

MINUTES
Glen Ellyn Architectural Appearance Commission
Wednesday, February 12, 2025 at 7:00 PM
Glen Ellyn Civic Center
Galligan Board Room
535 Duane Street

A. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chairperson Jacobson called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM and explained the Architectural Appearance Commission's function and procedures as an advisory body.

Roll was called.

Present: Chairperson Jacobson and Commissioners Albrecht, Commissioner Mees, Commissioner Rahn, Commissioner Schlembach, Commissioner Smith

Absent: Commissioner Goranov

Also in attendance: Anabel Pederson, Associate Planner, Anne Gould, Village Trustee, Richard Daubert, Village Engineer and Adriana Ohl Zamora, Recording Secretary.

B. Approval of the Minutes

Commissioner Smith made a motion to approve the draft minutes of the December 5, 2024 meeting. Commissioner Rahn seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

Commissioner Smith made a motion to approve the draft minutes of the December 11, 2024 meeting. Commissioner Rahn seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

C. Old Business

551 Crescent Boulevard: Exterior Appearance Review for the new Metra Station in the CR Zoning District

Staff Presentation

Anabel Pederson, Associate Planner discussed the return of the 551 Crescent Boulevard Exterior Appearance review for the new Proposed Metra Station. She explained that it was last seen and given feedback at the December 5th, 2024 Special Meeting. Due to the item not being new, she informed the Commission that Richard Daubert, Village Engineer and CDM Smith staff would be presenting any new material.

Richard Daubert, Village Engineer introduced CDM Smith staff Sarah Sutherlin and Matt Aklan, in addition to Capital Improvements Commissioner Steve Symanaski. He explained that the project was last visited in December 2025 and received great feedback and thus is back to provide an updated PowerPoint presentation, along with materials provided in packet. Mr. Daubert stated that the presentation would be focusing on design revisions which have been

made, and he would be skipping through project overview, general project area, scope of work, existing site plan, proposed site plan and prior input that has been provided. He noted that the slides are available for those who would like to review. He discussed that back on December 5th, 2025, the Architectural Appearance Commission noted there was a lot of positive movement with respects to the design but there was still room for improvement. He stated that the items of concern, such as the scale of ramp and stair assemblies on either side of the tracks, opportunities to break up those roof lines, facade of building, extending additional limestone along bottom portion of the building, and improving the design of the arches to better unite them with the 1926 station which was the inspiration for the design. He particularly mentioned the barrel ceiling along with some interior finishes and noted that Sarah Sutherlin with CDM is going to work through comments regarding the design.

Sarah Sutherlin, Transportation Architecture Discipline Leader, CDM explained and reviewed the design revisions starting with the façade of station and discussed how they implemented full texture stone similar to inspiration of 1926 station; she also stated that stone was introduced to base of building to tie together with rest of design. She discussed the revision to the arch, explaining that previously the name Glen Ellyn would be carved in name as monumental signage however now with backdrop of textured stone, the name would be stand off letters, similar signage and spacing but it would be metal sign on stand offs vs. carved into the stone. She stated that this is being proposed only for the side facing the train tracks and won't be necessary on the side facing Glen Ellyn.

Another revision presented by Ms. Sutherlin was the proposed extension of the barrel vaults from arch to arch as it allows for view of arch in its entirety on both sides and is a much cleaner look. She then presented the interior finish revisions and noted that one particular comment was made regarding the accent wall around restrooms. Ms. Sutherlin stated that it provided the opportunity to bring in warmth and wood material that is within the exterior canopy areas as well as within the station itself. Revision of bulkhead location was also considered, however due to mechanicals and structure of the vestibule they are recommending that they leave as is.

The overall image was then discussed and presented by Ms. Sutherlin to acknowledge and discuss comments that were not implemented. The biggest comment was the discussion of the south canopy, the question of breaking up the monotonous roof line and providing a marker to the ADA ramp entrance. Ms. Sutherlin stated that they are constrained by the platform width, needing to keep it clear so their design opportunities are simply in line with the roof to avoid adding cost and complexity to the structure. She mentioned they could add an applied dormer however it started to feel like a tacked-on piece and not integrated with the architecture and ultimately, they did not recommend going with the adjustment.

Ms. Sutherlin then discussed that the remainder of the presentation includes the same floor plans, light fixtures which the Commissioners are all familiar with from previous presentations and paused for comments from the Commissioners.

Questions and Comments:

Commissioners Mees stated that she loves the texture stone and that it looks so much better than the previous design.

Commissioner Albrecht stated that new design touched on all key items that they questioned previously.

Chairperson Jacobson stated that the presenter hit on all improvements that were being looked for and agreed that a long canopy over ramp would not look good, clean and straight is the best option.

Commissioner Smith asked if there were any changes to the materials. Ms. Sutherlin replied that no changes to materials however they did discuss specific roofing materials including shingles, high performance shingle with curved edge and straight edge shingles. Samples of each were shown to the Commissioners.

Commissioner Mees commented that the curved edge roof shingle makes it more similar to the old slate look.

Commissioner Albrecht said that stone texture looked like it has really changed, and if that was a different material or just a manner of installation. Ms. Sutherlin replied that there was no change to the stone material, and the changed look is most likely due to changes in the rendering. She commented that they have been trying to better show how the textured stone would appear on rendering, but it is same material.

Commissioner Albrecht asked if the stone was a cultured stone.

Ms. Sutherlin replied that it is a cast stone, and they have been looking at that for performance due to salt use. She commented that this was actually something that Metra themselves would comment on if they tried to place a stone material at the platform level.

Chairperson Jacobson said that it appears to be exactly what the Commission asked for and she hopes that it is as represented.

Ms. Sutherlin replied that she thinks that for the stone, materials, and things like that they will be writing specifications in the mockups as well so if something is not what they are expecting it to be they can provide examples of the intended material and perhaps a larger board format.

Chairperson Jacobson commented that it is hard to tell from the rendering if the metal trusses and the window frames black or bronze and asked for clarification.

Ms. Sutherlin clarified that the window frames are dark bronze and similarly the paint color would be an off black.

Chairperson Jacobson replied that she was trying to think of the rest of the site furniture within downtown Glen Ellyn and she believes it is black on black. As such, she was wondering if it should match the rest of the streetscape and light fixtures.

Ms. Sutherlin responded by stating that they could easily do an actual black paint if that is desired to match the associated adjacent street and streetscape items, but she would still recommend that they leave the window frames as a dark bronze along with antiqued brick to bring a historic feel.

Richard Daubert, Village Engineer commented that the bronze tones may stand out and complement each other more against the other black features. He also commented on the roofing materials, stating that the roof will not support real slate and funding would be a constraint. He anticipates that the asphalt shingle roof will be the final material.

Commissioner Smith stated that she prefers straight line asphalt shingle versus the curved shingle as it is cleaner and has a more cohesive look.

Commission Recommendation

Commissioner Schlembach made the motion:

After conducting a public meeting and deliberating on the request of the petitioner The Village of Glen Ellyn for approval of an Exterior Appearance review for 551 Crescent Ave., Glen Ellyn in the CR Zoning District, the Architectural Appearance Commission hereby recommends approval based on the findings of fact, as discussed or amended at the Architectural Appearance Commission public meeting on February 12, 2025, which are hereby incorporated into the Motion by reference as though fully set forth herein, and a copy of which will be attached to the minutes of this meeting and kept on file as part of the permanent records of the Village. The Architectural Appearance Commission makes this recommendation of approval with the following conditions:

1. That the project be constructed in substantial conformance with the plans and testimony presented at the Architectural Appearance Commission public meeting and before the Village Board of Trustees.

Commissioner Albrecht seconded the motion. The motion passed through a roll call vote with all Commissioners present voting "Yes".

Commissioner Schlembach asked if he may ask another question and received a confirmation from Chairperson Jacobson. Commissioner Schlembach inquired what the total costs of building proper were relative to overall budget costs.

Mr. Daubert responded that they can provide that figure and a breakdown of the details but he would prefer to run those numbers through staff to provide them.

D. New Business

None.

E. Chairman's Report

None.

F. Trustee Liaison Report

Trustee Gould discussed updates with regards to the following:

1. Trustees had a workshop in August and adjusted building permit fees to increase them, working with Management Team to closely align with intended increases.
2. The 405 Roosevelt Starbucks PUD was approved on February 10, 2025.
3. The pickle ball courts at Ackerman Park were approved on February 10, 2025.

G. Staff Report

Anabel Pederson, Associate Planner presented to the Commission the following updates:

1. 534 Duane Street, Fuchsia Boutique across the street was approved, the ordinance was recorded, and work has started.
2. The Downtown Event Park goes to Plan Commission on February 27, 2025 for setback variations.
3. 640 Taft Avenue, the Full Circle property went to Plan Commission on February 6, 2025 and got recommended for approval for a zoning map amendment and variations. Village Board Workshop for the RDA would be next step and will go at a date to be decided.
4. 580 Duane Street has a building permit in, is approved for exterior, and is currently being reviewed for parking lot alterations.
5. 515 Crescent Boulevard, the walk-up ATM property, was recommended for denial by the Architectural Appearance Commission and the ordinance of denial was approved by the Village Board. A representative from the company inquired about resubmitting an application with the Architectural Appearance Commission and Ms. Pederson informed them that unless the design had changed, it was unlikely for the Commission to approve the item as they had recently denied it. The representative will be discussing with their client about possible different locations, and it remains to be seen if the item will decide to come back before the Commission.

I. Adjournment

Commissioner Albrecht made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Mees seconded the motion, and the motion passed by voice vote at 7:32pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Adriana Ohl-Zamora
Recording Secretary