

DESIGN

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

COMMISSION

RE: 622 SOUTH MITCHELL AVENUE – SF/ADDITION - DC #26-034

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 23rd day of June, 2026 at the hour of
6:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

KIRSTEN KINGSLEY, Chairperson
JONATHAN KUBOW
JOHN FITZGERALD
TED ECKHARDT
RICH BONDAROWICZ

ALSO PRESENT:

STEVE HAUTZINGER, Design Planner

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: I'll call to order the meeting on June 23rd, 2026 for the Design Commission. Our first item on the agenda is Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Thank you.

Next item is roll call.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Bondarowicz.

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: Here.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Eckhardt.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Here.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Kubow.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Here.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Fitzgerald.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Here.

MR. HAUTZINGER: And Chair Kingsley.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Here.

Thank you.

Approval of minutes from May 19th, is there a motion or a discussion?

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: I'd like to make a motion to approve the minutes on May 19th.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: There's a motion to approve.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Second.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: And a second.

Discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: All those in favor say aye?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Minutes have been approved.

There's no old business, but new business. Our first item is 622 South Mitchell. So, I'll just briefly go over how we work the meetings here.

Staff will first present, then we'll give a time for the petitioner to come up and present. Then we'll open it up to the public if the public would like to say anything about the petition. Then the Commissioners then will discuss, okay? Steve?

MR. HAUTZINGER: Okay, let me just bring up their exhibits. Okay, Petitioner is here tonight proposing a single-story addition to an existing two-story home. The plans do comply with all of the R-3 Single-Family Zoning requirements.

The scope of this project includes demolition of an existing one-car attached garage which may have already been replaced with a new two-car detached garage in the rear yard. The one-car attached garage is attached to the front of the home. In fact, let me just zoom in on their aerial here.

So, they're proposing to demolish the one-car attached garage on the front to make room for a new single-story addition that will go across the front of the house. Again, the garage has been replaced with a new detached garage that is in the back rear yard here. Let me pull up their plans quickly.

So, the context elevation shows the existing home on the top in the middle with the existing one-car attached garage, and then you can see the proposed design with the new single-story addition across the front of the house. This type of single-story room addition, it's very commonly added to the back of the house, and there's probably countless homes throughout Arlington Heights that have had single-story room additions on the rear of an existing two-story house to expand a family room, a kitchen, a bedroom area. This one is unusual and the reason it's here tonight is, you know, kind of the unique arrangement that this addition is being proposed on the front of the house. So, it's giving the house a new front, a new identity, and it's just a little unusual.

That unusual arrangement is set up by the existing setback of the two-story portion of the house which creates a lot of space for them to add a significant addition on the front while still complying with the front yard setback requirement. But the resulting massing is going to be a little odd, and that's the reason we just want to let the Design Commission take a look at it. Again, from the street, the single-story portion will read as really the new front of the house. So, it's really going to feel like a single-story home that has a second-floor kind of towards the back. You can see in the side views the depth of the addition is really what's kind of setting up the somewhat unusual massing for the house.

So, that's their proposal and we're just requesting the Design Commission's evaluation of it.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Thank you.

Does the Petitioner want to come up and speak?

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Sure. Good evening, everyone. Thank you for having us and thank you for being here tonight. My name is Nico Georgaklis; I'm the architect of record for this project. Not only am I an Arlington Heights resident, I also live I think seven houses down from this particular residence. So, I'm also professionally and personally invested in this project.

The challenges that we did have for this particular project, Steve, would you mind flipping to the site plan please? So, yes, the challenges that we had in this project was the fact that we had an existing detached garage which was built before we started this study. Considering the restriction of room that we had in the backyard and the abundance of room that we had in the front yard, this was the solution that we came up to.

We talked about doing a second, so we discussed a myriad of different types of approaches to this. We looked at what would happen if we took the entire mass and put it in the rear yard, but we would still have to address the existing garage which was going to be demo-ed in any situation, which would still require us to do a little bit of work in the front. This was the proposal that the clients and I decided would fit their needs most cleanly.

While I do agree with the sort of, I would say, I'm trying to pick the right word here, the sort of unique nature of the second story or the two-story addition versus the one-story addition, we're trying to do as much as we can.

Steve, would you mind flipping to the front facade?

MR. HAUTZINGER: Sure.

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Thanks. So, what we did initially was we

created a mass that basically went out to the setback lines. After having explored a couple of those iterations, we decided to look to see what would happen if we broke down the rooms a little bit. So, we tried to break down the massing of it by not only having sort of two roof ridges, including a portico, and setting the bedroom section which is going to be on the right-hand side, setting it back a few feet as compared with the living room section which is on the left-hand side. So, you know, again while slightly unique in nature, I do think that the different types of massing that occurs helps to break down this sort of what would be a larger massing, but we think that this is, you know, a reasonable approach.

The other thing that the owners have committed to is they have committed to taking down the siding on the old section and putting in new siding throughout the entire residence so we can have a much more cohesive materialistic approach to this. So, the siding is going to be all the same, the roofing material, gutter material and all that is going to be all the same as well. The only material that we're not going to be bringing in from the old residence to the new residence is going to be the existing brick which you can see in the photos. I've also brought a piece of the brick with us here so you can look at the materials as well if you'd like. That's all I have to say.

Are there any questions for me?

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Not at this time.

Commissioners, do you have any questions?

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Can you describe the roof plan? I don't, there's not one in the set.

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Roof plan?

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: I'm trying to do it in my head just by looking at it. I believe you have ridges, each of those, the two major peaks have ridges all the way back in the existing house? Oh, there it is. Okay.

MR. HAUTZINGER: It was not in your packet, but --

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Oh, okay, I didn't see it.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Let me just staring at it for about two seconds.

MR. GEORGAKLIS: So, the two ridges with a large saddle in between.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: They go back to the house, and then there's a little saddle for the entryway. Shouldn't there be another line at the entryway going back and getting somewhere into the roof?

MR. GEORGAKLIS: So, yes, we have the primary roof ridge coming here, we have another primary roof ridge coming in this section, and then the portico is going to have its own roof ridge. So, this whole section is going to be sloping down in this direction, and this small section right here is going to be sloping down in the other direction. So, the triangle for the portico exists in this area. We've got the other triangle here, and then the other one over here above the bedroom area, and this is the large saddle.

Our plan for the saddle is to pitch it as much as required so that we can put asphalt shingles on top of that as well. We don't want to include yet

another material to this. So, we will make sure that that is pitched the minimum required for asphalt shingles.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: They're asphalt, okay. All right, thank you. Those are my questions.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: All right, thank you.

MR. GEORGAKLIS: That's it? Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Yes.

Is there anyone in the audience that would like to be heard on this or ask any questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: There are none.

Well, why don't we start with Commissioner Eckhardt?

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Okay, you know, it's unique. The Petitioner has an option to save his backyard by building in front. It is code compliant so that makes perfect sense to me. I like the fact that it's in the front, that it kind of de-scales the whole thing. So, I'm just going to take a quick peek all the way around the house. It looks like the fenestration is continuing around the house with both the brick and siding and they're mirroring the house.

Quite often, this Commission suggests that the petitioners provide a small roof at the backdoor so water is not banging in to the joints. On the backdoor, you've got a, I can't tell if it's a pair of doors or what. Maybe that door has the fenestration or the muntins, but there's a clear story piece, and it doesn't seem to go up as high as the roof. So, I don't know if stairs go down to it when it goes out.

But at any rate, a roof back there would be recommended. It depends on who makes the motion, but I'm okay with it.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Kubow?

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Yes, I tend to agree with Commissioner Eckhardt. I tend to have a bit more leniency when it comes to additions versus teardowns given, you know, it could be a little bit more challenging. Obviously, we have a unique kind of proposal here this evening.

I think two things. One, it looks like an addition and I'm fine with that. I have no issues there. We don't always want additions to match perfectly to the existing home, and they fit with this architecture and plays nicely.

I think the only question I have is the, or comment is if you look at the second floor, the left, just the two windows feel, I don't know, they're not symmetrical and they feel a little out of place. I get the placement because you don't really have a ton of room to play with there. I was just quickly drawing in the Pdf, did you ever think about introducing a gable at the front? I'm not sure how that would look, if it would be too busy and obviously it's introducing a bit more cost, but was that ever part of, kind of one of your iterations?

MR. GEORGAKLIS: We have talked about it. The goal for the clients is to limit as much work to the first floor as we possibly can, but we have discussed it.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Okay, yes, it's not going to be a

requirement or even a recommendation. It's just really a comment to help maybe even out the architecture at the ground floor or the first floor and the second floor, but otherwise, I'm fine with the proposal.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Thank you.

Commissioner Fitzgerald?

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: All right, first of all, I have no problem with the way that you've pulled the house out and you're using the space that you're using. I am concerned that we have a very clean, classic, simple existing house, and then to me, we seem to be putting a little bit of busyness in front of it. I'm wondering if there could be any simplification of it.

I also have a question on when I'm looking at Exhibit 2 which would be the east construction elevation, I see the portico and I see the two pillars that, I assume that that's sticking out from the house. How far is that sticking out?

MR. GEORGAKLIS: I believe it's only five feet or so. It's whatever the code requirement maximum is.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Okay, is there anything along the house that backs up those pillars or breaks up that frame on the house, or does the siding just go all the way across on a flat surface? Does the question make sense first of all?

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Yes. Yes, it does make sense, and yes, we probably would develop something like that, that would help sort of frame that opening and sort of define the portico a little bit more, because yes, I know what you're talking about. But, yes, I think that's something that we were planning on doing at some point.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: All right, so those are my two comments. I think something should be done with that, and then I do think that the roof lines are a little busy when I look at the original home. Now, we'll see what my colleagues have to say.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: All right, thank you.

Bondarowicz, Commissioner Bondarowicz. I could just only think of your first name, I'm so sorry. He's our newest member.

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: Yes. Well, my first comment is that I think it looks much better than a one-car garage that's projecting out the front of the house. So, which I think is great, it's a very creative solution to what you're dealing with here.

It appears you're not, so you don't have any brick on any of the addition portions, right?

MR. GEORGAKLIS: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: Right, so you have, you know, people will take that reclaimed brick so make sure you guys do something with it. Maybe you'll have an idea on that. They're looking for it. That's just a side note because we have a project that we're looking for reclaimed brick.

So, you're redoing all the siding on the house. It looks like your color scheme is such that your gables in here are going to be a shake style, but it looks like that's the same color as the siding, right? At least at this point?

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Right now, we're proposing two different colors,

and I've got the color samples here. We're choosing a lightish blue for the lower section, and then for the shakers we're going to choose like a greyish.

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: Okay, because you've got, oh, you have color to match, okay. So, Everest is the product. So, you have two different --

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Can you bring up the samples? Would you mind doing that?

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Sure, absolutely. So, the color to match the existing on the blue is what they've chosen for the garage which is there right now, the detached garage in the rear.

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: Oh, so that exists already and it's done and it's blue.

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Correct. The color to match existing on the shakers is a typo and it shouldn't be there.

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: Okay, that's why I was like what's going on with these colors.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: So, to reiterate, the first-floor siding on the front and the back is a light blue --

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: -- called Blue Grey; that matches the garage.

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: And then the second floor is color Everest or Storm?

MR. GEORGAKLIS: So, we're going with Storm. So, this is a different manufacturer than what I've listed here.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Oh, okay.

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Since we switched manufacturers, but these are the colors that they want to go with.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Okay, so just so everything is out here, it's Blue Grey for the first floor, Storm for the second floor including the shingles, and it's kind of like a light blue/slate blue.

MR. GEORGAKLIS: So, the second story, yes, so all of the horizontal siding will be the light blue, and all of the shaker siding will be the grey.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Will be the Storm, right?

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Okay, so all the siding is blue.

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: Yes. So, all the horizontal siding is matching the garage.

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Correct.

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: That's your kind of base color.

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: Okay, and the shake is a darker color.

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Correct.

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: So, to John Fitzgerald, that

may be, you know, it looks a little busy, too, because of that. It's coming off as black and white but it's really not going to look black and white, right? It's just going to have more texture.

So, the windows are white. You have some existing windows on the house.

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Right.

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: The new windows will be white, and then what happens with your, like the cladding around those existing windows which now is black?

MR. GEORGAKLIS: So, the trim around the existing windows, we're going to be using the white trim LP siding everywhere --

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: Okay.

MR. GEORGAKLIS: -- and all of the trim at the corners and along the gables, or yes, along the soffits and the trim that's going on horizontally, it's all going to be this white LP siding.

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: Okay, so the existing windows that are in the brick work currently have black cladding around them.

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Right.

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: What are you doing with that? They're getting swapped out?

MR. GEORGAKLIS: So, the windows themselves I believe are, they're white vinyl and we're going to get additional white vinyl. So, the black trim work around is going to be removed.

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: Yes, okay, okay. So, they'll all be consistent.

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Correct.

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: Got it. So, the only thing that really is going to remain original or sort of vintage here is the brick and the white vinyl windows that are existing in here; otherwise, everything is going to have a new feel to it.

MR. GEORGAKLIS: So, the upper section of roof is newer. I think it's only like five years, three years. A couple of years old.

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: It's not being replaced.

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Yes, that's not going to be replaced, and the new roofs are going to use the same shingles to match.

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: So, then what are you doing with the black gutters that are on here? Are they going to remain?

MR. GEORGAKLIS: They will remain and the new gutters will also be black.

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: Okay, are you doing anything with the electrical service?

MR. GEORGAKLIS: We haven't decided it yet.

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: It's on the back of the house, but it's, you know, because you know they're a bit of an eyesore.

MR. GEORGAKLIS: I think the intent is to keep it as is. We will be upgrading from 100 into 200 amps, but I don't think we have any plans right now to

go underground.

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: Well, I think assuming all of these elements are new on the house all the way around, I think it will be, it's going to be much nicer looking than what it looks like right now. So, I think it's great.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Thank you. So, I, too, think that, I commend you for keeping your house, for staying there, for trying to not touch what you have right now, you know, and making it doable for you guys to live there. I think that it is a unique project, having it come forward, but I think there are other homes that have, you know, one-story massing in the front with two-story in the back. So, it just needs to be done well.

I think that at first when I saw it, that it was a little busy with the triple gable. It makes sense though for roofing, you know, and how you're going to get the water off, to have the triple gable. I'm not, I don't think adding another one on the second floor where it could be a good idea, I just think it would fight with the first floor. So, I think I'm okay with it.

My only thought maybe would be not to have an open-ended, or I'm assuming, yes, it's an open-ended gable at the front door, right? It's, so we can see the hanging light, right, there's not a flat triangle in there. That would be my only thing is maybe thinking to enclose that, but I think it's fine the way it is.

I think the colors are good, too, especially since you already, the garage is already blue. So, I think that works and it's harmonious I think with the masonry.

I do have a question regarding the, there's a wood accent panel in your material list?

MR. GEORGAKLIS: So, that was something that was in the previous iteration of the elevations. We took that out, so that actually should not be there.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Okay, so in the front, that's all kind of white, and then the light blue and the grey?

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Okay, and so the ceiling of that porch is also going to be white?

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Well, actually that, we might actually make that out of wood. So, yes, the underside of the portico, yes, that might actually end up being wood.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: But other than that and the front door, there's no other wood?

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Okay, I think that works well. I agree with the other Commissioners about the window placing, but it's a tough one so I think it's fine for now. My only questions really would be about your trim, and like just to suggest that you use smooth trim versus the piece that you handed, what you showed us tonight.

MR. GEORGAKLIS: With the woodgrain?

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Yes, the woodgrain. I think you will still like the smooth better and LP makes smooth, and I think it's the same price. So, it's just a traditional, you have a traditional house, put on traditional trim.

Then to Commissioner Fitzgerald's comment about making that front offset by the porch, there is an offset on the north column, I believe it's north, the right as you're looking at it, right, because it sets back to the bedroom if you look at the plans? So, you have a little bit there, right?

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Could you repeat the question? I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: I'm just saying that the siding doesn't go all the way across whatever, you know, 40 feet or whatever that is. It stops, jogs back at the primary bedroom and then continues north.

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: So, you do have a break in the siding on the front elevation which is what I thought Commissioner Fitzgerald was asking.

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Yes. Yes, that's correct.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Okay, so perhaps as a solution, I'm sure you're going to have a corner board there, and is that going to be white?

MR. GEORGAKLIS: And it will be white, yes.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Okay, just a suggestion, to make a break at that same location, mirror it on the other side of the door and break the siding there. Maybe.

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Oh, so you're saying whatever happens, that corner behind the column, mirror it on the other side of the door so that both of the portico columns have that sort of visual break?

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Yes, it's just a suggestion.

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Like, so it's almost like an engaged column. It's nothing that sticks out really, but --

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Right.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: -- it's just, it's a vertical stop of the siding. I don't know how Commissioner Fitzgerald feels about that, but maybe that's a solution.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: I'd like a second chance when you're ready.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Okay, those are all my comments. Commissioner Eckhardt?

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Okay, after listening, and I'm in agreement with Commissioner Fitzgerald's concern about the front door, it occurs to me that the demolition of the garage and the stripping of the brick, the existing brick on the original house, there's going to be a lot of extra brick laying around, so much that trying to scavenge and find good pieces will not be difficult. So, I think the architect and the owners might want to consider using some of that brick to make their front door a little more ceremonial with some masonry and set that off. You can go further to put a wainscot across the bottom and run it around, but I think at least the front door deserves something special, and the brick may give you that. You're going to have plenty of it and you own it.

So, that's a suggestion. I don't know if it's going to make it to the motion, but I think it's something that, if it was my house, I would do it.

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Okay, we can explore something like that. I

think that's a good suggestion.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: I do have a question as well.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: So, at the gable entry to the front door, it's open, you can see the light fixture. What is the material of the ceiling?

MR. GEORGAKLIS: That probably would be the wood, yes.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: It would be the wood?

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Yes, either --

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Okay.

MR. GEORGAKLIS: -- beadboard or, yes, some sort of stained wood.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: I have one other comment. Someone had suggested having like a canopy over the backdoor or something to protect you as you're walking in. I wouldn't make it a requirement but a suggestion to, would you mind flipping to that elevation, Steve? Just to continue the roof line to what is our right here, so that would be the south, if you just continue that and have some kind of a bracket, it will cover the door going in, especially since that's a depressed doorway level entry, you know, like I'm assuming a roof drain there. But it would just be nice so that you have a little chance to unlock the door or corral kids or wipe off the dust for you to get in.

MR. GEORGAKLIS: It would help with water drainage, too.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Yes.

MR. GEORGAKLIS: So, yes, that's a good suggestion.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: I actually like that masonry idea. I like that, I'm not sure if they would bring it up just on either side of the door from like the corner by the primary room to the column, to the other column, but something might be okay.

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: All right, any other comments or questions for the Petitioner?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: I'm prepared to make a motion.

Motion to approve the proposed addition at 622 South Mitchell Avenue, DC #26-034, based upon the plans and materials received on 5/6/26, revised exterior elevations received 6/10/26, with the following recommendations:

- 1. A recommendation that the Petitioner utilize smooth trim;**
- 2. A recommendation that the Petitioner reuse some of the brick to further enhance the front entry door; and**
- 3. A recommendation that the Petitioner consider some type of overhang at the rear door to help provide additional protection and water protection.**

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Those are all recommendations?

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Correct.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Second.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: There's a motion and a second.

Anybody have questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Okay, all those in favor say aye?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: I'm sorry, we have to do roll call, right?

MR. HAUTZINGER: Yes, let's do a roll call vote.

Commissioner Fitzgerald.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Kubow.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Eckhardt.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Bondarowicz.

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: And Chair Kingsley.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: And I would just like to explain for the Petitioner's benefit; the motion included three recommendations but those are recommendations. So, you're not required to do those three things but, of course, you know, they would want to see that, you know, they would recommend doing that. But, again, when your building permit plans come in, you're not required to implement them, but if you decide to, that's acceptable as well.

All right, any questions, feel free to reach out --

MR. GEORGAKLIS: All right, thanks.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: -- and don't forget your samples. You don't need those, do you, Steve?

MR. HAUTZINGER: No.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Okay.

Thank you, and you're free to go.

MR. GEORGAKLIS: Thank you.

(Whereupon, the meeting on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.)

DESIGN

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

COMMISSION

RE: 318 WEST WING STREET – SF/TEARDOWN - DC #26-039(H)

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 23rd day of June, 2026 at the hour of
7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

KIRSTEN KINGSLEY, Chairperson
JONATHAN KUBOW
JOHN FITZGERALD
TED ECKHARDT (Recused himself for this petition)
RICH BONDAROWICZ

ALSO PRESENT:

STEVE HAUTZINGER, Design Planner

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Our next project is 318 West Wing Street, DC #26-039, a teardown.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Okay, I have to recuse myself from this matter. I'm the architect of record. Thank you, and --

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Have a good night.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: No, I'm going to wait outside.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: No, you're going to wait, okay.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT: Yes.

(Whereupon, Commissioner Eckhardt left the room.)

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: All right, so again, 318 West Wing, DC #26-039.

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

The existing home which is proposed to be demolished, and I'm just looking for the photos, here we are. There's separate exhibits in your packet with some photographs of the existing home, exterior and interior. The home was included in a Community Preservation Report which was prepared by the School of the Art Institute of Chicago for the Village of Arlington Heights. This was back in 2004. The report was prepared in an effort to raise community awareness and promote the preservation of historic character in certain neighborhoods in Arlington Heights. Homes in the report were surveyed and rated in order of importance as contributing, notable, or exceptional.

The subject house had the lowest rating, which is contributing, and the report estimated that the home's construction was between 1930 to 1950. Staff actually suspects that the existing home was built prior to 1930 based on just appearance and some construction details such as a brick foundation. It looks like an older home than that, I don't know that that is totally accurate. Regardless, it was again rated as a contributing historic home in their report, again encouraged for preservation.

Per the Village's Municipal Code Chapter 28, Section 13.7(c), code states that prior to issuance of a Certificate of Approval for demolition and new construction, the Design Commission will need to evaluate if the existing home has "significant architectural, historical, aesthetic or cultural value."

So, again, the Petitioner has provided some photos to help the Commission understand the condition of the home. I can just quickly scroll through some of those.

The exterior is really a little difficult to see because of the large tree that's blocking the front of the home, but through the interior, first floor images, again these are in your packet if you want to take a closer look or maybe you already have. Upper level, and then a couple of photos of the brick foundation down at the basement.

The Petitioner also provided an inspection report, a professional inspection report, which was also included in your packet. Reviewing

the report, most of the items were pretty minimal kind of maintenance issues, but it did note that there were sloping floors throughout due to foundation and structural issues. So, that sounds like a bigger issue. At face value, the home appears to be in relatively good condition. We definitely have seen homes in much worse condition than this one.

So, in regards to the significant architectural, aesthetic or cultural value, in Staff's assessment looking for that type of merit in this home, not necessarily the strongest contender in Staff's assessment. Architecturally, it's an interesting older home, but not necessarily of significant architectural character. Again, this is Staff's opinion on the matter.

Then, as well as the surrounding context is a factor from this case as well because, flipping to the photos, the context photos, the street is already very mixed with some older, more historic homes, but many newer homes of varying styles. It's really quite an eclectic block. So, again, you know, evaluating this house in this particular context, this is not an area where this is a really pure, important block of historic homes that has this great character and losing one of these homes or replacing it with new would be completely out of character. That has already taken place for many of the surrounding properties around this one.

So, for those reasons, Staff is not strongly opposed to the proposed redevelopment; however, that will be up to the Design Commission to evaluate.

Switching gears to the proposed new home, I'll bring up the colored front rendering. Overall, it's a nicely designed home, traditional style, it would generally fit well in this location. The colored rendering is very helpful, illustrating the proposed exterior materials and colors. All materials, nice quality, nice color palette, everything well-coordinated. Definitely has a nice appearance.

There's a few discrepancies between the rendering and the architectural front elevation. These are relatively minor details, but the bay window on the front of the home which will be somewhat of a focal point, you know, looks to have kind of a really flat roof above it, slightly shorter proportions. It just looks a little nicer on the rendering with the steeper roof a little bit taller in proportions, the windows all fit the same scale. So, incorporating those subtle details would be encouraged.

Secondly, the architectural elevation is not showing any decorative, like muntins or decorative grills in any of the windows around the house, whereas on the elevation or the rendering, there's just the one decorative muntin going down the center of each window that just adds a nice little touch of detail. Again, these are minor in the grand scheme of things, but those are a couple of details that Staff would recommend incorporating, again as recommendations.

Let's see. A couple of just comments on the proposed design. Staff appreciates that the garage is recessed back from the front of the home. Again, some of the homes on this block have detached garages, others have attached. But keeping that focused on the front wall of the house and the main entry is consistent with the design guidelines, so that's a nice arrangement here.

Then, also the stone base on this house, you know, we often see wanting to put a stone base on the front only and it's just kind of applied. Staff

acknowledges and appreciates that that stone base wraps the corner to the front of the garage all the way down the side of the garage and returns to the inside corner. It's also repeated again towards the back of the house and about halfway down the other side of the home. So, I just commend the architect on those details.

So, in summary, Staff is recommending or requesting the Design Commission to evaluate the proposed demolition of the existing house. If the Design Commission is okay with that, then we would be recommending approval of the design of the new house.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Thank you, Steve.

Petitioner?

MR. HAMMAN: Thanks for the report, Steve.

Just to keep it simple, I want to just read the main thing from the historic, or from the inspection report. There are two different types of foundations on the property. There's a brick foundation and a block. The west foundation was bowing and has shifted; there are many cracks and water penetrations coming in on all sides of the foundation. There is water penetration all over the floor as well as effervescence built up on the walls.

We've done and built a lot of houses in the area and really do care about historic preservation, but in the case of this house, between the foundation and the really low second floor, we don't think this is a good candidate for an addition. We've been working with the physician who is probably going to buy the house and he's really excited about the design of this. We think that it has a contemporary, but also a traditional setting designed to replace the old house.

We didn't think anything that remarkable of the old house besides the front porch. So, we're trying to keep the character of it by including a front porch in the new house. That's all I have.

Questions?

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: No, I think we'll, unless anyone has questions right now?

MR. HAUTZINGER: Sorry for the interruption. Would you state your name just for the record?

MR. HAMMAN: Oh, sorry. Mike Hamman.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Did you sign up?

MR. HAMMAN: I did.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Okay, anyone in the audience that would like to be heard on this?

MS. OLSON: I had a question. The listings --

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: If you could just state your name?
Sorry.

MS. OLSON: Oh, I'm sorry. It's Katherine Olson, O-l-s-o-n. The listings for this house stated it's 1864, you said it's 1930?

MR. HAUTZINGER: The Community Preservation Report had estimated a construction between 1930 and 1950, which Staff commented that it looks like an older home than that. I didn't know if it would be that old, or --

MS. OLSON: So, we live on the block and we're in one of the newer

houses that, you know, they had torn down a 1950's ranch to build this one instead, but there are older farmhouses that we believe are actually really old on that block. So, I was just curious about the dating on the house.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Yes, that report is not necessarily like, you know, certified to be accurate or anything. That was an estimation by the surveyors of what the year was. As we kind of noted, we're not sure if that's accurate or not.

MS. OLSON: I'm glad that there was discussion, you know, in 2004 or whenever, I'm glad that there was discussion about whether it's worth preserving. That's great.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: There's some more talk about that in the Village as well. There are some people that are trying to make it, just awareness essentially --

MS. OLSON: Yes, because --

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: -- to what's happening, you know.

MS. OLSON: -- we don't really think of Wing Street being historic because no historic districts across the tracks, but we do have some original farmhouses on that block.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Yes, and two doors away, there's an original farmhouse, right?

MS. OLSON: Yes, right.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: And I think there's one across the street as well.

MS. OLSON: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: So, I think looking at it, I mean, I think the people who did the survey looked at it and saw new siding and perhaps even new windows, but the window placement, I believe, and the porch make it seem to me that it's older. But, you know, and obviously the foundation it seems, you know, it's older.

Do you have any other comments?

MS. OLSON: No, thanks.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Before you leave tonight, can you just sign in?

MS. OLSON: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: That would be great. It just helps for our meeting minutes.

MS. OLSON: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Anyone else?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Okay, we'll go to the Board.

Commissioner Kubow?

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Yes.

Overall, it's a beautifully designed house. I think for us on the Board, our focus is always on a 360-degree architecture. I feel like you guys have hit it out of the park. In fact, I think maybe even the front elevation isn't my favorite; I love the rear elevation. I love this side elevation; I wish you mirrored everything. I

think it's really, really well done.

I also agree with Staff's comments regarding the front box bay and the mullions. When you came up, you didn't acknowledge that. So, my question for you is what are your thoughts on that?

MR. HAMMAN: Yes, I was about to say we were fine with the mullions and we agree, it looks too short on the front elevation unlike the rendered, so we're open to making that box window steeper.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Okay, great, thank you. Then, Steve, I think you did a great job and Staff on the assessment and just your overall review. I think whenever we see a teardown, it's important to look at context, especially if it's part of the report.

You know, this house looks like it's in decent condition from the exterior, and then when you see the report, you see the deterioration of the foundation which is really challenging to deal with. But, you know, it would have been nice to try and keep this but, you know, it's not going to stop me from approving the motion. Just because a house is old doesn't mean it can't be torn down. So, the historic nature, then I think it's a different conversation. In my opinion, I don't see this house as historic and I'm fine with having it being down, but overall, it's a beautiful house. That's it, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Thank you.

Commissioner Fitzgerald?

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Yes, I agree with everything that Commissioner Kubow just said.

I only have one question. On the front foundation, on the porch, is there stone along that wall and the wall that would be perpendicular to the front door that would be on the right side? It looks like there is siding on there, but then there is stone on the west elevation.

MR. HAMMAN: It looks like it's siding on the porch. So, it's --

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: So, if, which I'm not opposed to, but if you decided to do that, I think it should return right where the mouse is or the cursor is right now, and then I would remove the siding on, or I'm sorry, remove the stone on the west side. So, it would be one or the other. Either have the whole thing stone, or make it look like that room that has the box bay, that that has the stone and maybe the other part with an addition or vice versa. So, that's all I have.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: All right then.

Commissioner Bondarowicz.

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: My turn?

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: So, I concur with the other Commissioners, and I just want to maybe add to Commissioner Fitzgerald's comment.

I do strongly suggest that stone be added to that right side as you're going up to the entry. I think John, what you were saying, I was confused on where that stone is to the left of the door. Personally, I'm never a fan of taking stone on an elevation and just ending it. It looks like it just ends in the middle of nowhere on the left or the west elevation like that. It just seems like we ran out of

money, which is maybe the case, and that's usually the case because if there was more money, you would just carry it to the back. You might just be better off not having it there and not on the front of whatever that room is.

I think that, John, what you just said is that just looks like a siding element and put the stone on the right side of the door.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Yes, that is what I would suggest one or the other. Either stone all the way across or what we just said with the siding from the wall where the front door is all the way around the west elevation. One or the other.

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: And I'm the one non-architect here, so I'm going to reserve the architect's opinion, but the left side looks like we ran out of money. So, we might be better off just having no stone there and put the stone to the right of the door, unless there's a better way to break that up. Now, of course landscaping will break that up, we know that. The shrubs and everything will help that situation, but that would be my only suggestion.

I see zero significant value to that existing house. The windows were replaced with sliding windows that don't fit or look architecturally correct. It's either vinyl or aluminum siding. It just looks like a 70's remodel of an old house with a basement that's crumbling. I think it's time to bring something beautiful to the street and I think you guys did a great job with this.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: For what it's worth, I agree with what the Commissioner said. I think that's a good, Commissioner Fitzgerald pointing that out; I think it's a great recommendation and I'm a 100 percent on board with that.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: I agree.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: So, removal here and confronting one of the additions to the front and side portion of each.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Right. So, we're eliminating the stone on the west elevation; I agree.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: It feels more intentional.

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: It also looks like there might be stone to the left of the door. It's hard to tell with that railing.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Right.

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: It looks like there's a cap there, but I think what we're all saying is just get rid of the stone to the left of the door right there and don't wrap it around the corner. You'll spend less money and it will look more purposeful, like okay, that's a siding element.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Excellent. Anything else? No, okay.

So, I always hate to see buildings from 1860 being torn down, but seeing the condition of the home, it's hard. It's hard to do any additions, especially when the second floor has that ceiling kind of like that, and the foundation is in such poor repair. I would suggest, and it would be nice as a courtesy, to send in or give those pictures to the Historical Society, just so they know what was there, and if you have any existing drawings of it. Just submit that so that at least we have it historically in file for what was there.

So, the new building, yes, I think it's a really nice design. I

agree with all the comments with the stone. I do have a quick question regarding, if you could just go to the front elevation -- oh, the front elevation is up.

A couple of thoughts on this, especially looking at it in the drawing versus the rendering. The window sizes, I actually didn't zoom in to see if they were all the same, but it appears that the two second floor windows may be the same but I almost, it's like they're close but not close enough. It would be nice if at least the proportions of the windows on the front elevation were more similar.

So, right now when I'm looking at this, I like the proportion of the second-floor window in the bay that protrudes, but the first-floor bay that actually protrudes, it's a squat proportion. So, if any of those can change so that, whether they come in narrower or wide, you know, or wider, whatever, that would help. In the rendering, it doesn't come off that way and I think that was just a freedom of the renderer.

I also think that the really skinny windows over the garage, like they're kind of similar to the one at the toilet on the first floor, but they don't really match. So, maybe those could get wider, but again, it's about proportion. So, I would just, I love the muntins and that you are going to add those, but I think that having those proportions be more similar would make it much more of a success.

The other thing, kind of silly but I think would make the house more welcoming is, at the front door, and maybe it's a little more apparent in the rendering, but because there isn't a window to the left of the front door, I don't know, I feel like there needs to be another window. Everything is so symmetrical except for that little facade. I know you have like a mailbox slot there and the numbers there, but to me, and I know you have a bathroom there, but maybe add another window in there? That might be nice, just that's a suggestion.

Then the other one is maybe eliminate the railing. You don't need it by code. You're going to be less than 24 inches off the grade. To me, it's just a little more welcoming. I know the original porch had a railing, but it was much taller. I mean, you needed it by code. So, I know those are kind of random thoughts, but it did hit me.

The other one is I like the black windows, the fact that you have the white trim, but you have black fascia, soffit, gutters, correct?

MR. HAMMAN: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Because I'm seeing that on the rendering, but it's, and I see the gutters and the materials sample board, but I didn't see anything that said anything about the soffits and fascia.

MR. HAMMAN: You're correct. It appears as black off the rendering.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Yes. I know it's probably a big ask, not sure how the rest of the Commissioners feel, but because we're getting rid of a historic contributing building from around the turn of the century let's say, we're giving a lot of leeway here, to maybe give it a little more, the aesthetic is more historic where historically we didn't have black fascia, soffit and gutters unless the whole house was really dark.

So, my suggestion is to minimize that black, and I'm not sure what the right answer is, but I actually think having a white fascia/soffit with the black gutters, and you can have some black accents, but that might just make the

house fit in. If you look at the elevation of the street, there's no other black kind of house on the street. Frankly, I think if somebody drove by this house in 30 years, they're going to be able to date it because of those black soffits and fascias. So, I just suggest considering changing the colors of those things. That's it.

Any other comments or thoughts on what I said?

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: I would agree. I think all black on the eaves of it, can it just be suggestions, but it is going to look like exactly the year it was built, because anywhere you go that's historic simply does not have black eaves. What's been really successful is to simply take the windows and go to bronze or dark bronze, and then do dark bronze gutters and use that as an accent because the dark bronze gutters will look like copper gutters that have aged which then gives you a historic feel. Now, it gets away from the black and white look, but it is a little unusual to have a white frieze board with black eaves. It is just going to look like something that was done in 2026 and five years from now, again you might have a buyer for it and they may love this and it's their house and we get it, but in the context of a historic sort of a neighborhood as we're saying, I agree a 100 percent.

Frankly, I would make that bay lower. I'd bring the bay further down because right now it's like where does it fall in that room? It's like where is that window? With the height of that window, it feels a little bit, for sure, squat. Then what height is your ceiling in the room, and then what are you going to have in front of it? We're getting in interior architecture here, right.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Well, there's a desk in front of it so you're going to be --

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: Yes, I mean, it's just one of those things. Now, you probably will have shrubs in front of it, again, you'll have plantings, but a lot of those bays will go down a little bit lower at least. So, I think our suggestion will be to just study the proportion of those windows a little bit, definitely add the grids, and just consider maybe something not as stark as black eaves, something that maybe is a little bit softer. That will give you a long-term aesthetic appeal, especially because we're right Downtown Arlington Heights here.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Yes, I think if you moved, I mean, I would be so for that, to do all, if the black is changed out to dark bronze, which most people would be like, oh, it's black. But it just warms it up and then the siding could be a warmer grey and then the roof would be, instead of charcoal, a warmer color, it's dark. I think it would fit in better personally.

I think if we all decided that that's the way that we wanted to go; I think that that could be Staff approved.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: I like the idea.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: How does the Petitioner feel about something that went like that?

MR. HAMMAN: I think we're fine about it. I don't see, I have no strong opinion against it, although I agree it looks more historic.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Okay, any other comments, or are we up for a motion?

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: All right, I'll try to make a motion,

to approve DC #26-020 -- no, that's the wrong one, sorry.

DC #26-039 as submitted, with a recommendation to change the colors to be warmer, change the black to be bronze, possibly even the base of the house. A recommendation to add stone along the front wall where the front door is to connect all of the stone across the front, or remove it from the door wall all along the west side, and I would also like to comment that that would be our preference. A recommendation to get rid of the railing on the front. A recommendation to lengthen the box bay window in the front, and a recommendation to study the windows to get more symmetry.

A motion to approve the proposed demolition and the architectural design of the proposed new single-family residence located at 318 West Wing Street, DC #26-039, based on the architectural plans received 5/21/26, and the following:

- 1. A recommendation to change the colors to be warmer, change the black (windows and gutters) to be bronze;**
- 2. A recommendation to add stone at the base of the house along the front wall where the front door is to connect all of the stone across the front, or to remove the stone from the door wall and all along the west side, the latter recommendation being the preference;**
- 3. A recommendation to get rid of the railing on the front (porch);**
- 4. A recommendation to lengthen the box bay window in the front; and**
- 5. A recommendation to study the windows to get more symmetry.**

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: I second the motion.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: There's a motion and a second.

Do we have any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: I think it's, sorry, I think it's a little too late, okay?

MR. MEERSMAN: Is public comment allowed?

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: It was. I am so sorry.

MR. MEERSMAN: Okay, I'm late; I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: I'm so sorry. We're in the middle of a motion. I'm so sorry.

Okay, so we have a motion and a second.

Does anybody else have any thoughts?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: I have one thought and that is, first, we want to just put in the record that the muntins are going to be in the windows as the Petitioner had said. The other one is I actually would rather have a requirement for the colors.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Say it again?

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: A requirement versus a recommendation for the coloring. It's just how I feel, to make that a requirement.

The other ones can be recommendations. I don't know how you feel about it.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: I am usually very open on colors myself because I think they can just change the color whenever they want. So, I would like it to stay as a recommendation although I strongly think they should consider warmer tones.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Okay, anybody else?

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: I think I would feel differently if the Petitioner didn't acknowledge that they would potentially take that approach --

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: -- given their track record in the community and the homes they've built, that I guess I would say I would be fine with this sticking as a recommendation given their reputation.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Okay, okay.

Staff, you're okay with having that review if they change the colors?

MR. HAUTZINGER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Okay, any other comments, questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Shall we go for a vote?

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Fitzgerald.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Kubow.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: Commissioner Bondarowicz.

COMMISSIONER BONDAROWICZ: Yes.

MR. HAUTZINGER: And Chair Kingsley.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Yes.

It's approved.

MR. HAMMAN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: I'm sorry, I didn't allow you to comment. At the end of the meeting, we can have you talk.

Okay, is there any other business, Steve?

MR. HAUTZINGER: No, that's it.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: No. So, it is now public comment time.

Would you like to speak?

MR. MEERSMAN: Yes, please.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: And tell us what we missed.

MR. MEERSMAN: It's a simple question.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Yes.

MR. MEERSMAN: My name is Donald Meersman; I live at 420 on Wing right down the street. My question would be directed about the maple tree in the backyard. I did not see the site plan.

Are you going to knock down the maple tree?

MR. HAMMAN: I don't believe so. I believe that's still remaining.

MR. MEERSMAN: Oh, the reason being if it's one of the oldest

houses in Arlington Heights, that could be one of the oldest trees in Arlington Heights, and it does provide screening because there's a big apartment house.

MR. HAMMAN: Yes, they're not going to --

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: So, you're saying that the tree is going to remain?

MR. HAMMAN: The tree, you're talking about this one, right? This one, the one in that corner?

MR. MEERSMAN: Yes, it's on the --

MR. HAMMAN: Yes, that one is not going to be touched.

MR. MEERSMAN: Thank you. That's my question; thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Great, I'm glad. So, if you don't mind, if you could sign in at the end?

MR. MEERSMAN: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: That would be great.

MR. HAUTZINGER: You can sign in now.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: No, sign in now, this is great.

Does anyone else have anything that they would want to discuss?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: All right, is there a motion to adjourn our meeting?

COMMISSIONER KUBOW: I make a motion to adjourn tonight's Design Commission dated June 23rd, 2026.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: There's a motion and a second.

Roll call? Okay, all those in favor say aye?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON KINGSLEY: Thank you.

(Whereupon, the meeting on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.)

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS.

COUNTY OF KANE)

I, ANDY KRECZKO, 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.

ANDY KRECZKO

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

NOTARY PUBLIC