. So, we proposed signs there which was shot down by the Staff, so we reduced that as well. Now, the only thing we're asking for is our retractable awning with some sort of branding on it. Around the area, around Armand's upper floor, there are a total of 12 windows, 12. Five on the Vail side, one at a corner, and six on the Campbell side. 12 windows, four signs? It's not enough.

I think we had initially more, but I think six is the perfect number for it. It will tell people what we have and also give us the opportunity to let people know what we do, like we put on there weddings and corporate, but we also do Mother's Day brunch, Easter brunch, we do veranda parties. We allow more people to be able to view the sum of the summary and it's a great place for people to have fun.

So, we want to have the opportunity to give people an overview of what we do out there as well. This is bringing in tax dollars for the Village, too. So, what's two versus three on one side? No big deal, but it gives us a huge amount of opportunity and to improve the appearance of our second floor.

So, I really, you know, we also request the approval as submitted. Really, we have reduced what we have designed tremendously, according to the Staff and the Committee's requirement or suggestions and recommendations. This has been a two-year-long project, while we are trying to book events a year and two years ahead. I think that what we have designed is only improving the look of the building, not detracting from it.

They are certainly, I think aligning with the architecture of the window is very, very minor compared to everything that we are doing there.

Also, if, Steve, if you go to the picture of the veranda?

We are not leaving the veranda wall the way it is. We've mentioned it last time that we're going to paint it. So, the brick on this side and the window area will be the same color. So, once you have that, we'll have paint in there like maybe a white paste or off-white color, when you have that with a navy-blue colored awning with the gold logo on it, that will be so beautiful and striking looking. Nobody will pay attention to those four windows, how it's lined up. The reason you can see it more right now is because the color is not the same as the window framing, right? Now, you know, you can see the difference, but once the color goes in, everything blending perfectly, you're not going to see that anymore. It's just a flight of windows, not like two or three or four of them.

So, I think that we have thought of all possibilities and have exhausted all possibilities, that we really hope the Committee can approve so we

can go forward. Summer is coming. We're trying to book; we're trying to provide a good space for the community to have a good time. Also, this is, the questions can be answered by Allison as well that we wanted to provide a projection up to 12 feet or longer. We need the size of the 12 feet long, or wide awning.

Any questions for us?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, thank you.

Are you going to speak?

MS. HOLMES: I am with Thatcher Oaks Awning, yes.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, if you don't mind just stating your name and so forth?

MS. HOLMES: Allison Holmes, Thatcher Oaks Awning Company.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: And was there anything to add to that?

MS. HOLMES: Just to reiterate, the biggest issue with going within those pillar widths is that we just simply cannot get the arms to extend far enough. They only come in certain sizes. So, if we go with the smaller awnings, we can only get them to project out like 10, you know, 10 feet where it's just not going to be enough coverage for what they're looking for.

MRS. MANETTI: That defeats the purpose of providing coverage.

MS. HOLMES: Right. So, then at that point, it's a question of should they even bother doing it because you're still going to have all that space, you know, potential rain and weather.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Do you mind if I, Steve, can you pull up the floor plan, or the plan of that terrace? So, I don't see dimensions on there, but where, are these the new awnings, and that's the 20-foot, is that 12-foot deep or is that, what are the size of those awnings there?

MRS. MANETTI: They are 20 feet long.

MS. HOLMES: Yes, they're 20 feet wide.

MRS. MANETTI: Right.

MS. HOLMES: There's about an 80 span across the top.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: 20 feet wide, but how deep are they?

MRS. MANETTI: About 12 feet.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: So, that's the full depth of the --

MRS. MANETTI: Veranda.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Terrace, yes.

Any questions from the --

MR. MANETTI: Can I add a couple of things, too?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Sure. Do you mind stating your name? I understand if you don't need to, if you can't come up.

MR. MANETTI: Tom Manetti, I'm the owner as well. I've been, it's going up almost 20 years being here in this building. There is no person that knows better than myself kind of what's going to work in this space. That's all I do is space and events.

Architecturally, functionality, look, looking at what the customers are looking for, this is the best design we've come up with, unless you

guys have a better solution that's going to be within our price range. We have already exhausted all of the suggestions that you guys have made and this is the best option we've got.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Thank you.

MR. MANETTI: I just wanted to add that.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Thank you very much, appreciate your comment.

At this time, is there anybody from the public then that would like to step up?

Yes, sir, come on up, and repeat your name if you don't mind.

MR. McCASKEY: Doing this one on the fly.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Thanks.

MR. McCASKEY: Kevin McCaskey, Arlington resident, but I also am part owner of 111 West Campbell Street, the building next to Tom. I have to say I've known Tom for about 10 years now, and anything he does is perfect. He has a reason for what he does and how he does it.

I have the Ale House which is next door, I'm on the third floor, and I have an incredible difficult time creating marketing and advertising. I'm sure he's dealing with the same situation. It's great for Armand's, it's great for Hey Nonny, but what's upstairs, nobody knows. So, I think any bit that can help him is a great idea, and I think anything he decides to do is a great idea. He's not going to put junk up there. He's got a reputation; he's done a phenomenal job here in Arlington Heights.

As far as the awnings, I think they're incredible. I think that, I apologize, but I think retractable is the way to go because maybe there's a day you don't want that awning out there and you don't want to feel trapped underneath. But other times, I've been out on the patio and it gets real hot, then that awning would be perfect. You can crank that thing out, it starts to screen you, when you're trying to listen to Thursday music, that will be perfect. I think it looks sharp. I think a lot of times down on the street level you may not even see it or notice it.

You know, I think here is a great environment that you have because you go above and beyond what people may not even notice. But I think it looks good. I think the street looks better than the angle. The banners, unfortunately, you may like them or not like them, but we need them when you're higher up so people can see those and see what's going on up there. Because if I didn't live in Arlington Heights, I would just think the upstairs is Armand's upstairs, and the upstairs, the Metropolis, I would think that would just be an extension of Hey Nonny.

So, as the neighbor, that's my building right next door, so I have no problem with those banners. Metropolis, we do the banners there for our building, and even the theater did an extension awning out on the front to create an identity for 111 West Campbell and noted that that was a theater. I think that was a great idea to do that and it turned out to be a great idea.

So, I like what he did as a neighbor, I like what he does as a resident, and I support it.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Kevin, before you go, Mr. Chairman,

can I ask Kevin a question?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Of course, please.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Thank you.

So, when I'm looking at this proposal, the only thing I have issues with are the banners and the four, you know, versus six. I think if your operation, and you know that I'm very familiar with your restaurant, I designed and built it, so my question to you is you're remote from the street, and have you discussed banners for your third-floor location with somebody? Is that something, because what happens here when we make a decision to grant a variance, there's a precedent. It's logical for other owners to come in and say, gee, you gave those banners, you know, to the Metropolis Banquet, how about me? No one knows I'm up there, you know, and since we banned sandwich boards, what is your feeling about advertising yourself on the Metropolis building?

MR. McCASKEY: It's tricky because we're on the third floor and it's definitely a challenge. I don't know how, we're approaching our 10-year anniversary and we still have people that come up there and say I didn't even know you were here. Where do you live? I live in Arlington Heights. Like you live in Arlington Heights, you know, we're here, we're 10,000 square feet, we're probably the largest, I think Tom's is one of the largest as well in square footage, privately-owned commercial businesses, and people don't even know we're here. We hold 300 people and people still don't know 10 years later that we're there.

But it just has to be done a little bit of word of mouth, but it is a challenge as you can see. I respect the Village, but Metropolis puts their banners up for the second floor and they've got the awning.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Yes.

MR. McCASKEY: They have offered to let us use the awning for marketing for Ale House, but I don't know if people would notice it. They're a different angle.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: I think what's fair for one operation is fair for others. That can prove for hardship and you certainly are in that category. That's why that's going to come into play with my decision about yes or no on all these banners. Next door, there's nothing on your building.

MR. MCCASKEY: Well, we do have, as you can see, Metropolis has one going from the second to the third floor. They've got a few of those on there, but I think --

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: But there's nothing that says the Ale House, right?

MR. MCCASKEY: Correct, but they were there before me so they've kept those spots, but --

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Yes.

MR. MCCASKEY: -- I can't see Tom doing something that, if he put those up and it didn't look right, he would take them down. I don't see him having something like that if it doesn't look good.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Okay, thank you.

MR. MCCASKEY: Yes, thank you.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Thank you very much.

MS. HOLMES: I would like to add as a long-time Arlington Heights resident; I did not know that that was the Metropolis Ballroom there as well for a long time. I realized it later, but it took a while to recognize it and I never realized that all of the space above Armand's was this either.

MR. MANETTI: It's a unique space.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Yes. Thank you very much.

Any other comments from the public? If not, we'll move to the Design Commission then.

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: I'll go for a new start. I'll go to my right.

Commissioner Kubow.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Thank you.

So, Steve, can you show the proposed rendering of the awnings please? I think overall, for the awnings, I don't mind it, you know. I get why Staff is saying what they are, and I think this is a dramatic improvement from what you've proposed before.

What I would recommend, I want to ask if you've looked at this, I think the reason why it looks a little off is because you have the gaps, right? You have the gaps between the awnings. I'm wondering if, is there a way to reduce those gaps so they're much closer, so you won't even notice that it's not following the windows. If they're tight, then you'll never know.

MRS. MANETTI: Always going to be a gap between two awnings.

MS. HOLMES: So, there's going to be a, there would be a couple of inches. Renderings are tough, they're never right, but there would be, you know, a couple of inches, maybe like an inch or two. But we'll abut them up next to each other as, you know, as close as we can.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: I think that that would be key. Even like this, and again, I respect Staff's recommendation, but I just, I really don't have an issue. I would strongly recommend that you get them as tight as possible because it will look like one seamless, seamless.

MRS. MANETTI: Right. A couple of inches for 20 feet long or wide is basically like, I think --

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: You're through talking.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Sorry.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: So, it's us now. Just to be clear, it's just us.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: But I did ask the question.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: You were clear, your position is very clear.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: I hear you. So, for the awning, as long as we can get it as tight as possible, I'm fine with this.

Then, the only issue I really have are the banners. Listen, I respect what you guys are doing. I think it's a great space, I've been up there. It's a challenging design, I understand that, and I want to support businesses, especially those in Arlington Heights. I think this is a great unique space, so I want

it to thrive, I want to see you guys busy and successful.

But when I look at that, it just looks too busy to me, you know. I'm sorry, it's just, it's a little too much on such a prominent corner. But I could get behind having just four, and I know that's not what you want to hear, but I really have a problem with the way that looks. I just, I'll see it a lot and it will personally annoy me. So, I think four would be the absolute max that I would go with.

Other than that, I'm fine with everything.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Fitzgerald, please.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: All right, thank you.

I am coming around to the awnings. So, I think that the four even-spaced, I'm sorry, the four same-sized look fine, especially since we're putting an awning over parts that are not in front of the windows. So, I like that.

My next question is that you have the awnings, the blade signs, and the new entrance, are all of these blues exactly the same color?

MRS. MANETTI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Okay, then, I am confused if these banners are fabric or if they're vinyl. It's been said both ways.

MR. MANETTI: Can I answer that?

MR. HAUTZINGER: Absolutely.

MR. MANETTI: We haven't really, I believe they are vinyl, but we could probably go to a material to match.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Okay, does anybody know what the material of the Metropolis banners are?

MS. HOLMES: That wasn't our scope of work, but we do banners like that, and we have used similar material which matches the awning fabric, or a vinyl fabric which is a Ferrari vinyl which may be what this sign company was linking to, but I'm not sure on that.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Okay, do we have a sample of the yellow?

MR. MANETTI: You might have it, Steve, on what we sent you. Is it listed there, what it is?

MR. HAUTZINGER: I thought these were vinyl, and I got that information off of the documentation. I'm not sure where it's on.

MR. MANETTI: It might be the Sunbrella material.

MS. HOLMES: Just from being in the industry, I do know that the Sunbrella Marine Blue does have a match, and the Ferrari vinyl does have a color match.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Can you state it a little bit louder, please?

MS. HOLMES: From being in the industry, I know that Sunbrella Marine Blue has a color match for a Ferrari vinyl.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Okay, well, I would much prefer fabric versus vinyl because vinyl scares me. It seems like it's temporary when I'm hoping that these are going to be permanent. So, a little scared of the, it looks yellow, but is it gold or is it yellow?

MRS. MANETTI: Gold.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Okay, and then I would be in favor of four total, and it would be my preference the ones in the middle would be the ones that would not be used, because I also think it's too busy.

Could you explain what you're painting? That threw me. You're painting the cinder block on the right side? Anything else other than the cinder block on the balcony? Can you bring that up again?

MR. HAUTZINGER: Yes.

MRS. MANETTI: That whole face up there.

MR. MANETTI: The whole face is getting painted.

MRS. MANETTI: The whole face of the balcony.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: So, is that limestone up there, is it concrete? What is it?

MR. MANETTI: That's brick.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Wait, I guess I don't know what you're painting.

MR. HAUTZINGER: This is raw concrete block.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: So, that's being painted?

MR. MANETTI: And the band below it.

MR. HAUTZINGER: You know --

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Is that approved?

MR. HAUTZINGER: No, it's not, this is the first I've heard about it.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: And what color is it?

MR. HAUTZINGER: I have no idea.

MR. MANETTI: The same color as the --

MRS. MANETTI: Window framing, similar to that.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: I think the last time you came in here --

MRS. MANETTI: We talked about it.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: -- I was in attendance, and you were going to paint kind of a yellowish color to match the brick that's there, just because it stands out like concrete block. It never occurred that you were going to paint all the way down. I don't remember that.

MR. MANETTI: Yes, the whole idea there is to make it blend and look finished all the way down.

MRS. MANETTI: Yes.

MR. MANETTI: So, it's not separate. I think that would look the best, coming again from a designer as I am, I think that would look best.

MRS. MANETTI: Right.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: All right, so I'm going to take control back. So, thank you for answering my questions.

MR. MANETTI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: All right, so I think that paint, that definitely has to be approved by Staff as a minimum. So, again, four banners, the ones in the middle would be the ones I would take out would be my recommendation, and I really think they need to be fabric. I'm okay with the

awnings and I'm okay with the entrance canopy. That's all.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Eckhardt, please.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Thank you.

I concur with Commissioner Fitzgerald. I honestly think there are so many verticals in the windows below that it would be really hard sought to see where they're aligning. So, four is better, especially since anything less than four doesn't work. So, I don't think there's any testimony needed beyond that. So, I'm definitely in favor of the four.

The last time you were here discussing this a couple of years ago or whenever it was, there was discussion that, in a soft, but respectful complaint that the Hey Nonny people put such a big sign sort of in no man's land between their store and your store that it did look like the whole thing was Hey Nonny. There was some discussion about you coming up with a sign that might go on top that would identify, you know, the ballroom up there and sort of take away from the appearance of Hey Nonny being the whole user.

I didn't mean to be rude when I stopped you from talking, but generally we close the public down when we start here, but I'm going to open it up again so you can answer that question. Had you discussed the possibility of getting a sign that says, you know, the Metropolis Ballroom? Yes, go ahead.

MR. MANETTI: We did have one design that we also presented a while back, and we didn't have positive feedback from that. I've gotten to always --

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: If I could clarify?

MR. MANETTI: On the left, in the middle, on the right, you guys denied the blade sign on the corner of the building.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Refresh my memory, Steve.

MR. HAUTZINGER: No, I mean, this happened after the last meeting before this meeting. So, some plans that they had submitted with Staff we reviewed.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Okay.

MR. HAUTZINGER: They had proposed a corner-projecting blade sign coming off of this window here. You know, it's basically an arm with a big circle and, I mean, honest, I mean, Staff's feedback was that it didn't look good, it didn't fit in. We didn't see that you were going to get this positive support.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Well, I don't disagree with that, but I'm thinking something over --

MR. HAUTZINGER: That's the sign he's referring to.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: -- the balcony area which is your primary, you know, point of interest.

MR. MANETTI: We had one, yes.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: The fact that you took over the, what was his name? Hagenfinger, Hagenfinger?

MR. HAUTZINGER: Hagenbring.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Hagenbring, you know, I mean, we bought fabric for our kids in that store.

So, at any rate, I'm in favor of the four, I'm in favor of everything else. I'm in favor of four banners, taking the center one out. I just don't want this building and its neighbors to look like a used car sale lot with a bunch of flapping banners everywhere. I mean that, I mean you've seen it up on Elmhurst Road, near Elmhurst. That guy puts up 150 American flags which I'm not against American flags, but enough is enough, you know.

So, I think if you put them on the two ends, it will bookmark and mark your territory, but the precedence of this many is not good for this Committee to grant a variance, period.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, thank you.

Yes, I hope you can appreciate all this deliberation because I think everybody here unanimously wants this to succeed and wants to help you get more visibility. Unfortunately, whatever we agree, it's so unique it sets a precedent for others to take advantage of it in some way that, well, they did it here, so let us do it here, and we've got to be smart about what we approve.

So, please bear with us when we're reviewing this. I appreciate your patience because it's just, you know, the whole idea of the precedence is really what we have to think about. We want to do what's best for businesses, especially yours, but we just can't blatantly say yes and then suddenly turn to somebody else and say no because we don't like that. So, what we do here now enables people to put banners up and large canopies, and so I just try to take a look at what is the core issue here.

This is the most notes I'd ever taken on a subject, so I'm getting confused with all my different notes, but I'm going to say it seemed like number one was signage. You want more visibility for the second floor. I'm confused on why there isn't a sign on the second floor that is right aligned with the entry so you see it when you enter that there is the Metropolis Ballroom up on the second floor.

If you go to that view that looks to the terrace, I don't understand why there's not signage. If that's not allowed, then forgive me, but if that's been discussed and rejected, great, that's what it is. But it's just like that bare patch of CMU is to me calling for a sign that calls out the use of that second floor right above the entry, and no one is ever going to see the sign that's at the edge of those extended canopies. So, I can barely see the ones that are on Hey Nonny and they seem to be bigger, so it's never going to be legible.

So, I just don't understand. I just wish, it seems like signage if that's the number one concern up there, that would do it. So, I'm not sure where, you know, to deliberate that question if it is, but it seems like that would do it.

But with that said, I have no problem with the canopies. It's cleaner, you've done what we asked you to do. I hate going back and forth with new things. We told you to straighten it out, you straightened it up and you did your best you can with alignment.

I do have a concern, not part of our purview, but if you are extending all the way to the edge of the terrace, all that rainwater then is going off on to the street.

MR. MANETTI: It's not.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: I don't know if that's, if you're 12 feet and your terrace is 12 --

MS. HOLMES: The terrace is longer.

MR. MANETTI: The end of it is going to be on the lot, not overlapping the wall.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: I just want to make sure it is, because to me, I see the drawings and I go you're pouring onto the sidewalk, you can't do that.

MR. MANETTI: No, no. No, it's not.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: So, I would just make sure before any permits are pulled, they meet code.

MR. MANETTI: I wouldn't do that to my neighbor.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: No, it's okay. I just, I can appreciate that, but I just, I have to state it for the record that it looks like it's really close, and I just want to make sure that we're not dumping water onto the street because they're deep.

I actually think, quite honestly, instead of blue, a beige would have been something nice just to kind of create just, it's never going to be signage, so just make it pleasant. But I would only make that a recommendation and not a requirement, if you really feel like this is branding you, I still feel like it's very close to Hey Nonny, and something else with a sign would make it much more obvious of who is the user up there. That's just my own, I guess my own perception of it.

So, I do, I am okay with the banners. I want them to be code compliant with the water. I wish there was another alternative to the signage issue because that's not doing it. When it comes to the banners above Armand's, I do agree with the other Commissioners, I think the six is just too many. It's actually starting to feel a bit like a collegiate store with all these banners, like there's a sale or something. So, I just feel like it's a little too much and I would prefer it to be minimized.

I like the color scheme in a sense because, but to me just because of the fact that I'm a Marquette supporter, it looks to me like it's the Marquette store and it's just got this thing, so I can't get that out of my head because I see those things in colleges all the time. So, I know you're trying to get signage. I want to do everything I can to make it successful for you. I think six is too many, I would agree with the four.

With that, and keeping them as fabric, that's perfectly acceptable I think. I just still would like to wonder; I don't know if any of these things are getting you the signage that you really need. I feel like there's still a solution there to get you your signage.

I also think any improvements to that wall on the second floor, painting that brick, that would want to be reviewed I think. It's nice brick, but it does make it feel like it's part of the first floor. So, if you paint it, fine, but I think it's got to be reviewed because I don't know what color it is or anything. So, it's not part of this review as far as I can tell, but if there was a mention about painting it and there's a mention about improvements on the wall, that needs to be something that's reviewed. I'm sorry, we just have to because if it's not there and we say

we're going to paint it, but you don't give a color, anybody could go up and just paint it whatever color they want now. So, you know, we've got to kind of keep some controls over this process. So, to me, if there's going to be some paint, and it needs to be because exposed CMU is not a good look, so that needs to be part of a submittal, sorry.

So, with that said, I don't know if there's too much disagreement between the Commissioners, but I'm happy to deliberate some before there's a motion, unless somebody has a motion?

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: And I have a motion, unless there's things that the Commissioners want to discuss. I guess I do have one quick question.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: We can discuss it after the motion, right?

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: The fabric, is that confirmed? That is your plan to do a fabric material?

MR. MANETTI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Okay.

All right, I am prepared to make a motion.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: All right, I'd like to approve 6 South Vail, DC #25-081, with the following requirements and recommendations. Starting with the awning, I approve as proposed with the following strong recommendation that the gaps are as tight as possible. Two, I approve of the canopy as proposed at the ground floor at the main entrance. Three, I agree with Staff's recommendation to reduce the vertical banners from six to four, and require that all of those banners be fabric. Then, four, I require that the Petitioner go to Staff at the corner of the building where they're going to propose paint and that paint be reviewed by Staff. Then, finally, I strongly recommend that the Petitioner look at other potential signage opportunities, whether that's above the main entrance or it's at the corner, to help increase visibility to the public. That concludes my motion.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: I'll second.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: There's a second from Commissioner Fitzgerald.

Any discussion?

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Discussion, please.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Thank you, Commissioner Kubow.

I think putting a sign in line with the Hey Nonny above the canopy.

Yes, right there, thank you, Steve, is almost necessary.

The coloration of the sign on the canopy is really not strong enough; you can't see it. I mean, even from this image, I'm not, I mean I don't see well, but I can sure see Hey Nonny, but I cannot see your name.

So, I think you need to get an illuminated sign there like Nonny and put it right there, it might even be right underneath Upstairs, Come See Us Upstairs, I don't know. But the thing is putting it way in the back, you won't see it

from the sidewalk, so you'd only see it coming from way across the street where you see a sign on the second floor. It should be over that canopy. If you came to us with a sign, I would support it.

All the other things I'm fine with.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Well, then I have a comment that if we approve the four blade signs, and just so you know, if you came back with a sign over the door, part of what I would ask for is those blade signs be removed, because we're not going to have this whole building branded. That's just, I want you, fair warning, that that's how I would vote.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, so there's been some discussion and there is a motion with a second.

MR. HAUTZINGER: One last comment.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Yes?

MR. HAUTZINGER: What was the last line item that you said, No. 5? I just missed it.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: I think it was the option, to explore options for the signage. The recommendation for, or it was a requirement for the painting to be approved by Staff.

MR. HAUTZINGER: So, explore options, what do you mean by that?

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: It's pretty much what Ted was saying is that they should look at other signage, permanent signage options, like above the main entrance, maybe even the second floor.

MR. HAUTZINGER: See, I'd agree with Commissioner Fitzgerald, like I don't think that we can recommend approval of the sign variation for the banners while also recommending exploring and studying other options. I think we need to have a sign package to know what that is before a variation is approved because if some other signage is added, then your opinion on the variation may change as you stated.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: That's a fair point. It's kind of a --

MR. HAUTZINGER: I mean, we can proceed with what's been presented here. This is what they've submitted. We've encouraged all these things, studying a more significant canopy entrance feature here with a clear sign on it, not a marquee like the theater has, but something more substantial. They didn't want to do that.

I agree, the awnings above this terrace, they're not giving any signage. I mean, I know there's a teeny tiny little sign on the edge of these, but --

MS. HOLMES: It's an eight-inch --

MR. HAUTZINGER: -- it's not going to really give you any identity. All you're getting is weather protection, which I stand by, if you want weather protection, build a roof over that and do something else to get the signage you're looking for. Because, yes, I agree with some of the comments that have been made here, I'm not sure, are we lost on what the goals are? I mean, the main goal was always, you know, for the identity, but obviously, there's a goal for weather protection above the terrace as well, but I don't think you're getting both out of this proposal.

So, it's up to the Design Commission, but I'm a little concerned

with the wording of that motion, that last item I think creates some --

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: It does, it creates confusion. I agree and I appreciate you calling that out. So, I know others can make an amendment, but I'm going to go ahead and amend my initial motion to essentially remove the further study and recommendation for permanent signage.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: I guess if I may, we're still, and does that require a second?

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: It does.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Second.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Second by Commissioner Fitzgerald. We're in discussion still if I'm correct.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Yes.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: I would just like to ask the Petitioner, so you've heard some support about a larger sign variance, giving you access, but likely in exchange for these banners. Is that something that you feel like you would want to pursue, or do you feel like the banners does what you need?

MR. MANETTI: We've already gotten negative feedback from your place here on doing that. I had that all designed already.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, I'm not familiar with seeing that, but if that's it, then I mean just because I haven't seen it doesn't mean it wasn't proposed. So, if that was shot down, then there's no reason to make you go in circles.

MR. MANETTI: Right. So, what I would recommend here is to go with what we came in with.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: You're not going to come back with a new sign variance.

MR. MANETTI: Not right now.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Yes, okay.

MRS. MANETTI: And another thing that I was saying, for us to have a large appearance, and a corner property occupying like this much of a space, asking us to have one signage on one side of the, like concentrated on one area and then just saying that, you know, you are not going to, cannot have other signs to mark the entire monitoring of the building is difficult for us to do, you know.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: I can appreciate that. Thank you.

MRS. MANETTI: It is very difficult for us to say that. Then say like for example, Hey Nonny, if there's a fixed sign as Hey Nonny, why was it allowed for him to say Live Music on the awnings, right? So, for us to say Metropolis Ballroom and then put on the banners to say We do weddings, we do corporate, we do brunch, it's essentially the same thing as Hey Nonny occupying only like total four or five windows, a small space of the building to have that much signage.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, thank you very much.

So, moving forward if I could, do we need to read or re-read or hear the final proposed --

MR. HAUTZINGER: Motion?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Motion, thank you. Because I just want to be sure on what we're voting on, because there were a few different,

there are four items now, if I may.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Yes, and what I have is, you know, recommended for approval, that the retractable awnings are approved with a recommendation that the gaps between the awnings being as tight as possible, approval for the blue color on the entrance canopy from the street level, approval of the sign variation for the wall banners, but with a reduction from six to four, that if there's any exterior paint of the exterior walls up at the terrace, that needs to be submitted for review by Staff before proceeding with any changes. Then, the last one, I guess I'm still a little fuzzy, you retracted Item 5?

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Yes, I took Item 5 out.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Oh, you just struck it, okay, I thought you reworded it.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: No.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Okay.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: I believe we also have a requirement for the banners to be fabric.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Yes, correct.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Yes.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: So, the number of banners and the material was, it was a requirement to reduce them to four and a requirement for them to be fabric.

MR. HAUTZINGER: That's right, you're correct.

**A motion to recommend approval to the Village Board of the proposed new sign variation for Metropolis Ballroom located at 6 South Vail, DC #25-081, based on the plans received 3/16/26, with the following requirements and recommendations:**

- 1. That the design of the retractable awnings above the outdoor roof terrace be approved as proposed with the following strong recommendation that the gaps between the awnings be as tight as possible.**
- 2. That the design of the new fabric color at the Metropolis Ballroom existing entrance canopy be approved as proposed.**
- 3. That the variation from Chapter 30, Section 30-201 Downtown (B-5) District Sign Requirements be approved with the condition that the number of wall-mounted banners be reduced from six to four, and that the material of the banners be fabric.**
- 4. That any proposal to paint the exterior walls up at the terrace shall be submitted to Village Staff for review before proceeding with any changes.**

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, so that is the motion that's there, it's been seconded.

Any further discussion?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, so we will go to a roll call vote then.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Yes.

Commissioner Fitzgerald.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Kubow.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Eckhardt.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Acting Chair Seyer.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Then, I always like to reiterate just for sign variations, I know you guys know it, but the Design Commission for sign variations is a recommending body to the Village Board. Sign variations do require Village Board approval. So, we'll get the minutes from tonight's meeting and then we'll package this up for, and I'll coordinate that meeting with the Board.

MR. MANETTI: Okay.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Thank you very much.

MR. MANETTI: Thank you.

(Whereupon, the meeting on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 8:12 p.m.)

DESIGN

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF A MEETING  
BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS  
DESIGN COMMISSION

COMMISSION

RE: CHAPTER 30 SIGN CODE AMENDMENTS - DC #26-028

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of  
Arlington Heights Design Commission taken at the Arlington Heights  
Village Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 3rd Floor, Community Room,  
Arlington Heights, Illinois on the 28th day of April, 2026 at the hour of  
8:12 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

SCOTT SEYER, Acting Chairperson  
JOHN FITZGERALD  
JONATHAN KUBOW  
TED ECKHARDT  
KIRSTEN KINGSLEY (Not Present)

ALSO PRESENT:

STEVE HAUTZINGER, Design Planner

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, so we move to our last item of new business, and that's the Chapter 30 Sign Code Amendments.

Staff will begin with their comments on this.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: You won't hurt our feelings if you scoot.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: So, you don't have to hang around for this. If you want to listen --

MR. MCCASKEY: I've been told to stay. Yes, see you later.

MRS. MANETTI: Thank you.

MR. MANETTI: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Thank you very much.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Thank you.

Okay, yes, we have some Sign Code Amendments to the Chapter 30 of the Municipal Code, just some issues that have been, you know, they come up from time to time and eventually we believe that it's time to address it and actually look at amending the code.

So, there's three items, I'll go through them pretty quickly here. The first one is for drive-through restaurant menu signage, basically to allow fully electronic drive-through signage where static printed drive-through menus are currently the only thing that's allowed. Number two is wall signage for drive-through restaurants, and that's a proposal to allow a second wall sign for all drive-through restaurants. I'll give you a little more detail in a moment. The last one is to amend the notification requirements specifically regarding the mailings when a petitioner does have a sign variation.

So, very quickly, drive-through restaurant signage, as I mentioned, currently "only allows printed, non-electric menu board signs." There is a separate small, two-square-foot digital order screen that used to be common to confirm what your order is. Now, the trend in that industry is switching to fully electronic boards. As a result, we, and you, the Design Commission, have reviewed and approved six sign variation requests to allow fully electronic menu boards for various drive-through restaurants.

Those are summarized here on this chart. McDonald's, back in 2019, McDonald's did two of their restaurants. In 2021, Burger King did theirs. Portillo's in 2023, Dunkin' in 2025, and then the most current was Popeye's. So, this was helpful to see what they were asking for, were there any negative consequences of this. We haven't had any issues or complaints, and you can see the size is very consistent to have basically fixed by the size of these screens. They typically have two of them for the main menu and one of them if they have a pre-sell menu. So, we're basing our code amendment off of that.

This is an example of a traditional menu board. This one that's shown is 39 square feet; 49 square feet is what's allowed by code. That's going to remain. If somebody wants to do traditional still, they can. Raising Cane's

came in a brand-new building, they didn't want electronic menu boards. So, the code does allow a larger size for printed because obviously they can't change it as easily.

This is an example; this one happens to be a McDonald's. This is 20 square feet. We're proposing 23 for code, that's just to allow for slight variations in the framing and whatever that we've seen in the past proposals, but these are generally smaller, which is good. They can update and change the menu so they don't need as much space.

Our recommendation is to amend the code to allow fully electronic menu boards not to exceed 23 square feet, allow fully electronic pre-sell menu boards not to exceed 10 square feet, and then these should include a condition to require that they follow operational standards when it comes to electronic displays which is no scrolling, fading, flashing, animation or video, that it will be just static displays only. Obviously, they can change and update for breakfast to lunch and whatever and make daily changes, but it's not going to be something that's going to be constantly animating. Auto-dimming is another requirement. These are kind of standard requirements with any other electronic signs that we've had. So, that would be our recommendation.

Do you want me to go through all three and then we can make motions, or should we do one at a time?

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Can I just ask a quick question?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Go ahead, please.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Thank you.

Initially, I was going to ask about the square footages, but I see you came up with those in the precedents, which makes perfect sense.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Correct.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Item No. 2, Modify code to allow additional wall sign on an additional wall which fronts on the privately-owned parking area for the restaurant, can you just provide a little context of why?

MR. HAUTZINGER: Yes, that's the next one.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Oh, next, got it.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Does anybody have any questions about this one?

(No response.)

MR. HAUTZINGER: Do you want to make a motion for this one? I would recommend we just make a motion for each section.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Sure, okay. I'd like to make a motion to approve No. 1 with Staff's comments included.

**A motion to recommend approval to the Village Board of Sign Code Amendment Item No. 1, Drive-through Restaurant Menu Signage, as follows:**

- 1. Modify the current code to allow fully electronic menu boards for drive-through restaurants as follows:**
  - **Fully electronic menu boards shall not exceed 23 square feet in size.**

- **Fully electronic pre-sell menu boards shall not exceed 10 square feet in size.**
- **Fully electronic menus shall be required to follow operational standards:**
  - **The menu board shall have a static display only. No scrolling, fading, flashing, animation, or video is permitted.**
  - **The menu board must use auto-dimming photocell technology to adjust the display brightness automatically based on ambient lighting conditions.**
  - **Off-premises advertising is not allowed.**
  - **Shall only be illuminated the same hours that the business is open.**

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Second.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: There's a second by Commissioner Kubow.

Any discussion required?

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: We didn't open it up for public comment. Is this subject to public comment?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Yes.

Is there anybody in the public that would like to speak on the --

MR. MCCASKEY: I'm good. Good point.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Yes, thank you very much.

So, okay, we have a second, so we want to do a roll call vote

for Item 1.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Yes.

Commissioner Fitzgerald.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Kubow.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Eckhardt.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: And Acting Chair Seyer.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Okay, moving on then, Item No. 2, this is drive-through restaurant wall signage. Currently, per code, one wall sign is allowed per street frontage. That's just sort of a blanket requirement that applies to any business in Arlington Heights. Drive-through restaurants are kind of unique since they have the drive-through that rings around the front that generally pushes the main entrance on the side, and they always want a sign by their entrance and a sign on the front.

This is what we've been seeing. As a result, we have seen numerous sign variation requests from drive-through restaurants. Similar to the past one, here's a summary of what's been requested. You can see all these businesses, McDonald's, Arby's, Burger King, Taco Bell, Popeye's, all these

different drive-through restaurants, they happen to all have a single street frontage, so none of these were a corner property, which meant they were all allowed one wall sign. Every single one of these businesses came in and said we need more signs. Up to four was approved for McDonald's back, I guess I don't know, back in 2006, that's kind of going back. But three, two, two is very common. Sometimes they want more, sometimes they get more.

Staff's recommendation is to amend code to allow a second wall sign by right for these fast-food restaurants. If they want anything more than that, they'll have to come through the variation process and we'll evaluate those on a case-by-case basis, but the recommendation is to amend code to allow an additional wall sign on an additional wall which fronts on the privately-owned parking area for that restaurant.

Here is just one example of how that looks. This is very typical, one wall sign. This is a past sign variation, they got their wall sign on the front per code, and then they got a variation for this one which is above their entrance.

I'm happy to take any questions or comments.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Do they have to stay within the same square footage as the front?

MR. HAUTZINGER: The square footage is based on the size of the wall that it's mounted on per code. In fact, let me just look at my actual code language for that.

Yes, we didn't get specific about that. Generally speaking, per code, wall signs are limited to 25 percent of the area of the wall that they're mounted on up to a certain maximum that's defined by code. So, they would basically be allowed to have a sign of a size that's appropriate. That 25 percent rule comes in just making sure that a sign is not crammed in on a wall, filling it edge to edge, top to bottom, limiting that to 25 percent of the wall.

In this case, it looks like they were well under 25 percent of this, this would be the signable wall area would be the brick up here. Just eyeballing it, they were under 25 percent. But that's what they wanted, they didn't ask for more than that. If we amended code to allow it by right, they could have done a larger wall sign, but I suspect they would have proposed the same thing anyways based on their brand's standards.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: I'd like to make a motion to the Chairman.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Do we have to open it up to the audience?

MR. HAUTZINGER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Did you want to make a motion?

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: No, I was going to say do we have to ask if there's any comments.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Oh.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Yes, are there any comments from the public on this matter?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, Commissioner Eckhardt has a motion.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Thank you.  
I'd like to make a motion.

**A motion to recommend approval to the Village Board of Sign Code Amendment Item No. 2, Drive-through Restaurant Wall Signage, to modify the code to allow an additional wall sign on an additional wall which fronts on the privately-owned parking area for the restaurant.**

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Second.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, there's a second by Commissioner Kubow.

Any discussion from amongst us?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: There is not, so roll call.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Fitzgerald.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Kubow.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Eckhardt.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: And Acting Chair Seyer.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Okay, the last item is regarding the sign variation notification requirements. Per code, currently, if a petitioner is seeking a sign variation, they're required to provide public notification in the form of (1) posting a sign or signs at the property notifying the public of the meeting time and date and what the request is, and (2) they are required to send mailed-out notices to surrounding property owners.

Currently, code requires for sign variations that the mailing be sent out via certified mail and it has to be done seven days before the meeting. This is something that's inconsistent with the Village's notification requirement for zoning issues. So, if somebody was going to the Zoning Board of Appeals or Plan Commission for some sort of zoning-related request, their mailing requirement only requires first class mail. To put that in perspective, certified mail is like \$6 to \$10 per letter, where for first class mail is like 0.78 cents. That can become substantial depending on how many they're sending out.

Similarly, the zoning-related mailings are required to be done 15 days before the meeting, which is the same requirement for when the sign is posted. I don't know why for sign variations it's only seven days before the meeting, and Staff has concerns that that's not enough time. You put a letter in the mail seven days before a meeting, hopefully it gets in the hands of the person you're sending it to in time. Ironically, it actually might be delayed by certified mail because if they're not there to sign for it, it goes to the post office and they have to pick it up.

So, our recommendation is to amend the code so that the mailing requirement for a sign variation would be the same as what we require for other boards and commissions for zoning variations, which is to mail out via first class mail 15 days before the meeting.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Understood.

Is there anybody from the public that would like to speak on this matter?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: No, okay.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: I'd like to make a motion.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: So, motion by Commissioner Kubow.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: I'd like to make a motion.

**A motion to recommend approval to the Village Board of Sign Code Amendment Item No. 3, Sign Variation Notification Requirements, to modify code to change the requirement for written notifications for sign variations to be sent by first class mail (instead of certified mail) due 15 days before the meeting date (instead of seven days).**

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Second.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: We have a second by Commissioner Fitzgerald.

Any discussion required?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: No, okay.

Go to a vote.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Fitzgerald.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Kubow.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Eckhardt.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: And Acting Chair Seyer.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: That's all I had.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, thank you very much.

MR. HAUTZINGER: And these, for the Design Commission's understanding, will advance now to the Village Board. Similar to a sign variation, you know, your recommendation goes to the Village Board who has the final word on amending the code. So, I'll be setting that up and seeing that through with them. Pretty straight-forward though.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: I don't believe we have any other business?

MR. HAUTZINGER: Just general public comment.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Just general public comment.

Is there anybody from the public who'd like to talk?

MR. MOENS: I just want to thank the Design Commission for asking for public comment before the vote was taken on the motion. We appreciate that, and I assume this may be the last meeting for the Chair?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: For the Acting Chair, yes.

MR. MOENS: For the Acting Chair.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Is it possible I can give a closing statement as an Acting Chair with my last meeting?

MR. HAUTZINGER: Sure.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Okay, I just want to say, thanks for this opportunity to say, I wrote it down, sorry, but thank you for the opportunity to serve this community on this Commission for the past several years. It's been an honor to contribute my time and experience in the service of the Village. As an architect that's worked more than 30 years, working on projects both large and small, I've always believed that thoughtful design matters. It shapes how people live, work, gather and take pride in what they call home. I've tried to bring that perspective here with professionalism, fairness and respect for the residents and applicants and fellow Commissioners.

I'm proud of what we have accomplished together, helping guide development, preserving the character for our Village, and encouraging quality design that will serve future generations. While I'm disappointed not to continue, I respect the Mayor's prerogative to appoint new members, and I sincerely wish the next Commission success. I hope that the decisions will always be guided by integrity, sound judgment, and a long-term commitment to the community.

So, thank you again for the privilege of being part of this Commission. I have enjoyed my time. Hopefully, I've given some value. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. HAUTZINGER: As Staff Liaison, I thank you for your service.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Thank you very much.

MR. HAUTZINGER: You've been a super valuable person for this Commission and you'll certainly be missed.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Agree.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Scott, I forgot to bring the slide machine.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Well, on that note, do we have a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Sure, I'll make a motion to adjourn tonight's Design Commission dated April 28th, 2026.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: I'll second.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Second by Commissioner Eckhardt.

All those in favor? You want to a roll call?

MR. HAUTZINGER: One last time.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: One last time.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Fitzgerald.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Kubow.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Eckhardt.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: And Acting Chair Seyer.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON SEYER: Yes.

Okay, thank you very much. Meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 8:29 p.m.)

STATE OF ILLINOIS        )  
                                  ) SS.  
COUNTY OF KANE         )

I, RONALD LeGRAND, JR., depose and say that I am a digital court reporter doing business in the State of Illinois; that I reported verbatim the foregoing proceedings and that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript to the best of my knowledge and ability.

\_\_\_\_\_  
RONALD LeGRAND, JR.

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO  
BEFORE ME THIS \_\_\_\_\_ DAY OF  
\_\_\_\_\_, A.D. 2026.

\_\_\_\_\_  
NOTARY PUBLIC