

**APPROVED**  
**MINUTES OF**  
**THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS**  
**DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING**  
**HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING**  
**33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.**  
**SEPTEMBER 8, 2015**

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

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

Members Absent: Alan Bombick

Also Present: Brian Hyde, Greenscape Homes for *1013 N. Beverly Ln.*  
Linda & Martin O'Brien, Owners of *903 E. Crabtree Dr.*  
Tiana Brazzale & Paul Balga, Owners of *905 S. Evergreen Ave.*  
Keith Ginnodo, Kingsley Ginnodo Architects for *905 S. Evergreen Ave.*  
Kirsten Kingsley, Kingsley Ginnodo Architects for *905 S. Evergreen Ave.*  
Katie & Chris Karsten, Owners of *1216 E. Mayfair Rd.*  
Jereme Smith, Design First for *1216 E. Mayfair Rd.*  
Jeff Funke, Spring Bank Real Estate Group and Funk Architects for  
*Arlington Downs*  
Ryan Kettelkamp, Landscape Architect for *Arlington Downs*  
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

**REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM AUGUST 25, 2015**

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF AUGUST 25, 2015. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.**

## ITEM 5. COMMERCIAL REVIEW

### DC#15-110 – Arlington Downs – 3400 W. Euclid Ave. – Retail Development

**Commissioner Fasolo** recused himself from the discussion because of his previous involvement with the project, and left the meeting.

**Mr. Jeff Funke**, representing *Spring Bank Real Estate Group* and *Funke Architects*, **Mr. Ryan Kettelkamp**, the landscape architect, were present on behalf of the project.

**Mr. Hautzinger** presented Staff comments. The Arlington Downs mixed use development received Design Commission approval on December 13, 2011 with subsequent amendments. At this time, the petitioner is proposing to move forward with the development of the retail portion of the project located in Zones D & E. The scope of this proposal includes six new retail buildings and all corresponding site development within Zones D & E. The petitioner is seeking approval for the architectural designs, as well as the corresponding landscape design, hardscape design, site lighting design, and site furnishings. This proposal also requires Plan Commission approval for an amendment to the previously approved PUD.

The Arlington Downs Design Guidelines were presented to the commissioners, which were required as part of the original PUD approval to establish the overall architectural style, theme, and character for the development. The Design Guidelines dated 8/5/13 were approved by the Design Commission on August 13, 2013. The retail portion of the approved Design Guidelines illustrates an architectural theme based on the Arlington Park International Racecourse. Bright white buildings with pitched roofs, cupolas, and shed dormers established an aesthetic similar to Arlington Park. The retail buildings had staggered facades and they wrapped the corners of the site. The design included a gazebo pavilion structure in the plaza across from Tower One. Other requirements of the Design Guidelines were also reviewed. The current proposal appears to comply with the spirit of these requirements; however, the overall theme has been changed from the Arlington park aesthetic to a much more modern style and character.

With regards to the architectural design, **Mr. Hautzinger** stated that the renderings really tell the story. A modern theme for the retail portion is appropriate and consistent with the modern aesthetic of Tower One and the approved Sheraton Hotel building. However, the commissioners should evaluate the overall material palette proposed, which has an industrial feel. All six retail buildings share the same basic design concept, with slight changes in overall building length and CMU color. It is recommended that the design of the CMU walls be further developed with additional detailing such as horizontal banding of a contrasting color, and due to the dark color of the proposed charcoal CMU, it is recommended that this color be considered as an accent color only.

**Mr. Hautzinger** pointed out that portions of the architectural renderings inaccurately depict the proposed colors and they should be adjusted to more accurately represent the design intent. Items to clarify include:

1. The clear anodized storefronts and roof copings are shown as tan, where they are proposed to be silver.
2. The galvanized steel mesh wall is shown as tan on building D3, and a dark bronze color on buildings D2 & E1. The actual material sample is polished silver. The design intent needs to be clarified. It is recommended that a mock up sample of the mesh wall be provided for review.
3. The drawings are unclear regarding which buildings are proposed to be “charcoal” CMU versus “gray” CMU.
4. The drawings need to clarify where the rust colored corten steel will be used.
5. Building D1 includes a large canopy on the east. The petitioner should clarify the reason for the proposed canopy.

In regards to the site design, the site design elements of this proposal need to be further developed and documented to clarify the design intent, such as the following:

#### Site Design:

1. The aerial rendering of the overall site illustrated on page H1 depicts lively pedestrian plazas with outdoor dining on the south side of the retail buildings facing Euclid Avenue. This suggests lively retail storefronts facing the street. However, the site and landscape plans do not include pedestrian areas on the south side of the buildings which suggests that this will be the back side of the retail buildings. This could result in dead, blacked out storefronts. The view of the development from Euclid and Rohlwing will be the primary view corridors for this development, so it is important to evaluate this detail to ensure that all sides of the retail buildings will look like fronts.
2. The proposed pedestrian walkways range from 12.7-14.2 feet in front of the retail buildings. The retail site plan in the Design Guidelines included generous pedestrian walkways ranging from 25–60 feet. The required setback along Euclid and Rohlwing is 15 feet. Consider reducing the building setback to enlarge the pedestrian walkways.
3. The site plan indicates a row of dead end parking along the main entry drive from Euclid Avenue. Per the Design Guidelines, the main entry drives are required to have enhanced landscape features. The proposed dead end parking should be omitted in this area to allow more open space for an abundance of landscaping.

#### Landscape, Site Furnishings, and Signage:

1. The “Site Planting” and “Furniture-Finishes” character images represent some interesting landscaping schemes; however, detailed landscape and site furnishings plans are required to show where and how these various options will be used.
  - a. Detailed landscape plans are required with actual plant materials specified.
    - Along Euclid and Rohlwing ‘Long Grass’ is proposed. Incorporate additional landscaping that consists of a mix of trees, shrubs and perennials. Per the Design Guidelines, ‘the foundation areas around the buildings will be planted with a mixture of trees, shrubs and perennials to complement the architecture.’
  - b. Site furnishings are required on the parking side of all retail buildings. Site furnishing

plans are required with manufacturer cut sheets for all proposed site furnishings.

2. The service areas and drive aisles along Euclid are required to be fully screened with walls and/or landscaping.
3. The steel mesh building walls are illustrated with vegetation growing on them. Planters need to be shown to support the vegetation. Vines may be difficult to establish. The appearance of the mesh walls needs to be considered without any vegetation.
4. Shade trees are recommended along the widened pedestrian storefront walks.
5. The proposed horse sculptures to be located along the Euclid parkway are a fun landscape feature to help give this development a unique identity. However, more detail is required for review, such as the size and material proposed for the sculptures. In the past, the Design Commission has reviewed requests for public art, such as horse sculptures, so it is recommended that this item return to the Design Commission at a future date for a more detailed review.
6. The gabion basket features are proposed to be filled with crushed concrete. It is recommended that a stone with a variety of warmer colors to complement the building material palette be used.
7. A crushed concrete filled gabion basket wall is proposed to face the street intersection at Euclid and Rohlwing. This feature lacks interest and requires further design development. The proposed "Arlington Downs" signage is unremarkable and requires further design development. "Village of Arlington Heights" signage should be incorporated into this feature. The proposed electronic LED sign is not allowed. Separate review is required for all signage.

#### Hardscape:

1. The Civil site plans indicate concrete sidewalks and striped crosswalks. The renderings show various colored pavements and pavers. Detailed hardscape plans are required to clarify the design intent. Specialty paving is required at major building entries, pedestrian crosswalks, and to unify the retail uses. The crosswalks installed as part of Tower One are just painted stripes, which does not comply with this requirement.
  - a. The checkerboard crosswalk pattern shown in the photo on page I-12 is discouraged.
2. The renderings indicate detailed plazas with intricate paving patterns, planters, and fountains. Detailed site plans are required to clarify the design intent for the plazas.

#### Site Lighting:

1. Per the approved Design Guidelines, pedestrian poles and bollard lighting is required along the retail building storefronts. Additional pedestrian poles and bollard lights must be added to the proposed plans.
2. The proposed banners on the pedestrian light poles are a nice feature to add interest to the overall retail center. However, per the sign code, the lower banner arm is required to be at least 8 feet above pedestrian areas, and light poles with banners are required to have a 100 foot separation. A sign variation may be required to allow the quantity of banners proposed.
3. More detail is required regarding the proposed architectural building accent lighting.

Sustainability:

The extensive amount of sustainable design features outlined are encouraged and appreciated.

**Mr. Hautzinger** concluded by stating that Staff recommends the project be continued until some of the previous items can be further clarified. He also pointed out that the petitioner has an updated presentation for tonight, which may respond to some of the comments in the Staff report.

**Mr. Funke** gave an overhead presentation and said that they have been working on the 30-acre site for the last year and a half, trying to find a way to connect people and bring people closer together with the buildings, sidewalks and landscaping. The prominent corner at Euclid and Rohlwing is critical to how they set the stage for the retail development. Focal points were created to connect the tower to the corner at Euclid and Rohlwing with a pedestrian friendly plaza in front of the tower, a water feature, outdoor pavilion, and simple building architecture that creates and emphasizes the plazas and the landscape to bring people through to the retail landscape. Buildings E1 and D3 activate the corner with an entrance road created off Euclid, and screen walls were designed that create a trellis/canopy system that activates during the day as well as at night, and screen not only the trash enclosure area but also allow for outdoor space. The proposed retail building design is a simple rectangular design with trash and electrical rooms brought inside, which allows for more excitement for the screen walls and the end caps of the buildings. The two smaller buildings in front of the tower are also a simple design, with trash enclosures inside and an exciting glass wall/terrace feature.

**Mr. Funke** said that from an elevation perspective, the buildings are designed to be four-sided. However, they do anticipate retailers to focus their tenant space entrances on the north side of the buildings. They are not opposed to increasing the width of the sidewalks on the north side of the buildings along Euclid Avenue

**Mr. Kettelkamp** gave an overhead presentation of the proposed landscaping, plaza spaces, entry signage, site lighting, and site furnishings being proposed in each zone of the overall site. This includes enhanced paving in the pedestrian crosswalks, expanded green zones on the south side along Euclid and on the west side along Rohlwing Road, and a linear bike path that continues along Euclid with designated nodes for bike parking upon entry into the site. Trees will be planted in a grid "orchard" pattern to reinforce the architecture and allow the tree plantings to speak to the architecture. The lighting plan was also presented which introduces a pedestrian level of lighting, which is a continuation of the types and fixtures that exist on the site, as well as lighting on the screen walls. A series of mesh fencing with vines will help screen the parking, and a slight berm along Euclid Avenue will screen the restaurant drive thru lane. Proposed planting images were also shown that included a variety of vines for the screen walls, a hierarchy of tall grasses, tree hedging, ornamental trees that replicate the look of an orchard, and a layering of plantings to complement the existing plants on the site. The front corner of the site will be transformed to create a very memorable experience with a combination of signage, grasses, flowering perennials, lighting, site furnishings and sculptural elements. **Mr.**

**Funke** also presented and reviewed the material samples and colors being proposed. He clarified that the mesh building walls will be galvanized steel, not stainless steel as shown on the sample board, and the corten steel shown on the sample board has been omitted.

**Mr. Hautzinger** reiterated that the commissioners should decide if they feel there is enough information provided tonight to make a motion to approve the retail portion of this development. Staff felt that landscape and site design were not quite at a level of detail for approval, and he added that previous portions of this development were approved at a higher level of design development with specific details called out such as specific plantings. Staff felt the commissioners should provide feedback tonight as to whether or not there were any large areas that were heading in the wrong direction, both architecturally and site design.

**Commissioner Fitzgerald** liked the overall plan being proposed, although it was quite a departure from what was originally presented. He was in favor of the layout, the outdoor areas for people to gather, the screen walls with plantings, the different colors within the buildings, and the gabion walls that are very cool. He felt the landscaping looked preliminary at this level, although the basics look good, and he was not opposed to Staff approving the final details. He also liked the pedestrian paving treatments.

**Commissioner Kubow** liked the architecture being proposed and how the petitioner focused on the main entrance that was being accentuated at the prominent corner at Rohlwing and Euclid. He also liked how the mesh screen walls extend past the buildings. He understood the reason for no parking on the south side of the buildings along Euclid and he asked if efforts would be made to activate the south side of the retail buildings, such as with outdoor seating as shown in the rendering. **Mr. Funke** replied that the glass storefronts facing south will not be spandrel glass but might be used as storefront display areas. Outdoor seating would depend on each tenant; however, they intend on being as adaptive to each tenant as possible. In terms of the landscaping, **Commissioner Kubow** liked the concept of the long grass and the introduction of a berm along Euclid, which creates some intrigue within the development to draw people in. He felt the prominent corner was going in a good direction and he hoped to see the concept taken further, although he wondered about the gabion wall. **Mr. Funke** explained that the gabion wall will have a three dimensional quality with the different rocks creating shadows, which will then be lit at night.

**Chair Eckhardt** felt the development was very monumental, completely different than the white cupola design of the racetrack, which he felt was wise to move away from. He felt the 6 end cap pavilions were fantastic; however, he questioned if there were too many and whether the development was big enough to create sub-areas. He also referred to the proposed screen walls with plantings that were made into major elements of the facades and he felt the proposed vegetation was not realistic. Because the building architecture is well designed and so strong, he was concerned about the appropriateness of the end caps all being the same and how a tenant might want to modify it for their specific space. In terms of the proposed materials, **Chair Eckhardt** had no issue with the big blank walls, which help the signable area.

He felt the project was going in the right direction, although he wondered about the repetitiveness of the building design instead of each building having its own unique design.

**Chair Eckhardt** asked Staff for clarification regarding approval tonight and whether or not the individual buildings would return for another review. **Mr. Hautzinger** explained that the petitioner is seeking approval tonight for the architectural designs for all six retail buildings, as well as for all of the site design elements, and if approved, the individual buildings would not return for another review. **Chair Eckhardt** asked if there was enough detail being presented tonight. **Mr. Hautzinger** felt the petitioner answered and clarified many questions tonight, and there was adequate architectural details being shown tonight for an approval; however, he was not as comfortable with the amount of site design details presented tonight, which is a huge component of this development.

**Chair Eckhardt** asked about any Plan Commission review process for this portion of the project and **Mr. Hautzinger** explained that the petitioner will need to amend the PUD that was previously approved for the project because the layout of the buildings, overall square footage of the buildings, and parking has changed; however, the changes are mostly consistent with the original PUD approval.

**Mr. Hautzinger** also said that Staff shares the same concerns stated by Chair Eckhardt about the repetition of the building design, and he referred to the small, modern Esplanade Center located directly east of the site that has a lot of variety. He added that architectural lighting is a key component for the development, which he felt needed to be further clarified with regards to the mesh walls that are a huge feature within the development and depicted in different ways in the renderings. Staff suggested that a larger scale mock-up sample of the mesh wall be considered. **Mr. Funke** clarified that the mesh walls are intended to all be the same. In response to the reference made to the Esplanade, he said that they want to create simplicity with the buildings, and changing colors, shapes, and parapet height will lose its sense of place and take away from the cleanness of the building.

**Chair Eckhardt** stated that all 3 commissioners must vote in favor for the project for it to be approved tonight, since one commissioner is not here and another commissioner recused himself.

**Mr. Funke** also clarified that the mesh panels were revised to be a tighter weave and will consist of galvanized steel with a galvanized 1 x 1 mesh panel; and the vines have been omitted from the proposal. **Chair Eckhardt** cautioned the petitioner about wind noise with the mesh panels.

**Mr. Hautzinger** asked the commissioners if they were comfortable with the charcoal grey CMU color being proposed for the entire wall, which Staff felt was too dark and more appropriate as an accent color. Staff also asked for clarification on the alternating grey colors being proposed for the buildings. **Mr. Funke** replied that the building colors would be switched up with every other one being light grey and the other being dark grey, and some are larger, some are smaller, and the mesh panels slide in different ways to screen certain elements. **Mr. Hautzinger**

reiterated that there was still confusion about many of site design items and that the site plans need to be further developed before final approval can be given.

**Chair Eckhardt** asked Commissioner Fitzgerald for feedback on the current status of the landscape architecture. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** said there was nothing in the entire presentation that he did not like and he was fine with Staff approving the final details; however, if anything substantially changes from what is being shown tonight, then it should be brought back to the commissioners. **Commissioner Kubow** agreed.

**Mr. Hautzinger** asked for clarification from the commissioners that they felt the building design and site design for the development should be in substantial compliance with the renderings shown tonight, and the commissioners confirmed this. **Mr. Funke** clarified that from a plaza perspective, some of the details in the renderings vary slightly from what is actually being proposed; however, overall, the elements shown in the rendering will be incorporated into the final design. There will be more green space than what is shown in the rendering and a different paving pattern.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGNS FOR SIX NEW RETAIL BUILDINGS, LANDSCAPING, AND SITE DESIGN ELEMENTS WITHIN ZONES D & E OF THE ARLINGTON DOWNS MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT LOCATED AT 3400 W. EUCLID AVENUE, AS SUBMITTED, AND WITH REVISIONS SUBMITTED ON 9/8/15. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BASED ON THE PLANS DATED 8/12/15 AND RECEIVED 9/3/15, REVISED PLANS RECEIVED 9/8/15, 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. APPROVAL OF THE OVERALL ARCHITECTURAL THEME AND SITE DESIGN CONCEPTS PRESENTED TONIGHT, WITH A REQUIREMENT THAT STAFF REVIEW AND APPROVE THE FINAL DETAILS WHEN THEY ARE DEVELOPED, WITH ANY DRAMATIC CHANGES OR INCORRECT IMPLEMENTATION TO BE BROUGHT BACK TO THE DESIGN COMMISSION.**
- 2. 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.**
- 3. 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.**



**Chair Eckhardt** was okay with the very broad motion tonight; however, he encouraged the petitioner to not lose any of the charm that was presented tonight through the renderings when the final details are submitted to Staff for final approval. Staff needs to be convinced that the renderings being shown tonight are the true direction of the final design.

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