

Approved
Krillengerger/McMahon

**MINUTES
VILLAGE OF HINSDALE
PLAN COMMISSION
July 13, 2016
MEMORIAL HALL
7:30 P.M.**

Chairman Cashman called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m., Wednesday, July 13, 2016, in Memorial Hall, the Memorial Building, 19 East Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale, Illinois.

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

ABSENT: Commissioner Krillengerger

ALSO PRESENT: Kathleen Gargano, Village Manager, Robb McGinnis, Director of Community Development, and Chan Yu, Village Planner
Applicant Representatives for Case: A-10-2016, A-12-16 and A-14-2016

Approval of Minutes

Chairman Cashman asked the Plan Commission (PC) for any revisions or comments from the May 11, 2016, meeting. With none, Chairman Cashman asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Commissioner McMahon motioned and Commissioner Peterson seconded. The motion passed unanimously (7 Ayes and 1 absent).

Exterior Appearance and Site Plan Review

Case A-15-2016 – 120 E. Ogden Ave. – Hinsdale Management Corp. – Site Plan Review for a new secondary parking lot access driveway (O-2 Limited Office District) into Fuller Rd. (R-4 Single Family Residential District). This is a Public Meeting item.

Chairman Cashman summarized the latest information between the Village and applicant, in regards to resolving the issue, and informed the public meeting that the application will be continued at the September 14, 2016, PC meeting. Chairman Cashman explained the PC will not be discussing the item, however, recognized the audience and offered to listen to the comments by the public.

Jennifer L., 628 N. York Rd., apologized to the audience about the application being continued for the September meeting. She explained that they found out late Friday and by then, their post cards have already been sent out. She wishes that anyone present to please put the meeting on their calendars and watch for updates, to offer intelligent feedback to the Village, on how it will impact residents on Fuller Road.

Andrew L., expressed gratitude for the feedback from the Village, and happy to be part of the review process. He explained however, he wished the application would have moved forward and declined in its current form for the record.

Plan Commission Minutes
July 13, 2016

Michael C., 117 Fuller Rd., explained one of his neighbors Greg Peters wasn't able to attend tonight, but he monitored the traffic that came in and out of the building (at 120 E. Ogden Ave.) for four days, from 7 AM to 9 AM and in the afternoon from 4 PM to 6 PM. Michael summarized Greg's findings and found that the majority of traffic traveled east bound on Ogden Ave., and made a right turn onto York Rd. Michael also referenced 30 years ago, Koplun applied for this when he bought the property. He recalled the residents at the time also organized in opposition and the Village opposed the driveway application.

Chairman Cashman reiterated that the PC truly values the citizens input, and encouraged the public to come back in September.

Neil T., 111 Fuller Rd., is a newer resident, and explained that they bought the new home largely because they have children. It's not a cul-de-sac but it is a dead end street. He expressed how beautiful the street and Village is. He explained that he views the application as an investor, a parent and a surgeon. He believes Ogden is a dangerously busy street and Ogden and York is a busy corner. It astonishes him that there is no "no turn on red" sign when turning east onto Ogden from York. He explained all the various potential dangers of additional traffic in the area should the driveway be constructed. He believes approving this application would set a dangerous precedence. Moreover, he would like to explore a way to bring forth an ordinance to prevent a parking lot from applying to emptying out onto a residential street.

Darious N., 100 Fuller Rd., explained as a new resident, the home was purchased because it is on a quiet residential street. One of his biggest concerns is for the children of the neighborhood, including his soon to be born child. There are commuters already using his driveway to turn around in the cul-de-sac. He suspects the tenants and additional traffic will increase this issue from the new office driveway. He also mentioned a school is only three blocks away and additional traffic is not good. He summarized that he is opposed to the application and hopes the PC understands why.

Jordan P., 118 Fuller Rd., would like to echo Darious's concerns in regards to traffic. She mentioned speeding cars on the street after finding out of the dead end. She explained that she walks to work at Whole Food and sees how fast the traffic is already in the area. Allowing for more cars through the driveway will only increase the dangerous area. The cars she noted, already ignores stop signs and speed limit signage in the neighborhood.

Kelly S., 115 Fuller Rd., she explained that she is a seven year resident who purchased the home because it is on a quiet residential street. She expressed her concern for her children and the neighborhood children who are at an age where they can play unsupervised at all times. This driveway would also change the feel of the neighborhood. There is also concern that the commuters using the driveway will not look both ways and expect children while exiting. Property value will decrease from the new driveway. She also asked if there could be a neighborhood representative that could be more involved with the Village and applicant.

Plan Commission Minutes
July 13, 2016

Lyn W., pointed out that this application was denied about 30 years ago as Mike referenced. She also asked if there could be a neighborhood representative that could be more involved with the Village.

Chairman Cashman answered that would be Chan, the Village Planner. At this point, the PC knows as much as the public does he explained, and the application is being continued.

Lyn W., also explained that there is high speed and traffic congestion already, and for the PC to consider this.

Todd A., 114 Fuller Rd., indicated that he just moved back from LaGrange primarily for his children to be able to attend the school system. His family moved into the neighborhood for the safety, security, sensibility, schooling and serenity. He pointed out that the office currently has two curb cuts onto Ogden, and that they do not need a third one onto a residential street. This application is not OK and it was not OK back in circa 1985.

Bob K., 608 N. County Line Rd., explained that N. County Line and Fuller are major arterials already. Moreover, he explained that this driveway will add additional traffic, which will cause a butterfly affect and impact other traffic points that already back up into the residential streets. There are already numerous traffic incidents at the intersection he stated.

Rob S., 229 Fuller Rd., explains the street floods when there is heavy rain, and should be considered. There is already enough traffic in the area. Also, this resident's home features a living room near the front of the house, and will be more affected by additional traffic onto the street. In addition, he will not allow his kids to play in the front yard due to the increase in dangerous traffic. This resident also explained that the driveway will push additional cars south on York.

Meg P., 412 Fuller Rd., she explained that she grew up in Hinsdale and moved back 10 years ago. She recalled Fuller Rd. as a nice and quiet road. However, over the last 3 to 5 years, the traffic has increased. There is already enough speeding traffic in the area, and believes this driveway will make it worse since people will figure out a shortcut to access the highway. She also wished this application could have been denied today versus being continued at a later date.

Cindy K., 407 Fuller Rd., this resident explained that she is a teacher and referenced that the neighborhood sidewalks were installed in 1988. With this new driveway, her primary concern will be the danger for the kids, pets and residents to use it. She also suggested that the street is in bad shape, and that the Elm and Fuller Rd. intersection needs a stop sign.

Debra B., 802 Franklin, This resident indicated that she would like an earlier notice for the meetings, especially if the applicant chooses to continue it on another date. She explained that

Plan Commission Minutes
July 13, 2016

a lot of residents changed their schedules around for this meeting, so she hopes the applicant can give the residents a chance to also have the flexibility for a potential date change.

Chairman Cashman told the audience or anyone watching the meeting at home to please send emails to the PC. He explained that they review the emails and it's another way to communicate with the PC.

Mike M., 543 N. County Line Rd., this resident explained this proposed driveway will make traffic worse in the area.

Todd A., 114 Fuller Rd., asked if the Village or resident(s) can propose an ordinance to prevent an application like this from being submitted. He believes approval for this would set a dangerous precedence over protecting the residential neighborhoods.

Chairman Cashman recommended that he ask the Chan that question.

Chan, explained with respect to due process, the applicant owns the land, the land is zoned O-2 and can apply for a driveway, and that the driveway plan the applicant submitted meets the Code- and has the right to apply for it. In regards to how citizens can stop the approval of the application, he explained you/they are doing the right thing right now; and that's by showing up at the meetings to voice your concerns/opposition.

Todd A., 114 Fuller Rd., asked how we can prevent this application from coming back before the Village.

Robb McGinnis, Director of Community Development, replied that you could reach out to himself or Chan, and that we could potentially bring this forward as a staff driven text amendment to the Code.

Kathleen Gargano, Village Manager, introduced herself and reviewed that she had spoken with Mr. London last weekend, and that the Village is aware of the concerns of the neighbors. She expressed that she is glad to be in attendance tonight to hear the thoughtful comments by the residents. She also indicated that the Village will follow up with the traffic concerns brought up to the Police Department. She will review her notes with Chief Simpson the next day. Ms. Gargano pointed out that it's not uncommon for resident groups to request a review of the neighborhood traffic flows. She indicated that the Village will look into the desire of the residents to prohibit this type of application in the future. All general public meetings have a summary reported to the Village Board. To that end, all of the concerns and comments will be communicated to the Village Board. The PC is a recommending body to the Board, and has been aware of the materials and petition, and understands the concerns. The applicant is not present because the item is being continued. She reviewed that she talked to Mr. London about the applicant continuing this in response to the residential concerns, while considering

Plan Commission Minutes
July 13, 2016

for the safety for their tenants. Lastly, Ms. Gargano reiterated that the Village understands and hears the concerns by the residents. But at the same time, the applicant, has the ability to apply before the PC, and is working on a solution, other than the present application, which is clearly opposed by the participants of the current public meeting.

A question was raised in regards to stopping the application.

Kathleen Gargano, Village Manager, replied there's many ways to stop the application. The applicant can withdraw it, the PC can recommend for denial to the Board and the Board can concur with the PC. The Board is the ultimate authority.

A question was asked if the public has access to the Board.

Kathleen replied yes, everyone does, and that the petition and application materials have been shared, and the Board has been apprised of the situation.

A concern was raised from a resident that the continuance might be a way for the application to be somehow approved. He'd like this comment to be noticed and for the next meeting date to be noticed (August 9, 2016).

Kathleen replied that the Village is committed in working with the neighbors and hopeful for the commenter will understand the continuance is not an attempt to approve it.

A question was asked how long the applicant needs to wait to re-apply.

Robb McGinnis, Director of Community Development, replied two years is the duration. He also explained the difference between a public meeting and public hearing and the notification reason for the public meeting since it's within 250 feet from a residential lot.

Chan explained that the notification process will need to be continued with certified mailing, signage at the subject property and newspaper notification (Note: it should be clarified that this is NOT necessary as long as the continuance date is established for the next meeting).

More discussion about process ensued.

Chairman Cashman brought up that it's common for the PC to focus a lot of the time on applications that affect transition zones, between commercial and residential districts, and that the PC is respectful for the residents as a priority. He also reminded everyone to attend the next meeting and send emails to the PC.

Chairman Cashman asked for a motion to formally continue this item for the September PC meeting.

Commissioner McMahon motioned to approve. Commissioner Fiascone seconded. The motion passed unanimously (7 Ayes and 1 absent).

**Plan Commission Minutes
July 13, 2016**

Sign Permit Review

Case A-10-2016 – 49 S. Washington Street – Reflexion Spa – 1 Wall Sign with a Height Modification Request (13.25’ vs. 13’ above grade)

Chairman Cashman reviewed the next item on the agenda as a sign application from Reflexion Spa. He next asked the applicant to please introduce himself and the request.

Mr. Michael Kovar, the sign representative presented the wall sign modification request to allow a wall sign 3” over the maximum height per the Code.

Chairman Cashman indicated the bay window does pose a unique situation for the building since the maximum height (in this case) is set by the bottom of the second story window.

Chairman Cashman asked for any questions by the PC.

Commissioner Crnovich asked if the building owner plans to install more signs for the tenants upstairs.

Mr. Kovar explained that the building owner will apply for them separately if so.

Commissioner Crnovich mentioned that it’d be nice for all future signage to be on the same level.

Mr. Kovar indicated that he’d like to keep all the signage consistent in terms of material.

Chan asked if the sign is still non-illuminated.

Mr. Kovar replied correct.

With no other questions, Chairman Cashman asked for a motion to approve the sign application as submitted, with the height modification.

Commissioner McMahon motioned to approve. Commissioner Crnovich seconded. The motion passed unanimously (7 Ayes and 1 absent).

Exterior Appearance and Site Plan Review

Case A-12-2016 – 107 S. Vine St. – Psychological Resources – Exterior Appearance and Site Plan for a Wheelchair Elevator in the Rear Yard of an O-1 Specialty Office District. This is a Public Meeting item.

Plan Commission Minutes

July 13, 2016

Chairman Cashman reviewed the next item on the agenda as an exterior appearance review by Psychological Resources. He next asked the applicant to please introduce himself and the request.

Dennis Parsons, project architect, presented the proposed exterior elevator to the PC. The key points are the new elevator will feature the same colors and materials as the current house. The height of the elevator enclosure will be less than the building itself, as small as possible and proportionate to the current building.

Dennis Batchos, Owner of Psychological Resources, clarified that this is not to generate additional revenue. His wife has patients currently unable to walk and needs this to remain patients of the office. They want to take care of their current patients.

Commissioner Ryan asked for clarification of the location of the elevator.

Dennis Parsons and Batchos explained that it's on the east side by the back stairs area. It's approximately a 5' by 5' square going straight up.

Commissioner Fiascone asked if the area is currently landscape/greenscape.

Dennis Parsons replied no, it's a paved area already.

Chairman Cashman asked for any additional questions by the PC and for any comments by the audience. With none, he asked for a motion to approve the exterior appearance and site plan as submitted.

Commissioner McMahon motioned to approve. Commissioner Crnovich seconded. The motion passed unanimously (7 Ayes and 1 absent).

Case A-14-2016 – 5721 S. Garfield Ave. – Mr. Philip Miscimarra – Exterior Appearance Review for a Dormer Addition at Sutton Place townhome development in the R-5 Multiple Family Residential District. This is a Public Meeting item.

Chairman Cashman reviewed the next item on the agenda as an exterior appearance review as a dormer addition in the Sutton Place development. He next asked the applicant to please introduce himself and the request.

The homeowner, Mr. Philip Miscimarra presented the proposed dormer addition to the PC in a finished 3rd floor attic, with no current windows. The proposed dormer will face the interior of the development, opposite and not visible from the street (Garfield Ave.). There are similar dormers already in the development. He also explained that the Sutton Place homeowners association has already approved his plan. Mr. Miscimarra reiterated Chan's memo and pointed out that the dormer will not be taller or project further than the building envelope. The design will also match the current home in terms of quality and finish.

Plan Commission Minutes
July 13, 2016

Chairman Cashman asked for any questions by the PC and for any comments by the audience. With none, he asked for a motion to approve the exterior appearance and site plan as submitted.

Commissioner Ryan asked for clarification of the approval by the association and asked if there are other townhomes with similar dormers like the proposed.

Mr. Philip Miscimarra responded there are three or four other homes with existing attic dormers and that he made sure his location will not be too close to the next one over. He also clarified yes, the association has already approved for this dormer plan.

Chairman Cashman also mentioned about existing dormers on the other side of the common area.

Chairman Cashman asked for any questions by the PC and for any comments by the audience. With none, he asked for a motion to approve the exterior appearance application as submitted.

Commissioner Unell motioned to approve. Commissioner Ryan seconded. The motion passed unanimously (7 Ayes and 1 absent).

Other Business

Chairman Cashman announced the PC will not have a meeting in August and will meet again at the next regularly scheduled September PC meeting date. The meeting was adjourned at 8:49 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Chan Yu, Village Planner