

APPROVED
MINUTES OF
THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING
HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
AUGUST 25, 2015

Acting Chair Bombick called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

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

Members Absent: Anthony Fasolo

Also Present: Kevin Davis, Fairfield Homes for *922 N. Beverly Ln.*
 John Haran, E & J Builders for *1138 N. Mitchell Ave.*
 Michael Henderson, STR Partners for *Olive-Mary Stitt & Ivy Hill Schools*
 Ryan Schulz, A.H. School District 25 for *Olive-Mary Stitt & Ivy Hill Schools*
 Nancy Tolan, Presbyterian Homes for *The Moorings*
 Craig Kimmel, RLPS Architects for *The Moorings*
 Nick Peppers, Storino, Ramello & Durkin for *The Moorings*
 Scott Freres, The Lakota Group for *The Moorings*
 Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM AUGUST 11, 2015

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF AUGUST 11, 2015. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 5. INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW

DC#15-096 – The Moorings – 811 E. Central Rd.

Ms. Nancy Tolan, representing *Presbyterian Homes*, **Scott Freres**, representing *The Lakota Group*, **Nick Peppers**, representing *Storino, Ramello & Durkin*, and **Craig Kimmel**, representing *RLPS Architects*, were present on behalf of the project.

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

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The Moorings is an existing 41-acre senior living community that was originally approved as a Planned Unit Development in 1985. The existing campus includes a 5-story Independent Living Facility, a Skilled Care Facility, a Sheltered Care Building, and numerous independent living duplex cottages. At this time, the petitioner is proposing to build a new 4-story Assisted Living building, a new Fellowship Hall, and a new single story Memory Care building. This project does require Plan Commission approval for an amendment to the existing PUD.

This project received a preliminary Design Commission review on April 14, 2015. Overall, the Design Commission expressed support of the proposed Fellowship Hall design, and there were no comments on the proposed Memory Care building. The majority of the feedback pertained to the proposed 4-story Assisted Living facility, with highlights as follows:

1. Overall the articulation of the design was lacking. More depth, variety, and detailing was suggested, such as more detailing around the windows.
2. The entry of the building lacked prominence.
3. There was concern regarding the concern about the close proximity of the loading dock and service area to the residential cottages across the street.
4. Perspective renderings were requested to better communicate the design as it relates to the existing buildings on the site.
5. The existing landscaping is exceptional, and there were no concerns about the proposed landscaping.

The petitioner has developed the design and addressed the Design Commissioner's previous comments. Perspective renderings have been provided which illustrate how the proposed buildings fit in well with the existing context of the Moorings. Overall, the design of the proposed development is very nicely done, with nice materials and extensive landscaping. The proposed material palette is nicely coordinated, and the brick has been selected to match the existing 5-story Independent Living building. The use of the same material palette throughout all three of the proposed new buildings works very well to bring cohesiveness to the overall campus design.

The overall composition of the Assisted Living building is well done, and the proposed porte

cohere provides a distinctive identity for the building's main entrance. Additionally, the loading/service area has been modified with a greater setback and enhanced screening. The only design comment is regarding the application of the EIFS and horizontal siding on the building façade. The two materials appear out of balance, and it is recommended to consider reversing the two materials so that the horizontal siding becomes the primary wall cladding, with the EIFS used as the accent color on the top floor and feature areas of the building. As proposed the heavier texture and darker color of the siding material looks out of place located above the smooth, lighter colored EIFS.

The design of the single story Memory Care building has very nice massing and scale. The only design comment on this building is the lack of prominence of the main entry. As proposed, the entry is recessed and unidentifiable. Consider adding a small portico to draw attention to the entry.

All rooftop mechanical equipment is required to be fully screened from view. The petitioner is proposing a well between the two sides of the roof which works superbly to screen all of the rooftop mechanical equipment.

Numerous trees on the site are identified for removal; therefore tree replacement will be evaluated as part of the Plan Commission review. If possible, it is encouraged to preserve additional trees adjacent to the west lake and near the court yard. Also, transplanting some of the trees elsewhere on the site should be explored. It is recommended that the landscaping near the Memory Care building entry be enhanced with a mix of shrubs and perennials. For the Assisted Living building, it is recommended to increase the height of the landscaping to help soften the brick base where there is a significant grade change on the west elevation at the south half of the building.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed architectural designs for the new Assisted Living building, Fellowship Hall, and Memory Care building, with the following comments:

1. Consider reversing the EIFS and horizontal siding on the Assisted Living building.
2. Consider adding an entry portico at the main entrance of the Memory Care building.
3. Consider enhancing the landscaping near the Memory Care building entry with a mix of shrubs and perennials.
4. For the Assisted Living Building, it is recommended to increase the height of the landscaping to help soften the brick base where there is a significant grade change on the west elevation at the south half of the building.

Ms. Tolan gave background on Presbyterian Homes, a brief summary of the proposed project, and introduced the team of representatives present.

Mr. Freres gave a slide presentation regarding connectivity, context, and understanding the character around and within the 40-acre site. Photos of the surrounding areas were shown, with the site being surrounded predominantly by single-family and multi-family residential, with

the exception of a church and some small businesses to the north, and the Village of Mt. Prospect to the south and east. An aerial of the existing campus was shown, indicating the main entrance off Central and the location of the existing buildings. Photos of the existing buildings were also shown that reflect the scale and character of the site and include the Independent Living/Commons, Skilled Care, Sheltered Care, original cottages, and recent cottages. Vehicle circulation, building areas and pedestrian path were also pointed out and summarized.

The current proposal for a new Fellowship Hall building, Assisted Living building, and Memory Care building was presented and reviewed by **Mr. Kimmel**. He stated that the primary entrance to the Assisted Living building was minimized to detract visitors from using it as an entry point because they want to control entry into the Memory Care building that is connected through the lobby of the Assisted Living building. The service area of the Assisted Living building has been revised since the preliminary review, in order to create a larger landscape screening between the service area and the existing drive, and architectural changes were made as well to minimize the impact of the service area on the adjacent environment that exists along the entry drive. Circulation paths for both service and Assisted Living residents were also shown.

With regards to the Fellowship Hall, **Mr. Kimmel** explained that this building has evolved since the preliminary review, with changes that include pulling the brick up to create more of a masonry face to the building and creating more significance to the building. The building is central to both the pond and to the overall community, which is critical to the success of achieving all levels of care at the Fellowship Hall. Materials and colors being proposed for the Fellowship Hall were also reviewed.

Previous concerns made by the commissioners about the Assisted Living building, such as the size of the cross gables and the introduction of more residential detailing and trim work, were incorporated into the current proposal, with the idea of creating a nested gable that allowed the ability to create a larger element where the cross gable comes almost up to the ridge line of the building, and create smaller elements so as not to be repetitive around the building. Brick at the front entrance was pulled all the way up into the gable, which starts to complement the Fellowship building, and the brick was also extended out to create an opportunity to widen the windows and accentuate the front door and create asymmetry in the building.

The Memory Care building will be one-story, residential in appearance, and similar to the cottages, only larger. The building was designed to accentuate the social spaces located across the back of the building, which is where residents will spend the majority of their time. It will be connected to an outdoor controlled garden, metal roofing on the octagon shaped dining room, brick pulled in at the higher elements then transitioning down at the porch to lighter materials, and the eave height pulled out with a shed type element to give a stronger porch area with full shade.

Mr. Freres reviewed the foundation package for landscaping, which included not only the new buildings but bringing all of the buildings up to a new landscaping standard in terms of the

quality of material being used, variety of material, utilizing native plantings, and scale. Bigger plantings are being proposed along the streetscape and pond edges, in order to accentuate some of the spaces to not appear so open and bland. He pointed out one of the core areas of the campus, which will be the cloister courtyard space that touches many building facades, entries and windows, with a range of people utilizing the space on a daily basis, and all connected to access points. He also pointed out the pond, which is a focal point of all the buildings and accessible not only for pedestrians around the perimeter but as a fire lane around the building. Details such as stamped concrete or brick paver patio spaces, decorative railings, benches, pergola elements, and naturalized edges of the ponds are also being proposed. Primary circulation around the site will remain the same, with small changes to the circulation into the parking lot adjacent to the Memory Care building and drop-off at the Assisted Living building.

Mr. Freres also briefly discussed where parking is being proposed; surface parking adjacent to the Memory Care building, and underground parking at the Assisted Living building. Previous concerns about the service area at the Assisted Living building were addressed by reconfiguring the angle of the building, gaining distance off the road, landscaping the area, understanding the views from the adjacent cottage views, and introducing architectural elements from the buildings onto the service area. In closing, **Mr. Freres** stated that their timeline continues to move forward with a Plan Commission hearing date scheduled for the end of September, and they remain committed to starting the project next Spring.

Commissioner Kubow acknowledged the fantastic presentation by the petitioner, learning about the history and seeing the context of the site, which was very helpful. He felt the petitioner addressed a lot of the commissioners' previous concerns, and he felt the service area was very well done. With regards to the Assisted Living building, he felt that overall the composition was good; however, more contrast was necessary to help the stucco pop. He also asked about the reasons for recessing the portico entrance on the Memory Care building. The petitioner explained that the Memory Care entrance is being downplayed because it is not really an entrance, and resident family members will be encouraged to use the Assisted Living entrance that is a common entry for all of the buildings because it will allow better control of people going in and out of the buildings.

Commissioner Eckhardt questioned the lack of an entrance near the circular drive to allow drivers to travel down the ring road and pull to the front entrance, as opposed to driving all the way through the parking lot to get to the front door. The petitioner said this was primarily an issue of the vertical grade change in front of the canopy area, which is set because of the existing building, as well as the important desire to maintain the same elevation of that floor throughout the entire building.

With regards to Staff's suggestion to considering reversing the EIFS and horizontal siding on the Assisted Living building, **Commissioner Eckhardt** felt it might be more appropriate to have siding in the middle of the building facade and a smoother surface on top. He was undecided about the architecture of 3 different materials and 4 different material colors being proposed,

and then breaking it up in such a way to make the building look like row homes. He understood the base and the brick; however, he was unsure about the middle portion of stucco. The petitioner replied that using material and color on a large building like this is a way to break up the building, define elements, and create some verticality. **Commissioner Eckhardt** supported the idea of the tall, brick element behind the entrance portico, and felt that the bay windows and 2 pediment gables worked well together; however, he was concerned about the large 2-story expanse of EIFS being proposed at the corner of the building, void of any windows. He suggested adding another element to help break it down.

Commissioner Eckhardt felt that the proposed design of the Memory Care building significantly achieved which elevation is the front and which is the back. He felt the middle section of the building should have siding and EIFS in between the two, to help the building get along better with the Assisted Living building. He had similar comments about the courtyard side of the building, and questioned the fenestration of the elevation and whether it was designed within the context of the adjacent building.

Commissioner Fitzgerald agreed with the comments already made. Looking at the recommendations in the Staff report, he now understood why the entry portico at the Memory Care building was being downplayed, and he was fine with that. He suggested adding landscaping with more height near the entry to the Memory Care building, such as small ornamental trees. He was okay with the height of landscaping being proposed on the west elevation at the south half of the Assisted Living building, which emphasizes and enhances the significant grade change, and he really liked what was done at the service entrance. Overall, he felt the project was beautiful.

Acting Chair Bombick's commented about the Assisted Living building. He was fine with the dark band of siding at the top of the building; however, he felt the building appeared busy and the materials and colors could be simplified. He was also bothered by the way the gables were detailed; the horizontal trim board that runs across the bottom of the gable creates a deep shadow and looks dated. He suggested the gables be detailed more like a traditional 1920's home. He agreed with previous comments; in general, the building needs to be simplified, although he was fine with the 3 layers and the dark layer on top. With regards to the Memory Care building, he felt that the courtyard side of the building would be stronger if it were all brick, with a change at the other end of the building. Overall, he felt the petitioner added a lot of detail and worked out a lot of things with the project.

Acting Chair Bombick also said that site furnishings shown by the petitioner should be packaged together with colors, and manufacturer name/number as part of the approval process. Street lighting, fence and pergola details were not shown and discussed tonight, which he was concerned about and wanted Staff to review.

In response to the previous concerns about the Assisted Living building, **Commissioner Fitzgerald** questioned just how busy the building would look since the colors would be close together; it seemed like nice detailing to him, and he pointed out that the rendering showed

very drastic color changes that in reality would not appear that way. **Acting Chair Bombick** questioned if part of the problem was that the bay windows were white and everything else was beige, which breaks things up. **Commissioner Eckhardt** was okay with the bay color being different.

Commissioner Eckhardt summarized the concerns stated by the commissioners:

1. Break up large expanses of EIFS on the Assisted Living building.
2. Enlarge the plant material in the courtyard of the Memory Care building.
3. Add siding at the west elevation (back of Memory Care building) on the bump-outs.
4. Consider increasing contrast of the siding color.
5. Consider through study elevations, using stucco on the top floor.
6. Courtyard side of Memory Care building appears to have 2 different sides and looks out of balance.

Commissioner Fitzgerald wanted #2 to be a requirement; add small ornamental trees in the courtyard of the Memory Care building, for Staff review and approval.

After further review of the exterior elevations, the commissioners were fine with the material arrangement on the courtyard side of the Memory Care building (#6).

Commissioner Eckhardt wanted #3 to be a requirement; change the EIFS to siding on the west elevation bay bump-outs on the Memory Care building.

Acting Chair Bombick reiterated his concerns about the gable details on the Assisted Living building; he did not like the horizontal details running across the face of the gable. He was fine with the top course of siding on the building, and the colors; however, he felt the building was too busy with all the material changes. **Commissioner Eckhardt** felt that the material changes were subtle. **Commissioner Kubow** commented that there are 2 ways of breaking up an elevation; either horizontally with planes, or vertically like a townhome. He felt the petitioner was doing both, which is why the building looks a bit busy, and he suggested breaking up the elevation vertically, similar to a townhome, as it might simplify the building. **Commissioner Eckhardt** was unsure if seeing a sense of rhythm on the building was necessary, as opposed to the random appearance currently being proposed.

Commissioner Fitzgerald reiterated that enhancing the grade change that occurs from left to right should be taken advantage of; currently the brick is dropped on the right side; however, if the brick was brought up to be level on the left side, it would actually be very symmetrical so he preferred to leave the brick base as proposed. **Commissioner Eckhardt** agreed and was not concerned about this; he was concerned about seeing the one tall element of blank EIFS and wanted a horizontal line added along the second-floor to break it up.

Acting Chair Bombick felt that the 3 openings next to the right of the entry canopy were really nice and would look beautiful, although it did not show up nicely on the rendering.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED ARCHITECTURAL DESIGNS FOR THE NEW ASSISTED LIVING BUILDING, FELLOWSHIP HALL, AND MEMORY CARE BUILDING AT THE EXISTING MOORINGS CAMPUS LOCATED AT 811 E. CENTRAL ROAD. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE PLANS DATED 7/24/15 AND RECEIVED 7/27/15, 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 PLANT MATERIAL IN THE COURTYARD OF THE MEMORY CARE BUILDING BE INCREASED IN QUANTITY, TO BE REVIEWED BY STAFF.
2. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE WEST ELEVATION OF THE MEMORY CARE BUILDING BE ENHANCED WITH SIDING MATERIAL, IN LIEU OF EIFS AT THE 2 BAY PROJECTIONS UNDERNEATH THE GABLED ROOFS.
3. A RECOMMENDATION THAT THE PETITIONER STUDY THE EXTERIOR COLOR SCHEME TO DETERMINE IF A MORE CONTRASTING HARDI-BOARD COLOR IS NECESSARY.
4. A RECOMMENDATION TO ADD DETAILING TO BREAK UP THE 2-STORY BLANK EIFS WALL ADJACENT TO THE SERVICE/LOADING AREA.
5. 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.
6. 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.

Acting Chair Bombick asked that the petitioner be required to provide a complete package of site furnishings, such as furniture cuts, lighting, fences, etc., for Staff review.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT TO ADD THE FOLLOWING TO THE MOTION:

7. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PETITIONER PROVIDE A COMPLETE PACKAGE OF SITE FURNISHINGS TO STAFF FOR APPROVAL.

COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD SECONDED THE MOTION.

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