

Approved

**MINUTES  
VILLAGE OF HINSDALE  
PLAN COMMISSION  
April 10, 2019  
MEMORIAL HALL  
7:30 P.M.**

Chairman Cashman called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m., Wednesday, April 10, 2019, in Memorial Hall, the Memorial Building, 19 East Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale, Illinois.

**PRESENT:** Steve Cashman Julie Crnovich, Anna Fiascone, Scott Peterson,  
Debra Braselton and Mark Willobee

**ABSENT:** Troy Unell, Gerald Jablonski, and Jim Krillenberger

**ALSO PRESENT:** Chan Yu, Village Planner and applicant for case: A-14-2019, A-04-2019, A-07-2019  
and A-09-2019

---

**Approval of Minutes – March 11, 2019**

The Plan Commission (PC) **unanimously approved** the March 11, 2019, minutes, as submitted, 5-0, (1 abstained and 3 absent).

**Findings and Recommendations - Case A-05-2019 – 111 W. Chicago Ave., 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor - Responsible Driver – Special Use Permit for Driving School (requesting to relocate from its current location at 7 N. Grant St.)**

The PC **unanimously approved** Findings and Recommendations, with the condition that the date reflect the PC special meeting date on March 11, 2019, 5-0, (1 abstained and 3 absent).

**Sign Permit - Case A-14-2019 – 550 W. Ogden Ave. – Hinsdale Orthopedics - One new externally illuminated Wall Sign**

The applicant introduced the sign request and the purpose to help guide visitors to the entrance and is part of a rebranding effort to market the immediate care service Hinsdale Orthopedics offers. She also clarified that the external lighting is existing and shown on the application to help show the sign at night.

A Plan Commissioner asked when Hinsdale Orthopedics will begin the landscaping project.

The applicant replied that she does not know and is only in charge of the sign application.

A Plan Commissioner asked if there are any issues with finding the place because of all the signage requests.

The applicant replied that this sign would serve a different purpose and guide visitors to the entrance.

With no other questions, the PC **unanimously approved** the sign application as submitted, 6-0, (3 absent).

**Plan Commission Minutes**  
**April 10, 2019**

**Exterior Appearance and Site Plan - Case A-04-2019 – 10 N. Washington Street – Eve Assisted Living (10 N. Washington Properties LLC) – 2<sup>nd</sup> Major Adjustment to Site Plan/Exterior Appearance Application to construct a new illuminated ground sign at the corner of Washington and Maple Street.**

The applicant reviewed the reason for the proposed ground sign and explained that they were never satisfied with the current wall sign at Eve Assisted Living.

A Plan Commissioner asked if the proposed location will replace the current park bench.

The applicant responded, essentially yes, with landscaping around the ground sign.

A Plan Commissioner asked if they feel the need for the ground sign.

The applicant responded that the management of the building has been requested for better signage, due to persons not knowing what services the building provided.

A Plan Commissioner asked if there are plans for a 4-way Stop sign system at the corner of Washington and Maple.

Chan responded no, he is still waiting on the Police Department.

Chairman Cashman stated it would be helpful to see the sign with the landscape plan to fully understand what the proposed ground sign will look like onsite. He also added that he would prefer the sign face Washington Street versus diagonally.

A Plan Commissioner agreed about the ground sign orientation due to the neighbors down the street.

Chairman Cashman reiterated that it is difficult to fully understand the visual impact of the proposed ground sign without an image of the sign at the location.

A Plan Commissioner asked if there was a formal agreement for the open space in the original planned development.

Chan responded no, but that corner specifically was discussed at length during the initial major adjustment application.

A Plan Commissioner expressed concern for the large size of the sign in relation to the yard and building.

A few Plan Commissioners felt that the coach lights were unnecessary and would make it appear too busy.

The PC **unanimously continued** the sign application as submitted, with the request to see a landscape plan and sign exhibit with different sign orientations 6-0, (3 absent).

**Plan Commission Minutes**  
**April 10, 2019**

**Exterior Appearance and Site Plan - Case A-07-2019 – 830 N. Madison Street – Salt Creek Club – 4<sup>th</sup> Major Adjustment to Site Plan/Exterior Appearance Application to install 6 tennis court light poles at south east corner of the lot.**

The applicant introduced themselves and answered questions by the PC. The reason for the requested tennis court lights is to primarily allow the USTA team to play at night. The typical use, as explained by the applicant is 2 weeks a night, and between June and July.

Chairman Cashman asked what the hours of tennis play are.

The applicant responded currently, the paddle tennis courts close at 10:30 but staff needs to rake/prepare the courts for the next day.

A Plan Commissioner asked if they spoke with any of their neighbors about the plan.

The applicant replied that they notified them.

A Plan Commissioner asked if they held a neighborhood meeting.

The applicant replied no.

Chairman Cashman explained the importance of installing visors on the LED lights even if the Village codes are met.

A Plan Commissioner asked if they have plans to convert any tennis courts for pickle ball.

The applicant replied that they currently offer pickle ball at their paddle tennis courts.

A Plan Commissioner asked if they are open to the idea of relocating the lights west, as mentioned at the Village Board meeting.

The applicant stated that they are open to the idea.

A Plan Commissioner asked why light 4 courts specifically.

The applicant explained that this is a USTA requirement.

A Plan Commissioner asked how long have the courts been there.

The applicant stated in the 1960s.

Chairman Cashman explained that the tennis courts would not be permitted based on the current zoning code, and stated his concerns of glare and noise to the neighbors.

During the public comment period, six (6) residential neighbors adjacent to the Salt Creek Club strongly opposed the request to construct tennis court lights due to concerns for the additional noise, lights, traffic and impact to the wildlife in the area.

**Plan Commission Minutes**  
**April 10, 2019**

A Plan Commissioner reiterated that they have heard from several neighbors, and two letters in opposition of the request were also submitted, and to that end, concluded it is difficult to support this application.

The applicant replied that they meet the code requirements, and moving the lights to the west would be in wetland and unbuildable areas.

The Plan Commission, in concert, stated concerns for the request that mirrored the concerns voiced by the neighbors. The additional activity (hours of play), traffic, light, noise and reliance on trees to buffer the lights were all reasons the PC **unanimously recommended to deny** the application, 6-0, 3 absent.

**Exterior Appearance and Site Plan - Case A-09-2019 – 55<sup>th</sup> and County Line Rd. – Hinsdale Meadows – 4<sup>th</sup> Major Adjustment to Site Plan/Exterior Appearance Application to add a new: ranch plan, Hardie Lap siding style and 3 new color options.**

The applicant presented the proposed additional ranch plan and reason for it to fill in the (SF) gap between the current ranch plan and duplex options. The applicant also brought samples of the requested lap siding and 3 additional colors.

A Plan Commissioner asked how many units have been sold.

The applicant responded approximately 9.

A Plan Commissioner asked the applicant why the change requests.

The applicant responded to offer more options to the customers and to add more diversity to the neighborhood.

A Plan Commissioner commented that she likes the differences and additional choices because it doesn't project a condominium feel.

A Plan Commissioner asked about application statement that this would offer more price effective choices from this request.

The applicant explained the ranch plan would be priced more similarly to the current ranch plan, but offer a larger space. This would be a good alternative to moving up into a much larger 2-story home.

A Plan Commissioner asked what the difference is between "owner's suite" and "masters".

The applicant responded they mean the same thing.

With no further questions, **the PC unanimously recommended to approve** the application, 6-0, 3 absent.

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:11 p.m. after a unanimous vote.

Respectfully Submitted by Chan Yu, Village Planner