APPROVED

MINUTES OF
THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING
HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
NOVEMBER 27, 2018

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

Members Present:	John Fitzgerald, Chair Jonathan Kubow Ted Eckhardt
Members Absent:	Kirsten Kingsley Scott Seyer
Also Present:	Andy & Voula Behlis, Owners of *1518 W. Thomas St.* Jeff Eichhorn & Beth DeBaker, DeBaker Design Group for *1209 N. Dunton Ave.* Aidan Quinn, AKA Architects for *Goddard School* James Cazares for European *Crystal Hotel* John Powers, Dryvit Systems for *European Crystal Hotel* Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM NOVEMBER 13, 2018

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 13, 2018. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

Chair Fitzgerald stated that a positive vote from all 3 commissioners is required for approval of a project tonight.

ITEM 4. COMMERCIAL REVIEW

DC#18-102 – European Crystal (Chez) Hotel – 519 W. Algonquin Rd.

James Cazares, representing *European Crystal Hotel* and John Powers, representing *Dryvit Systems,* were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. This project requires Plan Commission review and Village Board approval for an amendment to the previously approved Land Use Variation allowing a hotel in the M-2 zoning district. Because this project is going to the Plan Commission, the role of the Design Commission is limited to building and signage only. The petitioner is proposing to build a new six-story, 61 room hotel addition to the existing European Crystal Banquet & Conference Center facility. The front portion of the existing banquet facility has been demolished to accommodate the new hotel tower.

This project was previously reviewed and approved by the Design Commission on three separate occasions. In 2016, the petitioner was proposing a 10-story building with 160 hotel rooms. However, due to a lack of sufficient parking on the site, in 2017 the proposal was revised as a 12-story building with 128 hotel rooms. Finally, in June of 2018, the Design Commission approved the design for an 9-story, 60 room hotel. The 2016 and 2017 designs were sleek and modern to create a new image and main entrance for the facility, but the 2018 concept retained the existing main banquet entrance on the west side of the building and the hotel tower was designed with traditional details and materials to match the existing banquet building.

At this time, the petitioner is seeking approval for a modified version of the traditional design concept that was approved in June. The floor plans have been revised to accommodate more hotel rooms per floor, so the height of the building has been reduced from 8-stories to 6-stories without losing any hotel rooms. The current design is consistent with the previously approved design in regards to the overall style and detailing. However, the following changes have been made:

- The stone base has been reduced from two-stories to one-story.
- The stucco exterior on the top floor has been omitted.
- The pattern of the window grids have been simplified.
- The brick exterior has been changed to a faux EIFS brick product.

Overall, the revised design is nicely done. The only concerns are:

- The rear elevation does not have windows on the top floor, so it looks somewhat top-heavy and unfinished. It is expected that a wall sign will be located on the blank wall, but a sign variation may be required to allow a sign on a wall without street frontage. Further design development of this area may be necessary. Consider the possibility of false windows with spandrel glass or additional EIFS banding to break up the blank wall area.
- The Design Commission should evaluate the proposed faux EIFS brick product. The petitioner is proposing this product in order to match the existing brick, which is no longer available. However, the Village's Design Guidelines discourage excessive amounts of EIFS wall cladding and fading of the EIFS color over time is a concern. It is recommended that real brick be used with as close of a color match to the existing brick as possible.

Staff recommended approval of the proposed design with consideration given to the comments regarding the top floor of the rear elevation and providing real brick instead of faux EIFS brick.

Mr. Cazares gave a slide presentation of the project. They are trying to match the existing building with the new facade of the addition, with a design similar to what was first proposed. He has worked closely with Staff to consider all their recommendations, and made modifications to those recommendations. The proposed elevations were presented, with cast stone on the first-floor, and a faux Dryvit brick for the top floors. A thin veneer or a masonry brick was originally proposed; however, while looking at the site, it was determined that the two buildings abutting each other and the dilemma of running the existing banquet facility while trying to put masonry on 68-feet of the building becomes an issue.

After further research, he found a 4-story boutique hotel in Columbus, Ohio that used this same faux Dryvit brick, and a representative familiar with that project and that hotel is here tonight to answer any questions.

Mr. Cazares continued his presentation. A sign is being proposed in the center of the south elevation, and he is open to adding windows there as suggested by Staff, although he preferred adding real windows, with screening to the service areas to allow for light to go through. Windows were originally proposed on the first-floor at the front desk; however structural issues would not allow windows so they were removed and a hand painted mural will now be located behind the front desk, as well as a seating area with a small fireplace for waiting guests. The proposed floor plans and interior layouts and room designs were shown, with the rooms becoming a little longer. A rooftop terrace is being proposed on the sixth floor, with a very preliminary design being shown tonight; this will be very unique and restricted for patrons of the hotel and banquet facility only. The existing ballrooms will be removed, and a portion of the existing building on the north elevation has already been demolished.

Mr. Cazares also presented pictures of what was done with the faux Dryvit system on the hotel in Columbus, Ohio, which was very restricted on space. He explained that his banquet facility is currently open and they continue to have about 120 events planned during the construction period, so their main goal is to erect the addition as fast as possible, clad the exterior, and complete landscaping to accommodate their customers. He commented that there is no cost savings with this Dryvit product compared to masonry, but he prefers it because it exactly matches the existing banquet building.

Chair Fitzgerald asked the commissioners if they had questions about the faux Dryvit material, and Commissioner Kubow asked what the warranty is. Mr. Powers came forward and explained the two different things that relate to warranty. The standard system that would be utilized has a 10-year standard warranty, and ultimately that warranty is renewable forever and would include everything from the sheathing out, and could include the sealants as a part of that. At the end of the original warranty term, the building owner can have a third party forensic firm architect visit the building to perform any needed maintenance, and then that warranty is re-issued to the original owner for another 10 years. At 10-20 years, it can be renewed forever. The second part of that as it relates to the Dryvit brick being proposed for this building, the standard warranty is for 25 years. Mr. Powers also gave an explanation as it relates to the technology of this product and the mandated energy codes across the United States. This product is associated with Dryvit, but ultimately it is an innovative continuous insulation (CI) masonry offering that could be used over an existing building because of the light weight of the Dryvit system, which is 2 pounds per square foot, and utilizes the same masonry mortar that is used with conventional clay or thin brick. It is designed to be used for the design life of the building; that is the life expectancy of it at this point, and is a good fit for this project.

Commissioner Eckhardt said he was very familiar with Dryvit installation and the issues associated with it in past years. He asked if it is a pre-fabricated product and Mr. Powers said that it can be, and he explained that the simple fundamental fact is that back in the mid 90's when there was a rapid growth in residential homes primarily on the southeast coast, there were issues with water intrusion, primarily related to windows, lack of flashing and other things. In the year 2000, the codes basically updated not only the residential but the commercial codes that now mandate the use of the air, water, vapor, thermal system. At that same time, Dryvit and other EIFS manufacturers complied with those requirements and now use moisture drainage systems that are well tested. Furthermore, it has now become the standard for all claddings to meet that same requirement. The key is making sure that it is an assembly; the codes today are based upon assemblies, not single components. With that in mind, new brick can actually be a panelized assembly done in a controlled environment off-site, or and it can be a full composite panel depending on the structure design. Commissioner Eckhardt asked how this project would be done, and Mr. Powers said it was not determined yet, but both systems would work with the addition being proposed.

Commissioner Eckhardt asked about the surface of the faux Dryvit system that appears to have some significant thickness, and Mr. Powers said that the surface is an acrylic technology. Commissioner Eckhardt also asked if the faux bricks are made on the flat surface with a template, and Mr. Powers replied that it is a proprietary process at this point that is patented, but ultimately the brick is extruded. Commissioner Eckhardt commented that Dryvit is dependent about the skill of the installer, and Mr. Powers agreed, stating that the most important decision of a building

owner is the contractor they choose to work with. He added that the second part of that is the assurances from the design professional's participation to ensure that that assembly is correctly designed to be functional when doing a mock-up. From that perspective, specific to new brick, it is adhesively attached in a manner that meets energy codes. Mr. Powers also explained the 2 drainage planes incorporated into the product.

Commissioner Eckhardt asked about the type of mortar used with this faux Dryvit system and how the new bricks stand up to a cleaning. Mr. Powers replied that the same cleaning process is used as regular masonry; there are products that have been fully tested for use over the top of this system. Standard colors for new brick use the exact same inorganic pigments that clay brick would use. The new brick is all about addressing the energy codes, the assembly testing, and the fire requirements. Commissioner Eckhardt asked how long this product has been in the United States and where was it first introduced. Mr. Powers said that a man who worked for Dryvit was with a competitor in China who changed their business model and he happened to see a technology that was similar to this, although not thought out to the extent being talked about now. He brought that technology back and started his own company and then brought it to Dryvit. With regards to a window opening, Commissioner Eckhardt asked what the recommended setback from the face of this product to the face of a window would be, and Mr. Powers said the distance is dictated by the window manufacturer; however, a 3-inch exposure could be easily handled if necessary. The commissioners had no other questions for Mr. Powers.

Commissioner Kubow loved the first design proposed by the petitioner, which was very modern, and he also liked what was being proposed tonight, which probably fits more with Arlington Heights. The color of the brick and the stone base would fit in nicely in the Downtown, and acts as almost a gateway from the highway into the Village. He felt the interior design was amazing, and he was glad that renderings were presented showing how fantastic the addition will look. With regards to the design, he recommended adding windows on the south (rear) elevation as suggested by Staff, and he would support a wall sign on the south elevation, as shown on the drawings.

Commissioner Eckhardt liked the current design, the stone element at the base of the building, and the massing. He questioned the vertical white elements on the pilasters, which Mr. Cazares said would be in the same color to match the gray cast stone. Mr. Hautzinger added that the plans indicate the bands to be an EIFS material. Commissioner Eckhardt concurred with Commissioner Kubow regarding the windows on the south elevation and support of a wall sign on the back of the building. He felt the building looked fine and the interior was great. With regards to the proposed faux EIFS brick, it appears to be a good product that has impact resistance that the older traditional EIFS did not have; however, he cautioned the petitioner to do his appropriate homework.

Chair Fitzgerald agreed with everything that was said.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE *EUROPEAN CRYSTAL (CHEZ) HOTEL* TO BE LOCATED AT *519 W. ALGONQUIN ROAD.* THIS APPROVAL IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE PLANS RECEIVED 11/13/18, 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 RECOMMENDATION TO ADD WINDOWS AT THE TOP FLOOR ON THE SOUTH (REAR) ELEVATION ADJACENT TO WHERE THE SIGNAGE IS SHOWN.
2. PRELIMINARY SUPPORT FOR A SOUTH FACING WALL SIGN AT THE TOP OF THE BUILDING, IF IT IS DETERMINED THAT A SIGN VARIATION IS REQUIRED.
3. THIS REVIEW DEALS WITH ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, NOR REPRESENT ANY TACIT APPROVAL OR SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED LAND USE OR ANY OTHER ZONING AND/OR LAND USE ISSUES OR DECISIONS THAT STEM FROM ZONING, BUILDING, SIGNAGE OR ANY OTHER REVIEWS. IN ADDITION TO THE NORMAL TECHNICAL REVIEW, PERMIT DRAWINGS WILL BE REVIEWED FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE DESIGN COMMISSION AND ANY OTHER COMMISSION OR BOARD APPROVAL CONDITIONS.

IT IS THE PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILTY 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; ECKHARDT, AYE; FITZGERALD, AYE.
ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.