

## DRAFT

### MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION VIRTUAL MEETING

MARCH 9, 2021

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

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

Members Absent: Scott Seyer

Also Present: Kevin Davis, Fairfield Homes for 219 S. *Evergreen Ave.*  
Chris Russo, ALA Architects for 219 S. *Evergreen Ave.*  
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

**Chair Fitzgerald** read the following statement: 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 FEBRUARY 23, 2021

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 23, 2021. MOTION CARRIED. COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT ABSTAINED.

**ITEM 1. SINGLE-FAMILY TEARDOWN REVIEW****DC#21-008 – 219 S. Evergreen Ave.**

**Kevin Davis**, representing *Fairfield Homes*, and **Chris Russo**, representing *ALA Architects*, were present on behalf of the project.

**Mr. Hautzinger** presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to demolish an existing two-story residence to allow construction of a new one-and-a-half story residence with an attached, two-car garage. The subject site is zoned R-6, Multiple Family Dwelling District; however, single-family homes are allowed in this zoning district. The proposed front setback needs to be slightly adjusted to comply with the average setback of the block, but otherwise the project does comply with the single-family zoning requirements.

This block is zoned R-6, Multiple-Family Dwelling District, and is comprised of a mix of housing types. The block currently has a mix of existing and newer single-family homes, as well as newer multi-family residences, row homes, and multi-story residential buildings. The subject property is located between two multiple-family buildings, so the proposed design looks small in comparison. However, the properties across the street are predominantly single-family houses.

In regards to the proposed design, the massing has awkward proportions, and further design development is recommended. The dormer on the front (above the garage) looks large and out of balance with the front porch gable. Additionally, the asymmetrical front-to-back main roof gable (side elevations) has an awkward and unbalanced appearance. To provide a more balanced composition with better proportions, the petitioner should consider changing the proposed large dormer to two smaller dormers, and increasing all front and side roof pitches to a 12:12 slope. Staff provided 2 sketches in the Staff report illustrating these suggestions. Staff recommends the proposed design be further studied with more design development to address these concerns.

**Chair Fitzgerald** asked if the petitioner had any comments at this time. **Mr. Davis** said that he is usually on the other side of things with the homes that he builds, overpowering the ranch homes on either side of it, casting shadows or blocking views, as opposed to this Master down home being reviewed tonight. He said that the design suggestions from Staff will raise the cost of building the new home, and he felt the current design is good-looking. He preferred to look at the current design and determine if it is good enough in this extremely eclectic environment of homes where there are no original homes left. He felt there was room to evaluate the current design without increasing his costs.

**Chair Fitzgerald** asked if there was any public comment on the project and **Mr. Hautzinger** said that there was.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Keith Moens, asked if this new home qualifies for the teardown fee under the Affordable Housing Ordinance, and if not, why. **Mr. Hautzinger** said that the fee would apply to this new home; all new single-family homes, whether a teardown or new home built on a vacant lot, are now charged a \$3,532 fee for the Affordable Housing Fund. **Commissioner Kubow** added that the new Affordable Housing fee is required at time of building permit, and no permit will be issued without this fee being paid. **Mr. Hautzinger** concurred.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Kubow** acknowledged that the new home is smaller than the context of this eclectic street, and he asked the petitioner why not go a little bigger with the home. **Mr. Davis** reiterated that this is a Master down home, and so it has an extremely large footprint, which makes an expensive foundation and roof; the cost per square foot is quite unaffordable. With the short walking distance to the Downtown, the new home has been designed to accommodate the older, aging-in-place audience, with a first-floor master bedroom, but it is not affordable. **Commissioner Kubow** understood and appreciated the context, which is very helpful.

In general, **Commissioner Kubow** liked the proposed design and always appreciates Staff's suggestions and sketches, which he felt would be an improvement here, and while he prefers the petitioner go with that type of design, the current design is trying to fit a need that the Village will want to accommodate in the future; therefore, he was in support of the current design as proposed.

**Commissioner Kingsley** said it was interesting to be reviewing a new home that is smaller than the context of surrounding homes, and she appreciates that the client wants to live Downtown in a smaller home; she commended the petitioner for doing that. She said the front elevation is okay; the dormer could be a little smaller, and two dormers would make it look more like a Cape Cod, which Staff suggested and she felt would be nice. If it is too expensive to change the roofing, she asked if anything could be done to make the side elevations more appealing, since they will be visible when walking down the street. **Mr. Davis** said that efficient ways to build are to utilize the peak of the roof for headroom on the second-floor; in general, a 1 and ½-story home utilizing the center of the roof peak lowers the building costs. He could not disagree that Staff's suggestion is a much better looking product; however, they do not want to invest the money in doing that when it will not provide more square footage or provide utility to the customer. **Mr. Davis** said he could defer to his architect for any ideas.

Thinking about the future homeowners that will not just be seeing the front elevation, **Commissioner Kingsley** suggested the architect look at the rear elevation and consider adding something above the back door for protection, breaking the roof plane to give it a little more interest. With regards to the sides of the home, **Mr. Russo** suggested hiping the very top part of the roof on the side elevations, above the second-floor ceiling line, which could give more visual interest to the sides of the home, while keeping the second-floor space designed within the roofline. For the rear elevation, he suggested extending the roof down over the patio door to provide for more protection, almost in line with the roof above the windows located right of the fireplace. **Commissioner Kingsley** asked about the size of the overhangs and **Mr. Russo** said the home has a 1-foot standard overhang. **Commissioner Kingsley** was in favor of the suggestion to hip the top part of the roof on the sides of the home, as well as the suggestion to extend the roofline over the patio door, with some type of bracket or column at the end. She had no further comments.

**Commissioner Eckhardt** agreed with and appreciated the comments made by the other commissioners. He felt the sketches from Staff were very nice, but he sympathized with the petitioner and his client to keep some costs down. He said that there is without question, a little bit of dwarfing with the front elevation at the front door, and at the higher double window dormer; however, he felt this would come across more attractive in three dimension. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said his main concern echoed Commissioner Kingsley's comments about the side elevations that appear large, flat, and without design. While he appreciated the architect's suggestion to clip the roof on the sides of the home, he would add a suggestion to extend the clipped roof down and bring a small roof over with brackets, which will give the sides of the home some design. He acknowledged the costs involved with these suggestions, but felt these small details would add charm to the sides of the home, which was important because of the visibility from the street. He had no further comments.

**Chair Fitzgerald** agreed with the comments made by the other commissioners. He said the front of the home was very nice and he liked the colors being proposed; however, he was concerned about the side elevations. He remembers this commission being very particular about the multi-unit building to the south that has balconies on the north side of it that will look right into this new home. He was in support of anything that can be done to add charm to the sides of the new home. He also liked the suggestion to extend the roof over the back door.

**Commissioner Eckhardt** asked the petitioner and his architect to respond to the concerns about the side elevations. **Mr. Davis** understood the commissioners' suggestions, and while this location is great for walking to the Downtown, he acknowledged the large townhome to the north that will be staring down on the new home, and he was concerned about his client's issues with the proximity of the townhome. **Mr. Davis** said he was not opposed to clipping the roof on the side elevations, and felt that extending the roof over the door on the rear elevation was a good idea in general, without too much additional cost. **Mr. Russo** liked the idea of clipping the roof on the sides and adding brackets as

suggested. **Chair Fitzgerald** suggested these changes be reviewed and approved by Staff.

**Commissioner Kingsley** pointed out the stone base being proposed to the left of the garage on the front elevation, which does not wrap the corner onto the north side of the home. She suggested eliminating this stone, and somehow stop it so it is more like a porch detail than a front elevation detail. **Commissioner Eckhardt** agreed.

There were no further comments.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED NEW (TEARDOWN) SINGLE-FAMILY HOME TO BE LOCATED AT 219 S. EVERGREEN AVENUE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 2/5/21, SITE PLAN RECEIVED 2/23/21, 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 CLIP THE CORNERS OF THE ROOF TO HIP THE NORTH AND SOUTH ENDS, MAINTAIN THE MINIMUM 1-FOOT OVERHANG, AND A RECOMMENDATION TO INCLUDE SOME KIND OF BRACKETS ON THOSE SIDES, TO BE REVIEWED BY STAFF.**
- 2. A REQUIREMENT TO EXTEND THE ROOF IN THE BACK SO THAT IT EXTENDS OVER THE BACK DOOR.**
- 3. A REQUIREMENT TO ELIMINATE THE STONE TO THE LEFT OF THE GARAGE DOOR.**
- 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.**

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

**ITEM 2. GENERAL MEETING**

**Mr. Hautzinger** reminded the commissioners the next meeting will be in 3 weeks on March 30, 2021.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO  
ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:00 PM.**

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