

APPROVED

MINUTES OF
THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING
HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
JULY 26, 2016

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

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

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Maqbool Khan & George Simoulis for *Marathon Gas Station*
Stephen Chakko, Owner of *Marathon Gas Station*
Norm Hassinger for *634 S. Burton Pl.*
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM JUNE 28, 2016

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FASOLO, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 28, 2016. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM JULY 12, 2016

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FASOLO, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF JULY 12, 2016. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 2. COMMERCIAL REVIEW

DC#16-084 – Marathon Gas Station – 1706 W. Northwest Highway.

Maqbool Khan and **George Simoulis**, representing the design team, and **Stephen Chakko**, the property owner, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing a complete renovation of an existing Marathon Gas Station building and site. Two existing mechanic bays are proposed to be converted to an indoor food mart and the exterior of the building will receive a complete makeover. The existing fuel pumps and canopy will remain; however, they will be re-branded and converted from Marathon to BP branding. The site will be improved with additional parking spaces for the food mart, new landscaping, and a new ground sign. This project does require review by the Plan Commission and approval by the Village Board as a Special Use.

With regards to the architectural design, the existing brick on the building is painted white. The petitioner is proposing to remove the paint to expose the existing reddish brick color, and repair and tuckpoint the brick as needed. The existing mechanic bay doors will be infilled with new clear anodized aluminum storefronts. A limestone base and new EIFS parapet wall completes the design. Overall, the proposed makeover will be a very nice improvement to the existing building, and the design fits well with the "BP" rebranding of the existing fuel pumps and canopy.

One new mechanical unit on the roof will be screened with a 4-sided screen system attached to the unit. It is recommended that the color of the mechanical screen be tan to match the EIFS wall color. The trash area is located behind the building and will be screened with a wood fence and metal gates. New landscaping is proposed throughout the site, and a detailed review of the landscaping is being conducted by Staff and the Plan Commission for compliance with the landscaping code requirements, including: the lack of landscaped parking islands, screening along the roads, and improved screening between the residential property to the north.

Signage is not included in this review, but it should be noted that the proposed monument ground sign is located within the 12-foot visibility triangle. The location of the ground sign will need to be adjusted to maintain a clear view from the driveway. It is recommended that the new sign be required to be a monument style sign (instead of pole mounted) as illustrated on the renderings. All new signage is required to comply with Chapter 30, Sign Code, and separate sign permits are required for all signage.

Staff recommends approval of the design with a requirement that the color of rooftop mechanical screen be a tan color to match the EIFS parapet wall, and a requirement that the ground sign be a monument style sign as illustrated on the renderings.

Mr. Kahn stated that re-branding of the existing gas station to "BP" will result in some renovations to the interior and exterior of the existing building. They are also working with Planning Staff with regards to the Plan Commission process.

Commissioner Kubow felt the proposed renovations were nice and he agreed with the requirements in the Staff report. He had no further comments.

Commissioner Fitzgerald agreed with the comments already said. In addition, he was concerned about the lack of landscaping, with only 4 shrubs and 17 perennials currently being proposed for the entire site. When landscaping is being discussed with Staff during the Plan Commission process, he encouraged additional landscaping to help soften the side wall of the building. **Chair Eckhardt** asked why the project did not include a fully developed landscape plan for Design commission review. **Mr. Hautzinger** replied that Staff is currently working with the petitioner on landscaping for this site, with encouragement to add plantings along the property line to screen the adjacent paved

area. Staff felt the landscaping was close to completion at this time. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** was in favor of allowing Staff to review final landscaping for the project.

Chair Eckhardt asked about the purpose of the wing wall on the front elevation, and **Mr. Khan** replied that it is an existing wall. **Chair Eckhardt** liked the design and asked Staff to advise the commissioners of any landscape issues that might arise with the project. He also asked that the motion include comments from Staff about the monument sign.

Mr. Chakko asked if the existing ground sign could be raised 2-feet higher because of visibility concerns from Northwest Highway. He explained that the existing ground sign is approximately 8 to 10-feet tall, and other BP ground signs are around 14-feet tall. **Commissioner Kubow** somewhat agreed that a 6-foot monument sign would not do much for west to east visibility. **Mr. Hautzinger** explained that 6-feet is the dimension in the sign code that differentiates between a monument style sign and a pole sign. A 6-foot monument sign has no setback requirement, as opposed to a taller ground sign that must be set back a minimum of 3-feet, and in this case the sign must be set back further due to the visibility at the driveway. **Chair Eckhardt** agreed that a 6-foot monument sign could be difficult to see. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** preferred a 6-foot monument sign, which he felt would have adequate visibility. He also said that the colors indicate what the station is, there are colors and a logo on the canopy, and there is signage on the building. **Mr. Chakko** explained that gas prices will be posted on the ground sign and BP signs also have an electronic message reader, with their smallest sign 12 or 14-feet tall. **Chair Eckhardt** pointed out the option of a variation if a taller sign is wanted by the petitioner. **Commissioner Fasolo** felt the ground sign should be no taller than what currently exists.

Mr. Hautzinger clarified that the intent was that the petitioner not return to the Design Commission for signage review. Signage is not typically part of a commercial redevelopment review because often the signage designs are not fully developed at the time of the review. Any and all signage will require a sign permit application and review by Staff for code compliance. He also reiterated Staff's recommendation to require a monument style ground sign as illustrated on the rendering, and that can be conditioned for the design to be approved by Staff.

Chair Eckhardt asked for discussion on the concept that Staff presented with regards to signage. **Commissioner Kubow** preferred to hear the petitioners' response first. **Commissioner Fasolo** felt no need for the petitioner to come back with signage as long as it met code and no larger than the existing ground sign. After seeing photos provided by the petitioner, **Commissioner Fitzgerald** felt the existing sign was big and fully visible; a taller sign was not necessary because the existing sign could be read clearly. He was not comfortable with saying that a new ground sign could be as tall as the existing sign without verification of the height. It was pointed out that the shrubs located near the base of the existing ground sign were on the adjacent property. **Chair Eckhardt** was inclined to allow a slightly larger sign than shown on the rendering; the existing ground sign looked a little tall; and he felt that 8-feet was an appropriate height.

Commissioner Kubow felt it was unnecessary to make the petitioner come back with signage; Staff has already recommended that a 6-foot monument style sign be required. **Chair Eckhardt** pointed out that code allows a 16-foot tall ground sign, which he could not support. **Mr. Chakko** reiterated that other BP ground signs are 14-feet tall and include an electronic reader board, which will be difficult to see from the street if the sign is not at least 14-feet tall. **Mr. Hautzinger** explained that an electronic message board sign is not allowed; only the electronic LED price is allowed on the ground sign.

Chair Eckhardt wanted the petitioner to be required to come back with signage since they did not know the type of sign they want at this time, and they have no images to present tonight. He added that the commissioners have typically been tough on petitioners regarding signs, and he did not want to put this responsibility on Staff. That being said, **Commissioner Fitzgerald** felt that the monument sign being shown in the rendering was a beautiful sign, with stone at the bottom that picks up the wainscoting on the building, which he preferred over a big, tall ground sign. **Commissioner Kubow** agreed. **Chair Eckhardt** clarified that the commissioners like the existing ground sign,

although they understand the petitioner wants something taller. He encouraged the petitioner to come back for review of the signage once they know exactly what they want.

Mr. Khan said that they would meet with BP to discuss signage and come back for further review of signage.

Commissioner Fasolo asked if the green color on the canopy and on the building were different, and Mr. Kahn replied that they will be the same color, which is a standard color for BP. Commissioner Fasolo felt that the louvers above the entry door should be painted the same green color to help them disappear, and the stone at the base of the building should continue across the wing wall. Mr. Chakko replied that the panels above the door are not louvers; they are a standard BP design element that matches the color in the center of the BP logo on the canopy. Commissioner Fasolo agreed with all of the requirements in the Staff report.

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

Mr. Hautzinger suggested a motion for approval of the overall project tonight, with a requirement that the petitioner return for review of the ground sign, so the entire project is not held up because of the sign. Commissioner Fitzgerald pointed out the existing tree on the adjacent Jimmy D's property that would block a taller ground sign; therefore, a lower ground sign might be beneficial.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FASOLO, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR RENOVATIONS TO THE *MARATHON GAS STATION* LOCATED AT 1706 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY. THIS APPROVAL IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE PLANS RECEIVED ON 7/15/16, COLOR RENDERINGS RECEIVED 7/8/16, 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 THE COLOR OF THE ROOFTOP MECHANICAL UNIT SCREEN BE A TAN COLOR TO MATCH THE EIFS PARAPET WALL.
2. A REQUIREMENT TO WORK WITH STAFF ON THE FINAL LANDSCAPE PLAN.
3. THE MONUMENT GROUND SIGN IS APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AND IF THE PETITIONER WANTS A TALLER OR DIFFERENT GROUND SIGN, THEN IT SHOULD COME BACK FOR DESIGN COMMISSION REVIEW.
4. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE STONE BASE ON THE FRONT OF THE BUILDING BE CONTINUED TO THE EDGE OF THE WING WALL.
5. 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.
6. COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES.

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