

APPROVED

MINUTES OF
THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING
HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
SEPTEMBER 12, 2017

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

Members Present: John Fitzgerald, Chair
Ted Eckhardt
Aaron Coon
Kirsten Kingsley

Members Absent: Jonathan Kubow

Also Present: Mark Hopkins, HKM Achitects for *Sigwalt Apartments*
Matt Katsaros, CA Ventures for *Sigwalt Apartments*
Anthony & Demetra Raschillo, Owners of *621 N. Belmont Ave.*
Jeffrey Everett, Architect for *621 N. Belmont Ave.*
Derik Leary, Kimley-Horn & Associates for *Target*
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM AUGUST 22, 2017

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF AUGUST 22, 2017.

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

ITEM 1. MULTI-FAMILY RE-REVIEWDC#17-089 – Sigwalt Apartments

Mark Hopkins, representing *HKM Architects*, and Matt Katsaros representing *CA Ventures* were present on behalf of the project.

Chair Fitzgerald 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 Downtown Master Plan identifies the southern quarter of this block for 4 to 6 story development. This project requires Plan Commission review and Village Board approval for the following: rezone the property from R-3 One-Family Dwelling District to R-7 Multiple-Family Dwelling District, Planned Unit Development, lot consolidation, and miscellaneous zoning variations. Mr. Hautzinger reminded the audience that the Design Commission's role is to evaluate the design. Matters relating to zoning, such as density and setbacks, will be reviewed by the Plan Commission on September 27, and the public is invited to attend that meeting. The public's comments regarding design are welcomed tonight.

This project was reviewed by the Design Commission on August 8, 2017. At that time, the Design Commission and residents expressed various concerns about the design, so the project was continued so that the design could be further studied, revised, and re-reviewed.

A summary of Staff comments from the August 8th meeting are as follows:

1. Evaluate the quantity and color of the proposed metal panel siding.
2. 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.
4. Provide additional landscaping throughout the site, in a layered design to soften the proposed building.
5. Fully screen the exterior transformer.
6. Consider adding specialty paving at the main entrance.

A summary of Design Commission comments from the August 8th meeting are as follows:

The Design Commission felt that the proposed design had good overall proportions, the building height was fine, and the tall windows looked great. However, they expressed the following primary concerns:

1. Metal Siding. Concern about the appearance, quality, and long-term durability of the metal siding. It was commented that the top floor looked like an addition. Masonry or other more durable cladding materials were suggested.
2. Massing. Concern about the lack of "push and pull" and flatness of the building massing, and the scale of the east and west elevations as it relates to the adjacent single family homes. It was suggested to recess the balconies on the east and west sides, and consider adding some recesses to the corners or larger apartment units.
3. Cornice. The top of the wall termination needed further study, possibly a reveal.
4. First Floor, East Elevation. It was commented that this part of the building lacked the same amount of detailing as the other sides. Additional false windows were suggested to match the west elevation.
5. Sign. A more contemporary font and style for the lettering on the sign was recommended.

A summary of resident comments from the August 8th meeting are as follows:

One resident felt the proposed design looked “awesome” and the different look for the Downtown was welcomed. However, the other residents had the following various design concerns:

1. The design is too boxy, lacking shape and flow. The massing needs to be improved.
2. Concern about context with the adjacent single family homes.
3. The building is too tall and needs better transition to the single-family homes.
4. North elevation is harsh and could be exposed for many years.
5. Concern that the metal balconies will rust and become an eyesore.

In response to the feedback received at the August 8th meeting, **Mr. Hautzinger** presented the following revisions being proposed by the petitioner along with Staff’s comments:

1. Metal Siding. The metal siding on the building has been omitted from the design. Charcoal color brick is now proposed on the top floor, and charcoal color fiber cement lap siding is proposed for the panels below the windows and at recesses in the walls.
 - The charcoal color brick on the top floor of the building is a nice improvement to the design. It gives the building a quality appearance, and works well to tie the building design together.
2. Massing. The walls on the east and west elevations have been recessed at the location of the balconies.
 - The recessed wall areas break up the large flat walls, and this is a very nice improvement to the massing and scale of the side walls.
3. Cornice. A clear anodized metal coping detail has been added around the top of the building.
 - The cornice detail is a nice improvement to the design, whereas the previous design looked unfinished at the top of the building.
4. First Floor. The color of the first floor brick wall has been changed from a light “ginger” color to a dark “charcoal” color to match the top floor of the building.
 - The dark color brick on the first floor is a nice improvement to the design. It coordinates with the top floor, and it works well to visually support and balance the building design.
 - At least one additional false window should be added to the first floor east elevation to add interest and break up the brick wall.
5. Sign. The font on the “Sigwalt Luxury Apartment” sign has been changed to a simpler more modern style, and it is positioned off-center on the wall for a more contemporary appearance.
6. Landscaping. Additional landscaping has been added to the west elevation to soften the building wall. Additional landscaping has also been provided around the electrical transformer, and specialty paving has been added to the main entry landing.
 - Overall, the landscape design is nicely done, and the additional landscaping along the west wall is a nice improvement which will help to soften the building wall and provide an enhanced buffer for the houses directly across the street. The specialty paving at the main entrance is a nice enhancement to the design and arrival experience.
 - It is recommended that the Morton Sweet spire around the electrical transformer be changed to an evergreen shrub to provide year round screening.
 - Consider substituting the Candytuft perennial along the front of the brick garden walls with a different perennial that has more height to soften the wall.

Staff recommends approval of the revised design, with the three recommendations summarized in the Staff report.

Mr. Hopkins said that he was not opposed to adding at least one false window on the first floor, east elevation, as suggested by Staff. He presented the materials being proposed, including the pavers and brick, and explained that the balconies will be aluminum and suspended by steel rods. Specialty pavers are being proposed at the front entrance to the building and up on the roof deck. Pervious pavers are specified for all of the on grade walkways illustrated in a brown pattern on the landscape plan, but all pavers will be of the same colors to complement the brick colors on the building. **Commissioner Eckhardt** asked about the mortar color for each of the 2 brick colors, and **Mr. Hopkins**

replied that the mortar will be tinted to match the color of the bricks.

Commissioner Eckhardt thanked the audience for returning for another review of this project, as well as their patience with this project. He also thanked the petitioner for responding to the comments made by the community, the Design Commission and Staff, with the revisions being presented tonight. He said that he was both surprised and pleased to see the brick now being proposed on the top floor, which he felt was probably a better material than Alucabond, and in terms of the severity of the metal and the unacceptability of metal siding, he felt this was a good alternative. He also felt that the first floor, with the dark brick and polished granite would be very attractive and rich. He liked the colors now being proposed; the stone headers and caps, and in general, he is satisfied with the products on the building. He understood the design aesthetic will not be a classic Arlington Heights building, which he is fine with. Although he was pleased to see some of the recessed areas on the west side elevation, he was not yet convinced if there should be more recessed areas, and he welcomed comments from the other commissioners. With the strong elements of the darker brick, he now liked the flat wall areas in the light brick. He felt the ground level of the new building has been superbly designed with landscaping, elevation change, and tiered landscaping closer to the building. In general, he found the revised design to be closer to the acceptable range for the new building.

Commissioner Kingsley thanked the petitioner for making revisions and listening to the previous comments that were made by the commissioners. She felt the palette was interesting and because of that she liked it; she liked that it was different from other buildings in the Village. She liked the push and pull on the building, and the two sections that are recessed in on the short elevations with the material change. She was not opposed to the previous metal siding, but felt that the brick is perceived as being a better material. She was unsure if the lap siding currently being proposed has more longevity than the metal siding, but she felt the more traditional look would be nice for the building. She also liked the revisions that were made to the north elevation. **Commissioner Kingsley** stated that she liked the design because it almost looks like a warehouse loft, which she meant in a good way; with the big windows and the big expanses; however, she suggested something else be done to enhance the center portion on the south elevation above the second floor. She liked that the cornice is simple, as well as the clear anodized material.

Mr. Hopkins said that changes are being proposed to the front entrance; taking what was previously there as a concept and giving it more pop. A granite with more grain and more polish was selected, the suspended metal canopy was changed from painted charcoal to clear, and they are trying to find either an aluminum or stainless channel to run horizontally in the joints to try to give the black feel more sparkle and pop. **Commissioner Kingsley** asked about the material for the trellis at the second floor, and **Mr. Hopkins** replied that it would be painted metal and suspended stained wood. **Commissioner Kingsley** liked that the front canopy would be clear anodized, and she asked if all the trim would match the Hardi-board siding, and **Mr. Hopkins** said that it would. **Commissioner Eckhardt** asked for clarification on the exact locations of the polished granite, which **Mr. Hopkins** indicated.

Commissioner Coon thanked the petitioner for the revisions that were made, which he appreciated. He asked for clarification from the rendering on the difference between the brick and the lap siding, which **Mr. Hopkins** explained. **Commissioner Coon** liked the change in materials and asked if the petitioner considered a cast stone header at the top floor. **Mr. Hopkins** said that cast stone was considered, but they felt it added a visual weight to the top of the building that they were opposed to. **Commissioner Coon** also liked the difference between the attached balconies on the south elevation, versus the recessed balconies on the sides. **Commissioner Coon** felt the petitioner touched on a lot of the things in the Design Guidelines; however, he wanted to address how the Evaluation Criteria section in the Design Guidelines relates to the proposed design. He said the new building was harmonious with the scale of the garage; he liked that it is taller than the garage and felt that it was harmonious with the Downtown; however, the new building adjacent to single-family homes, he felt it has been handled many different ways.

Commissioner Coon presented an aerial of the site and the surrounding properties, and referred to the mix of commercial buildings and single-family homes that were constructed prior to the Design Guidelines in 1995, all of which he felt were haphazardly designed. He presented a portion of the Village zoning map for the Downtown area where there are a lot of R-7 zoning districts with an R-6 buffer, and in that R-6 there tends to be more 3-story buildings, more lower height, more row homes. He liked an apartment building on this site, as opposed to row homes; however, he

wondered whether some gestures could be made. He explained that the areas highlighted in red on the zoning map are locations where R-7 projects directly abut to single-family homes; however, the majority of these areas have a cascading effect in the building massing. He also presented the list of Evaluation Criteria in the Commercial Design Guidelines, and felt the petitioner touched positively on all of them with the exception of matters relating to scale. Additional aerials showed Arlington Town Center as an example of a stepped down large commercial building, then row homes, and then single-family homes; a cascading effect into the Downtown, versus the older 1970's high density buildings, which **Commissioner Coon** acknowledged nothing could be done about. He wished the petitioner good luck with the variations they are requesting; otherwise he was in support of the project and felt the architecture had come a long way, and he liked the building and the top of the building. He asked if the lap siding was a fiber cement product intended to match the tone of the brick, and **Mr. Hopkins** said that it is.

Chair Fitzgerald said this is the first time he has seen the project and he likes the improvements a lot. He liked that the first floor and top floor of the building are a dark color, which made it feel shorter than it is. He liked the push and pull of the building and the little bit of the layering in front with the walls, and the way the entrance is designed. He agreed that the building looked like it could be an older building that has been 100 percent rehabbed and updated, and he liked the materials being proposed that are not completely foreign to the Downtown. Adding either a fence or evergreens to screen the utilities on Sigwalt would be a requirement for him, and he agreed with Staff's suggestion to substitute the Candytuft perennial with a different perennial, since it is not very hardy. He felt that adding at least one additional false window on the east elevation, first floor, was a nice detail, especially when driving towards the parking garage, and he questioned whether the silver reveals being added in the granite on the front elevation was needed, although he was not opposed to it. In general, he felt the landscape plan was very nice.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Cindy Churchill, lives in the Metropolis building. She asked if there would be a driveway/drop-off located along Sigwalt at the front entrance, because she is concerned about traffic stopping on Sigwalt when people visit the building. **Mr. Hopkins** said that this issue is currently unresolved, although it has been discussed with Planning Department Staff. **Mr. Hautzinger** clarified that this issue should be discussed at the Plan Commission review. Ms. Churchill was also concerned about screening of the utility equipment, and she suggested a small brick wall for screening instead of landscaping. She asked for clarification on the location of the trash dumpsters, and **Mr. Hautzinger** replied that dumpsters will be located inside the building. Ms. Churchill asked if there would be a street behind the building off of Highland Avenue for moving trucks and garbage trucks, and **Mr. Hopkins** referred to the striped loading area shown on Highland Avenue that will accommodate moving trucks and garbage trucks. Ms. Churchill also asked about the number of parking spaces versus units, and whether it was decided not to use the Vail Street parking garage for overflow. **Mr. Hautzinger** replied that 88 apartment units are proposed, with 110 indoor parking spaces, and the issue regarding the Vail Street garage is a Plan Commission matter.

In response to the suggestion for a small brick screening wall for the utility equipment, **Mr. Hopkins** said that he was unsure if this was practical or if there was even enough room to accommodate a brick wall. Currently proposed dense landscape screening will be changed from deciduous to evergreen for the utilities located at the northeast corner of the site; however, they do not control the 2 existing electrical boxes located in the parkway on Sigwalt.

Donald Meersman, 202 S. Highland Avenue. He was unsure if this was the right venue to address a traffic plan for the new building. **Chair Fitzgerald** explained that the Design Commission only reviews the architectural design of the new building, and other items such as traffic will be part of the Plan Commission review.

Michael Voss, 105 S. Mitchell Avenue. He felt that the revisions made were a drastic improvement to the building; much more within the context of the community. He felt that the comments regarding a warehouse look for the building was contradictory to the push/pull appearance, and his biggest concern is the transition from the scale of the new building (R-7) to the adjacent single-family (R-3) neighborhood. He agreed wholeheartedly that the new building lacks the stepped down affect, which he was unsure could be modified at this point. He was also confused about the depth over the entrance, which he could see on the elevation but not on the plan, and he was concerned about parking for

people visiting the new building, which the commissioners replied was part of the Plan Commission review.

Kari Dwyer, 30 S. Chestnut Avenue. Given the fact that her home looks directly at the rear (north) of the new building, she felt the north elevation was very disappointing, and not knowing what future plans are for the remaining portion of the site or what will be adjacent to this new building, felt that very little attention has been given to the rear of the building. From a landscaping perspective, there are only a couple of trees, and nothing from an architectural design perspective that would be appealing; she felt like all the attention was given to the front and sides of the building, and there should be more consideration for the north elevation. **Mr. Hopkins** replied that there is minimal in-and-out on the north elevation, and 18.4' of space between the main portion of the building and the north property line, and 5' of space at the bump out for the ramp at the east end of the north elevation.

Ileana Rodriguez, 18 S. Mitchell Avenue. She has lived in Arlington Heights for 20 years and it was the sense of community and the feel of Arlington Heights that motivated her family to set up roots here. She wanted to share a perspective that is shared among many of the homeowners of this neighborhood regarding this proposed construction, which is that we all want to see something happen on this lot; we want to see it developed and we welcome an active and thriving Chestnut Avenue. During the summer, many times she is stopped by people who tell her how pleasant it is to walk up and down her street when coming in and out of the Downtown, and she welcomes that. She wanted to share 3 reasons why they urge the Design Commission to reconsider this proposed new building as suitable for this neighborhood. The first reason is the historical context of greater Arlington Heights and the fit with the spirit of the Village's long term plan. Among the goals for population and housing, are to preserve the basic single-family character of the Village and to protect the present and future residential areas from encroachment by other less desirable buildings. This is a town of older and more historic buildings, and we are attached to this community and its historic context, and we believe that we feel somewhat alone in advocating for its preservation. In the 2015 survey of the Village's long term plan, 91 percent of the community said that they strongly support a preservation of buildings, and although nothing is being preserved on this particular site, they believe that also reflects the community values of older, historical buildings and preserving a sense of community. They are hard-pressed in seeing how this particular new building across from single-family homes stands up to that spirit, and what the vast majority of this community conveyed through that survey. They look to the Design Commission to partner with them in ensuring that there is a sensible, historically respectful building that enhances the community and does not distract from the history and the context. The second reason is the human activity; she is a social psychologist and thinks about people and how people interact and how people go through our community and our streets, and how that is part of being part of this community. The appeal of that particular area is the connection to the Downtown, sort of a sense of flow of in and out, and the proposed new building feels like it does not connect, and there is no landscaping that is going to make this not feel jarring walking down that street. We want to care for the full experience of the residents and the walkers, and really respect the feel of this particular community. Lastly, she acknowledged that maybe not every building needs to be a classic Arlington Heights building; however, we are actually not a particularly architecturally diverse community; we just do not have that much diversity of architecture, and this new building will stand starkly against the single-family homes that are well preserved invested homes across the street. There does not seem to be enough room or space for development for them to say that this project fits like anything else; it would not be the kind of building that the Village would think of as iconic of this community. Even with the revisions that were made, the building lacks integrity and it lacks grounding, and it feels kind of sad on a site that she felt the Village would want to feature a building to be proud of. We feel accountable to the community and to future generations, and we feel the weight of being part of the community that let this building go through; therefore, we hope that the commission will reconsider the fit of this building.

Commissioner Eckhardt appreciated that the resident spoke so eloquently about 2 major issues, both of which are different from each other; the first issue being size, and the second issue being whether or not we are proud of the new building. Assuming that the Village has designated this land to be zoned R-7 and there is a concept to step the building down, he asked the resident for her opinion about the height of the building on the west elevation on Chestnut Avenue. Ms. Rodriguez remembered the last review of the project where there was a lot of discussion about the height of the garage and the experience of a walker and how it would feel. With her psychology background she could only speak to the experience, which would be to feel like you have space and room when walking down the street. **Commissioner Eckhardt** reiterated that the charge of the Design Commission is to review the architecture of the project being

presented to them tonight, and try to make it as best as possible. If it were so offensive to the commission, because of height, size, mass, color, etc., it would not get approval from the Design Commission, as it was not approved at the last meeting. Although there is significant improvement from the previous design, the issue of height is not under the purview of this commission. Ms. Rodriguez replied that as architects, the commissioners are also thinking ultimately about the human experience within these buildings and spaces, which is why she is trying to compel the commissioners to consider her comments. **Commissioner Eckhardt** encouraged her to continue with the project through the Plan Commission and Village Board reviews.

Dan Rodgers, 206 S. Chestnut Avenue. With regards to a step down, his biggest concern with the single-family homes across the street is sunlight. He felt that a 2-story step down, roughly the same height as the single-family homes, would probably be most aesthetically pleasing. With respect to community, he asked if there are any common outdoor patio areas, which are common in many new buildings, and the second-floor outdoor space was pointed on the plans.

Barbara Voss, 105 S. Mitchell Avenue. She felt Commissioner Eckhardt's points were very well made with regards to what kind of a step down they would like to see; however, she felt it was being compared to an R-6 zoning that does not exist here; so in lieu of an R-6 zoning, anything taller than the surrounding homes seems to be acceptable. She has stood at her kitchen window for the last 27 years and watched her neighbors at Dunton Tower in the wintertime; daylight really does affect the quality of their lives in this neighborhood; we have made a vested interest here. This is a desirable community to live in; however, we are also a city of good neighbors, and part of that is the design concept that is so important, so that it does step down, so that it does gradually wave into the single-family homes that surround this property on two sides, and she hoped that the Design Commission would reconsider the building. It is a beautiful building but it is just not beautiful for where it is right now without a buffer of some kind in between.

Chair Fitzgerald closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

In terms of the building design, **Commissioner Eckhardt** wanted to see a commitment from the petitioner to add another false window on the ground floor as previously discussed, and he questioned if the effort made to create the push/pull on some elevations could be replicated on the north elevation to improve the shadow lines of that elevation. He added that the issue of stepping down is not part of the building design being reviewed tonight.

Commissioner Kingsley agreed that the commissioners are reviewing the building design that has been put in front of them, and the commissioners are not part of the decision regarding the zoning variations. She pointed out that the Village Comprehensive Plan was completed in 2015, which the Design Commission was not part of, and although the commissioners like a lot of the aspects of the new building, the site will be zoned R-7 and the adjacent homes are proposed to be re-zoned to R-6. When the Design Commission approves this project, it does not necessarily mean that the commissioners support the re-zoning and variations that are required. She wanted the record to show that she was unsure if it was appropriate to approve all of the variations. A lot of issues came up tonight, such as site lines, and daylight/shadow lines, parking, and traffic, all of which she felt should be satisfactorily addressed prior to getting any variations; however, there is nothing the Design Commission can do about that.

Commissioner Coon thanked Commissioner Kingsley for her comments, and added that when the commissioners review this project, they are reviewing the building, which is attractive; however, one of the evaluation criteria of the Design Guidelines is 'Conformance to Ordinances', and seeking 10 variances tells him that it does not conform to ordinances. Although the proposed building does conform to the Comprehensive Plan, the zoning requirements for R-7 versus the Comprehensive Plan, nearly all of these future R-7 properties are going to require variances, because the minimum site area for an R-7 building is 2 acres and all of these properties are one acre or less, all along Sigwalt. Therefore, to him the zoning ordinances are fighting the Comprehensive Plan. Do we believe in the zoning ordinances as a Village, or do we believe in the Comprehensive Plan and improving the Village to the extent that every one of these properties has to go through the variation process. He also felt the project did not comply with the Design Guideline criteria for harmony and compatibility with the surrounding buildings, which goes to the massing issue; however, he felt that all of the other factors in the Design Guidelines were closely studied and were met for the intent. He liked the architecture being proposed, and he disagreed with the notion that new projects need to look like they are

100 years old; he did not think this was the character of the Downtown. **Commissioner Coon** felt the building design as presented tonight was very nice and a step in the right direction, but the two criteria items in the Design Guidelines are big issues to him.

Chair Fitzgerald agreed with what has been said by the other commissioners. He liked the building and felt it was attractive; however, he had issues with the scale of the building, especially as it goes down towards Chestnut and towards Sigwalt, as well as the scale of the garage. He was unsure how much more could be done on the north elevation, since there will eventually be something built behind this building; however, on the south and west elevations there could be layering done to help soften the corner.

Commissioner Kingsley reiterated that the Design Commission's charge is to review the project that is front of them, taking into consideration the variations involved. With single-family home reviews, the Design Commission sometimes states whether the Design Commission supports or opposes variations for porches, etc. In this case, she was unsure if the commissioners could not approve the project visually because of matters regarding massing and zoning. **Chair Fitzgerald** felt it was the Design Commission's responsibility to make a recommendation to the Village Board about whether or not the project fits in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Kingsley said that she was in favor of approving the aesthetics of this building, with a few minor recommendations that were previously discussed, but with no variations; the building has to comply. **Commissioner Eckhardt** stated that the Design Commission cannot dictate the zoning; however, they can make a motion with strong recommendations, which is the direction he preferred to go in. He envisioned adding some soft shoulders on the west elevation of the building, and stepping down the south elevation; however, he felt this would not accomplish enough for the neighbors, it would still be three or four stories, and it would make the building appear lopsided and out of balance. The setback issue is probably more significant than de-massing the height. He was sympathetic to the other commissioner's comments about whether or not all of the variations are necessary for this project. He liked the building, although he wanted to see more done to the north elevation, and felt that a drop-off area at the main entrance on Sigwalt was an important item to be discussed with the Plan Commission. He felt a tremendous effort was made with the setback on the south elevation with a large opening being created; however, the north elevation was a little flat for him and he suggested increasing the amount of recessed balconies. He also felt that a tremendous effort was made with the finishes being proposed and correcting issues that were previously discussed. In terms of screening the transformers, he preferred evergreens over a brick wall. In response to the resident's comment about being proud of this building, **Commissioner Eckhardt** said that the commissioners want to be proud of the projects they review and approve; however, it can sometimes be difficult to make these decisions. He reiterated that he liked the new building, but felt it was going to be a problem being located on the edge of the growth of our downtown, because it will be next to older, beautiful frame homes. He supported the project and would be voting in favor of it, including the items that he previously asked to be in the motion.

Commissioner Coon said that looking at the context site plan without the building on the site is what sealed it for him. He was going to vote no for the project because he felt it was not harmonious and compatible, and there was not enough effort made to reduce the massing, although he felt the setbacks would help in that. In terms of the massing and scale of this building as shown, he would have to vote no. He felt the aesthetics were great and he would love to see those same aesthetics applied to a building that is more harmonious in scale.

With regards to scale, **Chair Fitzgerald** asked Commissioner Coon if his concerns were specific to one floor, two floors, or stepping back; if the project goes back to the petitioner, what guidelines would he give them. **Commissioner Coon** replied that some study and some attempt needed to be made with the scale of the building; the plan is pushed out as far as it can go, especially on the north side. Pushing the building inside on Sigwalt is a positive approach in terms of breaking down the massing; however, he knows very well as an architect, that an apartment building could not possibly be done that deep. This is a U-shaped plan, which benefits the massing of it, and he felt that more needed to be done. In terms of the north elevation, if the petitioner is asking for a variance to go beyond the footprint, than let go a little more and push the two end elevations north, so there can be more of a recess in at the front. Pushing the walls out another 3-feet at the two end units to create some undulation in that elevation from an aesthetic point of view, would

be a gesture of breaking down the massing of the building, even though the side yard is being increased slightly.

Chair Fitzgerald was unsure if the project would pass tonight if a vote were taken, and he felt that feedback should be provided to the petitioner at this time. He was on the fence himself; he liked the building, but he understood the context of the homes to the west; it is fairly abrupt. He referenced Lutheran Home at the corner of Kennicott and Oakton, where a taller section was built, although there is a large setback compared to this building.

Commissioner Kingsley asked Staff to review the variations that the petitioner is seeking from the Plan Commission. **Commissioner Coon** said that the Plan Commission process is putting the cart before the horse; if the variations are not approved by the Plan Commission, then the Design Commission is reviewing an entirely different building. **Mr. Hautzinger** read the original draft list of variations required for the project, and noted that the variations may have changed. **Commissioner Coon** said his intention is not to hold the project up until it turns into row homes; he asked if there was a way to pass this feedback on without Design Commission approval of the building, and let the project go before the Plan Commission to see what variations are approved, and then ask to review the re-designed building based on the approved variations. He pointed out that the Design Commission does not have the power to weigh in on the variations or approve those variations; he did not want to approve the building until the variations were sorted out and approved.

Chair Fitzgerald felt the project did not have to pass tonight, and he recommended a motion to table the project to a specific date, as well as ask the petitioner how he wanted to proceed. **Commissioner Kingsley** added that the re-review date with the Design Commission should be after the Plan Commission review.

Mr. Katsaros appreciated all of the comments that were made, which they have taken as many as possible into consideration. He clarified that they do not yet own this property and they are bound to a timeline to get this development purchased and built. After the first design review meeting, it appeared as though most of the commissioners liked the design, and 10 or 12 issues were outlined from that meeting, none of which were related to massing, with the exception of Commissioner Coon who had issues with the size, more than the other commissioners. Many if not all of the previous design concerns were addressed, and they can certainly work with adding more false windows on the lower level, and then finalize the design changes and allow the Plan Commission to address the variations required. If they have to take a step backwards to address the massing, and then come back to this commission if the building is changed, the project will die. He asked that the commissioners consider the design changes that were made, which he felt were pretty substantial, and include any additional items suggested tonight, and allow the project to continue on with the Plan Commission review in two weeks and let them address the variations.

Chair Fitzgerald asked if there was a motion at this time. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said that a motion could be made to support the building materials and some elements of the design, as well as comments about the commission's concerns with the adjacency to the R-3 district. He explained that the Design Commission is a recommending body to the Village Board, and the project could move forward to the Plan Commission with a recommendation to deny the project from this commission. He felt the commissioners were very clear about their concerns with all of the variations. He felt a motion of some kind should be made tonight.

Mr. Hautzinger suggested two possible options: a motion for approval of the design, with comments/concerns about context, scale, and massing per the Design Guidelines, as it relates to the adjacent context; or a motion for denial, with comments stating support for the design, but the denial is based upon scale and massing per the Design Guidelines. Either of those motions would send a clear message to the Plan Commission and Village Board on the Design Commission's position on the project. **Commissioner Kingsley** questioned whether these concerns would be heard and carry any weight, or should the project be tabled tonight until after the Plan Commission review. **Mr. Hautzinger** clarified that the Plan Commission is also a recommending body to the Village Board, and he asked if the Design Commission would recommend approval of the design if the Plan Commission recommends approval of the variations, but what would they do if the Plan Commission does not support the variations? The petitioner may proceed to the Village Board before making any design changes. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said that a third option is to approve the

design presented tonight, only if the Plan Commission approves all of the variations, because if the variations are not approved, then it becomes a different building that the Design Commission does not approve. **Mr. Hautzinger** stated that if the Design Commission approves the project tonight, and the Plan Commission and Village Board do not approve the variations, thereby requiring design revisions, then the new design will return to the Design Commission for re-review. An approval tonight is based upon the current design. Any changes that may happen as a result of the Plan Commission and Village Board that are beyond substantial compliance with these current plans, the project will be brought back to the Design Commission for re-review. **Mr. Hautzinger** recommended that the Design Commission make a motion tonight. **Chair Fitzgerald** supported a motion for approval of the current design, but with concerns about the massing.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED DESIGN FOR *SIGWALT APARTMENTS* TO BE LOCATED AT 45 S. CHESTNUT AVENUE. THIS APPROVAL IS BASED ON THE REVISED ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 9/6/17, 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 TO ADD AT LEAST ONE FALSE WINDOW ON THE EAST ELEVATION, FIRST FLOOR.
2. A REQUIREMENT TO CHANGE THE MORTON SWEETSPIRE SHRUBS AROUND THE ELECTRICAL TRANSFORMER TO EVERGREEN SHRUBS FOR YEAR-ROUND SCREENING.
3. A REQUIREMENT TO CHANGE THE CANDYTUFT PERENNIALS ALONG THE FRONT OF THE BRICK GARDEN WALLS TO A DIFFERENT PERENNIAL THAT HAS MORE HEIGHT TO SOFTEN THE WALL.
4. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE NORTH WALL BE REVISITED WITH THE SAME UNDULATION AS THE EAST AND WEST WALLS.
5. A STRONG RECOMMENDATION THAT THE VARIATIONS BE REVISITED AND SERIOUSLY REVIEWED, SPECIFICALLY THE HEIGHT OF THE BUILDING, PARTICULARLY ON THE WEST; THE PARKING; THE TRAFFIC; THE INDOOR LOADING DOCK; THE BUILDING LOT COVERAGE; AND THE SIDE YARDS.
6. 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.
7. COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES.

Commissioner Eckhardt expressed concern about the clarity of the message in the motion regarding the Design Commission's concerns about the variations for the project. **Mr. Hautzinger** recommended that the motion be less specific about the zoning variations, but that it instead touch on the evaluation criteria in the Design Guidelines that the Design Commission has concerns with.

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Eckhardt said that the minutes will show the Design Commission's concerns over the possibility that the project will be different and change radically to include additional setbacks, variations in height, parking, traffic, etc. These are all concerns to the extent that they are not necessarily Design Commission elements, but important because they tie into the Design Guidelines, which is harmony and compatibility. The logic of the design is good, only if all of the variations are approved. **Mr. Hautzinger** suggested that the Design Commission send a clear and concise message to the Plan Commission and Village Board stating whether or not the design is supported, along with the

general concerns regarding conformance to the Design Guideline criteria for 'Conformance to Ordinances' and 'Harmony and Compatibility'. He encouraged the commissioners to not get into specifics in the motion regarding the zoning variations, and leave those matters up to the Plan Commission and Village Board. **Commissioner Coon** reiterated that he liked the architectural character of the building, but wanted to see how the Plan Commission weighed in on the variations. He did not want to give the project a blanket approval and not have the Design Commission's concerns heard. He wanted the motion to be broken down to the specific categories in the Design Guidelines and state that the Design Commission approves that the project has a logic of design and it has architectural character, but it does not comply with certain criteria, which can be spelled out in the motion.

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

5. **THE DESIGN DOES NOT MEET THE DESIGN GUIDELINES EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR 'HARMONY AND COMPATIBILITY', SPECIFICALLY REGARDING HEIGHT AND SETBACK.**

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Eckhardt felt that the design did not conform to 'Ordinances', as well as 'Harmony and Compatibility'. He did feel that the project conformed with all of the other evaluation criteria listed in the Design Guidelines.

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

8. **THE DESIGN DOES NOT MEET THE DESIGN GUIDELINES EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR 'CONFORMANCE TO ORDINANCES AND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN'.**

COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT SECONDED THE MOTION.

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