

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 3. COMMERCIAL SCHOOL REVIEWDC#18-097 – Goddard School – 1316 N. Arlington Heights Rd.

Aidan Quinn, representing *AKA Architects*, was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is seeking approval of the proposed architectural design for exterior modifications to an existing commercial building. This project requires Plan Commission review and Village Board approval for Rezoning, PUD, Land Use Variation, and other variations to allow redevelopment of the site as a new day care facility. Because this project is going to the Plan Commission, the role of the Design Commission is limited to architecture and signage only.

There are two buildings on the subject property, a two-story single-family residence and a commercial building, formerly Sylvia's Flower Shop. The petitioner is proposing to demolish the former residence in its entirety, and renovate the commercial building with a complete interior and exterior makeover to convert it into a day care facility.

The scope of the exterior building improvements include the following:

- Replacement of all exterior materials with new stone base, thin-brick veneer, and fiber cement siding and trim.
- New windows throughout.
- A small classroom addition at the southeast corner.
- New covered porches/porch columns at the front and rear classrooms.
- New canopy above the new main entrance on the south end of the building.

The existing vacant single-family residence (to be demolished) is located in front of the existing commercial building, which blocks the view of the commercial building and creates an odd appearance from the street. The existing commercial building has an overall nice massing and composition, and the proposed exterior improvements will create an excellent fresh appearance for this building. The proposed exterior materials and details have a rich appearance and they are very nicely coordinated.

The petitioner is proposing one new 28 sf ground sign facing Arlington Heights Road. The proposed sign is a simple design supported by two 4x4 aluminum posts. Per Chapter 30 sign code, the maximum allowed size is 24 sf. In general, the sign is nicely designed, but it is recommended that the sign panel be reduced to 24 sf to comply with code, and that the base of the sign be enhanced with stone to match the building.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed design for the exterior modifications for the new school, with the recommendation to reduce the size of the ground sign panel to 24 sf to comply with code, and enhance the base of the ground sign with stone to match the building.

Mr. Quinn responded to the comments about the ground sign and said they would consider enhancing the base of the ground sign with stone; however, they were planning to add landscaping at the base of the sign, which could hide the stone. He had no additional comments.

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

Commissioner Eckhardt said that the renderings really help to show what is going on, but also show how the pavement goes right up against the building along the drop off/pick up area, and he recommended added planting areas there to help soften the building as it hits the walks. He is very familiar with this building and felt the proposed design brings the building to life and maintains the farmhouse charm, while keeping the important elements. He said the design was well done.

Commissioner Kubow agreed and said it was an impressive transformation of the existing building. It is completely different, looks fantastic, and the color palette is warm and welcoming. He also agreed with the comment about adding

landscaping along the drop off/pick up areas to make it more welcoming. He also suggested adding an architectural element above the door on the east elevation, which almost feels like a front entrance, although he acknowledged that doing so could draw people to think that was the drop-off area. **Mr. Quinn** clarified that these doors are an exit for the classrooms and they do not want to confuse them for an entrance. **Commissioner Kubow** understood and suggested adding landscaping there, which **Mr. Quinn** was not opposed to. **Commissioner Kubow** also said that the flat element above the new covered entrance on the south did not fit with the architecture and felt out of place with all of the low sloping roofs, and **Mr. Quinn** replied that they want to make this element stand out as the entrance, with possible future signage on it. **Commissioner Kubow** reiterated that other than adding more landscaping to help soften some of the harder areas of the building as previously suggested, he felt this was a great transformation of the existing building.

Chair Fitzgerald agreed with most of what was said. He did not feel that more landscaping was necessary at the main entrance because it does not face the street; he was open to it, but was also okay with leaving it as proposed. On the east elevation that faces Arlington Heights Road, he suggested more landscaping along the east wall, as well as a small amount where the fence is located to help soften that area. He also commented that although the exit doors along the east elevation are not meant to be welcoming, he felt the flat white doors should be a more attractive material, which is a requirement for him. **Mr. Quinn** was not opposed to the doors being a more traditional type design/material. **Chair Fitzgerald** also liked the colors being proposed and felt the design looked great and will be an enormous improvement.

Mr. Hautzinger suggested painting the exit doors the same color tone as the brick to down play their prominence. **Chair Fitzgerald** said he was open to that but did not want to see flat steel doors, but rather something decorative to go with the rest of the building, which could be reviewed and approved by Staff. To avoid someone mistaking these as the entrance, **Commissioner Eckhardt** agreed with painting the exit doors to match the adjacent siding, as opposed to white doors that could encourage entry. With regards to the south entry canopy, **Commissioner Eckhardt** liked that it indicates it is the main entrance, but suggested more cabinet framing on the canopy, rather than one big flat surface as currently shown on the drawings, which is not realistic. This could be approved by Staff. **Mr. Quinn** did not see a problem with breaking up the canopy face with additional detailing.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS FOR GODDARD SCHOOL TO BE LOCATED AT 1316 N. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS ROAD. THIS APPROVAL IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE PLANS DATED AND RECEIVED 10/23/18, 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 ADJUST THE COLOR AND PROFILE OF THE FLAT, WHITE FRONT FACING EXIT DOOR SO THAT IT HAS A MORE DECORATIVE APPEARANCE.
2. A RECOMMENDATION TO ADD LANDSCAPING ALONG THE FRONT WALL OF THE BUILDING.
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 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 Kubow commented that he was okay with the petitioner adding landscaping to the ground sign, or with not adding landscaping; however, he would require some type of base to match the sign. His requirement would be to either add landscaping or some type of base that would be the same material as proposed for the building. **Chair**

Fitzgerald was okay with the ground sign either way but pointed out that code requires landscaping at the base of a ground sign, which **Mr. Hautzinger** confirmed. **Chair Fitzgerald** also wanted the recommendation to add landscaping along the front wall of the building to be a requirement, and approved by Staff. **Mr. Hautzinger** asked that the landscaping comment remain as a recommendation because of the potential conflict with Plan Commission comments regarding landscaping. **Commissioner Eckhardt** concurred with the comments made by the other commissioners regarding the sign.

Mr. Hautzinger suggested adding a recommendation to add a stone base to the ground sign. **Commissioner Eckhardt** was concerned that adding a stone base could create site line issues with small children running around the site or walking pedestrians being blocked by the sign. **Mr. Quinn** felt this would not be an issue because they are maintaining the required 12' visibility triangle. **Mr. Hautzinger** clarified that the 12' visibility triangle is for vehicular visibility clearance, but there is a pedestrian walkway there so he recommended moving the sign and the 12' visibility triangle back away from the sidewalk. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said he was in favor of the stone base, to the extent that it did not create a hazard.

Chair Fitzgerald asked Staff if the commissioners were voting on a variation to allow the ground sign to be larger, or would the sign meet code, and **Mr. Quinn** said the sign would meet code.

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

- 4. A RECOMMENDATION TO REDUCE THE GROUND SIGN SIZE TO COMPLY WITH CODE AND ADD A DECORATIVE STONE BASE.**

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