

APPROVED

MINUTES OF
THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING
HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
SEPTEMBER 26, 2017

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

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

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Tom Meyer, Lexington Homes for *Lexington Heritage*
Michael Bova, Top to Bottom Construction for *1805 N. Walnut Ave.*
Robert Kolososki, Prairie Tech Ltd. for *1805 N. Walnut Ave.*
Robert Flubacker, Robert Flubacker Architects for *619 N. Arlington Heights Rd.*
Mr. & Mrs. Vincent, Owners of *619 N. Arlington Heights Rd.*
Matt Peota for *Passero*
Alex Perry, Right Way Signs for *Passero*
Dr. John Kotis for *Kotis Surgical Center*
Douglas Hammen, Douglas Design & Associates for *Kotis Surgical Center*
Susan Maish, JNKA Architects for *St. Edna Church*
Mike Maloni, Building Rep for *St. Edna Church*
Chris Stair for *Aldi*
Tom Strehmann for *Aldi*
David McCallum, McCallum Associates for *Aldi*
T.J. Doyle, Doyle Signs for *Aldi*
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM SEPTEMBER 12, 2017

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 12, 2017. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 6. CHURCH REVIEWDC#17-110 – St. Edna Church – 2525 N. Arlington Heights Rd.

Susan Maish, representing *JNKA Architects*, and Mike Maloni, *St. Edna Building Rep*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing a new Multi-Purpose Parish Center addition to the existing St. Edna Church building. The new building will consist of a multi-purpose assembly/gymnasium room with a raised stage, kitchen, and toilet rooms. A two-story rectory residence has been demolished to make way for the construction of the new addition. The new building will be connected to the existing building with a new corridor structure, but otherwise, the existing building will remain as is. The scope of the project includes site and landscape work around the new addition as well as a new 45 space parking area. This project requires Plan Commission review and Village Board approval for an amendment to an existing PUD.

This project was previously reviewed and approved by the Design Commission in 2013. At that time, the proposed Parish Center addition was 2,625 sf smaller and 5'-4" shorter than this current proposal:

- 13,425 sf currently proposed (10,800 sf previously approved)
- 31'-0" to the top of the wall currently proposed (25'-8" to the top of the wall previously approved)
- 36'-0" to the peak of the gable currently proposed (30'-8" to the peak of the gable previously approved)

The increased building height still complies with the zoning requirements. In 2013, numerous color schemes and massing options were studied for the proposed addition, and the current proposal retains the same basic color scheme and massing as the approved 2013 design.

Three new mechanical units are proposed to be mounted on grade adjacent to the new addition. The mechanical units will be fully screened by wood fences and landscaping. The new rooftop kitchen exhaust fan on the lower roof area is required to be screened from view. Overall, the proposed landscaping work is generally nicely done. The Petitioner will be required to comply with all landscape and parking requirements as part of the Plan Commission approval process.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed design for the church addition, with the comment to incorporate a screen around the rooftop kitchen exhaust.

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

Ms. Maish said that in response to the Plan Commission comments they received from Staff, additional landscaping has been added on the east side of the parking lot. They are also removing the kalwall on the existing lobby due to deterioration and replacing it with a hip roof. With regards to screening around the rooftop kitchen exhaust, she asked if they could work with Staff to determine the best way to do this; they are trying to blend it in with the existing gable shape. She presented some preliminary concepts showing new gables along the edge of the wall to block the view of the exhaust fan.

With regards to the screening of the kitchen exhaust, Commissioner Eckhardt said that he was okay with the three gables shown in the concept, or adding a cementitious fence around the exhaust, or just putting a simple box around it that matches the tan color of the wall. He had no issues with the design and no further comments.

Commissioner Coon felt the new gable on the left side was not warranted; he was in favor of a roof screen around the kitchen exhaust that matches the higher portion of the wall. Commissioner Kubow agreed with Commissioner Coon.

Commissioner Kingsley stated that she was not on the commission when the project was previously reviewed and approved. She felt that a third gable was unnecessary to screen the kitchen exhaust; she liked that the first-floor of the building tied in with the rest of the building; she questioned whether the gable end on the second-floor addition was necessary; and suggested something else be brought up there to give it more 'detail', rather than mimic the rest of the building. Her suggestions included not to finish it in white, or have a brown cross just in the middle instead of the brown accent going all the way across, or keep it less ornate so the rest of it can pop. She liked what was done with the kalwall area by introducing a new hip roof. **Commissioner Kingsley** reiterated that she was not on the commission when the color schemes were being reviewed and approved. **Ms. Maish** replied that many color combinations were considered, and she felt the white band at the top of the building helped the building appear less massive; she was concerned about removing it.

Chair Fitzgerald was okay with the size and scale of the new building addition, which he felt was not much different than the previous approval. He felt that something definitely needed to be done with the screening of the rooftop kitchen exhaust, and he was not in favor of adding another gable to screen it. He would make it a requirement to add a tree off to the side of this elevation, left of the walkway, consistent with the tree shown on the other side of this elevation, as well as add a tree on the side, if one will fit there. He would suggest this be reviewed and approved by Staff.

Commissioner Kingsley suggested changing the white finish at the top of the building to the dark color. **Commissioner Eckhardt** remembered that he felt strongly about the white color at the top of the building, instead of brown, because white helped tie it together with all of the buildings on campus. **Chair Fitzgerald** agreed and remembered the commissioners considering both brown and white at the top of the building; the white color was one of the elements that tied everything together for him.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER COON, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE ADDITION TO *ST. EDNA CHURCH* LOCATED AT 2525 N. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS ROAD, AS SUBMITTED. THIS APPROVAL IS BASED ON THE PLANS DATED 8/18/17, RECEIVED ON 8/29/17, 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 A TREE BE ADDED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER TO HELP SOFTEN THE FUTURE SCREENING OF THE ROOFTOP KITCHEN EXHAUST FAN FROM THE KITCHEN.
2. 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.
3. THE PETITIONER IS REQUIRED TO MEET ALL LANDSCAPING AND PARKING REQUIREMENTS, PER CHAPTER 28.
4. ALL SIGNAGE MUST MEET CODE, PER CHAPTER 30.

Chair Fitzgerald wanted to add that the screening of the rooftop exhaust fan can be approved by Staff. **Commissioner Kingsley** said the commissioners previously talked about having the screening match the color/material of the building located behind it. **Commissioner Eckhardt** was okay with adding this to the motion.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER COON, TO AMEND THE MOTION AS FOLLOWS:

5. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE SCREENING OF THE ROOFTOP KITCHEN EXHAUST MATCH THE COLOR/MATERIAL OF THE BUILDING BEHIND IT, TO BE REVIEWED BY STAFF.

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