

APPROVED

MINUTES OF
THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING
HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
OCTOBER 24, 2017

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

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

Members Absent: Ted Eckhardt

Also Present: Ross Duncan, BR Design & Architecture for *Pal-Win Shopping Center*
Indre Gliaudelyte, Owner of *918 N. Illinois Ave.*
Thomas Budzik, Thomas Architects for *133 S. Highland Ave.*
Mark & Mary Ericksen, Owners of *133 S. Highland Ave.*
John Haran, E and J Builders for *1625 N. Chestnut Ave.*
Karen Kristianson, Newman Architecture for *St. James Parish*
Fr. Matt Foley for *St. James Parish*
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM OCTOBER 10, 2017

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF OCTOBER 10, 2017. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 5. CHURCH REVIEW

DC#17-121 – St. James Parish – 831 N. Arlington Heights Rd.

Karen Kristianson, representing *Newman Architecture*, and Fr. Matt Foley, representing *St. James Parish*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to build a 6,431 sf addition to an existing church building. The proposed addition includes a new accessible building entrance, lobby, and gathering area on the south end of the building, as well as an expanded seating area within a new building addition on the east. The scope of the project also includes extensive site work to create a new parking lot on the south end of the church, adjacent to the new entrance, as well as an expanded parking area on the north side of the building. An existing three-story school building and two single-family houses are proposed to be demolished to create space for the new south parking lot and a storm water detention basin. An existing two-story rectory building at the northwest corner of the site will remain. This project requires Plan Commission review and Village Board approval for the following: amendment to an existing Special Use, amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, approval as a Planned Unit Development, consolidation of the zoning lots, and a variation for the quantity of off-street parking.

The church building (831 N. Arlington Heights Road), school building (821 N. Arlington Heights Road), and the single-family house facing Arlington Heights Road (811 N. Arlington Heights Road) were all included in a Community Preservation Report that was prepared for Arlington Heights by the School of the Art Institute of Chicago in 2004. All of the properties in the report are ranked by their historical value as: "Exceptional", "Notable", or "Contributing". The church building is listed as "Exceptional", whereas the school building and single-family home are listed as "Contributing". The petitioner reported that the existing school building is not being used to its fullest, and it has become a burden to keep viable. Demolition of the school building will not only allow for construction of the new parking area, but it will also create an obstructed view of the beautiful church building from Arlington Heights Road.

The existing church building is a great example of classic church architecture. The proposed addition is designed to match the existing building in all respects. Roof lines are being extended, and materials matched as closely as possible. Overall, the proposed building addition is very nicely designed, but Staff offers the following recommendations to further enhance the design:

Limestone Coping. The proposed limestone coping (on the top of the parapet walls at the areas with flat roofs) has a thin, minimal appearance that does not fit well with the ornate detailing on the rest of the building. It is recommended that the coping design be enhanced with additional stone or brick detailing for a more substantial cap on the large walls.

East Elevation. The new east wall is large and flat, and it lacks detail in the center portion of the wall. It is recommended that the wall area under the gable be bumped out slightly to break up the large flat wall. The edges of the bumped out wall should be detailed with limestone quoins to match the existing building.

Limestone Sign. Per Chapter 30, Sign Code, signs containing the names of buildings and/or the date of construction, when cut into any masonry surface, are exempt from permit. Therefore, the proposed "St. James Church" limestone sign is allowed. However, the sign is quite large and simple in design. The sign appears out of scale on the building and it detracts from the building architecture. It is recommended that the sign be omitted, and provide clerestory windows or other architectural detailing to fill the large wall space. The church does have a nicely designed, highly visible ground sign facing Arlington Heights that will remain.

One new mechanical unit will be located on grade on the north side of the building. The unit will be fully screened from view by masonry walls to match the building. A new trash dumpster enclosure is proposed to be located in the parking lot on the north side of the building. The enclosure is proposed to be built with wood fencing material. The enclosure

will be highly visible, so it is recommended that it be made of brick to match the building. Additionally, landscaping should be provided around the enclosure.

As part of the zoning approval process, Staff and the Plan Commission will perform a detailed review of the landscaping. The petitioner is required to comply with code requirements for 4" caliper shade trees in all parking islands, a continuous three-foot high parking lot screening along the roadways, and landscaping around the detention basin. The existing parking area is a large asphalt surface with no landscaped islands or perimeter landscape screening, so the new trees and shrubs throughout the parking area will be a nice improvement. However, the petitioner has not included any foundation plantings around the perimeter of the building. It is recommended that foundation landscaping be provided. The plantings should be layered and consist of a mix of shrubs and perennials. **Mr. Hautzinger** reported that the petitioner submitted a revised landscape plan today, which was not part of the packet provided to the commissioners, that includes additional landscaping added to the site, primarily focused around the entrance and along the building.

Staff recommends approval of the project, with these recommendations listed in the Staff report.

Ms. Kristianson said the primary purpose of this project is provide accessible entry into the church; the existing church is not accessible, and the new grade-level entry with elevator will provide not only access to the church level but also to the lower level meeting rooms, as well as provide handicap accessible bathrooms and parking. Donations are funding this project and they are working the best they can with the funds they have available with the architecturally significant building, and they intend to make the addition blend as seamless as possible.

In response to Staff comments, **Ms. Kristianson** said they are not opposed to increasing the thickness of the limestone parapet, maybe an 8-inch coping instead of 4 or 5-inch coping with a corbel brick underneath to give more of a crown to those single-story areas. In regards to the east elevation, the existing conditions there are very tight and they would like to keep a small landscape buffer, as well as not lose any of the parking directly behind or to the east of the church. They can look at other options for the limestone sign, although clerestory windows may not work because the bathrooms are located right behind. The trash enclosure will match the wood enclosure across the street at the school and be heavily landscaped, and the intent is to have landscaping at the perimeter of the building foundation.

Commissioner Kubow felt the architecture for the proposed addition was very nice and fit with the classic architecture of the existing church; however, he felt strongly that the wall signage felt out of place and unnecessary, and took away from the overall architecture of the addition. He agreed with Staff's recommendation to enhance the limestone parapet coping, and felt that no more than an 8-inch coping would be appropriate and not take away from the front elevation. He also agreed that the east elevation was very large and flat and he suggested a slight bump out in this area. Overall, he really liked the design of the new addition, as well as the landscaping being presented. He questioned the current use of the school to the south and **Fr. Foley** replied that the building is currently being used for storage.

Commissioner Kingsley felt the proposed addition was nicely done and she agreed with most of Staff's comments. She really appreciated that the petitioner wanted to replicate the existing church building with the design being proposed that will make the addition as nice as the existing building. The church is a beautiful building that makes a statement because of how it is situated on the property; it is a little gem. However, because of its uniqueness, she wished the existing church could remain as it is and not be wrapped with the addition; how thin it is, how well-proportioned it is, and how it can be seen from both the north and south on Arlington Heights Road. She appreciated all the details being put into the building and that most of the windows are being relocated or built to match. She agreed with the comments about the east elevation, and suggested adding quoins that come down from the gable returns, or adding a limestone column similar to the front elevation. She also agreed with the comments about the sign on the west elevation; it seems to diminish the grandeur of the church, it was unnecessary, and it should be eliminated. She felt that the addition should be pushed back slightly on the south elevation, to give more relief to the elevation as well as add some kind of fenestration there. **Ms. Kristianson** explained that the addition could only be pushed back another foot, in order to maintain the existing doors that go into the narthex, and that some type of masonry relief could be added to the elevation because of the ductwork going through there for the bathrooms. **Commissioner Kingsley** said that she was in support of trying to make the addition fit in with the existing building, but felt the cornice being proposed

was a sad compromise. She felt strongly that the detail at the top of the walls should be more grand, even if it is with a flat roof behind, because this will at least look similar to what is on the front elevation, or go less in the areas where there is coping stone. She agreed with Staff that the trash enclosure should be something nicer than wood, and if it is going to be wood, then it should be white instead of natural wood. She also pointed out that the trash enclosure was different on the landscape plan, and **Ms. Kristianson** replied that the revised landscape plan is probably more accurate than the original plan. **Commissioner Kingsley** had no further comments.

Commissioner Coon felt it was unfortunate that the existing church gets lost in the addition on the west elevation. He understood that the addition could not be pushed back much further, but he felt there was at least 30-inches to work with there, and pushing it back even 2-feet would be enough of a change in the west elevation to make the addition less continuous with the part of the church that is so special and so historic. He also preferred another plan option for the bathrooms on the west elevation; take some of the windows and put them back over on the side elevation. **Fr. Foley** explained that the new gathering space would also be used for small funeral wakes prior to the service. **Ms. Kristianson** reiterated that there are currently no accessible bathrooms on the main level of the church, and they are trying to align the windows to get natural light into the new gathering space with the existing windows on the south elevation.

Commissioner Coon reiterated the suggestion to push the west elevation back as much as possible. He agreed with Commissioner Kubow's comment that the wall sign seems like a guilty response to having too much blank wall, and felt that adequate landscaping will help soften the large wall with the proper placement of trees that will mature over time. He also said that although he liked that the windows were repeated and the quoins on the corners were repeated, he felt that it fell apart at the top. The limestone band with the 3 steps and the small detail at the top works well proportionately with the quoins; however, that detail or a slightly smaller version of it, or an adaption of that frieze detail, would help a lot with pulling the existing vernacular into the new addition. Because of the ceiling height, **Commissioner Coon** also had concerns about exposed plumbing vents, and **Ms. Kristianson** explained that no plumbing would be visible. **Commissioner Coon** also agreed with the comment that some relief is needed on the east side and quoin detailing added at the corners. Overall, he felt the petitioner did a great job with the church addition, with a few minor details to make it even better. He was in support of the project.

Chair Fitzgerald felt the petitioner did a great job with the addition that looks beautiful on the existing beautiful church building, and he agreed with the comments already made. He added a comment that the perimeter shrubs being proposed are too similar in appearance and will appear sloppy; therefore, he suggested plantings that are either purposely different, or just use one type of planting. He also wanted to require evergreens for year round interest, especially along Arlington Height Road.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Tom Walters, 727 N. Arlington Heights Rd. He said that he has full faith in everything the church is proposing to do and he supports the project. His concern is with parking. He stated that there have been six accidents in five years out in front of his home, with parked cars backing up to his driveway. This is a dangerous area and he asked if parking on Arlington Heights Road could be removed. **Chair Fitzgerald** explained that this issue is not under the purview of this commission; however, these concerns are now part of the record and will be included in the Plan Commission review. **Mr. Hautzinger** added that parking will be discussed in detail at the Plan Commission hearing for the project, which he encouraged the residents to attend. Mr. Walters asked whether parking on Arlington Heights Road is an IDOT matter or something the Village can make a recommendation on, and Staff directed him to contact the Village for further information or to attend the Plan Commission hearing.

There was no further discussion from the commissioners.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR *ST. JAMES PARISH* LOCATED AT *831 N. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS ROAD*. THIS APPROVAL IS BASED ON THE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED ON 9/29/17, 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 TO STUDY THE CORNICE/COPING STONE DETAIL AT THE FLAT ROOF AREAS, WITH A SUGGESTION TO MIMIC THE STONE ENTABLATURE DETAILING ON THE FRONT OF THE BUILDING.
2. A REQUIREMENT TO OMIT THE STONE SIGN ON THE FRONT WALL OF THE BUILDING, AND WORK WITH STAFF TO STUDY OTHER OPTIONS TO DETAIL THE LARGE WALL.
3. A REQUIREMENT TO CHANGE THE WOOD TRASH ENCLOSURE TO BRICK, TO MATCH THE BUILDING.
4. A REQUIREMENT TO WORK WITH STAFF TO REVIEW THE TYPE OF PLANTINGS SPECIFIED FOR THE PERIMETER SCREENING.
5. A REQUIREMENT TO BUMP OUT THE EAST WALL UNDER THE GABLE WITH QUOIN DETAILING AT THE CORNERS.
6. A REQUIREMENT TO MOVE THE NEW WEST WALL BACK AS FAR AS POSSIBLE WITHOUT IMPACTING THE EXISTING INTERIOR DOORWAY.
7. A RECOMMENDATION TO REVISIT THE LOCATION OF THE NEW BATHROOMS TO ALLOW FOR MORE WINDOWS ON THE WEST WALL OF THE ADDITION.
8. 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.

Mr. Hautzinger clarified that the requirement for landscaping pertains to Chair Fitzgerald's previous comments that the various specified plants are too similar to one another, and that either one consistent type of shrub be used, or make them distinctly different. Also, provide salt tolerant evergreen shrubs facing Arlington Heights Road for year round screening.

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