

APPROVED

MINUTES OF
THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING
HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
SEPTEMBER 13, 2018

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

Members Present: John Fitzgerald, Chair
Kirsten Kingsley
Jonathan Kubow

Members Absent: Ted Eckhardt
Scott Seyer

Also Present: Shaun Harris, South Water Signs for *H&R Block*
Mario Valentini, MRV Architects Inc. for *Taco Bell*
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM AUGUST 28, 2018

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF AUGUST 28, 2018. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 2. COMMERCIAL REVIEWDC#18-083 – Taco Bell – 1530 W. Algonquin Rd.

Mario Valentini, representing *MRV Architects*, was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to demolish an existing, older Taco Bell restaurant building to allow construction of a new Taco Bell restaurant. The proposed restaurant will include indoor dining and a drive through. The scope of the project includes a complete redevelopment of the site including parking areas and landscaping.

The proposed design represents the latest national prototype for Taco Bell. The design has a fresh modern aesthetic, and will be a significant improvement from the existing dated restaurant. The design includes an all brick exterior, which is complemented with 'bronze' color fiber cement accent panels and a faux 'rustwall' tower feature. The exterior materials and colors are very nicely coordinated. Overall, the proposed design is nicely done, and will fit in well in this location, especially with the other adjacent newer national fast food restaurant buildings. The proposed building has multiple rooftop mechanical units which are required to be fully screened from public view. The building design includes tall parapet walls to screen the equipment, which is ideal.

The proposed design includes three wall signs and one ground sign. Per Chapter 30 sign code, only one wall sign is allowed per street frontage. There are no previous sign variations approved for this property, and the existing building only has one wall sign. The number of wall signs should be reduced to comply with code, and the following recommendations should be considered:

1. It is recommended that the second wall sign on the side of the 'rustwall' tower be omitted.
2. The sign above the entry door on the right side of the building should be omitted to comply with code, but it should be noted that there are numerous other similar fast food restaurant buildings that have obtained sign variations for an additional wall sign above the side entry door.
3. The maximum allowed height for a ground sign is 16'-6". The proposed 20'-0" tall ground sign needs to be reduced in height to comply with code.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed design for the existing Taco Bell building with the recommendations regarding signage as summarized in the Staff report.

Mr. Valentini had no comments at this time.

Chair Fitzgerald noted that there was no one in the audience at this time.

Commissioner Kubow said it was a great design and he liked it; it is very sharp and very modern, and although he liked the old school Taco Bell look, he understood the change to a contemporary design. He approved of the design as proposed. With regards to signage, he felt the sign on the west elevation was unnecessary because there is no turn-in at that point, and the sign on the south elevation will become visible when passing the building to turn in. He had no other comments other than the design was fantastic, and he approved as proposed, with Staff's recommendations.

Commissioner Kingsley said it was a really nice design. She liked the brick and the colors being proposed, and asked if the rustwall panels were standard to the new prototype design. **Mr. Valentini** explained that the new design and materials have been a work in progress, with several locations initially having a material that looked galvanized; however, that material ended up rusting and the rust running down the building, so the material was changed to a pre-finished "rust" product that has been used successfully in several locations. **Commissioner Kingsley** said that she really liked the materials; however, her only hesitation was that the Urbane Bronze color of the Hardie panels and the

Iron Ore color of the canopy did not go together; one needed to be cooler or one needed to be warmer. **Mr. Valentini** explained that the metal sample presented tonight is very large in comparison to the actual small, thin size of the canopy that will be on the building. He added that the storefront windows would be clear anodized, which helps define the separation between the fiber cement board and the glazing.

Commissioner Kingsley also asked about the gooseneck lights and what they would light up. **Mr. Valentini** presented a building design that they previously considered, which included two areas of mosaics that were proposed to help break up the monotony of the solid side walls, and gooseneck lighting to illuminate the mosaic areas. The current, more modern design being presented tonight has eliminated the mosaic areas because they were considered signage; however, the gooseneck lighting has remained to help break up and wash the wall, as well as highlight the landscaping. **Mr. Valentini** said that they were open to discussions about bringing back the mosaic areas as well. **Commissioner Kingsley** felt the lighting helped to lighten up that area of the facade in the absence of windows. She added a suggestion to paint the service door a darker color, and **Mr. Valentini** replied that it could be painted to match the color of the surrounding Hardie-board.

Chair Fitzgerald agreed with painting the service door a darker color, and he liked the building design being proposed, which would stand the test of time. He also felt the two-sided tower element on the building appeared unfinished when heading west on Algonquin Road, and he suggested something be done to return it, or at least back it up with the same material on the front. **Mr. Valentini** was not opposed to using the same material to add a third side to the tower returning over the parapet wall. **Chair Fitzgerald** also felt the location of the sign on the east elevation above the entrance appeared oddly placed on the wall, and he suggested moving it more towards the front of the building. **Commissioner Kingsley** felt that moving the sign on the east elevation would help with balance and make it look like the other facades. **Commissioner Kubow** agreed, although he understood why the sign was currently located above the entry door on that side. He also asked for clarification on the concerns about the tower element, and **Chair Fitzgerald** explained that he was suggesting the tower element appear more like a 3-sided tower by returning the material onto the other side.

Mr. Hautzinger reiterated that the sign on the east wall is not allowed by code, and would require a variation. **Mr. Valentini** asked if the client wants a wall sign on the east and west elevations, as opposed to a sign on the front (south) elevation, would it still require a variation. **Mr. Hautzinger** reiterated that only wall sign is allowed per code, and more than one wall sign would require a sign variation review by this commission. **Commissioner Kubow** was in favor of allowing two wall signs; either on the east and west elevations, or on the south and east elevations. **Chair Fitzgerald** agreed.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR TACO BELL LOCATED AT 1530 W. ALGONQUIN ROAD. THIS APPROVAL IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE PLANS RECEIVED 9/5/18, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING:

1. A REQUIREMENT TO RETURN THE MATERIAL ON THE TOWER TO MAKE IT THREE-SIDED.
2. A REQUIREMENT TO PAINT THE SERVICE DOOR ON THE EAST ELEVATION A COLOR TO MATCH THE ADJACENT WALL PANEL COLOR.
3. A RECOMMENDATION TO ALLOW TWO WALL SIGNS ON THE BUILDING; ONE ON THE EAST AND ONE ON THE WEST ELEVATION.
4. THIS REVIEW DEALS WITH ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, NOR REPRESENT ANY TACIT APPROVAL OR SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED LAND USE OR ANY OTHER ZONING AND/OR LAND USE ISSUES OR DECISIONS THAT STEM FROM ZONING, BUILDING, SIGNAGE OR ANY OTHER REVIEWS. IN ADDITION TO THE NORMAL TECHNICAL REVIEW, PERMIT DRAWINGS WILL BE REVIEWED FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE DESIGN COMMISSION AND ANY OTHER COMMISSION OR BOARD APPROVAL CONDITIONS. IT IS

THE PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO INCORPORATE ALL REQUIREMENTS LISTED ON THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS INTO THE PERMIT DRAWINGS, AND TO ENSURE THAT BUILDING PERMIT PLANS AND SIGN PERMIT PLANS COMPLY WITH ALL ZONING CODE, BUILDING CODE AND SIGN CODE REQUIREMENTS.

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