

Approved

**MINUTES  
VILLAGE OF HINSDALE  
PLAN COMMISSION  
January 8, 2020  
MEMORIAL HALL  
7:30 P.M.**

Plan Commission Chair Cashman called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m., Wednesday, January 8, 2020, in Memorial Hall, the Memorial Building, 19 East Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale, Illinois.

**PRESENT:** Steve Cashman, Debra Braselton, Michelle Fisher, Julie Crnovich, Jim Krillenberger and Anna Fiascone

**ABSENT:** Troy Unell, Mark Willobee and Gerald Jablonski,

**ALSO PRESENT:** Chan Yu, Village Planner, Robb McGinnis, Director of Community Development and applicants for cases: A-39-2019, A-41-2019 and A-46-2019

---

**Approval of Minutes – November 13, 2019, and December 11, 2019**

With no questions or comments, the Plan Commission (PC) unanimously approved the November 13, 2019, and December 11, 2019, minutes, as submitted, 6-0, (3 absent).

**Sign Permit Review - Case A-41-2019 – 34 E. 1<sup>st</sup> Street – Jeans & Cute Top Shop – 1 New Wall Sign**

The sign contractor for the sign introduced himself and presented the request for the new wall sign.

Commissioner Krillenberger asked if sign reflects the business type.

The applicant responded yes, and it is a retail clothing store.

In general, the PC expressed that the proposed sign looks good.

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

**Exterior Appearance and Site Plan Review - Case A-39-2019 – 5500 S. Grant St. – Hinsdale Central High School (Hinsdale Township High School District D86) / ARCON Associates – Exterior Appearance and Site Plan for various Improvements, including a new Natatorium. (concurrent with Zoning Board of Appeals V-05-19 application)**

Chairman Cashman recused himself for this request because he is on the special committee for District 86, and asked Commissioner Crnovich to lead the discussion.

Commissioner Crnovich introduced the application and explained that this request is concurrently being reviewed by the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) for 5 variations. It was also noted that this is phase 1 of a 3-year project.

**Plan Commission Minutes**  
**January 8, 2020**

The project architect, Nick Graal, stated that this is correct, it is also before the ZBA for zoning relief. The request before the PC is phase 1 of a 3-year project. Nick reviewed a PowerPoint presentation and reiterated the multiphase project that will be presented to the PC when it is ready. Three buildings, tennis courts and parking lot, field/turf replacement work were all covered. It was noted that the main feature of the request is for the new natatorium in the middle of the subject property. A few colored elevation slides of the natatorium was focused on, and stated the intent is to complement and match the existing buildings. The brick material, glazing, metal panel near the roof and curtain wall/frosted glazing (although illustrated as what appears to be a blank wall) is for solar control and privacy. In regards to the street view, it was shown to be very difficult to see the natatorium due to far setback distances and existing streetscape features.

Commissioner Crnovich asked Chan about the light pole height at 16 feet, and if that is within code due to the additional height and setback distance bonus.

Chan replied that he believes in the IB District, there is a height “bonus” for every 5 feet of distance from the lot line.

Commissioner Crnovich asked if the lights will have shields.

The applicant replied yes.

Commissioner Krillenberger asked about the aforementioned blank wall.

The applicant reiterated that is essentially a frosted window that is not accurately illustrated on the application exhibits.

Commissioner Crnovich commented that the proposed natatorium fits in very well with the existing high school; and asked if the natatorium is attached to the school.

The applicant stated it will be attached and an addition to the building, and not considered an accessory structure.

Commissioner Fiascone asked what the equipment enclosure backs up to.

The applicant replied that it would be next to the buildings and grounds addition.

Commissioner Fiascone asked if that would be next to the classrooms.

The applicant replied no.

Commissioner Fiascone asked that the brick be carefully and best matched with the existing school, since the illustrations can be much different than what is actually utilized.

The applicant stated that he has been at the school three times with his brick specialist to try to match it the best they can. However, he noted that it will be challenging since the building has been added onto at least 10 times since the 1940s.

Commissioner Crnovich asked if there will be any signage.

**Plan Commission Minutes  
January 8, 2020**

The applicant stated that is to be determined, however, there is some fundraising going on. If there is, they will be back before the Village for review.

Commissioner Krillenberger asked if this is a state-of-the-art upgrade.

The applicant replied yes, it is a severe upgrade and have been working with the athletics department and coaches to achieve a world class facility.

Commissioner Crnovich asked if they had any feedback from the neighbors.

The applicant replied yes, they've received feedback in regards to the parking lot screening, and in response, addressed concerns by adding arborvitae on the east side of the parking lot to soften the edge. It was noted that the chain link fence will be replaced with a PVC privacy fence with painted metal supports.

Commissioner Crnovich asked if there is anyone in the audience who would like to comment on the application.

A neighbor asked about the impact on the traffic during construction on 57<sup>th</sup> Street and Madison.

The applicant explained that they have not finalized their construction operations plan with the school district, however, acknowledged some construction traffic will occur.

Commissioner Crnovich asked if they have held any neighborhood meetings.

The applicant replied yes, they hold a public meeting once a month, and will have a construction portal on the website with frequent updates on the construction.

Commissioner Crnovich asked if they could inform the neighbors of the website.

The applicant replied yes.

Commissioner Krillenberger believes the 3 phases of development will help, and would hear about any issues by the neighbors after phase 1.

With no further questions or comments, the PC **unanimously recommended approval** for the exterior appearance/site plan application, as submitted, with the condition it is contingent on ZBA approval, 5-0, (1 abstained and 3 absent).

**Major Adjustment to Exterior Appearance and Site Plan Review - Case A-46-2019 (contingent on Village Board referral on Jan. 7, 2020) – 24 W. Hinsdale Ave. – Michael Abraham Architects – Major Adjustment to approved Exterior Appearance for new storefront façade (Initial Application Case A-18-2019).**

The architects representing the applicant introduced the request and reviewed the original building façade (as the Hartley's Cycle Shoppe). It was explained that after removing the canopy and façade of the existing, they faced the challenges of inconsistent materials, conditions and hundred year old brick that was hard to match,

**Plan Commission Minutes**  
**January 8, 2020**

and stated it was not possible to make it cohesive. To this end, he explained Mr. Burdi decided to stain the building for a cohesive appearance.

Chairman Cashman asked if that decision was made without letting the Village know.

The applicant replied yes.

Commissioner Crnovich asked if the applicant knew the ordinance prohibited this.

The applicant explained that he did not know that painting required a permit.

Chairman Cashman reviewed that this was specifically discussed by the building owner, in regards to restoring the building to its original appearance. He also referenced that this building was categorized as a contributing structure when the research/survey leading up to the designation of the National Historic Downtown District was completed. To this end, he believes the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) needs to also review this.

In general, the PC would like to know the legal ramifications on this request, from the Village Attorney.

Chan stated that the color of this building has been locked in through the adopted ordinance.

Robb echoed this, and referenced the colored exhibit. However, he also acknowledged that exterior appearance review is triggered when a permit is required and it changes the appearance of the structure.

Chan added that he believes as long as the same building owner who signed the ordinance owns the building, the exhibit must be followed.

Chairman Cashman asked Robb if the Village Attorney could attend the next PC meeting.

Robb responded that he can certainly look into that.

Commissioner Fisher asked if there is a stain that would bring the building back to its original color.

The applicant replied that there are companies that specialize in doing that, with the appearance of old brick.

Chairman Cashman commented on the metal work and the original brick. Now, the stained brick blends in with the metal work too much he expressed.

Frank Gonzalez presented a PowerPoint presentation after Chairman Cashman asked if there were any public comments. To summarize: brick color will always contain inconsistency due to organic material, he did not notice any step cracking on the building, and that he contacted various contractors who specialist in paint removal.

John Bohnen spoke, and stated that there appears to be repairs to the building in order to get it opened, and disregarded good practice in terms of preserving the building. This led him to believe it was the original intent to paint the building and is now concerned that the building may not be able to be maintained down the road due to bad practice.

**Plan Commission Minutes**  
**January 8, 2020**

Commissioner Krillenberger asked Frank if he could comment on the idea of painting on top of the brick.

Frank responded that he would not recommend that yet because manufacturers do not intend the bricks to be painted. He reiterated that there are specialists that can remove paint.

Commissioner Fiascone mentioned however, even if they could remove the stain, 2/3's of the building would still not match the existing brick.

Frank responded they should remove it and install matching brick and that a wide range of brick is available. He next showed photos of the stained brick up close, revealing what he states are existing imperfections and damages the stain is covering up. He also reviewed various companies that he reached out to regarding stain removal.

Jim Prisby stated that if there's a method to remove the stain, it appears there's already direction for what should be done, and that is to follow the approved ordinance.

With no further questions or comments, the PC **unanimously recommended to continue** the application until the next meeting, 6-0, (3 absent).

**Public Hearing - Case A-23-2019 – Village of Hinsdale – Request to close the public hearing to secure a lighting engineer for the Proposed Text Amendment to the Hinsdale Zoning Code, Sections 9-101(D)(9), 9-104(H)(2)(h) and 12-206, relating to the definitions of the lighting regulations (Section 11-604). (continued from 10.09.19, 11.13.19, and 12.11.19 PC Meetings)**

The PC recommended to hire a lighting engineer to guide and help them with questions moving forward. Staff reported that this would take time, to a date uncertain, and requested to close the public hearing. (Once a lighting engineer is hired, the public hearing would need to be formally rescheduled). To this end, the PC **unanimously closed the public hearing for Case A-23-2019**, 6-0, (3 absent).

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:14 p.m. after a unanimous vote.

Respectfully Submitted by Chan Yu, Village Planner