

Approved:  
Buczowski/Massouras

MINUTES  
VILLAGE OF HINSDALE  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
NOVEMBER 9, 2010

Memorial Hall – Memorial Building, 19 East Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale  
5:00 P.M.

---

Chairman Pro Tem Arens called the meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission to order at 5:00 p.m. on November 9, 2010 in Memorial Hall in the Memorial Building, 19 East Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale IL.

Present: Chairman Pro Tem Arens, Commissioner Peterson, Commissioner Murphy, Commissioner Massouras, Commissioner Buczowski, Commissioner McGue

Absent: Chairman Keseric, Commissioner Bohnen, Commissioner Ives

Also Present: Village Planner, Sean Gascoigne

**Minutes**

Chairman Pro Tem Arens presented the minutes from the October 13, 2010 meeting to the Commission and asked if they had any changes to the minutes up for approval. Commissioner Massouras motioned for the approval of the minutes from October 13, 2010. Commissioner Buczowski seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**Discussion**

**Update on Burns Field**

Chairman Pro Tem Arens asked Village Planner Gascoigne to provide an update.

Mr. Gascoigne indicated that staff was asked to put this item back on just to confirm that no one had any additional questions from the consultant's report.

Commissioner Peterson expressed concerns regarding who would do improvements to the building.

Mr. Gascoigne confirmed that the Preservation Commission would be an integral part of the process.

**Upcoming Meetings**

Chairman Arens introduced the expanded worksheet for upcoming meetings and recommended that everyone write down their thoughts regarding what to discuss on specific meeting dates and be prepared to discuss at the December meeting.

### **Review of Existing Village Studies**

Chairman Arens opened discussions on the existing Village studies and clarified some confusion regarding the agenda.

Commissioner Peterson provided an update on his progress regarding the building permit information that he had been going through. He indicated that he would have a better idea of what was available at next month's meeting.

General discussion ensued regarding the Village Studies.

### **Role, Responsibilities and Authority of the Historic Preservation Commission**

Chairman Arens introduced the agenda item and asked staff to provide a summary of the findings.

Mr. Gascoigne indicated that the zoning code section that was referenced in regards to the referral process is very specific to state hearings and not meetings. He then went on to explain the difference between the two and how being one or the other could impact the Commission's ability to provide comment.

Mr. Gascoigne stated that in either situation, any discussions that the Preservation Commission had in regards to a Plan Commission case would be forwarded on to the respective body as a summary or a memo regarding their discussions, rather than a vote or a recommendation.

Mr. Gascoigne explained that staff had decided that anything that went for a public hearing in either the Historic Downtown or the Graue Mill Overlay District would be placed on the agenda and left at the discretion of the Commission as to whether they wanted to discuss the item or not. If the Commission opted to discuss the item, they would then have the option to forward on the meeting minutes for that discussion point or have a memo prepared by the Chair, outlining their comments or concerns, which would then be forwarded on to the appropriate Village body. He then went on to state that because of timing and process, public meeting items could not be afforded the same attention. If however any member of the Commission identified an item on an upcoming Plan Commission agenda that warranted discussion, they could contact the Chairman to place the item on the next Preservation Commission agenda. The item could then be discussed with the understanding that any discussion summaries would not be available to the Plan Commission but would then be forwarded on to the ZPS or Village Board to be considered.

General discussion ensued regarding the process.

### **Discussion Regarding Proposed Signage Text Amendment**

Chairman Arens introduced Tim Scott, Director of Economic Development and asked him to summarize the request.

Mr. Scott summarized the request and explained that the text amendment was two-fold, but that the Preservation Commission would likely be interested in only the portion regarding projecting signs as that could potentially impact the Historic Downtown District.

Mr. Scott explained that the initiative for the text amendment came as a result of comments made to both himself and President Cauley from both existing and prospective tenants within the Village. He then went on to identify different characteristics of the Village and more specifically the downtown that lend itself to this request.

Mr. Scott introduced his PowerPoint presentation and provided a brief history of projecting signs and their appeal to different locations throughout the country. He provided several slides of various projecting signs that he had photographed both in Hinsdale and other communities.

Mr. Scott explained some of the challenges he will be faced with in the upcoming weeks, in terms of drafting the suitable language and determining the appropriate standards that would come along with this text amendment to avoid visual chaos on the buildings. He also made it a point to indicate that the proposed text amendment would not result in every tenant filing an application for a projecting sign as not all buildings lend themselves to any additional signage, let alone a projecting sign.

Mr. Gascoigne clarified what current allowances were provided for projecting signs and indicated that all current sign regulations regarding number, size, etc. would still be applicable.

Chairman Arens began discussions on the topic and described the appeal and character that projecting signs can bring to the downtown. He then gave examples of areas around the country where he has seen some of these signs. He indicated that he liked the idea but his concern was what you do when you get four or five tenants on the second floor and how you control the potential clutter.

Mr. Scott acknowledged Chairman Arens concerns and indicated that the intent of the proposed language and the existing sign requirements was to avoid exactly that. He then went on to explain that given the layout of the buildings in the downtown, his current thought was to provide standards for multiple tenants on one sign, rather than permitting them to each have their own. He explained that Chairman Arens' concerns were the same issues he was looking to address as he moved forward with the proposal and the language.

Commissioner Buczkowski indicated that while uniformity is important, she was happy to see that Mr. Scott was analyzing individual buildings as it was important to make sure that signs match the character of the building.

Mr. Scott explained that a couple of years ago he began with an initiative to standardize projecting signs in the downtown but then realized while working through the details, that the character of each building downtown may not lend itself to a standard sign or bracket.

Discussion ensued regarding how the proposed changes would impact the level of signage on a building.

Mr. Scott indicated that he is looking closely at those types of concerns and that one thing to keep in mind is that the general signage requirements are still going to apply so that will also help to regulate the number and size of the signs on the building.

General discussion ensued and the Commission generally agreed that the proposal is a great idea.

Commissioner Massouras asked if Mr. Scott had done any research with regards to the zoning code allowances of the communities that he is using as examples.

Mr. Scott indicated that he was going to look at comparable communities across the country and check into those things as part of his research.

Mr. Gascoigne reiterated that in most situations the current general signage regulations are going to still apply and address most of the Commission's concerns.

General discussion ensued regarding the districts that the proposed text amendment would affect.

Chairman Arens addressed the Commission and asked how they would like to send on any discussion summaries to the Plan Commission.

The Commission agreed that the draft minutes of this meeting would suffice.

Mr. Gascoigne indicated that he would make sure that the draft minutes were provided to the Plan Commission.

Chairman Arens questioned how an applicant would then request approval for a projecting sign.

Mr. Scott took the opportunity to briefly summarize the second half of the text amendment. He explained the existing signage requirements and procedure and explained the extended timeframe required for a tenant to change the name of a business on the valance of an awning. He provided additional examples and further summarized the additional aspects of the proposal.

The Commission thanked Mr. Scott for his efforts.

### **Discussion Regarding a Map Amendment for 722-728 N. York Road**

Mr. Gascoigne summarized the request.

Chairman Arens asked if anyone had any comments or concerns on this matter.

No issues were raised.

Historic Preservation Commission  
November 9, 2010

**Adjournment**

Commissioner Murphy moved to adjourn. Commissioner McGue seconded and the meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m. on November 9, 2010.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sean Gascoigne  
Village Planner