

APPROVED

MINUTES OF
THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING
HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
OCTOBER 4, 2016

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

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

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Irfan Patel, North Suburban Petro for *Marathon Gas Station*
Mark & Lisa Livesay, Owners of *926 N. Hickory Ave.*
Gary Lira, Lira & Associates for *926 N. Hickory Ave.*
Jeff Benach, Lexington Homes for *Lexington Heritage Townhomes*
Jay Cox, BSB Design for *Lexington Heritage Townhomes*
Karl Krogstad, Krogstad Land Design Limited for *Lexington Heritage Townhomes*
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM SEPTEMBER 20, 2016

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FASOLO, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 20, 2016. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

Chair Eckhardt welcomed Kirsten Kingsley, newly appointed Design Commissioner, who was a former member in years past.

ITEM 3. MULTI-FAMILY REVIEW

DC#16-111 – Lexington Heritage Townhomes – 3216-3240 N. Old Arlington Heights Rd.

Jeff Benach, representing *Lexington Homes*, Jay Cox, representing *BSB Design*, and Karl Krogstad, representing *Krogstad Land Design Limited*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing a townhome subdivision consisting of nine buildings with a total of 48 attached townhome units. Three of the nine buildings will be three stories with rear loading garages, and the remaining six buildings will be two stories with front loading garages. The subject site consists of five land parcels. At this time, four of the five lots are developed with single family homes (to be demolished), and the fifth lot is vacant. This project requires Plan Commission review and Village Board approval for: rezoning from M-1 to R-6, amendment to the Village's Comprehensive Plan, Plat of Resubdivision, Planned Unit Development, repeal of the existing Old Arlington Heights Road Overlay Zone, and various corresponding zoning variations. Plan Commission review is currently scheduled for October 26, 2016.

The proposed townhomes are traditional in appearance with a variety of exterior materials including brick, vinyl siding, and asphalt shingles. The proposed designs incorporate a variety of siding profiles including horizontal siding, shake siding, and board & batten siding, which adds interest to the appearance. Two exterior material palettes are proposed. The color palettes are very similar, but they have slightly different brick, siding, and roofing colors. Overall, the proposed designs have a nice appearance, and are well done. The side elevations of the two-story buildings are nicely developed, and there is an adequate level of detailing on the rear elevations. The design style and detailing is consistent between the two-story and three-story buildings, which will provide a nice cohesive feeling for the development.

The following suggestions should be considered to enhance the overall appearance:

1. The two color schemes may be too similar:
 - Consider adjusting the siding colors to provide a bit more contrast.
 - Consider changing the shutter and front door colors between the two palettes to provide more interest.
 - The garage doors are prominent on the front of the two-story buildings, so the style and/or color of the garage doors should be varied between the two different palettes. Mr. Hautzinger stated that catalog cut sheets for the garage doors were received today from the petitioner and will be presented for discussion tonight.
2. The application of the two color palettes needs to be established. Should it be alternated with the same palette on every other building, or should the palettes be applied in clusters, such as groups of three?
3. The optional bay windows on the side of the three-story buildings should be provided as standard to enhance the side elevations. Furthermore, the bays should include one of the specialty siding treatments, either shake or board & batten style.

With regards to landscaping, Mr. Hautzinger stated that the existing site contains numerous trees that are proposed to be cleared to accommodate the proposed development. Through the Plan Commission review, the quality of the existing trees will be evaluated, and opportunities to preserve quality trees will be explored. Abundant new landscaping is proposed throughout the site. The petitioner has already responded to first round Staff landscape comments, and overall the landscaping plan is nicely designed.

The following suggestions should be considered to enhance the landscape design:

1. Consider adding some specialty paving at key areas, such as at the entry driveways.
 2. The proposed internal roadway lighting should be decorative to complement the architecture of the buildings.
- Mr. Hautzinger stated that catalog cut sheets for lighting were received earlier today from the petitioner and will be

presented for discussion tonight.

With regards to signage, the proposed "Lexington Heritage" monument style sign is simple, but it is nicely designed and it will fit well with the character of the development. The size complies with code, but the proposed location at the northeast corner of the site is not allowed. The sign should be moved to the entry drive from Old Arlington Heights Road, and a second sign is recommended to be located at the entry drive from Country Lane.

Staff is recommending approval of the proposed architectural design, with all of the recommendations in the Staff report.

Commissioner Kubow asked how many building types are being proposed, and **Mr. Hautzinger** replied that there are 2 building types; a 2-story and a 3-story, which vary in length and number of units. **Commissioner Kubow** also asked about the drive aisle off Country Lane shown on the site plan but not on the grading plan, and **Mr. Hautzinger** explained that the drive aisle is for emergency Fire Department access only. **Mr. Cox** added that the drive aisle will be paved and gated in some way. **Chair Eckhardt** asked about the detention area shown in the middle of the site, and **Mr. Krogstad** replied it is an open area for underground vaulted detention.

Mr. Cox stated that Staff did an excellent job presenting the project, and they have no objections to the recommendations in the Staff report. He clarified that there are 4 different unit types to create pleasing architecture and 4 different sidings, with 2 different exposures of the horizontal siding to create additional break-up of the facade. He welcomed any questions the commissioners had. **Mr. Hautzinger** asked for clarification on the location of the different exposures of horizontal siding, and the petitioner explained that the smaller exposure siding will be located up in the gables.

Commissioner Kubow said that his only issue was that there should be more differentiation in the material and color combinations being proposed. He felt that proposing 4 different building types presented an opportunity to go with more than 2 color options; there has to be a little more differentiation between each of the buildings. **Chair Eckhardt** asked the petitioner to clarify the color schemes for each building. **Mr. Benach** replied that they are trying to create a thematic thread throughout the site by using different brick and siding in the same color family, as well as vary the different exposures of the siding; however, he was cautious about using too many color palettes, similar to their Lexington Park project in Des Plaines, which he did not want to repeat. His inclination would be to alternate the proposed color options by building. **Chair Eckhardt** said that he was more interested in the buildings that face each other; will the buildings match or be different in color scheme? **Mr. Benach** preferred that the buildings that face each other be different colors, with colors alternated, instead of grouping the colors.

Commissioner Kubow had no further comments.

Commissioner Fitzgerald liked the proposed landscape plan as well as the plant selections, which will do well in this environment. Although the 2 siding colors shown in the rendering were nice, he felt that in reality the colors were very close, and he was not opposed to seeing a little more separation and a little more definition between the 2 colors. He was okay with the shutters and front doors being the same color, and he was not opposed to the garage doors being the same color as well, or at a minimum the color of the siding. He felt that Staff could approve each building color, and he agreed that signage for the development should meet code. Adding specialty paving was a good suggestion, and he agreed with Staff's suggestion that the bay windows on the side of the 3-story buildings be standard. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** reiterated that he liked the separation of siding colors shown in the renderings; however, based on the actual samples provided, they were too close, and the garage doors were too bright and too much of a focal point and should be toned down.

Commissioner Kingsley agreed with Commissioner Fitzgerald's comments about the closeness of the 2 siding colors, and the suggestion to change the color of the garage doors to either the front door color or the siding color. She questioned whether each of the siding colors could be used together on the top and bottom areas of the

buildings. She also liked the cream color of the trim shown in the renderings, as opposed to the white color of the sample, and she agreed with Staff's comment to consider adding specialty paving at the entry driveways. Although she was okay with Staff reviewing the final colors for each building, she suggested Buildings 1 & 3 be the same color, and Building 2 be a different color; she felt this made sense and would create a more harmonious environment. She asked what material the driveways will be, and the petitioner responded that they will be black asphalt.

Commissioner Fasolo felt the brick color shown in the renderings looked much better than the samples provided. He felt that a mix of color Scheme 1 and Scheme 2 should be considered with every other unit having a different color scheme on each building, instead of each building being a different color. This would be a solution to having buildings opposite each other with the same colors, as well as break up the monotony of the larger elevations with all the same color. He also felt that the brick colors were too similar and needed more contrast, and the siding colors were too similar as well. He agreed with Staff's recommendation to make the bay windows on the side elevations standard, and to vary the style of the garage door and match the color to the siding. He agreed that ground signage should meet code and be located at the entries, and specialty paving should be added at the entry driveways. He asked if a fence was being proposed around the site and **Mr. Krogstad** replied that a solid wood fence is located along the south and west property line, and some of the existing trees located near the fence would be saved. He added that in going through the Plan Commission process, a revision was made this morning to Building 1, which is that 1 of the 2 proposed retaining walls has been eliminated. **Commissioner Fasolo** also asked if any sustainable features are being proposed, and **Mr. Cox** replied that current energy codes were being met.

Chair Eckhardt supported the petitioner's idea of using 2 color schemes throughout the development, as well as Commissioner Kingsley's comments about using the same color scheme for Buildings 1 & 3, and Commissioner Fitzgerald's suggestion to tone down the color of the garage doors. He asked if the buildings have fire walls that go through the roofline and **Mr. Cox** replied that they do not. **Chair Eckhardt** also supported a mortar color to match the brick color, similar to what is shown in the rendering, and that the bay windows on the side elevations be standard. He could not see much of a difference between the 2 samples of bricks, as opposed to the brick colors shown in the rendering. The petitioner agreed and stated that the brick samples show only a small amount of the overall brick color, and the rendering colors could be slightly off from printing. **Chair Eckhardt** was concerned that the proposed brick colors did not have enough contrast. **Commissioner Kingsley** commented that the 'dark' brick color did not look dark enough and appeared to have a white wash on it; and the 'red' brick color has 2 inclusions, which usually means there will be some dark and some light brick that is not seen in the sample.

The petitioner presented an exhibit showing the proposed layout of the two color schemes for each of the buildings on the site, which the commissioners were not opposed to.

Chair Eckhardt asked the commissioners to comment on the issue of the brick colors. **Commissioner Fasolo** liked the brick colors on the small sample board, but he did not like the brick colors of the larger samples. He was in favor of brick colors similar to the small samples. **Commissioner Kubow** was less concerned about the brick and more concerned about the 2 siding colors that were too similar. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** was okay with the brick colors as proposed, and if the colors changed, he was okay with the change being approved by Staff. He agreed that the 2 siding colors were too similar; however, he was extremely intrigued with the suggestion to use both colors on one building as suggested by Commissioner Fasolo. **Commissioner Kingsley** liked the brick colors on the small sample board better than the large samples, and also felt that the 2 siding colors were too close. She preferred that there be 2 different siding colors on one facade, especially on the rear facades, and felt the garage doors should match the siding color. She also asked for clarification on the window color, and **Mr. Hautzinger** replied that the petitioner's material list indicates white windows; however, the rendering is showing a taupe color for the windows. **Commissioner Kingsley** liked the darker window color shown in the rendering, and strongly felt that the trim color should not be white.

Mr. Cox summarized that the commissioners want to see a mortar color that is complimentary to each brick color; more separation between the 2 field siding colors and an additional accent color for the siding; tone down the garage

door color by relating it to the field siding color; and make the bay windows standard on the sides of the 3-story buildings. He stated that they prefer not to mix the 2 color schemes within the same building, but they should stay with the 2 separate color schemes for the buildings to be applied as shown in the exhibit presented earlier. With regards to the window and trim color, it is their intent that the windows be very close in color to the trim color, which will be '30° White'. **Commissioner Kingsley** felt the white color was very bright, and **Chair Eckhardt** agreed that the bright white color did not look good with the rest of the colors.

Chair Eckhardt asked that the motion call attention to the following:

1. The bay windows on the side of the 3-story buildings be provided as a standard and not an option.
2. Add specialty paving at the key areas such as the entry driveways.
3. The commissioners support the 2 color schemes being proposed, with the layout presented tonight showing the color scheme for each building.
4. More separation between the 2 siding colors, to be reviewed by Staff.
5. Preference for the 2 brick colors shown in the renderings and not the actual samples.
6. A mortar color that is complimentary to each of the brick colors.
7. The commissioners support the 2 color schemes presented.
8. Garage doors to be a color to match the siding color, not a bright color such as white or cream.

Mr. Krogstad said that they considered specialty paving at the entrances; however, they are concerned about long term maintenance by the homeowners association, and prefer not to add the specialty paving.

Chair Eckhardt asked if there was any public comment on the project and there was no one present in the audience.

Mr. Hautzinger asked for clarification about the comment that one of the siding colors be used for all the horizontal siding, and the specialty siding patterns have a slightly darker siding color. The petitioner clarified that they do not want to mix color schemes on the same building; however, they were not opposed to adding a siding color that is complimentary to each of the 2 field siding colors (probably a darker color), for a total of 4 siding colors.

Commissioner Fitzgerald suggested using the 2 siding colors currently being proposed with the brick and then switching the highlighted colors, still staying with 2 siding colors. **Commissioner Kubow** felt this would help; however, he felt the rendering was not a true representation of the actual material palette, which is making the presentation and discussion difficult. **Chair Eckhardt** supported the idea of having 4 siding colors, and **Commissioners Kingsley and Fitzgerald** agreed.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED ARCHITECTURAL DESIGNS FOR THE *LEXINGTON HERITAGE TOWNHOME SUBDIVISION* LOCATED AT 3216-3240 N. OLD ARLINGTON HEIGHTS ROAD. THIS APPROVAL IS BASED ON THE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 9/16/16, LANDSCAPE PLANS RECEIVED 9/27/16, 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 THAT THERE BE 4 DIFFERENT SIDING COLORS, AND THE 2 DIFFERENT BASE FIELD COLORS BE REVISED TO HAVE SLIGHTLY MORE CONTRAST, AND IN THE SPECIALTY ACCENT SIDING FIELDS THERE WILL BE AN ACCENT SIDING COLOR.
2. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE GARAGE DOORS MATCH THE FIELD COLOR OF THE SIDING WITH THE COLOR SCHEME OF THAT BUILDING.
3. A RECOMMENDATION TO REVISE THE DESIGN OF THE GARAGE DOORS, TO BE REVIEWED BY STAFF.

4. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE APPLICATIONS OF THE COLOR SCHEMES FOR EACH BUILDING BE CONSISTENT WITH THE LAYOUT EXHIBIT SUBMITTED TONIGHT.
5. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE BAY WINDOWS ON THE SIDES OF THE 3-STORY BUILDINGS BE STANDARD, AND THAT THE BAYS BE THE ACCENT SIDING COLOR.
6. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE DEVELOPMENT IDENTIFICATION SIGN BE REVISED TO COMPLY WITH CODE AND BE LOCATED AT THE END OF THE ENTRY DRIVE.
7. A REQUIREMENT THAT SPECIALTY PAVING BE ADDED AT THE ENTRY DRIVES.
8. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE MORTAR COLOR MATCH EACH OF THE BRICK COLORS.
9. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE WINDOWS MATCH THE TRIM COLOR AS CLOSELY AS POSSIBLE, WITH A RECOMMENDATION THAT IT NOT BE BRIGHT WHITE.
10. THAT THE INTERNAL ROADWAY LIGHTING BE SUBMITTED FOR REVIEW BEFORE APPROVAL.
11. 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.
12. COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES.

Mr. Benach explained why they felt the corner of the site was a more natural place for signage, including that Country Lane is not a through street. Mr. Krogstad added that the entry sign was originally proposed at the Old Arlington Heights Road entrance to the site; however, it felt awkward to be in the front yard of one of the units and conflicted with utilities. Locating signage at the corner of the site would help identify the development when coming from the north. Mr. Hautzinger stated that code allows a ground sign at each of the entry drives per street; it is not allowed at the corner as shown. Chair Eckhardt explained that sign variations are reviewed by the Design Commission. Commissioner Kingsley suggested changing the motion to include a recommendation that signage meet code, leaving it up to the petitioner to decide whether to seek a variation for Design Commission review and Village Board approval.

Chair Eckhardt said that he did not support a variation for the entry sign to be located at the corner as shown tonight and explained how it would set a precedent for similar developments where this has not been allowed. Mr. Hautzinger clarified that code did not require there to be 2 ground signs, and a hardship would need to be demonstrated as part of a sign variation request. Mr. Benach said that he was not opposed to code compliant ground signs.

The petitioner submitted cut sheets for the exterior lighting. Commissioner Kingsley stated that the lighting should be dark sky compliant, and she preferred a more modern fixture less detailed than proposed, to be reviewed by Staff. She also suggested changing the requirement to add specialty paving to a recommendation.

Commissioner Kubow agreed with Commissioner Kingsley's comments about the lighting. He also understood the petitioner's thoughts on going with a traditional paving instead of stamped concrete or a paver because of maintenance issues for the homeowners; he was okay with it being a recommendation. Commissioner Fitzgerald agreed with the comments about the lighting; however, he felt the specialty paving should be a requirement. Commissioner Fasolo agreed with the lighting comments as well, and felt that specialty paving at the entries should be requirement because if done correctly, it should not be a maintenance issue.

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

13. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE INTERNAL ROADWAY LIGHTING BE DARK SKY COMPLIANT, WITH A RECOMMENDATION THAT THE LIGHT DESIGN BE MORE MODERN AND LESS TRADITIONAL, TO BE REVIEWED BY STAFF.

Staff reviewed the motion for clarification about the window and trim colors, and to confirm the requirements versus recommendations.

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