

APPROVED

MINUTES OF
THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING
HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
AUGUST 8, 2017

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

Members Present: Ted Eckhardt, Acting Chair
Aaron Coon
Kirsten Kingsley

Members Absent: John Fitzgerald
Jonathan Kubow

Also Present: Robert Lisk, DRH Cambridge Homes for *225 S. Waterman Ave.*
Don Meyers, Vital Signs USA for *Popeye's Restaurant*
Mike Henderson, STR Partners for *Greenbrier School*
Ryan Schultz, School District 25 for *Greenbrier School*
Mark Hopkins, HKM Architects for *Sigwalt Apartments*
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM JULY 11, 2017

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER COON, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF JULY 11, 2017. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM JULY 25, 2017

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER COON, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF JULY 25, 2017. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

Acting Chair Eckhardt explained that with 2 commissioners not here tonight, a unanimous vote from all 3 commissioners is required for approval of a project tonight. Petitioners have the option to continue their project to a future meeting when more commissioners are present.

ITEM 5. CBD MULTI-FAMILY NEW REVIEWDC#17-089 – Sigwalt Apartments – 45 S. Chestnut Ave.

Mark Hopkins, representing *HKM Architects*, was present on behalf of the project.

Acting Chair Eckhardt asked if there was any public comment on the project and there was response from the large audience.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is seeking approval of the architectural design for a new five-story apartment building with 88 residential apartment units and 110 indoor parking spaces. Parking will be located in the basement and partially on the first floor. The proposed site is the southern end of the vacant block on Sigwalt Street between Chestnut Avenue and Highland Avenue, just west of the Downtown. The project requires Plan Commission review and Village Board approval for zoning approval including, rezoning from R-3 to R-7, PUD approval, lot consolidation, and various zoning variations. Mr. Hautzinger clarified that all matters regarding zoning, setbacks and density will be reviewed in detail at the Plan Commission level, as well as by the Village Board, and the goal tonight is to review the aesthetic design of the proposed new building. In response to an inquiry from one of the Design Commissioners, Mr. Hautzinger explained that the Village has a comprehensive long range plan which is used to guide future development in the Village, and the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Map indicates the subject site to be high density multi-family which is consistent with the proposal being reviewed tonight.

Overall, the proposed design has a nice composition that relates well to the buildings located directly adjacent in the Downtown, such as the Vail Avenue parking garage, Dunton Tower Apartments, and Metropolis Loft condominium. The design includes a nice mix and balance of exterior materials. The colors work well together and complement the adjacent Downtown buildings. A similar example of scale and materials in this area is the existing multi-family building located at 110 S. Evergreen, which is in the neighborhood on the south end of the Downtown. 110 S. Evergreen is six-stories in height, and has a light colored base, brick body, and metal cladding on the top floor.

With regards to the proposed design, Staff would suggest the Design Commission evaluate the following:

1. Although there are examples of metal cladding in the Downtown, the Design Commission should evaluate the quantity and color of metal panel siding on the proposed design.
2. There appears to be a lot of wall space above the top floor windows. If possible, evaluate lowering the height of the top floor parapet walls one or two feet.
3. Evaluate stepping back portions of the top floor to break down the overall mass of the building, such as recessing balconies at the outside corners.

Overall, Staff supports the proposed architectural treatment of the building and believes it will be a nice addition to the Downtown.

Rooftop mechanical units are required to be fully screened from public view. The proposed design has all of the rooftop mechanical equipment recessed from the exterior walls and enclosed within mechanical equipment screens. Trash dumpsters will be stored inside the building. The exterior transformer on the east side of the building should be fully screened with landscaping or other appropriate method. The proposed landscaping will be reviewed in detail as part of the Plan Commission review and Village Board approval, but overall the proposed landscaping is minimal and it is recommended that additional landscaping be provided. The landscaping should be layered to help soften the proposed building, and specialty paving should be considered at the main entrance. The rendering shows a modest-sized development identification sign adjacent to the main entrance facing Sigwalt Street, which is nicely designed, complies with code, and is appropriate in this location. Separate sign permit applications are required for all signage.

With the comments previously stated, Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Hopkins reviewed the colors and materials being proposed for the new building, and presented samples. He said that a dark color is being proposed for the new building because it is a reticent material that tends to recede. The windows will be black and go all the way to the floor for a more upscale appearance, the balconies will be a dark bronze color, the railings will be black, the siding at the top floor of the building will be dark bronze and consist of metal panels, and there will be 2 different brick colors, "Ginger" and "Heirloom" that will be separated by a cast stone band that will be repeated at the top. There will also be dark colored honed granite at the front entrance. **Mr. Hopkins** explained that the height of the landscape wall around the building tapers down along Sigwalt because there is approximately 3-feet of fall in the grade from the northwest corner to the southeast. Additional layered landscaping can be provided as suggested by Staff.

Acting Chair Eckhardt asked for clarification on the east and north elevations, with regards to materials. **Mr. Hopkins** stated that the same architectural theme is carried around the building, because they consider all four elevations to be the 'front'. Metal panels are used below the windows as a design feature to group windows together. Entrance to the parking will be on the east elevation, with an overhead door and recessed wall sections with lintels for articulation. The north elevation has parking all along the first floor with an enclosed parking ramp element at the northeast corner of the building. **Acting Chair Eckhardt** asked about future development plans to the north and **Mr. Hautzinger** stated that currently there are no formal plans for the property north of the site and the Village Comprehensive Plan calls for mixed-use to the north. **Mr. Hopkins** added that the west elevation will include live windows in the first floor garage area with obscured glass that will be lit, as well as recessed wall areas with landscaping. The parapet could be lowered approximately 1-foot if necessary; they want the building to be as low as it can be. The suggestion to recess the balconies is more difficult because it will take square footage out of the building and the owner is not in favor of doing so. The walk-out amenity deck on the second-floor, which will not be visible from the street except for the arbor element that will wrap around the first-floor of the structure, will consist of a combination of paver areas, seating groups, and outdoor grilling stations.

Commissioner Coon asked about the size of the brick and **Mr. Hopkins** replied that the sample brick is smaller than the utility size brick being proposed. **Commissioner Coon** said he is really excited to see an apartment building on this site and he understands that the future planning calls for high density residential, but he didn't realize that this proposal is exceeding the allowed FAR and site coverage area but that is an issue for Plan Commission. In terms of the quality of the building, in black and white elevation he saw good proportions and he liked the base-middle-top, and the ganging of the windows; however, he felt it started to fall apart in the renderings and the building does not belong in Downtown Arlington Heights. He was having a hard time with the idea of the light gauge metal siding; every building in our Downtown is a permanent material, and the light gauge metal panels would not hold up and are not in keeping with the quality of the Downtown. He gave an analogy that the proposed design is equivalent to the quality of a cardboard box of wine, as opposed to a nice bottle of wine. He said that the quality and the long term standing of the materials of our Downtown buildings is vitally important, and he could not vote for this project with the metal siding; it has to go masonry. He pointed out the precedence for this in the Commercial Design Guidelines, which discourages using light gauge metal and states that the upper facade should give the building its feeling of importance, it defines the architectural style, and it should relate in a coordinated manner to the neighboring buildings. He did not see anything with the upper floor on the new building that relates at all to any building in Downtown Arlington Heights.

Commissioner Coon said that he lives on Highland Avenue, directly south of the site, and the new building will be in his front yard. He has concerns about the lower balcony being problematic in terms of noise; this is a huge concern for him. He liked the relief of the Sigwalt facade and how it steps back, the proportions are great and he is not afraid of the building height or the massing; however, he is hugely concerned with water drainage and retention on the site and he does not know how that is being handled for this project. In terms of the other elevations, he felt the balconies on the Chestnut and Highland elevations needed to be pushed in because the building is very flat, and the scale of the overall elevation is monstrous compared to the adjacent single-family homes; scale is very important. He would vote no for this project unless the materials change and something changes at the top of the building.

Commissioner Kingsley had similar comments. She felt the building was nicely designed, although she was also taken back a bit when she did not see as much relief, or push and pull in the elevations. However, there are a lot of

elements about the building that she really likes, such as the front being terraced and the front wall, which if done well, could be very nice, which she knows is the intention; therefore, it should be reviewed to make sure the details actually come out. As far as massing, she did not want to see the building any taller; she felt the proportion was fine for this area and it fits with the long range plan. She acknowledged that Arlington Heights is all about brick, and although brick is a long lasting material and better than EIFS, she wants relief from brick, and she commended the petitioner for trying to bring in another material that will give relief to other buildings in Arlington Heights. She referred to the building at 110 S. Evergreen, which is an older but similar building with black windows, a cream colored base, a brick building, and metal at the top. **Commissioner Coon** commented that the use of metal on that building as a standing seam metal roof reads as a roof and not as a replacement to the brick wall. He sees value engineering pouring out of the proposed project, and from the start, he felt this was the wrong direction for our Downtown. This site has been an open lot the entire 12 years he has lived in his home, and if this is what the answer is, then he would wait another 10 years for the right answer.

Commissioner Kingsley agreed and reiterated that the materials on the building at 110 S. Evergreen are similar; however, she understood that the metal on that building looks like a roof, as opposed to the metal on the proposed building that looks like it is value engineered. She was not opposed to metal on the new building, a metal that looks like siding, although she suggested a different material such as a smooth panel. The way it terminates at the top could also be different; the building does not need to have a cornice, just some type of reveal to give it shadow, which is not being seen right now. She reiterated the suggestion to have the push-and-pull of the facade so it is not quite as massive, and although she was glad that the south and west elevations are being treated as 'front' elevations, she felt that the east and north elevations look like the back of a building and should include more fake windows in the recessed areas, and if possible the transformer moved to the north elevation. She also asked about the material for the wrap of the balconies and underneath the balconies, and **Mr. Hopkins** replied that the wrap would be smooth painted aluminum and a painted aluminum soffit system underneath the balconies; however, they are considering using hanger rods, which are not shown in the elevations. **Commissioner Kingsley** was glad to see the granite sample in person because the renderings did not do it justice; however, she was still unsure about using granite, although it did go with the brick. She also suggested using less of an 'old school' type of text for the name of the building at the front entrance. She encouraged a more contemporary font for the sign.

Acting Chair Eckhardt asked if the new building would include a dog run, and if there were underground tanks for storm water detention. **Mr. Hopkins** replied that there is no dog run proposed, and underground detention vaults would be located in the north yard and part of the west yard. **Acting Chair Eckhardt** said that he always starts with 3 color materials when designing a building, which the petitioner has done, and he generally supports the idea of a darker object on top of a building to make the building appear less tall. He referenced a new building proposal for the Hickory/Kensington redevelopment area that is very similar to this building and other buildings in Chicago. This design seems to be a trend in Chicago, and it is not a transition building. He wanted the building to appear richer, and felt the metal should be replaced with a richer product. He liked the granite at the front entrance, but felt there should be more of it at the ground level, like a wainscot around the building. He would not want to see smooth metal paneling at the entrance. He acknowledged that the building design is definitely more contemporary, but he felt the material at the top of the building needed more study. He sees the top floor being similar to an antique building in Chicago that has had a metal clad addition added on the top, which is appropriate in Chicago, but he maybe does not like that aesthetic for this building. The configuration of the second floor relief on the elevation is wonderful and creates an element of space for tenants. The tall windows are awesome. He asked the petitioner to comment about the monolithic, tall, smooth brick surfaces, which concerned him. He acknowledged the economy of the cantilevered balconies, but expressed concern about the flatness of the building walls, which he is not yet comfortable with; and he suggested adding some relief to the corner units or the larger units. The building is very symmetrical and well planned, and he felt the petitioner took a conservative attitude that is appropriate. **Acting Chair Eckhardt** said the design is not quite there yet, he is not afraid of the height, and the massing was okay; however, he was concerned about the direction on the skin treatment.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mark Meskowskes, 100 S. Vail Avenue. He said this is an awesome project and he likes that it is different than everything else in the Downtown. He questioned why the new building should look like everything else in town, with brick at the top, although he agreed that maybe something different could be done at the top of the building.

Commissioner Coon replied that he is not advocating that the new building have a metal cornice with brackets underneath, nor is he advocating that the building look like the Wing Street building with the Italian entrance and the ornate stone; he is not looking for more detail. There are a lot of things he likes about the building, where he can see the architect's design touch, mainly with the streetscape and how the building meets the street, the landscaping, and the landscape walls; however, he wanted to see more relief in the overall massing to break down the general boxiness of the building. He was not advocating to replace the metal panels with brick per se, but felt that other quality materials should be considered, such as a terra cotta rain screen system that is a long standing material. He wanted to see a more permanent material, not necessarily more of the same brick; something that speaks to the longevity of the Downtown buildings.

Mark Meskowskes said that buildings in the Downtown all look the same to him in terms of buildings on Evergreen, Wing Street, and Vail Avenue. He liked the more contemporary look being proposed with the metal panels because it brings a change to the Downtown that is not currently there.

Mary Beth Delaney, 44 N. Vail Avenue. She asked what will happen with the power lines located on the site, and pointed out that there are existing parking problems in the Downtown and she is concerned about where guests of the new building will park, and whether the 110 parking spaces being proposed for the 88 units is sufficient. **Acting Chair Eckhardt** explained the purview of the Design Commission, which did not include issues such as parking, which are part of the Plan Commission and Village Board review. **Mr. Hopkins** replied that they are working in terms of code compliance with the number of cars needed on a per unit basis, and a traffic report that includes a parking component is part of the Plan Commission review process; however, he added that the neighborhood is going to absorb some of the parking. **Acting Chair Eckhardt** encouraged the resident to attend the Plan Commission hearing where these items will be addressed.

Tim Meyer, 29 S. Mitchell Avenue, said he had a lot of questions. He is confused by Architects calling what they do architecture, when all they are doing is taking a box and painting it different colors. Architecture should have shape and flow, and what is being shown tonight is a shoebox with different rectangles drawn on it, which is not architecture or design. He felt that better could be done in our town; he felt that Arlington Heights is more about shape and about history. Does anyone even know who Sigwalt was? There is history here and it is being ignored. He felt there was an opportunity to do something that could have a positive affect and reflect the community, not just paste over something that we have all seen somewhere else. This building is exactly the same design that the architect sold to Uptown in LaGrange; it was just built this past year, and has very slight differences. He has seen it on the architect's website and he drives past the building in LaGrange all the time. He is really disappointed that the Village is willing to accept a building that is already in a town within a 10 mile radius; this is not what Arlington Heights is about. We are a leader community, not a follower. He wanted to hear feedback from the commissioners about architectural standards in our Village, and history.

Ed Rojek, 104 S. Highland Avenue, lives directly across the street to the south. He pointed out that Sigwalt Street is not actually as wide as shown in the renderings. He is concerned about the units and the patio on the south elevation that will overhang his home, with people looking into his home. This situation is not found anywhere else in the Village. He has lost a lot of privacy already with the adjacent parking garage, and now with this new apartment building he will lose all of his privacy. You can hear the people cheering from Dunton Towers on nights when they are watching sporting events. He felt that better could be done in the Downtown and he is disappointed to see the proposed apartment building.

Amy Dempsey, 10 S. Dunton Avenue. She has lived in the Wing Street building and owns in Metro Lofts. She is all for condominiums, but she felt that people have invested in this area with rehabbed homes, custom homes, and vintage

homes with more brick, where each home is unique. She felt the similar referenced building at 110 S. Evergreen is awful, and Dunton tower has similar balconies as the proposed design, and they are rusted. She was also concerned about parking issues and the logistics of entering the parking garage directly across from the existing parking garage. She wanted to see more vintage or eclectic single-family homes on this site. She felt the proposed black balconies do not go, they will rust, and it is an eyesore.

Rosemary Rawleigh, 151 W. Wing Street. She lives on the south side of the Wing Street building, 8th floor, and will be looking at this new building constantly, since the northern portion of this site could be vacant for another 10 to 12 years. She has serious concerns about the ambience, the prettiness, the visual beauty, and the harshness of the north elevation, because it will be open perhaps to Campbell Street, for another decade. The new building is awfully close and the north elevation is not attractive. It was unfortunate that the Village felt that the 25 year old building located at 110 S. Evergreen, which is old and sad looking, is the best comparison of architecture being emulated using metal panels. She felt the building had a long way to go, especially for the people living in single-family homes in the area, to make this building a transition from multi-density to single-family.

Keith Allen, 46 S. Chestnut Avenue. He lives on the corner directly west of the site. He has heard no comments addressing context with the 100+ year old homes on Chestnut. His home was built in 1906, and the rest of the homes down the street are the same vintage. He has heard nothing from Staff addressing context towards the residents, or anything regarding the neighborhoods; everything was directed back toward Downtown. He lives 50-feet away from the new building; it is awful.

Ingrid Kubitz, 12 S. Chestnut Avenue. She lives at the north end of the block, across from the site. She reiterated the transition issue; she thinks that is all wrong, and the building is way too tall. She has a one-story single-family home and she believes the maximum height is 3-stories on the other side of the street. She did not know if the building had to be this tall. **Acting Chair Eckhardt** encouraged the neighbors to continue to express their concerns at future Village meetings. He pointed out that single-family homes previously existed on this property and were replaced with the Paddock Publication building. The single-family homes located directly west of the site are on the edge of a transition neighborhood, and the commissioners want to hear residents' concerns, and determine whether or not there is an architectural solution to perhaps step up the building and soften the elevations. Ms. Kubitz added that before she bought her home, she talked to Village Planning who told her that Norwood Builders owned the lot and that anything built here would transition to the single-family homes.

Mary Karavas, 115 S. Chestnut Avenue. She lives 4 lots south of the site and is a lifelong resident of Arlington Heights. She grew up in a 100+ year old home and now lives in a home that was built in 1974. Although she loves her home, she loves her neighborhood more, and her neighbors and her town, and she refers to her current home as being built in the 'coma period' for architecture, which is what she also felt when she saw the rendering of the new building; please do not make the same mistake.

Lou Greifenstein, 38 S. Chestnut Avenue. He lives directly across the street from the site to the west, and has lived in his 100+ year old home for about 15 years. He has never stopped working on his home, with updates consistent with the context and age of the home. His neighbors have done the same, all the way down the block it is the same, and the new construction two sites down is going to be made to look the same. He understood this is an architectural review board and he intends on going to the subsequent meetings for other issues regarding the new building. He always knew there was a risk of what might be built on this site, but one of their hopes was that great care is taken to make the transition better, especially for those that face the site directly. **Acting Chair Eckhardt** echoed those thoughts and said that in Chicago there are beautiful old homes next to mid-rise classic architecture and they live next to each other; they have to be equivalent. He felt the proposed new building will eventually get there.

Acting Chair Eckhart closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

Tim Meyer said that his previous questions to the commissioners about architectural standards in the Village were not yet answered. **Acting Chair Eckhardt** replied that he did not like that the professionalism of this commission was

being challenged; the commissioners are respectful of the petitioner's proposed design, the same way they are about any petitioner's proposal. The Village has a set of Design Guidelines that were established to address conformity with building designs, as well as the Village Comprehensive Plan. The commissioners have expressed concerns about the proposed new building tonight and will continue to do so until an acceptable design has been achieved. Although an interesting discussion, a debate about good and bad architecture is not what the commission is here to do tonight. **Acting Chair Eckhardt** respected Mr. Meyer's concerns and urged him to stay involved; the commission is concerned about the same things.

Commissioner Kingsley added that it is great to see all the neighbors here tonight, on a day-to-day basis this commission does not see a lot of residents, and the majority of what the commission reviews are single-family homes; sometimes the commission needs feedback from residents. She explained that the commissioners are all architects and residents of the Village, this is a volunteer position, and the reason we sit on this commission is because we care. We all love the history of this town and we all come from a different part of the aesthetic world, but we work together to make a solution, and it only makes it better if residents come out, even when a project is not in your neighborhood. This commission meets twice a month and all of the projects reviewed are on-line on the Village website.

Acting Chair Eckhart encouraged the petitioner to table the project at this time, with no vote taken tonight. **Mr. Hopkins** acknowledged that they need to reconnoiter and discuss their proposal. He replied that although architecture is subjective, he did take issue with some of the adjectives that were used tonight. The intent is to come up with a well-designed building, which can be done by rolling in good comments. He responded to the concerns about the massing of the building by stating that this is a small building, the runs of the facade are short, with the exception of the north elevation, and if they start breaking this up into one and two room wide panels, it will result in a busy facade. He acknowledged that they struggled with the materials, and they are looking for a good lightweight material that is a relief from the relentless brick they would otherwise have. He felt that three colors of brick on the facade is probably inappropriate and they are looking for that dark color on this building; that is a design goal that they have. He felt that if the wall color was lightened up, it would get more powerful on the street in terms of its overall appearance than it is now; it is going to press into the street more than it does now and it will appear taller than it does now. They intentionally did not go to 6-stories because they are trying to be sensitive as best they can. **Mr. Hopkins** also said that something will happen over time to the north of this new building, which will likely be significantly more massive than this building. This is going to end up in itself being a step down into the neighborhood. That being said, they will look for an alternate material and find something that is practical, he felt a lightweight material would be nice. He resists the facade bounce thing, especially with the south facade, and the likelihood that the north facade is going to be approximately 30-35-feet away from its future neighbor that will probably be taller than this building. They are trying to take the north facade and treat it in the best way they can; not as a back alley between two buildings. They are treating the north wall as a front.

Acting Chair Eckhardt felt that a lot of things the petitioner will be doing with this building will assist the Village Planners in making the area to the north a pedestrian access way, making it a special place, similar to elsewhere in the Downtown. He asked the petitioner if consideration was given to the adjacent single-family homes when the building went from 3 to 5-stories tall. **Mr. Hopkins** said that he was unaware of what the previous studies were for this site; however, they considered 4, 5 and 6-stories, and went for a sense of formality with a touch of contemporary freshness, using the basis of the context for the architecture that has been here since the mid-90's, but a little more crisp and a little more urban; they are trying to do a high quality building. The siding material is intended to be a statement, and the statement is not supposed to be cheap; let's find the right material. He wanted the commissioners to think about the whole facade balance, especially with such short runs of facade. He will go back and consider all of the comments made tonight by the commissioners and the audience. He asked that the project be continued to the next meeting in two weeks.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER COON, TO CONTINUE THE PROJECT FOR SIGWALT APARTMENTS (DC#17-089) TO THE NEXT DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING ON AUGUST 22, 2017.

**COON, AYE; KINGSLEY, AYE; ECKHARDT, AYE.
ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.**

Commissioner Kingsley asked when the site will be rezoned from R-3 to R-7, and why the petitioner is proposing R-7 instead of R-6. **Mr. Hautzinger** replied that rezoning for the project will be reviewed by the Plan Commission and Village Board, and the Village's long range plan, which was updated in 2015, calls for this property to be re-zoned to high-density multi-family which is essentially the R-7 Zoning District, which the petitioner's proposal is consistent with. **Commissioner Kingsley** asked how the Village Comprehensive Plan is approved and **Mr. Hautzinger** replied that Village Board has final approval of the plan.

Commissioner Coon felt that Design Commission approval would move forward easily for the petitioner if they clean up the design and the architect puts more of his own design into the building; the architect can and has done much better; however, he felt the project would have an uphill battle with the Plan Commission review.

Mr. Hautzinger said that as Staff continues to coordinate with the petitioner between now and the next meeting, and after hearing the residents' comments and concerns, he asked the commissioners to summarize their position with the proposed new building. **Commissioner Coon** said the architecture of the new building should follow the Commercial Design Guidelines; the architecture breaks almost every rule in the guidelines as currently proposed. He has no problem with the height; the side elevations should be made less flat; and his biggest concern is the materials, specifically the light gauge metal, which he felt would deteriorate over the years. He would like to see a more contemporary design; there is currently a dyslexic language going on with the building; does it want to be traditional, or does it want to be contemporary. Contemporary materials are being used, but in a traditional way, which is his struggle, and to him, the metal panels come off as a value engineering material. He did not want to see fiber cement siding used instead of the metal. **Commissioner Kingsley** suggested the petitioner use slate, and **Commissioner Eckhardt** suggested a Rainguard Alucabond panel system instead of the metal, which would be a very slick and modern aesthetic. **Commissioner Coon** was in favor of the building not being symmetrical. **Commissioner Eckhardt** was in support of the entire facade moving back 4-feet above the second story, similar to a terraced effect.

Commissioner Kingsley referred to the darker material board presented by the petitioner, which shows that the building is not symmetrical. She suggested using a different material with more shadow and reducing the parapet and having a slight undulation on the other 2 elevations. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said that if he were representing the neighborhood, he would prepare an exhibit of a cross-section from Sigwalt going north, showing the exact profile of the homes, which would be a powerful exhibit. **Mr. Hautzinger** pointed out the context elevations in the packet that show the adjacent houses in context with the proposed building. **Commissioner Coon** said that he is excited to see the new apartment building, he likes that it is taller than the garage, he likes that the garage recedes in scale; he felt the petitioner came in with a value engineered building.

Commissioner Kingsley felt it was the petitioner's responsibility to design the building, including material selection; however, she would suggest a more durable product as an alternate to the metal siding, which could be natural materials such as slate and wood; and other options such as the Alucabond rainscreen. **Commissioner Coon** wanted to see the effort that was put into the south elevation put into the east & west sides of the building including relief to the massing on the sides. **Acting Chair Eckhardt** felt there should be some mid-relief to the side elevations, which he felt was not a small building as stated by the Architect. **Commissioner Kingsley** felt the east elevation (Highland Ave.) turned its back on the street, and a pathway should be added along the east side, as well as on the north side as stated by the petitioner tonight.