

Approved  
McMahon/Cashman

**MINUTES**  
**VILLAGE OF HINSDALE**  
**PLAN COMMISSION**  
**SEPTEMBER 11, 2013**  
**MEMORIAL HALL**  
**7:30 P.M.**

Chairman Byrnes called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m., Wednesday, September 11, 2013 in Memorial Hall, the Memorial Building, 19 East Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale, Illinois.

**PRESENT:** Chairman Byrnes, Commissioner Crnovich, Commissioner Stifflear, Commissioner Johnson and Commissioner McMahon and Commissioner Cashman

**ABSENT:** Commissioner Sullins

**ALSO PRESENT:** Sean Gascoigne, Village Planner

---

**Approval of Minutes**

Chairman Byrnes stated that there were no minutes to approve and that they would approve the minutes of July 8 and September 11, 2013, at the October meeting.

**Findings and Recommendations**

**46 Village Place – Café LaFortuna – Site Plan/Exterior Appearance Approval for Exterior Modifications and Façade Improvements.**

Chairman Byrnes provided a brief summary of the discussion that took place on this agenda item at the last Plan Commission meeting and highlighted the findings and recommendations that were included based on these discussions. Commissioner McMahon motioned to approve the findings and recommendations for Site Plan/Exterior Appearance Approval at 46 Village Place – Café LaFortuna for Exterior Modifications and Façade Improvements. Commissioner Johnson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**Findings and Recommendations**

**302 S. Grant – Immanuel Hall/Hinsdale Historical Society – Amendment to Existing Special Use Ordinance**

Chairman Byrnes provided a brief summary of the discussion that took place on this agenda item at the last Plan Commission meeting and highlighted the findings and recommendations that were included based on these discussions. The Commissioners offered suggestions for several changes specific to the discussions that took place at the July meeting. Commissioner Cashman motioned to approve the findings and recommendations for an Amendment to Existing Special Use Ordinance at 302 S. Grant – Immanuel Hall/Hinsdale Historical Society, as amended. Commissioner Crnovich seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

## **Plan Commission Minutes**

**September 11 2013**

### **Scheduling of Public Hearings**

**A-26-2013 – 333 W. 57<sup>th</sup> Street – AT&T – Exterior Appearance/Site Plan Review and Amendment to Special Use for the Installation of Antennas on the Water Tower.**

Chairman Byrnes stated this public hearing would be scheduled for October 9, 2013.

### **Signage**

#### **421 E. Ogden – Adventist Hinsdale Hospital – Comprehensive Sign Package**

Chairman Byrnes introduced the case and asked if the applicant was present. John George, attorney for the applicant, introduced himself and summarized the request, which included the several variations that were unanimously approved at the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Kevin Harney, Architect for the applicant introduced himself and presented the details of the signs they were requesting, including the types of signs and their locations. He described the materials that were being proposed and how they tied in with the actual architecture of the cancer center. He explained how the Commission could relate the exhibits with the Variations that were approved and where those signs were located within the site plan.

Commissioner Stifflear asked the applicant why they didn't consider internally illuminating the signs rather than ground illumination.

Mr. Harney indicated that the predominant reason was cost. He then continued with his presentation and identifying the specifics of each sign.

General discussion ensued regarding the welcome sign for Hinsdale and the applicant confirmed that as part of the site plan/exterior appearance review, they agreed to provide a space at the southeast corner of the site for the sign, but weren't willing to pay for the actual sign.

Mr. George suggested that one of the subjects that should be discussed as the office park is developed further is the possibility of each development sharing the cost of a new "Welcome" sign.

General discussion ensued regarding the hospital's willingness to allocate land for the welcome sign. Mr. George indicated that they were happy to accommodate and acknowledge that willingness in whatever way would satisfy the Commission, whether it be written or verbal.

Commissioner Stifflear requested clarification on his understanding of the Variations that were granted.

Mr. George clarified the Variations that were approved.

General discussion ensued regarding the variations and why the applicant felt they needed a sign at the height requested for the Adventist logo on the building. Mr. Harney explained that it was a function of the distance from Ogden as well as the need for the patients to

## **Plan Commission Minutes**

**September 11 2013**

locate the facility due to the large canopy on the building. Discussion continued regarding the size of the sign and the applicant indicated it was approximately 85 square feet.

Commissioner Johnson expressed concern with the height, size and illumination of the proposed wall sign and whether it was necessary.

Discussion ensued regarding the size of the proposed wall sign and the Commission's discomfort with the issues raised by Commissioner Johnson. The Commission agreed that they were fine with the rest of the request however they were really concerned with the size and height of the proposed Adventist logo and they couldn't support that request.

Chairman Byrnes questioned if there was anything the applicant could do to reduce the impact of the sign.

Discussion ensued and the commissioner's agreed that they were not in support of the size, location or brightness of the sign and asked how the Variations played into their approval.

Mr. Gascoigne indicated that this request was slightly different from the First and Garfield example that was used earlier in the discussion. He explained that while it was ultimately recommended to not allow the signs above the second story on that request, it was the Village Attorney's position that they could recommend that under the standards of exterior appearance, since it could be argued that it affected the appearance of the building. Mr. Gascoigne went on to explain that in this situation, the Variations had already been granted in terms of the size, location, etc., and this was simply a sign approval rather than exterior appearance approval, which involved a different set of standards. He indicated that he would be happy to consult the Village Attorney regarding the Commission's authority in these situations, but could not definitively confirm these questions tonight.

Discussion ensued regarding the Commission's authority regarding signage when Variations had already been granted and the involvement of the Board in those requests.

Mr. Gascoigne indicated that he does not staff the Zoning Board of Appeals and therefore was not completely aware of those processes, but that he would speak to Robb McGinnis to find out which variation requests, if any, continue to the Board of Trustees for final approval.

Discussion continued regarding the wall sign and the concerns the commissioners had and the applicant's reasoning behind the requested sign.

Mr. Gascoigne encouraged the Commission to be specific in terms of what they did or didn't like about the sign so that when he was able to talk to the Village Attorney, he could verify if any of those concerns would take precedence over the approved Variations.

Commissioner Johnson indicated that she was fine with the rest of the request, but would like to see this sign removed in its entirety.

## **Plan Commission Minutes**

**September 11 2013**

Discussion continued regarding the specifics of the sign including the size, construction and the ability for the Zoning Board of Appeals to render final decisions on certain Variations.

Mr. Gascoigne stated that he is not directly involved with the Variations or the process, so he would have to double check with Mr. McGinnis to verify if any of the signs were expected to continue onto the Village Board for final approval.

The Commission confirmed aspects of the landscaping as well as the scale of certain information contained on the directional ground signs and confirmed that the inclusion of the additional signage was part of an agreement the hospital had with the other owner.

Discussion ensued regarding the Commission's authority and different options for how to handle the request until staff had the opportunity to provide the Village Attorney's position on the Commission's authority. The Commission expressed different concerns with the possibility of removing and continuing the specific sign and moving the rest of the sign package forward, while the applicant expressed concerns with continuing the whole sign package another month. The applicant indicated that while the construction of their sign was not critical, there were directional signs within the package that required approval to move forward with the final approval of the cancer center. The Commission continued discussion, expressing additional concerns with the sign.

Mr. George indicated that he did not want the concerns with this sign to hold up the approval of the others, so he opted to remove this sign from the application at this time, also indicating that they would make the same request to the ZBA.

The Commission confirmed that the applicant would also withdraw the sign from their ZBA request and were comfortable approving the package without the inclusion of the Adventist logo on the building.

Commissioner Cashman motioned to approve the sign package at 421 E. Ogden, subject to the applicant removing from the request, the large Adventist logo on the west elevation, as well as confirmation that area would be provided by the applicant for a welcome sign in the future. Commissioner McMahon seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

### **119 E. Ogden – Hinsdale Management – One Ground Sign**

Chairman Byrnes introduced the case and asked if the applicant was present. Dan Hussey introduced himself as the representative for the applicant and summarized the request.

The Commission complimented the applicant on the sign and confirmed the setback and specifics regarding landscaping.

Commissioner Stifflear motioned to approve the monument sign at 119 E. Ogden. Commissioner Cashman seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

## **Plan Commission Minutes**

**September 11 2013**

### **Exterior Appearance/Site Plan Review**

#### **35 E. First Street – Fuller’s Tap and Grill – Site Plan/Exterior Appearance**

#### **Approval for Façade Improvements**

Chairman Byrnes introduced the case and asked if the applicant was present.

Doug Fuller introduced himself and summarized the request which included, amongst other façade improvements, accordion style bi-fold doors on the south elevation, a new two story balcony on the east elevation and two new wall signs.

Chairman Byrnes confirmed the process and the number of motions the Commission would be considering.

Commissioner Stifflear summarized his concerns regarding the bi-fold doors, garbage and screening for the dumpster, as well as striping and circulation for the existing hardware store.

Jim Carlstrom addressed the concerns and explained how they planned to manage these areas.

General discussion ensued regarding the proposal, including outdoor seating and the previous requests for a temporary tent at Dips n’ Dogs.

Commissioner Stifflear expressed concerns with the façade of the south elevation and the bi-fold doors.

General discussion ensued regarding the doors and there function, including the idea of leaving the limestone knee wall in place.

Commissioner Cashman indicated that he was fine with its removal and expressed his excitement and support for the project as a whole, including the bi-fold doors and the balcony as it was his goal to see a more vibrant First Street.

General discussion ensued regarding the proposed changes along First Street and the trash collection.

The applicant confirmed that they could go to a seven day pick-up, double the size of the collection dumpster and screen the enclosure with vines.

Discussion ensued regarding the material and appearance of the seasonal enclosures and hours of the patio.

The Commission then confirmed that the loading/deliveries and the circulation of the existing parking lot would remain the same as it currently is.

Discussion ensued including the hours of operation, signage and the general layout of the restaurant.

## **Plan Commission Minutes**

**September 11 2013**

General discussion ensued regarding the changes and the Commission was complimentary of the improvements.

Commission Stifflear suggested that any motion for approval include vines on the trash enclosure and conditions for the balcony that mirrored those of the Fox's approval. He also requested that due to the concerns raised with the bi-fold doors, the record reflect that his comfort with them as proposed was due to the seven foot recess in front of the building.

Discussion ensued regarding the circulation within the parking lot and a more permanent seasonal enclosure around the first floor of the balcony. While most Commissioners agreed that a more permanent enclosure would look better, they generally agreed that it may be cost prohibitive and suggested that the applicant explore the possibility in the future as it would be in their best interest to make it look as good as possible.

Commissioner Cashman motioned for Exterior Appearance Approval for Exterior Modifications and Façade Improvements at 35 E. First Street – Fuller's Tap and Grill, subject to the applicant providing vines on the trash enclosure. Commissioner McMahon seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Cashman motioned for Site Plan Approval for Exterior Modifications and Façade Improvements at 35 E. First Street – Fuller's Tap and Grill, with the condition that the conditions for the balcony, mirror those at Fox's. Commissioner McMahon seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Cashman motioned to approve the two wall signs at 35 E. First – Fuller's Tap and Grill. Commissioner Crnovich seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

### **Public Hearing**

Chairman Byrnes indicated he would switch the last two items to accommodate the applicants that were waiting for the last item.

### **A-22-2013 – 201-205 S. Vine - Zion Lutheran – Map Amendment from IB, Institutional Buildings to R-4, Single-Family Residential. (Transcript of the following Public Hearing on file).**

Keith Larson introduced himself and summarized the request. He explained that this is the last step in completing the process recommended by the Plan Commission about a year ago, to remove the two lots from the Planned Development and converting them back to single-family residential.

Mr. Gascoigne clarified why the two lots would be non-conforming lots when they were rezoned.

Commissioner Crnovich motioned to approve case A-22-2013 – 201-205 S. Vine - Zion Lutheran – Map Amendment from IB, Institutional Buildings to R-4, Single-Family Residential. Commissioner Cashman Seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**Plan Commission Minutes**

**September 11 2013**

**A-18-2013 – Village of Hinsdale – Text Amendment to Section 11-103 (Plan Commission), as it relates to Term Limits. (Transcript of the following Public Hearing on file).**

Chairman Byrnes introduced the case and provided a summary of the request.

Commissioner Cashman made a motion to approve case A-18-2013 – Village of Hinsdale – Text Amendment to Section 11-103 (Plan Commission), as it relates to Term Limits. Commissioner Stifflear Seconded. The motion passed unanimously and the request was approved.

**Adjournment**

Commissioner Crnovich moved to adjourn. Commissioner Cashman seconded and the meeting adjourned at 9:37 p.m. on September 11, 2013.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sean Gascoigne  
Village Planner