

## APPROVED

MINUTES OF  
THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS  
DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING  
HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.  
MARCH 31, 2015

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

Members Present: Alan Bombick, Acting Chair  
John Fitzgerald  
Anthony Fasolo  
Jonathan Kubow  
Ted Eckhardt, Chair

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Keith Neumann, Greenscape Homes for *1805 N. Fernandez Ave.*  
Douglas Espinal, Owner of *428 S. Evanston Ave.*  
Josh Wohlfreich for *Arlington Downs*  
Todd Bellis, Studio3 Design for *Teleflex*  
Chad McRoberts, Catalyst GC & Development for *Teleflex*  
Brian Murphy, K. Hovnanian Homes for *Christina Court*  
Mark Rykovich, K. Hovnanian Homes for *Christina Court*  
Randall Wilt, K. Hovnanian Homes for *Christina Court*  
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

### REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM MARCH 10, 2015

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FASOLO, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 10, 2015. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 6. SINGLE-FAMILY NEW REVIEWDC#15-025 – Christina Court Subdivision – 1306/1310 E. Olive St.

Mr. Brian Murphy, Mr. Mark Rykovich, and Mr. Randall Wilt, representing *K. Hovnanian Homes*, were present on behalf of the project.

Commissioner Eckhardt recused himself because of his working relationship with the petitioner to assist in the initial planning of the project, and he left the meeting.

Acting Chair Bombick asked if there was any public comment on the project and there was response from the audience.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. Christina Court is a proposed 14 lot subdivision to be located on East Olive Street in an R-3 One Family Dwelling District. The petitioner is proposing a series of 4 different single family residential floor plans with a total of 11 exterior elevations. All plans will be required to comply with the R-3 zoning requirements. The petitioner is seeking approval for the general architectural designs and exterior material packages for the single-family residences, and if the Design Commission concurs, then each individual lot will be submitted and reviewed for Administrative Approval by Staff as the plans, options, and material package for each lot are selected and finalized. The Christina Court Subdivision is pending Plan Commission review and Village Board approval, with no date scheduled as of yet.

With regards to landscaping, the site is currently heavily wooded and the petitioner is proposing to clear all of the existing trees to provide a clean slate for development. Staff has visited the site to evaluate the condition of the existing landscaping, and due to the low quality of the exiting trees as well as grading issues, Staff agrees with the petitioner's proposal to clear the site. As part of the Subdivision approval process, Staff is recommending improving the landscaping around the perimeter of the storm water detention area in the southeast corner of the site, as well as along the proposed retaining wall along the north. The petitioner has recently responded to these suggestions with an updated landscape plan.

In regards to front yard landscaping, the Design Commission should consider if landscaping in the front yards should be required as part of the Design Commission approval, or if front yard landscaping should be left up to the new homeowners. Staff recommends the petitioner provide landscaping in the front of each home in order to ensure a cohesive appearance throughout the new subdivision. Plans for the front yard landscaping could include curving landscape beds along the front elevation and adjacent to the hardscape areas, with an abundant mix of trees, shrubs, and perennials.

The proposed subdivision will be required to comply with the monotony requirements per Chapter 28, Section 28-6.4 which states that houses of the same floor plan shall be separated by two or more lots, and may not be erected directly across the street from each other.

In regards to the architectural designs, overall, Staff feels that the proposed set of plans and elevations will work well together to create a cohesive new subdivision. However, there are various concerns that need to be addressed as recommended below:

1. Brick and stone shown on the front elevations should be returned down the side elevations to a

- natural break point, or approximately 3' minimum, to be approved by Staff.
2. Windows should be added to the side garage walls, typical for all plans. At least one window shall be added for standard garages, and at least two separate windows shall be added for tandem garages.
  3. Window trim, shutters, and grilles provided on the front elevation should also be provided on the side and rear elevations to match, unless not practical as approved by Staff.
  4. The optional side bay windows are not allowed to project into the required side yard setbacks.
  5. Victoria & Morton models. Consider adding a covered portico above the rear patio door to break up the large flat rear walls.
  6. Morton F & G. Adjust the porch column spacing so that the windows are centered between the columns.
  7. Memphis H. The blank wall space above the garage doors looks odd. Explore options to break up the flat empty wall.
  8. Boulder model. The optional garage door facing the side yard should be omitted.

**Mr. Hautzinger** explained that a large amount of exterior color/material palettes are being proposed. The petitioner is proposing that all vinyl windows, steel garage doors, engineered wood trim, aluminum soffits, fascia, and gutters will have a white finish on all homes. The white components will be paired with 23 different exterior material packages having varied colors of engineered wood siding, clay brick, cultured stone, asphalt shingle roofing, and accents. It is difficult to assess the proposed material packages without color renderings, photos of completed projects, or actual material samples, but overall the packages appear to be nicely coordinated. The only two items of concern are the "Prairie Wheat" siding color in package #6 which looks very yellow, and the "Evergreen" siding color in package #NR01 which looks quite bold. It is recommended that these two packages be revised or omitted.

Based on Staff comments and the ten (10) recommendations listed in the Staff report, Staff recommends approval of the project.

**Mr. Rykovich** presented a handout of revised elevations and explained that these elevations were identical to the original application submitted; however, the height of the roof ridge has been lowered on a number of the elevations to comply with the height ordinance. **Mr. Hautzinger** added that Staff is seeing these revisions for the first time tonight. **Acting Chair Bombick** asked the petitioner to limit discussion to general information about the site, and comments in response to the concerns stated by Staff.

**Mr. Rykovich** referred to the revised elevations and explained that the height of the Victoria model was lowered to meet code, approximately 12-inches. The proposed exterior materials include LP siding, trim, and columns, which is a composite siding similar to cement board but without cementitious material; aluminum soffit, fascia and gutters; and vinyl windows. The last page of the revised handout shows a photo of a completed house with the proposed 'Prairie Wheat' color, which they are not opposed to eliminating from the options if necessary.

**Mr. Rykovich** responded to Staff comments as follows:

- #3 - Each home will include a landscape package that includes a tree and full sod in the front and rear yards.
- #4 - Brick and stone on the front elevation will be returned down the side elevations 2' instead of the suggested 3'.

- #5 - Agree with the requirement to add windows to the side garage walls, add at least one window for standard garages, and add at least 2 separate windows for tandem garages.
- #6 – Agree to wrap all windows with trim, and to match whatever front window design a homebuyer chooses on all windows for all elevations on all sides. However, adding shutters to side and rear windows can create a clustered and awkward look, especially with some windows close to corners and close together.
- #7 – They feel most buyers will choose at least one of the options offered on the rear elevation such as extended family rooms, breakfast nooks, fireplaces, and bay windows, to help break up the rear elevation.
- #8 – Agree with the requirement to adjust the porch column spacing on 'Morton F & G', so that the windows are centered between the columns.
- #9 - Agree to explore options to break up the flat empty wall above the garage doors on 'Memphis H'. An 8' garage door (in lieu of a standard 7' garage door) will take up some of the empty space above the doors.
- #10 – Agree to the requirement to omit the optional garage door facing the side yard, to be replaced with a man door if necessary.

**Mr. Rykovich** also stated that 3 floor plans were presented at the neighborhood meeting previously held; however, a fourth plan, the Victoria, was added in response to the monotony code.

**Acting Chair Bombick** asked why composite siding material was being proposed instead of a cementitious product. **Mr. Rykovich** replied that LP siding creates a heavier texture and cedar look to the home without having the maintenance of cedar, and is virtually maintenance free. They feel it is a better product than typical vinyl siding and will add architectural detail to the homes that they prefer in this neighborhood and price point.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Mr. James Malik**, 1119 E. Olive Street, located just west of the proposed new subdivision. He asked about the retention wall that was referenced earlier; what is being retained? **Mr. Rykovich** replied that 2 retaining walls are being proposed; one around the detention basin to hold the stormwater before it releases off-site; the other across the top of the site, which is a grade change between this site and the adjacent site. **Mr. Malik** was concerned that Lot 1 was not large enough to accommodate the possibility of Olive Street being widened in the future. **Acting Chair Bombick** encouraged the resident to address this concern with the Engineering Department, since it was not under the purview of the Design Commission. He also pointed out that the aerial exhibit being shown tonight was not to scale. **Mr. Rykovich** added that Lot 1 would have a larger side yard setback from the property line, plus the right-of-way of Olive Street.

**Mr. Russell Hill**, 1041 E. Talbot Street, located at the end of the cul-de-sac on Talbot Street, directly west of the retention basin. He found it rather ironic to hear discussion about moving columns 1' or 2' on the homes, yet all of the existing trees on the site were being removed. He said that the entire existing wetland natural preserve, which was actually promised to them when they purchased their lot and built their home, would be ruined, and there is tremendous wildlife located there. Cutting down all the trees would destroy what was built by the builder, what was preserved by the Army Corp of Engineers for a number of years, and what is now being preserved by the Village. He was interested in further commentary on this.

**Acting Chair Bombick** suggested the resident obtain and provide any documentation he had regarding a

promise to preserve the existing trees. He also reiterated that the purview of the Design Commission is to review only the architectural designs for the new homes and to have a compatibility discussion of how the homes will fit in with the surrounding neighborhood. He encouraged the resident to discuss his concerns during the Plan Commission review. **Mr. Hautzinger** added that the petitioner has submitted a tree survey of all existing trees on the site along with a proposed landscape plan that will be reviewed as part of the Plan Commission review for approval of the Subdivision.

**Mr. Andy Kinastowski**, 1317 E. Olive Street, located directly across the street from the proposed retention area. His concern is with keeping the current homogenous look of the neighborhood, specifically the setbacks that currently exist for homes on the north side of Olive Street. He said that Lot 1 was too close to Olive Street, which would be a problem if and when Olive Street is widened. **Mr. Hautzinger** reiterated that any setback issues fall under the purview of the Plan Commission review; however, he clarified that the petitioner is proposing to comply with all R-3 zoning requirements for the new lots. The south (exterior side yard) setback on Lot 1 will be based on the average front yard setback of the existing homes on the block. It was pointed out by a resident that the 7 or 8 newer existing homes on Olive Street were all granted a variance for setback, and located closer to the road.

**Mr. Kinastowski** asked the petitioner to further explain the retention/retaining wall. **Mr. Rykovich** replied that the retention wall would be a moderate drop-off from 3-feet at the sidewalk to approximately 5-feet in the middle, with landscaping around the wall. He pointed out that the exhibit shown tonight only shows the outlot/detention area; the retaining wall is actually shown on the engineering plan to be reviewed by the Engineering Department, and shows the location and height of the proposed retaining wall. **Acting Chair Bombick** suggested the petitioner better delineate the lines shown on the drawings for the detention area, prior to the Plan Commission review. **Mr. Hautzinger** clarified that the proposed retaining wall will have an approximately 3-foot drop down into the detention area, which will be reviewed in more detail as part of the Plan Commission review. At this time, Staff's recommendation for Plan Commission review is to omit the proposed retaining wall and create a gradual slope into the detention area instead, although this recommendation has not yet been finalized. **Acting Chair Bombick** questioned why the new homes did not just terrace downhill at the north end of the property, and **Mr. Hautzinger** replied that this relates to managing storm water and the new detention area.

The public comment portion of the meeting was closed. The commissioners commented on the recommendations made in the Staff report.

**Commissioner Kubow** wanted to make a statement, in order to avoid this from happening in the future; that the Design Commission should clarify what they are here to do, instead of having an hour long question and answer session about Plan Commission and Engineering issues. What the petitioner provided tonight is exactly what is expected for a Design Commission review. He wanted to make it very clear so that neighbors do not waste their time, that this is strictly an architectural review tonight and not a PUD related review, which will be done by the Plan Commission. **Acting Chair Bombick** felt that the residents want to be heard and need to be directed to the appropriate department. It is important that the Design Commission listen to their concerns and make sure the residents understand that there is another official hearing where these issues will be dealt with.

**Commissioner Kubow** really liked what was being proposed by the petitioner. He felt the focus tonight should be on the recommendations and requirements from Staff, instead of going through each home individually. He felt Staff did a great job with their recommendations and requirements, which he agreed

with, and he appreciated that the petitioner already took into account some of the requirements and recommendations, which he agreed with as well. His only comment was about requirement #8 in the Staff report regarding respacing of porch columns which he felt were fine as proposed. Otherwise, he was in support of approving the project as proposed, with the recommendations made by Staff.

**Commissioner Fasolo** felt that Memphis, Elevation H had too many shutters and not enough wall space and appeared cluttered. He agreed with all of the recommendations and requirements in the Staff report; however, he disagreed with the requirement to continue the shutters on the side and rear elevations (#6). He especially agreed with the concern about the flat empty wall space above the garage, and he suggested lowering the roofline above the garage and increasing the height of the garage doors. He liked the color palettes being proposed, with the exception of the 'Prairie Wheat' siding color. **Commissioner Kubow** felt the 'Prairie Wheat' siding color was a bit much; however, he really liked the "Evergreen" siding color.

**Commissioner Fitzgerald** said that the existing wetlands to the west of the site is an unbelievably beautiful area, and although he could not tell from the plans being shown tonight, he hoped that Village Staff (Planning & Engineering) did not allow this area to be ruined because it really is fantastic and a hidden gem. He agreed with much of what Staff has recommended and required, and he specifically agreed with #7, to add either a covered portico above the rear patio door or a fireplace to help break up the large flat rear elevation walls. He felt the side elevations looked weak, and all the expense was being put on the front elevations. He was okay with the "Prairie Wheat" siding color as well as the "Evergreen" siding color; however, he was not in favor of the "Evergreen" siding color being used in combination with the "Hartford Green" metal roof.

**Commissioner Fitzgerald** reviewed the list of trees being removed, and although he understood the neighbors' concerns, he pointed out the existing trees were realistically scrub trees. However, he wanted to see more than just one tree added in the front and rear yards of each new home, and he was very concerned about taking a wooded area down to nothing. He felt that the petitioner should be required to beef up the site with big trees. He was also concerned about the perimeter landscaping; the proposed 2-1/2" caliper trees and the 6" evergreens were fairly small going in, and he felt really sad for the residents who live on the east side of Williams Way who face the site and will be staring at the back of the new homes. He reiterated that the back of the new homes were very unattractive and did not fit the neighborhood at all; therefore, something needed to change with the rear elevations or with the landscaping, otherwise the homes would look like low-end homes when driving down Williams Way. He was uncomfortable with the way the rear elevations were currently proposed and he wanted Staff to be aware of these concerns when reviewing each home individually for administrative approval.

**Acting Chair Bombick** agreed with Commissioner Fitzgerald's concerns about the rear elevations, which would be wide open to Williams Way, and he felt the expense of adding more details to the rear elevations would be minimal and not ruin the pricing structure being considered by the petitioner. He felt that in general, how the new homes were planned was well done and addressed all of the things he complained about earlier in the meeting. Although he did not know what was on the tree survey in the area located directly east of the existing nature preserve and detention area, he felt it was worth a close look to try to preserve something, especially at the edge of the property, 5 to 7-feet at the back of the rear yards, which would greatly improve how the new subdivision fit in its context.

**Acting Chair Bombick** felt the plans and elevations looked fine with proposed siding; however, when the siding changed to brick, it appeared pasted on, and he felt that more thought needed to go into how the

returns complete themselves. He felt the side elevations were pretty plain, although the trim pieces would help; however, adding details on the rear elevations that are not flat would be a much better solution. He was also not in favor of shutters on all four elevations. He liked the bold colors being proposed for the new homes, and felt that homeowners should have a choice in whatever color they liked. He also referenced the Astoria Place subdivision on Hintz Road, that had rear elevations facing Arlington Heights Road that were nice, simple and had relief.

**Mr. Hautzinger** explained that Staff shares the same landscape concerns expressed by the commissioners tonight, and those concerns will be made part of Staff's recommendations for the Plan Commission review, specifically, to add 30 to 40 more replacement trees to the site, and increase the caliper of the new trees. He suggested the motion include a similar recommendation, which would then go forward to the Plan Commission and reinforce the concerns expressed by Staff. He also explained that the revised packet submitted tonight was provided only to illustrate the slight height adjustment that was required on the roof pitch of some of the new homes in order to comply with code, and that the motion should focus on what was originally submitted by the petitioner.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FASOLO, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED GENERAL ARCHITECTURAL DESIGNS AND MATERIAL PACKAGES FOR THE NEW SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES FOR CHRISTINA COURT TO BE LOCATED AT 1306 & 1310 E. OLIVE STREET. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS DATED 3/6/15 AND RECEIVED 3/9/15, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND RESOLUTION OF THE FOLLOWING:**

1. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PETITIONER SEEK FINAL DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL FOR EACH INDIVIDUAL HOME THROUGH THE ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL PROCESS.
2. A REQUIREMENT TO COMPLY WITH MONOTONY RESTRICTIONS, PER CHAPTER 28, SECTION 28-6.4.
3. A RECOMMENDATION TO PROVIDE CURVING LANDSCAPE BEDS ALONG THE FRONT ELEVATION OF EACH HOME AND ADJACENT TO THE HARDSCAPE AREAS, WITH AN ABUNDANT MIX OF TREES, SHRUBS, AND PERENNIALS.
4. A REQUIREMENT THAT BRICK AND STONE SHOWN ON THE FRONT ELEVATIONS BE RETURNED DOWN THE SIDE ELEVATIONS 2', AND SOFTENED WITH LANDSCAPING.
5. A REQUIREMENT THAT WINDOWS BE ADDED TO THE SIDE GARAGE WALLS, TYPICAL FOR ALL PLANS. AT LEAST ONE WINDOW IS ADDED FOR STANDARD GARAGES, AND AT LEAST 2 SEPARATE WINDOWS BE ADDED FOR TANDEM GARAGES.
6. A REQUIREMENT THAT WINDOW TRIM AND GRILLES PROVIDED ON THE FRONT ELEVATION ALSO BE PROVIDED ON THE SIDE AND REAR ELEVATIONS TO MATCH, AND A FINAL DECISION ABOUT SHUTTERS ON ALL SIDE AND REAR ELEVATIONS BE MADE BY STAFF.
7. A REQUIREMENT TO ADD ONE ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENT ON THE BACK OF EACH HOME TO BREAK UP THE FLAT WALL, WHETHER IT IS A PLAN OPTION, FIREPLACE, PORTICO OR BAY WINDOW, TO BE APPROVED BY STAFF.
8. MORTION F & G: A REQUIREMENT TO ADJUST THE PORCH COLUMN SPACING SO THAT THE WINDOWS ARE CENTERED BETWEEN THE COLUMNS.
9. MEMPHIS H: A RECOMMENDATION TO EXPLORE OPTIONS TO BREAK UP THE FLAT EMPTY WALL ABOVE THE GARAGE DOORS.

10. BOULDER MODEL: A REQUIREMENT TO OMIT THE OPTION GARAGE DOOR FACING THE SIDE YARD.
11. AN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT THAT THE ROOF PITCHES ON SOME OF THE HOMES WILL BE ADJUSTED TO COMPLY WITH THE HEIGHT REQUIREMENT OF CODE.
12. A STRONG RECOMMENDATION THAT MORE TREES BE ADDED ON EACH PROPERTY.
13. A STRONG RECOMMENDATION FOR LARGER AND MORE PLANT MATERIAL ON THE EAST SIDE OF THE DEVELOPMENT, AS WELL AS ON THE WEST SIDE, ALSO WITH A CONSIDERATION TO LEAVE A 5' BUFFER OF WHAT IS THERE NOW.
14. A RECOMMENDATION TO NOT PAIR THE EVERGREEN SIDING COLOR WITH THE HARTFORD GREEN METAL ROOF IN MATERIAL PACKAGE #NR07.
15. THIS REVIEW REPRESENTS DESIGN APPROVAL 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, SIGN CODE OR BUILDING OR ANY OTHER REVIEWS.
16. IT IS THE PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO SUBMIT THE APPROPRIATE PERMIT APPLICATION(S) TO THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL PRIOR TO PROCEEDING WITH ANY WORK. 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 Fasolo asked if adding something on the rear elevations was a requirement, and Commissioner Fitzgerald replied that it was. With regards to #3 in the motion, Mr. Hautzinger explained that the petitioner indicated that it is their intent to provide a landscape package, which was not submitted tonight. The petitioner explained that each model of home would have a landscape package, which was not yet designed.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FASOLO, TO AMEND THE MOTION AS FOLLOWS:

3. A REQUIREMENT THAT STAFF REVIEW THE PROPOSED LANDSCAPE PACKAGE FOR EACH MODEL OF HOME.

FASOLO, AYE; KUBOW, AYE; FITZGERALD, AYE; BOMBICK, AYE; ECKHARDT, RECUSE.  
THE MOTION CARRIED.