

APPROVED

MINUTES OF  
THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS  
DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING  
HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.  
APRIL 6, 2017

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

Members Present: Ted Eckhardt, Chair  
Anthony Fasolo  
John Fitzgerald

Members Absent: Kirsten Kingsley  
Jonathan Kubow

Also Present: Michael Brito-Amador for *Mago Grill & Cantina*  
Anthony Massarelli, Owner of *845 S. Bristol Ln.*  
George Evangelopoulos, Architect for *845 S. Bristol Ln.*  
Scott Nielsen, Fairfield Homes for *919 N. Fernandez Ave.*  
Chris Russo, ALA Architects for *919 N. Fernandez Ave.*  
Joe Labelle, Rize Properties for *948 N. Fernandez Ave.*  
Chris Russo, ALA Architects for *948 N. Fernandez Ave.*  
Brent Widler, Architect for *828 N. Forrest Ave.*  
Megan Carlson, Owner of *828 N. Forrest Ave.*  
Tomasz Augusta, Avas Atelier Design for *905 W. Maude Ave.*  
Agnes Piersa, Owner of *905 W. Maude Ave.*  
Kris Shirley, Brentwood Development for *1111 W. Maude Ave.*  
Alex Pereira, UP Development for *Heart's Place*  
Therese Thompson, Cordogan, Clark & Associates for *Heart's Place*  
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM MARCH 14, 2017

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FASOLO, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 14, 2017. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FASOLO, TO MOVE PROJECT DC#17-025, MAGO GRILL & CANTINA, TO THE BEGINNING OF THE AGENDA. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 8. COMMERCIAL REVIEWDC#17-036 – Heart’s Place – 120-122 E. Boeger Pl.

Therese Thompson, representing *Cordogan, Clark & Associates*, and Alex Pereira, representing *UP Development*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to build a new 18,800 square foot, two-story, 16-unit, multi-family supportive housing development to provide housing for families living with disabilities that are in need of supportive services. All units within the building will be 2-bedroom. The first floor contains 7 units, as well as laundry and storage space, a community room, and two offices that can be used to provide the supportive services to the residents. The proposed development includes site improvements with new on-grade parking, an outdoor gazebo, and landscaping throughout the site. The subject property consists of two lots of record comprising a total of 40,435 square feet (0.93 acres). The east lot, which is currently vacant, is zoned B-2, General Business District, while the west lot is zoned B-1, Limited Retail Business District. This proposal requires review by the Plan Commission and approval by the Village Board as a Planned Unit Development, approval to consolidate and rezone the two lots to I, Institutional, as well as various zoning variations (zoning district area, collector street frontage, building/pavement separation, gazebo in the side yard, and parking quantity reduction).

With regards to the architectural design, the overall design has a nice scale and proportion, and a good balance of stone and siding on all facades. The dark brown siding color contrasts nicely with the white trim and the “Sienna” stone, creating a very attractive appearance. The design fits well with the surrounding one and two-story commercial buildings that are primarily dark brown brick construction.

Staff comments relative to site design are as follows:

1. **Parking.** As part of the Plan Commission review, construction of the land-banked parking spaces may be required as part of the development.
2. **Trash Enclosure.** It is recommended that the trash enclosure be constructed of masonry to match the building in lieu of vinyl which is less durable.
3. **Landscaping.**
  - a. As part of the Plan Commission review:
    - i. 4” caliper shade trees are required in the parking islands at the end of all parking rows.
    - ii. Staff is recommending that a 6 foot tall fence be provided on the sides and rear of the property for additional site buffer and security, and additional evergreen trees be provided along the fence.
    - iii. Four additional existing trees are recommended to be saved.
  - b. Additional foundation plantings along the south (front) and east elevations are recommended. The plantings should be layered and consist of a mix of shrubs, perennials, and groundcover.
  - c. Brick pavers are recommended at the main entrance.
  - d. Site furnishings including benches and planter pots are recommended in key site areas such as at the main entrance and under the gazebo.
4. **Mechanical Unit Screening.** The Site Plan indicates 18 individual condensing units on grade. 14 units are on the side of the building, and 4 units are in the rear. All mechanical equipment is required to be screened from public view, so it is recommended that all 18 condensing units be moved to the back of the building and screened with landscaping.
5. **Ground Sign.** The proposed sign is too tall and large, and does not comply with code. 40 sf is the maximum allowed sign area, where 48 sf is proposed. It is recommended that the overall height of the sign be reduced to 6 feet above grade. The message on the sign is small as compared to the size of the sign panel; consider enlarging the message for better readability.

With all of these comments in mind, Staff recommends approval.

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

With regards to the comments about mechanical unit screening, **Ms. Thompson** stated that there was probably not enough room to line up all 18 of the condensing units across the width of the site, as suggested by Staff. However, they are not opposed to beefing up the landscaping as much as needed on the south elevation to better screen the mechanical units. She also stated that they intend to comply with code for the proposed ground sign; however, the final text on the sign has not been determined. **Chair Eckhardt** commented that the commissioners are looking at the design of the sign as part of the overall review of the project tonight, and he asked for more specific details about it. **Ms. Thompson** replied that the ground sign would not be illuminated, the panel color would be a dark color to match the dark siding on the building, the trim color would be white to match the white siding on the building, the stone would be the same as the stone on the building, and the aluminum letters have not yet been determined, although they could be either a mill finish, or a light anodized aluminum to stand out against the dark sign background, or a white baked enamel to match the trim. **Chair Eckhardt** had no issue with the design of the ground sign as shown in the drawing.

**Ms. Thompson** said that other than their concerns about trying to move all of the condensing units to the north side of the building, they have no concerns with the other suggestions made by Staff. She added that although it is not shown on the drawings, they are considering adding site furniture on the patio, the gazebo, and possibly a bench or two under the entrance canopy.

**Commissioner Fasolo** liked the design of the new building, the materials, and the compositions; it is nicely designed, and he was confident that the final sign design will meet code; the colors and materials are consistent with the building. With regards to the condensing units, he suggested locating the units in a well on the roof, and **Ms. Thompson** replied that it can be difficult to make this type of roof detail look normal and screen the units from the adjacent neighbors, especially on a 2-story building like this. They felt the units would be less visible if they were located on the ground and screened with landscaping. **Commissioner Fasolo** understood; however, he felt the units that are adjacent to the gazebo could be pushed further north to be more on the northwest corner. He also agreed with Staff comments about changing the trash enclosure to masonry to be consistent with the building. **Commissioner Fasolo** also agreed with the other comments about the site regarding brick pavers and site furnishings.

**Commissioner Fitzgerald** agreed with all of the Staff comments, and felt it was a very nice building on all four sides, which is appreciated. He suggested dressing up the single doors shown on both the east and the west elevations, which **Ms. Thompson** stated were exit-only doors in the stairwell. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** commented that 'Austrian Pine' can be killed by fungus, and 'Hameln Grasses' can be difficult to grow.

**Chair Eckhardt** felt the project was great, and although he initially thought that the stone should be raised all the way up, the horizontal line going around the building is a nice detail.

**Commissioner Fitzgerald** said that he was in favor of allowing Staff to review and approve the ground sign.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER FASOLO, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FITZGERALD, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR HEART'S PLACE TO BE LOCATED AT 120-122 E. BOEGER DRIVE. THIS APPROVAL IS BASED ON THE PLANS RECEIVED 3/10/17, 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 FINAL DESIGN OF THE GROUND SIGN BE REVIEWED BY STAFF.
2. A REQUIREMENT TO EITHER PAINT THE SINGLE-DOOR ON BOTH THE EAST AND WEST ELEVATIONS TO MATCH THE SIDING OR PROVIDE PANELIZATION TO THE DOORS.
3. A REQUIREMENT TO MOVE THE CONDENSING UNITS LOCATED NEXT TO THE GAZEBO, FURTHER NORTH TOWARDS THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF THE BUILDING.

4. A REQUIREMENT TO SCREEN ALL OF THE CONDENSING UNITS WITH EVERGREEN LANDSCAPING.
5. A REQUIREMENT TO REPLACE THE 'AUSTRIAN PINE' AND 'HAMELN GRASSES' WITH A DIFFERENT PLANTING MATERIAL.
6. A REQUIREMENT TO CHANGE MATERIAL ON THE TRASH ENCLOSURE FROM VINYL TO MASONRY, TO MATCH THE BUILDING.
7. A REQUIREMENT TO ADD MORE FOUNDATION PLANTINGS ALONG THE SOUTH AND EAST ELEVATIONS, TO PROVIDE MORE LAYERING WITH A MIX OF SHRUBS, PERENNIALS AND GROUND COVER.
8. A RECOMMENDATION TO PROVIDE BRICK PAVERS AT THE MAIN ENTRANCE.
9. A RECOMMENDATION TO ADD SITE FURNISHINGS THROUGHOUT THE SITE, INCLUDING THE MAIN ENTRANCE GAZEBO AND PATIO.
10. THIS REVIEW DEALS WITH ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, NOR REPRESENT ANY TACIT APPROVAL OR SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED LAND USE OR 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.
11. COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES.

**Chair Eckhardt** felt it was a hardship that the trash enclosure is all masonry, and he suggested changing it to include stone corner piers and a combination of materials that are on the building. **Ms. Thompson** said that from an economic standpoint, in terms of installation they prefer that the enclosure be all stone instead of a combination of materials. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** suggested adding to #3, the option for Staff to review the revised location of the condensing units, in case of any zoning issues. **Commissioner Fasolo** agreed with the suggestion.

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

3. A REQUIREMENT TO MOVE THE CONDENSING UNITS LOCATED NEXT THE GAZEBO, FURTHER NORTH TOWARDS THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF THE BUILDING, TO BE REVIEWED BY STAFF IN CASE OF ANY CHANGES.

**Commissioner Fasolo** suggested changing the gates on the trash enclosure from aluminum to siding to match the building. **Ms. Pereira** was concerned about using fiber cement siding without some substantial backing to it and felt the aluminum was more durable. **Mr. Hautzinger** suggested a dark finish to match the building and **Ms. Thompson** agreed.

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