

Approved

**MINUTES
VILLAGE OF HINSDALE
PLAN COMMISSION
MEMORIAL HALL
19 E. CHICAGO AVENUE, HINSDALE, IL
July 14, 2021
7:30 P.M.**

Call to Order & Roll Call

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Plan Commission was called to order by Chairman Cashman on Wednesday, July 14, 2021 at 7:32 PM.

Roll call was taken and a quorum was present at the meeting.

PRESENT: Steve Cashman, Julie Crnovich, Anna Fiascone, Patrick Hurley, Jim Krillenberger, Gerald Jablonski, Cynthia Curry

ABSENT: Jim Krillenberger, Troy Unell, Mark Willobee

ALSO PRESENT: Bethany Salmon, Village Planner

Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items

Chairman Cashman asked for any public comments. There was no public comment pertaining to non-agenda items.

Approval of the Minutes – May 12, 2021

A motion was made by Commissioner Crnovich, seconded by Commissioner Fiascone, to approve the April 12, 2021 draft minutes as submitted. The motion carried by the roll call vote as follows:

Ayes: Commissioner Crnovich, Fiascone, Hurley, and Chairman Cashman

Nays: None

Abstain: Commissioner Curry, Jablonski

Absent: Commissioner Krillenberger, Unell, Willobee

Signage

a) Case A-10-2021 – 137 S. Garfield Street – Union Church of Hinsdale – Installation of One (1) Ground Sign with a Bulletin Board

Matthew Klein, the applicant representing Union Church, presented the request for the proposed bulletin board sign to be located at the southwest corner of the property. The proposed sign will provide improved communication and announcements to residents, will be lighted similar to the current sign, and will be located in the same location as the current sign. Mr. Klein explained the proposed sign was designed to recognize the concerns of neighboring residents. It will be constructed of high quality materials that compliment the church building and features a similar size, shape, and color scheme.

Mr. Klein provided plans of the proposed and existing sign to the Plan Commission. Details such as the block base, internal lighting, masonry cap, and orientation of the bulletin board were discussed. Mr. Klein stated the proposed sign will be of similar design common to other Hinsdale church locations as well as those found around the nation.

Sharon Olsen, the head of Union Church Building and Grounds, provided further detail related to the lighting of the proposed sign. Ms. Olsen explained the proposed sign would be lower in height than the existing sign, thereby reducing the impact on neighbors. The light fixture is 12 watts compared to the existing 40 watts, will be close to the surface of the sign, and will emit 900 lumens, and produces a yellow light color at 2700K. Ms. Olsen shared a model of the proposed light fixture with the Plan Commission. Cut sheets were also offered to the Plan Commission to help provide additional details. Mr. Klein noted that the proposed sign would be less bright than the existing 60 year old sign and only visible to one home.

Some questions were asked from the Plan Commission for clarification on the proposed sign size and brightness of the light. Inconsistencies were noted in the documents submitted to the Plan Commission as part of the packet. In particular, it was determined that the light specification sheet did not correspond with the information and light fixture presented at the meeting.

Commissioner Curry asked why a modern block font was used on the proposed sign instead of the Old English font used on the current sign. Laurie McMahon, representing Union Church, stated that the modern block font was larger, more visible, and in line with the font the church uses currently on publications. Mr. Klein provided copies of examples of similar signs in Hinsdale to the Commission.

Commissioner Crnovich expressed concerns over the number of temporary signs on the property as well as existing lighting. It was noted that the church property is a highly visible location and perhaps the church should consider proposing a design that eliminates the need for the large amount of temporary signage to reduce visual clutter. The Commission felt that the size of the proposed sign would make it one of the largest in the area and therefore may not be compatible with the historic character of the neighborhood and the adjacent single family homes. It was requested that the church submit a proposal to better suit the area.

Mr. Klein stated the sign size was not large in relation to the building size, was shorter and slightly wider than the existing sign, and would be barely visible from nearby front porches or bedrooms. Mr. Klein further commented that a great deal of effort was put into the proposed sign design to meet church needs, Village requirements, and the neighborhood characteristics.

Further discussion took place about the 4 inch tall lettering, the opaque background, and the color of the bulletin board.

Chairman Cashman asked about the coping material at the top of the sign. Mr. Klein confirmed that it would be constructed of metal with a stone finish. Similar to the Historic Preservation Commission, Plan Commissioners suggested that an actual stone material should be used and would be an improvement over the metal coping. It was requested that a rendering of the proposed sign illuminated at night should be included as part of a revised resubmittal by the church.

In response to questions on if any surrounding landscaping was proposed, Mr. Klein explained the proposed sign would be grade level and existing plantings would remain.

Chairman Cashman opened the discussion up to public comments.

Jim Oles, a resident of 305 and 306 S. Garfield, spoke in opposition of the proposed sign. Mr. Oles stated that more than one house can see the sign and the proposed sign does not fit into the historic neighborhood. It was suggested the church keep the existing sign and the proposed sign might be better suited in a different location on the property closer to the business district. Mr. Oles asked if a photometric study was completed and it was noted that neighbor input was not part of the process. Mr.

Oles read into the record an email sent from Sharon Starkston to the Plan Commission prior to the meeting that provides further information on concerns and opposition to the sign.

Roseann Coyner, a resident at 310 S. Park, stated that despite being very neighborly to the church in regards to traffic, noise, crowds and activities, the neighbors were left out of the process. Ms. Coyner expressed concerns over the proposed sign and stated that she wished the church had reached out to nearby residents ahead of time. She also noted the lighted sign will be visible from her property and would impact them. Ms. Coyner felt the permit application should be very specific on the exact in lumens and light levels, noting that the Village should be aware of and responsive to the increasing problem of light pollution. The brightness of the existing lights in the parking lot is also a concern. Finally, clarification that the sign illumination would be turned off by 10 p.m. was provided.

Nancy Cox, a resident at 127 E. Third, addressed the Commission requesting, as she did at the Historic Preservation Commission meeting, that the sign be softened with landscaping and plantings around the base of the sign. Ms. Cox stated the lighting will be impactful to the neighbors and requested a neighbor meeting to address concerns.

Commissioner Crnovich asked about use of vinyl material on the logo portion of the sign and noted metal would be more appropriate. Mr. Klein stated vinyl letters have proven to be durable and cost effective.

Chairman Cashman suggested a dimmable light that can be adjusted be used on the bulletin board.

The Plan Commission continued the sign permit application to the following meeting on August 11, 2021. The applicant agreed to consider revisions and address the comments provided at the meeting. The comments discussed include: consider holding a neighborhood meeting to get feedback from the neighbors, provide a rendering of the sign illumination at night, provide updated cut sheets for the LED lighting that accurately shows the details for the proposed light fixture and reflect a maximum of 900 lumens and 2700K, provide details on permanent and temporary signage on elsewhere on the property, provide landscaping details on the sides of the sign, and use masonry instead of metal on the top caps of the sign.

A motion was made by Commissioner Jablonski and seconded by Commissioner Fiascone, to continue the sign permit for Case A-10-2021 for the installation of one (1) ground sign with a bulletin board for the Union Church of Hinsdale located at 137 S. Garfield Street to the August 11, 2021 Plan Commission meeting. The motion carried by a roll call vote of 6-0 as follows:

Ayes: Commissioner Hurley, Jablonski, Crnovich, Fiascone, Curry, and Chairman Cashman.
Nays: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Commissioner Krillenberger, Unell, Willabee

b) Case A-13-2021 – 28 E. Hinsdale Avenue – Marabella Home – Installation of One (1) Wall Sign

Anthony Alfano, the sign company representative, provided an overview of the proposed sign and stated it would be acrylic letters on a backer panel. Commissioner Curry asked why a backer was used and if the option of removing the backer was considered to be consistent with other signs on the block. Mr. Alfano said that with the thin font style, a backer provides a more stable mount and less drilling into the building. The color of the backer matches the logo used by the business.

Discussion of the location of the sign centered over the window or the door followed. The majority of the commissioners stated they preferred the sign centered over the window.

A motion was made by Commissioner Hurley and seconded by Commissioner Jablonski to approve Case A-13-2021 for the installation of one (1) wall sign with option 1 (where the sign is center over storefront window only) for Marabella Home located at 28 E. Hinsdale Avenue. The motion carried by a roll call vote of 6-0 as follows:

Ayes: Commissioner Hurley, Jablonski, Crnovich, Fiascone, Curry, and Chairman Cashman
Nays: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Commissioner Krillenberger, Unell, Willobee

c) Case A-14-2021 – 110 S. Washington Street – County Line Home Design Center – Installation of One (1) wall sign

Patrick Fronz, representing the sign contractor company, stated that two sets of letters would be ordered to add depth to the sign and bring items to the same plane. It was stated the applicant did not have a preference as to color being either gold or black. Overall, the Plan Commission was supportive of the design.

A motion was made by Commissioner Crnovich and seconded by Commissioner Curry to approve Case A-14-2021 for the installation of one (1) wall sign for the County Line Home Design Center located at 110 S. Washington Street, as submitted. The motion carried by a roll call vote of 6-0 as follows:

Ayes: Commissioner Hurley, Jablonski, Crnovich, Fiascone, Curry, and Chairman Cashman
Nays: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Commissioner Krillenberger, Unell, Willobee

Adjournment

A motion was made by Commissioner Jablonski, seconded by Commissioner Crnovich, to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 9:19 PM after a unanimous voice vote of 6-0.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jennifer Spires, Community Development Office

