

**MINUTES**  
**VILLAGE OF HINSDALE**  
**PLAN COMMISSION**  
**WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2008**  
**MEMORIAL HALL**  
**7:00 P.M.**

Chairman LaPlaca called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. Wednesday, February 13, 2008, in Memorial Hall Board Room, the Memorial Building, 19 East Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale, Illinois.

**PRESENT:** Chairman LaPlaca, Commissioner Byrnes, Commissioner Geoga, Commissioner Stewart, Commissioner Moore, Commissioner Kluchenek, Commissioner Thacker

**ABSENT:** Commissioner Parsons, Commissioner Flynn

**ALSO PRESENT:** Sean Gascoigne

---

**MINUTES**

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve the minutes with corrections for the Wednesday, January 23, 2008 meeting. Commissioner Thacker seconded. Motion carried.

**Findings and Recommendations**

- **Case A-13-2007 – Sedgwick of Hinsdale – Special Use Permit, Planned Development, Map Amendment, Subdivision and Site Plan/Exterior Appearance Review**

Chairman LaPlaca stated there was a revised copy of the Sedgwick Findings and Recommendations submitted and she had a few changes to paragraphs 4 and 5, that were grammatical in nature and in paragraph 2 that described the way the property was measured and was restated to clarify that it is the applicant's position regarding where they got those numbers from and was exclusive of right of ways and easements. Chairman LaPlaca asked the Commissioners to review the revised document.

Chairman LaPlaca said there was some question as to whether Lots 1 and 2 are subject to the age restriction requirement and it was the position of the applicant that they have exhibits attached that state those two lots would not be subject to the age restriction. She went on to state she thinks it should be left up to the ZPS for clarification.

Commissioner Stewart said he thinks the applicant did request the two lots be excluded, however, the recommendations of the Plan Commission stipulated that they would be included and be part of the Planned Development

Chairman LaPlaca said they could not make them part of the Planned Development because the application did not request the lots be part of the Planned Development, however, if that changes the acreage calculation then that is something that will have to be determined at that point.

**Plan Commission Minutes  
February 13, 2008**

Commissioner Thacker said they were to be part of the zoning re-classification, but not the age-restriction because they are single-family homes.

Sean Gascoigne, Village Planner, stated there was nothing in the transcripts that mentioned the two lots would be included in the age-restriction, however, Lot 1 and 2 were going to be included in the reverter clause.

Chairman LaPlaca suggested that the statement read the applicant has provided that the Planned Development is subject to a deeded age restriction and not mention Lots 1 and 2, than that issue can be addressed at the ZPS when they discuss those lots.

Commissioner Thacker stated that the revised document states that the resident has to be 55 or older as opposed to the purchaser of the property.

Mr. Gascoigne stated the concern was that someone could purchase the home and let someone else live in the home, which is why the stipulation was made that a resident living within the home had to be 55 or older.

Mr. Gascoigne stated that paragraph 5 was added by a request from the Commission that was excluded from the original Findings as an additional condition placed upon the development to indicate that they could not subdivide Lots 1 and 2 any time in the future.

Commissioner Geoga said the figures in the original Findings did not have any specific figures and questioned the 19.19 and 20.167 figures in the revised document and asked if the Commission had to decide based on these calculations if they agree with figures.

Chairman LaPlaca said those are numbers that certain people who testified, would disagree with.

Commissioner Geoga asked if, based on these calculations, they are being asked to decide if they agree with the applicant or Mr. Kracower.

Commissioner Kluchenek said these are Findings and not necessarily a reflection of the arguments on the pros and cons.

Chairman LaPlaca said that since the Commission approved the applicant, they would have to accept this position in that approval.

Commissioner Geoga said he does not agree with the applicant's calculations and asked what that means with respect to these Findings and Recommendations.

Commissioner Kluchenek asked if this is a vote in favor or against the application or are they voting that these Findings reflect the ultimate decisions that were cast at the last Plan Commission Meeting.

Commissioner Stewart said he thinks it is important the numbers be in the public record, however, they did not find them, they were presented to the Commission and it is not to be interpreted that the Commission found that to be the facts.

## **Plan Commission Minutes**

**February 13, 2008**

Commissioner Kluchenek said he does not think that legally need to serve as a foundation for the Finding if you need facts in support thereof or whether it can be conclusory with references to presentation.

Chairman LaPlaca said what is in the original Findings and Recommendations was factually accurate and suggested Mr. Gascoigne substitute the initial paragraph 2 back into the revised Findings.

Commissioner Kluchenek asked whether they were voting on whether the Findings are an accurate representation.

Commissioner Geoga said it is his understanding that they could vote to approve the Findings the same way they vote to approve the minutes.

Commissioner Stewart moved to recommend approval of the Findings and Recommendations for Case A-13-2007, Sedgwick of Hinsdale with the initial paragraph 2 to be inserted in the final document. Commissioner Moore seconded. Motion carried as follows:

**AYES:** Chairman LaPlaca, Commissioner Stewart, Commissioner Geoga, Commissioner Thacker, Commissioner Kluchenek, Commissioner Byrnes, Commission Moore

**NAYES:** None

**ABSENT:** Commissioner Parsons, Commissioner Flynn

- **631 E. Hickory – Hinsdale Adventist Academy – Fence for Play Area**

Commissioner Stewart moved to recommend approval of the Findings and Recommendations for the wrought iron fence at the Hinsdale Adventist Academy. Commissioner Flynn seconded. Motion carried as follows:

**AYES:** Chairman LaPlaca, Commissioner Stewart, Commissioner Geoga, Commissioner Thacker, Commissioner Kluchenek, Commissioner Byrnes, Commission Moore

**NAYES:** None

**ABSENT:** Commissioner Parsons, Commissioner Flynn

## **Scheduling of Public Hearing**

Case A-01-2008 – Applicant: Harvey Seybold – Request: Text Amendment to Section Section 11-503(e)(o) of the Hinsdale Zoning Code to allow the Zoning Board of Appeals to hear applications to increase, by not more than 10%, the maximum building coverage permitted, in all districts rather than just B-2. Chairman LaPlaca scheduled the public hearing for Case A-01-2008 for March 12, 2008.

## **Sign Permit Review**

**Plan Commission Minutes**

**February 13, 2008**

❖ **14 E. Hinsdale Avenue – Hinsdale Cleaners – Wall Sign**

The applicant presented two revised proposal for sign designs. Chairman LaPlaca asked if the sign was still on a raceway. The applicant stated yes and that it was necessary because there is no access behind the wall in which to work. The applicant went on to state the raceway would be painted to match the façade after it is pressured washed. The Commission agreed that they liked the revised sign design with the “Hinsdale” outlined in black and the “Cleaners” in white.

Commissioner Byrnes moved to approve the sign as proposed. Commissioner Stewart seconded. Motion carried.

❖ **5757 S. Madison – Sebesta Builders – Ground Sign**

The applicant described the sign as proposed. Commissioner Stewart asked if the legs would be four by four posts. The applicant stated yes and they would be painted white with a piece of trim on the inside. Commissioner Stewart asked that the posts be a weather resistant type material other than treated wood.

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve the sign with the condition that the posts are made of weather resistant material other than treated lumber. Commissioner Moore seconded. Motion carried.

**Public Hearing - Case A-16-2007 – 149 E. Ogden Avenue - Applicant: BP Products- AM/PM – Request: Exterior Appearance Design Review and Sign Permit CONTINUED FROM 1/23/08**

Chairman LaPlaca stated that since the applicant had not arrived yet, they could discuss the revised application and since the revised application is not much of an improvement from the previous application, the Commission could give some specific comments to offer as much guidance as possible for further revisions. Chairman LaPlaca said that since it is an Exterior Appearance Review, they Commission does have some flexibility with the colors in the sign color for the ground sign.

Paul Landa, applicant for BP, arrived at 7:40 p.m.

Chairman LaPlaca explained to the applicant that the Commission still feels that there is too much disparity with the color scheme of this application and suggested leaving the roof the way it is and put up the AM/PM signs so that at least from afar it looks the same. Commissioner Stewart suggested some background consistency with the canopy and the corner sign the same color as the roof with the only color differentiation is the green and yellow BP versus the orange and purple with AM/PM.

Mr. Landa said BP is providing two services to the community, a gas station and a quick shop and he would like the Commission to look at this as an investment into the community that would be aesthetically pleasing. He went on to say that BP is not going to make a concession to paint the canopy and BP has made the concession that were asked for.

Commissioner Kluchenek asked if it was inconsistent with the branding strategy to leave the canopy and the roof the same color and just change the sign. Mr. Landa stated it is

## **Plan Commission Minutes**

**February 13, 2008**

two separate services being provided and the colors for both services needs to be represented.

Mr. Landa said BP is making concession regarding the bullnose, on the awning, and on the fascia of the building and asked where the concession is on the part of the Village.

Chairman LaPlaca said they do not have to make concessions and this is the gateway of our community and they do not want something that is not aesthetically pleasing. Commissioner Stewart said this is not a new use and the investment has already been there for many years. Mr. Landa indicated changing over to AM/PM has been proven to be a better service for this type of community and BP is spending a lot of money to change over in certain communities. Chairman LaPlaca said she would suggest they are doing this to make more money, not to benefit the community.

Commissioner Moore said it is understandable that keeping the canopy where the fuel is white for safety reasons, however, the roof of the building needs to be a color that blends better with that white and suggested bringing it closer to a cream or an ivory, then the blue bullnose around the building would tie it all in.

Commissioner Stewart said the trim around the green bullnose on the side and using the same color behind the emblem so there is some color continuity.

Chairman LaPlaca asked if it was possible to bring a sample of the colors for the next meeting to help the Commission get a better understanding the true colors being proposed. Mr. Landa said he would bring some different choices and consult with Mr. Gascoigne before the next meeting. Commissioner Stewart said he would be happy to come in and review the samples and provide feedback.

Chairman LaPlaca continued the public hearing to the March 12, 2008 meeting.

Chairman LaPlaca asked fellow Commissioners if anyone objected to continuing the matter of the sign brackets to the meeting of March 12, 2008. No members objected.

Chairman LaPlaca asked Warren James, applicant for Sedgewick, if he had any comments. Mr. James apologized for being late and asked to be brought up to speed on the discussion regarding his application.

Chairman LaPlaca explained that the Commissioners felt the Findings and Recommendations should be limited to factual findings that were undisputed as opposed to things that were disputed and to leave disputed matters such as the calculations to the record and the transcript as to why people voted they way they did. Commissioner Kluchenek said they swapped paragraph 2 from the old version to the new version.

Mr. James said the numbers referred to in paragraph 2, specifically the 23.576 gross acres is factually inaccurate and they hold title to 20.17 acres and to suggest the gross site area is 23.576 includes Barton and Hannah's rights-of-way, which they do not own. He went on to say the Exhibit 4-D was based upon the recorded plat of subdivision and that is why they could not stipulate to the notion that the gross site area is more than 20.17 acres.

**Plan Commission Minutes**

**February 13, 2008**

Chairman LaPlaca asked Mr. Gascoigne where he came up with the numbers. Mr. Gascoigne said the 23.576 is the gross number of 24.498 minus the .922 acres that was listed as Lots 1 and 2 removed and he suggested they could strike those numbers and leave it at 24.5 acres.

Commissioner Stewart said the 24.5 acres number has been the original site area since the very beginning. Mr. James said as long as it reads original site area, they agree, however, they do not hold title to that land currently. Chairman LaPlaca suggested using the 24.498 gross acres number and not say anything about how anything else was calculated. Mr. James agreed to have it read that way. Mr. Gascoigne said for clarification the Findings will read the original site area in total is 24.498 and is currently zoned R-2.

Commissioner Kluchenek moved to approve the above changes to the Findings and Recommendations for Case A-13-2008 – Sedgwick of Hinsdale. Commissioner Stewart seconded. Motion carried as follows:

**AYES:** Chairman LaPlaca, Commissioner Stewart, Commissioner Geoga, Commissioner Thacker, Commissioner Kluchenek, Commissioner Byrnes, Commission Moore

**NAYES:** None

**ABSENT:** Commissioner Parsons, Commissioner Flynn

Chairman LaPlaca said the next meeting would be held on March 12, 2008 at 7:30 p.m.

Commissioner Moore moved to adjourn. Commissioner Stewart second and the meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m. Motion carried.

Respectfully Submitted

Kerry L. Warren  
Community Development Secretary

:

**Plan Commission Minutes**  
**February 13, 2008**