

Approved
McMahon / Ryan

**MINUTES
VILLAGE OF HINSDALE
PLAN COMMISSION
November 11, 2015
MEMORIAL HALL
7:30 P.M.**

Chairman Byrnes called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m., Wednesday, November 11, 2015 in Memorial Hall, the Memorial Building, 19 East Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale, Illinois.

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

ABSENT: Commissioner Peterson

ALSO PRESENT: Chan Yu, Village Planner
Applicant Representatives for Cases: A-36-2015 and A-40-2015

Approval of Minutes

Chairman Byrnes asked the Plan Commission (PC) to review the minutes and for any comments from the October 14, 2015 meeting. With no comments, Chairman Byrnes asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Commissioner Cashman motioned and Commissioner Crnovich seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Findings and Recommendations

Case A-22-2015 – 12 Salt Creek – Med Properties – Major Adjustment (Trex)

Chairman Byrnes provided a brief 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 Krillenberger motioned to approve. Commissioner Ryan seconded. The motion passed 7 Ayes to 1 Nay.

Case A-23-2015 – 10 Salt Creek – Med Properties – Major Adjustment (Dumpster)

Chairman Byrnes provided a brief 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 Crnovich motioned to approve. Commissioner Unell seconded. The motion passed 7 Ayes to 1 Nay.

Case A-24-2015 – 120 N. Oak St. – SprintCom Inc. – Exterior Appearance and Site Plan for new Telecommunication Equipment at existing cell box location.

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

**Plan Commission Minutes
November 11, 2015**

Commissioner McMahon motioned to approve. Commissioner Cashman seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Case A-26-2015 – 125 S. Vine St. – Vine Academy – Major Adjustment for 90 Students

Chairman Byrnes provided a brief 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 Krillenberger motioned to approve. Commissioner McMahon seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Case A-30-2015 – 50 S. Washington Ave. – Lee Wisch – Exterior Appearance for Façade Improvements to commercial building in the B-2 business district

Chairman Byrnes provided a brief 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 Crnovich seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Scheduling of Public Hearing

Case A-35-2015 – 20 E. Ogden Ave. – LaMantia – Text Amendment to allow Showrooms for Interior Design and Remodeling in the O-2 Limited Office District. (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 December 9, 2015 PC meeting.

Exterior Appearance and Site Plan Review

Case A-36-2015 – 222 E. Ogden Ave. – AMITA Health – Exterior Appearance and Site Plan for Main Entrance Removal for new Façade Wall and Sign. An ADA ramp at the front entrance is also proposed.

Chairman Byrnes introduced this case and asked the applicant to please review the proposed project.

Jeff Myers, the architect introduced himself and explained the plan to remove the columns of the building, replace the existing ADA ramp and install new motion sensor doors. He also noted that they are not adding square footage or changing the parking situation at the property. Lastly, he explained the proposed new wall and subsequent wall sign.

Commissioner Crnovich asked if there was any proposed work on the existing windows. Both Commissioners Crnovich and McMahon agreed that the windows look different on the rendering.

Plan Commission Minutes
November 11, 2015

Mr. Meyers explained that they “photo shopped” the windows and they appear different. However, he confirmed no changes to the windows.

Commissioner Ryan asked about the colors for the sign.

Mr. Meyers explained that he has been working with the sign company on the colors, and that the word “Health” would be the 4th color.

Village Planner Chan Yu explained that the PC would also be discussing if the gradient composed of 3 colors can be considered as “3 colors” per the Zoning Code.

Mr. Meyers introduced Katie Conroy, the sign designer to add to the presentation.

Ms. Conroy provided a brief overview of the sign. She mentioned that it is halo lit, and that the gradient transitions from green to blue to teal. She also explained that it is based on a branding process by AMITA Health.

Chairman Byrnes asked Chan to clarify that the PC is reviewing exterior appearance, site plan and the sign.

Chan replied the PC can consider the sign, if they are comfortable with determining a 3 color gradient as “3 colors”, and recommending a color change to the word “Health” to meet the 3 color maximum Code regulation.

After clarification, Chairman Byrnes expressed that he considers Ogden Avenue to be the gateway into Hinsdale; and the street features numerous classical colonial style buildings. Moreover, the subject building would lose its classical features by moving forward with the proposed project. Thus, the potential appearance of the building would not fit in with the surrounding area.

Commissioner Crnovich agreed with Chairman Byrnes. She explained taking away the columns would remove the classical look of the building.

Commissioner Ryan agreed with Chairman Byrnes and Commissioner Crnovich. She explained that she visited the building, and believes the proposed sign would make the building look sterile, and would take away the integrity of the building. She also expressed that the proposed wall appears to be constructed solely to hold the wall sign up. Additionally, the proposed sign would take prominence over everything else on the building.

Commissioner Cashman agreed with Commissioner Ryan, and added examples of surrounding buildings in the area that matched the subject building. He expressed that he is not comfortable with what is being proposed. However, he is fine with the Site Plan showing the new ADA ramp.

Chairman Byrnes added that the proposed wall sign simply does not fit in with the area.

**Plan Commission Minutes
November 11, 2015**

Commissioner Cashman brought up the proximity to the Overlay District, which is designed to preserve the characteristics of the area.

Commissioner Unell added that he also agreed with what the other Commissioners have expressed. He explained that the proposed façade does not fit well with the rest of the building.

Commissioner Fiascone also agreed with the rest of the Commissioners. She explained what was being proposed is not Hinsdale. Moreover, to approve it would negate the PC's work in keeping Med Property's buildings tied to the Hinsdale look.

Commissioner Cashman concurred and used 12 Salt Creek as an example of adding new elements to the building while keeping the colonial look.

Discussion in regards to the proposed colors of the wall sign ensued.

Chan explained that if the PC determines a gradient of 3 colors is interpreted as 3 colors per the Zoning Code, all potential signage with gradients would essentially be acceptable.

Commissioner Crnovich responded that she is not comfortable with a gradient.

Commissioner Krillenberger expressed that a gradient contains multiple colors versus only a few.

Additional discussion against the notion of allowing color gradients ensued.

Chairman Byrnes asked the applicant if he'd like to come back with a revised proposal.

The applicant replied they will come back with a revised application.

Exterior Appearance and Site Plan Review

Case A-40-2015 – 25 E. Hinsdale Ave. – Casa Margarita – New Awnings and Enclosure at the Brush Hill Train Station Building in the B-2 District

Chairman Byrnes introduced this case and asked the applicant to please review the proposed project.

Chase Lotfi introduced himself as the owner of Casa Margarita and the proposal to install awnings and kitchen ventilation enclosures to the exterior of the building.

Commissioner Crnovich asked if he brought a sample of the awning.

Chase replied yes, and gave a history of how the awning design changed 4 times throughout the process with the Board of Trustees and staff.

Plan Commission Minutes
November 11, 2015

Commissioner Crnovich asked why install 26 awnings.

Chase replied individual awnings for each window has a better appearance.

Commissioner Ryan asked for clarification that each window would have an awning.

Chase answered correct.

Commissioner Cashman asked if there were awnings on the building before.

Chase replied yes, but the last tenant took them down when they left.

Commissioner Crnovich expressed her concern for the historic look of the building. She also mentioned her preference for the Casa Margarita's La Grange location's single colored awnings.

Commissioner Cashman asked if it would be possible to install the enclosures on the opposite side of the building.

Chase explained that was his first choice. However, the BNSF has an issue with this.

Commissioner Crnovich asked where the Cosi venting system was located.

Chase explained that Cosi never had a full kitchen system that required one.

Commissioner Cashman asked how the system would be installed.

Chase responded it would be through the window and kept for future restoration. The enclosure itself is constructed from stained cedar, and colored to match the façade of the building.

Commissioner Cashman asked if it'd be possible to cover the intake and exhaust with an awning versus the enclosures.

Chase explained an iron awning could be possible.

Commissioner Crnovich expressed that the enclosures look large, and asked about the size.

Chase responded the size is roughly 3' by 5'.

Chairman Byrnes asked if the vents make noise, and if they function continuously.

Chase explained the noise isn't very noticeable, and that they will operate when they cook but will be turned off at night.

Commissioner Cashman asked if it was possible to install it on the roof.

Plan Commission Minutes
November 11, 2015

Chase replied it'd cause a lot of damage to the roof, in addition to constructing a platform.

Chairman Byrnes mentioned the historic and attractive lintels of the train station; and to this end, asked if he needs awnings.

Chase answered yes, it is the only opportunity to show that they are a restaurant at the location.

Commissioner Cashman expressed that he is OK with the concept of the awnings at the location.

Commissioner Unell asked how close the enclosures are to the train station.

Chase replied not too close, and described its location by the ATM machine.

Commissioner Cashman asked which side is the intake and exhaust.

Chase explained the exhaust is on the west of the two pipes. It is separated by a window because there needs to be a certain distance between the intake and exhaust.

Commissioner Cashman asked where the kitchen will be located.

Chase replied it will be located where Cosi had their kitchen.

Commissioner Fiascone asked if Casa Margarita plans to use both entrances.

Chase answered yes.

Commissioner Fiascone asked if the enclosure and venting system is as small as possible.

Chase explained it is based on the size of the hood (inside, 14' long) above the equipment. The exhaust motor is about 2 feet long.

Commissioner Cashman asked what they plan on matching the enclosures with.

Chase replied the brick (color).

Chairman Byrnes expressed that there are too many awnings, and suggested consolidating the smaller awnings into one. The 2nd issue he had pertained to the stripes of the awning, and suggested the solid colored awning at the La Grange location. The final point he made, was a suggestion to lower the awnings to reveal the historic lintels on the building.

Chase replied he'd review the possibility of lowering the awnings to expose the lintels.

Commissioner Crnovich agreed with Chairman Byrnes in regards to fewer awnings and keeping the awning to a single color (or it looks too busy for a historic building).

**Plan Commission Minutes
November 11, 2015**

Chase reiterated the importance for small business branding.

Commissioner Cashman asked if he was proposing to install wall signs on the train track side.

Chased replied yes.

Additional discussion in regards to striped awnings or solid awnings ensued. Commissioners against the stripes suggested it was too busy and conflicted with the building.

Commissioner Crnovich reiterated the importance of preserving the historic look of the building, and asked if he spoke with any of the Historic Preservation Commissioners.

Chased replied no.

Chairman Byrnes reviewed and asked the PC for a motion to approve the exterior appearance plans with the modifications to: (1) move the awnings down to expose the lintels, (2) reduce the number of awnings shown on the North and South walls. The 3 smaller awnings should be consolidated into 1 awning. And (3), the kitchen ventilation screening enclosures on the south wall shall be painted to match the brick of the train station façade.

Commissioner Krillenberger motioned to approve. Commissioner Crnovich seconded. The motion resulted in a tie, 4 Ayes, 4 Nays, and 1 absent.

Chairman Byrnes reviewed and asked the PC for a motion to approve the site plan as submitted.

Commissioner Crnovich motioned to approve. Commissioner Fiascone seconded. The motion passed 7 Ayes, 1 Nay, and 1 absent.

The meeting was adjourned after a motion was made by Commissioner Krillenberger and seconded by Commissioner Cashman at 8:46 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Chan Yu, Village Planner