

APPROVED

MINUTES OF  
THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS  
DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING  
HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.  
MAY 28, 2019

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

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

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Marc McLaughlin, Taylor Morrison Illinois for *Taylor Morrison Townhomes/Sigwalt 16*  
Mark Hopkins & Eden Richards, HKM Architects for *Taylor Morrison Townhomes/Sigwalt16*  
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM MAY 14, 2019

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF MAY 14, 2019. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 1. MULTI-FAMILY REVIEWDC#19-034 – Taylor Morrison Townhomes / Sigwalt 16 – 37-45 S. Chestnut Ave. & 36-40 S. Highland Ave.

Marc McLaughlin, representing *Taylor Morrison of Illinois*, and Mark Hopkins and Eden Richards, representing *HKM Architects*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is seeking design approval for three new 4-story townhome buildings with a total of 16 units on an existing vacant site at the south end of Block 425 on the edge of the Downtown. Tonight's review is regarding aesthetics and architectural design of the buildings only. This project also requires Plan Commission review and Village Board approval for all matters pertaining to zoning. The Plan Commission meeting is tentatively scheduled for June 26, and separate public notification will be provided once that meeting date is confirmed.

Mr. Hautzinger explained that this project received a preliminary Design Commission review on February 26, 2019. At that time, Staff reported that the Village Board and neighboring residents had previously expressed their preference for a traditional style development in this location to complement the context of the adjacent single-family neighborhood. At a Committee of the Whole meeting on June 11, 2018, the Village Board expressed their preference for an example of a traditional style multi-family development on the edge of Naperville's Downtown. In order to comply with the direction from the Village Board, Staff had recommended that the modern style townhome proposal be redesigned with a more traditional aesthetic, and several design suggestions were provided. However, despite the Village Board's preference for a traditional style development, the Design Commission liked the overall modern style direction for this project, including the materials and colors. However, they did recommend the following:

- It was encouraged to enhance the appearance of the buildings as townhouses by further defining the appearance of each individual townhome.
- It was recommended to add windows to the blank wall areas facing south.
- There was a preference to omit the grids (muntins) from the windows.
- Sustainable design was encouraged, and a list of "green" design features was requested.

Based on the feedback received at the preliminary Design Commission review, the petitioner has made the following changes to the proposed design:

- Massing. The overall appearance of the design as individual townhomes instead of one large building was greatly improved by the following:
  - The three story corner "tower" element was omitted and replaced with a two-story box bay creating a clear identity for the corner townhome unit.
  - Box bays were added to all of the units, providing a very nice residential scale.
  - Scuppers and downspouts were added between each of the units, which provides a subtle visual break between each of the units.
- Brick Colors. The brick colors were revised from shades of gray to a creamy white and a reddish brown.
- South Windows. The south walls of the east and west buildings were redesigned to include three vertical rows of windows.
- Window Grids. The window grids (muntins) were omitted from the design.
- Sustainable Design. An extensive list of sustainable design features was provided.

Staff felt that overall, the proposed design is very nicely done, consistent with the Design Commission's support for a more contemporary design. The softened material palette combined with the changes to the massing helps to create a transitional style development that has a fresh modern appearance to complement the Downtown, yet has a nice scale and level of detail to fit with the adjacent traditional style single-family neighborhood.

Staff's concerns to be evaluated by the Design Commission are as follows:

- North Elevation of the Highland building. The north elevation of the Highland building is lacking detail. Although visibility of this elevation will be limited, it is recommended that additional masonry and windows be provided to enhance the appearance.
- Optional Fourth Floors. The petitioner is proposing to offer the fourth floors for all interior units as an option to potential buyers. The fourth floor for all end units will be standard, which raises concerns about the potential for a random appearance to the massing at the top of each building. To ensure a consistent appearance for the development, it is recommended that the fourth floor space either be included for all units on all buildings, or completely eliminated.

All rooftop mechanical equipment is required to be screened from public view. Air conditioning units are located on the fourth floor roof terraces, and will be fully screened by the parapet walls. Exterior wall-mounted equipment and meters must also be screened from view. The locations of these items is not yet determined, but it is recommended that they be required to be located on the back of the buildings, away from the street frontages.

**Mr. Hautzinger** concluded that Staff recommends approval of the proposed design for the new Sigwalt 16-Taylor Morrison Townhomes, with recommendations to provide additional masonry and windows on north elevation of the Highland building, a requirement that the fourth floor space either be included for all units on all buildings, or completely eliminated, and a requirement to locate all exterior wall-mounted mechanical equipment and meters on the back of the buildings, away from the street frontages.

**Mr. McLaughlin** said that a neighborhood meeting was held on April 11, 2019, where positive feedback was received from neighbors and their input was considered when the preliminary design was revised for tonight's review. There was also good discussion about the fences in the front yard, which were ultimately eliminated from the design.

**Mr. Hopkins** appreciated the feedback received on this very important transitional site. He felt the proposed design was more transitional than contemporary because it was a little bit cleaner than a highly detailed traditional building, but with all the allusions to traditional urban row homes without super contemporary or modernistic approaches to details. In response to Staff's concerns that the north elevation of the Highland building lacked detail, **Mr. Hopkins** said that this was because the windows look at the parking deck and they felt punched openings were unnecessary there. He also said that they are trying to locate all exterior wall-mounted mechanical equipment and meters on the rear of the buildings; however, there is a place on the corner units where they might not be able to do so, which he presented a diagram of, but they are committed to fully screening any meters with landscape (a total of 3 meters on each corner building).

**Chair Fitzgerald** asked if there was any public comment and there was response from the audience.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Gabriela Rojek, 104 S. Highland Avenue. She lives directly across the street from the site (to the south) and was at the neighborhood meeting on April 11<sup>th</sup>. She appreciated the design being presented tonight, which she felt was a lot better than the previous development that was proposed for the site. She felt the scale was better too, and she liked individual homes rather than rentals. She had concerns about the carve-outs shown on Sigwalt because of the high amount of traffic and the plows. **Mr. Hopkins** clarified that there was no carve-out for parking being proposed on Sigwalt, only on Chestnut. Ms. Rojek liked the design and had no further comments.

Lauree Harp, 44 N. Vail Avenue. She has lived here for 19 years and followed all of the Block 425 reviews, which she is very happy with how that development turned out. Living Downtown and seeing the development of the Downtown, she had concerns about how these buildings look, which is more industrial. She also had concerns about traffic on Sigwalt, which is a narrow street that carries a lot of traffic and travels very quickly, and felt that carving out space for cars to pull in for package delivery and such was necessary. **Mr. Hautzinger** explained that these comments are matters to be discussed by the Plan Commission. With regards to the design, **Ms. Harp** felt that the proposed buildings look like the Chestnut building, which is a downgrade of the Campbell/Vail/Wing buildings, and not as architecturally attractive as what is going in on Block 425 or the surrounding buildings. Architecturally, she felt that something could

be added to the buildings to resemble the look of Arlington Heights look, as opposed to the industrial look; the design looks very plain to her and did not add to what is existing on Chestnut.

There was no further public comment.

**Commissioner Eckhardt** said the current design was a great improvement from the design presented at the preliminary review, and the petitioner established each elevation of each building as a separate unit to be identified as such. He referred to the south elevation and asked for clarification on the function of the box bays. **Mr. Hopkins** explained that they will add interior floor space, and when the box bay is only 2-stories tall then the bedroom floor does not extend that far out. **Commissioner Eckhardt** felt they looked a little boxy and a little blank. In terms of the building design, when he first reviewed it he wondered if it should be similar in architecture to the future building next to it on Chestnut, but now he preferred the differences between the buildings. He felt it was a transitional design, boxy with a 4<sup>th</sup> floor walk-out setback, which he felt was a good design element. He referred to the southwest corner unit and asked why the box bay did not go all the way up; it looks a little boxy as shown. **Mr. Hopkins** replied that it is a result of getting the right alternation going down the street with high/low and wide/narrow box bays. If they changed the height of the corner box bays, then they would need to change other things down the rest of the elevation. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said that at this point he was generally in favor of the design being shown tonight, and he liked the massing. He wanted to hear comments from other commissioners before making any further comments.

**Commissioner Kingsley** said it was a nice project and she appreciated a lot of things the petitioner was doing on the project, and although she liked the design being shown tonight, she really liked the previous design as well. She was unsure about the box bays and the fact that units with a box bay on the second and third-floor do not get a canopy. She felt this was a little more foreboding with less light, and if the current design moves forward, then the light quality and how it will portray each door will be very important. She liked the canopies and did not mind the box bays on the ground. She understood how the scuppers make a rhythm across the building and break up the elevations; however, she felt this was contributing to the industrial look of the building, and she questioned whether there was a way to get that same rhythm by doing a reveal in the brick and then having internal drainage. She also had concerns about the downspouts being painted to match the surrounding brick. **Mr. Hopkins** replied that they prefer not to do internal drainage, and the current location for the downspouts was approximate.

**Commissioner Kingsley** asked for clarification that the window trim, when in brick, would be a cast stone material, and the window trim in a box bay or siding would be vinyl, and if all of the trim will be smooth. **Mr. Hopkins** reviewed the window trim details, which will break the plane and all be a clay color, the spandrel panels in the box bays will be one smooth piece in the Siding D color, all of the trim will be smooth, and the cap on the coping stone will match the cast stone. **Commissioner Kingsley** said that she liked the previous small roof overhang on the penthouse, which was now eliminated, and **Mr. Hopkins** said that it was eliminated as a result of feedback given. **Commissioner Kingsley** felt there should be some kind of overhang on the doors for protection, and she agreed with Staff that the fourth-floor space should either be included for all units, or completely eliminated.

**Mr. McLaughlin** replied to the comment about the optional fourth-floor space. After receiving feedback from Staff, input from their architect, and the competing market conditions of the starting price for these units and whether to include this element as a standard or an option, they have decided to make this fourth-floor element standard on the corner units, and an option on the interior units, in order to market the units at a particular dollar amount. Their solution to keep everything feeling like a 4-story building if buyers do not option them, is to do a faux wall just at the front of the buildings. The faux wall would be the same material across with a door, which would be visible from the front elevations. **Commissioner Eckhardt** asked if the faux wall would be the same height as the occupied space, 10' tall, and **Mr. McLaughlin** agreed, adding that they have rendered this and it looks just like it would if it was a full build-out. This is their solution to keep to the integrity of the 4-story massing, however they feel most buyers will buy this option, with it only being an issue for 1 or 2 units; however, but they cannot guarantee that. **Commissioner Kingsley** said she was not in favor of doing a false wall because so many people would be seeing this from above. She liked the color palette and although she felt the previous color palette was a little stronger, this color palette blends itself more with the

neighborhood and the other developments going in. She felt it would be nice to see a little more of the dark versus light siding color, the white brick is unique but felt it could be a little more white.

**Commissioner Kubow** commented about the tight turning radius for cars into the garages, which the petitioner acknowledged and added that the anticipation is for tenants to own a small car and use the train. In terms of the architecture, **Commissioner Kubow** really liked the original design, but after looking at the current architecture in Arlington Heights and what is being proposed tonight, he really liked the color palette, the materials, and the transitional design of the buildings. He is always a big proponent of seeing more contemporary housing, which this is stepping towards, and felt the petitioner, architect, developer, and the Design Commission have done a good job of working together to come up with a design that fits within Arlington Heights. So well done to everyone involved with the project. Initially, he had some concerns with the box bays, specifically that the 2 infill units were lacking an entrance there, but he felt it could be done with downlights recessed either below the box bays or below the canopies to help highlight where each entrance is. The petitioner said that recessed lighting is proposed in the bottom of the box bays and the canopies.

With regards to the fourth floor material, **Commissioner Kubow** liked the cornice on the previous design and felt the box protruding from the fourth floor in the current design is lacking. He recommended going back to what was previously proposed, maybe something even simpler because there needs to be some type of projecting feature at the top of the fourth floor. He also felt that a dark material for the fourth floor might be an interesting idea to consider, and the screening material could be different instead of the same as the enclosure. He said it was important for residents of the Highland building to have windows added on the north side of the building, even though it will have limited exposure. With regards to the fourth floor space, **Commissioner Kubow** felt that a rendering showing the space included, the space not included, and a rendering that showed the false wall from the rear would have been helpful. **Mr. Hautzinger** said that the petitioner did provide an updated rendering to show how the false wall would look, and it essentially looks identical as the rendering with the full fourth floor.

**Commissioner Seyer** did not have a lot to add to the other commissioner's comments other than he applauded the petitioner's efforts to respond to some of the comments made at the preliminary review, such as adding windows to the solid wall and improving the softscape at the entry by eliminating the fence. He agreed with Commissioner Kubow that the top of the fourth floor could use a little more of a pronounced parapet because right now it is flat going all the way up, and the little bit of articulation that was previously there was nice. He understood the intent of the downspouts, which certainly help break up the elevation in a positive way, at least in the renderings, but he questioned how it would look in real life. He explained that a paint color that looks like brick will wear differently than brick and eventually not blend. At the very least, he felt it should be the same color as the windows, to tie in with the aluminum in the windows; however, he preferred to see the downspouts go away and be replaced with a brick detail, bumped out for articulation. If this is cost prohibitive, then he said that there needs to be a lot of care into how the downspouts are treated, otherwise it will be a major aesthetic detriment to the property value and how it looks aesthetically, which is a big concern to him. **Commissioner Seyer** had no further comments.

**Chair Fitzgerald** had a big issue with the fourth floor space and the faux wall in the rear. He was unsure how it would look, other than it would look odd, especially since that part would be visible by so many people that are higher. He did not understand this detail enough to be comfortable with approving it tonight. He agreed with the comments that the fourth floor could be darker and the cap a little nicer, and he liked the colors and materials being presented. He also liked that the fencing in front of the buildings was eliminated, and he really liked the idea of adding windows or some type of architectural detail to the area on the northeast corner of the building. He pointed out the 28' wide opening there and that this is a walking neighborhood where people will see the elevation. All in all, **Chair Fitzgerald** liked the project, which he agreed is transitional in style, and he liked how the proposed materials were brought from the neighborhood and combined in a good way.

**Commissioner Kingsley** asked the petitioner if the gas meters could be located on the east and west walls between the buildings. **Mr. Hopkins** replied that there is only 5' of space in the pedestrian passages, which is not enough space to add meters, and they are still waiting for NICOR's response to their request on the location of the meters.

**Commissioner Kingsley** referred to the dark bronze color proposed for the canopies and railings, and pointed out how light the back of the building will be. She suggested a warmer color for the railings, a color in between the 'Siding A' color and the dark bronze canopy color.

**Commissioner Eckhardt** asked for clarification on the petitioner's intent to build the fourth floor space. **Mr. McLaughlin** replied that all corner or end units would be built with the fourth floor space, with a buyer option for the remaining units. **Commissioner Eckhardt** was concerned that the fourth floor would be out of balance and look unfinished if some units had the faux walls and some did not. **Mr. McLaughlin** presented a rendering that showed what they believe to be the best and worst case scenario if only some units have the fourth floor space, which would be their approach from a sales perspective. **Chair Fitzgerald** said that what was shown in this rendering looked okay, but if it was not balanced it would not look okay. **Mr. McLaughlin** replied that they are in favor of the balanced look as well. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said he has never seen a developer come here with a major architectural element such as this as an option, and **Mr. McLaughlin** suggested thinking of it as a basement option, which **Commissioner Eckhardt** replied was different because a basement is not visible.

**Commissioner Kubow** asked about the roof material for a unit where a false wall would be, and **Mr. Hopkins** said that roof pavers would be used where there are roof decks, and only roofing where there is a false wall. **Commissioner Eckhardt** asked if a buyer could option a big roof deck instead of the fourth floor space and **Mr. McLaughlin** said that that would not be an option because of building code issues. He reiterated that they anticipate that every buyer would option for the fourth floor space.

**Mr. Hautzinger** commented that having a glass patio door in a false wall would have a strange appearance if you can see the sky through the glass door. He asked if the petitioner considered spandrel glass instead. **Chair Fitzgerald** reiterated his concerns about the residents in Downtown buildings looking down on these buildings and seeing this odd detail of false walls; he could not visualize how this would look. **Commissioner Kubow** pointed out that traditional row homes have a lot more units across the building, sometimes having different character and different levels, and since there are only 5 units here, he was unsure if the false walls would look as bad architecturally and be that noticeable.

**Mr. McLaughlin** said that they looked at the false wall from the street; however, he understood the concerns about how it would look from above, which is why they rendered other variations of it. **Commissioner Kingsley** suggested meeting halfway; the commissioners really want to have the fourth floor space built on all the units, and if it cannot be done, then at a minimum on the Chestnut building, it follow both the white brick or the red brick, and the same on the Sigwalt building, so at least it makes sense with the elevations. The petitioner understood and said that they actually tried to do just that.

An audience member asked if it was too late to comment on the project. **Chair Fitzgerald** re-opened the public comment portion of the meeting.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Andrew Wimberly, 615 W. Haven Drive. He said that the population of Arlington Heights is decreasing, not because people are leaving but because home sizes are getting smaller due to people having less children and downsizing, etc. and he felt the 3 bedroom standard for this development was not adapting to this housing market or to the way the housing size trend is going in. **Commissioner Eckhardt** acknowledged the issue of this demographic, ownership of smaller units is difficult to find in town, but pointed out that smaller rental units are coming with the other development on this site. **Mr. Wimberly** added that 6% of the homes in downtown Arlington Heights only have 1 car, and he clarified that the 25' wide turning radius for this development is actually larger than the standard parking lot aisle which is 22' to 24'.

Gabriela Rojek asked if the developer is committed to the landscaping as shown. **Mr. Hautzinger** replied that the landscaping and all site design elements would be reviewed in detail as part of the Plan Commission hearing.

**Commissioner Kingsley** pointed out that the plans do not show lighting and she asked if this has been developed yet, specifically at the patio doors, on the fourth floor, and in the walkways between the buildings. **Mr. Hopkins** indicated the can lights on the canopies and under the box bays, as well as in the overhang above the garage doors; otherwise there are no surface mounted lights. **Commissioner Kingsley** suggested that any lights proposed in the rear of the buildings be a lamp that is shielded to not show the source of the light, and lights in the walkways be low to just light up the ground.

**Commissioner Eckhardt** suggested a straw vote at this time prior to a motion because there could be differing opinions about some very large elements of the buildings, particularly the top. He summarized that he was in favor of a darker tone at the top level of the buildings, and he was not in favor of the faux wall idea because the big giant block across the building makes it look like a big mechanical penthouse, which did not make sense to him. The downspouts are somewhat of an issue for him as well because they are not an attractive design element, he was okay with the color palette, he liked the bricks, he was in favor of adding windows on the northeast elevation, and he agreed with the suggestion that the railings be the same color as 'Siding A'.

**Commissioner Kingsley** summarized that she was not in favor of a false wall for the fourth floor, and was more in favor of following the facade so that it looks like it matches vertically. She was in support of eliminating the scuppers and doing something different in those locations, whether it be a reveal or something that projects out, although she would rather not see a projection. She was also in support of doing some kind of parapet or expression of the cornice, not in a detailed way, but just a projection on the fourth floor. She also emphasized her preference for the wall mounted mechanical equipment to be located in the rear of the buildings.

**Commissioner Kubow** agreed with the comments made by Commissioner Kingsley. **Commissioner Seyer** and **Chair Fitzgerald** agreed as well.

**Commissioner Kubow** asked the petitioner if they thought about a compromise for the fourth floor, and **Mr. McLaughlin** replied that if all the options for the fourth floor space could not be sold, they could work with putting them in the white brick units, as opposed to the brown brick units. **Mr. Hautzinger** clarified that this concept goes against the idea of having each end/corner unit as standard then, and **Mr. McLaughlin** said the space would remain standard on the corner units and this scenario would only apply to the interior units. **Commissioner Kingsley** reiterated that each elevation should make sense vertically, whether it is red brick or white brick.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL THE PROPOSED ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE SIGWALT 16-TAYLOR MORRISON TOWNHOMES TO BE LOCATED AT 37-45 S. CHESTNUT AVENUE AND 36-40 S. HIGHLAND AVENUE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON AND SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS DATED AND RECEIVED 4/12/19, EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS AND RENDERINGS DATED 5/22/19 AND RECEIVED 5/24/19, 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. A REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL WINDOWS ON THE NORTH ELEVATION OF THE HIGHLAND BUILDING.
2. A PREFERENCE THAT THE FOURTH FLOOR BE CONTINUOUS, AND IF NOT, THAT IT FOLLOW THE LEAD OF THE FRONT FACADE SO IT READS VERTICALLY.
3. A REQUIREMENT TO LOCATE ALL EXTERIOR WALL MOUNTED MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT AND METERS ON THE BACK OF THE BUILDINGS AWAY FROM THE STREET FRONTAGES, AND IF NOT POSSIBLE, THEN REVIEWED BY STAFF AS TO HOW THEY WILL BE HIDDEN.
4. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE DOWNSPOUTS BE INTERNALIZED AND THAT THOSE DIVISIONS IN THE FACADE BE BROKEN UP BY EITHER A REVEAL OR A BRICK PROTRUSION, TO BE REVIEWED BY STAFF.
5. A REQUIREMENT TO ENHANCE THE FOURTH FLOOR COPING WITH A SIMPLE PROJECTED PROFILE.

6. A RECOMMENDATION THAT THE RAILINGS BE A WARM BROWN COLOR, AND NOT AS DARK AS THE DARK BRONZE COLOR.
7. A RECOMMENDATION THAT THE COLOR OF THE FOURTH FLOOR BE A DARKER AND RICHER COLOR, SUCH AS THE 'SIDING A' COLOR.

**Commissioner Eckhardt** asked for clarification on the motion regarding the fourth floor. **Commissioner Kingsley** explained that the motion states the commissioners' preference that all units have the fourth floor space, and if this could not be done, then it must be built as a unit, not as a false wall, and match what it is on the base of the unit. **Commissioner Seyer** added that the materiality of the massing divisions should be followed on the fourth floor. **Mr. Hautzinger** added that the fourth floor space would be standard on the end units of each building in all cases, regardless of the color of the brick.

**Commissioner Seyer** asked for clarification on the issue of the downspouts; do they need to be changed or eliminated in favor of a brick reveal. He also pointed out that the previous version did not have external downspouts. **Ms. Richards** replied that they have not fully designed the roof drainage plan yet, but drainage is needed from the roof deck because it is a flat roof deck area at the third floor, and external downspouts are preferred. **Commissioner Kingsley** clarified that the motion did not state how the petitioner should change the downspouts, only that it is a requirement not to see the downspouts. **Commissioner Seyer** was in favor of that, but expected the petitioner to have an issue with it and wondered if there should be discussion about it now. **Mr. McLaughlin** said he was going to propose that the downspouts be a different color and not match the brick. **Chair Fitzgerald** said that he and two other commissioners appear to be in favor of the downspout requirement in the motion. **Commissioner Kubow** said he was okay with the downspouts as proposed, which help break up the elevation. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said that he is used to seeing scuppers and downspouts on the back of buildings, not on the primary elevations. He was not in favor of the downspouts as proposed; they are not attractive to him, especially on the Sigwalt elevation. **Mr. McLaughlin** asked if the only concern is the four downspouts on the end elevations facing Sigwalt. **Commissioner Eckhardt** reiterated his preference that the downspouts be internal and the overflow go out the back or somehow camouflaged. He reiterated that the Sigwalt elevation is the most prominent and disturbing, and the downspouts are not as prominent on the other elevations. He was also concerned about the blank brick wall areas that will be left after the downspouts are removed.

**Chair Fitzgerald** asked if the commissioners were comfortable leaving the motion as is. **Commissioner Kingsley** asked what would happen if the petitioner determines during construction documentation that they cannot comply with this requirement. **Mr. Hautzinger** replied that Staff would work with the petitioner to achieve a solution that is in the spirit of what the motion states, and if it was not attainable, then the petitioner would be required to return to the Design Commission to review it.

To clarify, **Mr. Hautzinger** said that the motion currently includes a requirement to internalize all of the downspouts, whether they are on the front or the ends of the buildings. **Commissioner Kingsley** added that the motion did not specify an elevation; it just states scuppers in general. **Mr. Hopkins** asked about the gutters and downspouts on the rear elevations. **Commissioner Seyer** and **Commissioner Kingsley** were not concerned about the downspouts on the rear elevations because those walls are all siding. This only applies to the three main street façades.

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

4. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE DOWNSPOUTS BE INTERNALIZED AND THAT THOSE DIVISIONS IN THE FACADE BE BROKEN UP BY EITHER A REVEAL OR A BRICK PROTRUSION, TO BE REVIEWED BY STAFF. THE EXPOSED DOWNSPOUTS MAY REMAIN ON NON-STREET ELEVATIONS.

**Mr. Hautzinger** understood that a brick detail was required on the front elevations between the units in place of the downspouts, but he asked if that detail also applied to the south elevations of the Chestnut and Highland buildings. **Commissioner Kingsley** replied that it did not apply in those locations.



**Mr. Hautzinger** also asked for clarification on item 1 of the motion, to confirm if additional masonry is required on the north elevation of the Highland building. **Commissioner Kingsley** replied that only the addition of windows is required.

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