

Approved  
McMahon / Cashman

**MINUTES  
VILLAGE OF HINSDALE  
PLAN COMMISSION  
December 9, 2015  
MEMORIAL HALL  
7:30 P.M.**

Chairman Byrnes called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m., Wednesday, December 9, 2015, in Memorial Hall, the Memorial Building, 19 East Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale, Illinois.

**PRESENT:** Chairman Byrnes, Commissioner Crnovich, Commissioner Ryan, Commissioner Peterson, Commissioner Cashman, Commissioner Unell and Commissioner McMahon

**ABSENT:** Commissioner Krillenberger and Commissioner Fiascone

**ALSO PRESENT:** Chan Yu, Village Planner  
Applicant Representatives for Cases: A-33-2015, A-35-15, A-41-15 and A-45-15

---

**Approval of Minutes**

Chairman Byrnes asked the Plan Commission (PC) to review the minutes and for any comments from the November 11, 2015 meeting. With no comments, Chairman Byrnes asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Commissioner McMahon motioned and Commissioner Ryan seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**Findings and Recommendations**

**Case A-40-2015 – 25 E. Hinsdale Ave. – Casa Margarita – Exterior Appearance and Site Plan at Brush Hill Train Station**

Chairman Byrnes provided a summary of the application and asked the PC for any comments. With none, he asked for a motion to approve the Findings and Recommendations.

Commissioner Cashman motioned to approve. Commissioner Unell seconded. The motion passed unanimously (6 Ayes and 3 absent).

**Sign Permit Review**

**Case A-33-2015(cont.) – 1 Grant St. – Evergreen Bank Group – Ground Sign**

Chairman Byrnes introduced the applicant to present the proposed ground sign, after giving a brief review of the history of the initial application for 3 wall signs. A wall sign was denied at the previous meeting, however, the PC suggested applying for a ground sign.

Al Santa Maria from Aurora Sign Company, representing Evergreen Bank presented the ground sign. He described the 3' by 8' face, and that the LED illuminates the copy only. At night, the background will appear black. He also reviewed the ground sign setback distances.

**Plan Commission Minutes  
December 9, 2015**

Chairman Byrnes asked for clarification for how the sign will appear at night.

The applicant replied a dim logo, due to the vinyl, the white on the drawing will bleed white, and everything else would be painted white aluminum.

Commissioner Ryan asked if you would, or would not see those features at night.

The applicant explained you would only see the letters. The gold underscore will also illuminate, but will only be about 40% of the brightness due to the vinyl. The background will not illuminate.

Chairman Byrnes asked if the traffic view would be blocked, turning onto Chicago Avenue.

The applicant replied no, there will be a 45 foot visibility triangle. The distance he explained, is about 35 feet from the end of the building (from the front façade facing parking lot), plus another 12 feet of canopy area, and another 8-10 feet of sidewalk distance. To conclude, the applicant stated the sign is far away from the visibility triangle and one can easily see turning onto Chicago Avenue.

Chairman Byrnes explained there is a formula to it.

The applicant responded yes, the formula is 45 feet. The proposed ground sign is about 65 to 67 feet he explained. The height of the sign is 6 feet 6 inches tall.

Chairman Byrnes asked Chan if this is fully compliant.

Village Planner Chan responded yes. (Chan will correct at the next meeting that Code is a 100 foot visibility triangle. A stop work request was made to the applicant)

The applicant stated that the brick on the ground sign will be matched as closely as possible to the building.

Chairman Byrnes asked if anyone else had any comments or concerns. With none, he asked for a motion to approve the ground sign as presented.

Commissioner Unell motioned to approve. Commissioner Cashman seconded. The motion passed unanimously (7 Ayes and 2 absent).

**Case A-39-2015 – 12 Salt Creek Lane – Hinsdale Surgical Center – Wall Sign**

Chairman Byrnes asked if the applicant was present for the proposed wall sign.

Chan responded no, and he will take the blame for not contacting them sooner about the meeting.

**Plan Commission Minutes**  
**December 9, 2015**

Chairman Byrnes gave a brief history for the site, and asked if the PC would like to move forward with the application or wait until the applicant presents in the future.

Commissioner Cashman said he was expecting a larger sign, and he's OK with reviewing it now.

Commissioner McMahon expressed it seems noncontroversial.

Chairman Byrnes asked if it was illuminated.

Chan responded it is illuminated.

Commissioner Cashman explained yes, it's halo so at night you'd see it glow.

Chan reviewed that he's been corresponding with Med Properties, and they stated Hinsdale Surgical Center will be the only tenant for the entire building. Thus, they could potentially apply for 100 SF of signage.

Chairman Byrnes asked for clarification, since he believes there is already existing signage on the other side of the building (at the entrance).

Commissioner Cashman asked Chan if the north side is a different tenant.

Chan responded he does not recall any other signage on the building.

Commissioner McMahon believes Hinsdale Surgical Center is using the entrance on the other side of the building.

Chan explained that if there was any other tenant at the building, the 25 SF maximum signage area would be triggered. He reviewed this many times with Bill Dvorak from Med Properties.

Commissioner Cashman asked Chan if it'd be likely, they would not be able to put another sign up in the future.

Chan replied if another tenant applied for signage, Hinsdale Surgical Center would need to remove this one because it's already over 25 SF.

Commissioner Cashman believed he recalled previous discussion that there would only be one tenant at the building, and maybe it was the Surgical Center.

Commissioner Crnovich believed that's what she recalled too.

Additional discussion about the signage and the building ensued.

**Plan Commission Minutes  
December 9, 2015**

Chairman Byrnes asked if anyone else had any comments. With none, he asked for a motion to approve the wall sign.

Commissioner Cashman motioned to approve. Commissioner Peterson seconded. The motion passed unanimously (7 Ayes and 2 absent).

**Case A-41-2015 – 25 E. Hinsdale Ave. – Casa Margarita – 3 Wall Signs**

Chairman Byrnes introduced the applicant, Chase Lotfi to present the application.

Chan noted that he passed out revised sign exhibits received after the PC packets were mailed. The new exhibits propose larger signs, from 18.75 SF to 22 SF (17% increase).

Chairman Byrnes asked if the signs are still compliant.

Chan replied yes, and added the request will be for two allowable signs and one modification request to allow for an additional sign.

Chairman Byrnes asked the applicant if he is requesting for 3 signs.

The applicant replied yes, and added it's a very unique free standing building with 2 entrances.

Chairman Byrnes asked what his plan was for the east wall if he is applying for a wall sign on the north, south and west walls of the building.

The applicant responded he would be seeking for a vinyl window sign with just the logo on the door.

Chairman Byrnes asked where the main entrance is.

Chase replied it really depends on which direction you are coming from, and stressed the reason for signage on both ends. However, this application only reflects a request for the north, south and west sides of the building. He explained that he intends on seeking a variation for an additional sign for the east side.

Chan clarified that process would be through the ZBA.

Commissioner Crnovich asked Chase to clarify that he is requesting 2 signs, plus a modification for an additional sign (PC), and will seek in the future for a 4<sup>th</sup> sign through the variation process (ZBA).

Chase responded yes.

**Plan Commission Minutes  
December 9, 2015**

Commissioner Cashman mentioned the 4<sup>th</sup> sign would only be visible if you entered the “portico”.

Commissioner Crnovich asked if there will be an entrance on the east end of the building.

Chase replied yes, and that’d be open from day one since a lot of commuters wait in the area.

Commissioner Crnovich stated that she noticed some changes to the signs since the exterior appearance review meeting.

Chase responded correct, he removed the margarita glass logo because it was not code compliant.

Commissioner Cashman asked what part of the code.

Commissioner Crnovich responded under the Village liquor code.

Chairman Byrnes asked for any additional comments.

Commissioner Ryan expressed that she liked the neatness, simplicity, and the overall look is in character with the business. It also does a good job to match the building.

Commissioner Peterson questioned if the sign needs to be larger, as shown on the updated application.

Chase replied that it is a 100 foot long building, and the proposed signs are in proportion to the building.

Commissioner Peterson replied that it is a historical building, so that needs to be taken into consideration.

Commissioner Crnovich agreed with Commissioner Peterson’s comment, and prefers the original sign size proposed. She asked Chase if he’d consider a blade sign in lieu of a 4<sup>th</sup> wall sign since that would not require a variation.

Chase said he’d consider it.

Chairman Byrnes expressed that he also prefers the initial smaller sign size.

Commissioner Crnovich explained that the 3 signs should still be very noticeable along with the awnings.

Chairman Byrnes asked for any additional comments.

Commissioner McMahon and Commissioner Cashman expressed that they don’t feel strongly either way.

**Plan Commission Minutes  
December 9, 2015**

Chairman Byrnes asked the applicant if he could install the initial smaller signs.

Chase replied it's a very prominent and long building. The 2 sizes he explained, are barely noticeable due to a 3 SF difference.

Commissioner Crnovich noted that he is asking for a third sign.

Chase responded that the building has 4 sides, and would need it for train pedestrians to notice the restaurant. He also noted that the awnings shrunk 10" in height to expose the lintels and most likely be one color.

Commissioner Crnovich expressed that she'd prefer the smaller signs since he is requesting for a 3<sup>rd</sup> sign from the PC.

Commissioner Peterson and Chairman Byrnes both agreed.

Commissioner Crnovich added that the applicant consider the blade sign as an option rather than seeking a variation through the ZBA.

Chairman Byrnes asked if the blade sign is a possible option.

Chan responded they are allowed in the downtown; however, he needs to make sure the location is in the only district where blade signs are allowed.

Chase pointed out that the wall signs will be made out of channel letters, and the initial smaller sized signs are not large enough to bend the metal. Thus, it'd be a backlit box with a vinyl front. In his opinion, channel letters appear a lot better than a backlit sign box.

Chairman Byrnes asked if there is a difference in depth between the 2 options.

Chase replied the same, however, the channel letters would extend out from the building.

Chairman Byrnes asked about the illumination.

Chase responded yes, the sign would be illuminated by LED.

Commissioner Peterson asked what part illuminates.

Chase replied only the letters.

Commissioner Cashman asked for clarification about the background, the green and yellow colors.

Chase replied correct, that will only be the background.

**Plan Commission Minutes  
December 9, 2015**

Commissioner Cashman asked for clarification about the 5” projection of the sign.

Chase responded the projection would be closer to 4”.

Commissioner Cashman asked how this channel letter sign would differ from the smaller sign design.

Chase explained the box essentially uses a Plexiglass with a colored vinyl face; and the entire box is lit from the back.

Chairman Byrnes expressed he prefers the lit channel letter design.

Commissioner Peterson asked how deep the sign is in the preliminary design.

Chase replied between 4” and 5”.

Commissioner Peterson asked if this means it’s basically double the depth.

Chase explained no, the channel letters are mounted on a flat piece of metal. Thus, there is no additional depth.

Commissioner Peterson questioned if the overall project is 11” from the brick.

Chase responded no.

Commissioner Peterson referenced to the drawing that it appears to be 11”.

Commissioner Cashman agreed with Commissioner Peterson’s observation.

Chairman Byrnes asked if the sign will project around 10” from the wall.

Commissioner Cashman replied yes, for the channel letter sign.

Chan stated that the exhibit shows a 5” projection.

Chase explained the only part of the sign that would project are the letters themselves.

Additional discussion in regards to the differences between the smaller sign box versus the larger channel letter sign ensued.

Commissioner Cashman expressed that he’d prefer the smaller box sign.

Commissioner Crnovich agreed with Commissioner Cashman.

**Plan Commission Minutes  
December 9, 2015**

Chairman Byrnes asked if the applicant would consider the initial application.

Chase responded the larger signs were due to new information while communicating with Chan. In addition, he believes the larger signs would look more appealing.

Commissioner Unell asked if the concern at the moment is the projection of the sign.

Chairman Byrnes replied yes.

Chase stated that he can work with the design of the channel letter sign to match the depth of the box sign.

Commissioner Crnovich stated that she is more comfortable with the smaller sign, keeping in mind it's a historic building and the PC has the authority to allow a modification to approve a 3<sup>rd</sup> sign.

Chase explained he would do the smaller sign if he could. However, due to the size, the channel letter design is not possible.

Commissioner expressed that she believes it's a reasonable request given the adjustments the applicant has already made and that the signs will look nice.

Commissioner Peterson added, however, it needs to project only 5" from the brick.

Chairman Byrnes asked for a motion to approve the (revised/larger) wall signs, as submitted, with the stipulation that it projects only 5" from the wall.

Commissioner McMahon motioned to approve. Commissioner Ryan seconded. The motion passed (6 Ayes, 1 Nay and 2 absent).

**Case A-45-2015 – 125 W. 2<sup>nd</sup> St. – Steil Dermatology – Ground Sign**

Chairman Byrnes introduced the application after giving a brief review of the history of the location.

Steven Schmitt, Kolbrook Design introduced himself and reviewed the zoning and location of the office building.

Commissioner Cashman expressed that the proposed ground sign looks very nice, and matches the building.

Chairman Byrnes asked if it is illuminated.

Steven replied no.

**Plan Commission Minutes  
December 9, 2015**

Commissioner Ryan expressed that the sign is very tastefully done.

Chairman Byrnes asked if there is an address on the sign or building.

Steven replied not at the moment.

Commissioner Cashman asked if the location was chosen to clarify the entrance.

Steven explained yes, and that they asked the Board to consider a gate the night before to direct pedestrians to the correct entrance.

Chairman Byrnes asked for a motion to approve the sign for Steil Dermatology.

Commissioner Unell motioned to approve. Commissioner Cashman seconded. The motion passed unanimously (7 Ayes and 2 absent).

**Scheduling of Public Hearing**

**Case A-42-2015 – Village of Hinsdale – Text Amendment to Remove Registering Home Occupations to Match Municipal Code. (This item was for scheduling the time and date)**

Chairman Byrnes provided a brief summary for the scheduling purpose of the application. To this end, he established a public hearing for this item at the January 13, 2016 PC meeting.

**Public Hearing**

**Case A-35-2015 – 20 E. Ogden Ave. – Text Amendment to allow Showrooms for the Interior Design and Remodeling in the O-2 Limited Office District**

Chairman Byrnes provided a brief review of the application and public hearing item, and introduced the applicant to present the proposed text amendment.

Nick Esposito introduced himself as the representative, on behalf of the applicant, LaMantia. He next explained the services LaMantia provides and clarified that they would not sell products retail, and products would not be warehoused or fabricated at the location. Nick further reviews the text amendment application to the PC.

Commissioner Cashman asked if the house to the west of the property is zoned O-2.

Nick responded, there is a small lot between the property and house.

**Plan Commission Minutes**  
**December 9, 2015**

Further presentation of the text amendment application and exhibits by Nick ensued . A few major points included: parking meets code, planned landscaping improvements, offices hours are 7:30 AM to 5 PM and most of the customer visits are appointment based.

Chan clarified that the plans presented by Nick, as explained earlier, would be through a separate exterior appearance and site plan review process.

Nick replied he understood, but wanted to give the PC a preview to potentially avoid any “surprises”.

Commissioner Cashman expressed that he doesn’t believe anyone would be able to see the showroom from the street, based on Nick’s presentation photos.

Chairman Byrnes formally opened the public hearing for the application and asked the audience if anyone would like to make any public comments.

Commissioner Cashman explained that he believes the review should be approached first on the decision as a permitted use or special use. And the second part of the review based on the special use permit application for the specific property.

Chan mentioned that he passed out larger maps at the dais for an improved illustration of the O-2 districts in the Village. He also briefly reviewed the text amendment language change, to allow (proposed in **bold**) “Interior design **and remodeling** and decorating services **including showrooms**, but not including painters and paperhangers or showrooms or retail sales on the premises” in the O-2 Limited Office District.

Commissioner Cashman commented that “showrooms” occurs in the same sentence as something excluded, and thus is confusing.

Chairman Byrnes asked if it would work if “showrooms” is omitted from the language.

Commissioner Cashman replied yes. And also explained that he also feels strongly that the text amendment be considered as a special use permit and not a permitted use. His reasoning revolved around the uncertain potential impacts at each district by future applicants.

The PC in general agreed.

Nick replied he supports this. He also mentioned that they brought it up at the Board meeting.

Chairman Byrnes reviewed for the PC, a special use permit would be reviewed on a case by case basis. And he expressed that he believes this is absolutely the way to go.

**Plan Commission Minutes**  
**December 9, 2015**

Chairman Byrnes asked if this business will be different compared to Normandy in the B-3 district.

Chan replied Normandy may store materials. But in this particular case, LaMantia has stated there will be no retail sales, storage of raw materials and fabrication.

Commissioner McMahon asked the applicant about the sales tax component of the business.

Anthony LaMantia, business owner, explained they purchase products from the supplier, at wholesale without tax. However, at the end of the month, they pay sales tax on it.

Chairman Byrnes expressed that he believes it's a good use for the location.

Commissioner McMahon expressed that she is fine with it.

Commissioner Crnovich stated they have nice improvement plans.

Commissioner Cashman explained that it is nice to find a unique use that gives the medical office building a second chance purpose, given its unusual location and "transitional" district. Further, he believes and hopes that the neighbors would not even notice the change.

Chairman Byrnes asked if the 250' notice was completed as part of the public meeting process.

Nick and Chan responded yes.

Chairman Byrnes and Commissioner Cashman asked the resident attending the meeting if he has any comments and/or in favor of the application.

Raja Babu Chigurupapi, resident of 645 Washington Street, was sworn in and asked if there are any modification plans for the small property in between his house and the office building.

Nick replied no. The current building owner also mentioned they are unable to modify the land in any way due to the cemetery and zoning.

Chairman Byrnes asked the homeowner if he is satisfied with the answer to his question.

Raja Babu Chigurupapi replied yes.

Chairman Byrnes asked for any additional comments before he closed the public hearing. With none, he closed the public hearing.

Chairman Byrnes asked for a motion to approve the text amendment to allow interior design **and remodeling** and decorating services **including showrooms**, but not including painters and paperhangers or retail sales on the premises" in the O-2 Limited Office District as a special use permit.

**Plan Commission Minutes**  
**December 9, 2015**

Commissioner McMahon motioned to approve. Commissioner Cashman seconded. The motion passed unanimously (7 Ayes and 2 absent).

Chairman Byrnes asked for a subsequent motion to approve the special use permit application to allow interior design, remodeling and decorating services including showrooms at the subject property.

Commissioner Cashman motioned to approve. Commissioner Unell seconded. The motion passed unanimously (7 Ayes and 2 absent).

The meeting was adjourned after a motion was made by Commissioner Crnovich and seconded by Commissioner Cashman at 8:48 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Chan Yu', written in a cursive style.

Chan Yu, Village Planner