

Approved:
Bohnen/Massouras

MINUTES
VILLAGE OF HINSDALE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

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

Chairman Arens called the meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission to order at 5:00 p.m. on April 12, 2011 in Memorial Hall in the Memorial Building, 19 East Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale IL.

Present: Chairman Arens, Commissioner Peterson, Commissioner Murphy, Commissioner Massouras, Commissioner Bohnen and Commissioner Ives

Absent: Commissioner Buczkowski

Also Present: Village Planner, Sean Gascoigne

Minutes

Chairman Arens presented the minutes from the April 12, 2011 meeting. Commissioner Ives motioned for the approval of the minutes from April 12, 2011. Commissioner Massouras seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion

Update on Preservation Month

Chairman Arens opened up discussions on Preservation Month and provided his thoughts on the strengths and weaknesses for the month which included the shortfall on coloring submittals.

Mr. Gascoigne explained that he wasn't sure how the Commission could regulate what happens once the schools have the electronic copy. He indicated that everything had been forwarded to the schools and wasn't sure how they could follow through to make sure it was actually distributed to the students.

General discussion ensued regarding the contests and ways to improve their process.

Chairman Arens explained that with the departure of some Commissioners and the arrival of new ones, they would have to do some reorganization in terms of sub-committees and responsibilities.

General discussion ensued regarding the nomination process and how to continue those efforts for this year's nominations.

Discussion re: Proposed Text Amendment Regarding the Design Review Commission

Chairman Arens introduced the discussion regarding the Design Review Commission (DRC) and explained that Commissioner Bohnen had an interest in discussing this topic amongst the Historic Preservation Commission. He then asked Commissioner Bohnen to summarize the request for the other Commissioners.

Commissioner Bohnen provided a brief summary and indicated that as a Commission, they should discuss the matter and provide a position to the Plan Commission for their upcoming public hearing on the matter. He then asked Mr. Gascoigne to lead off the conversation with some of the history.

Mr. Gascoigne apologized for his minimal knowledge on the matter and explained his understanding as to the evolution of the text amendment. He explained that his main capacity was managing the process of the text amendment and unfortunately not as much emphasis on the history and specifics of the actual amendment itself. He then indicated that Robb McGinnis was the staff liaison to the Design Review Commission and had a better working knowledge as to how the Commission came to be and how the design standards were derived. He stated that Mr. McGinnis would be present at the Plan Commission meeting, along with certain Design Review Commissioners, to present the amendment and answer specific questions.

Commissioner Bohnen offered to provide some additional background and provided his thoughts as to how the Design Review Commission came about and how it was tied back to the 2025 study. He explained how the different discussions of the 2025 study progressed and that the largest hurdle amongst these discussions was how to incentivize builders to go through a review process. He identified how the discussions evolved to the idea of FAR and defined the concept of FAR. He also explained some of the other ideas, of which one was to reduce the allowed FAR in the zoning code by a percentage, and then let someone earn that amount back by going through the design review process.

Commissioner Bohnen went on to express his concerns with the amendment as proposed and offered examples of how the elimination of FAR could be problematic if passed. He summarized various documents provided by either the Village or the DRC that he felt were misleading and provided the Commission with a physical sample of how the proposed language could impact development. He summarized his findings in the document and how he arrived at his position. He explained how the DRC process was put on hold to address the rewriting of the Zoning Code which would have addressed different options for bulk and potentially affected the direction the DRC could have proceeded but that the rewrite was never completed. Commissioner Bohnen then explained his understanding and concern as to how the DRC was revived which resulted in the proposed text amendment they were discussing.

General discussion ensued regarding various points of Commissioner Bohnen's summary.

Mr. Bohnen provided his response and provided excerpts from various Village documents and e-mails that he felt supported his concern. He explained the design standards the DRC had drafted and commended them on their efforts. He wrapped up his discussion by summarizing the findings of the SEG group responsible for these discussions as part of the 2025 plan and enumerating his various concerns as a result of this proposal.

Chairman Arens thanked Commissioner Bohnen and offered his thoughts. He asked Mr. Gascoigne how the proposed amendment would affect landmark homes.

Mr. Gascoigne indicated that his understanding of the proposed amendment was that it was only applicable to new homes.

Commissioner Bohnen disagreed and indicated that the proposed ordinance also included renovations.

General discussion ensued regarding the impact of bulk and curb appeal if in fact renovations were considered as part of this proposal as well as the impacts of removing the FAR requirement.

Commissioner Ives explained his thoughts and concerns with the removal of FAR and felt it should be left in place.

The Commission discussed various concerns including the practicality and ramifications of removing of FAR.

Chairman Arens questioned how the Commission could convey their concerns to the Plan Commission for their public hearing.

Mr. Gascoigne explained how the Commission could memorialize their concerns and he would be happy to pass those on to the Plan Commission before their public hearing discussion.

General discussion ensued and the Commissioners raised several questions regarding the process that would be put in place should the amendment be approved, so that they could better understand the impacts.

The Commission generally agreed that the Chairman should draft a letter on the Commission's behalf and submit it to the Plan Commission. The Commission then discussed the intent of the language to be presented.

Mr. Gascoigne offered his thoughts on how to accomplish this and also avoid conflicts with the Open Meetings Act.

The Commission continued their conversation on what should be included in the memo to best illustrate the Commission's position and concerns.

Discussion re: Commission Vacancies

Chairman Arens provided the Commission with an update on existing vacancies within the Commission and the importance of everyone's attendance.

Discussion re: Agenda Items for Upcoming Meetings

Chairman Arens asked the Commission to consider upcoming meetings and come up with anything they would like to discuss.

Chairman Arens offered some final thoughts and asked for a motion to adjourn.

Adjournment

Commissioner Murphy moved to adjourn. Commissioner Ives seconded and the meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m. on September 13, 2011.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sean Gascoigne
Village Planner