

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION

HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
SEPTEMBER 28, 2021

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

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

Members Absent: Kirsten Kingsley

Also Present: Heidi Lapin, WT Group for *Trio Gas Station*
Brian Wente, Graham Enterprises for *Trio Gas Station*
Orlando Vivacqua, Soos & Associates for *Chipotle*
Richard Silverman, MJK Real Estate for *Chipotle*
Brian Roginski, Owner for *Cortland's Garage*
Jim Platt for *Cortland's Garage*
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FOR AUGUST 24, 2021

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF AUGUST 24, 2021. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 4. COMMERCIAL REVIEWDC#21-056 – Chipotle – 600 E. Rand Rd.

Orlando Vivacqua, representing *Soos & Associates*, and **Richard Silverman**, representing *MJK Real Estate*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to build a new free-standing Chipotle casual restaurant at the Southpoint shopping center. The proposed restaurant will be located in an existing parking area facing Palatine Road, adjacent to the existing Olive Garden restaurant. 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, landscaping, and an adjacent future outlot building.

The proposed design is based on Chipotle's prototype drive-through building design. Overall, the proposed design is quite plain and lacking detail. Additional design development is recommended to add additional architectural interest. Examples of similar completed Chipotle restaurants have been provided for reference. Both of the examples have an overall simple appearance, but the design of the building in Plano, Texas includes a continuous wrapping storefront feature that adds architectural interest to the design. A continuous canopy shade feature could also be considered as an additional design feature.

The proposed design includes four wall signs, one on each wall of the building. Per code, only one wall sign is allowed per street frontage, so the three additional wall signs are not allowed. Sign variations have previously been approved to allow a second wall sign at similar drive-through restaurants, but four wall signs is excessive. The review tonight is for building design only, with signage to come under a separate review.

The proposed building has two rooftop mechanical units, which are required to be fully screened from public view. The building design includes a continuous parapet wall which is an ideal way to screen the rooftop equipment. Utility meters on the west wall will be screened from view landscaping. One trash dumpster enclosure is proposed to be built behind the building with gray colored split-face CMU and gray PVC gates. The gray colored materials coordinate well with the proposed gray EIFS building.

Based on these comments, Staff recommends the Design Commission evaluate the proposed design.

Mr. Silverman said that his company is a small, family-owned, third generation real estate development company out of Northfield that has built 27 buildings, most of which they still own and operate, with more than 10 of those being Chipotles, with 3 more Chipotles proposed for next year in multiple states including Illinois. Chipotle has been in Arlington Heights for more than 15 years in the adjacent shopping center to the north, and they want to relocate to an outlot building that will include a pick-up window for mobile and phone orders; it will not have drive-through ordering. Chipotle has just under 3,000 locations in the United States and their new prototype is for a free-standing building; they no longer want to be in multi-tenant strip centers. A free-standing development is being proposed at this location, based on this new prototype, with the sign component to come directly from Chipotle under a separate submittal. **Mr. Silverman** added that Chipotle will most likely be requesting sign variations for this new building, which are depicted in the renderings to show the architectural impact they will have.

Mr. Silverman said that Staff has provided them with many rounds of comments, and they feel they have addressed most of them, including an additional 100 sf landlord room into the building to add a roof hatch and ladder for mechanical equipment, as well as additional screening for the garbage corral. The suggested awing component wrapping around the building has been done before, and Chipotle has found that they do not provide screening cover, but rather are an architectural feature that ends up just getting damaged and cost money to maintain. The proposed building will consist of EIFS, with the front of the building to be almost full glass that faces north and the west side of the intersection of Rand & Palatine. No windows are located on the south elevation because it is the back of the building where cooking stations and cold storage are located. He concluded his comments and welcomed any questions at this time.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Seyer** was happy to see a well established chain coming to this location that will add some activity to this shopping center, which he is in favor of. He was also supportive of there being design standards for large chains such as Chipotle, but he felt that other existing stand-alone Chipotles look better than the prototype being presented tonight; there is something missing. He pointed out that other stand alone Chipotles, setting aside any with their own piers at the corners where there is a dual entry, have a plane change between the front entry storefront and whatever is happening on top. This prototype design feels like a hat on top of a brick wall that has openings, and it is unappealing to him. From a design perspective, he wanted to see the front of the building treated differently with a plane change; either the stucco portion comes out or the storefront is set back, similar to other store examples seen online, such as 'Statesboro'. The current prototype is lacking any real design articulation that would help it stand out and be a positive attribute to the area. He also liked the idea of the material at the top of the building coming down to the ground somewhere, which he has seen on other stores. **Commissioner Seyer** concluded that his primary concern is how the front of the building looks, which he felt could be easily enhanced and mean a lot to the design of the building.

Commissioner Eckhardt agreed with Commissioner Seyer's comment and asked the Architect if there is currently a plane change on the front of the building. **Mr. Vivacqua** clarified that there is currently approximately 6-inches of difference between the upper portion and the lower portion, and **Commissioner Eckhardt** said he was okay with the 6-inches being proposed. **Commissioner Eckhardt** also said that from an aesthetic standpoint, he liked the simplicity of the building with the white on top and the grey down below; however, he wanted to see more transparency. He felt that the pilasters were very heavy in terms of scale and seem to be flush with the glass instead of protruding somewhat to show they are real pilasters. He liked the previously shown store with a curtain wall, which would be a cost savings way to go instead, and he wanted to see the corner of the building be more integral by letting it wrap like other stores. **Commissioner Eckhardt** also questioned if it would be better to change the control joints on the north elevation, because right now it is going down the center of the sign, which really bothers him; he wanted to see it become 3 panels so the sign sits on its own white solid background. He also said that the building does not look good without the signs, and the signs will make the building come together. He was okay with the rest of the building.

Commissioner Fitzgerald said it seems like the building has been designed to have signs on all four sides, and thinking that that might not happen, he wanted to see more design on whichever 2 sides the petitioner chose. He felt the front (north) elevation was very very plain and needed something done to beef it up, and he asked if there would be a ground sign and where it would be located. **Mr. Silverman** said that Staff asked them to omit the ground sign, which they did. **Mr. Hautzinger** clarified that Chipotle will be part of the Southpoint Shopping Center and therefore eligible for a tenant panel on the existing monument sign for the center, which is located directly adjacent at the driveway. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** said he preferred the building design shown in Plano Texas versus the Dallas store because it had more detail with the windows; however, his biggest issue is with the sides of the building that have no signage.

Chair Kubow said the design shown in the Plano example was really clean, super simple, and really welcoming. He felt the petitioner could do that very easily at this location, and still keep the cap. He added a suggestion to do a slight bookend with the white color dropped down about 3-feet to give more articulation on the back. He felt the design was pretty close and needed only a few adjustments to be similar to the example in Plano, Texas.

Chair Kubow asked if there was any public comment on this project and there was no response from the audience.

Mr. Silverman appreciated the commissioners' feedback on the design and said they will continue to work with Chipotle on a design that works for them. He said that a building in Texas has to be designed a lot different than a building in Illinois that has winter conditions year round, for both efficiency purposes and ownership purposes. Having windows around the corner of the building is concerning to them but they will look at that, and the concerns about the appropriate location of the EIFS reveal may not be an issue if Chipotle decides to ask for signage above the door. They have already omitted the ground sign at the request of Staff, knowing that building signage is much more important, and they are happy to figure out how to make the front elevation more welcoming; however, they are trying to balance what Chipotle is asking for and the feedback given by this commission and Staff, as well as the Plan Commission review

they are scheduled for at the end of October, which they are concerned about possibly missing because this review has not been finalized. He added that the Southpoint Shopping Center needs help with new activity and they are trying to get things moving along with this project.

In terms of compatibility with this very simple but nicely designed building, **Commissioner Eckhardt** asked the petitioner if they had any idea of what the design of the future adjacent building might be, and **Mr. Silverman** said that it could be anything from a food user with a drive-through, to a medical building, to a retailer; however, there is no tenant interest at this time for the second building.

Chair Fitzgerald asked about options for the project to be reviewed again. **Mr. Hautzinger** said that since there is no public meeting sign posting required for Design Commission review of this project, so there is flexibility in terms of rescheduling for another review. If the project is not receiving approval tonight and returns for another review, he recommends a motion to continue the project. Ideally, the goal is to complete the design review process before the project goes before the Plan Commission, and there are two Design Commission meetings scheduled before the Plan Commission review of this project at the end of October.

Commissioner Eckhardt stressed the importance of this commission approving the project at either of the next two Design Commission meetings, to ensure the Plan Commission review of the project is not impacted. He reiterated his comments as follows: he wants to see the bottom of the building get a little lighter in color; he was okay either way with bringing some of the white colors down to the ground, as opposed to the darker surface; and he had concerns about EIFS at the ground level. It is all a visual thing for him.

Commissioner Seyer said that he respects the timing issue with this project, but if this commission makes special efforts for this petitioner, then every petitioner would wait until the last minute and come in with a bad design and ask for approval to avoid rescheduling other reviews with the Village; this commission cannot do that and he encouraged the petitioner to get the design right. He felt that wrapping the storefront all the way around would make it more inviting and a significant improvement, similar to the Chipotle in Countryside, Illinois at 5801 S. LaGrange Rd, which looks so much more inviting and lighter. He also wanted to see a little more EIFS come down lower, even if the brick remains at the base. He would go along with the rest of the commission if certain things are just created more inviting with the storefront. **Mr. Hautzinger** clarified that the base of the building is EFIS not brick; there are two EIFS colors proposed. **Mr. Silverman** said that making the EIFS on the back of the building white is an easy change.

Commissioner Fitzgerald reiterated that he wants to see some kind of option on the top of the building if signage is not allowed on all four sides, and the white color brought down on either the south or west elevation, which **Commissioner Seyer** illustrated how it would look. The petitioner said they are happy to make those updates to the design; the storefront to match closer to the store in Plano and Countryside, and pulling down the white EIFS in the rear of the building.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO CONTINUE THE REVIEW OF THE CHIPOTLE PROJECT(DC#21-056) TO ONE THE NEXT TWO DESIGN COMMISSION MEETINGS.

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