

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

**VILLAGE OF HINSDALE  
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
December 21, 2016**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Bob Neiman called the regularly scheduled meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals to order Wednesday, December 21, 2016 at 6:35 p.m. in Memorial Hall of the Memorial Building, 19 E. Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale, Illinois. Chairman Neiman welcomed new member Mr. Joseph Alesia to the Board.

**2. ROLL CALL**

**Present:** Members Gary Moberly, Keith Giltner, Joseph Alesia and Chairman Bob Neiman

**Absent:** Members Marc Connelly, Kathryn Engel and John Podliska

**Also Present:** Director of Community Development/Building Commissioner Robb McGinnis and Village Clerk Christine Bruton

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**a) Regular meeting of October 19, 2016**

There were not enough eligible voting members present to approve, Chairman Neiman deferred this item to the next meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

**4. APPROVAL OF FINAL DECISION**

**a) V-05-16, 631 S. Garfield Street**

There were not enough eligible voting members present to approve, Chairman Neiman deferred this item to the next meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

**5. RECEIPT OF APPEARANCES – None**

**6. RECEIPT OF REQUESTS, MOTIONS, PLEADINGS, OR REQUESTS TO MAKE PUBLIC COMMENT OF A GENERAL NATURE – None**

**7. PRE-HEARING AND AGENDA SETTING**

**a) V-06-16, 727 S. Stough Street**

Paul and Julie Constantino, homeowners, addressed the Board. Mr. Constantino explained they purchased the home in 2007, when they had two children, but now they have three. He explained that they want to add an additional bedroom to the attic story of the home. However, because of the slope of the lot and the zoning rules, a variance for maximum elevation is required. Mr. Constantino said that even with addition of this room, his

1 house is still lower than the one next door, because of the slope.

2 Mr. Dan Bryan, architect for the project, explained that after the addition,  
3 the home is still 3.5' below the maximum height allowed, however, because  
4 of the slope of the property the addition does not meet the maximum  
5 elevation requirements. He said that the additional height added to the  
6 third floor would not count toward floor area ratio (FAR), and the only  
7 visible change to the building would be a 9' x 12' cupola.

8 Mr. Constantino added the cost of moving is prohibitive, and Mrs.  
9 Constantino described the challenges of their current home.

10 Chairman Neiman commented the applicants have done a good job  
11 addressing the 7 criteria for approval, but by the public hearing, the Board  
12 would like to know the neighbors have been contacted and whether there is  
13 any opposition.

14 Member Moberly clarified this is not a height issue, but an elevation issue.  
15 The public hearing was set for the next scheduled meeting of the Zoning  
16 Board.

17  
18 **b) V-07-16, 100 S. Garfield (Hinsdale Middle School)**

19 Chairman Neiman introduced the item and said he understands the  
20 application has been amended, and hopes the applicant will explain the  
21 changes. He also clarified that although the renderings provided to the  
22 Board include a parking deck, the parking deck is not before the Board at  
23 this time. When the Village and school district come to terms on that  
24 structure, a separate request might be submitted.

25 Representing District 181, and present this evening, were Superintendent  
26 Dr. Don White, Attorney John Izzo, Architect Brian Kronewitter, and Civil  
27 Engineer Paul Wiese.

28 Dr. White addressed the Board and explained that the revisions were made  
29 in response to input from neighbors at a Community meeting. The changes  
30 have been approved by the school board. He confirmed Chairman  
31 Neiman's remarks regarding the parking deck.

32 Mr. Kronewitter walked the Board through the site plan and outlined the  
33 changes, which are a deeper front yard setback and an increase in height  
34 on the southeast wing to reduce the need for Third Street setback. The bus  
35 drop-off area will not be on Garfield; the revised design maintains the  
36 existing drop-off site on Third Street, and thereby eliminates the need for a  
37 loading variance in the front yard. As a result of the redesigned third story,  
38 the building is shifted two feet to the south, and eliminates the need for a  
39 setback variance at the alley on Second Street.

40 Still required is two feet of rear yard setback relief on Washington Street,  
41 FAR relief, and a parking variance for the front yard setback on Garfield  
42 Street.

43 Chairman Neiman reminded the applicant that each of the seven criteria  
44 necessary for approval will have to be met for each of the three variances  
45 requested. He commented that he is glad to hear that the school is being  
46 responsive to the concerns of their neighbors.

1 Member Alesia asked what the difference in FAR will be. Mr. Kronewitter  
2 said 107,000 is allowed, and added that the existing building, including the  
3 mobile units, is 112,000. He did not have the exact number, but stated it  
4 will be appropriate for the 136,500 square foot building.

5 Ms. Sharon Starkston, a Third Street resident, addressed the Board and  
6 stated that she owns three properties in the affected area. She thanked the  
7 school board for all the neighbor meetings, but complained there was no  
8 neighbor input during the design phase. She believes the bus drop off on  
9 Third Street is a problem because it blocks driveways and there are buses  
10 idling in the area. She said it is very busy during drop off times. She asked  
11 the ZBA to consider the residential buffer zone very carefully, and believes  
12 all activity should be oriented to the commercial area.

13 Member Moberly asked about water issues, and Mr. Wiese said all Village  
14 ordinances would be met. Mr. Kronewitter reported the traffic study  
15 indicated that the student drop-off area is most efficient where it currently  
16 exists on Third Street.

17 The public hearing was set for the next scheduled meeting of the Zoning  
18 Board.

19  
20 **8. PUBLIC HEARINGS – None**

21  
22 **9. NEW BUSINESS**

23  
24 **10. OTHER BUSINESS**

25  
26 **11. ADJOURNMENT**

27 With no further business before the Zoning Board of Appeals, Member Moberly  
28 made a motion to **adjourn the meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals of**  
29 **December 21, 2016.** Member Giltner seconded the motion.

30  
31 **AYES:** Members Moberly, Giltner, Alesia and Chairman Neiman

32 **NAYS:** None

33 **ABSTAIN:** None

34 **ABSENT:** Members Connelly, Engel and Podliska

35  
36 Motion carried.

37  
38 Chairman Neiman declared the meeting adjourned at 7:09 p.m.

39  
40  
41 \_\_\_\_\_  
42 Christine M. Bruton  
43 Village Clerk

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_