

MINUTES
VILLAGE OF HINSDALE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

April 8, 2014

Memorial Hall – Memorial Building, 19 East Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale
5:00 P.M.

Chairman Peterson called the meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission to order at 5:03 p.m. on April 8, 2014 in Memorial Hall in the Memorial Building, 19 East Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale IL.

Present: Chairman Peterson, Commissioner Bohnen, Commissioner Hutter, Commissioner Harloe-Mowery and Commissioner Gonzalez

Absent: None

Also Present: Village Planner, Sean Gascoigne

Findings and Recommendations

HPC-02-2013 – 319 N. Washington Street – Barrow Residence – Withdrawal of Local Landmarking.

Chairman Peterson summarized the request from the two discussions. Commissioner Hutter motioned to approve the findings and recommendations for HPC-02-2013 – 319 N. Washington Street – Barrow Residence – Withdrawal of Local Landmarking. Commissioner Bohnen seconded. The motion passed with five (5) ayes and zero (0) nays.

Minutes

Chairman Peterson introduced the minutes from March 11, 2014. Commissioner Harloe made a motion to approve the March 11, 2014 minutes. Commissioner Gonzalez seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion

Chairman Peterson opened discussion regarding the proposed text amendment the Commission would undergo, to address standards and criteria for withdrawing a landmark.

Commissioner Bohnen offered his thoughts regarding how the term “financial hardship” could be subjective as well as a response to a Trustee’s comments regarding the First Amendment at prior meetings.

Mr. Gascoigne explained that because this was the first withdrawal the Village had seen, there has been a learning curve for everyone. He then stated that as a result, he and the Village Attorney had spent a significant amount of time in the withdrawal section of the Preservation Ordinance and summarized the differences between the different requests and how an applicant would qualify for the various criteria.

General discussion ensued regarding the proposed text amendment language and how to best amend the language to provide a reasonable balance between maintaining rigidity on the intent of landmarking, while not discouraging homeowners from doing it. The discussion continued and the Commission agreed that if an applicant had a true hardship, they should have an out.

Commissioner Hutter suggested that time needed to be spent on the language, now that everyone had a better understanding of what the Commission wanted to accomplish with the text amendment.

General discussion ensued and the Commission agreed that while the exact fix wasn't clear at this point, they could take some time to review the language and were confident they could come up with criteria that provided an applicant some flexibility based generally on financial hardship.

Chairman Peterson moved through the additional bullet points and provided brief summaries of the other discussion points on the agenda including the mapping project and the status of other homes that had expressed interest in possibly landmarking. He then went on to Preservation Month and asked the Commissioners to provide a brief summary of their progress.

Discussion ensued, the Commissioners each presented a summary of their progress and briefly discussed the prizes for the various contests.

Commissioner Bohnen offered some final thoughts regarding wrought iron fences in a residential application and requested that the Commission consider placing this on a future agenda to discuss.

Adjournment

Commissioner Bohnen moved to adjourn. Commissioner Gonzalez seconded and the meeting adjourned at 5:41 p.m. on April 8, 2014.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sean Gascoigne
Village Planner