

## APPROVED

MINUTES OF  
THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS  
DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING  
HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.  
JUNE 25, 2019

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

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

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Dan Olsen, Watermark Engineering for *McDonalds*  
Joe Kerchner, Lingle Design Group for *McDonalds*  
Joe Bibat, Town & Country Chicago Associates for *Raising Cane's*  
Jeff Cossel, Visconsi Companies for *Raising Cane's*  
Jeff Pountney, ADA Architects for *Raising Cane's*  
LuAron McCormack, *Raising Cane's*  
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

### REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM JUNE 11, 2019

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 11, 2019. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 2. COMMERCIAL REVIEWDC#19-047 – Raising Cane's – 225 E. Palatine Rd.

Joe Bibat, representing *Town & Country Chicago Associates*, Jeff Cossel, representing *Visconsi Companies*, Jeff Pountney, representing *ADA Architects*, and LuAron McCormack, representing *Raising Cane's*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to build a new free standing Raising Cane's fast casual restaurant at the Town & Country shopping center. The proposed restaurant will be located in an existing parking area facing Palatine Road between BMO Harris Bank and the Verizon store. The restaurant will have indoor dining, outdoor dining, and a drive through. The scope of the project includes redevelopment of the site with new parking and landscaping.

This project requires Plan Commission review and Village Board approval to amend the existing Planned Unit Development for Town and Country shopping center, as well as Special Use approval for a restaurant with a drive-through. Because this project is going to the Plan Commission, the role of the Design Commission is limited to building and signage only.

The proposed building design is based on prototype branding for Raising Cane's. The design has a fresh modern appearance that is generally consistent with other fast casual restaurants in this area. The exterior materials and colors are nicely coordinated, and the black outdoor dining canopy has an inviting appeal. The red number "1" on the face of the entry tower is considered a large wall sign, so it is not allowed by code, and will either need to be omitted or a hardship demonstrated to justify a sign variation. Overall, the architectural design is nicely done, and will fit in well in this location.

In addition to the large number "1" wall sign, the proposed design includes three more wall signs and one ground sign that do not comply with Chapter 30 sign code. This building has one street frontage, so only one wall sign is allowed, with a maximum size of 25% of the wall that it is mounted on. The proposed wall mural is not allowed to be painted directly on the building wall, without a variation being given. One 6-foot tall ground sign is proposed, however the location of the sign is not shown on the site plan. Raising Cane's will be part of the Town & Country shopping center, and Town & Country already has three code-compliant multi-tenant ground signs. Additional ground signs are not allowed. The adjacent Verizon store has a small ground that was approved by variation in 1981.

Signage will either need to be revised, or sign variations requested as a separate application to be reviewed based on hardship. Preliminary feedback from the commissioners tonight regarding signage is welcome.

The proposed new building will have multiple rooftop mechanical units, which are required to be fully screened from public view. The building design includes a continuous equipment screen which is nicely coordinated with the building design. One minor concern is the rooftop guard rail on the back of the building that sticks up above the wall. Since the back of the building will be highly visible from the Town & Country parking lot, it is recommended that an alternative solution be studied to better fit with the building design.

A trash dumpster enclosure is proposed at the southwest corner of the site. The enclosure is proposed to be built with split-face CMU in a "Texas Buff" color to complement the colors of the building, with a black standing seam flat roof.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed architectural design for the new commercial restaurant building with the comments to explore alternative solutions to eliminate the rooftop guard rail, and either revise the proposed signage package to comply with the sign code, or request sign variations.

Mr. Bibat introduced his team in attendance tonight, and said that they have been working with the Village for the past few months to obtain approval of this project. He was prepared to answer any questions the commissioners might have.

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

**Commissioner Seyer** said that in general, he liked the aesthetic of the building, which follows a more modern theme seen a lot with these types of uses. He completely agreed with Staff's comments about the rooftop guard rail, and asked if a solid parapet could be used instead. The petitioner replied that they prefer the guard rail to a solid parapet because of design standards. The guard rail is for the adjacent roof hatch which is in a mechanical room that is located more outward on the building and there is nowhere else to move it. He added that the guard rail would be painted black to blend in with the fascia and other materials of the building. **Commissioner Seyer** said the guard rail would look better as a solid continuation of the parapet wall, rather than an open guard rail; it looks like they ran out of material, and he wanted to see a different type of design element than the unsightly guard rail. He liked the overall aesthetic of the building.

**Commissioner Kingsley** liked the design aesthetic of the building and was glad to see the new restaurant being built. She agreed that the guard rail should be changed and suggested raising the parapet wall and returning it so it looks less like a parapet and more like an actual volume behind it. She also commented about the trash enclosure, which she preferred to be attached to the building, although she appreciated the metal being proposed for the canopy and the doors. She was not in favor of the CMU material because it would be quite visible, and she suggested a more long lasting material such as brick instead. The petitioner explained that the CMU split-face would be textured and colored in a color that will accent the building, not painted. **Commissioner Kingsley** had no further comments.

**Commissioner Eckhardt** asked for clarification on the location of the two different brick materials, and the petitioner replied that the iron spot brick would be on the front elevation and the common brick would be on the side elevations. **Commissioner Eckhardt** asked about the significance of the large number 1 on the front elevation, and **Ms. McCormack** explained that it represents their one love, which is their high quality chicken fingers that they serve. **Commissioner Eckhardt** understood the concerns about the guard rail at the top of the building and supported a modification to the design to include a solid extension of the parapet instead of the guard rail. **Mr. Hautzinger** clarified that the high wall shown on the elevations is actually the roof mechanical screen that is recessed back, which the commissioners understood. **Commissioner Eckhardt** concluded that he liked the varying materials being proposed, he supported the painting of the sign on the brick building, similar to Portillo's, and he liked how the materials break up with the darks being different colors. His only issue was the guard rail.

With respect to the concerns about the guard rail, the petitioner asked for clarification about raising the parapet as suggested, and whether it needed to be raised across the entire facade. **Commissioner Eckhardt** replied that he was okay with it only be raised in the section where it currently is.

**Commissioner Kubow** really liked the color palette of materials, which were very warm with a modern touch. His initial thoughts about the signage was that there is a lot happening there; he really liked the number 1, which he supported because it was very important, and he liked the wall sign above the front entrance; however, he felt the wall sign to the left of the entrance was a bit much and a little busy. He was not overly concerned about the guard rail at the top of the building because it faced the parking lot and was not on the corner, and the impact of the view would not be that great; however, he encouraged the petitioner to consider the suggestion to extend the parapet just in that section.

**Chair Fitzgerald** liked the building design and asked about possible options if the number 1 on the front elevation did not receive approval. The petitioner explained that the number 1 would be the same shape as the Dryvit material behind it and would be applied to it in the same shape. If the metal is not allowed, then the number 1 could be painted instead. **Chair Fitzgerald** liked the front elevation and was okay with the signage on the left side of the entrance, which he felt was fun. He felt the sides and back of the building would be more visible than anticipated because of people entering from both Rand Road and Arlington Heights Road through the shopping center, and he wanted to make sure the back of the building looks better than it does so that people know what the building is. **Chair Fitzgerald** encouraged a little more detail or some very heavy landscaping because the back of the building does not look anything like the front; it does not even look like it is part of the same building. **Chair Fitzgerald** agreed with the concerns about the guard rail and was in favor of changing it to something else as suggested, and he suggested the petitioner study signage allowed for the adjacent buildings in this unique situation because he believed that variations were approved.

The petitioner commented that the whole site is landscaped extensively and the entire site will be part of a visitor's experience. He added that the tower elements are intended to be monolithic and they are proposing a heavy duty, high impact Dryvit in lieu of the hydraulic limestone material specified on the plans. There would also be no control joints in

the Dryvit. **Commissioner Kingsley** expressed concerns about the maintenance of the Dryvit at the ground, and the petitioner replied that the product has a 20-year warranty for damage.

**Commissioner Eckhardt** also cautioned the petitioner about EIFS at the ground level, especially near a hard surface because the product is highly dependent upon the skill of the application. The petitioner understood and agreed with this. **Commissioner Eckhardt** added that he was not a big proponent of EIFS without control joints or something similar because eventually cracks would appear, and this commission has always discouraged the use of EIFS at the ground level.

**Commissioner Kingsley** asked if the EIFS would come all the way down to the ground, and the petitioner replied that details are currently being developed for the material at the base of the building so the EIFS would not sit directly on a concrete surface or on top of the landscaped areas. **Commissioner Kingsley** pointed out that the current drawings and photographs show the hydraulic limestone coming all the way down to the ground to meet the concrete, and she had a really difficult time changing that material to EIFS. **Commissioner Kubow** asked if costs were driving the change in material to EIFS and the petitioner said it was more of an overall design issue from the prototype. **Commissioner Eckhardt** asked if there have been issues with the cementitious material and the petitioner said he was not aware of any, but as the prototype design evolves, different materials and finishes are being considered.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE NEW *RAISING CANE'S RESTAURANT* TO BE LOCATED AT 225 E. PALATINE ROAD. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON THE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 5/22/19, EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS AND ROOF PLAN RECEIVED 6/14/19, 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 INCLUDE A PARAPET WALL IN LIEU OF THE ROOFTOP RAIL, THAT WILL TURN THE CORNER IN AREAS WHERE THE THICKNESS OF THE PARAPET WILL BE SEEN.
2. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE TRASH ENCLOSURE MATERIAL BE CHANGED FROM CMU TO A MATERIAL THAT IS ON THE BUILDING, SUCH AS BRICK.
3. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PETITIONER SUBMIT TO STAFF FOR REVIEW, THE DETAILING AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR THE EIFS BEING PROPOSED FOR THE LIGHTER COLOR WALLS; SPECIFICATIONS TO KNOW THAT CONTROL JOINTS ARE NOT NECESSARY, AND HOW THE DETAILING AT THE BASE OF THE BUILDING WILL WORK WITH THE HARD SURFACES AND LANDSCAPE SURFACES, TO UNDERSTAND THAT THERE WILL NOT BE A GAP IN MATERIALS.
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 Eckhardt** suggested a more durable material for the lower 6-inches of the building, such as a glazed brick, tile, or something durable to meet the ground. He reiterated the tremendous amount of splash up and wear-and-tear on EIFS that hits the ground; it is a very difficult detail. He added that the images shown in the petitioner's photographs of the other restaurant does not show a margin or reveal, and he wondered if the originally proposed cementitious material has had problems with that as well. He reiterated that EIFS does not like hitting the ground and a more durable material should be considered for the first 2 or 3-inches between the ground and the EIFS.

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

3. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PETITIONER SUBMIT TO STAFF FOR REVIEW, THE DETAILING AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR THE EIFS BEING PROPOSED FOR THE LIGHTER COLOR WALLS; SPECIFICATIONS TO KNOW THAT CONTROL JOINTS ARE NOT NECESSARY, AND HOW THE DETAILING AT THE BASE OF THE BUILDING WILL WORK WITH THE HARD SURFACES AND LANDSCAPE SURFACES, TO UNDERSTAND THAT THERE WILL NOT BE A GAP IN MATERIALS, AND THAT IT WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE FOR ANOTHER MORE DURABLE MATERIAL TO BE ADDED AS A BASE TO HELP WITH THE EIFS CONCERNS, TO BE REVIEWED BY STAFF.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT SECONDED THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION.

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