

DRAFT

MINUTES OF  
THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS  
DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING  
HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.  
JUNE 14, 2016

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

Members Present: Ted Eckhardt, Chair  
John Fitzgerald  
Jonathan Kubow

Members Absent: Alan Bombick  
Anthony Fasolo

Also Present: Anthony Izzo, Anthony James Builders for *2 N. Phelps Ave.*  
Tony VanDijk, Emerald Homes for *415 & 503 N. Gibbons Ave.*  
Tom Meyer, Lexington Homes for *Lexington Towne Subdivision*  
Chris Russo, ALA Architects for *Lexington Towne Subdivision*  
James Cazares representing *Ivy Hotel*  
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM MAY 24, 2016

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF MAY 24, 2016. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

**Chair Eckhardt** explained that with only 3 commissioners here tonight, projects need to be unanimously approved. Petitioners have the option to continue their project to the next meeting if they choose.

ITEM 4. SINGLE-FAMILY NEW REVIEWDC#16-056 – Lexington Towne Subdivision – 909 & 929 W. Campbell St.

Mr. Tom Meyer, representing *Lexington Homes*, and Mr. Chris Russo, representing *ALA Architects*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. Lexington Towne is a proposed 16 lot subdivision that will include 15 new single family homes and one lot for storm water detention. Two floor plans are being proposed with multiple front elevation options, as well as an optional third car garage bay. 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 Lexington Towne Subdivision was recommended for approval by the Plan Commission on May 11, 2016, and is pending final review/approval by the Village Board.

The subject property is comprised of two existing single family properties totaling 204,296 sf or 4.69 acres. The proposed subdivision will include the extension of Kennicott Avenue through the existing site from Campbell Street to Sigwalt Street. The proposed single family lots do comply with the R-2 zoning requirements for minimum lot area (10,000 sf) and width (90' corner, 75' interior).

The existing site is heavily wooded and will be partially cleared to accommodate the proposed development. However, numerous existing mature trees are planned to be preserved, primarily in the parkways along Kaspar, Campbell, and Sigwalt. In addition to the preserved trees, 144 replacement trees will be provided within the development as either parkway trees, trees around the detention basin, or trees installed as part of the landscape package included with each lot. The petitioner is proposing to provide landscaping for each new home including sod in the front yards, seed in the back yards, and foundation planting bed along the front of each home. A variety of trees, shrubs, and perennials are recommended to be provided at each home to create a diverse appearance throughout the development.

Village code requires new houses to comply with the monotony requirement per Chapter 28, Section 28-6.4, which Mr. Hautzinger read for reference. For new subdivisions with multiple homes, it is recommended that at least four different floor plans be provided to comply with the monotony requirement, and to allow for flexibility within the development. In this case, the petitioner is only proposing two different floor plans, which does not comply with code. Each of the two plans includes changes to the front portion of the floor plan to generate different exterior massing on the front of the home, and each floor plan option has different exterior material treatments to create further variety.

Floor Plan #1 includes three different exterior elevation options as illustrated in Plans 210(A), 220(B), and 310(C). Floor Plan #2 includes three different exterior elevation options as illustrated in Plans 410(D), 420(E), and 510(F).

Staff recommends that the petitioner provide at least one, preferably two, additional house designs with substantially different floor plans and exterior elevations in order to comply with the monotony code.

Mr. Hautzinger explained that the surrounding neighborhood consists of a mix of single story and two story homes with predominantly front loading two car garages. The proposed house designs are a traditional style with pitched roofs and traditional detailing and front loading garages, and they will fit in well with the context of the neighborhood. Overall, the elevations are nicely designed with good proportions, balanced compositions, and varied detailing including various brackets, bay windows, and covered porches. The only elevation that does not fit in well is Plan 510(F1-F4). Elevations F1-F4 include a two-story entry portico that looks out of balance on the facade, and looks out of place with the rest of the traditional designs. Per Staff's encouragement, the petitioner has provided an additional elevation, F5, which includes a full front porch and flat facade instead of the two story portico. Elevation F5 looks

very nice and fits in very well with the rest of the proposed designs much better than elevations F1-F4. It is recommended that elevations F1-F4 be replaced with variations of F5, similar to the other five elevation options, A thru E.

In regards to the side and rear elevations, the petitioner has indicated on the plans that, "Details and materials shown on alternate front elevations will carry around side and back elevations. Selected masonry will terminate at logical transition points, inside corners or window lines." Staff will review each individual house for compliance with this requirement at the time of the individual Design Commission submittal.

**Mr. Hautzinger** explained that the petitioner is proposing a variety of exterior materials including 16 vinyl siding colors, 7 aluminum gutter/trim colors, 5 dimensional asphalt shingle colors, 10 brick colors, and 5 stone colors. White vinyl windows will be standard on all of the houses. The exterior materials for each individual home will be selected by the customer and builder, and submitted for Staff review. Overall, there is a wide range of colors and materials proposed, which will create nice variety throughout the development.

Because of the issue of monotony, Staff recommends the Design Commission require revisions and then re-review the project. **Mr. Hautzinger** explained that adding a third floor plan design to the group of homes will allow the petitioner to comply with monotony; however, due to the two site separation requirement, it will result in a lack of flexibility in selecting the house for each site, forcing an A,B,C rhythm on the street. Adding a fourth floor plan design is encouraged to allow for more flexibility in selecting the house design for each site.

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

**Chair Eckhardt** asked how a determination was made to locate the detention basin on Sigwalt, and why only two different floor plans were being proposed. **Mr. Meyer** replied that they had a number of meetings with Staff and Engineering about the detention basin, and it was determined that the proposed location would work best. He also explained that the two floor plans being proposed are fresh designs that they have not used in other communities. The designs meet today's lifestyle and also include a number of different interior plan options such as filling in an interior volume space that converts to an additional bedroom or in-law suite, and a 3-car garage option. They want to be as efficient as possible.

**Mr. Meyer** reviewed the elevations, floor plans and materials being proposed. He said that they understand the monotony code and realize that each home will be reviewed and approved individually; however, they took a master approach to offer flexible floor plans to buyers, and they want buyers to be involved in the selection of the elevation, floor plan and materials.

**Commissioner Fitzgerald** wanted to see one more floor plan offered; he felt the two floor plans being proposed were extremely similar, and that everything would feel the same and be the same. He liked the different options being offered to buyers to add details, as well as the colors being proposed, and he suggested adding more colors if possible. He agreed with Staff's concerns about the stuck-on appearance of the 2-story entry portico on Plan 510(F1-F4), and liked the alternate design (F5) provided by the petitioner. He felt the subdivision was starting to look like a high-end condo development; extremely neutral with the same feel. He also wanted to see more variation in the front landscaping, with each lot to be approved by Staff.

**Commissioner Kubow** said that he felt differently than Commissioner Fitzgerald. When he first looked at the plans and elevations he was a little nervous; however, he liked them a lot more after seeing the streetscape renderings presented tonight. His overall concern is more of a global concern; what if all of the buyers choose the cost effective option, or what if they start to choose the same color palette? He wanted to ensure that this would not happen by individually reviewing each new home. In general, he liked the designs and colors being proposed for the new subdivision, and he asked the petitioner if they had a third floor plan available. **Mr. Meyer** replied that a third floor plan was not yet developed, although it could certainly be done; however, he was hoping for approval tonight to treat

the floor plans as 6 stand alone plans, and then add a seventh floor plan. He was concerned that developing a third floor plan and not counting the currently proposed floor plans as 6 floor plans instead of 2, could result with the A, B, C rhythm mentioned earlier. **Commissioner Kubow** also agreed with Staff concerns about the two-story entry portico on Plan 510, and preference for the alternate (F5) elevation provided. **Commissioner Kubow** also commented that all of the garage doors look the same, and more variety should be required.

**Chair Eckhardt** agreed that the garage doors all look the same and need differentiation. He also felt the overall exterior color palettes for the homes were very beige and very predictable, and he wanted to see a little variety and some brighter colors. **Mr. Meyer** replied that they are not opposed to adding additional colors, which he felt buyers would want, but they do not want to offer a color that really stands out and looks like a mistake because color is part of the streetscape. **Chair Eckhardt** also stated that he was not opposed to the floor plans being the same and felt the petitioner was successful in changing the elevations enough that they do not look like the same floor plan. He also agreed with the concerns about the front entry portico on Plan 510, and preferred the alternate design presented. **Mr. Meyer** said that they were not opposed to the suggestions being made; however, they are trying to be as efficient as possible on the 15 homes. **Chair Eckhardt** further stated that the commissioners typically do not like the front of a home to look different than the sides and rear of the home.

**Mr. Fitzgerald** asked Staff if there were any other similar developments that were given a variation from the monotony code. **Mr. Hautzinger** referenced the Arlington Market development located north of Mariano's that included 3 different floor plans with 4 elevations each, which received a variation from the monotony code to allow the same floor plan to be located directly next to each other or directly across the street from each other; however, the exterior elevations were required to comply with the 2-lot separation. Buyers ended up preferring one floor plan over the other two, which resulted in the same model being built repeatedly on the same street, and the repetition of this is visible. **Mr. Hautzinger** commented that if a similar monotony variation were granted for this project, then it should include a restriction that no more than two of the same floor plans be allowed in a row to prevent the repetition that occurred at Arlington Market. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** was unsure what a variation would mean when the Village has no control over which model will be bought more than another. **Mr. Hautzinger** said that if the monotony code is enforced then it will force the models to be separated from each other regardless of what buyers may want, but the petitioner would need to offer a minimum of 4 floor plans to avoid the repetition pattern of A,B,C, A,B,C, A,B,C down the street.

**Commissioner Fitzgerald** was uncomfortable with a variation of the monotony code. **Chair Eckhardt** reiterated that he felt the floor plans being proposed were different enough. **Mr. Meyer** said that they would like the commissioners' support of the master plan being presented tonight, and did not want to undo all of the work they have done; however, he did not know the logistics of the next step since only 3 of the 5 commissioners were here tonight. Their desire is to go with the two floor plans being presented tonight, with all of the different elevations proposed. **Mr. Hautzinger** clarified that, as has been done with similar subdivisions in the past, the petitioner is seeking overall approval for all of the designs and materials with one formal review with the Design Commission tonight, and then each individual home would be submitted to Staff for an administrative review and approval for compliance with the approved plans and any conditions that the Design Commission may require. **Chair Eckhardt** did not have an issue with that, although he thought that the petitioner would return for a formal review for each home. He felt the commissioners should discuss this because this is a very significant development in the Village. **Mr. Hautzinger** referenced both Arlington Market and Christina Court as similar recent subdivision projects that were reviewed in this same manner.

**Commissioner Fitzgerald** felt there was no hardship for a variation and he was concerned about setting a precedent if a variance was approved. **Commissioner Kubow** was concerned about a variation when the floor plan is driven by the buyer, and he referred to the Arlington Market project where buyers bought one model more than the others, and that model was repeated 6 or 7 times in a row. Although, he liked streetscape renderings presented tonight with the variation of elevations. **Mr. Hautzinger** reiterated the option for a partial variation to the monotony code; restricting no more than two of the same floor plans to be built in a row. **Mr. Meyer** asked how they could work

together on that and **Mr. Hautzinger** asked if the petitioner would be building two model homes to allow buyers to experience both floor plan options. **Mr. Meyer** was not opposed to the suggestion which he would take back for review.

**Chair Eckhardt** reiterated that the commissioners do not want the homes to look alike. The project does not comply with the monotony code because there are only 2 floor plans; however, the Design Commission was not the entity to grant a variation. He was concerned about not reviewing each individual home and felt that perhaps the first 3 or 4 homes should come back for formal review. He added that he did not support a variation for monotony and asked the other commissioners how they felt. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** and **Commissioner Kubow** also did not support a variation for monotony.

**Mr. Meyer** said their intention was to present what they have, gather support, and try to work together. **Mr. Russo** asked if there was a way for the commissioners to remove the floor plan separation requirement from their review and give support for the character and feel of the development, to help the petitioner if they decide to seek a variation from the monotony code. **Chair Eckhardt** felt that the commissioners already did so with their previous comments. **Mr. Meyer** said that they have no problem trying to meet a happy boundary some place with looking at the floor plans; however, they have spent a lot of time and effort on the livability of the two floor plans being presented tonight, and felt they were almost there.

**Mr. Hautzinger** said that it appeared as though the petitioner did not have the support of at least 1 of the 3 commissioners here tonight who feels that there should be an additional floor plan added to the series for diversity. He recommended a requirement that the petitioner provide another floor plan that has 3 exterior elevations for a total of 3 floor plans and 9 exterior elevations, which would comply with monotony. **Mr. Meyer** said that they could develop a restriction list that would restrict a specific floor plan to a specific lot because of monotony issues, but having some ability for relief from the monotony requirement would help them.

**Commissioner Fitzgerald** said that he would support adding a third floor plan, to be approved by Staff, which would allow the petitioner to move forward, as well as have each individual home come back to the Design Commission for review. **Commissioner Kubow** felt it was not necessary to see each individual home. **Chair Eckhardt** could support the requirement for a third floor plan with elevations, and the possibility of individual homes coming back to the Design Commission only if Staff has any concerns about them. He felt the motion tonight should clearly state that the Design Commission supports and wishes to maintain the monotony code as written and that it be enforced by Staff review, to the extent that the petitioner has the option to seek a variance. **Mr. Hautzinger** asked the commissioners for their thoughts regarding the option for monotony relief to allow the same floor plan to be directly next to each other, but with no more than two in a row. This would require a variation; however, it would provide some flexibility from the A,B,C, A, B,C pattern. The commissioners had no problem with this suggestion since a third floor plan was being required.

After further discussion of the recommendations in the Staff report, along with the comments made by the commissioners tonight, the following motion was made:

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE GENERAL ARCHITECTURAL DESIGNS AND MATERIAL PACKAGES FOR THE SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES FOR THE *LEXINGTON TOWNE SUBDIVISION* LOCATED AT 909 & 929 W. CAMPBELL STREET. THIS APPROVAL IS BASED ON COMPLIANCE WITH THE PLANS DATED 5/12/16 AND RECEIVED 5/27/16, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING:**

1. A REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE ONE ADDITIONAL HOUSE DESIGN WITH A SUBSTANTIALLY DIFFERENT FLOOR PLAN AND THREE EXTERIOR ELEVATION OPTIONS TO COMPLY WITH THE MONOTONY CODE, TO BE APPROVED BY STAFF.
2. A RECOMMENDATION TO PROVIDE A FOURTH FLOOR PLAN TO ALLOW FLEXIBILITY WITHIN THE DEVELOPMENT.
3. THE DESIGN COMMISSION IS NOT OPPOSED TO A VARIATION FROM THE MONOTONY CODE REQUIREMENT TO ALLOW THE SAME FLOOR PLAN TO BE LOCATED DIRECTLY NEXT TO EACH OTHER, OR DIRECTLY ACROSS THE STREET, WITH NO MORE THAN TWO OF THE SAME FLOOR PLAN IN A ROW, BUT THE ELEVATIONS MUST COMPLY WITH THE MONOTONY REQUIREMENT.
4. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE PETITIONER SEEK FINAL DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL FOR EACH INDIVIDUAL HOME THROUGH THE ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL PROCESS.
5. A REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE A VARIETY OF TREES, SHRUBS, AND PERENNIALS AT EACH HOME TO CREATE A DIVERSE APPEARANCE THROUGHOUT THE DEVELOPMENT, TO BE APPROVED BY STAFF.
6. A REQUIREMENT THAT ELEVATIONS F1-F4 BE REPLACED WITH VARIATIONS OF F5, SIMILAR TO THE OTHER FIVE ELEVATION OPTIONS, A THRU E, TO BE APPROVED BY STAFF.
7. A REQUIREMENT THAT DETAILS AND MATERIALS SHOWN ON THE ALTERNATE FRONT ELEVATIONS WILL CARRY AROUND THE SIDE AND BACK ELEVATIONS, AND SELECTED MASONRY WILL TERMINATE AT LOGICAL TRANSITION POINTS, INSIDE CORNERS, OR WINDOW LINES, TO BE APPROVED BY STAFF.
8. A REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE A VARIETY OF GARAGE DOOR STYLES, TO BE APPROVED BY STAFF.
9. THIS REVIEW DEALS WITH ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, ANY OTHER ZONING AND/OR LAND USE ISSUES OR DECISIONS THAT STEM FROM ZONING, BUILDING, SIGNAGE OR ANY OTHER REVIEWS. IN ADDITION TO THE NORMAL TECHNICAL REVIEW, PERMIT DRAWINGS WILL BE REVIEWED FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE DESIGN COMMISSION AND ANY OTHER COMMISSION OR BOARD APPROVAL CONDITIONS. IT IS THE PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO INCORPORATE ALL REQUIREMENTS LISTED ON THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS INTO THE PERMIT DRAWINGS, AND TO ENSURE THAT BUILDING PERMIT PLANS AND SIGN PERMIT PLANS COMPLY WITH ALL ZONING CODE, BUILDING CODE AND SIGN CODE REQUIREMENTS.
10. COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES.

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