

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION

HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
AUGUST 22, 2023

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

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

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Tom Budzik, Thomas Architects for 227 S. Mitchell Ave.
Bernard Citron, Thompson Coburn for 116-120 W. Eastman St.
Katie Lambert, OKW Architects for 116-120 W. Eastman St.
Thomas Roszak, Mocer & Roszak for *Arlington Heights Gateway*
Mike Mocer, Mocer & Roszak for *Arlington Heights Gateway*
Steve Hautzinger, Planning Staff

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FOR AUGUST 8, 2023

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEYER, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF AUGUST 8, 2023. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 2. MULTI-FAMILY RE-REVIEW**DC#22-099 – 116-120 W. Eastman St.**

Bernard Citron, representing *Thompson Coburn*, and **Katie Lambert**, representing *OKW Architects*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner team is here tonight seeking approval of the architectural design for this new multi-story apartment building in the Downtown. This project was previously reviewed and approved by the Design Commission on April 11, 2023; however, on May 24, 2023 the project appeared before the Plan Commission, at which time residents that live primarily directly north of the site raised a number of concerns about the design being too modern of appearance in this location, as well as other zoning issues. In response to the feedback that the petitioner received at the Plan Commission hearing, the petitioner has made substantial changes to the plans, including a complete redesign of the exterior. **Mr. Hautzinger** clarified that the Design Commission is here to look at the architectural design, the appearance of the building, and signage only. Any other matters regarding zoning, building height, parking, etc. will be discussed at the upcoming Plan Commission meeting for this project.

Mr. Hautzinger touched on key points from Staff. Overall, Staff feels the new design direction works well to address the residents' concerns regarding the context of the design fitting in with the Downtown as well as the residential neighborhood to the north; having a primarily brick exterior with more traditional detailing. However, Staff has some concerns for the Design Commission to consider in their review tonight.

Massing: Looking at the south elevation, which is the front of the building facing Northwest Highway, Staff is interested in the petitioner's explanation of the design, primarily with introducing the recess in the wall that divides the facade into a feeling of 2 separate buildings, with the one on the right being very narrow with vertical proportions, and the one on the left being more traditional with a base, body, and top, which is more horizontal. Also, the large arched entry in the left portion of the façade is offset to the right and cramped. The composition is unusual, which the Design Commission should evaluate.

Materials: Brick was discussed at the last meeting and the addition of more brick to the design is a nice enhancement. However, in the courtyard, the walls are red and dark gray stucco to mimic the red brick and dark gray brick. The Design Commission should evaluate the actual samples brought tonight by the petitioner.

Cornice: There is a nice decorative cornice at the top of the building, however, the north elevation is lacking some detail at the top of the brick portion. This is an area where Staff is recommending some additional detailing to enhance the design.

East Elevation: The east elevation was not discussed much in the previous review of this project, but where the building abuts the existing adjacent building, there are no window openings. The north and south ends of the east elevation are large blank walls, and further design development is recommended to add additional interest and break up the large blank walls.

Signage: The wall signs include the building address, and an additional new sign at the entrance has been added. Because these are separate signs, per code this would be interpreted as two wall signs, and only one wall sign is allowed per street frontage.

Mr. Hautzinger requested the Design Commission's evaluation of the revised design and Staff's concerns.

Bernard Citron said they understand this is a design review commission that is not looking at the zoning of the property, but the changes they made to try to work with the Neighborhood Association (HANA) are fairly extensive and did drive a lot of design elements seen here tonight. The entire building was lowered; there is now a full level of parking below the building, which is more of a zoning issue, but it does lower the whole massing of the building, and along with that, other things happened. On the north elevation, the building was set back, which lowered the height of that end of the building. He asked the commission to keep that in mind, even though it is not this commission's purview because that is the context that they are doing this in. He introduced Katie Lambert, the architect.

Katie Lambert gave a presentation. Since they were last here a few months ago, they had an extensive collaboration with the neighborhood group, primarily about changes in massing. She presented an image to show an overlay of where the massing from the north had been several months ago, versus where it sits today. The other thing that has changed is the carve out on the south facade on Eastman, which was eliminated to try to more substantially carve out from the north, which is in response to the neighbors. The other issue they heard from HANA is that a brick building was going to be more contextual within the world of Arlington Heights in general. They took inspiration from a lot of the Downtown district buildings in Arlington Heights, in an attempt to be as responsive and respectful to some of the great architecture that is already here.

In addition to a 10-foot setback at grade, a 30-foot set back at the top floor has been incorporated, in order to have a more substantial stepping profile on the north. The basic premise is a U-shaped building, opening with a courtyard facing Highland Avenue, a pool in the middle, and residential amenity in the middle. The total unit count has been reduced from 151 to 136 as part of these changes, and parking spaces were also lost to fit into a basement level and a partial first-floor garage.

A major change made at the first-floor relates to the ingress and egress from the parking garage. Previously, everyone would enter and exit off of Highland; however, trying to be respectful towards the idea of headlights facing neighbors on Saint James, the concept now being proposed is for ingress on Eastman and egress south only onto Highland. The garage had previously been an open garage, and now that the garage is partially submerged underground, they are proposing an entirely mechanically ventilated garage, which is going to be pretty much concealed from the residents. The basement level parking was shown, which is pretty straightforward, and the units up above. They are still looking at a concept that would have pretty substantial amenities at both the first-floor and at the second-floor. This building is really all about incorporating that social space into the design and highlighting that space, especially from the Eastman side of the building.

The sixth-floor plan shows the set back on the north side, which is more than 50-feet from the property line, until the sixth-floor of the building. The context of Arlington Heights was presented because it had been part of the conversation with the neighborhood, although **Ms. Lambert** acknowledged that the building is not necessarily just a historic building, but there are some really nice things already happening in the Downtown district that they want to call attention to, such as the full arch elements of the Arlington Heights Police Department building, and the Metropolis Arts Center, which they feel makes sense in the context of this new building. The general idea for the front door being on Eastman was inspired from a lot of these, and their approach to the elevation on Eastman has been that they are interloping forms, things that stretch the entire block. The idea of having a different material at the sixth-floor penthouse helps to break up the facade and introduce a little bit more of a dynamic quality on this block and break down the mass. Another important

thing to understand is that the building plan itself is not a symmetrical plan; what is happening on the east side with the entrance into the garage is very different from what is happening with the restaurants. They want a design that really relates to that, and the location of the arch opening is primarily driven by this location being at the residential entrance and at the core. They feel strongly about the idea to be able to take a brand and use it in a way that was interesting and well detailed.

The Highland Avenue facade was presented, which incorporates some detail along the outside of the garage. **Ms. Lambert** pointed out the parking spaces that are fronting Highland, with the wall behind it to be a fully enclosed wall that would not show lights into the garage. On the north elevation they want to find a way to have an expression on the north side of the garage that introduces some detail, but also keep it fully enclosed to not see any headlights. The wall at the sixth-floor is set back 30-feet.

Ms. Lambert said they can continue to look at finding ways to introduce additional detail at the north and south ends of the east elevation, maybe a vertical detail there. Fire Department requirements were basically driving the lack of windows, but they could look at that as well to see if there are areas that can be knocked back a few feet. The courtyard elevations were presented, with true stucco being proposed and not EIFS, a stone product similar in tone to the proposed brick, along with a system of reveals. The other stucco color will be the color of the coping.

The section of the building along St. James shows some of the stepping profile where the project is most substantially different from when it was last presented. The view from the southwest was shown where the primary red brick is being proposed, which is relatively desaturated in color and complimentary to the huge range of color and brick in Downtown Arlington Heights. Dark gray is also being proposed, and the lighter brick will be at the garage portion of the building.

Looking at the north elevation, a close-up shows some of the partial arched elements as well as the brick corbel being proposed around the body of this plinth, with a capstone cap on top of that. **Mr. Hautzinger** asked if it is a solid wall behind that and **Ms. Lambert** said yes. She said there may be portions of it that might need to be louvered, but the intent is that it be solid where it can be. Details at the entrance were shown, with some of the details surrounding the arched element with a metal inset arch within that. It is intended to be a full-service restaurant, with a combination of a stone base, brick soldier course above, metal louvers, as well as a very small narrow projection of the canopy. Mortar samples were also presented, with the thought being that the vibe of this building seemed to make sense to have a tinted mortar to keep it relatively taught in terms of the color palette that we are using, but they are open to other options.

Commissioner Eckhardt asked where the break point is on the stucco material and the masonry at the corner, and **Ms. Lambert** pointed out where it wraps around the corner and ends at the brick.

Chair Kubow asked if there was any public comment and there was response from those in the audience.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Vivian Menzies, 212 W. Fremont St. She is a Board member of HANA, which has about 600 homes in the HANA area, with the majority of the homes being historic. Since they last met with the Design Commission, they are pleased to announce that the down zoning of the 7 homes on Saint James, which is the southern border of HANA, was unanimously approved by the Village Board. A lot has happened in the last several months since the Plan Commission rejected this project. The project team came back to HANA with these initial revisions and she felt a lot of the changes are really great, and they are really pleased with much of it. Overall, the HANA reaction was very favorable toward the changes; however, they feel that a lot more can

be done. She understood that height and density are not addressed here tonight, but those really are the areas that they still have an issue with. They are happy with the level of collaboration between the Village, the Design Commission, the Plan Commission, the Board, the neighbors, and the developer; everybody has worked together on this and they hope that level of cooperation continues so the project can be the absolute best fit for her neighborhood. They really appreciate the Design Commission and their insight and guidance to help make that happen. Thank you, and they look forward to more.

Sarah McKinney, 203 W. Fremont St. Many residents still have lingering concerns about this project, herself included, however, she said it is great that the developer and the architect have made so much progress in integrating the building into the surrounding area. They have managed to address some aspects that they previously deemed impossible, which is wonderful. She appreciates seeing them demonstrate the architectural details of other large municipal buildings that have been scattered through the Village as inspiration. She asked about other opportunities for this design to be even more cohesive with its surrounding structures, namely the single-family homes across the street and in the immediate area. This is where this commission can help because she has seen the Design Commission use their thoughtfulness and expertise to scrutinize architectural details for \$1,000,000 new builds on Dunton Street that are situated next to historic homes. Witnessing that in one of the previous meetings is what inspired her to create a bunch of visuals of our neighborhood so this commission is able to have that context. She is asking the Design Commission to use their collective expertise here and apply the same level of scrutiny for this project, which is easily 50 to 60 times the cost and size of a new single-family home and resides next to many historic homes. We look forward to further collaboration with the Village, the developer, and the architect, to make this project the best fit it can be in our community. She felt the developer and architect have considered the context of this neighborhood, and she wants to make sure the Design Commission sees her neighborhood too. Elena will come up and show some slides, which is what the residents presented to Plan Commission to show their area that they are so proud of and want this commission to look at the whole picture. Thank you so much.

Elena Cochran, 121 W. Fremont St. She has been asked by the neighborhood to present pictures to walk everyone through what their neighborhood that they are so passionate about and what they have been working so hard for over a year of meeting with Compass Point to protect. These are the HANA boundaries, just north of the tracks and across the street from this new building. The red is where the new building would be and these are the boundaries of their neighborhood. She showed the historical grounds and the museum where there are many events held. There was representation of the existing multi-family housing that is in the triangle right now, which shows there is nothing even close to the drastic design that is being talked about tonight. The existing multi-housing is really beautiful and blends in with the neighborhood, or at least does not tower over and stand out. This is a collection of their slice of Arlington Heights heaven that they are all working so hard to protect, with a lot of this being close to the building and there are some differences between this design and what will be right across the street. A visual was shown of what is directly across the street from this massive development. You can see that these people have put a lot of time and effort and sweat equity into their homes, and they are so thankful to have this Commission to help them work with Compass Point to try to make a beautiful design that will really enhance their neighborhood.

Eileen Devine, 201 W. Euclid Avenue. She has been a member of HANA for 36 years. She gave a little history about what happened with these homes. During the first meeting with the Design Commission, Christine Murray, a resident of Fremont, gave a heartfelt reminder that this is not just about buildings, but about people in the neighborhood. She has thought about Christine's comments, about the challenges we have as residents, developers, and Board members. When she tells people that she lives in Arlington Heights, a few homes west of the Historical Society, they are impressed with this beautiful area. When she purchased her almost 100-year old home, it was referred to as the witches haunted house. After World War II, it was

turned into a rooming house, then condemned and closed by the Village, later rezoned and configured to a 2-flat. She and her husband purchased the home in 1986 and the zoning changed back to single-family, so together with neighbors and family they slowly restored their home into this beautiful lady. This is a very common thread with the stories of homes on Saint James, Fremont, Park Street, and Euclid. So many of them were abandoned and left to rot or be demolished. This area was built by visionaries to create a neighborhood community and they did it. Generations later, they have kept that vision alive, joining together the past and the present. The present is all of us here tonight as we try to collectively create the very best design for the Eastman project. Hopefully we can reach a respectful balance. I agree with Joe Taylor when he referred to the apartment building that Compass Point is developing in his village of Barrington, and I'm sure he applies that same thought to Arlington Heights. We aim to enhance what is already here. Compass Point has proposed to invest millions in our community and I understand why, because it is a beautiful place in our neighborhood. But please remember, the people that Christine Murray spoke about at the last Design meeting; we are here, we are the first investors. Collectively, we have invested millions of dollars in this neighborhood, in our homes and in our community. Thank you.

Chair Kubow closed the public comment.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** appreciated the changes that were made, he always hoped that the building would be brick to help it fit in better. He liked the colors of the brick, he liked the colors of the stucco, and he was okay with the stucco wrapping around the top. He liked the front entrance, it does not feel cramped, and he liked the way the front of the building is off-set. With regards to the 2 signs shown tonight, he was okay with the petitioner asking for a variation, if the signage is similar to what is shown tonight. He agreed that the north side of the building could use some detail at the top, and a little more detail on the east elevation. Overall, he liked the changes and he liked the materials.

Commissioner Eckhardt thanked the residents for coming tonight. He loves and appreciates this neighborhood and the homes, and as a resident, he understands the trauma going on with the residents and this project. He appreciated the petitioner's 100% turnaround on the design of this building, which to him looks like an old loft building in Chicago that has been rehabbed and elegantly detailed with new windows and given a new life. There is a contrast of materials and the brick palette is soft. Although there was discussion at the last review of this project about things that were not the purview of the Design Commission, tonight he was going to focus on the architecture of the building. He said that the only thing that seems a little out of place is the lower-level arcade with the arch tops, which is difficult to visualize and he is unsure about. The south elevation is very nice, elegant and detailed, and the north elevation is a different building. This is still a tall structure, and as a standalone building, he felt it was fine; however, he was still torn about whether or not the building fits in with the neighborhood. He appreciated the efforts to set the building back and he did not dislike that it is 6-stories tall; however, he felt the building could also be 3-stories tall by lowering the side of the building to step it down, which would be the natural thing to do because it is on the edge of the HANA neighborhood and faces a community that is a very important community. He had no further comments at this time and wanted to hear from the other commissioners.

Commissioner Kingsley concurred with Commissioner Eckhardt's comments, which were well stated. She commended all the neighbors for doing what they are doing and for rezoning the street, which is huge for them and for the Village. This project is really the first really large building next to historic homes, so it should be looked at closely, and stepped down zoning should be done here. Although that is not this commission's purview, she is a proponent of that. She was impressed that the petitioner came back with changes, and she felt there were a lot of really great things about the changes. She really liked the front elevation and the division between the east side and the west side, she liked that there is a straight cornice on the red brick

building and a more detailed cornice in the stucco area, and she was not in favor of making it more detailed on the red brick areas, on any elevation. She said the color palette is a bit dark, but will work really well, and she liked the colored mortar that will dress it up. **Commissioner Kingsley** was concerned about the north elevation, and similar to Commissioner Eckhardt, she wondered if it should step down. She commented that the black stucco portion of the building that is set back from St. James looks a little tall, especially the stair tower. She also agreed with Commissioner Eckhardt's comments about the arches at the arcade area, although she understood the inspiration for them. Overall, she felt the detailing of what is presented tonight is very nice and the materials are very noble.

Commissioner Seyer appreciated all the comments from the neighbors who spoke tonight, which he felt were important. Keeping his comments to the materials and the design presented tonight, he said it was a great improvement and lower in scale. He did not have a lot to add to the comments from the other commissioners, with the exception that he could go either way with the base and the shallow arch. It would be interesting to see it another way, but he also understood why it is there. His biggest issue is that the building feels like a loft building with the vertical brick bands and the red brick with the gray brick underneath, and working left to right, the vertical bands line up with the piers below and are the same width, but in other areas they do not. It would look a lot cleaner if there was some consistency to the verticals lining up with the actual columns. There is something similar on the south elevation where there is consistency on the left side where it comes down in the middle, but there is no rhyme or reason to anything at the garage. He said that this could be playful, but he preferred more consistency to this and wanted to hear how the other commissioners felt. He liked the reveals, the breakdown, the massing, and the materials, but felt it could be a little more cleaned up to make it a better building.

Chair Kubow was very impressed with the participation tonight by the neighbors; their love and thoughtfulness for their neighborhood really shows and the collaboration being shown with the architect and the developer is impressive. This goes to show the type of community Arlington Heights is. He was also very impressed by the architecture team and the development team, because compared to where things were before and where they are now, some large, substantial changes have been made. He reiterated that this commission should only focus on the architecture, but with a project like this it is almost impossible to do so because of the context and the neighborhood, which really defines this project. **Chair Kubow** said that although he really liked the previous modern architecture of this project, he understood why the petitioner made changes. What is being presented tonight and the thought behind some of the precedence in Arlington Heights is very well thought out; however, he felt that more development on the details could be done. He acknowledged the previous comment that the cornice could probably use something more and he did not want to talk about step backs because it is not the purview of this commission.

Focusing on the architecture, **Chair Kubow** said that he loved the strong entrance on the south elevation and the detail in the arch is beautiful. He was fine with the signage being shown and suggested reducing the size of the '116' address. In terms of the arches, he could go either way, but he applauded the petitioner for the impressive change in architecture from the previous design. He felt the building would be a great addition to the Village and fits with what we have here, and comments related to zoning, height, massing and density are not the purview of this commission. He commended everyone in the collaboration of this impressive project.

Commissioner Eckhardt agreed with the other commissioners' comments about the very top of the building on the north elevation that needs more detail, similar to the beauty that has been developed on the south elevation. As a standalone building, he felt that a lot was done to make the building fit as its own unit, with the number of units being reduced, and the parking situation being fixed. Although the proposed colors

appear a bit dark, in the bright sunlight they would not. He was in favor of moving this project forward the way it has been designed and presented tonight, with a requirement for more detailing and the petitioner submitting some alternative arcade designs for Staff review. He felt the changes presented tonight were meaningful, although they might not be loved by everyone in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Fitzgerald echoed the comments of Commissioner Eckhardt. **Commissioner Seyer** agreed as well. **Commissioner Kingsley** also agreed and said the commissioners did not talk about the east facade, although Staff did comment about it, and she felt there should be a recommendation or requirement that the petitioner address Staff's comments about the east elevation. **Ms. Lambert** said that the east side of the building is on the property line and would need to be moved 3-feet back in order to add small windows there, which they are not opposed to looking into the possibility of doing. **Commissioner Eckhardt** pointed out that the adjacent site to the east could produce a tall building in the future, and he had concerns about this new building being right on the property line. **Mr. Citron** said they previously approached AT&T about the adjacent building to the east and were told fairly emphatically that while AT&T is selling off a lot of their infrastructure, there are no current plans to redevelop that particular site; however, it is unknown about what might happen in five or ten years. **Commissioner Eckhardt** asked the petitioner about their design intent for the garage elevation on the east side, from the second-floor down. Will it be set back far enough for masons to install similar material even though it is buried behind the building. **Ms. Lambert** replied that it will be tricky because it will have to be built from the inside, so a product with a finished face will need to be used.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR 116-120 W. EASTMAN STREET. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE PLANS AND RENDERINGS RECEIVED 8/2/23, EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS, MATERIAL LIST, AND SAMPLE BOARD RECEIVED 8/17/23, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATION AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING:

1. A REQUIREMENT TO STUDY THE CORNICE ON THE NORTH ELEVATION WITH ALTERNATE DETAILING OPTIONS SUBMITTED TO STAFF FOR REVIEW.
2. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PETITIONER STUDY THE SHALLOW ARCHES ALONG THE FIRST-FLOOR OF THE BUILDING, WITH THE POSSIBILITY OF CHANGING THEM TO STRAIGHT LINTELS INSTEAD OF ARCHES.
3. A RECOMMENDATION TO STUDY THE LAYOUT OF THE VERTICAL BRICK PIERS ON THE BUILDING TO ALIGN THE UPPER STORIES WITH THE GROUND FLOOR BELOW WHEREVER POSSIBLE, TO FURTHER DEVELOP THE AUTHENTICITY OF WHAT APPEARS TO BE AN OLDER WAREHOUSE BUILDING.
4. A REQUIREMENT TO DEVELOP A PLAN FOR THE APPEARANCE OF THE WALLS ON THE EAST SIDE OF THE BUILDING BEHIND THE EXISTING ADJACENT AT&T BUILDING, TO PROVIDE A FINISHED APPEARANCE IN THE EVENT THAT THE AT&T BUILDING WERE TO BE DEMOLISHED IN THE FUTURE, TO BE REVIEWED BY STAFF.
5. 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.

Commissioner Seyer wanted the vertical pilaster spacing to be a requirement. He felt it could easily be solved to become a little more cohesive, and Staff could review and determine if there is a reason not to do this.

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

3. A REQUIREMENT TO STUDY THE LAYOUT OF THE VERTICAL BRICK PIERS ON THE BUILDING TO ALIGN THE UPPER STORIES WITH THE GROUND FLOOR BELOW WHEREVER POSSIBLE, TO FURTHER DEVELOP THE AUTHENTICITY OF WHAT APPEARS TO BE AN OLDER WAREHOUSE BUILDING.

Commissioner Kingsley wanted the motion to include the petitioner looking at the exposed areas on the east elevation, which the architect already said that they would. She said she is okay with the requirement to study the cornice on the north elevation, but she did not want to require a cornice if it is just going to be on the north elevation. Commissioner Eckhardt clarified that the requirement is to study the cornice on the north elevation, not to provide something specific. Commissioner Kingsley was okay with that. Commissioner Fitzgerald agreed with Commissioner Kingsley comment to add a requirement that the petitioner look at the exposed areas on the east elevation, and Commissioner Eckhardt asked the architect to clarify these areas on the east elevation.

Looking at the east elevation, Ms. Lambert pointed out the center portion of the wall that is inset, and the two walls that sit on the property line, which is a fire issue and why windows were not added there. Options would be to add some sort of metal panel detailing on the two walls that sit on the property line, or some sort of opaque treatment. Another option would be to potentially take a portion and inset it 3-feet. Commissioner Kingsley felt there should be a recommendation that the petitioner look at this detail and that Staff review it.

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

6. A REQUIREMENT FOR ADDITIONAL DETAILING ON THE BLANK PORTIONS OF THE EAST ELEVATION, SUCH AS RECESSED WINDOWS OR BREAKING DOWN THE MASS WITH A MIX OF MATERIALS.

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

The petitioner thanked the commissioners for their time and consideration.