

APPROVED

MINUTES OF
THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
DESIGN COMMISSION
VIRTUAL MEETING
AUGUST 11, 2020

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

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

Members Absent: Jonathan Kubow

Also Present: Joseph Fara, JRC Design Build for *1161 N. Beverly Ln & 1215 N. Walnut Ave.*
Steve Ballaton for *NW Community Wellness Center*
Jeremy Mertz, Poblocki Sign Company for *NW Community Wellness Center*
Chris Jenks for *Driven Car Wash*
Dan Olson, Parvin-Clauss Sign Co. for *Driven Car Wash*
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

Chair Fitzgerald read the following statement as requested by the Village: I find that the public health concerns related to the coronavirus pandemic render in-person attendance at the regular meeting location not practical or prudent.

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FOR JULY 28, 2020

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF JULY 28, 2020.

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

ITEM 3. SIGN VARIATION REVIEW**DC#20-023 – Northwest Community Wellness Center – 900 W. Central Rd.**

Steve Ballaton, representing *NW Community Wellness Center*, and Jeremy Mertz, representing *Poblocki Sign Company*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is seeking sign variation approval for an Electronic Message Ground Sign for the Northwest Community Wellness Center which is a fitness, cardiac care, and rehabilitation facility that is part of the overall Northwest Community Hospital campus. The hospital campus has extensive existing signage including two existing entry ground signs facing Central Road, two entry ground signs facing Kirchoff Road, as well as numerous internal directional ground signs. There are no changes currently proposed to the internal directional ground signs, so the focus of this review is on the main ground signs facing the roads.

In 1995, a Campus Master Plan for the hospital was approved per Ordinance 95-013. The Master Plan included plans for signage throughout the hospital campus with a requirement to have a consistent design and unifying theme. The Master Sign Plan includes four main entry ground signs not to exceed 16'-6" in height and 80 sf in area.

The proposed new sign is intended to identify and serve the Wellness Center facility, which currently has no signage facing the street. The proposed design has a style that is consistent with the existing entry ground signs, but it is a smaller version at 10-feet tall, 28.7 sf, where the main ground signs are 14-feet tall, 58.5 sf. Code allows only one ground sign per street frontage, and the proposed ground sign for the Wellness Center was not included in the original Master Plans, so a variation is required to allow a fifth ground sign on the property. Additionally, code requires a minimum separation of 800-feet between ground signs, so a variation is required to allow only 125 feet of separation between the proposed sign location and the existing adjacent ground sign.

The following sign variations are being requested:

1. A variation from Chapter 30, Section 30-701 Electronic Message Signs, to allow an electronic message sign facing Central Road, where electronic message signs may only be permitted at designated major arterial commercial corridors.
2. A variation from Chapter 30, Section 30-302.a, to allow a total of five ground signs, where only two ground signs are allowed.
3. A variation from Chapter 30, Section 30-302.a, to allow a ground sign with a 152-foot separation, where 800 feet minimum separation between ground signs is required.

A summary of existing and proposed signage was presented as follows:

Ground Sign	Frontage (one sign allowed per street frontage)	Sign Height (16'-6" allowed)	Sign Area	Separation Distance (800 feet minimum required)	Remarks
EXISTING					
Sign 120	Central Road	14'	58.5 sf	700'	Approved in 1996, Phase I Sign Plan
Sign 01	Central Road	14'	58.5 sf	700'	Approved in 1999, Phase II Sign Plan
Sign 31	Kirchoff Road	14'	58.5 sf	1,110'	Approved in 1999, Phase II Sign Plan
Sign 65	Kirchoff Road	14'	58.5 sf	1,110'	Approved in 1999, Phase II Sign Plan
PROPOSED					
Sign 08	Central Road	10'	28.7 sf	152'	Variations Required for

					Number of Signs and Separation
--	--	--	--	--	--------------------------------

Mr. Hautzinger reviewed a brief background on electronic signage. In 2017, Chapter 30 Sign Code was amended to allow electronic message signs along certain major arterial commercial corridors, away from residential zoning districts. The subject property is in a location where electronic message signs are not permitted; therefore, a variation is required. The proposed electronic message sign does meet all other code requirements for an electronic message sign as summarized in Table 2 in the Staff Report. Additionally, per Chapter 30, Section 30-705.h, the operation of an electronic message sign is required to abide by the following restrictions, to which the petitioner has provided written agreement:

1. The electronic display shall be static displays only with no scrolling, fading, flashing, animation, video, or sound.
2. Messages must be displayed for a minimum of 10 seconds.
3. Auto-dimming photocell technology is required to automatically adjust the display brightness to .3 footcandles maximum above ambient lighting conditions.
4. Off-premises advertising is not allowed.
5. Only permitted to be illuminated the same hours that the business is open.

The petitioner has submitted a letter addressing the conditional review criteria for the electronic message sign as well as the sign variation criteria, which in summary states the need for the proposed sign to provide visibility for the Northwest Community Wellness Center and to communicate related Healthcare specific information as provided by the Wellness Center.

Staff comments are that the Northwest Community Hospital campus is a unique entity in Arlington Heights, and the Wellness Center is a unique facility within that campus. The Wellness Center is available for fitness memberships to the general public, as well as serving a large cardiac care patient population. Currently, there is no signage facing the street to identify the Wellness Center. Since it is a stand-alone building with unique services that is open to the general public, Staff does not object to some signage for the Wellness Center. Additionally, the location of the proposed sign makes sense, adjacent to the driveway in front of the building, and it is appropriate that the scale of the proposed sign is smaller than the primary hospital entry signs. However, five signs for the hospital campus is a concern, and the Design Commission should evaluate if it is becoming excessive.

With regards to the proposed electronic message display, Staff does have concerns about opening up electronic signs on corridors not specified in the ordinance, and the potential competitive advantage that an electronic sign at this location could provide over other fitness centers. However, in 2017, when the Village-wide matter of electronic signage was studied, one option that was considered was to allow electronic signage for unique uses, such as major tourism venues. However, the Design Commission and Village Board decided that it would be better to review such unique requests on a case-by-case basis as sign variations. Therefore, the Design Commission should evaluate if the Wellness Center and overall hospital campus is an appropriate example of a unique use where an electronic sign may be appropriate. The surrounding context is primarily commercial, where an electronic sign should not have a negative impact on residential uses.

Staff recommends the Design Commission evaluate the 3 variations, as well as evaluate whether 5 ground signs would be excessive for the hospital campus, evaluate concerns about opening up electronic signs on corridors not specified in the ordinance, and evaluate the potential competitive advantage that an electronic sign could provide over other fitness centers.

Chair Fitzgerald asked if the petitioner had any comments at this time. **Mr. Ballaton** said that awareness is something they deal with on a routine basis with those who consider the Wellness Center part of the hospital. People are not aware of the services the Wellness Center offers within their building, and they have tried to overcome this with post card mailings and other marketing tools. They see the electronic signage as a unique way to advertise what the Wellness Center does, especially the free classes and free lectures that change on a monthly basis. **Mr. Mertz** added that setback requirements are

being met for the new sign, and with respect to the nearest existing hospital sign, they do not want to add more advertising to that sign because it is the main hospital sign that services access to the hospital emergency department.

Chair Fitzgerald asked if there was any public comment on the project and **Mr. Hautzinger** said there was none at this time.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Seyer** felt that signage was necessary for the Wellness Center, since there is currently no signage indicating anything for them other than local knowledge; however, he felt that signage for the main hospital takes precedence and he was concerned that the new electronic sign could become more powerful than signage for the hospital. Electronic signage is something new for him and for this area, and he was interested to hear the other commissioners' opinions. Although he supports signage for the Wellness Center and is in favor of the scale of signage being proposed, the electronic portion of the signage was giving him a bit of pause because of the possibility that it could overwhelm the signage for the hospital.

Commissioner Eckhardt appreciated Commissioner Seyer's comments and concerns about electronic signage. He said that from the beginning, he has been a supporter of electronic signs that are handled in a responsible way, and the ordinance created by Staff provides for that. For the record, he is a member of the Wellness Center, although he did not feel he had to recuse himself tonight. He liked the green color being proposed for the signage, which is different from the colors of the hospital signage, which is very important. In general, he was okay with the electronic sign being proposed, and was glad to see that the signage meets both setback and landscape requirements. The sign sits back far enough that it is definitely tied into the building and he did not want to see it any closer to the entrance. He was in support of the variations.

Commissioner Kingsley agreed with the other commissioners with regards to some signage being necessary here; the Wellness Center is an important amenity in the Village and it deserves its own signage; however, she had concerns about the scale of the sign, as well as the electronic portion of the sign. She was concerned that the electronic sign would overtake signage for the hospital, especially when traveling from the west. She compared the setbacks for the existing hospital sign that is set back 19' from the curb, and the proposed electronic sign that would be set back 15'. At a minimum, she felt the new sign should be pushed back to 19', to be in line with the hospital signage and allow for sufficient visibility of the sign for the hospital, especially considering that the "Emergency" is a lower sign on the hospital sign. She had concerns about other electronic signs in the Village; however, knowing they were approved because of unique circumstances, she felt this proposed electronic sign was also unique. If the guidelines are followed for electronic signs, she felt the proposed electronic sign would be okay in this location and it would work well.

Chair Fitzgerald said that he is also a member of the Wellness Center and felt no need to recuse himself. He was not opposed to a ground sign for the Wellness Center because the way the building is designed it would be hard to put signage up on the building to identify it. He strongly agreed that the sign should not be any closer to the street than the existing hospital sign, and it should not be similar in size because it does take attention away from the hospital signage. **Chair Fitzgerald** was not in favor of the electronic sign here; he felt there was no special need for the Wellness Center to have this electronic sign, and if the sign is approved, then approval for electronic signs would have to be given to almost every other workout facility in the Village. He did not see the hardship of why the Wellness Center needs an electronic sign. He was also against the sign because it takes away from the main hospital sign, which is especially important.

Mr. Hautzinger clarified that code requires the sign to be set back 15' from the property line. The 15 foot dimension shown on the site plan is measured from the property line, but there is also a note stating 15 feet from the curb. This is a big difference, and it needs to be clarified. **Mr. Mertz** clarified their intent is that the new sign be set back 15' from the property line, not the curb. In response to the concerns about the new sign interfering with the main hospital sign, he said that given the mature landscaping in this area, and being that people coming from the west are on the opposite (south) side of the road, the angle that you would be at to the point where the sign would interfere with the main hospital sign would never happen because you would be so far back that the landscaping itself would be blocking the hospital entrance, before the new sign would. He added that they conducted studies and scenarios at the site to ensure that nothing of that nature would occur, and found that there is no point where the new sign is visible if you are eastbound coming from the west; the signs do not interfere with each other in any way. He added that the green color being proposed for the new sign is a softer color compared to the bright red color of the emergency panels.

Mr. Hautzinger asked **Mr. Mertz** to confirm the setback of the existing hospital sign, and **Mr. Mertz** stated that he believed that the existing hospital sign was set back less than 19 feet from the curb as noted on the plans, and the proposed new sign will be further back than the existing hospital sign. **Mr. Hautzinger** said that the setback will need to be confirmed and clarified at the time of permit review, if the variations are approved.

Commissioner Seyer asked for clarification that the main hospital sign, shown as Location 120 on the site plan, would have the same sloping design of the new electronic sign, and **Mr. Mertz** replied that the design of the main hospital sign already exists as shown in the drawing and photo. **Commissioner Seyer** asked why there is a need to have the 2 signs be identical and to make one of the signs more powerful than the other is disconcerting; nobody here wants the hospital to become a second fiddle in signage, so why is there a need for them to be the same design, same scale, same outline, and same size. **Mr. Mertz** said the new sign is about 40% smaller than the existing hospital sign, and the design is similar for consistency purposes; they did not want to create something that was visually different in the area.

Chair Fitzgerald wanted to see the new sign be shorter and omit the electronic portion of it. **Commissioner Kingsley** asked the petitioner why the text of the new sign is not like the other existing signs, the 'nch Northwest Community Healthcare' portion of the sign. **Mr. Mertz** explained that there is a main campus design for 'nch' and there is an off-site design for it too; both are similar in design, but the design being proposed for the electronic sign is the design used at their non-hospital off-site locations. He referred to an off-site location in Kildeer, where a similar sign was completed.

Commissioner Seyer wanted to discuss the concerns about the digital portion of the electronic sign. Code allows electronic signs to change no less than every 10 seconds; however, because of the commissioners' concerns about the new sign overpowering the hospital sign, he asked if the digital portion could be static for a 24-hour period. **Mr. Hautzinger** commented that the petitioner has not indicated in their application how often they intend to change the messages on the new sign. **Mr. Ballaton** said their intent is to have 5 messages per month on the new sign, changing monthly, and the messages will be controlled by their corporate marketing department. **Commissioner Seyer** asked about the display duration of the 5 different messages per month, and **Mr. Ballaton** said they have not yet discussed that, but they would abide by any recommendation given to them because they do not want the sign to be distracting. **Mr. Mertz** said that with a message changing every 10 seconds, the average motorist would not see more than 1 message at a time. He felt that holding a message for 24-hours was a little strict; the sign is a rather large investment to commit to having only 1 message a day. **Commissioner Seyer** said that if the electronic sign is approved, increasing the duration would help minimize the opportunity for drivers to be distracted by a switching message on the sign.

Commissioner Kingsley suggested a lower, wider electronic sign so that it did not overpower the nearby hospital sign. **Mr. Ballaton** said that they already reduced the size of the video screen from what was originally proposed and reducing it any further would not make it worth the investment. **Mr. Mertz** agreed and compared the width of the sign to that of a large screen TV, with a TV being larger and viewed from only 10 feet away in your home, as opposed to 200 feet away from cars driving past this sign. **Mr. Hautzinger** added that the sign code requires the electronic display to be the lower portion of the sign, so if code allowed this sign in this location, it would be a code-compliant design.

Commissioner Seyer said he could appreciate the request and the need for the electronic display because the Wellness Center is an important neighbor, and this is still a facility that needs to be able to self-operate. He was ready to make a motion or discuss further. **Chair Fitzgerald** was ready for a motion.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO RECOMMEND TO THE VILLAGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING SIGN VARIATION REQUEST FOR NORTHWEST COMMUNITY WELLNESS CENTER LOCATED AT 900 W. CENTRAL ROAD:

1. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-701 ELECTRONIC MESSAGE SIGNS, TO ALLOW AN ELECTRONIC MESSAGE SIGN FACING CENTRAL ROAD, WHERE ELECTRONIC MESSAGE SIGNS MAY ONLY BE PERMITTED AT DESIGNATED MAJOR ARTERIAL COMMERCIAL CORRIDORS.
2. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-302.A, TO ALLOW A TOTAL OF FIVE GROUND SIGNS, WHERE

ONLY TWO GROUND SIGNS ARE ALLOWED.

3. A VARIATION FROM CHAPTER 30, SECTION 30-302.A, TO ALLOW A GROUND SIGN WITH A 152-FOOT SEPARATION, WHERE 800 FEET MINIMUM SEPARATION BETWEEN GROUND SIGNS IS REQUIRED.

THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON THE PLANS RECEIVED 7/16/20, FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING:

1. A REQUIREMENT FOR A 10 FOOT HEIGHT MAXIMUM FOR THE ELECTRONIC SIGN, SO THAT IT IS 4 FEET SHORTER THAN THE EXISTING HOSPITAL SIGN.
2. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE ELECTRONIC SIGN MATCH THE EXISTING HOSPITAL SIGN SETBACK, WHETHER IT BE 15' OR 19', AND THAT THE SITE PLAN BE AMENDED TO SHOW THE CORRECT SETBACK.
3. A REQUIREMENT THAT THERE BE A 2-MINUTE STATIC HOLD PER MESSAGE, INSTEAD OF THE CODE ALLOWED 10 SECONDS.
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 asked that the motion include a statement that the setback for the new sign will not in any way block or become senior to the existing main hospital sign, shown as Sign #120 on the site plan. He wanted to be sure that the new sign is sited with that intent. **Commissioner Seyer** agreed and said that any study mentioned by the petitioner would be an important part to require as part of this approval, to further clarify and help establish that there is no visual conflict between the 2 signs. **Mr. Mertz** said that it is very clear from an overhead view of eastbound traffic coming from the west, being on the far south side of the center line of the road, that in order to gain an angle to where there might be a visual conflict between the 2 signs, you would have to be $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile back where the signs are not even visible at that point anyway. **Commissioner Seyer** said that it would be extremely helpful if there was an image showing this; to see a view of the signs from the street, from the left-hand lane going eastbound. This would be helpful to clarify that the new sign would not be an obstacle or disturbance to the existing hospital sign. **Commissioner Eckhardt** added there are often emergency vehicles that drive on the wrong side of the road when approaching the hospital, and he felt a site line analysis exhibit needed to be done for the new sign. **Mr. Hautzinger** noted that the Design Commission makes recommendations to the Village Board for all sign variations, and a requirement can be added to the motion that the petitioner prepare this exhibit prior to the Village Board review.

Chair Fitzgerald had concerns that if this electronic sign is approved, then the hospital might want to add an electronic portion to their existing ground sign. **Commissioner Seyer** felt the goal of this electronic sign is to have different messages change with frequency, which he can appreciate the Wellness Center needing to do; however, he was unsure what changing messages the hospital would need to advertise. He also asked if the hospital was involved in any way with the electronic sign being proposed for the Wellness Center, and if they were on board with the new sign. **Mr. Ballaton** said that the Wellness Center is owned by the hospital, and this capital request is being paid for by the hospital, and the messaging on the new sign will be controlled by the hospital. **Commissioner Kingsley** asked if the hospital could also display a message on the new sign and **Mr. Ballaton** said that they could, although only specific to events occurring at the Wellness Center.

Commissioner Seyer said that because of the close proximity of the proposed Wellness Center sign and the existing hospital signs, he would suggest this commission propose a stipulation that by approving this sign, the hospital forgoes all rights to request an electronic sign at their existing sign location 150 ' away from this sign. **Commissioner Kingsley** agreed. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said that because circumstances with the hospital could change in the future, he felt

this commission should be more flexible about the opportunity to review a future sign variation request from the hospital because of the possibility that this commission finds the request compelling enough to recommend approval. **Mr. Hautzinger** clarified that electronic signs are not allowed in this location, so if the hospital wanted to add an electronic sign, it would be a separate variation request that would require Design Commission review.

Mr. Hautzinger commented about the requirement in the motion that the setback of the proposed new sign must match the setback of the existing hospital sign, either 15' or 19'. He clarified that the new sign must be setback a minimum of 15' from the property line, and if for example the existing hospital sign turns out to be setback 5', then the new sign could not comply with this requirement and would not meet code. **Commissioner Seyer** explained that the site plan shows a 19' setback from curb for the existing hospital sign, and the proposed sign is setback 15' from curb. He wants the new sign to be pushed back further to align with the existing hospital sign, should that be 19' from the curb. **Mr. Hautzinger** apologized for not requiring the petitioner to submit a more precise site plan because it currently shows a dimension of 15' setback from the property line for the proposed sign, with a notation that states '15 feet from the curb', which is an obvious discrepancy.

Commissioner Seyer said the motion can be amended to include a comment that the proposed sign be setback to the 15 foot minimum code compliant setback, with the exception that if the existing hospital sign is pushed back further, then the 2 signs must align. The petitioner agreed. **Commissioner Kingsley** asked where on the sign the 15' or the 19' is measured from; the site plan states, 'from the south edge of the pylon sign', and **Mr. Mertz** replied that the setback is measured from the leading edge of the sign, with the flat side of the sign to face the street.

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

1. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PETITIONER INCLUDE FOR VILLAGE BOARD REVIEW, A SITE STUDY SHOWING THAT THE EXISTING HOSPITAL SIGN DOES NOT COMPETE WITH THE NEW ELECTRONIC SIGN WHEN TRAVELING IN THE LEFT LANE, EASTBOUND ON CENTRAL ROAD.
2. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE ELECTRONIC SIGN FOR THE WELLNESS CENTER HAVE APPROVAL FROM NORTHWEST COMMUNITY HOSPITAL, IN ITS USE AND ITS LOCATION.
3. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE ELECTRONIC SIGN BE A MAXIMUM 10' HEIGHT, COMPARED TO THE 14' HEIGHT OF THE EXISTING HOSPITAL SIGN LOCATED 152' AWAY.
4. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE LED COMPONENT OF THE ELECTRONIC SIGN HAVE A MINIMUM 2-MINUTE STATIC HOLD ON ANY MESSAGE.
5. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE ELECTRONIC SIGN BE PLACED AT THE MINIMUM 15 FOOT CODE COMPLIANT SETBACK DISTANCE, OR FURTHER IF THE EXISTING HOSPITAL SIGN IS SET BACK FURTHER SO THAT THE 2 SIGNS WOULD BE IN ALIGNMENT FROM THE CURB.
6. 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 SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

Mr. Hautzinger reiterated that the Design Commission approval tonight is a recommendation to the Village Board who has final review and approval. He would be in contact with the petitioner regarding the scheduling of the Village Board review date.