

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  
48  
49

**VILLAGE OF HINSDALE  
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
January 20, 2021**

**1. ROLL CALL**

**Present electronically:** Members Gary Moberly, Joseph Alesia, Keith Giltner, Tom Murphy, Leslie Lee, John Podliska, and Chairman Bob Neiman

**Absent:** None

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

**2. CALL TO ORDER**

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Hinsdale Zoning Board of Appeals (conducted electronically via Zoom) was called to order by Chairman Bob Neiman on Wednesday, January 20, 2021 at 6:32 p.m., roll call was taken.

Chairman Neiman - Opening Remarks:

*“On September 18, 2020, Governor Pritzker entered the latest in a string of emergency declarations related to the COVID-19 pandemic. In light of that declaration, and consistent with various Executive Orders entered by the Governor, and the recent amendments made to the Open Meetings Act in Public Act 101-640, it is not practical or prudent to conduct an in-person meeting. This Open Regular Meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Village of Hinsdale is therefore being conducted remotely.*

*Public Act 101-640 allows public bodies to meet remotely during public health disasters, so long as the public is able to monitor the meeting, and certain other conditions are met.*

*Public comment is permitted during the Receipt of Requests, Motions, Pleadings, or Requests to Make Public Comment of General Nature portion of the meeting, and during any public hearing. When we get to those portions of the meeting, I will ask persons wishing to make public comment to identify themselves.*

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

a) **Meeting of December 16, 2020**

Following changes to the draft minutes, Member Podliska **moved to approve the draft minutes of December 16, 2020, as amended.** Member Giltner seconded the motion.

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

**NAYS:** None

**ABSTAIN:** None

**ABSENT:** None

Motion carried.

1 **4. APPROVAL OF FINAL DECISIONS – None**  
2

3 **5. RECEIPT OF APPEARANCES**

4 Court reporter, Ms. Kathy Bono, administered the oath to all persons intending to  
5 speak during tonight's proceedings.  
6

7 **6. RECEIPT OF REQUESTS, MOTIONS, PLEADINGS, OR REQUESTS TO MAKE**  
8 **PUBLIC COMMENT OF A GENERAL NATURE – None**  
9

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

11 a) **V-07-20, 425 & 417 Elm Street**

12 Ms. Jenna Edelmayer, from Michael Abraham Architecture, addressed the Board.  
13 She explained the homeowners currently own 425 Elm Street and want to buy the  
14 neighboring vacant lot, 417 Elm Street, and consolidate the properties. This would  
15 increase the width of the 425 property, resulting in the necessity of a variance for  
16 minimum total side yard requirement. The existing house will remain in its current  
17 location, but will be in the interior side yard resulting in about 5' feet of necessary  
18 relief. No additions or extensions to the existing house are planned, and the  
19 consolidation will reduce the existing non-conformity.

20 Mr. Steve Groetsema, homeowner, added they are completing a painstaking  
21 renovation to the existing 100-year old home. Their intent is to create a  
22 magnificent lot for their family to enjoy, an investment in the future and history of  
23 the property.

24 Trustee Podliska asked if joining the two lots would reduce other non-conforming  
25 aspects of the property. Ms. Edelmayer provided floor area ratio (FAR) and  
26 building coverage numbers, but lot coverage was unavailable. It was noted that if  
27 anything new were built on the lot it would have to meet current zoning  
28 requirements. Mr. McGinnis noted the scope of work on the existing property does  
29 not meet the definition of demolition, and that if those lots were subdivided in the  
30 future, they would have to be conforming lots.

31 Chairman Neiman advised the applicant to be prepared to review the approving  
32 criteria and explain why those have been met, and to reach out to neighbors for  
33 input. The hearing was set for the next scheduled meeting of the Zoning Board of  
34 Appeals.  
35

36 b) **V-01-21, 428 East 55<sup>th</sup> Street**

37 Mr. Mahesh Patel, homeowner, addressed the Board stating he purchased the  
38 property in 2013, that consists of two lots. He resides at 5500 S. County Line  
39 Road, the back lot is 428 E. 55<sup>th</sup> Street. He would like to put a house on the back  
40 lot, but needs zoning relief to do so. He is convinced the back lot has the potential  
41 to have a house without issue to anyone. Otherwise, he is stuck with a huge  
42 backyard needing too much maintenance and of no value. He does not believe  
43 there was ever a house on the 428 E. 55<sup>th</sup> Street property. Mr. Patel stated he  
44 purchased the property as two lots, but speculates that it was subdivided at some  
45 time in the past.

46 Discussion followed regarding the size of the 428 lot relative to other lots on 55<sup>th</sup>  
47 Street, as well as the size of a future home relative to others. Mr. Patel stated he  
48 intends to install a circular driveway to address concerns regarding traffic on 55<sup>th</sup>

1 Street. Mr. McGinnis added there is enough lot width for a circular driveway, but  
2 the curb cuts will be up to the County.

3 Chairman Neiman advised the applicant to be prepared to review the approving  
4 criteria and explain why those have been met, and to demonstrate neighbor  
5 support, as it is an implied criteria for approval. The hearing was set for the next  
6 scheduled meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals.  
7

8 **c) V-02-21, 33 South Garfield Avenue**

9 Ms. Jamie Zaura, project architect, and Mr. Kevin Flynn, homeowner, were  
10 present. Ms. Zaura explained the Flynns purchased the property last month. The  
11 main building is office space, and the barn is a residence. The applicant is  
12 requesting 6.3%, or 3,427' square feet of relief from the total lot coverage  
13 requirements in the O-1 zoning district. Additionally, the applicant is requesting  
14 relief from the parking requirement of nine spaces, to four spaces.

15 Mr. Flynn stated he believes the proposed parking is a workable solution, and for  
16 the residence only one parking space is needed.

17 Chairman Neiman advised the applicant to be prepared to review the approving  
18 criteria and explain why those have been met, and to reach out to neighbors for  
19 input. The hearing was set for the next scheduled meeting of the Zoning Board of  
20 Appeals.  
21

22 **8. PUBLIC HEARING**

23 **a) V-06-20, 5500 South Grant Street (Hinsdale Central High School)**

24 *(A transcript of the following proceedings is on file with the Village Clerk.)*

25 Chairman Neiman opened the public hearing, and explained the Board would hear  
26 each of the six variation requests separately, and vote on each. He noted that all  
27 but one are a recommendation to the Village Board. Director of Community  
28 Development Robb McGinnis clarified his conversation with the Village Attorney  
29 regarding the conflicts in the municipal and zoning codes with respect to fence  
30 approvals. Out of an abundance of caution, it was recommended to stay the  
31 course, and treat these items the same as was done for Phase 1 of the project.

32 Mr. Nick Graal, project architect, presented to the Board. Also present  
33 representing the high school were Mr. Jason Oskorep, Facilities Director, and Ms.  
34 Dorothy McCarty and Mr. Jack Stumpf, owners representatives.  
35

36 **Variation request #1 - Grandstand and press box**

37 Mr. Graal introduced the request to replace the existing grandstand and press box.  
38 These structures are existing non-conforming accessory structures. They are  
39 proposing a one for one replacement, with slight improvements to the existing  
40 height. They are also asking that the landscape screening requirement be waived,  
41 but will preserve the evergreens that provide some screening on Madison. They  
42 are also asking to waive the outdoor activity open space buffer requirement. The  
43 seating for the grandstand will increase from 2,402 to 2,409, and accessibility  
44 ramps will be installed for building code compliance. He noted there is no change  
45 to the gate off Madison to the west of the huddle house. Discussion followed  
46 regarding use of the gates.

47 There were no additional questions from the Board, and no public comment on the  
48 matter.

1 Member Podliska moved to **close the public hearing for V-06-20, 5500 South**  
2 **Grant Street, variation request #1 for a grandstand and press box.** Member  
3 Giltner seconded the motion.  
4

5 **AYES:** Members Moberly, Alesia, Giltner, Murphy, Lee, Podliska and Chairman  
6 Neiman

7 **NAYS:** None

8 **ABSTAIN:** None

9 **ABSENT:** None

10  
11 Motion carried.

### 12 **DELIBERATIONS**

13  
14  
15 Member Moberly began deliberations stating he had concerns regarding safety on  
16 Madison, but the explanation of the applicant has satisfied his concerns. He has  
17 no objections to the request. Member Podliska agrees the standards for approval  
18 have been met.

19 Member Podliska moved to **approve the request for V-06-20, 5500 South Grant**  
20 **Street, variation request #1 for a grandstand and press box.** Member Alesia  
21 seconded the motion.

22  
23 **AYES:** Members Moberly, Alesia, Giltner, Murphy, Lee, Podliska and Chairman  
24 Neiman

25 **NAYS:** None

26 **ABSTAIN:** None

27 **ABSENT:** None

28  
29 Motion carried.

### 30 31 **Variation request #2 - Replace chain link fence perimeter of grandstand** 32 **and press box**

33 Chairman Neiman noted this approval is a recommendation only to the Board of  
34 Trustees.

35 Mr. Graal explained this fence is located behind the grandstand. The fence is  
36 currently galvanized chain link, and will be replaced in kind. He explained this is  
37 only a partial replacement, in order to provide site access for construction. He  
38 summarized the standards for approval, noting the fence will be the same height,  
39 and chain link is a good choice to provide security and visibility. There were no  
40 questions from the Board. There was no public comment.

41 Member Podliska moved to **close the public hearing for V-06-20, 5500 South**  
42 **Grant Street, variation request #2 for perimeter fencing for the grandstand**  
43 **and press box.** Member Giltner seconded the motion.

44  
45 **AYES:** Members Moberly, Alesia, Giltner, Murphy, Lee, Podliska and Chairman  
46 Neiman

47 **NAYS:** None

48 **ABSTAIN:** None

49 **ABSENT:** None

1  
2 Motion carried.

3 **DELIBERATIONS**

4  
5 Member Podliska believes the standards for variations have been met as set forth in  
6 the submission, and as stated in the hearing. He would recommend approval to the  
7 Village Board. The Board concurred.

8 Member Podliska moved **to recommend approval to the Village Board of Trustees**  
9 **of V-06-20, 5500 South Grant Street, variation request #2 for perimeter fencing**  
10 **for the grandstand and press box.** Member Giltner seconded the motion.

11  
12 **AYES:** Members Moberly, Alesia, Giltner, Murphy, Lee, Podliska and Chairman  
13 Neiman

14 **NAYS:** None

15 **ABSTAIN:** None

16 **ABSENT:** None

17  
18 Motion carried.

19  
20 Chairman Neiman reviewed the standards used by the Board to approve this request  
21 to be included in the Final Decision.

22  
23 **Variation request #3 – Construction of a ticket booth that exceeds allowable**  
24 **height for an accessory structure**

25 Chairman Neiman noted this approval is a recommendation only to the Board of  
26 Trustees.

27 Mr. Graal said they are requesting two feet of height relief for the construction of a  
28 ticket booth. The allowable height is 15' feet, the proposed structure would be 17'  
29 feet. They want to match the huddle house, and they want the building to be  
30 consistent with last year's Phase 1 approvals for the soccer shelters. He noted that  
31 the building is deep within the site, away from public view from 55<sup>th</sup> Street and  
32 Madison. The Board had no further questions, there was no public comment.

33 Member Podliska moved **to close the public hearing for V-06-20, 5500 South Grant**  
34 **Street, variation request #3 for the construction of a ticket booth.** Member  
35 Murphy seconded the motion.

36  
37 **AYES:** Members Moberly, Alesia, Giltner, Murphy, Lee, Podliska and Chairman  
38 Neiman

39 **NAYS:** None

40 **ABSTAIN:** None

41 **ABSENT:** None

42  
43 Motion carried.

44  
45 **DELIBERATIONS**

46  
47 Member Murphy began deliberations stating he believes the applicant has met the  
48 requirements for approval. The Board agreed.

49 Member Podliska moved **to recommend approval to the Village Board of Trustees**

1 **of V-06-20, 5500 South Grant Street, variation request #3 for the construction of**  
2 **a ticket booth** Member Giltner seconded the motion.

3  
4 **AYES:** Members Moberly, Alesia, Giltner, Murphy, Lee, Podliska and Chairman  
5 Neiman

6 **NAYS:** None

7 **ABSTAIN:** None

8 **ABSENT:** None

9  
10 Motion carried.

11  
12 Chairman Neiman reviewed the standards used by the Board to approve this request  
13 to be included in the Final Decision.

14  
15 **Variation #4 – Replace chain link fencing backstop around varsity baseball**  
16 **field**

17 Chairman Neiman noted this approval is a recommendation only to the Board of  
18 Trustees.

19 Mr. Graal explained the existing chain link fence and hooded backstop is an existing  
20 non-conformity. They propose replacing the fence in kind, and installing safety  
21 netting and poles. This is the standard for baseball and softball fields. It is safer for  
22 patrons, and provides aesthetic and sight line improvements. This request is  
23 consistent with improvements approved last year. The Board had no further  
24 questions, and there was no public comment. Member Murphy moved to **close the**  
25 **public hearing for V-06-20, 5500 South Grant Street, variation request #4**  
26 **replacement of chain link fencing and backstop around varsity baseball field.**  
27 Member Giltner seconded the motion.

28  
29 **AYES:** Members Moberly, Alesia, Giltner, Murphy, Lee, Podliska and Chairman  
30 Neiman

31 **NAYS:** None

32 **ABSTAIN:** None

33 **ABSENT:** None

34  
35 Motion carried.

36  
37 **DELIBERATIONS**

38  
39 Member Moberly began deliberations stating he believes the criteria for approval  
40 have been met. The Board agreed.

41 Member Podliska moved to **recommend approval to the Village Board of Trustees**  
42 **of V-06-20, 5500 South Grant Street, variation request #4 replacement of chain**  
43 **link fencing and backstop around varsity baseball field.** Member Giltner  
44 seconded the motion.

45  
46 **AYES:** Members Moberly, Alesia, Giltner, Murphy, Lee, Podliska and Chairman  
47 Neiman

48 **NAYS:** None

49 **ABSTAIN:** None

1       **ABSENT:** None  
2

3       Motion carried.  
4

5       Chairman Neiman reviewed the standards used by the Board to approve this request  
6       to be included in the Final Decision.  
7

8       **Variation #5 – Install chain link fencing around softball and baseball fields**

9       Chairman Neiman noted this approval is a recommendation only to the Board of  
10       Trustees.

11       Mr. Graal introduced the item requesting a variation for material and height for a black  
12       coated chain link fence in the outfield to block the field of play from a required drainage  
13       basin installed per Village engineering requirements. The second request is for the  
14       black coated chain link at the junior varsity softball field. This is a one for one  
15       replacement of the existing non-conforming fence and hooded backstop. The existing  
16       fence is past its useful life. The third location is the varsity baseball field where a  
17       small portion on each side of the dugout shelters will be a one for one existing non-  
18       conforming replacement. The fencing in all three locations is consistent with baseball  
19       and softball field standards, and consistent with what was previously installed in  
20       Phase 1. The Board had no further questions, and there was no public comment.

21       Member Podliska moved to **close the public hearing for V-06-20, 5500 South Grant**  
22       **Street, variation request #5 installation of chain link fencing around softball and**  
23       **baseball fields.** Member Giltner seconded the motion.  
24

25       **AYES:** Members Moberly, Alesia, Giltner, Murphy, Lee, Podliska and Chairman  
26       Neiman

27       **NAYS:** None

28       **ABSTAIN:** None

29       **ABSENT:** None  
30

31       Motion carried.  
32

33   **D E L I B E R A T I O N S**

34  
35       Member Podliska believes the standards for variations have been met as set forth in  
36       the submission, and as stated in the hearing. He would recommend approval to the  
37       Village Board. The Board concurred.

38       Member Alesia moved to **recommend approval to the Village Board of Trustees**  
39       **of the variation for V-06-20, 5500 South Grant Street, variation request #5**  
40       **installation of chain link fencing around softball and baseball fields.** Member  
41       Giltner seconded the motion.  
42

43       **AYES:** Members Moberly, Alesia, Giltner, Murphy, Lee, Podliska and Chairman  
44       Neiman

45       **NAYS:** None

46       **ABSTAIN:** None

47       **ABSENT:** None  
48

49       Motion carried.

1  
2 Chairman Neiman reviewed the standards used by the Board to approve this request  
3 to be included in the Final Decision.  
4

5 **Variation #6 – Parking lot light fixtures exceeding allowable height**

6 Chairman Neiman noted this approval is a recommendation only to the Board of  
7 Trustees.

8 Mr. Graal explained the request for two proposed fixtures for the new lot that conform  
9 in height to those that were approved in Phase 1. The request is for a variation for  
10 an accessory structure, as they will exceed the allowable 15' feet. These will be 27'  
11 feet 6" inches, with a concrete base and a 20' foot light pole. There are four existing  
12 non-conforming structures already in place; these will match that height. They will  
13 provide safety for after school hours recreational and extra-curricular activities. They  
14 are controlled, and dimmed after a certain time. The new fixtures are low profile LED  
15 lights providing a larger luminous surface area with low glare and high optical  
16 performance, and meet the standards of the Village code for allowable lumens. He  
17 explained it is a challenging area to light, because of site constraints. The Board had  
18 no further questions, and there was no public comment.

19 Member Podliska moved to **close the public hearing for V-06-20, 5500 South Grant**  
20 **Street, variation request #6 parking lot fixtures exceeding allowable height.**  
21 Member Murphy seconded the motion.  
22

23 **AYES:** Members Moberly, Alesia, Giltner, Murphy, Lee, Podliska and Chairman  
24 Neiman

25 **NAYS:** None

26 **ABSTAIN:** None

27 **ABSENT:** None  
28

29 Motion carried.  
30

31 **DELIBERATIONS**

32 Member Moberly began deliberations asking for confirmation that there have been no  
33 neighbor objection to the light poles. Mr. Oskorep and Ms. McCarty confirmed they  
34 have not received any objections to the light poles. Member Podliska had concerns  
35 initially about the proposed lighting, but with the additional information provided, he  
36 is convinced. The Board concurred the standards for variations have been met as set  
37 forth in the submission, and as stated in the hearing.

38 Member Podliska moved to **recommend approval to the Village Board of Trustees**  
39 **of V-06-20, 5500 South Grant Street, variation request #6 parking lot fixtures**  
40 **exceeding allowable height.** Member Moberly seconded.  
41

42 **AYES:** Members Moberly, Alesia, Giltner, Murphy, Lee, Podliska and Chairman  
43 Neiman

44 **NAYS:** None

45 **ABSTAIN:** None

46 **ABSENT:** None  
47

48 Motion carried.  
49



1  
2 Chairman Neiman reviewed the standards used by the Board to approve this request  
3 to be included in the Final Decision.  
4

5 Chairman Neiman thanked Mr. Graal for his detailed presentation of these matters, and  
6 his thorough outreach to neighbors.  
7

8 **9. NEW BUSINESS** – None  
9

10 **10. OLD BUSINESS** – None  
11

12 **11. ADJOURNMENT**

13 With no further business before the Zoning Board of Appeals, Member Podliska made  
14 a motion to **adjourn the regularly scheduled meeting of the Zoning Board of**  
15 **Appeals of January 20, 2021.** Member Murphy seconded the motion.  
16

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

19 **NAYS:** None

20 **ABSTAIN:** None

21 **ABSENT:** None  
22

23 Motion carried.  
24

25 Chairman Neiman declared the meeting adjourned at 8:02 p.m.  
26  
27  
28

29 \_\_\_\_\_  
30 Christine M. Bruton  
31

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