

**VILLAGE OF HINSDALE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
Wednesday, August 3, 2022**

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Village of Hinsdale Historic Preservation Commission was called to order by Commissioner Prisby in Memorial Hall of the Memorial Building, 19 E. Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale, IL on Wednesday, August 3, 2022 at 6:30 p.m., roll call was taken.

PRESENT: Commissioners Sarah Barclay, Shannon Weinberger, Alexis Braden, and Jim Prisby

ABSENT: Commissioners Frank Gonzalez and William Haarlow, 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 Weinberger, seconded by Commissioner Braden to appoint Commissioner Jim Prisby Pro Tem Chairman for the August 3, 2022 Historic Preservation meeting. The motion carried by a roll call vote of 4-0 as follows:

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

Approval of Minutes – July 6, 2022

Pro Tem Chairman Prisby asked for comments on the draft of the July 6, 2022 Historic Preservation Commission meeting minutes.

Commissioner Weinberger made note of two (2) errors. The first error, on page three (3) of the draft minutes, the vote included Commissioner Weinberger mistakenly as a "Nay" vote and should be changed to "Abstain" for the motion to approve Case HPC-05-2022 – 430 E. Seventh Street – Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to Demolish a Single-Family Home in the Robbins Park Historic District.

The second error included the vote of Commissioner Weinberger mistakenly recorded as a "Nay" and should be changed to "Aye" for the motion to approve Case HPC-05-2022 – 430 E. Seventh Street – Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to Construct a New Single-Family Home in the Robbins Park Historic District.

A motion was made by Commissioner Barclay, seconded by Commissioner Weinberger, to approve the July 6, 2022 draft minutes as amended. The motion carried by a voice vote of 4-0.

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

Public Meetings

- a) **Case A-15-2022 – 36 S. Washington Street & 4 W. Hinsdale Avenue – Airoom – Exterior Appearance Review and Site Plan Review to allow for changes to the exterior façade of the existing building and a Sign Permit Review to allow for the installation of two (2) new wall signs on the building located at 36 S. Washington Street and 4 W. Hinsdale Avenue in the B-2 Central Business District**

Mike Klein, representing Airoom, was present to address the Commission and provided an overview of the project. Mr. Klein shared historic photographs of the building and of the current building. He stated the application included a proposal to install a white aluminum framed glass storefront system restoring the window height to approximately what it was in the historic photograph. The glass installed would be insulated and raise the level of glass in the storefront to a more proportional level. The door will be brought forward instead of set in. The copper canopy would be removed.

The proposed sign size on Washington Street falls within the allowable size, includes the Airoom name and logo in a simple back lit design, and is flush with the building. The smaller letters underneath the main text that read "Design + Build Studio" were confirmed to be routed out illuminated letters.

Pro Tem Chairman Prisby asked if the proposed sign was a cabinet sign. Mr. Klein stated the sign is not internally illuminated.

Mr. Klein stated the window on Hinsdale Avenue would not be replaced and a smaller version of the Washington Street sign would be installed above the existing window.

Commissioner Barclay asked if the windows would have lettering on them. Mr. Klein stated that the windows would not contain lettering.

Pro Tem Chairman Prisby asked staff to clarify the ordinance as it relates to signage on the window. Ms. Salmon responded the code includes permanent window signage as part of the total allowable signage but stated that window signage was not submitted as part of this application.

Pro Tem Chairman Prisby asked about the basket-weave brick work on the building. Ms. Salmon stated she believed this feature was not part of the original building.

Pro Tem Chairman Prisby asked if the street had been raised to help relate architecturally the proportional height of the proposed window. Discussion followed and it was decided the street was likely raised and the floor lowered as a result.

Pro Tem Chairman Prisby stated the building was already a complex case for signage with two (2) sides in addition to the proposed architectural changes to a historical building. He noted concerns about the band covering the steel beam behind the "Airoom" signs and stated it appears to read more as the metal panel and part of the sign instead of an architectural element. Pro Tem Chairman Prisby stated this area should be more of an architectural element and perhaps the applicant consider adding a crown molding cap, rails, columns or entry that projects further out from the building to give the appearance of a covered entry and better fit the building style.

Mr. Klein stated that the slope of the building is a challenge and asked Pro Tem Chairman Prisby to clarify what he would like to see. Pro Tem Chairman Prisby suggested adding a flat box extending twelve (12) to eighteen (18) inches from the building with some molding and other architectural features, perhaps with some down lights. Pro Tem Chairman Prisby stated that adding an architectural piece like this would create depth and shadow lines.

Further discussion took place about the proposed design looking like an international style on a Colonial Revival building and the need to add architectural characteristics. Mr. Klein stated he felt the proposed design of "less is more" was simple and did not compete with the other features already existing on the building. Discussion followed about how the architectural box proposed could be constructed and attached to the building and possible designs to incorporate the wrought iron sconces to minimize the modern feel of the proposed design. It was confirmed the wrought iron pieces on the second floor were to remain.

Commissioner Weinberger stated that removing the recessed door entry and making the area above the windows flat gives a very urban appearance on a very important historic location within the Village. Mr. Klein stated that the use of the interior space is very limited without pushing the door outward. Mr. Klein also stated that he would be willing to make some of the changes discussed to building an architectural box but felt removing the recessed door was necessary.

Discussion continued about design possibilities for the architectural box. Ms. Salmon stated that posts could not be constructed in the right-of-way and the box would need to be cantilevered over the door opening. Pro Tem Chairman Prisby asked staff to clarify the allowable height of a cantilevered box. Ms. Salmon stated that the ordinance states it would need to be at least eight (8) feet above grade and project out about a maximum of three (3) feet.

Discussion continued about the specific design of a potential architectural box to include corbels and pediments, trim on the bottom, and an architectural cap on the top that would be a balance between an architectural interest piece that would contribute to the Colonial Revival building style and being too ornate.

Mr. Klein stated that he would like to continue moving the project forward in relation to the glass windows as the architectural box and sign design are finalized and approved. Ms. Salmon stated that unfortunately those aspects of the project could not be separated out, the project must move forward together to the Village Board.

It was stated the role of the Historic Preservation Commission is advisory and revised plans of the architectural box based on the suggestions from the HPC would need to be submitted the following day on August 4, 2022 to be included in the next the Plan Commission meeting for approval. Mr. Klein stated he felt revised plans could be submitted by the end of next business day in an attempt to keep the project moving forward. Ms. Salmon stated that in the past, cases have been referred forward to the Plan Commission with revisions based on the recommendations of the HPC and shared with the Chairman, in this case Pro Tem Chairman Prisby to ensure agreement.

Ms. Salmon stated it was up to the discretion of the Historic Preservation Commission to continue this case to the next month's meeting with revised plans or to refer the case to Plan Commission subject to revisions based on the recommendations.

Further discussion took place about the sign illumination. It was stated that the sign would not be internally lit but rather it would contain halo / edge lighting of the letters, similar to what Every Day is a Sundae originally proposed. Michelle Forsys, of Aurora Sign, shared specific details of the illumination and directed the Commission to view the night time elevation provided in the packet.

Commissioner Braden asked how the sconces, recommended by the HPC to remain, would work with the proposed sign.

Commissioner Weinberger asked if the Hinsdale Avenue sign needed to be lit since customers would be entering the business from Washington Street. Mr. Klein stated that he felt the Hinsdale Avenue sign should be lit and felt the proposed signs were far more subtle than existing, face lit signs in the area.

Commissioner Braden stated it is part of the Commission's job to "right" some past decisions that were unknowingly made and acknowledged that it is difficult not to make comparisons to decisions made in the past for existing businesses in the area. Mr. Klein stated that the small size of the sign does require some lighting to be legible.

Pro Tem Chairman Prisby explained the interior box of this sign proposed is being lit rather than each individual letter mounted as has been approved by this Commission in the past. Ms. Forsys stated that LED halo lit illumination of each letter would not be possible due to the small size of the letter font. Mr. Klein stated that the size of the proposed sign was very limited due to the oversized signs of the neighboring businesses approved on the building.

Commissioner Braden asked for clarification on the approval of the neighboring signs. Ms. Salmon stated the sign face change was approved in 2015 and recent requests for variations allowing more signage were not approved. Ms. Salmon also stated that building owners can assign allowable sign space in unequal amounts to tenants.

Pro Tem Chairman Prisby asked about a possible variation in light of the hardship of allowable sign size. Ms. Salmon stated that the Plan Commission can allow for a slightly larger sign size at an administrative level but noted the Plan Commission has not typically supported variations for increased signage. Ms. Salmon stated that another option would be for the building owner work with the other tenant to remove some of the existing signage.

Mr. Klein stated that he felt the proposed sign is creating the same effect of individual back lit letters that would be created by a halo lit sign design suggested by the Commission but is impossible to do this design because of the small sign size and font. Mr. Klein re-stated the proposed sign is not a face lit sign. It was stated later that the logo would be face lit.

Further discussion took place about design suggestions to eliminate illumination from parts of the sign and the amount of colors used in this and other allowable signs. It was stated that a night-time full streetscape would be helpful to the Commission in the future.

With no further comments on the Washington Street sign, discussion moved to the sign on Hinsdale Avenue. Mr. Klein stated this sign was simply a smaller version of the Washington Street sign that would fit directly above the window. Commissioner Braden asked if the phrase "Since 1958" was on the sign. It was confirmed that phrase would be on the Hinsdale Avenue sign but not on the Washington Street sign. The phrase would not be illuminated.

Discussion took place about the above window location of the Hinsdale Avenue sign and if there were other, more appropriate locations. It was determined the location directly above the window was the most appropriate location for the sign for various reasons, but the Commission is not in favor with the illumination of this sign.

Commissioner Barclay asked if the sconce lighting could be a source of illumination for the Washington Street sign. Pro Tem Chairman Prisby stated he did not believe that gooseneck lighting, which is often preferred by the Commission, would be possible as a source of illumination over a sign mounted to architectural box.

Pro Tem Chairman Prisby asked for comments from the public. No public comments were shared.

Further discussion took place about procedural steps for potential motions. Discussion also took place about the necessity to include the red Airoom logo as part of the sign.

Commissioner Barclay made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Braden, to approve Case A-15-2022 – 36 S. Washington Street & 4 W. Hinsdale Avenue – Airoom – Exterior Appearance Review and Site Plan Review to allow for changes to the exterior façade of the existing building and a Sign Permit Review to allow for the installation of two (2) new wall signs on the building located at 36 S. Washington Street and 4 W. Hinsdale Avenue in the B-2 Central Business District subject to Commissioner Prisby receiving revised architectural plans showing a box pediment with corbel support on the Washington Street side by August 4, 2022 to ensure revisions are in line with tonight’s discussion. The motion failed by a roll call vote of 2-2 as follows:

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

Discussion followed about the motion lacking language related to sign lighting resulting in the denied motion and about procedures to split the motion to address specific items.

Commissioner Barclay made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Weinberger, to approve Case A-15-2022 – 36 S. Washington Street – Airoom – Exterior Appearance Review and Site Plan Review to allow for changes to the exterior façade of the existing in the B-2 Central Business District subject to Commissioner Prisby receiving revised architectural plans showing a box pediment with corbel support on the Washington Street side by August 4, 2022 to ensure revisions are in line with tonight’s discussion. A roll call vote of 3-1 was made as follows [see note below]:

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

Commissioner Weinberger made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Braden, to deny Case A-15-2022 – 36 S. Washington Street & 4 W. Hinsdale Avenue – Airoom – Sign Permit Review to allow for the installation of two (2) new wall signs on the building located at 36 S. Washington Street and 4 W. Hinsdale Avenue in the B-2 Central Business District. The motion failed by a roll call vote of 1-3 as follows:

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

Please note, following the meeting, staff reviewed Title 2 Chapter 12 of the Village Code that outlines the general powers, duties, and procedures of the Historic Preservation Commission. In accordance with Section 2-12-3(A): “Quorum And Necessary Vote: No business shall be transacted by the commission without a quorum, consisting of four (4) members, being present. The affirmative vote of a majority of the commission, consisting of at least four (4) members, shall be necessary on any motion to recommend approval of any matter or any application. Any lesser vote on any such motion, even if a majority of those voting, shall be considered a final decision to recommend denial of such matter or application.” The votes of the Historic Preservation Commission noted above are considered votes recommending denial based on this code section.

b) Case A-17-2022 – 36 E. Hinsdale Avenue – Performance Wealth Management – Exterior Appearance and Site Plan Review to allow for exterior changes to the rear façade Sign Permit Review to allow for the installation of one (1) new wall sign for the existing building located at 36 E. Hinsdale Avenue in the B-2 Central Business District

Mike Zalud Jr., from Courtland LLC, was present to address the Commission. Mr. Zalud stated this request is a result of customers parking in the rear of the building being confused by location of Performance Wealth Management due to lack of signage and the sharing of the building with another tenant. Mr. Zalud stated the door trim changes proposed to the rear opening would mirror the opening at the front of the building and the Zazu sign would be removed to make room for the proposed Performance Wealth sign.

Pro Tem Chairman Prisby expressed concern that the design of the proposed wood surround and trim around the rear entrance doors was not proportional and recommended that the design be altered to match the scale of the front design. It was noted that the plinths / bases of the pilasters appeared too wide and did not match the scale of the surround, the top trim (cornice) appeared too narrow in comparison to the header / frieze, and the pilasters were too narrow leaving exposed brick areas between the pilaster and door frame.

Commissioner Weinberger asked why the rear sign was not designed like the front sign and not located above the entry door for Performance Wealth, but instead was located near the Salon Loft portion of the building. Mr. Zalud responded it was related to the amount of allowable sign square footage and the desire to have a rear illuminated sign where a large majority of the customers park for frequent evening appointments. Commissioners noted the location of the sign was confusing, especially with the branding of the Salon Loft employee door.

Pro Tem Chairman Prisby stated this sign was an internally lit sign and suggested it be more similar to the front sign that is illuminated with goose neck lighting. Commissioners also stated this is an area with a large amount of truck traffic and any goose neck lighting would need to be high enough to be clear of truck traffic but low enough to illuminate the sign. Ms. Salmon stated there was no code to address the required height of the gooseneck lights, but there is an existing awning that projects from the building that is assumed to not be problematic for truck traffic.

Commissioner Weinberger stated gooseneck lighting would serve dual functions, sign illumination as well as lighting the entry door.

Hearing no public comments, Commissioner Weinberger made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Braden, to approve Case A-17-2022 – 36 E. Hinsdale Avenue – Performance Wealth Management – Exterior Appearance and Site Plan Review to allow for exterior changes to the rear façade for the existing building located at 36 E. Hinsdale Avenue in the B-2 Central Business District subject to the changes in design discussed. The motion carried by a roll call vote of 4-0 as follows:

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

Commissioner Braden made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Weinberger, to deny Case A-17-2022 – 36 E. Hinsdale Avenue – Performance Wealth Management – Sign Permit Review to allow for the installation of one (1) new wall sign for the existing building located at 36 E. Hinsdale Avenue in the B-2 Central Business District with the recommendation the wall sign be relocated to the trim area above the double doors and that the sign be illuminated with gooseneck lighting, similar to design utilized on front façade. The motion carried by a roll call vote of 4-0 as follows:

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

Public Comment

No public comments were shared.

New Business

Ms. Salmon shared information from a recent conversation with Anthony Rubano from the State Historic Preservation Office about the property tax assessment freeze program. It was stated Mr. Rubano is willing to conduct a free training session via zoom/web ex to share valuable information tailored to the Community to dispel some myths about the program. The training session can be recorded and available on the Village website for the future use. Ms. Salmon stated that there have been approximately 19 approved applications since the program's inception and a small number of applicants are eligible due to the difficulty meeting the regulations for fair cash value. Ms. Salmon suggested to the Commissioners that the Village take advantage of this opportunity to make homeowners aware of the program and educate them on the application process and requirements.

Old Business

a) Amendments to Title 14 – Status Update

Ms. Salmon reported that the public hearing will be held at next week's Plan Commission meeting. The public notification was published and as of tonight, Ms. Salmon has not received any inquiries related to it. Ms. Salmon reported that if no further changes are required, it could go to the Board in September. Ms. Salmon will keep the Commission aware of the time-line.

b) Village of Hinsdale 150th Anniversary Celebration

Ms. Salmon reported a survey was put out to help prioritize and plan a budget for either the roof railing, the plaza in front of Memorial Hall, or the gazebo in Burlington Park. The survey results showed the priority was to update the patio in front of Memorial Hall. Ms. Salmon stated that many details are still being worked on and any further updates will be shared at a later date.

c) Robbins Park Historic Gateway Signs

Ms. Salmon shared an updated map showing the four (4) primary locations and three (3) secondary locations that were discussed previously. Ms. Salmon reported there were no changes to the sign location on Blaine and the majority of the Commission preferred the west corner. It was also reported there were no changes to sign location numbers two, three or four.

The fifth location at Garfield and First Street was still in the process of being discussed, with the possibility of re-locating the no trucks sign. The sixth location was also in the process of discussion with a possible location near the driveway on the south side of First Street.

Discussion took place about the need for a sign at location number six since it is inside the defined area and all of the street signs will eventually have toppers.

Ms. Salmon shared photos of existing street topper, downtown historic district, and way finding signs. A narrowed group of potential sign examples the Commission discussed were shared.

The group decided to wait for more Commissioners to be present further this topic.

Adjournment

Commissioner Weinberger made a motion to adjourn the regularly meeting of the Village of Hinsdale Historic Preservation Commission meeting of August 3, 2022. Commissioner Braden seconded the motion.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:39 PM after a unanimous voice vote of 4-0.

ATTEST: _____
Jennifer Spires, Community Development Office