

DRAFT

MINUTES OF  
THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS  
DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING  
HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.  
JANUARY 22, 2019

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

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

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Mike Fitzgerald, OKW Architects for *Arlington Downs-Retail B*  
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM JANUARY 8, 2019

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 8, 2019. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 1. SINGLE-FAMILY TEARDOWN REVIEW

DC#18-066 – 1518 W. Thomas St.

Staff requested a motion to continue the project to the February 12, 2019 meeting, per the petitioner's request.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO CONTINUE THE PROJECT FOR 1518 W. THOMAS ST. (DC#18-066) TO THE FEBRUARY 12, 2019 DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING.

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

## ITEM 2. COMMERCIAL REVIEW

### DC#19-001 – Arlington Downs / Retail B – 3400 W. Stonegate Blvd.

Mike Fitzgerald, representing *OKW Architects*, was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is seeking approval of the architectural design for a new multi-tenant retail building at the Arlington Downs Planned Unit Development. This project was reviewed by the Plan Commission and approved by the Village Board as an amendment to the previously approved Arlington Downs Planned Unit Development (PUD). Because this project went to the Plan Commission, the role of the Design Commission is limited to building and signage only. The Arlington Downs development has received Zoning and Design Commission approval for the following: existing "One Arlington" luxury apartment building (former Sheraton hotel building), Family Entertainment Center (existing former water park), ADR-II five-story apartment building with parking garage, and five-story Vib Hotel. The development plans also include four single-story retail buildings. At this time, the petitioner is seeking approval of the architectural design for the first retail building "B". The retail site is currently vacant.

The proposed design is nicely done with a modern aesthetic that is appropriate in this location. Overall, the colors and materials complement the approved five-story apartment building and Vib Hotel, and the proposed "Cedar" color brick and "Buff" cast stone are the same exact materials to be used on the five-story apartment building, which will work well to unify the development. The "Midnight Black" brick and "Dark Burma" siding will add uniqueness to the retail building. It is recommended that this proposed design aesthetic be used for the remaining three retail buildings, as shown in the conceptual aerial perspective rendering, to be approved administratively by Staff.

Consideration was given to recommending the addition of glass storefronts on the south elevation to enliven the facade facing Euclid Avenue; however, this is the back of the building so it is anticipated that storefronts in this location would need to be blacked out, which could result in excessive window signage. Instead, it is recommended to keep the facade as designed, which will be softened with extensive landscaping along Euclid per the approved PUD landscape plan.

All mechanical and utility equipment/meters are required to be screened from view. The drawings do not clearly show if the rooftop mechanical units will be fully screened by the perimeter parapet walls. If not fully screened, then the parapet walls will either need to be raised, or separate unit screens will be required. Additionally, it is anticipated that utility meters will be located on the back (south) wall of the building, which will be visible from Euclid Avenue. It is recommended that decorative screens be required to enclose all exterior wall-mounted utility meters/equipment.

The trash enclosure should be masonry construction to match the building. Pursuant to the PUD Ordinance 18-036, the dumpster enclosure is required to be attached to the building facing away from Euclid Avenue. The final location of the trash enclosure requires further review to confirm compliance with the PUD Ordinance.

There is no signage included in this proposal. All signage shall comply with Chapter 30 Sign Code, and separate permits are required. Each business is allowed one sign per street frontage, and one additional sign facing the parking area.

Staff recommends approval for the design of the proposed Retail B building, to include the recommendations previously stated by Staff, and a recommendation that the design aesthetic for the Retail 'B' building be used for the remaining three retail buildings, as shown in the conceptual aerial perspective rendering, to be approved by Staff.

**Mr. Fitzgerald** presented revised drawings and material samples. He explained that they want to make sure that the 4 smaller retail buildings work well with the new apartment building and new hotel previously reviewed and approved, and that there is a significant amount of interest, detail, and articulation in these retail buildings. Therefore, what they are proposing to start with for this retail building that sits at the corner of the overall site opposite the residential building, and flanking the main ring road entrance into the development, is a series of layers of materials that help give this retail building some significance and interest. Visual height is being provided to the building, given the scale of it relative to the 2 residential buildings and the hotel, by creating frames at the corners of the building that help visually heighten the building. This is seen on the north elevation that faces into the main field of parking, as well as on the south elevation, particularly the southeast corner that will anchor that portion of the entrance to the site.

Since the south elevation functions as the back of the building, they want to make sure this elevation has some visual interest; therefore, two different brick colors are being proposed; a light color and a dark color, with the light color brick being forward of the dark color brick. Within the light color brick, there will be further articulation by pulling some of the brick forward and creating horizontal bands of projected brick that wrap around the corners to articulate specifically the southwest and southeast corners, as well as above the service doors on the south elevation.

With regards to screening of rooftop equipment, **Mr. Fitzgerald** said that the proposed retail building has varying height parapet walls, and they are confident that even the lowest parapet will be adequate to screen the rooftop equipment; however, if there are larger mechanical units, they will consider either a separate screen, or will raise the parapet to screen the equipment appropriately.

**Mr. Fitzgerald** presented the material samples of the adjacent residential building, as well as the material samples being proposed for this retail building, which includes a light brick, a dark background brick, and a siding product by Resysta, which they believe will show a good contrast between the brick and the siding, as well as help emphasize the layers of the building. After looking at many Resysta colors, **Mr. Fitzgerald** explained that they could not find a color that provided the best contrast with the 'Cedar' brick color, so they are proposing to change from the 'Cedar' color brick to a lighter color called 'Platinum', which he presented a sample of. This change would not be identical to the material palette of the residential building, but the tones are very complimentary and the dark and light brick colors on the retail building are very much in keeping with the dark and light fiber cement panels on the residential building. They feel this revision for all the retail buildings would define them as retail and be different than the residential building, but have similar color tones. The other materials being proposed for the retail building were also reviewed, which include a dark bronze coping, a black storefront frame, and clear glass.

With regards to screening the utility meters on the back (south) wall of the building, **Mr. Fitzgerald** said they agree with Staff's comments to screen this equipment with some type of metal gate screening, probably in a dark tone finish to complement the metal accents on the building. He also reiterated the reasons why a lighter brick color is now being proposed, which better contrasts with the Resysta color siding that they want to use.

**Chair Fitzgerald** asked if there was any public comment on the project and there was no response from the audience.

**Commissioner Kubow** asked for clarification on the location of the revised 'Platinum' brick color, and **Mr. Fitzgerald** explained that the 'Platinum' brick would be the lighter brick color on the south elevation, in the lower zone at the corner on the side elevations, between the storefront, and framed by the Resysta siding on either the sides or on the north elevation. He added that the tone of the brick color shown in the rendering is actually more representative of the 'Platinum' color than of the previously proposed 'Cedar' color. **Commissioner Kubow** said he did not see a big difference between the two brick colors; the tone of both colors are similar enough, and he liked the separation between retail and residential with the revised brick color being presented tonight.

In terms of the overall development, **Commissioner Kubow** said the retail building was nicely designed and he liked the different 'faces' being proposed. He understood Staff's comments about making the south elevation more inviting, but he agreed that this did not always work, and he liked that the petitioner is attempting to draw people towards the middle of the plaza where all the activity will happen by introducing some planer changes on the south elevation. He asked about landscaping at the south elevation on Euclid for the single retail building, and **Mr. Fitzgerald** referred to the landscape plan, which includes a variety of large and small scale plantings. **Mr. Hautzinger** pointed out the hatched area on the landscape plan that specifies shrubs and perennials along Euclid, but specific species are not called out. He added that as part of the Plan Commission review, Staff has discussed with the petitioner about providing a mix of deciduous and evergreen trees along Euclid Avenue. **Mr. Fitzgerald** added that the landscape plan submitted does not show the location of service doors on the south elevation or the sidewalks out to the driveway associated with them. He also said that the trash service screen in the southwest corner has been moved, detached from the building; however, it will be masonry to match the building and be approximately 8' in height.

With regards to the concerns about parapet height for screening of rooftop equipment, **Commissioner Kubow** reiterated the petitioner's previous statement that there would be a 16' clear height to the underside of the structure, which would result in a minimum 4' of screening, which given angles, he felt would be fine. He agreed with Staff's comments and he looked forward to seeing the rest of the development come to fruition.

**Commissioner Seyer** said that the design of the proposed retail building looked great and he was happy to see more development happening in this area. His biggest concern was with the parapet screening. He pointed out that the overall Master Plan rendering on Page 1 shows the buildings at the interior having a tall parapet on all 4 sides. He felt that there was an emptiness and openness at the southwest corner of the 2 buildings along Euclid and he wanted to see it proven out how the mechanical equipment will be screened, because there is nothing uglier than seeing not only the mechanical equipment but the back of a parapet wall. Without it being proven out, he had no way of knowing if this will happen or not. This was a real concern for him; it looks empty and it looks unresolved.

**Mr. Fitzgerald** stated that right now there is a 2' differential between the higher and lower parapet, but they are not opposed to raising the 22' parapet to 24' if necessary. **Commissioner Seyer** reiterated that the more the petitioner could do to confirm what the view lines would be, the better it would be for everyone. **Commissioner Seyer** also asked what color the doors on the back of the building would be, and felt that the color should match the revised 'Platinum' brick color and all the doors should be painted the same color.

In general, **Commissioner Kingsley** was happy with how the new retail building looked, although initially, she was worried about the brick over the storefront and the wood above it; however, since nobody else had concerns, she was okay with it since it was a stacked bond pattern. She was unfamiliar with the Resysta product being proposed, and she asked if the corners would be mitered, and what the details of the soffit return would look like. **Mr. Fitzgerald** believed there would be a channel or corner board instead of a mitered corner, and said that details of the return have not been finalized, although he understood the concerns. **Commissioner Kingsley** said she was okay with the 'Dark Burma' color being proposed for the siding, but also referred to the Resysta website for other possible colors that she had seen. **Mr. Fitzgerald** replied that the siding colors on the website look different from the actual color samples, and he presented various actual color samples for reference. **Commissioner Kingsley** encouraged the petitioner to follow their intent with the Resysta color, although she was also okay with the 'Dark Burma' color being proposed. She also referred to the 'Cast Stone' shown on the materials list, and **Mr. Fitzgerald** stated that this was an error; there is no cast stone on the building.

**Commissioner Kingsley** felt the trash enclosure should be attached to the building and kept on the west/southwest elevation, especially if there would be a restaurant drive-thru in the building. She also felt that the exposed concrete foundation should be dressed up with a material on top of it to hide the concrete. **Mr. Fitzgerald** explained that where there is sidewalk up against the building, the top of the foundation would be flush with the finished floor of the building, which the drawing incorrectly shows. Exposed concrete will only be visible where there is landscaping around the building. **Commissioner Kingsley** also asked about the up-lights shown on the walls of the building in the rendering, and **Mr. Fitzgerald** replied that they do not intend to up-light the light brick walls of the building, but there will be 2 types of light fixtures, one on the piers of the Resysta on the north elevation, and another more utilitarian fixture over the service doors on the south elevation. **Commissioner Kingsley** had no further comments.

**Commissioner Eckhardt** supported Commissioner Seyer's comment that the doors should be painted the same color as the building, especially on the rear elevation. He asked if the Resysta product was a rain guard material and **Mr. Fitzgerald** said that it was. **Commissioner Eckhardt** liked that the building appears to have 3 distinct colors in the rendering, as opposed to the final drawing that shows only 2 and a quarter colors because of the subtle difference between the Resysta color and the brick color. He was okay with either one of the brick colors, but preferred the color with the most contrast from the Resysta color. He liked the design of the new retail building and concurred with the concerns about the parapet walls and visibility of rooftop equipment.

**Chair Fitzgerald** said that overall, the project looks really nice and he agreed with the comments from Staff and the other commissioners. He referred to the landscape plan where there appears to be a 5-foot wall of plants proposed on the south elevation that would hide some of the details on the building and also go across to where the doors are, which is unclear to him. Looking at Sheet A101, there appear to be pavers proposed for this same area on the south elevation, from the door furthest east going to the west. He wanted the motion to include a requirement that Staff review this to ensure that the entire south elevation is softened, whether it be between the drive-thru lane and the building, or at least to the south of the drive-thru. **Chair Fitzgerald** had no further comments.

**Mr. Hautzinger** asked if there would be a walkway along the rear (south) wall of the building connecting all of the service doors, or if the doors would lead straight out to the drive aisle. **Mr. Fitzgerald** replied that a 3-foot carriage walk along the curb line could be provided, with 4-feet of plantings up against the building. **Chair Fitzgerald** reiterated that he wanted the south elevation wall to be softened, not hidden, and that Staff should review this area. He also agreed with Staff's suggestion that the design for this retail building be used

for the remaining 3 retail buildings, and that they be approved by Staff. **Commissioners Eckhardt, Kubow and Seyer** also agreed, as long as the design is substantially the same as this building and the materials are the same. **Commissioner Kingsley** hesitated because of the concerns stated tonight about the parapet and rooftop screening, landscape details, and the trash enclosure, otherwise she was okay with Staff approving the remaining 3 buildings. **Chair Fitzgerald** reiterated that he was okay with Staff reviewing and making a final decision on the landscape concerns on the south elevation, and **Commissioner Kubow** agreed.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE PROPOSED *ARLINGTON DOWNS - RETAIL B BUILDING* TO BE LOCATED AT 3400 W. EUCLID AVENUE. THIS APPROVAL IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 1/18/19, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PARAPET WALLS FULLY SCREEN THE ROOFTOP MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT, AND IF NECESSARY, RAISE THE PARAPET WALLS.
2. A REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE DECORATIVE SCREENS AROUND ALL EXTERIOR WALL MOUNTED UTILITY METERS AND ROOFTOP EQUIPMENT.
3. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE TRASH ENCLOSURE SHALL BE MASONRY CONSTRUCTION TO MATCH THE BUILDING.
4. A RECOMMENDATION THAT THE TRASH ENCLOSURE BE ADJACENT TO THE BUILDING.
5. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PETITIONER WORK WITH STAFF ON LANDSCAPING THE SOUTH ELEVATION TO HELP SOFTEN THE ELEVATION.
6. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE DESIGN OF THE 3 FUTURE RETAIL BUILDINGS BE CONSISTENT WITH THE DESIGN APPROVED TONIGHT, TO BE APPROVED BY STAFF.
7. APPROVAL OF THE REVISED 'PLATINUM' BRICK COLOR PRESENTED TONIGHT, IN LIEU OF THE 'CEDAR' BRICK COLOR.
8. 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.

**Commissioner Kingsley** asked that it be a requirement that the trash enclosure be attached to the building, and the petitioner be allowed the option of choosing the other Resysta color presented tonight that she felt was more appropriate with their design intent. **Mr. Hautzinger** said that attaching the trash enclosure to the building should be left as a recommendation because it is part of the PUD approval through the Plan Commission. **Commissioner Kingsley** asked that the motion then state that the Design Commission strongly believes that the trash enclosure should be attached to the building so the garbage does not have to go across the drive-thru and across the entry. She also clarified that the petitioner's design intent is to have a siding color that is similar to the brick on the adjacent residential building, and the the 'Dark Burma'

color is looking a little green because of the lighting in the room tonight. She wanted to give the petitioner the flexibility of choosing the 'Java' color that could be more appropriate and has more of a contrast.

**Mr. Fitzgerald** explained that 'Dark Burma' is the Resysta color being proposed, and they want to ensure that in natural sunlight this color will not only complement the cedar brick on the residential building, but also provide an appropriate contrast with the revised 'Platinum' brick color, as well as consider another Resysta color similar to the 'Java' if it is also complementary to the 'Cedar' brick color and provides an even greater contrast with the 'Platinum' brick color.

**Chair Fitzgerald** asked for clarification of the requirement that the design of the 3 future retail buildings be consistent with the design approved tonight, and that it be approved by Staff. **Commissioner Kubow** stated that if the design of the remaining retail buildings is similar to the building being approved tonight, then it can be approved by Staff, but Design Commission review is required if the design is different.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO AMEND THE MOTION AS FOLLOWS:**

4. A STRONG RECOMMENDATION THAT A DIFFERENT LOCATION BE CONSIDERED FOR THE TRASH ENCLOSURE, ONE THAT IS DIRECTLY ADJACENT TO THE RETAIL BUILDING, TO AVOID TRASH REMOVAL ACROSS THE DRIVEWAY.
9. THAT THE PETITIONER WORK WITH STAFF ON THE FINAL CHOICE OF THE RESYSTA COLOR IN NATURAL LIGHT.

**Commissioner Seyer** wanted to add that the back service doors be painted a color to match the surrounding brick. He also asked if the issue of the parapet screening was addressed in the motion, because although he strongly agreed that the parapet screening be proven out, he felt it should be done in two-dimension as well as a three-dimension view from the intersection of Rohlwing and Euclid. **Commissioner Kubow** said the original motion covered the issue of the parapet screening and the petitioner said that if the rooftop units are larger than expected, they would add screening. **Mr. Hautzinger** said that the minutes will reflect Commissioner Seyer's specific comments about the parapet screening and Staff will work with the petitioner on this issue, so the motion did not need to be amended.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO AMEND THE MOTION TO ADD THE FOLLOWING:**

10. THAT THE SERVICE DOORS ON THE SOUTH ELEVATION BE PAINTED A COLOR TO MATCH THE SURROUNDING BRICK COLOR.

**Commissioner Eckhardt** said that he completely supported the issue of moving the trash enclosure out of the front door of this beautiful building; this was just bad planning. This should go as a very strong message to the Plan Commission.

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



ITEM 3. GENERAL MEETING

There was no further discussion.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:30 P.M. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

DRAFT