

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION VIRTUAL MEETING

APRIL 27, 2021

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

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

Members Absent: Scott Seyer

Also Present: John Kuzynowski & John Mauer, Wold Architects & Engineers for *Timber Ridge School*
Julie Jilek, NSSEO for *Timber Ridge School*
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

Chair Kubow 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.

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FOR APRIL 13, 2021

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 13, 2021. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 1. SCHOOL RE-REVIEWDC#21-023 – Timber Ridge School – 201 S. Evanston Ave.

Jonathan Kuzynowski & John Mauer, representing *Wold Architects & Engineers*, and Julie Jilek, representing *NSSEO*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing a new gymnasium and classroom addition to the existing Timber Ridge School. Timber Ridge School is a therapeutic day school serving kindergarten through eighth grade students with special needs or disabilities. The school is owned and operated by the Northwest Suburban Special Education Organization (NSSEO), which is a non-profit entity funded by local school districts to provide special education services to their students. The proposed two-story addition includes a new gymnasium, elevator, stairway, toilets, fitness room, two classrooms, three offices, a positive sensory lounge, and additional support spaces.

This project requires Plan Commission review and Village Board approval for Special Use approval to allow an existing elementary school with the proposed addition within the R-3, One-Family Dwelling District. Variations are also required for parking and to allow a 30.5 foot tall building where 25 feet is the maximum allowed. Because this project is going to the Plan Commission, the role of the Design Commission is limited to building and signage only.

The project was previously reviewed by the Design Commission on April 13, 2021, at which time the project was continued primarily based on the commissioners' concerns about the design of the pre-cast concrete gymnasium portion of the addition.

Previously, Staff recommended further design development of the precast concrete gymnasium exterior. Additional horizontal reveals were recommended to be added to break up the large tan walls and create a panelized look. Additionally, alternative layouts for the blue accent stripe should be studied. Consider a smaller accent stripe or stripes. For additional interest and refinement, consider adding horizontal reveals in the brick walls to align with horizontal reveals in the precast concrete and window openings/mullions.

The following is a summary of the commissioners' comments from the April 13 meeting:

1. The north and east elevations will be very visible and they need further design development.
2. The recently completed addition to the Arlington Ridge Center has a similar precast concrete gymnasium. Design cues could be taken from that building with respect to adding horizontal reveals and possibly additional windows.
3. The north and east elevations do not tie into any part of the original building. Consider adding materials from the original building onto the gymnasium addition, or maybe more of the new blue color onto the original building.
4. There was some concern about how the blue stripe wrapped onto the west elevation. It was suggested to possibly raise the blue stripe, or raise the single-story brick wall to align with the top of the stripe. It was suggested to possibly change the brick wall coping color to blue to match the stripe.

In response to the comments from the April 13 Design Commission meeting, the petitioner has enhanced the gymnasium design by adding horizontal reveals and additional accent striping. Two options are provided for consideration. Both options include a new gray painted reveal in the middle of the blue band, and Option A includes additional small gray painted horizontal accent stripes towards the top and bottom of the walls. Option B includes new horizontal reveals without the additional gray stripes.

Staff comments on the two options are as follows: The gray painted reveal in the middle of the blue band works well to break up the size of the blue band as well as to tie it in with the single-story brick wall on the west elevation. The new horizontal reveals work well to give the precast walls a panelized appearance, and they align with the curtain wall mullions on the east elevation. The additional gray stripes towards the top and bottom of the walls in Option A make the design look too busy. Option B works best to provide the needed additional detail, without looking too busy. Staff

recommends approval of Option B for the addition to Timber Ridge School, based on the revised architectural plans received 3/12/21, and revised elevations and renderings received on 4/20/21.

Chair Kubow asked if the petitioner had any comments at this time.

Mr. Kuzynowski thanked the commissioners for allowing them to present this project which they are very excited about. In response to Staff's comment about the blue stripe, he said that the blue stripe is intended to be the same color in both renderings, with the lighter grey color that starts to speak to the colors that are occurring with the aluminum storefront at the entrance.

Chair Kubow asked the commissioners for their comments, prior to public comment.

Commissioner Fitzgerald said that the revisions were nice, although he wished it could have gone further; however, he was okay with the revised design being shown tonight. He preferred Option A because the detailing being shown is needed, and he liked the way the horizontal bands match up with the south end of the building; how it pulls the windows and everything from the other side of the building and gives it a lot more detail, because the other parts of the building have a lot of details. He also liked the 3 grey stripes, which pulls in the grey from the rest of the building. He added a recommendation that the trees shown in the exhibit on the east side of the building be planted as shown because it will help soften the building both during the growing season and the winter.

Commissioner Eckhardt said he was leaning more towards Option A because he liked the activity of the 3 sections and colors. Although he appreciated the 'corporate' look of Option B with just the reveals, he felt it started to look too corporate for a building that is a school and a fun place. **Commissioner Eckhardt** also agreed with Commissioner Fitzgerald's suggestion about the trees shown in the exhibit, and he was curious to know which design option the petitioner preferred.

Commissioner Kingsley acknowledged the petitioner's quick turnaround of the revisions being presented tonight. She really liked the scoring or the additional reveals put into the concrete that breaks down the thickness of the exterior of the building as well as bring it more to a pedestrian scale. She was a little torn between the two options being shown. She was unsure if she liked the top-to-bottom symmetry, and she preferred to see the blue color in a different location, such as under all the windows, lower down on the building. She liked a portion of Option A and a portion of Option B; she suggested Option A without the bottom grey reveal, or Option A without the top grey. She also said that the base of the building could be the blue color, from the windows down or from the windows up; a coping or a base. **Commissioner Kingsley** had no further comments at this time.

Chair Kubow agreed with the comments made by the commissioners. He was leaning more towards Option B because of its simplicity; however, he felt Commissioner Kingsley's comments were interesting, specifically about moving the blue stripe either up or down on the building. He was fine with either option, with a preference for Option B because of its simplicity.

Chair Kubow asked if there was any public comment on the project and **Mr. Hautzinger** said there was no public in attendance at this time.

Chair Kubow asked if the petitioner had a specific direction they wanted to move forward with between the two options. **Mr. Kuzynowski** said his team gravitated toward Option A, just to give a little more diversity and make it a bit more playful. Option A also ties in to some of the massing that occurs on the existing building in the horizontal lines; it carries the horizontal nature across the building and starts to pick up on that detail. He appreciated the interesting comments about the blue and the base, and said that they looked at doing a portion of the blue color at the bottom and using a brick tone color to ground the base; however, they were concerned about it looking too busy and not being able to get the right match for the brick.

Chair Kubow asked if the commissioners had any further comments to add. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** reiterated that he liked Option A, and he was open to moving the blue band if the other commissioners felt strongly about doing so; he liked the idea of playfulness on the building. **Commissioner Eckhardt** reiterated his preference for Option A. Although he was intrigued by the suggestion to move the blue band, he felt the band was important where it is currently shown between the two windows and tying it into the canopy. He liked the half/half proportion being shown because if the band is moved down, the top part will have too much of the tan/buff color. He liked what the petitioner put together in Option A and he was in support of it. **Commissioner Kingsley** suggested making the bottom band of the building the grey color so there is a base to the building; she asked if the petitioner considered this. She also appreciated that the petitioner said that they looked at different places for the blue color. **Mr. Kuzynowski** stated that they had not looked at the grey specifically, just trying to pull the brick color across the base below it, which **Commissioner Kingsley** acknowledged could result in it being too busy. **Commissioner Kingsley** could see the preference for Option A, but she also liked the simplicity of Option B.

Mr. Hautzinger said there is now public in attendance with a hand being raised to speak at this time.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Melissa Cayer asked why she was not allowed to join this virtual meeting until 6:46 pm. **Mr. Hautzinger** apologized and said there was a technical issue. He offered to review the Design Commissioners comments, and he asked if she had any questions about the project. Ms. Cayer had no comments.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF 'OPTION A' FOR THE ADDITION TO THE *TIMBER RIDGE SCHOOL* LOCATED AT 201 S. EVANSTON AVENUE. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON THE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 3/12/21, REVISED ELEVATIONS AND RENDERINGS RECEIVED 4/20/21, 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 RECOMMENDATION THAT THE THREE TREES AS DEPICTED IN THE RENDERING BE STRONGLY CONSIDERED BECAUSE THEY ARE A KEY ELEMENT TO THE EAST ELEVATION.
2. 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.
3. ALL SIGNAGE MUST MEET CODE, CHAPTER 30, OR APPROVED VARIATIONS.

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