

**VILLAGE OF HINSDALE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
Wednesday, June 1, 2022**

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Village of Hinsdale Historic Preservation Commission was called to order by Commissioner Jim Prisby in Memorial Hall of the Memorial Building, 19 E. Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale, IL on Wednesday, June 1, 2022 at 6:30 p.m., roll call was taken.

PRESENT: Commissioners Sarah Barclay*, Shannon Weinberger, Frank Gonzalez, Jim Prisby, William Haarlow

ABSENT: Commissioner Alexis Braden and Chairman John Bohnen

ALSO PRESENT: Bethany Salmon, Village Planner

Commissioner Prisby asked for a motion to appoint him as the Chairman pro tem for tonight's meeting. A motion was made by Commissioner Barclay, seconded by Commissioner Haarlow, to appoint Commissioner Jim Prisby Pro Tem Chairman for the June 1, 2022 Historic Preservation meeting. The motion carried by a roll call vote of 5-0 as follows:

AYES: Commissioners Barclay, Gonzalez, Weinberger, Prisby, and Haarlow
NAYS: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Braden and Chairman Bohnen

Approval of Minutes – April 6, 2022

Hearing no comments, a motion was made by Commissioner Weinberger, seconded by Commissioner Barclay, to approve the April 6, 2022 minutes as submitted. The motion carried by a voice vote of 5-0 as follows:

AYES: Commissioners Barclay, Gonzalez, Weinberger, Prisby, and Haarlow
NAYS: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Braden and Chairman Bohnen

Findings and Recommendations

a) Case HPC-02-2022 – The Bagley House – 121 S. County Line Road – Application for Local Landmark Designation

Commissioner Prisby asked for any comments on the Findings and Recommendations. The Commissioners had no comments.

Bob Lennox, 503 Chanticleer Lane, addressed the Commission. Mr. Lennox grew up in a Frank Lloyd Wright designed home located at 223 North Euclid in Oak Park, Illinois. Mr. Lennox stated that historic homes are very difficult to maintain and hopes the Village of Hinsdale does not have any financial involvement or provide financial support to the Bagley Home.

Commissioner Gonzalez asked Ms. Salmon if she was aware of any request for financial support for the Bagley House. Ms. Salmon responded that she is not aware of any such requests and it may be possible that sometime in the future the Bagley Home, and others, receive some type of financial assistance as a result of the Historic Overlay District but that would be a long way off.

A motion was made by Commissioner Weinberger, seconded by Commissioner Barclay, to approve Case HPC-02-2022 – The Bagley House – 121 S. County Line Road – Application for Local Landmark Designation as submitted. The motion carried by a roll call vote of 5-0 as follows:

AYES: Commissioners Barclay, Gonzalez, Weinberger, Prisby, and Haarlow
NAYS: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Braden and Chairman Bohnen

Sign Permit Review

a) Case A-09-2022 – 14 W. Hinsdale Avenue – Every Day’s A Sundae – Installation of One (1) Wall Sign

The applicant, Robert Whalen, was present to address the Commission with Corey Hock, the sign contractor. Mr. Hock described the sign as a push through style shoe box cabinet that will be edge lit at night and contain a standard white face with LED lighting.

It was confirmed the awning will remain in place below the proposed sign. Commissioner Prisby asked about the gooseneck lighting missing from one of the photos. Mr. Whalen stated the existing gooseneck lighting will remain but the light bulbs would be removed above the storefront. Commissioner Prisby stated that he was concerned with leaving the unused gooseneck lighting in place and the resulting lack of symmetry. Mr. Hock stated it was not a problem to remove the goose neck lighting.

Commissioner Weinberger asked if the gooseneck lighting could remain and the sign itself not be illuminated. Commissioner Weinberger stated that generally the Commission is not in favor of illuminated signs, especially on the street that faces the train. Mr. Hock responded that the sign was not face lit, but edge lit giving the appearance of back lighting.

Commissioner Prisby stated the Commission is generally not in favor of cabinet signs and asked if this was similar to the recent Zazu sign. Ms. Salmon confirmed this sign is the same type of sign as the original sign proposed by Zazu at a recent meeting.

Commissioner Barclay asked what the result would be if the lighting remained in the goosenecks above the lighted sign. Mr. Hock responded the two light sources would compete.

Commissioner Prisby stated he was appreciative that the sign was placed between the two layers of limestone but had concerns with the inconsistency of the entire elevation if the goosenecks were not used above this location. Discussion followed about the Guaranteed Rate sign. Several Commissioners were in agreement that the sign was not internally illuminated and instead was lit with the gooseneck lights. It was noted by Commissioner Prisby that the applicant will be doing a lot of evening business.

Commissioner Prisby asked if it was possible to construct this sign with individual letters. Mr. Hock stated the access was not there to utilize a sign with individual letters. Mr. Hock stated the depth of the box was two (2) inches and the letters outside of the box extend a half inch with a clear acrylic letter edge.

Commissioner Barclay stated she does not have a problem with the sign but the unlit goosenecks would give the appearance of the landlord’s need to change the bulbs. Mr. Hock stated that removing the gooseneck fixtures would clean up the appearance. Further discussion took place about the asymmetrical look of the entire building if the goosenecks were to be removed and removing the bulbs in the goosenecks and treating the gooseneck light as an architectural feature.

Commissioner Prisby stated that he liked the location, the size, and the look of the sign, but reminded the Commission of the standard of not using cabinet (interior) lighting and instead encouraging the use of exterior gooseneck lighting.

Commissioner Haarlow acknowledged the dilemma, but suggested the Commission should follow the precedent of not using cabinet signs.

Commissioner Barclay asked if a sign using the gooseneck lighting as the illumination source was considered. Mr. Whalen stated that he liked the sign presented by Mr. Hock and that design is consistent with another location of the ice cream store.

Commissioner Prisby stated he can appreciate the consistency of sign design for various locations, but felt corporations can and have made concessions in their sign design to meet the standards of a historic location. Commissioner Prisby asked if there was anybody in the public that had a comment or concern. None were shared.

A motion was made by Commissioner Weinberger to deny Case A-09-2022 – 14 W. Hinsdale Avenue – Every Day’s A Sundae – Installation of One (1) Wall Sign as submitted.

Commissioner Gonzalez asked if a logo of similar design could be placed on the awning and be illuminated by the gooseneck lights in the evening. It was stated that the existing gooseneck lights would not properly illuminate the awning.

Commissioner Haarlow asked if the applicant would be willing to consider removing the internal illumination aspect of the proposed sign and allow the gooseneck lights to illuminate it. Mr. Whalen stated that the back light design would attract more attention to the new business and let them know the ice cream shop is open.

Discussion took place again about removing the bulbs from the gooseneck lights above the sign. Mr. Hock stated that although the gooseneck lighting is across the entire building, each tenant is an individual business with differing signage needs, and the backlight sign is key for this business.

Discussion took place about the aspects of the sign. It was stated that the Commission has set the precedence of encouraging the use of gooseneck lights to illuminate signs and backlit signs. Mr. Hock stated that the sign is essentially back light but it is referred to as edge lit because of the technique used for this smaller scale sign. Mr. Hock stated that a traditional back lit could not be done with this design.

Further discussion took place by the Commissioners about the depth of the sign, color of the lit edge of the sign, and the gooseneck lights providing a consistent streetscape. Staff was asked if this was the same sign type & illumination that was approved for Silver Birch. Ms. Salmon reported that the Silver Birch sign was a black acrylic panel with white vinyl letters and it was not illuminated. Ms. Salmon also reported that the Guaranteed Rate sign is not illuminated.

Commissioner Haarlow seconded the motion to recommend to deny Case A-09-2022 – 14 W. Hinsdale Avenue – Every Day’s A Sundae – Installation of One (1) Wall Sign. The motion carried by a roll call vote of 3-2 as follows:

- AYES:** Commissioners Weinberger, Prisby, and Haarlow
- NAYS:** Commissioners Barclay and Gonzalez
- ABSTAIN:** None
- ABSENT:** Commissioner Braden and Chairman Bohnen

Public Comment

Commissioner Prisby asked for public comments. Annie Acker, resident of 833 S. Lincoln, was present to address the Commission. Ms. Acker stated that there have been many updates to maintain their existing home, which includes an addition designed by R. Harold Zook, but the family has been interested in updating the garage to a more functional level for a modern family. Various methods to do so have been explored without much level of success and Ms. Acker stated she was disappointed the proposed historic overlay regulations do not currently consider detached structures which would provide some additional options to the family. Ms. Acker stated that she would like to see detached structures added to consideration for future approval.

Commissioner Prisby asked Ms. Acker to clarify the desired location of the proposed garage. Ms. Acker stated the family was hoping to rebuild a larger garage and driveway on the south side of the lot. The current garage and driveway would be converted back to green space. Ms. Acker stated that without any allowances for setbacks, this proposal is not a possibility and the condition of the current garage is deteriorating to the point where the family does not use the garage because of safety concerns.

Further discussion took place between the Commission, staff and Ms. Acker about the complexity and the specific design needs of this case. Ms. Acker stated that including detached structures in the regulations would provide much needed relief for younger families to preserve existing homes while allowing for safe structures that are more functional.

Ms. Salmon briefly explained the steps of the proposed historic overlay district and status, identifying the process for properties to be included for consideration and the general timeline associated with the proposed regulations. Ms. Salmon stated that Ms. Acker might also consider the variance process due to the unique nature of this situation.

Discussion followed about what methods, such as a trellis or breezeway, that might be used to consider a garage detached or attached structure. In response to Ms. Acker's question about the next step, Ms. Salmon responded that the variance process might be a more timely process but further discussion between the family and staff should take place.

Commissioner Haarlow suggested that Ms. Acker focus on the hardship aspect of the lot size if she did bring an application to the Zoning Board of Appeals. It was stated that is important to keep in mind that all the parties involved share the same goal of preserving the house.

New Business

There was no new business to be discussed.

Old Business

a) Amendments to Title 14 – Status Update

Ms. Salmon reported that the Board granted a referral to bring the entire packet for the historic overlay district to the July 13, 2022 Plan Commission Meeting for the purpose of scheduling a public hearing, with August 10, 2022 being the intended date of the public hearing. Ms. Salmon requested that any interested Historic Preservation Commissioners that wished to speak at that meeting reach out to her so proper notice can be completed.

b) Village of Hinsdale 150th Anniversary Celebration

Ms. Salmon reported a kick-off meeting took place on May 18, 2022 with approximately thirty (30) to forty (40) people to begin discussing activities and event ideas. A quote was obtained for putting the railing back on the roof of Memorial Hall and the need to bring any proposed changes to the Historic Preservation Commission in the future if this improvement is approved because the building is landmarked.

Ms. Salmon reported that discussion also took place about making some changes to the front landscape of Memorial Hall, referred to as Presidential Plaza. Improvements such as a band shell, gazebo, or stage were also discussed for Burlington Park. Ms. Salmon added that the possibility of a historic sign on Interstate 294 at the Ogden Avenue exit for Hinsdale, similar to what LaGrange has, was discussed.

Commissioner Haarlow stated that any rooftop rail project would be a restoration since the pins to hold the rail remain on the roof and he believed the landscape plan discussed at the meeting were currently on the desk of the Village Clerk. Commissioner Haarlow requested that historical accuracy be considered for any landscape projects at Memorial Hall as the discussion and plans move forward.

c) Robbins Park Historic Gateway Signs

Ms. Salmon reported visiting the boundaries of the historic district with Public Services to get a better understanding of what possible sign options may include. Ms. Salmon stated that some parameters need to be established for this project before it goes out to bid. It was stated that Public Services has installed some of the sign toppers along the parade route and installation will continue as they continue to work on outdoor dining set ups and parking changes taking place in downtown.

Ms. Salmon shared that there are underground utilities that may prove to be problematic for sign installation as well as quite a few narrow public right of way areas. At location number one (1), the south-east corner of Garfield and Chicago, a free-standing sign might be utilized due to the narrow right of way. It was noted that location number two (2) was incorrectly shown on the map and should be the corner of County Line and Chicago Avenue. This location also has a very narrow right of way and pose physical challenges such as utility lines, light poles, stop signs and hydrants.

Ms. Salmon asked the Commission for comments on these two (2) locations. Commissioners Haarlow and Prisby stated they like the proposed locations.

Ms. Salmon stated that the third location, County Line and Eighth Street, also contains some challenges but existing signs can be re-located to accommodate the new gateway signs. The Commission had no comments on this location.

Ms. Salmon stated that location number four (4), the corner of Eighth and Garfield, is a bit larger physical space than the other locations and currently contains a street sign that can be re-located. The corner is currently under construction and may end up looking a bit different at the end of the year than it looks today. Commissioner Weinberger asked if nearby residents would be notified before the signs are installed. Ms. Salmon responded yes once final plans are developed, public outreach will take place.

Ms. Salmon reported the fifth (5th) location, the intersection of First Street and Garfield, was the most challenging because of the proximity to downtown, existing physical features and existing sign clutter. Ms. Salmon stated the signs can be mounted to the light poles and other currently existing light pole signs be re-grouped and re-located.

Commissioner Haarlow acknowledged the challenges present at this location but stated a sign mounted to the street light was not his first choice. He suggested using a free standing sign as in the other four (4) locations but perhaps pushing the free standing sign back from the corner, despite some nearby buildings not being historic for the sake of maintaining consistency.

Commissioner Prisby asked the Commission if they felt a sign was needed at this fifth location since the four (4) corners would each have a sign. In light of these challenges, Commissioner Haarlow suggested the fifth gateway sign be located at Blaine and Chicago.

*Commissioner Barclay left the meeting at 7:59.

Brief discussion took place about the need of the fifth location sign with the sign toppers. Ms. Salmon stated that it would be noted that the Commission has some concerns with the fifth location and a formal plan can still be developed despite the uncertainty of this location.

Commissioner Haarlow asked if the budget could be rolled over to the next year. Ms. Salmon stated the budget cannot be rolled over but the budget can hopefully be re-allocated for the future with cost estimates provided by a contractor as a result of the bid process starting soon.

Commissioner Weinberger asked the Commission about having two different sign designs for Robbins and the gateway signs, stating she preferred they both be consistent. Commissioner Weinberger also asked about the desire to put signs at Ogden and York in the future to point the way to the area.

Commissioner Prisby liked the idea suggested earlier in tonight's meeting of placing one of the gateway signs at First and Blaine and would like to further discuss placement at Garfield and First despite the challenges.

Commissioner Haarlow asked if funding for this project by part of the 150th budget. Ms. Salmon stated that might be a possibility and it would be great to have some of the signs installed for the 150th celebration. She added that it could possibly be a part of the sponsorship program but generally a design would need to be decided upon before a sponsor would step forward.

Ms. Salmon will bring back further information on the locations discussed tonight, put together a map to show existing downtown signs and get more information about the way finding signage for the next meeting.

Ms. Salmon stated that although no decisions needed to be made at this meeting, most communities use a single post sign for this type of signage. She showed some renderings and actual photograph examples to the Commission. Ms. Salmon also showed some examples of double post signs used in communities for the purpose of comparison.

Commissioner Prisby stated he believed that with the tight locations proposed, it would be difficult to make anything other than a single post sign work and suggested the Commission focus in on the single post examples.

Commissioner Haarlow stated he liked the design of example number three (3) and eleven (11) from the sign post options shared. It was stated that residents would likely prefer something simple and classic since it will be a sign posted in front of their home, an area they think of as their front yard.

Commissioner Prisby stated he liked example number nine (9) if it was not wood because it looked as if it were a framed plaque mounted to a post.

Commissioner Weinberger stated that she thought that the gateway signs should have a consistent look with the street signs in terms of the brackets used and the design selected.

Commissioner Gonzalez stated that he liked the round sign in the examples shared by Ms. Salmon and the font in example number seven (7) but not necessarily the post.

Commissioner Haarlow asked staff to confirm the historic downtown signs were paid for by the Economic Development Commission. Ms. Salmon stated she is still currently working on tracking down the information for this topic. Commissioner Haarlow suggested the EDC might be willing to contribute some funds to this cause. Ms. Salmon shared that these signs were in the EDC budget based on what funds were granted in the past.

Adjournment

There being no further business before the Commission, Commissioner Prisby asked for a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Weinberger made a motion, Commissioner Gonzalez seconded the motion, to adjourn the regularly scheduled meeting of the Village of Hinsdale Historic Preservation Commission meeting of June 1, 2022.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:16 PM after a unanimous voice vote of 4-0.

ATTEST: _____
Jennifer Spires, Community Development Office