

**MINUTES
VILLAGE OF HINSDALE
PLAN COMMISSION
May 13, 2015
MEMORIAL HALL
7:30 P.M.**

Chairman Byrnes called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m., Wednesday, May 13, 2015 in Memorial Hall, the Memorial Building, 19 East Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale, Illinois.

PRESENT: Chairman Byrnes, Commissioner Crnovich, Commissioner McMahon, and, Commissioner Ryan Commissioner Krillenberger, Commissioner Unell, and Commissioner Johnson

ABSENT: Commissioner Cashman, Commissioner Fiascone

ALSO PRESENT: Robert McGinnis, Director of Community Development/Building Commissioner and Chan Yu, Village Planner
Applicant Representatives for Cases: A-08-2015, A-09-2015, A-14-2015 and A-07-2015

Approval of Minutes

The Plan Commission reviewed the minutes from the April 8, 2015 meeting. Commissioner Johnson motioned to approve as submitted. Commissioner Crnovich seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Sign Permit Review

Case A-08-2015 – 440 E. Ogden Avenue– Normandy Remodeling- Existing Ground Sign Re-Face

Chairman Byrnes provided a brief summary for the reason to review signs as a commission, such as monuments signs, versus administratively for other examples (such as typical wall signs). He next introduced the applicant from Normandy Remodeling for their proposed ground sign re-face.

Mr. Rob Whitehead from the sign company introduced himself and explained that they are proposing to remove the existing face of the sign and replace it with a new one (to reflect new logo). It will be illuminated by LED and use the existing structure of the ground sign.

Chairman Byrnes asked if it's essentially a swap out- "like for like".

Mr. Rob Whitehead responded yes.

Commissioner Ryan commented that the proposed sign will look far better than the existing.

Chairman Byrnes asked if there were any questions. Having none, he asked for a motion to approve the proposed sign as presented.

Plan Commission Minutes

May 13, 2015

Commissioner Ryan motioned to approve. Commissioner Unell seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Case A-09-2015 – 30 E. 1st Street – Ashley’s Custom Stationary - New Wall Sign and Awning Fabric color change (no text)

Chairman Byrnes introduced the next item of the agenda.

Ashley and Josef (sign company) introduced and presented themselves as the first tenants at the new building/development on Garfield Ave. Ashley explained the colors of her business and the need to replace the current awning colors because they are mustard yellow. She is branding herself and showed her logo and color, navy blue.

Josef explained the proposed wall sign will be 20 square feet (SF), which reflects the conversation with Village staff; and within the limits of the code.

Chairman Byrnes explained that he spoke with Village staff and discussed the importance of allocating sign space (square footage) in multi-tenant buildings.

Mr. Robert McGinnis, Director of Community Development/Building Commissioner explained that the general standards define the land owner as responsible for dividing the allowable signage space in a multi-tenant building. And that space is 100 SF maximum or 25 SF per tenant- whichever is the greater of the two.

Chairman Byrnes made a comment that the proposed looks good and proportional.

Ashley agreed and is happy about the way it looks.

Chairman Byrnes asked the Commission if they liked the blue.

Commissioner Ryan commented that it is very tasteful.

Commissioner Crnovich asked for clarification about the 25 SF per tenant.

Mr. Robert McGinnis mentioned this was a question he reviewed with the Village Attorney and referenced the “greater of” stipulation. Moreover, if you consider the preceding general standards of section 9-106-11, that refer to the aforementioned landlord as responsible for dividing the signage space in a multiple users. He also reached out to Sean Gascoigne, the previous Village Planner for historical context. To that end, the Village has taken the position of allowing 25 SF maximum, per tenant in a multi-tenant building. For example, a 5 tenant building would be allowed up to 125 SF.

Commissioner Crnovich explained that she wanted to be careful and clear moving forward with future sign reviews.

Chan Yu, Village Planner mentioned that the owner of the building was notified for the proposed sign.

Plan Commission Minutes
May 13, 2015

Ashley expressed that she would like to be able to put a sign at the rear of the building, where there is an entrance. And unfortunately, there is no more allowable space for a sign in the rear.

Mr. Robert McGinnis believes this is a conversation that the Plan Commission may consider to have in the future.

Chairman Byrnes stated that this is a unique building in the downtown.

Ashley believes this will be a problem in the future for directing her customers after utilizing the parking in the rear.

Commissioner Crnovich asked staff if a projecting sign is allowed in the downtown.

Chan Yu said yes, and it does not count against the allowed SF.

After Josef mentioned that Ashley's has 5 SF left to use, Ashley expressed that she would like to add text to the awning. Josef explained this was reviewed with staff and that would count towards the signage threshold.

Neale again referenced the 5 SF and the possibility of adding something to the door.

Ashley explained that she plans to install a sign indoors on the wall and have a light shine on it.

Chairman Byrnes stated that the general goal is to prevent excessive clutter in the downtown area.

Chairman Byrnes asked for a motion to approve the proposed sign as presented.

Commissioner Ryan motioned to approve. Commissioner Unell seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Case A-14-2015 – 36 and 42 S. Washington Ave. – Grafton Holdings LLC - New Wall Sign and Awning Re-Face with text added to its Valance

Mr. Peter Coules introduced himself as the representative for the sign applicant. He explained the historical background of the sign application; of it originally going through the ZBA process, but canceled it since it was not a variance. He asked Mr. McGinnis to correct him if he is wrong.

Mr. McGinnis replied correct, you could argue with a multi-tenant building with more than 4 tenants, you could potentially have more than 100 SF of signage.

Plan Commission Minutes
May 13, 2015

Mr. Peter Coules explained at the pre-hearing of the ZBA meeting, he was told he did not have to go through the process and to apply to the Plan Commission. He next explained what was being proposed.

A question was asked if the awning shown on the screen would be replaced.

Mr. Peter Coules replied yes; with black, white and grey on the new awning fabric.

Chairman Byrnes asked Chan, Village Planner what the size of the proposed awning is.

Chan Yu replied, the wall sign is 20.4 SF and the awning valance is 7 SF.

Mr. Peter Coules mentioned this puts them over the 25 SF as a tenant, but not per sign.

Commissioner Crnovich asked which tenants are currently occupying the building.

Mr. Peter Coules and the landlord replied with the name of the tenants.

Commissioner Crnovich asked if they counted the permanent window sign.

Mr. Peter Coules stated the window sign does not count.

Chan Yu replied the window sign (area) was not counted.

Commissioner Crnovich stated that she believes it should count.

Mr. Peter Coules explained the window sign is not permanent because it hangs.

Mr. McGinnis explained that it was not included in the applicant's submittal. And if it is a permanent window sign, it should be counted.

Chairman Byrnes reiterated that the proposed is over the maximum 25 SF.

Mr. Peter Coules explained that this is not a variance because he applied this exact application to the ZBA, and the Village attorney explained that it is not a variance.

Mr. McGinnis explained this was not the problem. Instead, with six tenants, they are permitted up to 150 SF total. However, it is a problem if there was no window signs included in the application that needs to be counted.

Commissioner Crnovich cited Section 9-106(j) and what is counted towards the area calculation. She concluded that the Lash Spot has a permanent window sign.

Mr. Peter Coules stated they did not count it because it's a decal.

Commissioner Crnovich explained it is their permanent sign nevertheless.

Plan Commission Minutes
May 13, 2015

Discussion to clarify the tenants of the building ensued.

Chairman Byrnes asked why the ZBA was involved if the Plan Commission approves signs.

Mr. Peter Coules explained that if they needed more signage area than what's allowed, they needed to apply to the ZBA. In addition, the Planner at the time, Sean, suggested they apply for a variance. However, the Village attorney told them they did not.

Discussion to clarify the tenants of the building ensued and whether or not the barber shop was included in the ZBA application.

Chairman Byrnes asked if the window sign was included in the application.

Chan Yu replied no.

Chairman Byrnes states he doesn't know if we can move forward without this information.

Mr. Peter Coules asked if they did return, if the issue had to do with color or etc.

A reply referenced the size and not the color.

Commissioner Crnovich asked if the frame of the proposed wall sign was calculated for the area.

Chan Yu replied that it is excluded.

Mr. Peter Coules replied that by code, it is excluded. However, they could create a sign without the frame. But the idea was to match the other framed sign and existing elements of the building.

General comments included the sign looks larger with the frame and that it looks more like a frame than a window frame. Furthermore, Commission members expressed that they'd like to see the existing frame removed as well, since it would look better without it.

Mr. Peter Coules asked when they return, are the color, materials and awning alright with everybody.

General agreement was reflected to Mr. Peter Coules and suggested that the frame be removed from the existing wall sign; At a minimum, shrink the proposed wall sign frame.

Commissioner Crnovich believes that the frame should be counted towards the area.

Chan Yu explained he interprets it should not count since they could technically wrap text onto the frame.

Plan Commission Minutes

May 13, 2015

Discussion to clarify the area, how it is shared between the tenants of the building and whether or not the existing Caldwell Banker frame can be removed ensued.

Mr. Peter Coules asked if the awning could be approved.

Chairman Byrnes agreed and asked for a motion to approve the awning as submitted. Commissioner McMahan motioned and Commissioner Johnson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Site Plan and Final Plat Review

Case A-07-2015 – 950 and 954 S. Madison Street. – Tentative and Final Plat Approval for David Weekly Homes Subdivision

Chairman Byrnes gives a background in regards to the issues raised (such as the trees, sidewalks and etc.) by the Plan Commission (PC) and that they were covered at the Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting. However, the BOT remanded back to the PC to review the Site Plan application. Chairman Byrnes also mentioned the concern for the alley purchase was also satisfied by the BOT.

Kevin Seay, the applicant explained that they will purchase the alley at the same time with the land. He mentioned that they are scheduled to close on the land on June 1st, and addressed the tree preservation concerns.

Chairman Byrnes also reiterated that he and Mr. McGinnis had discussed about the detention basin and subsequent drainage improvements in the area.

Mr. McGinnis added that Benes & Associates has completed the engineering review.

Chairman Byrnes explained the proper procedure would to approve the Site Plan application, and subsequently, on a separate motion, approved the Findings and Recommendations, as amended (to include the Site Plan review requirement has been a satisfied) to approve the Site Plan and Plat of Subdivision.

The motion was moved and seconded for each of the above and passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned after a motion was made and seconded at 8:15 p.m..

Respectfully Submitted,



Chan Yu, Village Planner