

APPROVED

MINUTES OF  
THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS  
DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING  
HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.  
JANUARY 8, 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: Jennifer Thorstenson, MRV Architects for *Dunkin/Baskin Robbins*  
Ivan Nockov, Vequity for *7-Eleven*  
Yousuf Ghorri, ILekis Associates for *7-Eleven*  
Mark Bettenhausen for *7-Eleven*  
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM DECEMBER 11, 2018

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF DECEMBER 11, 2018. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

## ITEM 2. COMMERCIAL REVIEW

### DC#18-108 – 7-Eleven Gas Station – 1650 W. Algonquin Rd.

Ivan Nockov, representing *Vequity*, Yousuf Ghori, representing *ILekis Associates*, and Mark Bettenhausen, Real Estate for 7-Eleven, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is seeking approval of the proposed architectural design for a new gas station and convenience store. This project requires Plan Commission review and Village Board approval for a Special Use to allow redevelopment of the site with a new gas station and convenience store. Because this project is going to the Plan Commission, the role of the Design Commission is limited to building and signage only.

This site was previously used as a Citgo gas station with convenience store. The property is currently vacant and planned for demolition to allow construction of a new 7-Eleven convenience store and gas station. The scope of the project includes a complete redevelopment of the site including new fuel pumps, fuel pump canopy, convenience store, and signage. The proposed design is based on the current 7-Eleven prototype. The design is simple in form, but it has a clean modern appearance that will be a very nice update for this property. This design will also fit well with the new Taco Bell restaurant that is planned for construction on the adjacent site, which has a similar boxy massing and similar materials.

The proposed gray fiber cement “brick” wall panels have a nice modern appearance that works well with the black storefront, black canopy, black light fixtures, black wall coping, and gray “stone” base. The fuel pump canopy columns and trash enclosure are nicely detailed to match the building. Material samples were presented by the petitioner.

The Design Commission should evaluate the following details:

- The flush transition between the fiber cement “stone” base panels and the upper fiber cement “brick” wall panels looks too flat and has a fake appearance. It is recommended that a projecting sill trim piece be included between the two materials for a more authentic appearance. Consider using an adhered cultured stone sill detail.
- The stone base panels on the trash enclosure and canopy columns have a heavy appearance. Consider omitting the stone panel details on these items, providing an all brick appearance.

The proposed building has multiple rooftop mechanical units which are required to be screened from public view. The building design includes tall parapet walls on all four sides to fully screen the equipment, which is ideal.

The proposed development includes a complete package of new signage based on 7-Eleven’s branding. Overall, the signage package has a nice appearance that enhances the overall appearance of the development. A few details will need adjusting at the time of permit to comply with code, including a three-foot minimum setback for the ground sign and a slight reduction in the size of the west wall sign.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed design for the new gas station and convenience store, to include Staff comments regarding the stone detailing.

**Mr. Nockov** said that they agree with the suggestion to add separation between the brick and stone; however, they need to confirm with the manufacturer about how it can actually be done.

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

**Commissioner Kubow** said the proposed new building was fantastic. He really liked the old-school manufacturing, single-story warehouse appearance, and the gas pump bays that have a cool, modern look. He fully agreed with Staff's comments, especially on the column detail at the pumps; bringing the brick all the way down makes sense. His only question was about the proposed new ground sign that is different than the sign shown in the photo of the store in Wheaton. **Mr. Nockov** replied that the signage is location based, and would be under a separate permit from the rest of the project. **Mr. Hautzinger** explained that the building and the signage are subject to Design Commission review, and the proposed ground sign is code compliant as shown tonight; however, Staff does often encourage a lower, more decorative monument style sign. In this case, based on the location and surrounding context, Staff did not raise that issue, but the Design Commission's feedback on changes or enhancements to the ground sign are welcome.

In general, **Commissioner Kubow** loved the design of the new building and agreed with Staff's comments on the gas pump bays and doing something to transition between the stone and brick on the building. He preferred the monument sign at the Wheaton store, which is clean and consistent with the proposed new building, and he recommended that style sign for this project. **Mr. Bettenhausen** said they are not opposed to a monument style sign and they like the masonry base and cap; however, they do not want the sign to be as small as the monument sign in Wheaton, but it does not need to be 16 feet tall. **Commissioner Kubow** reiterated that the design of the sign in Wheaton is consistent with the design of the building being proposed here. **Mr. Bettenhausen** said they are accepting of any comments, but they really do not want the sign to be less than eight feet in height.

**Commissioner Seyer** supported the suggestion of a separation between the base material and the wall material, and he also supported Staff's recommendation to eliminate the stone panel detail on the fuel pump canopies as well as the trash enclosure; just being on the building itself has a cleaner appearance. He asked if the metal canopy color was the same dark bronze color as the storefront and the metal above the faux brick within the canopy. The petitioner said that it was the same color. **Commissioner Seyer** also asked about the color of the fuel canopy itself, and the petitioner stated that the gasoline canopies would be white, but not illuminated, and **Mr. Hautzinger** clarified that the fuel canopy fascia will have signage and colored striping graphics as shown in the signage package, and he added that the Village does not restrict illumination of the gas station canopy fascia. **Commissioner Seyer** said that architecturally, the new building looks good, with the comments he previously made; however, he still had some concerns about the signage; 16' is a really big sign when the building is only 18.5' tall, and there are no other big signs in the area. He felt the sign was not only an eyesore as far as its size, but a hazard, and he encouraged a more respectful sign at this particular corner. He was interested in the other commissioners' comments on this.

**Commissioner Kingsley** agreed with the suggestions made by Staff, and with the concerns that the ground sign is too tall. She was in support of lowering the ground sign, which is located close to a pedestrian walkway where landscaping would typically be. She also felt the wall sign on the front elevation looked a little small. **Mr. Hautzinger** clarified that the wall sign on the architectural rendering is shown smaller than actually proposed in the signage package. She asked about the wall mounted light fixtures on the front elevation that are important lights to the design of the building because there are only 2 of them, and **Mr. Nockov** said the fixtures would be down lit. **Commissioner Kingsley** wanted the lighting cut sheets to be reviewed by Staff because it was important that the lights not look like a wall pack; the light fixtures should be aesthetically

pleasing. She also asked about the details of the fiber cement columns at the ground, and the petitioner said the fiber cement would come within one inch of the ground. The petitioner also commented that as part of the Plan Commission review, Staff has given positive feedback about the lighting cut sheets they have submitted.

**Commissioner Eckhardt** concurred with all the comments made by the other commissioners, and added that the columns at the pump stations appear unfinished at the bottom and should have some kind of stone pediment detail at the bottom to protect the base of the material, similar to the cap at the top.

**Chair Fitzgerald** agreed with everything said so far, and he especially agreed with the conversation on the wall lights; the lights need to be special and Staff should review and approve them.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED DESIGN FOR 7-ELEVEN LOCATED AT 1650 W. ALGONQUIN ROAD. THIS APPROVAL IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE REVISED PLANS RECEIVED 12/21/18, 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 ELIMINATE THE GRAY STONE BASE PANELS ON THE CANOPY COLUMNS AND ON THE TRASH ENCLOSURE.
2. A REQUIREMENT TO WORK WITH STAFF ON FURTHER DETAILING THE BASE OF THE CANOPY COLUMNS.
3. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE WALL LIGHTING BE REVIEWED BY STAFF AND ADDRESS THE COMMISSION'S COMMENTS THAT THE FIXTURES BE AESTHETICALLY PLEASING TO THE BUILDING AND AVOID GLARE.
4. THE COMMISSIONERS PREFER THAT THE PROPOSED 16' TALL GROUND SIGN BE REDUCED IN HEIGHT, SIMILAR TO THE PHOTO OF THE STORE IN WHEATON.
5. 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 Eckhardt** pointed out that Algonquin Road is a fast moving street and it was important for drivers to see this sign when approaching; he discouraged a low monument sign or anything lower than 14' because it would not help the situation. **Mr. Hautzinger** asked for clarification about working with the petitioner to further detail the base of the canopy columns, and **Commissioner Eckhardt** replied that there needs to be something at the base of the columns to protect the brick panels, and a concrete foundation 4 inches above the pavement would be sufficient. **Mr. Hautzinger** asked for clarification of the motion to reduce the ground sign if it was a recommendation or a requirement. He added that for projects such as this, signage is part of the overall review and the commissioners are encouraged to comment on signage. **Commissioner Kingsley** felt the ground sign needed to be lowered an undetermined amount, and her intention was that it

be reviewed by Staff; this was a requirement. She also liked the appearance of the sign in Wheaton. **Commissioner Eckhardt** felt the motion should be amended to clarify that the previous recommendation to lower the ground sign is now a requirement.

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

4. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PROPOSED 16' TALL GROUND SIGN BE LOWERED AND BE MORE IN KEEPING IN THE AESTHETICS TO BE SIMILAR TO THE WHEATON GROUND SIGN, AND BE REVIEWED BY STAFF.

COMMISSIONER KUBOW SECONDED BY THE MOTION.

**Chair Fitzgerald** felt that referring to the 'Wheaton' sign in the motion made it sound as though the requirement is to lower the sign to that height, low to the ground, whereas the actual intent is to lower the sign just a little bit to be more in keeping with the scale of the building. **Commissioner Eckhardt** completely agreed and felt that a reference to the "Wheaton" sign should be removed from the motion. **Chair Fitzgerald** said the requirement should be to lower the ground sign and be approved by Staff.

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

4. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PROPOSED 16' TALL GROUND SIGN BE LOWERED A MINIMUM OF 2', AND REVIEWED BY STAFF.

**Mr. Hautzinger** asked if the commissioner's previous discussion regarding the introduction of a sill detail on the building between the stone and brick was something to be included in the motion or not. The commissioners responded that they wanted this included in the motion.

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

6. A REQUIREMENT TO INTRODUCE A SILL DETAIL ON THE BUILDING BETWEEN THE STONE AND THE BRICK.

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