

APPROVED

MINUTES OF  
THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS  
DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING  
HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.  
MARCH 12, 2019

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

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

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Robert Losselyoung, Tinaglia Architects for *Arlington Block 425*  
Kelle Bruckbauer, Tinaglia Architects for *Arlington Block 425*  
Steve Ross, Firsell Ross LLC for *Arlington Block 425*  
Edin Lepuzanovic for *924 N. Walnut Ave.*  
Heather Moss & Matt Shimkus, Owners of *915 N. Walnut Ave.*  
Joe & Jon Zivoli, for the *Elm Shopping Center*  
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM FEBRUARY 26, 2019

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 26, 2019. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 1. CBD MIXED-USE RE-REVIEWDC#18-104 – Arlington Block 425

Robert Losselyoung and Kelle Bruckbauer, representing *Tinaglia Architects*, and Steve Ross, representing *Firsel Ross LLC*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is seeking approval of the proposed architectural designs for three new multi-story apartment buildings in the Downtown. This is the design review portion of the approval process, with the zoning to be discussed at the Plan Commission review on March 27, 2019. Because this project is going to the Plan Commission, the role of the Design Commission is limited to the review of the building and signage only tonight.

This project received a preliminary Design Commission review on December 11, 2018 and a formal Design Commission review on February 12, 2019, at which time the project was continued to allow design concerns to be further studied and addressed by the petitioner. Highlights of the Design Commission feedback from the February 12 meeting are as follows:

- Chestnut Avenue Building:
  - The Design Commission was in favor of the design as submitted.
  - There was one recommendation to consider a nicer roofing material above the main entrance, such as faux slate shingles.
- Campbell Street Building:
  - There were concerns about the stone base terminating in the middle of the second floor windows, which created a castle-like crenellation appearance. It was encouraged to raise the stone to above the second floor windows.
  - Similarly, there was concern about the castle-like crenellation appearance at the top of the brick piers at the eighth floor.
  - The detailing of the curtain wall feature on the north elevation was discussed. It was recommended to add a horizontal break across the eighth or ninth floor line to give more hierarchy to the top of the building.
- Highland Avenue Building:
  - There was concern about the understated appearance of the main building entrance on the north elevation. It was encouraged to enhance the entry design with additional detailing for a more grand appearance.
  - Further design development of the first floor on the south elevation was encouraged to break up the appearance of the blank wall.
  - One commissioner felt that the top glass portion of the building needed better integration with the masonry garage base.
  - Two of the commissioners encouraged adding the curved central bay feature on the east elevation to match the west elevation.

Based on the feedback received at the February 12 Design Commission meeting, the petitioner has made the following changes to the proposed design:

- Chestnut Avenue Building:
  - The asphalt shingles have been changed to a black faux slate roofing material.
- Campbell Street Building:
  - The stone base has been raised to above the second floor windows, and transoms have been added to the second floor windows.
  - The brick piers at the eighth floor have been lowered to align with the top of the brick wall.

- A horizontal break has been added across the ninth floor line to give more hierarchy to the top of the building.
- The exterior material at the top floors has been changed from PVC panels to EIFS.
- Highland Avenue Building:
  - The design of the main building entrance on the north elevation has been enhanced with a grand appearance that works well with the design.
  - Inset metal screens for vegetation have been added across the first floor on the south elevation, which work well to break up the appearance of the blank wall.
  - The decorative Azek cornice at the top of the glass curtain walls has been changed to a simple aluminum parapet cap.
  - A flat glass curtain wall has been added in the middle of the east elevation.

Staff comments on the revisions are as follows:

- Chestnut Avenue Building:
  - Overall, the proposed design is very nicely done, and the faux slate roofing is a nice enhancement to the design.
  - The petitioner needs to clarify the material and finish of the ramp walls going down to the garage. The renderings illustrate brick, and the architectural drawings show a large-format running bond. It was previously mentioned that this will be a concrete form liner. If so, the finish/color needs to be confirmed.
  - Staff recommends approval of the design as submitted, with clarification of the ramp wall material and finish.
- Campbell Street Building:
  - The changes to the stone and brick detailing are nicely done, and address the Design Commission's concerns.
  - Staff recommends approval of the design as submitted.
- Highland Avenue Building:
  - For a more cohesive appearance, it is recommended that the central curtain wall feature on the east elevation be revised with a curved bay to match the west elevation.
  - The "44 S. Highland" wall sign is not allowed above the second floor ceiling. The sign should be revised to comply with code, or a sign variation would be required.
  - Signage should be developed for the parking garage so as to promote available customer parking for the development.
  - Staff recommends approval of the design, with these recommendations.

Additional Staff comments include all mechanical equipment, utility equipment, and utility meters are required to be screened from public view. All three buildings include perimeter parapet walls to screen the rooftop mechanical equipment. All wall-mounted equipment and meters must also be screened from view. The site plan indicates preliminary meter locations on the side and rear of the buildings. Staff recommends a condition of approval stating that where possible, all equipment and meters should be inside the buildings; however, for equipment that is required to be on the exterior, it shall be located on the side or rear elevations, away from the public walks, and enclosed with decorative metal screens. Separate sign permits and detailed sign plans will be required for the proposed address wall signs.

**Chair Fitzgerald** asked about any variations being requested for this project, and **Mr. Hautzinger** said that he did not have a prepared summary of variations; however, in general, the petitioner is seeking approval to rezone a portion of the site in the center of the block, PUD approval is required, and a land use variation to allow residential units on the first floor of the Chestnut building in the B-5 district.

**Mr. Ross** said that revised plans were submitted, and both Rob and Kelle from Tinaglia Architects could respond to any questions or comments from the commissioners. **Mr. Losselyoung** clarified that the material and finish of the ramp walls of the Chestnut building are intended to be form liner walls with brick piers around the opening. The ramp walls will be finished in a color to match the stone at the base of the building, with the form liner pattern as shown on the architectural drawing.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Susan Catlin said that she lives on Wing Street. She commented that the parking garage looks like a municipal parking garage; it does not look any different than the Municipal parking garage. She asked who the architect is for the Highland building, and **Chair Fitzgerald** replied that the same architect is designing all 3 buildings. **Ms. Catlin** felt the building looked too much municipal. She has lived in downtown Arlington for 14 years and said this looks really bad.

Kathleen Gabriel, 115 N. Pine Avenue. She stated that her comments are going to be more appropriate for March 27<sup>th</sup>. She has lived in Arlington Heights her entire life and has seen all the development, and is concerned that Arlington Heights is taking the term 'heights' very very literally. We are becoming a town of towers and aesthetically, she found the proposed project institutional looking, just like many other buildings in town. The concentration of this project makes her claustrophobic just thinking of the heavy, heavy concentration of all the buildings in a relatively small space. She is very familiar with this area and is concerned about the largeness of the project, and will attend the Plan Commission hearing on March 27<sup>th</sup> with more specific comments.

Keith Moens, 636 S. Cleveland Avenue. He is trying to ascertain what the number of affordable units will be in this project. The petitioner replied that the affordable housing component is currently being discussed with Staff and will be part of a Housing Commission hearing in the near future.

The commissioners gave their comments.

**Commissioner Eckhardt** had no issues with the Chestnut building and appreciated the roof change to simulated slate, which he felt was elegant and rich looking. He also appreciated and supported the form liner being used, along with brick and stone, which was a nice detail. He had no other issues with the Chestnut building. He appreciated that his previous comments about the Campbell building were addressed, and he asked for clarification of the material and color in the rendering of the bright white crown above the second-floor window, as well as the pilasters and the columns. **Mr. Losselyoung** said that what appears as white in the rendering will actually be more of a light grey limestone color, and the color of the pilasters and columns will be buff; the color difference would be much softer than as shown in the rendering. **Commissioner Eckhardt** was okay with the rear of the building, and had the same comment about the top of the building with the bright white pieces; he was disappointed that a sample was not presented tonight and felt the motion should include a review of a comparison of the buff and the trim color. In response to the resident comment that the parking garage looks like a municipal garage, **Commissioner Eckhardt** explained that the intent is to pick up the same architecture as the existing municipal garage, which he felt was appropriate because it would send a clear message that it is a parking garage. He liked the improvements that were made to the entrance of the Highland building, he supported a variation for signage above the second-floor ceiling height as shown, and he added a suggestion to enhance the sign with LED lighting. **Commissioner Eckhardt** also supported the details of the glass box on the corners, which is true to the aesthetic of the building, and he suggested the curved bay element on the west elevation also be on the east elevation, at least at the top 3 or 4 floors at a minimum. In conclusion, **Commissioner Eckhardt** was okay with the Highland building as proposed. He had no further comments and was ready to make a motion tonight.

**Commissioner Kingsley** thanked the petitioner for the hard work that went into the project and the changes that were made. With regards to the Campbell building, she was pleased to see that the piers were brought up. She pointed out where the buff color material and the limestone would be located on the building and asked if the light grey color of the limestone would be cool or warm in nature. **Mr. Losselyoung** said that either could be used. **Commissioner Kingsley** referred to the material sample board that had really warm materials, and had concerns that a grey limestone color

could be too stark. She felt the color should be reconsidered to ensure its compatibility with the other materials being proposed. In general, she really liked the color palette, which blends itself with the Arlington Heights aesthetic, but felt that care should be taken with the selection of the limestone to make sure it is more of a warm buff color, and lighter than the one being shown. **Commissioner Kingsley** was not in favor of using EIFS for the horizontal band through the curtain wall because the materials will wear differently and not look the same. She was also not in favor of using EIFS for the walls on the top 2 floors. With regards to the detailing of the second floor window heads, she suggested the petitioner look at how high the header will be and the tightness between the header and the stone band; maybe they should be separated. She also suggested getting rid of the white bases of the brick piers at the third floor line, which she felt were not appropriate.

With regards to the Highland building, **Commissioner Kingsley** appreciated the effort put into the entrance, and she liked the signage shown above the second-floor. **Mr. Losselyoung** reviewed the materials and colors proposed for the building, and **Commissioner Kingsley** asked if the buff color would be lighter or similar to the color on the Campbell building, and if the EIFS color would match the Campbell building. **Mr. Losselyoung** said that the buff stone color would be lighter, but the EIFS color would match the white color at the top of the Campbell building. **Commissioner Kingsley** said she was not in favor of the white color on either the Highland building or the Campbell building, and she was not in favor of the EIFS. She appreciated the cornice detail that was done at the top portion of the Highland building, but she was not in favor of the design in general; it was not cohesive. **Commissioner Kingsley** had no further comments.

**Commissioner Kubow** said that although he was not at the previous review of this project, he has reviewed both the meeting minutes and the plans that were presented and he appreciates all the time and consideration the petitioner put into responding to the commissioner's comments and concerns that are reflected in the design being presented tonight. He felt the buildings were better looking than before. Additionally, he felt the petitioner did a great job with overall site planning for the project in terms of density, transition, and the architecture. The designs nicely transitioned from west to east with a more traditional look, and more contemporary architecture towards the Highland building where there is more density. He appreciated the color palette as well, which he agreed is very much an ode to Arlington Heights, and felt the petitioner paid close attention to the Design Guidelines and the Village Comprehensive Plan.

In general, **Commissioner Kubow** wished the project was a little more contemporary in design. He asked about the window color and if the same color would be used on all 3 buildings. **Mr. Losselyoung** said that the windows on all 3 buildings would be bronze, and the tower on the Highland building would have a slight window tint for the floor to ceiling windows, with opaque spandrel panels. **Commissioner Kubow** referred to the Campbell building and he liked the modern curtain wall element as a transition from traditional to more modern, as well as the consistency in the material palette. He really liked both the Campbell and the Chestnut building, which address the issue of transition; however, he was struggling with the tower on the Highland building, although he understood what was trying to be accomplished. He asked if the Village was requiring the new parking garage to match the existing parking garage, and **Mr. Hautzinger** said no, this was the petitioner's choice. **Commissioner Kubow** liked the cornice detail, he was not against the white color, and felt the EIFS was a fine product to use; however, he was struggling with the lack of separation aesthetically from the Village garage. He also appreciated what was done with the entrance, making it more grand, and the height of the signage made no difference to him. In terms of the curved versus flat pieces, he was fine with flat on both sides for consistency, or he was also fine with curved on one side and flat on the other side. He had no other comments at this time.

**Commissioner Seyer** applauded the efforts of the petitioner to take the comments made by the commissioners and bring them into this latest design. He had no objections to the Chestnut building; it looked nice and the scale was appropriate. He liked the improvements that were made to the Campbell building, both in design and materials, with the exception of the white color of the cornice that was a little bit off and contrasting to the warm colors in the renderings. He recommended changing the white color to an off-white color instead. With respect to the Highland building, **Commissioner Seyer** acknowledged the changes that were made with respect to the integration of the glass and the parking, which he felt were better; however, he felt the white color at the top of the building should be a color more

complimentary to the rest of the palette. The spandrel glass seemed fairly transparent, and he cautioned the petitioner about the challenges of making a shadow box in the way it is shown in the rendering; more thought should be given to what that color is, especially in a mock-up to get the desired consistent appearance as shown in the rendering. With respect to the center bay, **Commissioner Seyer** questioned why the curve was there to begin with because it was foreign to the entire massing of the building. To him, the curve was odd; however, he liked the idea and supported the idea of matching it on both sides of the building. He added that although he was not objecting to the signage location aesthetically on the Highland building, he felt more thought should be given to how successful that sign location will be for the address, people driving up to the building will not be able to see the address because it is so high, especially with the canopy blocking the view of the sign.

**Chair Fitzgerald** liked the entire campus of 3 buildings and the way they match the existing buildings around the site. He liked how the Highland building is more modern and in the middle of everything, and will eventually be bordered on all four sides. He also liked that the Highland building matches the existing Village garage, making the garage less obvious. He was okay with the location of the building address on the Highland building, and he liked the details of the entrance; the height of it, the width of it, and felt it would solve the issues previously brought up by the commissioners. **Chair Fitzgerald** also liked the curved wall glass element on the Highland building; the building looked like it could have been an old building and then additions were done to it to bring it to be old versus modern, which he liked. He was okay with the flat element on the east side of the building; either way was fine with him, and he agreed with the concerns about the white color at the top of the building and wanted to see a warmer color. He also agreed with Staff's comments about hiding mechanical and utility equipment. Overall, **Chair Fitzgerald** liked the project and felt it was exciting, especially how each building was designed for a specific market of residents.

**Commissioner Eckhardt** felt that it should be a requirement that the top of the Highland building not be white.

**Commissioner Kingsley** wanted to clarify that comments about the garage on the Highland building matching the adjacent Village parking garage were brought up at previous meetings, where it was said that this was the petitioner's intent. She felt this was a huge challenge, to try to match the existing garage. She also agreed with Commissioner Seyer's comments that the curved element on the Highland building was unnecessary; she liked the building better without the curve.

**Commissioner Kubow** reiterated Chair Fitzgerald's comment that the Highland building would at some point be surrounded by something being built at the south end of this parcel; therefore, not much of the parking garage would be visible. He also agreed with Commissioner Kingsley's comment that it is difficult design challenge to attach to the existing garage, and how to approach that in terms of design. In general, **Commissioner Kubow** really liked this development and was excited to see something built here; the Village needs the density. He hoped the Village trustees make the right decision this time.

There were no further comments from the commissioners.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED ARCHITECTURAL DESIGNS for 33 S. CHESTNUT AVENUE, 225 W. CAMPBELL STREET, AND 44 S. HIGHLAND AVENUE. THIS APPROVAL IS BASED ON AND SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE REVISED PLANS DATED AND RECEIVED 3/01/19, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING:**

**1. CHESTNUT BUILDING:**

- A. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE RAMP WALL BE DETAILED WITH A COMBINATION OF RED BRICK PIERS ABOVE AND CONCRETE PANELS THAT ARE FORMED WITH FORM LINERS BELOW.
- B. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE SIMULATED SLATE ROOFING SAMPLE PRESENTED TONIGHT BE USED.

**2. CAMPBELL BUILDING:**

- A. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE BRIGHT WHITE COLOR BE ELIMINATED AND A SOFT OFF-WHITE OR BUFF COLOR COMPATIBLE TO THE OTHER WARM COLORS BE SELECTED.
  - B. THAT STAFF REVIEW THE COLOR OF THE STONE CROWN MOULDING TO MAKE A DETERMINATION OF THE COMPATIBILITY OF THE WARM TONES, AND IF NECESSARY, BROUGHT BACK TO THE DESIGN COMMISSION FOR REVIEW.
  - C. A REQUIREMENT TO ELIMINATE THE BRICK PIER BASES ON TOP OF THE STONE CROWN MOULDING.
3. HIGHLAND BUILDING:
- A. THE DESIGN BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED WITH A BAY ON ONE SIDE OF THE BUILDING AND FLAT ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE BUILDING.
  - B. A RECOMMENDATION THAT THE PETITIONER SUBMIT EXHIBITS FOR SIGNAGE THAT HIGHLIGHT THE PUBLIC PARKING ENTRANCE.
  - C. A REQUIREMENT THAT ALL METERS BE SCREENED AND/OR LOCATED NOT ON PUBLIC WALKWAYS WHERE THEY CAN BECOME A VISUAL NUISANCE OR TRIPPING HAZARD.
  - D. A RECOMMENDATION THAT THE ENTRANCE TO THE BUILDING BE HIGHLIGHTED WITH SPECIALITY LIGHTING TO MAKE ITSELF MORE PROMINENT.
  - E. THE HEIGHT OF THE SIGN AS SHOWN IS ACCEPTABLE, WITH A RECOMMENDATION TO ALSO CONSIDER SIGNAGE AT A PEDESTRIAN LEVEL.
  - F. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE BRIGHT WHITE COLOR BE ELIMINATED AND A SOFT OFF-WHITE OR BUFF COLOR COMPATIBLE TO THE OTHER WARM COLORS BE SELECTED.
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.

Commissioner Kingsley asked if landscaping and lighting between the building should be discussed tonight, and Mr. Hautzinger replied that site design elements and landscaping will be reviewed by the Plan Commission. Commissioner Kingsley suggested the motion include a statement that the lighting should be pleasing, not harsh, and integrated with the design of all 3 buildings; less is more.

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

- 5. AS A NOTE TO THE PLAN COMMISSION AND VILLAGE BOARD, THE LANDSCAPING INTEGRATION, SOFT LIGHTING, AND LIGHTING IN GENERAL NEEDS TO BE STUDIED CAREFULLY IN AND AROUND THE BUILDINGS FOR PEDESTRIAN USE.

With regards to the Highland building, Commissioner Eckhardt suggested adding to the motion an option for the petitioner to either add another curved bay window or eliminate both of them, since the commissioners have voiced differing opinions. Chair Fitzgerald was okay with that option. Commissioner Seyer said that he and Commissioner Kingsley were okay with them both being flat, if that was the direction the petitioner wanted to pursue. Commissioner Kubow agreed as well.

Mr. Hautzinger asked for clarification regarding the requirement about the ramp walls for the Chestnut building. Commissioner Eckhardt just wanted the record to show a requirement to treat the ramp walls with the brick and stone

form liners and coloration. **Mr. Losselyoung** clarified that there will be brick piers above as posts for the guard rails, and the ramp walls below will be a form liner wall.

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

3. HIGHLAND BUILDING:

- A. THE DESIGN BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED WITH A BAY ON ONE SIDE OF THE BUILDING AND FLAT ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE BUILDING, OR AS AN OPTION TO THE PETITIONER, EITHER ELIMINATE THE BAY WINDOW ON THE WEST ELEVATION, OR ADD A BAY ON THE EAST ELEVATION, OR MAKE THEM BOTH THE SAME FLAT.

**Commissioner Kingsley** asked for clarification that the vote is for all 3 buildings in one vote, and **Chair Fitzgerald** said that it is.

SEYER, AYE; KUBOW, AYE; ECKHARDT, AYE; FITZGERALD, AYE; KINGSLEY, NAY.  
THE MOTION CARRIED.