

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION VIRTUAL MEETING

NOVEMBER 10, 2020

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

Members Present: John Fitzgerald, Chair
Scott Seyer
Ted Eckhardt

Members Absent: Jonathan Kubow
Kirsten Kingsley

Also Present: Tony VanDyke, Marton Premier Homes for *508 S. Phelps Ave.*
Julie Jilek & Beth Anne Ausnehmer, *NSSEO for Miner School*
Mary Boehmler & Grady Hamilton, Trammell Crow Co. for *Senior Housing Development*
Lukas Van Sistine, Gretchen Camp, & Teresa Forsberg, ESG Architects for Trammell
Crow Senior Housing Development
Jake Coryell, Confluence for *Trammell Crow Senior Housing Development*
Brian Radiszack, SPACECO, Inc. for *Trammell Crow Senior Housing Development*
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 feasible.

Chair Fitzgerald also reminded those speaking tonight to state their names before speaking. **Mr. Hautzinger** added instructions for public attendees that want to speak tonight, as well as muting when not speaking.

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FOR OCTOBER 27, 2020

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF OCTOBER 27, 2020. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 4. INSTITUTIONAL PRELIMINARY REVIEW**Trammell Crow Senior Housing Development – 2045 S. Arlington Heights Rd.**

Mary Boehmler and Grady Hamilton, representing *Trammell Crow Company*, Lukas Van Sistine, Gretchen Camp and Teresa Forsberg, representing *ESG Architects*, Jake Coryell, the landscape architect, and Brian Radiszack, the civil engineer, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger said that he would present Staff comments after the petitioner provides an overview of the project.

Ms. Boehmler said that the proposal is for a 3-story, 175-unit luxury senior living development. The project will include independent living units, assisted living units, and memory care units, with ample amenity space that includes exterior gathering spaces. She gave background about Trammell Crow that was founded in Dallas, Texas in 1948, and doing business today across the country in 18 offices. Their team is based in the Chicagoland area and they develop throughout the Midwest. She introduced those present from ESG Architects, who together as a team, they are working on their 14th residential project, as well as Jake Coryell, landscape architect with *Confluence*, and Brian Radiszack with *Spaceo*, their civil engineer.

Ms. Boehmler said they are all here tonight to be a resource and address any comments or questions the commissioners have. Their goal is to deliver a superior outcome for their residents and the communities they build in, and they look forward to the discussion tonight. They are prepared to discuss the recommendations in the Staff report as well. Ms. Boehmler referred to Lukas Van Sistine, the lead architect on the project to walk through the design in more detail.

Mr. Van Sistine presented an aerial of the site showing surrounding context that includes a mix of uses, heights, and design aesthetics. Looking at the site in a metaphoric way, the proposed building is almost like a city in itself; the center of the site being the core where the common spaces are located, and the wings being the neighborhoods of independent and assisted living, and a variety of outdoor spaces with primary and secondary drop-offs that are designed to feel plaza-like and pedestrian friendly. The memory care garden to the northeast, a more intimate courtyard to the southeast, and a terrace space off the indoor pool. Service areas to the east along Tonne Road will be screened as much as possible, and there will be walking paths around the site for residents to enjoy.

Mr. Van Sistine reviewed the materials and their thinking behind the design. They are proposing high quality materials such as brick, white fiber cement panels, and brown fiber cement siding with a wood look. They want a harmonious balance of the color palette, therefore, a limited palette is being proposed that expresses itself in different ways. The building appears like townhomes with smaller expressions of the building, which helps to scale it down. A variety of window types are proposed that accentuate character and proportion; the feel of the building is contemporary but with elements of traditional to make it feel familiar to residents. Common spaces are expressed with more glass so that the use of the building is understood by the way it expresses itself. Mr. Van Sistine also presented an aerial rotation of the proposed building on the site that includes a street view, the intimate outdoor spaces, the pool building and terrace, and the paths around the site.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. Overall, the proposed design is very nicely done with quality materials, nice scale, proportion, and detailing. The scale of the large building is broken down with changes in materials, jogging of the exterior wall planes, using a combination of recessed and projected balconies, and varying the parapet wall heights. All of these details work well together to add a lot of interest and nice scale to the overall design. The exterior materials are varied in type, color, and texture. The materials and colors are very well coordinated, and they offer a nice amount of contrast to break up the large walls. Other details, such as vertical grouping of windows add the finishing touches to the success of the overall composition.

Staff recommended the following revisions to further enhance the design:

- **Balcony Fascia/Soffit.** The balcony fascia and soffits are proposed to be clad in a light gray metal. It is recommended to consider changing the fascia/soffit color to black for more contrast against the exterior walls, and to coordinate with the black balcony railings.
- **Elevator Overrun.** There are two elevator overruns projecting above the roof. The overruns are proposed to be clad in black fiber cement panels to match the wall coping. However, these “black boxes” are prominent and they detract from the rest of the design. As proposed, the elevator overruns are in line with the exterior walls. It is strongly recommended that they be setback from the exterior walls to reduce their prominence. It appears that the floor plans could accommodate a five or six foot setback. Additionally, it is recommended to change the black color to a gray color (matching the grey brick) to soften the appearance.

Mr. Hautzinger also said that sustainable design is always encouraged, especially for large Planned Unit Developments such as this. The petitioner has provided an extensive list of sustainable design features that have been incorporated into the design. All exterior mechanical equipment is required to be screened from public view. The majority of mechanical equipment is proposed to be located within the building; however, there is a small grouping of mechanical units located in the center of the roof, and if those units will be visible from the road, then a screen will need to be provided. A sight line study is required to confirm. Utility meters are proposed on the east side of the building, which will be screened with landscaping.

With regards to signage for Institutional developments, Chapter 30 Sign Code allows one ground sign per street frontage, with 800 feet of separation required between the signs. The petitioner is proposing two ground signs facing the adjacent streets, and two internal ground signs at each driveway, for a total of four ground signs. All of the signs are proposed to be low, monument style signage, which is an appropriate scale for this development. However, the two ground signs facing the streets are approximately 490 feet apart (measured along the property line), where 800 feet minimum is required, and the two internal ground signs are not allowed. The petitioner will either need to revise their signage plans to comply with code or seek variations.

Aside from the previous comments made, Staff recommends approval of the project.

Chair Fitzgerald asked the petitioner if they had any comments on the recommendations in the Staff report. **Mr. Van Sistine** said they appreciated the feedback from Staff, and they have prepared a few exhibits to speak to these recommendations. Beginning with the balcony fascia/soffit color, **Mr. Van Sistine** presented a revised rendering that showed the change in color to black, which they feel looks great; however, if the underside of the balconies need to be black, it would limit the manufacturers. He asked that options be left open for the color of the balcony underside to be either be black or a dark color. They are agreeable to setting back the elevator overrun, as well as changing the siding color to a grey color to match the brick. They did an initial site line study of the rooftop mechanical units that are for the common space heating and cooling, which showed that the units will not be visible; however, they will work with Staff to ensure this and add screening if necessary. With regards to the monument signs, **Mr. Van Sistine** said they would agree to eliminate the 2 interior monument signs, and keep the sign on Arlington Heights Road; however, for tonight's discussion they would agree to eliminate the sign on Seegers Road, and if they determine it to be important as the project progresses, they would come back for another review of that sign. He asked for feedback from the commissioners tonight regarding the sign shown on Seegers Road, because it is located at the secondary entrance that will be used a lot when family visit the residents.

Mr. Hautzinger appreciated the petitioner's responses to Staff's comments. With regards to the signs being shown tonight, he agreed with the petitioner's response to omit the two internal signs, keep the sign facing Arlington Heights Road as a primary entrance sign, and considering the second sign on the north side as a possible sign variation. **Mr. Hautzinger** pointed out that there is a 12-foot visibility triangle requirement for the ground signs, and the sign facing Arlington Heights Road appeared to be encroaching into the required clearance. He recommended that the location of the sign be slightly adjusted to ensure that it will be outside of the 12-foot triangle for visibility. **Mr. Van Sistine** understood and said this should not be a problem.

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

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Seyer** completely agreed with Staff's comments with regards to the massing being fine, the way it breaks off at Arlington Heights Road, and he liked the way the massing itself is broken up into several components. He also liked the material palette and he encouraged the petitioner to keep it somewhat simple and not too complicated. He was appreciative that the petitioner was in support of Staff's comments, which he agreed with as well, such as changing the color of the fascia of the small balconies to black, and he was in support of the petitioner's option that the underside of the balconies be grey, almost to match the brick. **Commissioner Seyer** acknowledged the difficulties of moving around the elevator overrun; however, making it a lighter color to match the brick was a good option. If the rooftop mechanical equipment is visible, he would make it a requirement to have it screened in the same material as the overruns, so they tie together on the rooftop. **Commissioner Seyer** commented that as an Architect he tends to be about certain design rules, and he noticed that at locations that are close to the intersection of the massings, the balcony canopies are eliminated, and he asked if there was a reason for this. **Mr. Van Sistine** said the main reason for this is because the inside corners seem to get a little busy with a canopy, and they found it to be less distracting to have a cleaner inside corner there, which he understands is very subjective. **Commissioner Seyer** appreciated the logic behind that decision, and he would not make this a requirement, depending on how the other commissioners felt about it. He had no further comments.

Commissioner Eckhardt said he was trying to determine the best way to analyze the elevations of such a large building; the flat elevations versus the renderings, and he commented that the white color being proposed is pretty bright. He asked the petitioner if they have built this building before somewhere else in the country, and **Mr. Van Sistine** said they use a lot of white in their buildings, which he feels is a contemporary color, and they like to mix a contemporary color with a more traditional and familiar cornice. Overall, the building wants to be a contemporary building, but because of the residents that will live there, it also wants to have a little familiar and traditional. **Commissioner Eckhardt** asked about the color of window trim color throughout the building and **Mr. Van Sistine** said the window trim is white, but the windows will be either black or dark bronze; the trim is contemporary to match the white on the building, and window color gives a pop to the windows. **Commissioner Eckhardt** asked if all windows are the same color tones and **Mr. Van Sistine** said they are the same dark color throughout, whether in the residential living units or the common space.

Commissioner Eckhardt commented on the difficulties of reviewing such a large project that has so much going on, although he felt the petitioner gave a nice presentation tonight. The proposed building is difficult to review in a flat elevation because it is a 3-dimensional building and a very complicated building with a lot of ins and out and movement. In general, he was trying to determine the intent of the pattern designs, and if there is any repeat with color and finishes, because the segmented portions in the elevations appear to be a bit disorganized on the flat elevations. He asked the petitioner how the building was colorized and **Mr. Van Sistine** pointed out the 3 different expressions; the first expression is the end cap where there is grey brick with large square windows, and then the taller grey cornice; the second expression is next to it where the building is white for the first 3 levels and highlights a 1 over 2 effect with the windows and muntins; and the third expression is located into the wing of the building where there is brick at the base with the white on top, and a 2 over 1 effect with windows and muntins. That happens on the inside of the arms and the wood tone happens at the recess but continues into the inner part that is typically where the common spaces are.

Commissioner Eckhardt referred to Sheet A1-7, East partial elevation 2, which he felt was all over the place with movement, and he asked the petitioner to explain this elevation. **Mr. Van Sistine** explained that on the left of this elevation where there is brick at the base and the horizontal lines, it implies that the brick would stick out every third or fourth course; that grey brick base and white top is a residential unit expression, which is a different situation than the others because there are balconies here. What happens at the common areas is that the brick is what you feel and see when entering the courtyard area; what happens at the lower portion is that the same horizontal patterning is only happening at the lower base and not carrying it all the way up. They are trying to create interest within the set of rules and stick to them as much as it makes sense and as much as possible without compromising a unit for the rigidity of

the language. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said that the building has been broken up so well that he was confused about how it was done and he appreciated the explanation. He also commented that in the flat elevation renderings, the roof parapets and the roof flashings appear to vary with some appearing dark bronze and some white. He asked how many different roof flashing colors were being proposed and **Mr. Van Sistine** said there are 3; white, the wood look, and the grey.

Commissioner Eckhardt said that he liked the proposed building and now understands what the petitioner is trying to achieve with it, and he felt the scale of this large building was broken down nicely with the colors. He pointed out that because this project is going before the Plan Commission, this commission can only review building design, colors and signage, but he wanted clarification that access to this site from Arlington Heights would be right in/right out only, which the petitioner confirmed. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said that this meant the proposed ground sign at Arlington Heights Road and Seegers Road would only be visible when entering the site from the south, and he felt most visitors would enter from the north. **Commissioner Eckhardt** had no further comments.

Chair Fitzgerald said that he really liked the project and the comments made by the other commissioners. He appreciated Staff's comments and that the petitioner is agreeable to them. He said he was open to the color for the underside of the balconies, to be approved by Staff, and he was also open to variations for signage for a project this big, within reason, if the petitioner decides to come back with a sign variation request.

Commissioner Eckhardt pointed out that only 3 of the 5 commissioners are here tonight and a positive vote from all 3 commissioners is required for approval. He asked Staff to confirm that this is not a preliminary review, and that the petitioner is seeking approval tonight. **Mr. Hautzinger** said that there was no preliminary review of this project, which is an optional step, and the project is planned to move forward to the Plan Commission and Village Board for review after tonight's review by the Design Commission. Based on the feedback received tonight, he encouraged the commissioners to proceed with making a motion.

Commissioner Eckhardt said that for a project this size, more details are typically provided for this commission to review, and he was unsure what he is actually approving in terms of some of the building details. He was a little concerned about that, and if the project moves forward tonight, he would ask the architect to submit detailed wall sections to Staff for review. **Mr. Van Sistine** appreciated that and said they will continue to work with Staff on those details to make sure that they are appropriate and a high quality of aesthetic and function. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said that from a practical standpoint, it looks like there should be a roof over the sliding door of the balconies to prevent driving rain inside, and all of the residents should be given proper protection on their balconies. He had no further comments.

Chair Fitzgerald said he was good with the project moving forward with the recommendations from Staff becoming requirements, and that additional details of the building be submitted to Staff for review and approval.

Commissioner Seyer supported a requirement to add roofs over the balconies, and that the rooftop mechanical systems be screened with the same material as the elevator overruns, if they are visible. He felt these were necessary from an aesthetic as well as from a practical point of view. **Chair Fitzgerald** and **Commissioner Eckhardt** supported these as well.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED DESIGN FOR THE TRAMMELL CROW SENIOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AT 2045 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS ROAD. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON AND SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE PLANS RECEIVED 10/28/20, 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 THAT THE FASCIA AT ALL OF THE BALCONIES BE CHANGED TO BLACK TO MATCH

THE GUARDRAILS.

2. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE UNDERSIDE OF THE BALCONIES BE BLACK OR GREY TO MATCH THE BRICK.
3. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE ELEVATOR OVERRUNS BE CLAD IN GREY TO MATCH THE BRICK.
4. A REQUIREMENT THAT IF THE ROOFTOP MECHANICAL UNITS ARE VISIBLE, THAT THEY ARE SCREENED WITH THE SAME MATERIAL AND COLOR AS THE ELEVATOR OVERRUNS.
5. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE BALCONIES TOWARDS THE INTERSECTION OF ALL FOUR MASSING ARMS, THAT SEEM TO BE MISSING A ROOFTOP OR CANOPY, HAVE A CANOPY ADDED TO THEM FOR CONSISTENCY ON THE ELEVATION AND USE.
6. 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 adding a requirement that the petitioner submit detailed wall sections and other building details as they are developed to Staff, to better understand how the building will be developed, as well as detailed cut sheets for light fixtures, all to be reviewed by Staff. **Commissioner Seyer** said that overall, the use of the exterior materials as shown in the reference photos submitted on the materials sample board feel very nice to him.

Mr. Hautzinger commented that the petitioner was looking for flexibility with the color of the underside of the balconies to be either black or grey, depending on the manufacturer they choose. **Commissioner Seyer** said the color could be black or grey, although he felt grey was a better choice because it ties in with the base of the building, whereas black is a bit heavy; but either way is acceptable.

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

7. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PETITIONER SUBMIT A FINER LEVEL OF DETAIL OF THE EXTERIOR WALL COMPONENTS AND LIGHT FIXTURE CUT SHEETS, FOR FINAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL BY STAFF.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT SECONDED THE AMENDED MOTION.

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