

Approved

**MINUTES
VILLAGE OF HINSDALE
PLAN COMMISSION
MEMORIAL HALL
19 E. CHICAGO AVENUE, HINSDALE, IL
August 11, 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, August 11, 2021 at 7:33 PM.

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

PRESENT: Chairman Steve Cashman, Commissioner Julie Crnovich, Commissioner Jim Krillenberger, Commissioner Gerald Jablonski, Commissioner Cynthia Curry

ABSENT: Commissioner Anna Fiascone, Commissioner Troy Unell, Commissioner Mark Willobee, Commissioner Patrick Hurley

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 – July 14, 2021

A motion was made by Commissioner Krillenberger, seconded by Commissioner Crnovich, to approve the July 14, 2021 draft minutes as submitted. The motion carried by the roll call vote as follows:

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

Public Hearings

Case A-12-2021 – 149 E. Ogden Avenue – Design Review Permit, Exterior Appearance and Site Plan Review, and Sign Permit Review to allow for exterior changes to the existing convenience store building and gas station canopy, and to allow for the installation of new signage for The Pride of Hinsdale located in the B-3 General Business District

Please refer to **Attachment 1** for the transcript for Public Hearing Case A-12-2021.

Dan Soltis, the applicant representing The Pride of Hinsdale, provided an overview of the proposed changes, which include painting the roof, removing the awnings and replacing them with brown stained trellises/pergolas, removing the Pride sign in the window and adding a new wall sign, modifications to the corner sign, and re-imaging the canopy sign to BP's newest version. Mr. Soltis explained the new canopy sign was an improved housing design but would be the same green LED lighting as the existing. Mr. Soltis offered to provide photos of the proposed canopy sign installed at a different location.

Commissioner Crnovich asked about any changes to the landscaping around the ground sign. Mr. Soltis replied that the application does not contain any landscape changes and stated he would verify the landscape shown on the landscape plan is present on the site. It was suggested to add more landscape as needed. Commissioner Crnovich supported the simplified design of the ground sign.

Commissioner Jablonski had no questions for the applicant.

Commissioner Krillenberger asked if the number of colors on the sign was problematic. Commissioner Crnovich replied she felt the number of colors in the sign was acceptable in this case because both sign faces can be looked at separately, and contain under three (3) colors. Discussion followed and the Commission agreed the proposed colors met the village's code requirements.

Commissioner Curry asked if the black roof paint was going to be matte. Mr. Soltis believed it to be matte black but will confirm. In response to Commissioner Curry's question, if the pergola was going to be stained, Mr. Soltis replied the cedar would be stained in a semi-transparent brown color and showed an image to the Commission.

Chairman Cashman added that he believed the proposal would be an improvement and had no further questions.

A motion was made by Commissioner Crnovich, seconded by Commissioner Krillenberger, to approve Case A-12-2021 – 149 E. Ogden Avenue – Design Review Permit, Exterior Appearance and Site Plan Review, and Sign Permit Review to allow for exterior changes to the existing convenience store building and gas station canopy, and to allow for the installation of new signage for The Pride of Hinsdale located in the B-3 General Business District as submitted. The motion carried by a roll call vote of 5-0 as follows:

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

A motion was made by Commissioner Krillenberger and seconded by Commissioner Curry to close the public meeting. The motion carried by a roll call vote of 5-0 as follows:

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

Public Hearings

Case A-27-2021 – 531 N. Oak Street – Tentative & Final Plat of Subdivision to allow for the subdivision of one (1) lot into two (2) code compliant lots in the R-4 Single Family Residential District

The applicant, Patricia Halikias representing 531 North Oak LLC, provided an overview of the project. At this time, the applicant is only proposing to subdivide the existing lot. There are currently no plans to redevelop either lot. The existing single-family detached home will remain on Lot 1. Lot 2 will

remain vacant and plans for new construction may be proposed in the future following the sale of the lot to a new owner. The two (2) code-compliant lots will be nearly equal in size. Lot 1 will measure 13,662.6 square feet and Lot 2 will measure 13,668.3 square feet. Detailed plans or engineering plans have not been prepared to meet the tentative and final plat and the Ms. Halikias requested this requirement be waived since there are no plans to redevelop either lot.

There were no questions from the Commissioners. Chairman Cashman commented there were very few of these types of lots left in town.

A motion was made by Commissioner Krillenberger, seconded by Commissioner Jablonski, to approve Case A-27-2021 – 531 N. Oak Street – Tentative & Final Plat of Subdivision to allow for the subdivision of one (1) lot into two (2) code compliant lots in the R-4 Single Family Residential District as submitted. The motion carried by a roll call vote of 5-0 as follows:

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

Sign Permit Review

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

Sharon Olsen, applicant representing Union Church, shared with the Commission that a neighbor meeting was held one week after the July 14th Plan Commission Meeting. Thirteen (13) neighbors were invited to the meeting and eight (8) property owners attended. Ms. Olsen stated much feedback was shared and learned at the meeting resulting in a design that meets Village requirements and better meets the needs of the neighbors.

Ms. Olsen described the revisions made to the sign since the July 14th Plan Commission meeting. The sign will have four (4) inch letters, be constructed of one (1) stone material for the base and the columns, with a solid limestone top cap and cornice. Ms. Olsen stated the Church logo will have a bronze finish over aluminum and a matte finish bulletin board.

Ms. Olsen stated the Church text and logo will be back-lit and the bulletin board was revised to be top-lit with graze lighting only with a 2700 Kelvin high output and a total of 915.42 lumens. Ms. Olsen noted the revised design has lower lumen levels that are stretched at the top and contains an additional 3.6 square feet of lit area.

Matt Klein, the applicant representing Union Church, provided further details of the revised sign design. A picture of the proposed sign was displayed and Mr. Klein stated the base and the column will be constructed of high quality true limestone, horizontally oriented, installed in the same location, and be compatible with the building and properties in the surrounding area.

Commissioner Crnovich attended the neighbor meeting to discuss concerns with proposed sign and concerns with the temporary signage. Commissioner Crnovich asked for clarification on allowable temporary signage.

Ms. Salmon provided a brief explanation on the calculations used for temporary signage. Mr. Klein stated the Church is working toward developing a policy to handle future temporary signage via internal Church discussions.

Commissioner Crnovich stated she still had concerns that the sign does not meet standards and requirements related to visual compatibility and value enjoyment of neighboring properties. The Commissioner stated the sign was too big and too commercial for a historic, residential neighborhood and can be seen by many neighboring properties and distracts from the design of the Church.

Mr. Klein stated the horizontal lines and materials are compatible with the church. The curves, arches, and bell tower were not able to be addressed in the proposed sign design due to sign height limitations.

Commissioner Jablonski stated the temporary signage remains a concern, specifically the very large, plywood sign installed by the Bible School Students. Commissioner Jablonski stated the importance of the Church having a policy in place to address temporary signage.

Commissioner Krillenberger stated that although he shared concerns about the temporary signage, he liked the cornice, orientation, and compatibility of the proposed ground sign.

Commissioner Curry commented she too was surprised to see the large temporary sign. She asked when the circular drive and the black light poles were added to the parking lot. Mr. Klein stated the drive was installed approximately in 2000 and the light fixtures were installed a few years ago.

Commissioner Curry asked about available green space. Mr. Klein pointed out that the Church has a Memorial Garden and an interior courtyard. Commissioner Curry stated she would like to see more garden space to gather and the location of the proposed sign detracted from the green space. Mr. Klein responded the location of the proposed and existing sign was the best location and distributed paper copies of sign examples of other churches to demonstrate common appropriate locations and designs.

Ms. Olsen stated the design was purposeful and the logo was more modern to reflect the changes in their Church. Ms. Olsen went on to state that it is the hope of the Church that temporary signage will not be necessary if the message space on the proposed sign is approved.

Commissioner Crnovich agreed with the idea of a garden gathering space suggested by Commissioner Curry and suggested the installation of the bench could be a nice fit.

Chairman Cashman asked about the masonry veneer on the sign and expressed concern about it impacting the quality of the sign. Mr. Klein provided information on the depth of the veneer. Chairman Cashman asked if the sign was sitting on a full foundation base. Mr. Klein replied the proposed sign would sit on two (2) pylon columns that would be unseen. Chairman Cashman added that all the examples of other Church signs provided to the Commission by the applicant were constructed with sign boxes supported on a true masonry structure, something he felt was an important part of the structure. Chairman Cashman added he remained concerned with the quality of the proposed sign.

Chairman Cashman asked how thick the coping on the base would be. Mr. Klein stated it appears to be about an inch and half of limestone. Chairman Cashman replied the proportions were not appropriate, a thicker band would look better aesthetically.

Chairman Cashman asked if the finish on the coping and cornice was a cut limestone. Mr. Klein replied it was rough cut. Further inaudible details about the finish was shared with the Commission.

Chairman Cashman expressed concern with the appearance of the cornice on top of the sign box. Chairman Cashman restated his concerns that the materials proposed negatively impacted the quality of the sign and was not appropriate for a building with a historically significant rating. He stated the Church is in the Robbins Park Historic District and it is a very important building to the Village. Chairman Cashman stated revision of some design details of the sign would result in a higher quality product similar to the example signs of other Churches the applicant shared with the Commission.

Chairman Cashman asked for clarification on graze lighting and recess of the bulletin board. Inaudible details were provided by the applicant to address these concerns.

Chairman Cashman asked for public comments.

The resident at 127 E. Third, Nancy Cox, was present to address the Commission. Ms. Cox stated she looked at many different sign options, and had evaluated the proposed line breaks, font, lay out, text, and the bulletin board. Ms. Cox asked Ms. Olsen to verify all the bulletin board letters will be four (4) inch. Ms. Cox stated she preferred the horizontal design, the modern font, and large text. Ms. Cox went on to state she was happy with the neighbor meeting and the ability to have a contact person from the Church to reach out to.

The resident at 306 S. Garfield Street, Jim Oles, was present to address the Commission. Mr. Oles stated the neighbor meeting was productive and the material upgrade to the sign was an improvement. Mr. Oles would like to see the sign move to the north to a safer location and away from the historic neighborhood. Mr. Oles also stated he was glad to see the banner signs removed. Chairman Cashman asked for any further public comment, none were noted. Chairman Cashman asked the Commissioners for any further comment.

Commissioner Crnovich asked if the sign lights could be shut off at 8:00 pm for the benefit of the neighbors.

Commissioner Jablonski stated his concerns remained with the overall quality of the sign.

Commissioner Krillenberger stated he would like to see the veneer be thicker and asked what could be done to move towards a vote rather than send the applicant back to re-design the sign and bring it back to a future meeting.

Chairman Cashman stated the masonry structure of the sign remains problematic because it does not match the architectural design of a significant historical building and the character of the historic district. Chairman Cashman stated he would be more comfortable to continue the application to allow for further changes to be made to the sign rather than voting.

Commissioner Curry asked if an architect had looked at the design of the sign. Ms. Olsen stated her husband and her, who are both architects, worked on the sign together. Ms. Olsen asked for clarification from Chairman Cashman about desired changes he would like to see. Discussion followed about construction details. Ms. Olsen requested to continue the application to address the remaining concerns.

A motion was made by Commissioner Curry, seconded by Commissioner Krillenberger to continue Case A-10-2021 – 137 S. Garfield Street – Union Church of Hinsdale – Installation of One (1) Ground

Sign with a Bulletin Board to the September 8th Plan Commission meeting. The motion carried by a roll call vote of 5-0 as follows:

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

Adjournment

A motion was made by Commissioner Jablonski, seconded by Commissioner Krillenberger, to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 9:21 PM after a unanimous voice vote of 5-0.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jennifer Spires, Community Development Office