



## MEETING AGENDA

**MEETING OF THE  
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
WEDNESDAY, March 20, 2019  
6:30 P.M.  
MEMORIAL HALL – MEMORIAL BUILDING  
(Tentative & Subject to Change)**

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. ROLL CALL**
- 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
  - a) Regular meeting of January 23, 2018
- 4. APPROVAL OF FINAL DECISIONS**
  - a) V-09-18, 306 North Garfield
  - b) V-11-18, 118 North Monroe
- 5. RECEIPT OF APPEARANCES**
- 6. RECEIPT OF REQUESTS, MOTIONS, PLEADINGS, OR REQUESTS TO MAKE PUBLIC COMMENT OF A GENERAL NATURE**
- 7. PRE-HEARING AND AGENDA SETTING – None**
- 8. PUBLIC HEARING – None**
- 9. NEW BUSINESS**
- 10. OLD BUSINESS**
- 11. ADJOURNMENT**

The Village of Hinsdale is subject to the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Individuals with disabilities who plan to attend this meeting and who require certain accommodations in order to allow them to observe and/or participate in this meeting, or who have questions regarding the accessibility of the meeting or the facilities, are requested to contact Darrell Langlois, ADA Coordinator at 630-789-7014 or by TDD at **630-789-7022** promptly to allow the Village of Hinsdale to make reasonable accommodations for those persons.

[www.villageofhinsdale.org](http://www.villageofhinsdale.org)

**VILLAGE OF HINSDALE  
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
January 23, 2019**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Bob Neiman called the regularly scheduled meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals to order on Wednesday, January 23, 2019 at 6:31 p.m. in Memorial Hall of the Memorial Building, 19 E. Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale, Illinois.

**2. ROLL CALL**

**Present:** Members Gary Moberly, Joseph Alesia, Keith Giltner, Tom Murphy, Kathryn Engel, John Podliska and Chairman Bob Neiman

**Absent:** None

**Also Present:** Director of Community Development/Building Commissioner Robb McGinnis, Village Clerk Christine Bruton and Court Reporter Kathy Bono

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**a) Regular meeting of December 19, 2018**

Following corrections to the draft minutes, member Giltner moved to **approve the minutes of the regular meeting of December 19, 2018, as amended.** Member Murphy seconded the motion.

**AYES:** Members Moberly, Alesia, Giltner, Murphy, Engel, Podliska and Chairman Neiman

**NAYS:** None

**ABSTAIN:** None

**ABSENT:** None

Motion carried.

**4. APPROVAL OF FINAL DECISIONS – None**

**5. RECEIPT OF APPEARANCES**

Court Reporter Kathy Bono administered the oath to all those intending to speak during these proceedings.

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

**7. PRE-HEARING AND AGENDA SETTING – None**

**8. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**a) V-09-18, 306 North Garfield**

Chairman Neiman opened the public hearing and recused himself because of his home's proximity to the subject property. Vice-Chair Giltner assumed

1 responsibilities for conducting the hearing.

2 Mr. Bob O'Donnell, attorney representing home owners Ms. Dana Gapinski  
3 and Mr. John Wheeler, addressed the Board. He introduced Mr. Dennis  
4 Parsons, architect for the project. Mr. O'Donnell stated his clients are  
5 seeking a variation of the required corner setback, on Hickory Street. They  
6 would like relief to reduce the setback from the required 44.7' feet to 30.10'  
7 feet. Currently, the home has a detached garage located on the northwest  
8 corner of the subject property. The home fronts on Garfield; they are  
9 proposing a porte cochere and circular driveway on the Hickory Street  
10 elevation of the property. He referenced the plat of survey to illustrate the  
11 property details. He referenced the 43' foot building line noted on the plat, for  
12 which an agreement with the property owner to the west for a release of this  
13 property line has been recorded with the County Clerk. The porte cochere will  
14 cover the proposed circular driveway, and will allow covered access from  
15 vehicles to the residence. He believes it is a functional and attractive feature.  
16 This property is located in the R4 district; the average setback is 35' feet, but  
17 about 10' feet larger because of the other homes on Hickory. The Garfield  
18 setback is about 50' feet calculated including other properties on Garfield.  
19 No zoning relief is required for the circular drive. He noted that with the porte  
20 cochere the lot coverage is still only 81%. The impervious area, including the  
21 driveway and porte cochere is 83%. He added this is not an enclosed area  
22 and therefore not part of FAR calculation.

23 Input from neighbors includes a statement of approval signed by 10 of the  
24 properties in the vicinity.

25 Mr. O'Donnell addressed the standards for approval of variation:

26 The hardship results from the fact the home was constructed in 1876, and  
27 was formerly a larger property sited in a fashion where the setback was well  
28 off the streets. The detached garage is less than one foot off rear property  
29 line; significant zoning relief would be required to build an attached garage.  
30 The three properties on Hickory included in the calculations were all  
31 constructed after 2000. The porte cochere brings the property into  
32 consistence with modern living. Member Podliska asked about a portico, or a  
33 canopy between the garage and house. Mr. O'Donnell explained that would  
34 be the same type of structure as the proposed porte cochere, and would, in  
35 fact be a larger structure imposed on that setback. Mr. Parsons added that  
36 the door into the house is on the west side, and 7" feet above the ground. If  
37 you were to attach the garage, another variation would be required, and  
38 would not address the need of guests to get into the house. Mr. O'Donnell  
39 stated the alternative to what is proposed would require additional  
40 construction and would be less functional, less attractive, and require more  
41 zoning relief.

42 The unique physical condition results from how the house is sited on the lot,  
43 resulting in significant setbacks on both streets, and limiting the building  
44 envelope. This situation was not created by the owner. In terms of denial of  
45 a substantial right, they are currently only using 73% of allowable building  
46 coverage and increasing it to 81%; it would be a denial of their property rights  
47 to use as needed and desired. The proposed porte cochere does not

1 interfere with any codes and ordinances, and is well within that which is  
2 permitted. There is nothing proposed to detrimentally impact other neighbors  
3 or the public at large. There is no other remedy; any alternatives would still  
4 require zoning relief.

5 Mr. Parsons added that from time to time he rehabs old houses, and this one  
6 was brought back from the brink. The whole house was in various states of  
7 disrepair. He explained that lifestyles when this home was built are different  
8 than today; not a lot of thought was given to a large yard, or rear yards or  
9 garages. In this case, 10,000' square feet of front yard is out of play. A porte  
10 cochere is an aesthetically and contextually appropriate functional entrance to  
11 the home. The owners don't want an attached garage. He asked the ZBA  
12 members to help people preserve these older homes by granting the  
13 requested encroachment. He does not believe it will start a trend.

14  
15 **Member Engel moved to close the public hearing for V-09-18, 306 North**  
16 **Garfield.** Member Moberly seconded the motion.

17  
18 **AYES:** Members Moberly, Alesia, Giltner, Murphy, Engel, Podliska and  
19 Chairman Neiman

20 **NAYS:** None

21 **ABSTAIN:** None

22 **ABSENT:** None

23  
24 Motion carried.

25  
26 **DELIBERATIONS**

27  
28 Member Moberly began deliberations stating he is in favor of the request; this  
29 is nice looking and improves the appearance of the home. Member Engel  
30 added there are no neighbor objections, and understanding the topography of  
31 the garage in back, it makes sense to build the porte cochere. Member Alesia  
32 said he is not sure about merely a special privilege or no other remedy, but  
33 feels other factors outweigh these concerns, especially the neighbor support.  
34 Member Engel added the way the building is structured and when it was built  
35 comes into play, but she doesn't think there is a good alternative. There were  
36 no additional Board concerns or objections.

37  
38 **Member Murphy moved to approve the variation for V-09-18, 306 North**  
39 **Garfield.** Member Engel seconded the motion.

40  
41 **AYES:** Members Moberly, Alesia, Giltner, Murphy, Engel, Podliska and  
42 Chairman Neiman

43 **NAYS:** None

44 **ABSTAIN:** None

45 **ABSENT:** None

46  
47 Motion carried.

1  
2 **b) V-11-18, 118 North Monroe**

3 Chairman Neiman opened the hearing.

4 Mr. Joe Gent, applicant, introduced his wife, Marylou, his architect, Patrick  
5 Plunkett, and Peter Byrne, his builder. Mr. Gent explained they are  
6 requesting a variance at 118 N. Monroe, to reduce the side yard setback from  
7 the required 20' feet to 15' feet. This property is similar to other lots in the R3  
8 and R4 districts. They are currently planning to put the building 6' feet off the  
9 north lot line, and 9' feet off the south lot line. They are proposing a side-  
10 loading garage, and orienting the house as such, so the south side will have  
11 windows to enjoy the seasons. Their offer to purchase is not contingent on  
12 approval of the variance. The current home sits 4' feet off the north lot line,  
13 and the attached garage is about 7' feet off the south property line. They  
14 hope to create a home to fit their lifestyle, to age in place in charming  
15 Hinsdale, and to be close to their grandchildren. He added that he  
16 appreciates the help they have received from staff through this process.

17 Mr. Patrick Plunkett, architect for the applicant, explained they are trying to  
18 create a home with the minimum side yard setback in order to accommodate  
19 a 35' foot wide house on a 50' foot wide lot. He explained there are only  
20 seven 50' foot wide lots in the R2 district, they are the exception. He  
21 reviewed the exhibits provided to the Board in the packet. The plat shows the  
22 existing house predates current zoning, and the proposed house would  
23 improve the setback on the north side by 2' feet. The regulations for an R3  
24 zone would be more accommodating to a 50' foot lot. All other zoning  
25 requirements would be met. This is a non-conforming R2 legal lot of record.

26 Chairman Neiman referenced neighbor concerns about water runoff. Mr.  
27 Plunkett explained a longer narrower house might relate to how the water  
28 flows, and be a greater obstruction. Mr. Gent added that he had talked to Mr.  
29 McGinnis about a solution, and was told there is a separated storm water  
30 system on Monroe, and he can tie all downspouts and sump into the  
31 stormwater system, eliminating water that is on the property. He noted the  
32 current house is not tied-in. Mr. Byrne explained the calculation on the  
33 impervious area of the current home; the new home would be about the same,  
34 and would not increase the impervious area on the lot. Whatever drainage  
35 issues exist would not be added to, and with the tie-in to the storm sewer,  
36 water drainage in the area would improve. The rear of the proposed building  
37 on the west side would not be as far back as the existing building. Member  
38 Podliska mentioned that one of the neighbors is concerned about site lines,  
39 and confirmed that this will not affect the neighbor. They will make a wider  
40 house, not a longer house, said Mr. Plunkett, and confirmed there will be 139'  
41 feet from the current lot line. There would not be a substantial change in this  
42 neighbor's line of site.

43 Mrs. Gent said their thoughts are to age in place, and thinking for the future,  
44 they are looking to attach a side-loading garage forward out to Monroe for  
45 safety issues. The master bedroom would be on the main level, all the living  
46 spaces would be on the first floor. There would be three bedrooms and two  
47 baths upstairs. There will be a downstairs walk-out basement, hoping to

1 create a courtyard effect on the south side. They won't have to go down a  
2 flight of stairs, their outdoor living will be out the side, and therefore there will  
3 be no decks or patios in the back yard.

4 Discussion followed regarding additional solutions for drainage relief. Mr.  
5 Plunkett said they would be willing to consider a permeable surface for the  
6 driveway. Chairman Neiman recommended approval of the variance with the  
7 caveat the driveway be a permeable surface; not concrete, but brick pavers or  
8 gravel. The applicants agreed.

9 In terms of the criteria necessary for approval, the unique physical condition  
10 is that the lot is very narrow and unusual in this district, and creates a  
11 hardship as a result. This is not self-created, this is an old lot. They would  
12 be denied substantial rights if they were required to have two 10' foot  
13 setbacks, as this is disproportionate to other lots and residences. This is not  
14 special privilege; this is an improvement over the non-conforming setbacks of  
15 the existing home. It is compliant with code and plan purposes and in  
16 harmony with the community and other Village ordinances. The proposed  
17 home would be in line with the character of the neighborhood, and will look  
18 better if wider, instead of a tall, narrow home, which would create more  
19 drainage problems.

20 The Gents are not contemplating a third floor.

21  
22 **Mr. Eric Bilenko of 122 N. Monroe** addressed the Board. He and his wife  
23 Diane live north of the subject property. They built their home seven years  
24 ago on a 57' foot wide lot, and had to conform to the 10' foot required  
25 setbacks. Upon notification of the Gents proposal, they spoke with various  
26 experts, real estate agents, their builder and John Bohnen of County Line  
27 Properties to help them figure this out. They were confused by the presented  
28 site plan. Mr. Bohnen is asking what the hardship is. Given there is only a  
29 site map, he does not feel it is adequate to endorse. They asked for more  
30 than a site plan, but the Gents did not want to provide full drawings. They are  
31 worried about site lines, gables and that the garage would be in their site line.  
32 Discussion followed regarding the location of the proposed garage.

33 **Ms. SarahTims of 111 N. Adams** addressed the Board stating she has not  
34 seen the plans, but anytime there is a teardown situation she is interested  
35 because Hinsdale is exceptional and should be protected. With regard to the  
36 storm sewer, she shared that the storm drain at the corner of Maple and  
37 Monroe is already one that frequently overflows in the neighborhood.  
38 Additionally, the neighbors directly to the south of the property closed on their  
39 property 14 days ago, and probably haven't had a chance to think about this  
40 proposal. As to the line of site problem, she believes there is a difference  
41 between a detached garage with space between it and the home, and an  
42 attached garage.

43 **Ms. Meg Fletcher of 621 W. Maple** addressed the Board and stated she had  
44 given the variation letter to the new people. She is concerned about  
45 stormwater. She believes there were times when people wanted to tie into  
46 storm sewers, but were not allowed to do so. Mr. McGinnis explained that  
47 one third of Hinsdale still has combination sewers, but where they are

1 separated, staff encourages people to tie in. Ms. Fletcher wants the Board to  
2 consider a retention basin, or an underground holding tank. She does not  
3 oppose the setback request, as she does not see a marked impact.  
4

5 Mr. Plunkett responded to the neighbor to north to point out there is a  
6 substantial difference between the home that can be built on a 50' foot lot as  
7 opposed to a 57' foot lot. Mr. Byrne noted there is no increase to the FAR  
8 with this request, and if the variance is not granted, a potential buyer would  
9 likely built a longer and/or taller house having a more significant impact on  
10 neighbor site lines.  
11

12 Member Podliska moved to **close the public hearing for V-11-18, 118 North**  
13 **Monroe**. Member Giltner seconded the motion.  
14

15 **AYES:** Members Moberly, Alesia, Giltner, Murphy, Engel, Podliska and  
16 Chairman Neiman

17 **NAYS:** None

18 **ABSTAIN:** None

19 **ABSENT:** None  
20

21 Motion carried.  
22

## 23 D E L I B E R A T I O N S

24  
25 Member Podliska began discussion, stating that with conditions, he believes the  
26 applicant has satisfied the requirements for approval of a variation, and the  
27 concerns of neighbors, regarding site lines and water issues. He added there is a  
28 substantial difference between a 57' foot lot and 50' foot wide lot, as it results in a  
29 30% decrease in the size of the home. Member Moberly said he would not want the  
30 home closer than 10' feet. He feels this protects the property rights for the  
31 surrounding neighbors. Member Podliska pointed out the existing house is closer  
32 than 10' feet. Theoretically, they paid more for the land, said Member Moberly, and  
33 there is an expectation of more space between the homes in the R2 district.

34 Member Giltner said this decision is more difficult than he thought; without neighbor  
35 objection, he would agree with the setbacks, but this home will be a larger portion of  
36 the lot. Although the applicant has gone out of their way to address the water  
37 issues, he is not convinced based on neighbor objections. Member Alesia echoed  
38 Member Podliska's remarks stating the big issue is water, but feels that will be  
39 alleviated. Further, the site lines could potentially be worse if another buyer builds  
40 on this property in terms of length and height of the home. Member Engel added  
41 the water issue has been addressed, and overall the new build will be better than  
42 what is there. Member Murphy added the proposed home will be further back than  
43 the existing house which is likely to be taken down in any case. And although there  
44 is neighbor concern regarding the length of the house, he has not heard anyone say  
45 they are opposed to the requested side yard setback relief. He wondered if it would  
46 be possible to defer a decision, and get a more substantive plan to give everyone an  
47 idea what this would look like. Mr. McGinnis explained this is not a requirement,

1 this is an interior side yard setback request, fairly detailed site plans have been  
2 provided, and there is testimony that it will be limited to two stories, but it is the  
3 Board's prerogative to continue the decision so that some additional details could be  
4 refined. Chairman Neiman added that more drawings might provide the neighbors  
5 some comfort, but that is not part of the variance as requested. And while it may be  
6 the prerogative of the Board to defer, the applicants have a their right to a decision.  
7 He stated he agrees with Member Podliska, based upon the applicants having  
8 addressed the approving criteria, and the issues of neighbors, he believes this  
9 variance should be approved with the provisions that runoff water be tied into the  
10 sewer system, and the driveway be made of pervious material. Discussion followed  
11 regarding the possible height of the garage and the 139' foot setback on the site  
12 plan. Mr. and Mrs. Gent requested an opportunity to make further comments;  
13 however, the hearing is closed. Member Moberly believes the applicant has had a  
14 fair hearing and that the house shouldn't be designed from the dais.

15 Member Podliska moved to **approve the variation for V-11-18, 118 North Monroe,**  
16 **with the conditions previously discussed with respect to water runoff and the**  
17 **permeable surface for the driveway.** Member Alesia seconded the motion.  
18

19 **AYES:** Members Alesia, Engel, Podliska and Chairman Neiman

20 **NAYS:** Members Moberly, Giltner, Murphy

21 **ABSTAIN:** None

22 **ABSENT:** None

23  
24 Motion carried.

25  
26 **9. NEW BUSINESS – None**

27  
28 **10. OLD BUSINESS – None**

29  
30 **11. ADJOURNMENT**

31 With no further business before the Zoning Board of Appeals, Member Giltner  
32 made a motion to **adjourn the meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals of**  
33 **January 23, 2019.** Member Podliska seconded the motion.  
34

35 **AYES:** Members Moberly, Alesia, Giltner, Murphy, Engel, Podliska and Chairman  
36 Neiman

37 **NAYS:** None

38 **ABSTAIN:** None

39 **ABSENT:** None

40  
41 Motion carried.

42  
43 Chairman Neiman declared the meeting adjourned at 8:06 p.m.

44  
45  
46 \_\_\_\_\_  
47 Christine M. Bruton  
Village Clerk

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



## FINAL DECISION

### VILLAGE OF HINSDALE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS PETITION FOR VARIATION

- Zoning Calendar:** V-09-18
- Petitioner:** Dana Gapinski & John Wheeler
- Meeting held:** Public Hearing was held on Wednesday, January 23, 2018 at 6:30 p.m. in Memorial Hall, in the Memorial Building, 19 East Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale, Illinois, pursuant to a notice published in The Hinsdalean on December 27, 2018.
- Premises Affected:** Subject Property is commonly known as 306 N. Garfield, Hinsdale, Illinois and is legally described as:
- LOT 1 IN OLD'S RESUBDIVISION OF LOT 3 AND THE EAST ½ OF VACATED ALLEY WEST AND ADJOINING SAID LOT 3, IN JOHNSTON'S SUBDIVISION OF BLOCK 11 OF AYER'S ADDITION TO HINSDALE, A SUBDIVISION OF PART OF THE NORTH ½ OF THE SOUTHWEST ¼ OF SECTION 1, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 11, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT OF SAID OLD'S RESUBDIVISION RECORDED MARCH 13, 1957 AS DOCUMENT 835304, IN DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS
- Subject:** In this application for variation, the applicant requests relief from the minimum corner side yard setback requirements set forth in section 3-110.D.2(a)(i) footnote 8 for the construction of a porte cochere. The applicant is requesting a 13'9" reduction from the block average of 44'7" to 30'10".
- Facts:** This property is located in the R-4 Residential District in the Village of Hinsdale and is located on the northwest corner of Garfield and Hickory Street. The property has a frontage of approximately 121' feet, a depth of approximately 141.50', and a total square footage of approximately 17,121. The maximum FAR is approximately 5,309 square feet, the maximum allowable building coverage is 25% or approximately 4,280 square feet, and the maximum allowable lot coverage is 50% or approximately 8,560 square feet.

**Action of the Board:** Members discussed the request and agreed that the standards for variation set forth in 11-503 (F) of the Hinsdale Zoning Code had been met. Specifically cited reasons included the location and layout of the house on the lot, existing grades, and the amount of property lost to setbacks on both the front and corner side due to block average.

A motion to recommend approval was made by Member Murphy and seconded by Member Engel.

**AYES:** Members Moberly, Giltner, Alesia, Murphy, Engel, Podliska

**NAYS:** None

**ABSTAIN:** Chairman Neiman

**ABSENT:** None

THE HINSDALE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

---

Chairman Robert Neiman

Filed this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, with the office of the Building Commissioner.

**FINAL DECISION**

**VILLAGE OF HINSDALE  
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
PETITION FOR VARIATION**

- Zoning Calendar:** V-11-18
- Petitioner:** Joseph & Marylou Gent
- Meeting held:** Public Hearing was held on Wednesday, January 23, 2018 at 6:30 p.m. in Memorial Hall, in the Memorial Building, 19 East Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale, Illinois, pursuant to a notice published in The Hinsdalean on January 10, 2018.
- Premises Affected:** Subject Property is commonly known as 118 N. Monroe, Hinsdale, Illinois and is legally described as:
- NORTH 50 FEET OF LOT 2 IN BLOCK 15 IN ESTABROOK ADDITION TO HINSDALE A SUBDIVISION STIUATED IN SECTION 2, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 11 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, IN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
- Subject:** In this application for variation, the applicant requests relief from the minimum interior side yard setback set forth in section 10-105(A)(3)(b)(i) for the construction of a new home. The applicant is requesting a 4' reduction in the minimum side yard setback. The code prescribed minimum is 10'.
- Facts:** This property is located in the R-2 Residential District in the Village of Hinsdale and is located on the west side of Monroe between Maple and Walnut Street. The property has a frontage of approximately 50', a depth of approximately 297', and a total square footage of approximately 14,850. The maximum FAR is approximately 4,764 square feet, the maximum allowable building coverage is 25% or approximately 3,712 square feet, and the maximum allowable lot coverage is 50% or approximately 7,425 square feet.
- It is one of seven 50' lots in the R-2 zoning district.
- Action of the Board:** Members discussed the request and agreed that the standards for variation set forth in 11-503 (F) of the Hinsdale Zoning Code had been met. Specifically cited reasons included the fact that this lot was one of the

smallest lots in the R-2 zoning district. Its size was more in line with that of a lot in the R-4 zoning district. Several members agreed that there was a substantial difference in a lot that is 57 or 58 feet wide versus 50 feet due to the fact that a house could be constructed at 38 feet versus 30 feet wide; nearly a 30 percent increase.

Members stated that the new house would be further off the lot line than the existing house, that the owner committed to keeping it limited to two stories in height, and maintaining the 139' setback off the rear lot line in accordance with the site plan exhibit.

Members discussed the drainage concerns voiced by the neighbors and the owners' commitment to construct a pervious driveway and tie the sump pump and downspouts into the storm sewer.

A motion to recommend approval with conditions was made by Member Podliska and seconded by Member Alesia. Specific conditions included the installation of a pervious driveway and connection of the sump and downspouts to the storm sewer on Monroe in order to help minimize any impact to downstream neighbors.

**AYES:** Members, Alesia, Engel, Podliska, Chairman Neiman  
**NAYS:** Members Moberly, Giltner, Murphy  
**ABSTAIN:** None  
**ABSENT:** None

#### THE HINSDALE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

---

Chairman Robert Neiman

Filed this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, with the office of the Building Commissioner.