

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION

HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
NOVEMBER 9, 2021

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

Members Present: Ted Eckhardt, Acting Chair
Kirsten Kingsley
Scott Seyer

Members Absent: Jonathan Kubow, Chair
John Fitzgerald

Also Present: Mark Nosky, CVG Architects for *BMO Bank*
Dan Slattery, Storebuild for *BMO Bank*
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FOR OCTOBER 26, 2021

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF OCTOBER 26, 2021. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 2. COMMERCIAL REVIEW

DC#21-068 – BMO Bank – 630 W. Northwest Hwy.

Mark Nosky, representing *Charles Vincent George Architects*, and Dan Slattery, representing *Storebuild*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger summarized Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to demolish an existing vacant auto repair building to allow construction of a new BMO Bank building with three drive-through lanes. The scope of the project includes a complete redevelopment of the site with new parking and landscaping. This project requires Plan Commission review and Village Board approval for a Special Use to allow a bank with drive-through in the B-2 Zoning District. Because this project is going to the Plan Commission, the role of the Design Commission is limited to building and signage only.

The proposed design is based on BMO Bank's new prototype building design. Staff has the following concerns with the proposed design:

- The proposed design has numerous different materials and colors, and there is concern that it is too busy.
- The various colors and materials do not all work well together. The two different brick colors paired with the blue metal panels have a contrasting appearance.
- It is recommended to simplify the building's material and color palette. Consider using just the red brick, and omit the dark brick, or select a different brick that better complements the blue panels.
- The two metal coping colors are very similar. It is recommended to omit one of them.
- The blue metal panel color is quite bold. Per the Village's Design Guidelines, bright colors should be used for accent only. It is recommended to limit the amount of blue panels to the entry tower and drive-thru canopy wall only.
- The spandrel glass color is unusual and does not appear to work well with the other building colors.
- The continuous wall of windows on the southwest elevation (facing Northwest Highway) feels out of place as compared to the punched openings throughout the rest of the design. It is recommended to change the southwest elevation to match the southeast elevation with brick and punched openings.

One wall sign is allowed per street frontage. The subject property has two street frontages, so two wall signs are allowed. The proposed design includes two wall signs, with one sign located above the main entrance on the east, and the second wall sign on the west drive-through wall. Approval of the locations of these signs is still under review, and will be confirmed once a complete signage package is received. In addition to the wall signs, two ground signs are proposed including an existing pole-mounted sign facing Northwest Highway, and a new monument sign to face Euclid Avenue. Per code, 600 feet of separation is required between the ground signs, where only 160 feet (approximately) is proposed. The petitioner will either need to omit one of the ground signs, or apply for a sign variation. The existing ground sign has an old and dated appearance. It is recommended that it be removed and replaced with a new decorative monument style ground sign designed to match or complement the building design.

The proposed building has one rooftop mechanical unit, which is required to be screened from public view. The building design includes parapet walls which will screen the rooftop equipment. Landscaping is recommended to screen the exterior wall-mounted utility meters and equipment located on the north wall. One trash dumpster enclosure is proposed to be built with red brick to match the building design.

Overall, Staff is asking the Design Commission to evaluate the proposed design and the comments given by Staff. In addition, earlier today Staff received a revised design from the petitioner in response to Staff's comments, which is another option for the commissioners to look at tonight.

Acting Chair Eckhardt asked if there was any public comment on the project and there was no response from those in the audience.

Mr. Nosky said he received comments from Staff, took them to heart, and spent time in the past week trying to modify the building design and address some of the concerns. As a result, he presented the commissioners and Staff with a revised design. He explained that BMO is working towards developing a prototype design that is still evolving, and some of Staff's recommendations can be addressed because there is now a new set of materials selected for the prototype design. His firm previously worked on a BMO building in Hoffman Estates that includes the tan color brick called 'Grey'; however, BMO has since modified their prototype design package.

Mr. Nosky presented a color rendering of a BMO building in Ontario that consists of the same brick and stone, which are basically grey in nature, and the blue metal panel. The previously provided color photo of the BMO building in Hoffman Estates accurately shows the blue panel, but not the combination of the 2 brick colors being proposed at this new location in Arlington Heights. He also presented revised color elevations showing the field brick and accent brick/stone that are now being proposed, which are more on the dark grey side, and the accent brick color that consists of both lights and darks. He reviewed the changes that were made to the building elevations, which include eliminating some of the blue metal panel on the southwest elevation and replacing it with a punched window with a stone pattern, and doing the same on the northwest elevation where the stone will fill the area that was previously proposed as red brick. No changes were made to the parapet heights. **Mr. Nosky** also pointed out the silver metal panel areas on the drive-through canopy, and said they decided to remain with one coping color; however, the spandrel glass color was changed to a warm grey, and all other glass will be clear vision glass. The brick on the trash enclosure area will be the same as the field brick. A revised material list was also provided and **Mr. Nosky** said that samples of the revised materials were ordered last Friday from Canada, but not yet received for tonight's review. He asked that a condition of approval be made stating that the elevation drawing provided tonight depicts the revised materials. He also said that they agree with Staff's suggestion to remove the existing pole sign; however, the sign vendor will submit a sign package that could include variation requests for a monument sign and possibly an additional wall sign.

Acting Chair Eckhardt asked if Staff had an opinion about the signs shown on the exhibits, and **Mr. Hautzinger** replied that sign variations are not being reviewed tonight; however, 2 wall signs are allowed by code, one for each street frontage. An additional wall sign would require a variation, as well as more than 1 ground sign.

Commissioner Comments

Commissioner Seyer said that with only 3 commissioners here tonight, a unanimous vote from all three is required for approval of the project. **Acting Chair Eckhardt** also explained the petitioner's option to table the project until more members are present, and asked for clarification that the petitioner is seeking approval of the revised design presented tonight, which **Mr. Nosky** confirmed.

Commissioner Seyer asked for clarification of the box shown at the top right on the northwest elevation, which he did not see on the roof plan. **Mr. Nosky** said the box is the backside of the entry tower which is u-shaped. **Commissioner Seyer** said that because this will be seen from far away, he preferred that the tower be 4-sided, or have the inside be the same color. He was also confused about why spandrel glass is being used, he wanted to know more details about the lights that look a bit commercial, and which of the 2 materials are being proposed on the trash enclosure. **Mr. Nosky** explained that spandrel glass occurs at the back wall that is closed in. It is there because BMO already developed it as a piece of the prototype design for identity. **Commissioner Seyer** did not understand why the spandrel glass windows are needed there and felt they looked out of place; however, he might be okay with the window to the right of it because they align with the windows on the right. With regards to the lighting, **Mr. Nosky** said that lighting has already been developed and is part of the Plan Commission submittal. The lights are flat, with the light source coming out at the bottom edge and not visible. The field brick is proposed on the trash enclosure.

Commissioner Seyer reiterated his previous comment that the box at the top right on the northwest elevation should either wrap all the way around or be painted all the same color; however, he preferred it be wrapped around and become one element. He suggested eliminating the spandrel glass windows on this elevation, or come up with a better

solution. **Mr. Nosky** referred to the photo of the BMO building in Hoffman Estates that has a similar condition with spandrel glass, and **Commissioner Seyer** said that a better term for it there is shadow box, because the vision glass goes all the way up, with the wall set back, which is nicely incorporated. **Commissioner Seyer** was in favor of the spandrel glass on top of the vision glass, but when it comes to the single windows on the northwest elevation; however, he preferred something else be done on the larger window, or eliminate it all together. He also said that final approval should include the brick material be submitted to Staff for review and approval, because although he liked the brick and how it looks on the rendering and the images, which is better than before, the actual sample should be submitted and looked at by Staff. **Mr. Nosky** said that they would consider wrapping the entire box at the top right on the northwest elevation, as suggested by Commissioner Seyer.

Commissioner Kingsley agreed with the comments made by Commissioner Seyer and appreciated the revisions that were done by the petitioner. She said that when she received the packet for tonight, she was really drawn to the photo of the BMO in Hoffman Estates, which has a consistent design theme with fewer materials on it; however, she felt the revised design presented tonight is a big improvement and she liked it. She was not a huge fan of the accent brick that is supposed to look like the stone, and preferred to see it used on certain elevations without the wainscoting; having the massing follow the materials might look nicer. She agreed with Staff about having a little less of the blue panels, which should be included on the southwest elevation because it is a main elevation. This building is at a prime location in the Village and will be seen from all different angles; however, the southwest and the northeast elevations feel like the 'back of the house', while the northwest and southeast elevations hold together much better. She wanted to see something done on the northwest and southeast elevations to make them look even nicer. She asked if the coping will match the silver, like it does on the Hoffman Estates building, and **Mr. Nosky** said that it would, which **Commissioner Kingsley** liked. She also liked that it ties in with the color of the windows; however, she was unsure about the color of the brick and felt either Staff or the commissioners need to review and approve it once a sample is submitted.

Commissioner Kingsley also had concerns about the location of the lights on the building and the photometrics of those lights. She felt the existing building should be documented prior to demolition because it is an iconic building from an era that will never be seen again, particularly the showroom on the left. She wanted it to be a requirement that the existing building be documented, at least photographically, and submitted to the Village prior to demolition.

Acting Chair Eckhardt generally agreed with the other commissioners' comments. With regards to the proposed masonry products, he asked if the brick is a flat, wire-cut brick, and **Mr. Nosky** said that it is. **Acting Chair Eckhardt** also asked how much color variation there is with the brick, because he was not getting the true aesthetic of it, and **Mr. Nosky** said he has not yet seen an actual sample of the brick. **Acting Chair Eckhardt** liked the originally proposed brick color scheme, which is similar to the new Chase Bank building recently built in downtown Mt. Prospect. He also liked the blue color being proposed that will help to identify the building, and he was okay with the mixture on all the elevations. He said that Commissioner Seyer's comments about the spandrel glass were appropriate, and he suggested the petitioner consider going with a shadow-box in the 2 bottom lights and vision light on top, which will allow natural light to get to the back-of-the-house. Other than those comments, **Acting Chair Eckhardt** was fine with the revised design, although he agreed that seeing the actual material samples was important, and he was okay with Staff reviewing them or bringing them back to the commission for review if necessary.

Acting Chair Eckhardt again asked if there was any public comment on the project, and there was no response from those in the audience.

Commissioner Seyer said the commissioners appear to have four major issues with the revised design. The first is whether or not the accent brick material is acceptable, which he was okay with as long as the sample is acceptable with regards to the true color. The second issue is whether or not the commissioners feel the blue panel on the southwest elevation in the center above the roof reads as a front entry or not; he felt that it felt like a front door and he would probably be supportive of a variation; however, he was okay with it the way it is proposed. The third issue is the tower at the corner along the northwest elevation that goes up, and a requirement to wrap it all the way around. The fourth issue is the spandrel glass on the northwest elevation, and whether or not the commissioners agree on where

that solution should be. One idea is to just make it one window, which he was okay with, or no windows. The fifth issue would be a requirement that historical photos of the existing building be submitted to the Village prior to the demolition of the existing building.

Commissioner Kingsley asked the other commissioners if they agreed with her recommendation to eliminate the stone wainscot which does not fit with the contemporary style. **Commissioner Seyer** was in favor of the suggestion. **Commissioner Kingsley** agreed with the issues summarized by Commissioner Seyer, except for the blue color, which she was having a hard time with. **Acting Chair Eckhardt** asked for a landscape plan for the site, and **Mr. Hautzinger** said that since this project is being reviewed by the Plan Commission, the Design Commission is limited to review of the building and signage only. **Mr. Nosky** indicated where foundation plantings are being proposed around the building, although he did not know specific species of plantings.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR *BMO BANK* TO BE LOCATED AT 630 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON THE PLANS RECEIVED 10/7/21, 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 THAT THE TOWER ELEMENT ON THE NORTHWEST ELEVATION, TOP RIGHT CORNER, BE WRAPPED AROUND IN THE SAME BLUE PANEL.
2. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE EXISTING BUILDING BE PHOTOGRAPHED FOR HISTORICAL PURPOSES AND SUBMITTED TO THE VILLAGE, AS DONE WITH PREVIOUS PROJECTS.
3. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE SPANDREL WINDOWS ON THE NORTHWEST ELEVATION, LEFT SIDE, BE ELIMINATED, PROVIDED THERE ARE NO SAFETY ISSUES WITH THE OWNER.
4. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE STONE WAINSCOT BE ELIMINATED, AND THAT BRICK MASONRY PRODUCT COMES ALL THE WAY DOWN TO THE GROUND IN AN APPROPRIATELY DETAILED MANNER.
5. A RECOMMENDATION TO LOOK AT AN ALTERNATE MATERIAL, SUCH AS THE SAME STONE, FOR THE SOUTHWEST ELEVATION ABOVE THE GLASS, TO MAKE IT FEEL MORE LIKE A FRONT DOOR.
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, 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.
7. THE PETITIONER SHALL COMPLY WITH ALL FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES.

Acting Chair Eckhardt agreed with the motion but asked for clarification about the requirement to eliminate the blue portion above the window on the northwest elevation. **Commissioner Seyer** said he was referring to the southwest elevation, where Commissioner Kingsley said she had issues with. **Commissioner Kingsley** confirmed this was a concern for her because it is in the same plane, and they are flush but have a different pattern. She felt there should be an offset from the horizontal to the vertical, if it is the same material. She commented that this is only a recommendation in the motion. **Commissioner Seyer** said the tower on the southwest elevation at the far right side is a 7'-4" piece, and it is in the same plane when it meets the brick on the other side, which is the concern. If that 7'-4" piece were to bump out another 10 inches, it would feel more like a tower and not be in the same plane with the blue that is wrapping horizontally at that point. He asked if the petitioner was open to a plane change there, if the required setbacks allow it. **Commissioner Kingsley** said this suggestion is similar to the BMO in Hoffman Estates. **Mr. Nosky** gave thought to the suggestion and asked if it was necessary to be at 10-inches, he was considering 8-inches instead,

and Commissioner Seyer said it should be no less than 6-inches.

Commissioner Kingsley said that since the commissioners and Staff have not seen a sample of the brick and stone materials, she felt it should be a requirement in the motion that the samples be submitted to Staff for approval, or brought back to this commission if Staff has concerns. She added that looking at the brick and stone on-line, both look a little dark, and she preferred a stone with less texture.

Mr. Hautzinger asked if there were concerns with the colors between the brick and stone. Acting Chair Eckhardt said that without seeing the materials, it was difficult to know if the colors should be different enough so they look different, or be the same or similar for both, but a different pattern. If Staff has any hesitation when reviewing the samples, they should be brought back to the commissioners for review. Mr. Nosky said he believed that some of the field brick color is in the accent stone, but with more range of dark in it; however, he agreed that having the actual materials in-person is the only way to see the true colors.

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

1. A REQUIREMENT THAT SAMPLES OF THE NEW MASONRY MATERIAL PRESENTED ON THE REVISED DRAWINGS TONIGHT, BE SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL BY STAFF.
2. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE TOWER ELEMENT AT THE FRONT ENTRY, THAT IS VISIBLE ON THE SOUTHWEST ELEVATION, BE BROUGHT OUT A MINIMUM OF 6-INCHES TOWARDS NORTHWEST HIGHWAY, PREFERABLY 8-INCHES, BUT NOT TO EXCEED PAST THE PROPERTY LINE, TO CREATE A PLANE CHANGE FROM THE HORIZONTAL BLUE PANELS THAT ARE TO THE LEFT OF IT.
3. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE TOP OF THE TOWER ELEMENT AT THE FRONT ENTRY BE WRAPPED AROUND ON ALL FOUR SIDES WITH THE BLUE PANEL.
4. A RECOMMENDATION TO KEEP THE LOCATION OF THE ENTRY DOORS ON THE SOUTHEAST ELEVATION AS PROPOSED, BUT IT IS OKAY TO MOVE THEM TO BE SYMMETRICAL IF PREFERRED.
5. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE 2 SPANDREL WINDOWS AT THE LEFT SIDE OF THE NORTHWEST ELEVATION BE ELIMINATED, UNLESS THERE ARE SECURITY CONCERNS IN DOING SO, THEN ONE VISION WINDOW CAN REMAIN, WHICH IS A VISION OPPORTUNITY. THE DESIGN COMMISSION PREFERS THAT BOTH BE ELIMINATED.
6. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE STONE WAINSCOT BE ELIMINATED, AND THAT THE BRICK MASONRY MATERIAL BE BROUGHT DOWN ALL THE WAY DOWN TO THE GROUND IN AN APPROPRIATE MANNER.
8. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE EXISTING BUILDING BE PHOTOGRAPHED FOR HISTORICAL PURPOSES AND SUBMITTED TO THE VILLAGE, AS DONE WITH PREVIOUS PROJECTS.
9. THIS REVIEW DEALS WITH ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, 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.
10. THE PETITIONER SHALL COMPLY WITH ALL FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES.

Mr. Hautzinger asked for clarification that the blue panels above the windows on the southwest elevation are to remain as currently proposed, which Commissioner Seyer confirmed.

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