

DRAFT

MINUTES OF
THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING
HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
JANUARY 9, 2018

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

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

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Michael Porto, CA Ventures for *Sigwalt Apartments*
Mark Hopkins, HKM Architects for *Sigwalt Apartments*
Tony Divizio, Divizo Group for *523 W. Ridge Ct. & 504 S. Mitchell Ave.*
Piotr J. Janota, Miyako Investments LLC for *223 S. Dunton Ave.*
Brian Hyde, Greenscape Homes for *626 N. Harvard Ave.*
Don Forlani, Owner of *626 N. Harvard Ave.*
Keith Ginnodo, Kingsley/Ginnodo Architects for *132 W. Northwest Hwy.*
Michael & Ellen Para, Owners of *132 W. Northwest Hwy.*
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM DECEMBER 12, 2017

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

ITEM 1. MULTI-FAMILY RE-REVIEWDC#17-156 – Sigwalt Apartments – 45 S. Chestnut Ave.

Michael Porto, representing *CA Ventures*, and Mark Hopkins, representing *HKM Architects*, 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 audience.

Mr. Hautzinger stated that tonight's meeting is regarding design review, and this project will then proceed to the Plan Commission for zoning review which is currently scheduled for February 14, where comments regarding zoning and parking can be discussed, and then proceed to the Village Board for final review. This project was previously reviewed by the Design Commission on August 8, 2017 and again on September 12, 2017. At that time, the Design Commission recommended approval of the design with the following conditions:

1. A requirement to add at least one false window on the east elevation first-floor. This requirement has been addressed in these revised plans.
2. A requirement to change the Morton Sweetspire shrubs around the electrical transformer to evergreen shrubs for year-round screening. This requirement has been addressed in these revised plans.
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. This requirement has been addressed in these revised plans.
4. A requirement that the north wall be revisited with the same undulations as the east and west walls. This requirement is in regards to the semi-recessed balconies on the east and west walls, which have now been added to the north wall.
5. The design does not meet the Design Guidelines evaluation criteria for 'Harmony and Compatibility', specifically regarding height and setback.
6. The design does not meet the Design Guidelines evaluation criteria for 'Conformance to Ordinances and Comprehensive Plan'.

Following the Design Commission review, the project was reviewed by the Plan Commission on September 27, 2017, and the Plan Commission recommended approval. The project was then reviewed by the Village Board on October 16, 2017, and the project was denied. On December 4, 2017 the petitioner presented revisions to the project to the Village Board during early review.

At this time, the developer has made the changes to the proposed development, with highlights as follows:

1. The top floor of the building has been stepped back to reduce the massing and height at the outer walls in response to the Design Commission's concerns regarding harmony and scale. Staff feels this is a good improvement to the project.
2. The brick on the first floor has been changed from a black color to a brownish color, and the black granite at the building entrance has been changed to the brownish brick. The goal was to be more compatible with the color tones of the neighborhood, which Staff also feels is a nice change.
3. The entire building has been shifted approximately 4 feet to the east on the site providing a larger setback to the west.

Overall, Staff feels the proposed changes to the design are positive improvements to reduce the scaling and massing; however, Staff encourages the petitioner to maximize the amount of windows on the top floor to break up the amount of wall siding and lighten the appearance. Staff recommends approval of the revised design.

Mr. Hopkins said that Staff summarized the changes that were made to the building; however, he said that one of the major changes to the building is at the entry, and he presented a revised image that shows a limestone color on the pergola and the canopy, rather than the dark bronze shown on the rendering. They feel the revised color is a better

design. In addition, the pergola was pulled off the elevator tower and brought forward as a garden element, in a further attempt to create a more residential approach to the design.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Vera DeGiorio, 102 S. Chestnut Avenue. She thought this project was denied by the Village Board late last year and now the petitioner is back with what they see as essentially the same plan that was previously denied, although the petitioner claims the development has been redesigned to accommodate earlier Village objections, but we just do not see it that way; what we see is a re-hash of the earlier design with a few non-critical modifications that seems to be in effort to placate the wishes of the Village and our neighborhood. We understand the Design Commission is limited in its scope of review, so she will keep her comments isolated to those comments. She believes the massing of this building on this site, which is just under 1 acre in size, is too dense and is not fitting for this neighborhood. She believes that was a point of objection on the prior design, and the developer has not properly addressed this objection with its new design. The project size for this site and neighborhood was also a strong point of objection, and we notice the developer has made slight modifications to the building size by adding 3 bedroom units to the mix and reducing the total number of units by 8 apartments to the proposed 80 units. The developer's revised plan shows the actual bedroom count has been reduced by only 8 bedrooms in the complex. Once again, we believe the development size is not fitting for the neighborhood and the petitioner has done very little to address the concerns of the Village and the neighbors. Finally, we find the appearance of the building has changed very little over the design that was originally submitted, and subsequently rejected by the Village Board. In several ways we feel this design is actually worse than the original submittal. The petitioner's attempt to set the 5th floor back from the top of the 4th floor exterior wall; while seeing it makes the 5th floor not visible from the neighbor's vantage point is a foolish statement, one completely without merit and a move that drastically degrades the architecture and integrity of this building. In addition to these concerns regarding design, we are at a loss to understand why Staff supports this development with such vigor. It has become somewhat obvious to us that the Staff's desired approval for this development is in direct conflict with the wishes of the neighboring property owners and at least a majority of our Trustees, as proven by their last denial of this plan. We beg the commission to reject the approval of this submittal as presented; this plan does not fit our neighborhood and the petitioner has not made a good faith effort to address objections. Thank you.

Keith Allen, 46 S. Chestnut Avenue. He agreed with Vera's comments completely. Essentially for the third time, this is the same building; same size, same footprint, and the majority of the same issues that caused the project to be rejected in the first place remain unresolved. From his point of view, reducing the number of units by adding the 3 bedroom apartments, enabled the petitioner to comply with the required parking ratio; however, it did not accomplish addressing the problems with the parking layout, the drive aisle widths, insufficient turning radiuses, and the basic layout of the first and basement levels. Parking was added along Sigwalt by taking away the public right-of-way, which the petitioner will argue adds parking, but he will argue that it may exacerbate the parking and traffic issues on Sigwalt, as there is now loading/unloading/move in/move out/public parking/package and mail delivery, all vying for those spots on Sigwalt. If those spots are full, there will be double parking on Sigwalt, which is the thru street, and will cause a disaster. It also takes away substantial green space along that side of the building. The step back at the fifth floor will only be hidden for people standing on this parcel or in the middle of the street; neighbors around this parcel, it makes no difference to them, they see it from their front porch, their front windows and second-story windows; it does not hide it from them at all. All of this leaves us with the following big issues still unresolved: a comprehensive plan that does not reflect the actual conditions surrounding this parcel; an R-7 building on a parcel that is less than half the size required to support an R-7 development; a non-compliant building that still requires numerous variance requests, and a building that is not harmonious or compatible with its surroundings. In the commissioners' evaluation of the proposal tonight, he would ask the commissioners to focus on 2 big picture criteria that are set forth in the Village Design Guidelines that govern this commissions' evaluation of a design proposal: conformance to ordinances and the Comprehensive Plan, and the harmony and compatibility of the proposal to the surroundings.

Kari Dwyer, 30 S. Chestnut Avenue. She agreed with her neighbors that already spoke; there are not enough changes that have occurred to the renderings. Her greatest concern is 2-fold, with the first being the amount of variances that are being requested. She had to comply with a lot of regulations that the Village has set forth when restoring her 100

year old home, which she was willing to do so, although frustrating at times, for the fact that the guidelines are in place for a reason; to preserve the aesthetics of this community, the reason why we live in this community. From the community's perspective, she asked what message this sends to the next developer that comes in that asks for more variances; where does it stop and what legal recourse if any, do we have for those that have already complied with these variances and projects were denied. It does seem fair that we can now turn the tide and start to view projects in a different direction because it is convenient when someone is available to build on this property. We should stay true to the community and make sure this project is the right fit for the parcel that is available. Her other concern is that we continue to reflect on the Comprehensive Plan and how this property is R-7 and how our homes are actually on a Comprehensive Plan viewed to be R-6. She would ask then, when proposed to the Commission and Board over a year ago, why was the property next to her at 26 S. Chestnut Avenue approved to be developed for a single-family home? We could have turned the tides then and agreed at that point that it should have been zoned for R-6, but it was not and it continued to remain R-3, and now we have done nothing to create more of a flow from this large massive building to our homes, but yet it was approved. She just wondered: is it the conflict with the Comprehensive Plan that has been established, does that need further review? Because we are trying to fit something so large on such a small space, but yet we are not asking for any changes anywhere else. These are a couple of considerations and we ask that you listen to our voice; we know you are appointed officials and that you are speaking on behalf of us.

Commissioner Eckhardt thanked the neighbors for coming out and asked the petitioner if he had any meetings with the community, which he believed was the intent of the Village Board and others. **Mr. Porto** replied that there was a meeting held with the neighbors. **Commissioner Eckhardt** asked for a show of hands from residents that attended that meeting, and although hands were raised, a resident spoke out and said that the hands raised was not a comprehensive assessment as to who was actually invited to attend the meeting because she was not invited, although she lives directly across from the site. **Commissioner Eckhardt** felt that the intent of the Village Board and others was to make sure the petitioner was talking with the neighbors, which is important, and he reiterated that this commission only reviews the architecture of the building, which the Design Commission previously approved based on the merits of the building, with comments. He was unsure if he agreed with the residents who state that there has been no effort made by the petitioner to change the building; the residents are not architects and the building looks the same to them; however, to those who review architecture, he felt the changes are worthy. He explained that the Master Plan allows for a building of this size or larger on this site, which is unfortunate that in so doing, the Village self-created the need for many of these variations being requested. He is aware that there is another project coming for the north side of this site, and he suspects that it will make this building look like a pipsqueak, although he has only heard rumors and not seen any drawings. **Commissioner Eckhardt** also said that the Master Plan, rightfully or wrongfully, also designates the homes on the west side of Chestnut as a higher density zoning than R-3. In terms of the massing of the building, he referred to the context elevations, and said that the massing of the new building appears to fit going east; however, there is an obvious difference in height and in character to the west, which abuts residential. In terms of the effort to set back the building, he felt a site line would show that the top floor, when standing across the street on the sidewalk, only a hint of the top floor would be visible; however, from the upstairs levels, the top floor would be visible. Although the fifth floor is there, it no longer creates a wall that was at one time right on the front. With regards to the materials being proposed, he liked that the ground-floor of the building is now warmer browns instead of the previous harsh black tones. In an effort to keep cars from double parking on the street, **Commissioner Eckhardt** pointed out that the petitioner has created a place for cars to park around the building and not restrict traffic flow, however, this resulted in a loss of green space in various places around the building, which is somewhat of a concern for him. **Commissioner Eckhardt** asked Staff to review the variances being requested so he can understand how many of the variations are relative to the fact that anything is being built on this small site, versus what might be viewed as getting an advantage to create more density.

Mr. Hautzinger read the list of the variances from the notification for the Plan Commission hearing:

1. Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.3, Minimum Area for Zoning District, to allow the R-7 District to be approx. 1.39 acres where code requires a minimum of 2 acres for the R-7 District.
2. Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.4, Minimum Lot Size, to allow a 39,587 sq. ft. lot where code requires a minimum of 61,500 sq. ft. in lot size.

3. Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.6, Required Front Yard, to allow a front yard setback (east side) of 6.8' where code requires a 49' setback.
4. Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.6, Required Front Yard, to allow a front yard setback (west side) of 20.0' where code requires a 49' setback.
5. Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.6, Required Side Yard, to allow a side yard setback (north side) of 5' where code requires a 39' setback.
6. Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.7, Maximum Building Lot Coverage, to allow 72% building lot coverage where code allows a maximum 45% building lot coverage.
7. A variation to the maximum allowable building height to increase the maximum allowable building height from 60' to 63'-8".
8. Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.13, Maximum Floor Area Ratio, to allow 242% F.A.R. where code limits maximum F.A.R. to 200%.
9. Chapter 28, Section 11.7(a), Loading Requirements, to waive the requirement for one off-street loading space.
10. Chapter 28, Section 6.6-5.1, Permitted Obstructions, to allow certain balconies to project 5.3' into the required front, exterior side, and side yards.
11. Chapter 28, Section 6.6-5.1, Permitted Obstructions, to allow a transformer within the required front yard setback where code requires all transformers to be located outside of all setback areas.
12. Chapter 28, Section 11.2-8, to allow certain drive aisles to be no less than 20' wide where code requires a minimum drive aisle width of 24'.

Commissioner Kingsley thanked the audience for being here and addressing the commission in such a concise and thoughtful manner. She liked the changes that were made to the proposed building and agreed with Commissioner Eckhardt that the changes are worthy of looking at, and she commended the petitioner for addressing some of these issues. That being said, she felt that a lot of the items previously talked about by the commissioners had to do with the variances and compatibility; the design does not meet the Design Guidelines criteria for 'Harmony and Compatibility', and the design does not meet the Design Guidelines criteria for 'Conformance to Ordinances and Comprehensive Plan'. These two items are still outstanding and this concerned her. Specifically, the things that both the architect and the developer have done, such as stepping back the top floor, lightening the pergola, changing the base color, and moving the building to the east; all of those were worthy of looking at. It is hard for her to hear the neighbors and their objections, and for the commissioners to approve something based on just the design, when in reality, there are still two items that are outstanding and cause her to pause.

Commissioner Coon said that he does not take this project lightly, being a \$17.5 million dollar project, and he does recognize that changes were made in terms of the massing, density, setbacks, and an effort was made to accommodate the concerns about the fifth floor height, which was one of the major things he previously had an issue with. He watched the Village Board review of the project and put together some thoughts based on that review, because he did not want to come here tonight and say that the changes were not worthy enough and the petitioner did not go far enough, when the petitioner did have a meeting with the neighbors and sent out notices farther than the required 250-foot radius. He received a letter because he lives within the boundaries, and heard there were approximately 40 people at the meeting. He asked the petitioner if there were any changes in the design being presented tonight, as opposed to the design that was shown at the early review with the Village Board on December 4, that incorporated any comments, suggestions, or input from any of the neighbors. **Mr. Porto** replied that no changes were made because drawings for tonight's meeting had already been submitted prior to the neighborhood meeting, and they want to gather all of the input from the neighborhood meeting.

Commissioner Coon liked the changes that were made at the front entrance, going from the black brick to a brownish brick color at the first floor, which fits better with the color tones of the adjacent residential neighborhood. With regards to the massing, in terms of density and height, he illustrated in a very elementary way, the difference in square footage between the original design and the revised design by holding up paper squares representing the two sizes. One representing an 88-unit, 100,165 sf building and the other being 5% less, 95,220 sf of density. He then showed other paper squares with a perceptible difference in the sizes. He then discussed the addition of 3-bedroom units to the building plans and explained the difference in overall beds compared to the overall square footage as being less than

5%, which he would not say are worthy by any means. With all due respect, he heard some really good comments from the residents tonight, and to sweep those aside saying that they are not architects; he has been an architect for 22 years and he knows the difference.

With regards to the height, **Commissioner Coon** referred to the Village Comprehensive Plan, which calls for the best use of an undeveloped site, and pointed out that Planning Department Staff demonstrated the tax generation and retail establishment benefits of the proposed new building. He also referred to the 'Downtown Master Plan Objectives' in the Goals and Policies of the Village Comprehensive Plan, which were touched on at the Village Board early review of this project by Village Staff who said that the site is planned as R-7, 4-6 stories, and the proposed development fits right in at 5 stories, and the building is not adjacent to single-family homes because it is across the street from single-family homes that are comprehensively planned to be R-6 thus creating the change in density and height. He also reported that the Village Manager said that this is a challenging parcel, and **Commissioner Coon** agreed that it is a challenging parcel, which became challenging when it was decided to extend the parking structure over the street. He stated that it was also said this development already takes the height and goes from high to low to lowest to single-family, but right now it is one story higher than the parking structure. It may be true when considering the future development of the AT&T site as residential, which may be 7 to 8 stories in height, but right now this is spot zoning by our own zoning definition. The definition of spot zoning is that it's not continuous with the R-7 development. The R-7 zoning district is 2 acres and this is 1.39 measured to the right-of-way centerline of the adjacent streets and on those borders is a different zoning district. However, Planning Staff also noted that per the Comprehensive Plan, the parcels on either side of Highland are comprehensively planned for R-7, and there is an R-7 development currently at the corner of Vail and Sigwalt on the west side, and taking in all of those elements creates a zoning district.

Commissioner Coon said that he thoroughly studied the 'Goals and Policies' in the Comprehensive Plan and pointed out that there is a lot of revenue that can be used to support our Police and Fire departments; however, what is not being discussed are all of the things in the Comprehensive Plan that are looking out for the residents, which is his job as an appointed design commission member; to look out for what is best for this community and not what is best for the revenue stream of Arlington Heights, that is not his job. After reading through the Comprehensive Plan, he has many questions that he will be sending the Village Trustees and the Comprehensive Planning team of 19 people, because he felt there are some serious issues that need to be addressed with the Comprehensive Plan along this corridor. He also touched on the value of historic preservation in the Comprehensive Plan, which is repeated several times. In the R-7 comprehensively planned zones south of Sigwalt, there are nine houses approximately 100 years old with very fine character that we are justifying this saying these could be other apartment or condo buildings to create a wall of high density multi-family along this corridor. With regards to height, he looked at the height and setbacks of the four buildings along Sigwalt that are located across the street from single-family homes; a comparative analysis of what the right solution is here. Personally, he felt all of the condo buildings located in the single-family neighborhoods are a downside of Arlington Heights; there is no aesthetic value, but it is a condition that exists. There are many examples where these buildings are located across from single-family homes, generally 4-stories, 40 to 45 feet tall, with just one 5-story building that is setback 26 feet. To say that this is the appropriate scale is questionable, but to say that a 5-story building across the street from single-family is an appropriate solution, he strongly disagreed with, and to say that a 20-foot setback is adequate when the majority of that setback is taken up by underground water storage that will not allow for trees or shrubs to grow above that.

Commissioner Coon also wanted to look at what impact the step back has on the building. At the previous review, the petitioner's attorney showed a rendering that was cut off at the top and he stated that the fifth floor would not be seen; however, if the rendering were extended up, there was no question that it would be seen. Line of site studies will show that standing from across the street on the sidewalk, the 60 degree cone of vision encompasses the entire building; you will not see sky until you look up. This is not meaningful to him; it is an incremental change that is not worthy. At the second Design Commission review of the project, the developer stated that if the Design Commission voted no, then they would pull the plug; therefore the commissioners voted yes with comments that the project did not comply with harmony and scale or the zoning guidelines. They say that the Design Commission's job is to approve the aesthetics; however, he felt the commissions' job is to go beyond that, and he reiterated the eight things in the Commercial Design Guidelines that the Design Commission looks at. He said that the building has not really changed

in terms of architectural aesthetics, which he likes now and at the last meeting, he thinks it is a very good looking building, although he questioned the fiber cement board siding but understood this change due to the setback and structural reasons.

Commissioner Coon elaborated on why he feels the building does not comply with ordinances is not just because of the excessive list of variances, but because it does not follow Section 9.4-2 of the Planned Unit Development, 'Qualifications for Granting Variations', 1) such exceptions shall not exercise a detrimental influence on the surrounding neighborhood, and 2) exceptions shall be justified when other characteristics of the development exceed the minimum standards of the Municipal Code. He did not know how it can be justified that they are exceeding the minimum standards, when the petitioner is asking for variances that get them out of all of the requirements for R-7. That is where he stands on that, and he does not support this design. He prefers a 3-1/2 story building, basically the same building with a floor off of it with the same setbacks. Lastly, he commented on the petitioner's statement that any changes to the density meant this project is dead, but the petitioner came back really quick with changes in square footage and in units, and it did not kill the project. He wonders if there is more room to go here. He did not want to see them go away; he felt it was a good project, but it is too tall and it takes up too much site, and the petitioner should work on the setbacks and on the height as it relates to the single-family. He felt there needed to be a balance between what works for the Central Business District and what works for the single-family homes that are adjacent to it, and that is demonstrated in our Goals and Policies throughout Chapter 2 of the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Kubow appreciated the comments already made, and said that he was not at the previous reviews of this project, which he acknowledged is a very important matter to the Village and the residents. He agreed with Commissioner Kingsley that the petitioner has taken into account a lot of the recommendations previously made by the commissioners, trustees and residents, and he referred to the list of conditions from the previous approval listed in the Staff report, with Items 1 through 4 being met by the architect and developer. Instead of going back and talking about architecture, massing or zoning, which have already been talked about significantly, he wanted to give the petitioner the opportunity to speak about Items 5 and 6, and how they believe this development meets 'Harmony and Compatibility' and 'Conformance to Ordinances and the Comprehensive Plan'.

Mr. Hopkins said that the Village has been trying to formulate its image of what the Downtown should end up being for many decades. Over the past decades, there have been guided improvements to the Central Business District to try to establish it as what it is today, which is a leader in the nation with regards to urban planning and livability in a Downtown. A zoning district is a chosen mechanism for approval to determine whether this fits into the image of where we think Arlington Heights wants to go, and clearly there is a disconnect and tension here at the edge between the existing residential fabric and the edge of development, which is not uncommon across the country. The Master Plan is in tension with existing conditions at Chestnut and Sigwalt, but looking farther north along Campbell there are 6-story apartment buildings that have been there even prior to the Village Green or Metropolis, and those were adjacent to single-story properties; those tensions occur. He cited other examples of larger buildings adjacent to single-family on Evergreen. The Master Plan anticipates that the west side of Chestnut and the south side of Sigwalt are designated as transitional zones, but what we have here is the first brick in the final steps of the redevelopment of the Downtown, and the next project to the north could be two times the height of this building, according to the mixed-use B-5 district. The AT&T site could be in the range of eight or nine stories. We have to see some sort of common picture of what will be the completed picture of the Central Business District. It is hard to take a look at this project in a vacuum. We have to take a look at this thing as a community and in the context of a bigger picture of an evolving design, and where do we want that evolving design to end up, and what is the real picture of Downtown Arlington Heights in its completed form.

Mr. Hopkins continued and asked how does this development fit in? Well if you believe the Master Plan, it fits in well; in fact, 6-stories is anticipated, with 3 to 4-stories across the street. He questioned whether there would be the same kind of resistance if this were a 4-story building because the building is abrasive at this time because the picture is not complete and we do not have a full context for the final design.

Chair Fitzgerald said he was a little torn, and he went back to what he said at the previous review; he felt the building itself looks good, he liked the materials, he liked the building, and he would go back to the dark color on the pergola and the overhang. That being said, he referred to the resident living across the street from this site who spoke about the renovations she made to her home and was made to stay within specific zoning standards, and now we are telling her and everyone else on her block that this development does not. He was going to stick to just the aesthetics of the building because that is what this commission is supposed to do; he felt the building was a very nice building, but he was not sure if it is good in this spot.

Chair Fitzgerald asked if there were any more comments from the commissioners, or a motion, and there was no response. He added that a minimum of 3 positive votes was required for the project to pass.

Commissioner Kubow asked if Staff had any other comments about the project regarding mechanical screening or any other comments, and **Mr. Hautzinger** replied that he previously did not mention the rooftop mechanical screening because nothing changed since the last review; the rooftop mechanical units are proposed to be screened, and are illustrated on the drawings. Also, the trash dumpsters will be stored inside the building and the transformer on the east side of the building will be screened with evergreens.

Commissioner Eckhardt asked Staff for clarification about whether the Master Plan splits this super block into two areas, or is the entire site zoned R-7, with anticipation that ownership of the north portion of this site will come in with B-5 zoning. **Mr. Hautzinger** replied that the Master Plan designates the southern portion of this block, which is the site being reviewed tonight, to be zoned R-7, and everything north to be B-5 mixed use. **Commissioner Eckhardt** questioned how the line between the R-7 and B-5 was determined. He pointed out that there will be another zoning change request for the north portion of this site, which is rumored to be a B-5 zoning. His concern tonight, which **Mr. Hopkins** hit square on, is the decision about where the edge of the Metropolis of Arlington Heights going to stop. If the Village Board decides not to approve this project, then the value of the property goes down, and someone is going to build 3-story buildings, and eventually the single-family homes across the street might also be 3-story buildings, and that will be the end of the growth going west. He previously lived at Sigwalt and Walnut many years ago and often wondered if the Downtown would ever reach where he lived, and now it is right at the front door of those on Chestnut. He agreed with **Chair Fitzgerald** that we are here to look at a building that has been submitted by a petitioner, and we make a determination based on aesthetics and not so much the zoning, which is reviewed by the Plan Commission and the Village Board. He liked the building and approved it the first time around, even though it was rejected by the Village Board. The petitioner has come back with changes, and as **Commissioner Coon** pointed out from a percentage basis, the changes are not so significant to satisfy the scale and desire of the residents on the other side of the street. He reiterated that something really big could be coming for the north portion of this site, and it will be interesting to see what happens. Honestly, he was of the ilk of being sympathetic, he would like to see this building built, and felt everything to the right and to the north is fitting in; however, if this ends up being the edge of the Downtown, then it is a little bit troubling that it is going to go from this, to that, if it never grows to the west. That is sort of where he stands right now.

Mr. Hautzinger said that he did not come prepared to talk about the Comprehensive Plan; however, based on information he pulled from his file, he clarified that per the Comprehensive Plan, this site is envisioned to be zoned R-7; everything north on this block is envisioned to be mixed-use, which essentially is the Downtown B-5 Zoning District. Across the street to the west is envisioned be either moderate density or single-family attached, zoned either R-5 or R-6, and R-7 is envisioned all across the south side of Sigwalt, except for the westernmost edge that changes to R-5 or R-6 before transitioning back to single-family neighborhood that is envisioned to always remain that way. So according to the Comprehensive Plan, this site is not quite the edge of development, and it is possible that the houses on the west side of Chestnut could be redeveloped as something more dense in the future.

Chair Fitzgerald asked if all the properties located on the west side of Chestnut could eventually be similar to what is on Evergreen south of Sigwalt, where there are some attached row homes; or are we talking even bigger. **Mr. Hautzinger** replied that it could probably be three-story row homes to which **Chair Fitzgerald** said that in his opinion, row homes next to this proposed building is a fairly large transition. **Commissioner Eckhardt** added that row homes

could be 35-feet tall, 3-stories. **Commissioner Kingsley** pointed out that if the single-family homes across the street are rezoned to R-5 or R-6, the lots would need to be consolidated, and it could be 100 years or more before that ever happens. We see a lot of this throughout the Village where there are larger homes intermittent in a residential community, and it would be interesting if we could get some background on when this zoning was written, which could have been when some of these neighborhoods were previously in transition and we were not yet established. This is another thing that causes us to stop and ask whether the Comprehensive Plan is really something that is going to happen, or are we going to have this severe drop off. **Commissioner Eckhardt** asked staff if any preliminary drawings have been submitted for the north side of this site and **Mr. Hautzinger** said there are none to his knowledge.

Chair Fitzgerald asked if there was a motion to forward this project with any changes to it, or a motion to deny this project, or do a straw vote of what the commissioners think about this project as presented. A straw vote was taken with **Commissioner Kubow** being in favor of approving, **Commissioner Coon** being against, **Chair Fitzgerald** being against, and **Commissioner Eckhardt** being in favor of eliminating one-story.

Commissioner Kingsley said that she had a very difficult time with this because the commissioners previously approved the project with specific conditions, after debating about whether or not to approve the project, as well as discussing the purview of this commission. At that time, she wanted to send a very strong opinion to the Plan Commission and Village Board that the Design Commission likes the aesthetics of the new building, but not Items 5 and 6 listed in the motion that was made. The petitioner has returned with Items 1 through 4 taken care, but not Items 5 and 6; so does that mean that the project should be denied tonight?

Mr. Hautzinger stated that the commissioners had the same discussion and struggles at the last review of this project, and he reiterated the two options that Staff suggested at that time: a motion to approve because the commissioners like the design, which was done with a caveat about concerns about the harmony, compatibility, ordinances and Comprehensive Plan; or a motion for denial, which he recommended should include an explanation that the denial is not because of how the building looks, but rather that it does not meet some of the Design Guidelines evaluation criteria. He explained that the Design Commissioners have stated tonight that they like the design, and the Plan Commission and Village Board want an opinion from the Design Commission on the aesthetics of the building. He understood the Design Commission's concerns about harmony and compatibility, but he posed the question that, in a bubble, without context, do you like the way the building looks or not? Last time the decision was to recommend approval with the concerns about the Design Guideline criteria, which is a viable approach again this time. If there is a motion for denial, then it should be clarified as well. **Chair Fitzgerald** was in favor of that line of thinking, saying that the building looks good but here are the reasons why not. He thought that was fair to everyone and clear moving forward.

Based on that, **Commissioner Coon** wanted to add some thoughts on the aesthetics of the building that he did not previously address. He wanted the color of the fiber cement board siding to be studied so that it better works with the two brick tones, because now it feels even more of a third material. He felt the darker brown brick was an improvement and he liked getting rid of the stone at the base; he felt the entry feature has improved greatly, especially now that it is symmetrical and seems to have resolved itself a little more in a nicer way. He also felt that the charcoal grey siding should be looked at to determine whether it is appropriate, or whether it should be a warmer material or something with more earth tones to it. Also, the fifth floor was previously a corrugated metal panel that he strongly objected to; however, a change was made to bring in the dark brick at the top floor, which is a nice change, but now along the north side the fifth-floor wall is on top of brick, but now it is siding. He wanted to see that come back to the more permanent material.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR SIGWALT APARTMENTS TO BE LOCATED AT 45 S. CHESTNUT AVENUE. THIS APPROVAL IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS DATED AND RECEIVED 12/11/17, 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 ADDITIONAL WINDOWS BE ADDED TO THE TOP FLOOR TO BREAK UP THE AMOUNT OF WALL SIDING.
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.

There was no second to the motion; therefore, the motion failed.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER COON, TO DENY THE PETITION FOR *SIGWALT APARTMENTS* TO BE LOCATED AT 45 S. CHESTNUT AVENUE. THIS DENIAL IS BASED UPON THE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS DATED AND RECEIVED 12/11/17, AND THE FOLLOWING:

1. IN GENERAL, THE DESIGN COMMISSION IS IN APPROVAL OF THE AESTHETICS OF THE BUILDING WITH THE FOLLOWING COMMENTS:
 - a. THAT THE COLOR OF THE FIBER CEMENT SIDING, THE COLOR OF THE CANOPY, AND THE COLOR OF THE PERGOLA BE RECONSIDERED.
 - b. THAT ADDITIONAL WINDOWS AT THE TOP FLOOR TO BREAK UP THE AMOUNT OF WALL SIDING BE CONSIDERED.
2. DUE TO THE FACT THAT ITEMS 5 & 6 FROM THE DESIGN COMMISSION'S PREVIOUS APPROVAL, WHICH HAD TO DO WITH 'HARMONY AND COMPATIBILITY' AND 'CONFORMANCE TO ORDINANCES AND THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN', THE DESIGN COMMISSION IS OBLIGED TO DENY THE PETITION.

Commissioner Eckhardt said that he continues to be very concerned that when a large development comes in on the north part of the block, the entire site is going to look out of balance and lopsided and be a complete failure. He is now rethinking his thoughts about a stepped elevation concept where the building would get taller as it goes back. His gut feeling is that he wants to see this building here, but the reality is that it is going to sit alone for a long time before the rest of the block development comes around, and for that reason, he goes back to the Design Guidelines about compatibility. The building makes sense where it is, but there is one side of it that does not make sense, and he wonders if the U-shaped top floor could be pulled back to leave the taller part in the back, so that there is no chance of seeing it because it will be at least one unit back. At this time, he is leaning towards some modifications to the building, although he believes he could still support it, but the way it is presented tonight and the way things are going, and the uncertainty, he is very concerned about this, and even more concerned about what is happening to the north.

Chair Fitzgerald made the point that we do not know what is happening to the north, nothing has been submitted; therefore, it should not be considered at this time.

KINGSLEY, AYE; COON, AYE; FITZGERALD, AYE; KUBOW, NAY, ECKHARDT, NAY.
MOTION CARRIED.

Chair Fitzgerald asked Staff what the petitioner's next steps are. **Mr. Hautzinger** stated that the project can continue to proceed forward to the Plan Commission and the Village Board if the petitioner chooses. The Design Commission is advisory to the Village Board, so they will be taking the Design Commission's vote into consideration for their final review.

ITEM 2. SINGLE-FAMILY TEARDOWN REVIEWDC#17-136 – 523 W. Ridge Ct.

Tony Divizio, representing *Divizio Group*, was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to demolish an existing two-story residence and two-car attached garage to allow construction of a new two-story residence with an attached, three-car garage. The project does comply with all R-3 zoning requirements. The existing neighborhood consists of primarily single story homes with a mix of one car and two car attached garages. However, there have been numerous teardowns previously completed in this neighborhood, although this will be the first teardown on this cul-de-sac.

Overall, the proposed design is similar to other newer homes previously approved in this neighborhood. Features such as the single story front porch and single story garage roof help the design to fit in with the scale of the adjacent single story homes, and the hipped main roof keeps the height of the side walls from being too tall. The proposed third car garage space is recessed approximately 20 feet from the face of the two-car garage. The subject property is a large lot, and there is an abundance of open space behind the house. Staff recommends approval as submitted.

Mr. Divizio stated that this is not a teardown; the right side of the existing home will remain as a first-floor, and only the left side will be torn down, and a new second-story will be added across the home.

Commissioner Kubow said that architecturally, the home was very nicely designed, and he recalled a similarly designed home in terms of massing with a third car garage that was set back on a cul-de-sac, and he approved it. It helps that a home of this size is on a cul-de-sac because it is set back and not on a corner. Overall, he felt it was a well designed home and he was in support of it as proposed. He also liked the material palette and colors, and felt the petitioner took into account what the commissioners always talk about which is continuing the color palette on most sides of the home.

Commissioner Coon agreed with most of the comments made by Commissioner Kubow. He saw the attempt being made with the bay window turret roof element above the garage; however, because it is symmetrical with the garage door, he felt it drew more attention to that, and he wondered if there was an opportunity to tie in some of those other smaller scaled dormers; maybe two dormers instead of the larger turret. He also suggested moving the bay element further south and aligning it with the wall, to be off-center of the garage door. Mr. Divizio said that he was trying to avoid a typical gable or hip end and propose a full 2-story in that location; trying to soften it because of all the ranch homes on the cul-de-sac.

Commissioner Eckhardt felt the proposed elevation looked like 3 little homes. He liked that the second garage bay was centered as proposed, which would bother him if it were off-center, and felt it was so far out of the perspective of the home. He liked the front elevation and the design as submitted, and would make a recommendation to approve it as is.

Commissioner Kingsley asked about the first-floor height, and Mr. Divizio said it would be 10-feet. Commissioner Kingsley agreed with the other commissioners that the home is nicely designed, almost like in 3 little pieces like Commissioner Eckhardt pointed out; however, she struggled with the main bay with the 2-car garage, where the eave was raised even higher with the large bay and turret above the 2-car garage; she felt this was unresolved. She added that she is a huge advocate of trying to take the main eave line of the home down as low as possible to be as close as possible to the homes on either side; the entire section can be lowered, which will help with the homes on either side. In addition, she felt that the eave of the 2-car garage, at minimum, should match the other eaves, and Mr. Divizio clarified that the garage roof will be in line with the porch roof, as shown in the context elevation versus the rendering. Commissioner Kingsley had no further comments.

Chair Fitzgerald liked the home and the details on all four sides, and he liked the colors. He also agreed that the eave of the garage could come down; however, he liked the structure that way it is shown, and added that when he first looked at the design, he looked at the turret and not the garage. He liked the design as submitted, as long as the eaves line up.

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

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO APPROVE THE DESIGN OF THE PROPOSED NEW SINGLE-FAMILY HOME TO BE LOCATED AT 523 W. RIDGE COURT. THIS APPROVAL IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 10/27/17, REVISED SITE PLAN AND ELEVATIONS DATED 11/15/17 AND RECEIVED 11/17/17, 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 THE FIRST-FLOOR EAVE LINE MATCH ALL THE WAY ACROSS THE HOME, AND THAT THE GARAGE EAVE LINE BE LOWERED TO MATCH THE REST OF THE HOME.
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.

Commissioner Kingsley wanted the motion to include that if the petitioner changes the height of the windows to come down, then the eave line should come down as well so that the relationship of the eave to the head height match. **Commissioner Eckhardt** was not opposed to adding this to the motion, although he felt it was not necessary; the design of the windows at 8-feet is appropriate with the 10-foot ceilings. **Mr. Divizio** clarified that he intends to make the eave line straight across and make all the window heights 8-feet. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said that he is approving the home as presented and expects that to be built. **Mr. Hautzinger** added that Commissioner Kingsley's comments to lower the porch roof if possible will be noted in the minutes.

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

ITEM 3. SINGLE-FAMILY NEW REVIEWDC#17-149 – 504 S. Mitchell Ave.

Tony Divizio, representing *Divizio Group*, was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to build a new two-story residence with an attached, side load, two-car garage on a vacant lot. This project does comply with the R-3 zoning requirements, except for two air conditioning units that need to be relocated to avoid encroaching into the required side setback. The subject property is part of a new four-lot subdivision that received final approval in April 2017. The new subdivision consists of lots for three new single-family homes, and one lot for stormwater detention. This proposed new home will be on Lot 2. As part of the subdivision approval, two existing trees along the south property line on the subject property, and one existing parkway tree are required to be preserved.

This neighborhood, and this street, consist of a wide variety of houses including single-story, two-story, historic, newer, attached garages, and detached garages. However, the subject site is adjacent to three charming vintage cottage style homes that have a very consistent appearance. The proposed design does a nice job of picking up on the traditional form of the adjacent houses with a steeply pitched asymmetrical garage gable facing the street. However, the main body of the house has a large hipped roof that does not quite fit with the character of the garage massing on the front. The stone tower feature next to the entry also feels out of context with the steep garage gables.

The primary concern with the proposed design is that a side-load garage on a relatively narrow lot pushes the main body of the house towards the back of the lot, whereas the adjacent houses on the street are justified towards the front setback line. The Design Commission should evaluate the appropriateness of the proposed side-load garage configuration, or whether a revised design with the main body of the house at the front of the lot and the garage recessed away from the street would be more appropriate.

Mr. Divizio said that he previously met with Staff regarding these concerns. While reviewing this proposed new home for Lot 2, he asked that the commissioners consider what will happen on Lots 1 and 3. He could propose more of a cookie-cutter type home for this lot, with the home and garage to face Mitchell; however, he decided on a side-load garage for this lot because of what could happen on Lot 1. Lot 1 is a very important lot because the new home could face either Mitchell Avenue or the church across the street on Park Street, and the garages could vary as well. Lot 1 might include the garage facing Mitchell and the front of the home facing the church, or the front of the home facing Mitchell and a detached garage in the back or towards to the west, or the garage facing the church. He asked the commissioners to consider everything on how this subdivision comes about. He also previously discussed with Staff the exterior side yard requirement as stated in the subdivision is 25-feet on Lot 1, with the average going down the block at 8 to 10-feet. He is trying to make the side yard facing Park Street to be 10-feet so it blends in with what is existing in the neighborhood, all the way down Park Street. Commissioner Eckhardt commented that this has been done many times in the Village, and he would not discourage the petitioner from going in that direction.

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

Commissioner Coon acknowledged that looking at the elevations, he could see that a lot of effort went into the garage to make it fit in with the home to the south, and also to make the east elevation look like there is living space behind it and not just a garage. He appreciated all those things, as well as the large gable over the garage door; however, he also felt that flipping the home could work equally as well; completely flipping the home and putting the garage in the back, resulting in a longer driveway. He pointed out that there are many examples of this in the Village, and the petitioner agreed. Commissioner Coon felt the proposed configuration was a preference and the garage exceeded expectations of what a garage would be, which would not necessarily be required or justified if the home were flipped. Based on the petitioner's personal preference and the fact that this has been done successfully before, he was not bothered by the entry being set back, so if this is the direction the petitioner wanted to pursue, then he felt he could support it. He agreed that how Lot 1 develops should be considered, and he wanted to see a home that is pulled up

in line with this new home, as opposed to being pushed to the west, because he did not want to be driving west on Park Street and look down Mitchell to the south and just see a garage as the anchor to this long residential street. **Mr. Divizio** felt that to get any square footage out of the home on Lot 1, it would have to be built in line with this garage on Lot 2, and **Commissioner Coon** said that this would obscure the exposure of the garage doors on the south elevation of this home. **Mr. Divizio** added that placement of the garage on Lot 2 was also done to allow space from looking into the rooms on Lot 1. **Commissioner Coon** asked how the 5/12 pitch on the front elevation is resolving itself with the peak of the 10/12 pitch at the center, and **Mr. Divizio** explained that the 10/12 pitch is coming off of a 1-story elevation in the back; trying to make it softer.

Commissioner Coon felt it was a valiant effort to tie the new home into the smaller Tudor-style element of the adjacent home by bringing the roof down; however, he was unsure if it was entirely necessary; he would almost rather see a more balanced elevation. **Mr. Divizio** was not opposed to making it even; he was attempting to make it asymmetrical because the elevation is asymmetrical.

Commissioner Eckhardt really liked the new home and that it is quirky and not symmetrical or balanced. He asked if there was a reason why the first-floor window in the closet on the right side elevation was not centered and **Mr. Divizio** said that the window could be moved over to be centered. In terms of high and low, **Commissioner Eckhardt** felt the new home was spectacular, there is a lot of European character to the new home and he really liked it.

Commissioner Kingsley also liked the quirkiness of the design, although she pointed out that there are some unresolved details on the drawings. Looking at the site plan and going back to what the commissioners were talking about with the previous petition, the configuration of this new home is being created for the future home on Lot 1; however, she felt the left side (south) elevation turns its back on the adjacent home and creating a courtyard for the new home here so that this home here would not have as much of a home to look onto. If the new home was flipped 180 degrees, it might actually work better for the adjacent home. **Mr. Divizio** replied that the garage roof on the left side was lowered to less than full-story, with a small 2-story element in the center of the elevation and a 1-story element at the rear of the home, instead of it being a full-story home elevation, to consider the existing cottage-story home to the south. **Commissioner Kingsley** acknowledged and appreciated that, and wanted it to be clear for the record that it is nice to hear when a petitioner is proposing a new home, about how it will relate to the existing homes in the neighborhood, not what is to be built next door in the future. She felt the front elevation was fine as proposed, although she did not particularly care for sideload garages like this because she did not like the courts that are created; it de-emphasizes the garage, but it also de-emphasizes the entry, and it minimizes the whole porch scene that is evident on Mitchell. She felt the rest of the home was fine.

Commissioner Kubow said that in general, he liked the quirky architecture and it seems like there is a consistency among the petitioner's designs, which he could appreciate. He liked what is being proposed architecturally and the material palette looks great. He personally does not like these sideload garages that many people seem to like, because if all of these homes had a sideload garage with the home set back, it would look awful. His big issue with it that it de-activates the residents from the neighborhood because the living space of the home is set back so far from the street. However, he appreciated that the petitioner went out of his way to design the new home to make the garage look interesting; it makes him feel a little more comfortable with approving what is being proposed tonight. He said it would have helped if the petitioner provided a 3-dimensional image of the new home; for him personally, to help de-emphasize the garage and with the quirky architecture, it would be fun to see how it all would come together. Overall, he liked the design and the material palette was great, but he was not a big fan of the footprint; the sideload garage and pushing the home back, although it did not mean that he would not approve the design because the petitioner really went out his way to architecturally make the garage more interesting; he just was not a fan of the footprint. **Mr. Divizio** agreed with the comments but also noted that he could have come in with a simple, frontload garage home, which is not what he is looking to do in the Village.

Chair Fitzgerald liked the new home as proposed, although he liked the comments made by the other commissioners. He liked the materials and he appreciated that all 4 sides of the home are interesting. He felt that the motion should require some kind of landscaping on the side of the driveway to help soften the garage door from the future home next

door, which could be approved by Staff. He also pointed out that the comments made tonight by the petitioner about blending in with the future home on Lot 1 will be referenced when that home comes before the commission, and Mr. Divizio said that he fully understood that.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER COON, TO APPROVE THE DESIGN OF THE PROPOSED NEW SINGLE-FAMILY HOME TO BE LOCATED AT 504 S. MITCHELL AVENUE. THIS APPROVAL IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS RECEIVED 11/17/17, 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 EVERGREEN TYPE LANDSCAPING BE PROVIDED FOR YEAR ROUND SOFTENING TO BE IN LINE WITH THE VIEW FROM THE GARAGE TO THE ADJACENT LOT TO THE NORTH (LOT 1).
2. A RECOMMENDATION TO CONSIDER A BETTER PLACEMENT OF THE WINDOW ON THE RIGHT SIDE ELEVATION IN THE FIRST-FLOOR CLOSET.
3. 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.

Commissioner Kubow asked if the eave on the front elevation should be raised to be consistent with the adjacent home to the south. Commissioner Eckhardt replied that he liked the quirkiness of the new home as it is proposed, and Commissioner Coon agreed. Commissioner Eckhardt suggested the option of allowing the petitioner to even off the eave line, although he liked it the way it is currently designed. The other commissioners agreed.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER COON, TO AMEND THE MOTION TO ADD THE FOLLOWING:

4. A RECOMMENDATION TO RAISE THE EAVE LINE ACROSS THE FRONT OF THE HOME TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE ADJACENT HOME, ALTHOUGH THE EAVE LINE AS PROPOSED IS ACCEPTABLE AS WELL.

Commissioner Kingsley asked if the petitioner was seeking a variance for the location of the a/c units that appear to be located across the lot line, and added that she preferred that the units be located next to the garage of the adjacent home. Mr. Divizio replied that he is not asking for a variation, and the units are currently drawn at 8-feet; however, they could probably be moved back and tucked in near the stairs to comply with the side yard setback requirement of 7-feet.

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

ITEM 4. SINGLE-FAMILY TEARDOWN REVIEWDC#17-153(H) – 223 S. Dunton Ave.

Piotr Janota, representing *Miyako Investments LLC*, was present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to demolish an existing two-story residence to allow the construction of a new two-story residence with a new detached garage. The project does comply with the R-6 zoning requirements for single-family residences. The subject property is located in one of Arlington Heights' older neighborhoods amongst primarily historic homes, located just south of the Downtown. The existing house (proposed to be demolished) was listed in a Community Preservation Report which was prepared for the Village of Arlington Heights by the School of the Art Institute of Chicago in 2004. The Preservation Report was prepared in an effort to raise community awareness and promote the preservation of the historic character of certain neighborhoods in Arlington Heights. Homes in the report are rated in order of importance as "Exceptional", "Notable", or "Contributing". The subject house is rated as "Notable".

Although the existing house is included in the Preservation Report, the petitioner has reported that the house has multiple deficiencies most notably a failing brick foundation. Photos of the existing conditions have been provided. Due to the poor condition of the foundation, the petitioner is proposing to replace the house with a newly constructed home. The proposed new house with a front porch and a detached garage is nicely designed to fit the scale and character of the neighborhood, and Staff recommends approval as submitted.

Mr. Janota said that it was a difficult decision to propose to demolish the existing home, and he presented photos of the existing foundation that is in poor condition with missing bricks. **Chair Fitzgerald** said that he was recently inside this home and there is no saving the home at all, it is for sure a teardown.

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

Commissioner Kingsley said that she is a strong proponent of saving historic structures in the Village; however, she knows that the existing home is not in good condition. Although she preferred to see a home just like the existing home being demolished put back in, she felt the massing chosen for the new home is nice. She liked the detail added around windows and the scale, although the columns might be a little heavy, and she said that Hardi-siding was being proposed instead of vinyl. She asked if window muntins were proposed in all the windows and **Mr. Janota** said that he planned on following what is shown in the renderings. He added that he is a resident of Arlington Heights and he likes this historical area of the Village. He walked down both Fremont and St. James to find inspiration for the new home, which included keeping the historical spirit alive in the design to fit the neighborhood. **Commissioner Kingsley** commended the petitioner for doing so, and if possible, she recommended using true divided lights for the windows or at least have the muntins on the exterior.

Commissioner Eckhardt questioned why the trim board feature on the front of the home did not continue around the entire home for more authenticity, otherwise he felt the home was fine.

Commissioner Coon said that he liked that the front elevation almost looks like the existing home was saved and added on to; a lot of the proportions were kept and he felt it was a great compromise to not using the original historic home as a starting point, which he commended the petitioner on. However, he had an issue with the first-floor of the new home being built so close to the ground, as seen with many new homes, which causes privacy issues with pedestrians walking by. He pointed out that many older historic homes, including his, have the first-floor about 4-feet above ground, and/or steps leading up to a porch or front door, which is a great connection to the neighborhood. He liked that there are 2 steps going up to the porch of the new home, allowing for the possibility of a nicer porch floor, and he referenced the home across the street at 222 S. Dunton that has another step up to the porch, which nods it head a little more to the other raised homes in the neighborhood. These blocks leading up to the Downtown have a lot of homes with the first-floor up 4-feet from the sidewalk and steps leading up to the porch/front door, which he felt is

one of the features of the new home that is potentially missing. Although he supported the new home as currently proposed with 2 steps up to the front porch, he felt it would be an improvement to make the home blend in more with the context of the neighborhood by increasing the amount of steps. **Mr. Janota** said that they tried to go with 3-feet up to the porch and lowered the first-floor ceilings because of the height of the roof, which is not as high as other homes in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Eckhardt said that he designed the home down the street at 205 S. Dunton Avenue, which is a 2-unit building with clerestory windows in the basement that allow for a lot of natural light. He agreed with Commissioner Coon's comments and strongly recommended the proposed new home be raised up, consistent with the raised homes on either side of the site. **Mr. Janota** was concerned that raising the home would interfere with meeting the code requirement for height.

Commissioner Coon recommended adding a window on the south elevation in the living room or landscaping in front of that wall. **Mr. Janota** explained that there are huge trees located on the south side of the site that he wanted to preserve, and these trees would block any windows there.

Commissioner Kubow questioned the 'Notable' rating given to the existing home through the preservation report that was done. **Commissioner Eckhardt** explained that the study was done many years ago by college students, which he felt was not a completely legitimate historic landmark study and he personally did not weigh too much on the study. **Mr. Hautzinger** added that all the homes included in the study were historic in terms of age, and he agreed that there did not appear to be any exceptional merit with the architecture of this particular home. **Commissioner Eckhardt** added that although the original home at 205 S. Dunton was not 'Notable' prior to it being torn down for his previous project, the Village still asked that he photograph the home and prepare existing floor plans, which were then submitted to the Village for record keeping. **Mr. Hautzinger** added that Staff works with the Arlington Heights Historical Museum by sending them a monthly list of all approved teardowns to be photographed, regardless of the age of the home or its historical significance.

Commissioner Kubow said that overall, he was in agreement with the other commissioners, and he agreed with Commissioner Coon's comments about the consistency of the front elevation with the previous home. He also agreed with Commissioner Kingsley's recommendation to add real window mullions on the outside of the windows, Commissioner Eckhardt's suggestion to continue the belly band around the entire home, and Commissioner Coon's recommendation to raise the home a few more steps to be consistent with the surrounding homes and context.

Chair Fitzgerald agreed with Commissioner Kubow's summary of the other comments already made.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO APPROVE THE DESIGN OF THE PROPOSED NEW SINGLE-FAMILY HOME TO BE LOCATED AT 223 S. DUNTON AVENUE. THIS APPROVAL IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS DATED AND RECEIVED 12/21/17, 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 RECOMMENDATION TO ADD FULL WINDOW MULLIONS TO THE GLAZING.
2. A RECOMMENDATION TO ADD A HORIZONTAL BELLY BAND CONSISTENT WITH THE FRONT ELEVATION, TO ALL SIDES OF THE HOME.
3. A RECOMMENDATION TO RAISE THE HOME TO BE MORE CONSISTENT WITH THE SURROUNDING HOMES.
4. 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.

Chair Fitzgerald said that it should be a requirement to use real window muntins on at least the front elevation since the new home is only 10-feet from the sidewalk. **Mr. Janota** replied that the new home will be 15-feet from the sidewalk to comply with code requirements. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said that the home he built at 205 S. Dunton was brought forward approximately 5 or 6-feet to become the average front yard setback of the homes on the block, with the adjacent red home being located on the lot line. **Chair Fitzgerald** wanted to further discuss this, as he assumed the new home was being built at the same setback as the existing home. **Mr. Hautzinger** clarified that the existing home is located 11'-7" from the property line and the new home will be pushed back another 3'-5" for the required 15-feet. **Commissioner Eckhardt** suggested adding to the motion the commission's support if the petitioner chooses to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals to move the home forward because of the precedent in the neighborhood; there is without question a strong contextual appearance of the surrounding homes.

Commissioner Kubow agreed with moving the new home forward, but he was hesitant about requiring the window muntins on the front elevation because he felt it was not necessary.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO AMEND THE MOTION TO ADD THE FOLLOWING:

5. THAT THE DESIGN COMMISSION SUPPORTS THE PETITIONER IN A POSSIBLE DECISION TO SEEK A VARIATION TO MOVE THE HOME FORWARD TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE SURROUNDING HOMES.

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

ITEM 5. SINGLE-FAMILY NEW REVIEW**DC#17-154 – 626 N. Harvard Ave.**

Brian Hyde, representing *Greenscape Homes*, and Don Forlani, the homeowner, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is proposing to build a new two-story residence with an attached, three-car garage on an existing vacant lot. The subject site is zoned R-E and the project does comply with the R-E zoning requirements. The existing neighborhood is predominantly single-story homes with attached garages. However, there is also a variety of other house styles with numerous split-level and two-story homes and a few previously completed teardowns. The subject property is a large corner lot with an abundance of mature landscaping, especially along the west property line.

Overall, the proposed design is nicely done in a traditional style that complements the variety of existing houses in the neighborhood. The front elevation is nicely designed, and the stone base is returned down the side wall of the garage. The only concern with the design is the quantity of small transom windows on the large exterior side elevation. Since this elevation will be highly visible, the following revisions are recommended:

- Change the two transom windows in the second floor Master Bedroom to full size double hung windows.
- Consider adding a box bay window feature in the Dining Room (similar to the Den/Guest Room) to break up the large flat wall.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed design with the recommendations stated above.

Mr. Hyde responded to the Staff comments. He explained that changing the two transom windows on the south elevation in the master bedroom to full size double hung windows would interfere with furniture arrangement and privacy; the homeowner wants to focus their views out toward the rear yard, south and west. The first-floor dining room has a similar situation; it is an open floor concept and transom windows are being proposed on the south wall to allow for furniture placement. A lot of time was spent trying to place the home on the lot to save as many of the mature trees as possible, with many large trees along the street side on Harvard that provide screening of that elevation. Fencing and landscaping are also being proposed on the left side of the home, with large evergreens being proposed near the kitchen.

Mr. Forlani said that he and his fiancé have owned this vacant lot since 2015 and have both grown up in the area; they want a lot of privacy and it was rare to find this big of a lot to provide that, and the trees are very important to them. In response to Staff comments, they are definitely more open to the suggestion on the second-floor, and are definitely opposed to the suggestion on the first-floor. With the fence and the landscaping being proposed on the outside of the fence, in addition to the existing trees, he felt there would not be much of a line site there to spend the investment of a bay window on a home that is already pushing the envelope of what the market can support on this lot. During the 3 years that he has owned this lot, he received feedback and offers from builders that wanted to construct 2 homes on this site, and he also pointed out the apartment line site from the corner that they are trying to mitigate with the trees. They believe that between the existing trees that will be saved, the fence, and the landscaping, the first-floor windows make a lot of sense as proposed, as well as the functionality from the inside. He reiterated that they are willing to work with the commissioners on the upstairs if they feel it is a big enough issue because it is important that the project move forward.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mark Swenson, 1209 W. Hawthorne Street, directly west of the site. He said that there are no storm sewers in this neighborhood and this corner site is at the low part of the entire block; the west end of Hawthorne Street is 6-feet higher than this end of the street to the east, and the previous home on this site would be surrounded by water when there were heavy rains. His only comment about the new home is that he felt the petitioner should be required to put in a

storm sewer that ties into a larger storm sewer on Harvard.

Chair Fitzgerald explained that this issue is not under the purview of this commission; however, the comments made by the resident will become part of the record and he encouraged the resident to contact the Village Engineering Department to discuss further, as well as communicate with the builder and the homeowner. **Mr. Swensen** stated that he has lived here for 30 years and has a history of talking to Engineering and not getting any results. **Commissioner Eckhardt** suggested the resident contact the Village Manager as well.

Commissioner Kingsley pointed out that the petitioner is proposing only 3,697 square feet of impervious surface where 12,725 square feet is allowed, which she is glad to see. She understood the homeowner's preference not to add windows in the living room or increase the size of the windows in the master bedroom, but she felt that further consideration should be given to this suggestion because the rooms are quite large and would allow a visual to the outside, as well as have a lasting effect on the home. She also felt that larger windows in the kitchen should be considered; bring the proposed windows down to the countertop for improved views of the outside. **Commissioner Kingsley** also suggested adding some type of canopy over the back door for weather protection, especially if there is going to be an outdoor eating area or kitchen. She felt that trim details from the front elevation should be continued around the east side of the home that faces Harvard; consider making the east side of the home almost as special as the front elevation because of the corner lot.

Commissioner Eckhardt supported the petitioner's position on the transom windows on the left side elevation, pointing out that the other elevations have ample windows and the dining room has large windows on 2 sides; he was okay with the windows as proposed. He also agreed with the suggestion to add a covering over the back door.

Commissioner Coon was fine with all of the comments previously stated about the home itself; however, he had concerns about the prominence of the garage on the corner and he asked if the petitioner considered flipping the home, which he felt would solve the dilemma of getting better architecture facing the street. **Mr. Hyde** said that flipping the home was discussed with Staff and was considered, but it is not financially feasible. He explained that the original layout from Greenscape Homes had the master bedroom and the backyard facing west; however, they wanted to face the existing tree line as opposed to the street. In response to the concerns about the garage being on the corner of the site, he pointed out all of the surrounding garages and apartment building. **Commissioner Coon** said that because the petitioner is saving the existing trees along Harvard Avenue and adding a new fence, along with the amount of setback from the street, the plainness of the east elevation did not necessarily bother him. He noted that the survey shows the new home being built under the canopy of the existing tree line, and he asked if this was realistic in terms of preserving the trees. **Chair Fitzgerald** replied that there appears to be more than enough room for over dig during construction, and he suggested hiring an arborist to root prune the existing trees. **Commissioner Coon** also thanked the petitioner for not maximizing the size of the home on the site, which would have been allowed by code.

Commissioner Kubow agreed with the comments made by Commissioner Coon about rotating the home, which it appears the petitioner considered and has reasoning behind the current orientation of the home. He said it was a beautiful home and he had no further comments.

Chair Fitzgerald agreed with the comments already been said, and he suggested a recommendation to change the windows on the left side elevation so the petitioner has the opportunity to do so without having to come back here.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO APPROVE THE DESIGN OF THE PROPOSED NEW SINGLE-FAMILY HOME TO BE LOCATED AT 626 N. HARVARD AVENUE. THIS APPROVAL IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS DATED 12/8/17, RECEIVED 12/11/17, 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 RECOMMENDATION TO ADD A COVER ABOVE THE BACK DOOR.

2. A RECOMMENDATION TO INCREASE THE SIZE OF THE WINDOWS ON THE EAST (HARVARD AVENUE) ELEVATION.
3. 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.

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

ITEM 6. CBD COMMERCIAL REVIEW**DC#17-155 – 132 W. Northwest Hwy.**

Keith Ginnodo, representing *Kingsley/Ginnodo Architects*, and Michael & Ellen Para, the owners, were present on behalf of the project.

Chair Fitzgerald and Commissioner Kingsley recused themselves from the project and left the room.

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

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is seeking approval of the architectural design for a second floor addition and a single-story attached one-car garage addition to an existing single-story commercial building in the Downtown (B-5) Zoning District. The property is a triangular site on the north side of the railroad tracks, directly west of the Mobil gas station. The existing vacant building was previously used as an office, and it is proposed to be converted to a retail store. The second floor addition will be a single-family dwelling unit to create a live/work mixed-use building. The scope of the project includes modifications to the existing parking lot as well as new landscaping. This project requires Plan Commission review and Village Board approval as a Planned Unit Development, as well as approval of setback variations.

Style and Materials. The proposed design is a complete makeover of the existing single-story pitched roof building to create a new modern style building, and the second floor addition is proposed to be clad with a dark gray, horizontal fiber-cement lap siding. With reference to the Design Guidelines, the Design Commission should evaluate the proposed modern style with the context of the surrounding buildings, and evaluate the use of horizontal lap siding as the primary wall material, and consider whether a masonry façade would be more appropriate for a feeling of permanence and a better relationship to neighboring buildings.

East Elevation. The east elevation is the back of the building, but it will be highly visible from Northwest Highway and Vail Avenue. As proposed, the upper façade of the east wall is a blank wall of siding. The wall is approximately two feet from the east property line, and preliminary building code review concludes that window openings are not allowed where exterior walls are less than five feet from the property line. With reference to the Design Guidelines, it is recommended that the design of the east wall be enhanced for a more attractive appearance. Options for incorporating some windows should be explored such as stepping back sections of the wall or using fire rated glazing. In addition, consider adding vine cables (as shown on the west elevation) for architectural interest and to promote the growth of vines onto the upper facade.

Storefront. The proposed retail storefront faces Northwest Highway on the south and west walls of the building. As proposed, the retail storefront has an understated appearance and it does not stand out as a commercial space. With reference to the Design Guidelines, it is recommended that the two existing punched opening windows on the west wall be changed to a full storefront in order to maximize the window display area for the retail space. Additionally, it is recommended that the southern balcony bay be omitted to provide an unobstructed view of the storefront. As an alternate, the size of the balcony could be reduced and cantilevered for a lighter appearance above the storefront.

Signs. There is no clear sign frieze provided for retail signage. With reference to the Design Guidelines, it is recommended that a sign frieze be incorporated into the design to accommodate wall signage and to further enhance the appearance of the retail storefront. Separate sign permit applications are required for all signage.

North Elevation. The north elevation is predominantly a blank solid wall facing the public sidewalk. It is recommended that additional windows be added to break up the blank wall and add interest along the sidewalk.

Landscaping.

New Landscaping is being proposed throughout the site, including a new row of shrubs along the south edge of the property to screen the view of the parking lot. Overall, the landscape design is nicely done, but the following recommendations should be considered to enhance the design.

- Provide specialty paving within the plaza area along the west and south building walls.
- Provide a detail of the proposed decorative fence for review, which the petitioner submitted today.

Staff is supportive of this project to renovate and improve this property; however, it is recommended that the Design Commission require revisions and re-review the proposed design, based on the recommendations in the Staff report.

Mr. Ginnodo said that the owners are urban dwellers that have found the perfect spot for themselves in the suburbs, and their vision is to develop a live/work environment; live on the second-floor and work below, with separation between the two. He responded to the comments in the Staff report as follows:

1. He reviewed the context of the area, pointing out other modern style buildings such as 116 W. Eastman located directly across the parking lot, the red brick AT&T building, the church on Dunton Avenue, and the gas station. They feel the modern language being proposed is appropriate for this location and are not interested in trying to traditionalize it; it also suits the owners' appetite, style, and way of living.
2. A masonry facade was considered instead of the siding on the second-floor; however, this would be costly and not in line with their budget; therefore, fiber cement siding was chosen, which is a quality, long lasting residential material. Also, this is a mixed-use project with one contextual language below with brick and storefront, and a second language above with a residential material and balconies; they feel it is appropriately designed.
3. No windows are being proposed for the east elevation, with the exception of the existing first-floor window that will remain. Modulating the exterior wall would be at cost and damage to what they are trying to accomplish with the floor plans, which is a very simple, clean, loft-like floor plan, and adding windows above the kitchen or in the closet area would require a variation process. The proposed landscape plan has accommodated for a 2-foot area between the building and the adjacent gas station, where climbing hydrangeas will grow up the side of the building.
4. Cost would be a factor in changing the two existing punched opening windows on the west elevation to a full storefront, and eliminating the small strip of wall in between would result in the loss of display space for shelving products. There is also a second storefront entrance in the middle of the elevation, which is intended to be used as a second entrance for the office and the store.
5. Cantilevering the balcony was suggested early on by the owners; however, cost was a factor. They are trying to capture outdoor living with southern balcony because there is no yard space for the building.
6. A nicely designed sign is currently in the works for the project; however, the sign will adapt to the architecture of the building; they do not want a sign frieze because the second-floor would be compromised by a separate band. They understand there are sign requirements for the retail, and the sign will be located on the south elevation, on the second-floor wall material.
7. Adding windows on the north wall along the sidewalk would be impractical because of the interior stair that starts to the left of the door and goes up, and the building is located immediately on the sidewalk, so privacy and security concerns are trying to be addressed.
8. Specialty paving at the front of the building near the storefront entrance would be a cost issue compared to the concrete being proposed.
9. He presented a detail of the proposed decorative fence.

Mr. Ginnodo said that he is hoping to come to an agreement tonight with the design being presented, with any recommendations or requirements, so the project can move forward.

Commissioner Kubow loved the proposed design and felt it was fantastic. Although he appreciated Staff's comments and understood where they were coming from, he respectfully disagreed with some of them, specifically making the west wall a full storefront. He understood trying to attract people to the building with an open storefront, but he felt the architecture would do that on its own; the building will have no trouble attracting attention. Besides the architecture, he really liked the location of the building, and the cool modern building that people coming eastbound into Arlington

Heights will see. In his opinion, the Village needed more modern, contemporary buildings, and this building acts as almost a gateway into the downtown. He really did not have much constructive criticism for the project; it is a really cool space, and he would love to see some windows facing east, but it just does not work when the building is on the property line. In terms of signage, **Commissioner Kubow** felt it would make sense potentially at the corner to have a sign that projects southward off the corner approximately 3-feet, very rectangular but still modern, that will capture east and west traffic and maybe some traffic on Eastman. He asked if a ground sign was being proposed and **Mr. Ginnodo** said no, although there is an existing ground sign on the property. **Commissioner Kubow** was in favor of the project and looked forward to watching it be built and the business thrive.

Commissioner Coon said that he had a lot of comments that are meant to be seeds that the petitioner can ponder and think about. He felt there was no reason to re-review this project, he felt it was really fantastic. He had questions about certain materials and how some things are resolved and some suggestions. In terms of the materials, it was unclear to him what material is being proposed for the planter boxes, the deck, and the underside of the deck. **Mr. Ginnodo** replied that the structure that projects from the building will be steel, with lattice work above, welded steel planters, and the floor will be decking material. **Commissioner Coon** liked the geometrical simplicity of the north façade, but felt that a little more glass in the stairwell could help to tie it into the south facade of it coming down, although he was unsure if it warranted it. **Mr. Hautzinger** clarified Staff's suggestion to add windows to the north wall was in relation to the space underneath the stairs; perhaps there was an opportunity to create a window as part of the retail storefront, resulting in visibility on the north side as well as the south and on the west. **Mr. Ginnodo** said the space under the stairs is proposed to be a closet for storage, as it is not useful.

Commissioner Coon also questioned the necessity of the glass garage door and the type of glass being proposed. **Mr. Ginnodo** replied that the glass would be frosted and he preferred the option of glass, although they are still considering this expensive feature. **Commissioner Coon** felt the glass would draw attention to that area, and he had concerns about a glass overhead door appearing architecturally significant, especially with the cost. This cost could be put toward making a full storefront on the west wall as suggested by Staff, although he was not really bothered that there is no storefront except for the existing under the new balcony. He would rather see the storefront door on the south elevation stand alone and the 2 sidelights removed and infilled with brick, which would establish a rhythm that works with the other punched windows openings, linking the older building with the new building on top.

With regards to the east elevation that faced the adjacent gas station, **Commissioner Coon** pointed out that the floor plans show the wall to be very thick, which he thought related to sound rating issues from the adjacent gas station, and **Mr. Ginnodo** stated that it was a drawing error. **Commissioner Coon** felt that a green wall could be an improvement to the east wall, as opposed to adding some decorative fluff.

Acting Chair Eckhardt understood the east wall and that it is next to the gas station, but felt there were some opportunities to break up the east wall by building a 10-foot arbor structure. He was also concerned about the deck not having a pergola for sun shade, and the security issue of having the stairs to the second-floor residential space so close to the retail storefront entrance, which was very disturbing to him. He was also concerned that the windows on the first-floor did not scream retail business, and that the building appeared top heavy; however, if signage was located on the side of the building, he might have a different opinion. On the north elevation, he loved the idea of the three contrasting materials being proposed, but felt it looked odd where the white panels meet the existing first-floor brick, underneath the new second-floor. He considered the suggestions made by Staff, but ultimately felt the design was fine as proposed, and he agreed with **Commissioner Coon's** suggestion to reconsider the glass overhead door and save money. **Acting Chair Eckhardt** was also concerned about this smooth white panels being damaged by graffiti vandals, since there is nothing like this and it is an attractive billboard for graffiti. He asked about exterior lighting, which he felt there should be an abundance of since this building is in the downtown.

Mr. Ginnodo responded to the comments. He said that a the front section of the terrace will be a deep planter, supported by the garage roof, that will include small trees for shade, as well as other large trees being proposed around the building. A gate will be located on the stairs leading to the second-floor. If it is a requirement, they will do it, but if it is a recommendation they will seriously consider the suggestion about the full storefront on the west wall.

Acting Chair Eckhardt strongly recommended the owner consider the suggestion to make a full storefront on the west wall, which will allow for more product displays. **Mr. Ginnodo** had no response regarding the corner on the north façade, although he will consider the comment, and he understood the comments about the glass garage door, which they will reconsider. He added that exterior lighting is part of the Plan Commission review, and will include can lights above the overhang and rear door, and a light bar at the garage door. No site lighting is being proposed; however, there are street lights all around the site. In the absence of Chair Fitzgerald, who designed the landscaping, **Mr. Ginnodo** reviewed the proposed landscape plan, which included bringing trees onto the property, and continuing the existing landscaping around the site for continuity. **Acting Chair Eckhardt** commented about the climbing Hydrangeas on the east elevation, which he has at his home, and how they will become very heavy and woody over the years and may require a wire mesh on top of the brick wall to allow the plant to hold onto.

Acting Chair Eckhardt reiterated his concerns about the corner on the north elevation and wanted to see something done with it. **Commissioner Kubow** said that he liked the juxtaposition of what is being proposed, and wanted to keep it as three distinct and different shapes. **Mr. Ginnodo** clarified that the grey siding projects out 2-inches from the white panels. **Commissioner Coon** clarified his previous comments about the garage door; he was not implying that a residential style door found at a big box store be proposed; he preferred something contemporary, clean and simple like the adjacent walls.

Mr. Ginnodo summarized the commissioners' comments. Consider changing the two existing punched window openings on the west wall to a full storefront; clarification on how the wall sign will be hung up and used; consider something other than glass for the garage door; and clarification on exterior lighting. Additional comments included concerns about security and protection for the stairs leading up the second-floor; and consider adding a window on the north elevation below the stair;

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER COON, TO APPROVE THE DESIGN FOR 132 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY. THIS APPROVAL IS SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS DATED AND RECEIVED 12/11/17, 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 RECOMMENDATION TO STUDY THE STOREFRONT SYSTEM ON THE GROUND FLOOR, TO POTENTIALLY ACCOMMODATE MORE GLAZING TO MAKE IT MORE STOREFRONT AND RETAIL LIKE.
2. A RECOMMENDATION TO RECONSIDER THE GLASS GARAGE DOOR FOR SOMETHING THAT WOULD BRING LESS ATTENTION TO THAT AREA.
3. A RECOMMENDATION TO ADD A WINDOW BELOW THE STAIRS ON THE NORTH ELEVATION.
4. A RECOMMENDATION TO CONSIDER ADDING VINE CABLES ON THE EAST ELEVATION TO HELP WITH EITHER PLANT GROWTH UP FROM THE GROUND OR ADD PLANTINGS AT THE TOP OF THE WALL TO GROW DOWN.
5. ALL SIGNAGE MUST MEET CODE, CHAPTER 30.
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.

Acting Chair Eckhardt commented about climbing concerns with the horizontal balcony railings, and suggested further research by the petitioner to determine the best wires for the climbing plants.

KUBOW, AYE; COON, AYE; ECKHARDT, AYE; KINGSLEY, RECUSE; FITZGERALD, RECUSE.
MOTION CARRIED.

DRAFT

ITEM 7. GENERAL MEETING

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER COON, TO EXTEND THE MEETING PAST 10:30 P.M.

ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

Mr. Hautzinger responded to concerns raised by Commissioner Coon, via email, about the proposed Chapter 28 amendments. He explained that the proposed amendments are basically a clean-up of duplications and clarifications in Chapter 28. Chapter 6 of the municipal code outlines the duties and responsibilities for the Design Commission, where no amendments are being proposed. Commissioner Coon said that the document he previously had from last year has since been revised to address his comments regarding this matter, which included encouragement of petitioner's providing 3-dimensional renderings or images for project reviews.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY CHAIR FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 10:32 P.M. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.