

APPROVED

MINUTES OF  
THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS  
DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING  
HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.  
MAY 23, 2017

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

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

Members Absent: None

Also Present: John Sorenson, U.S. Shelter LLC for *1715 N. Mitchell Ave.*  
Tom Abbatemarco, Prestigious Homes for *1831 N. Mitchell Ave.*  
Sal Genauldi, Owner of *1831 N. Mitchell Ave.*  
Jon Clark, Clark Associates Architects for *Stonebridge Village Apartments*  
Rodney Johnson, The Connor Group for *Stonebridge Village Apartments*  
Joe LaBelle, Rize Properties for *221 S. Evergreen Ave.*  
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM APRIL 25, 2017

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

**ITEM 4. MULTI-FAMILY PRELIMINARY REVIEW****221 S. Evergreen Ave.**

Joe Labelle, representing *Rize Properties*, was present on behalf of the project.

**Mr. Hautzinger** stated that the site is located at northeast corner of South Street and Evergreen Avenue, and currently consists of a single-family home. This entire block of Evergreen is zoned R-6 and located south of the Downtown. The project is scheduled for review at the Zoning Board of Appeals on June 12, 2017, and time did not allow for the project to come for a formal review with the Design Commission first. The petitioner is proposing to tear down the existing single-family home and construct a new 3-unit townhome building, with garages at the first-floor and 2 levels of living above that.

**Chair Eckhardt** asked if split-face block was being proposed at the ground floor of the new building, and **Mr. LaBelle** replied that decorative CMU is being proposed at the first-level, with brick above that. **Chair Eckhardt** really liked the 3 levels of coloration being shown in the rendering, and he loved the rear elevation. He suggested adding details in the white areas at the bottom of the building such as limestone window sills, and adding more trim to the bay windows. He had no further comments.

**Commissioner Kubow** agreed with the comments made by Chair Eckhardt. He liked the rear elevation so much that he wanted to see the dark color continued onto the front of the building, although he was not a huge fan of the brick color, which could be further studied by the petitioner. Overall, he felt it was a very cool building.

**Commissioner Fitzgerald** liked the rear and side elevations, and was not bothered by the brick color. The only thing that stood out to him was the scale between the front door and the overhang over the front door, versus the window bays over the garage doors. He suggested somehow beefing up the front door look because it almost seems secondary to the rest of the building. **Commissioner Kubow** agreed. **Commissioner Kingsley** disagreed, as did **Chair Eckhardt**.

**Commissioner Kingsley** asked about the variations, which **Mr. Hautzinger** replied included density for the lot size, setback requirements on the north, and the balcony projection into the side yard.

**Chair Eckhardt** commented that the area where the white stone meets the brick needs a stone trim piece instead of a flush transition.

**Commissioner Kingsley** felt it was a nicely designed building, although she was unsure if she liked the dormers. She felt the bigger issue about the color is how it will look in the location being suggested, which the Zoning Board of Appeals will look at as well. Although she felt it was a great looking building, she had concerns about the mass and whether it is appropriate for this location, and she did not like the steep rise of the stairs that come off the sidewalk and go straight up, versus incorporating the stairs on the inside. She also pointed out that the location of the garage on the end unit is closer to the corner than the entry stairs, which is not being pedestrian friendly.

**Mr. Hautzinger** asked the Design Commission for their input on if the end unit should face Evergreen, resulting in one garage door and one front entry facing Evergreen and the other two facing South Street. **Commissioner Kingsley** felt the building was a nice composition as shown. **Chair Eckhardt** felt that the elevation was really balanced and perfect across the front, and he was not in favor of taking the left side and turning it sideways. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** liked that the garages were on the south side of the site because that is more the public part of the street. **Commissioner Kingsley** felt the front doors needed to be approachable because this is a pedestrian friendly street.

**Mr. LaBelle** said that they are under contract to purchase the site; however, they want feedback from the ZBA on what would be allowed before they commit to the purchase. The design being presented tonight is conceptual at this

time and based on a plan they are building in Mt. Prospect. One of the challenges of this plan is that the building height is causing the setbacks to be so far back, and options include lowering the garages partially below grade, or a conceptual plan of a flat roof that he could share tonight. **Mr. Hautzinger** stated that Staff previously suggested lowering the plate height of the current pitched roof design approximately 2-feet, which would result in clipped ceilings on the front and back, and would help reduce the setback requirement.

**Commissioner Fitzgerald** agreed with Commissioner Kingsley that the dormers could be eliminated, and **Chair Eckhardt** agreed as well. **Mr. LaBelle** presented the flat roof option to the commissioners for feedback. **Commissioner Fitzgerald and Commissioner Kubow** preferred the original pitched roof design to the flat roof design because it would fit better in the neighborhood. **Mr. Hautzinger** added a suggestion to break up the rear elevation third floor into 3 separate bays instead of a continuous long bump-out. **Commissioner Kingsley** clarified that as a whole, the commissioners like the design of the new building, but whether or not the appropriateness of this massing on this particular site has not been discussed.

**Mr. LaBelle** commented that moving the stairs to the interior as suggested is an option, although this would result in the front door being considerably lower, which could draw away from the door. **Commissioner Fitzgerald** suggested an extra tall door, and **Commissioner Kingsley** suggested a front door with a transom above, and she reiterated her dislike of the steep stairs as currently shown.