

Approved  
McMahon/Cashman

**MINUTES  
VILLAGE OF HINSDALE  
PLAN COMMISSION  
JANUARY 8, 2014  
MEMORIAL HALL  
7:30 P.M.**

Chairman Byrnes called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m., Wednesday, January 8, 2014 in Memorial Hall, the Memorial Building, 19 East Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale, Illinois.

**PRESENT:** Chairman Byrnes, Commissioner Crnovich, Commissioner Johnson and Commissioner McMahon, Commissioner Cashman and Commissioner Stifflear

**ABSENT:** Commissioner Sullins

**ALSO PRESENT:** Sean Gascoigne, Village Planner

---

**Approval of Minutes**

The Plan Commission reviewed the minutes from the November 13, 2013 meeting. Commissioner Cashman motioned to approve the minutes of November 13, 2013, as amended. Commissioner McMahon seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**Scheduling of Public Hearings**

**A-01-2014 – 35 E. First Street – Special Use Permit to Allow a Personal Training Facility on the Second Floor.**

Chairman Byrnes stated this public hearing would be scheduled for February 12, 2014.

**Exterior Appearance/Site Plan Review**

**125 W. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street - Site Plan/Exterior Appearance Approval for a Reconfigured Surface Parking Lot.**

Steven Kolber, architect for the applicant, introduced himself and provided a history of the proposal, indicating that they were coming back with a different parking lot design, based on the Commission's comments and responses from the first proposal. He then addressed the presentation boards and continued explaining the proposed changes from the original proposal, which included pushing the parking lot to the north and providing extensive landscaping.

He then indicated that with the revisions proposed, he felt that the parking lot and vehicles would be almost entirely shielded from view by the residents on the south.

Commissioner Stifflear asked Mr. Kolber to speak to the neighborhood and the concerns originally presented by the neighbors.

## **Plan Commission Minutes**

**January 8, 2014**

General discussion ensued regarding the existing parking situation and how the new proposal would impact the neighbors to the south. He then indicated that he had reached out to the Police Chief regarding the suggestion to use street parking and they had received a response that he was not in favor of giving up any of those spaces.

General discussion ensued regarding existing street parking in the area.

Mr. Kolber explained the reasoning for his client's desire to have the additional parking and other feedback from the neighborhood.

Commissioner Crnovich expressed her concerns, which included the use of the drive aisle to the east of the property being cut off and used for tandem parking. She complemented the applicant on the proposed changes and their effort to minimize the Commission's original concerns, but still felt that the proposed driveway, as well as the concept of tandem parking along the east of the property, created too large of a negative impact to the residential component of the neighborhood and that she felt it was not in keeping with the intent of the O-1 District.

Chairman Byrnes appreciated Commissioner Crnovich's comments, but felt that the changes the applicant had made were a significant improvement to the area. He indicated that he also had concerns with the tandem parking area, but was happy with the other improvements.

Mr. Gascoigne indicated that the drive aisle was an existing condition but that based on the Commission's concerns, he would follow up with the Police Chief and the Village Attorney to get their thoughts regarding that portion of the request.

Chairman Byrnes expressed his thoughts and indicated that these challenges are typical any time you have office districts that abut residential.

Commissioner Stifflear offered his thoughts and indicated that given all of the street parking that had been identified and the fact that no parking is technically required, he felt that was sufficient and that a parking lot was not necessary. Especially considering that the code did not allow parking lots in the front or corner side yards.

Commissioner Crnovich suggested alternative solutions to the parking lot and general discussion ensued regarding the surrounding land uses and parking options. She then went on to discuss other concerns she had, including the location of the handicap space and the ability for someone to turn around.

Mr. Kolber confirmed that the proposed drive aisle width met the code which is designed to allow for someone to back out of the handicap spot and turn around in the parking lot.

Commissioner Cashman asked the applicant to identify where the required setback would fall on the existing site plan and general discussion ensued regarding the parking lot placement, in relationship to that setback.

## Plan Commission Minutes

January 8, 2014

Mr. Kolber explained his client's position and indicated that they were trying to find the best possible solution to accommodate his client's parking needs.

Commissioner Cashman expressed his concerns and could not see the benefit in providing 5 extra spots considering the impact to the neighborhood, the degree of variation being requested and the feedback the Commission had received regarding the proposal. He complimented the applicant for their effort, but indicated that he could not support it.

General discussion ensued regarding the potential impact to the neighbors and the general impact of parking lots in residential neighborhoods.

Commissioner Crnovich confirmed the variations and which requests would proceed to the Board.

Mr. Gascoigne indicated that he believed that the setback variations would be final at the Zoning Board, but that he thought the others would have to go onto the Board.

Chairman Byrnes appreciated the concerns regarding the parking lot in the corner side yard and questioned whether the Commission should be considering this aspect of the request since the Zoning Board will be considering this as part of their variation requests.

General discussion ensued and certain Commissioners felt that the standards set forth for site plan and exterior appearance approval, still allowed the Commission the ability to make a recommendation with regards to its location on the site.

Commissioner Cashman offered his final thoughts and indicated that he appreciated the applicant's efforts, but reiterated that he couldn't support it.

General discussion ensued summarizing the additional concerns raised by the Commission as well as the need for the handicap spot.

Commissioner Stifflear motioned for the ***disapproval*** of the Site Plan for a Reconfigured Surface Parking Lot at 125 W. Second Street. Commissioner Crnovich seconded. The motion passed and the site plan was recommended for ***denial*** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Stifflear, Commissioner Johnson, Commissioner Crnovich and Commissioner Cashman. Nays: Chairman Byrnes and Commissioner McMahan. Several Commissioners summarized their previous positions and offered final thoughts as to why they were or weren't in favor of the request.

Commissioner Crnovich questioned signage and the location of the dumpster.

The applicant indicated that those details had not been worked out yet.

Commissioner Stifflear motioned for ***disapproval*** of Exterior Appearance for a Reconfigured Surface Parking Lot at 125 W. Second Street. Commissioner Crnovich seconded.

## **Plan Commission Minutes**

**January 8, 2014**

General discussion ensued regarding the scope of the approval and what the Commission should be looking at.

Mr. Gascoigne indicated that the request for exterior appearance in this situation was specific to the request being made, so there was no real need to differentiate between the driveway and the building since the building had already been approved and was not part of this specific request.

The motion passed and the site plan was recommended for *denial* with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Stifflear, Commissioner Johnson, Commissioner Crnovich and Commissioner Cashman. Nays: Chairman Byrnes and Commissioner McMahon.

### **Signage**

#### **301 W. 59<sup>th</sup> Street – Hidden Lakes Apartments – One Ground Sign**

Chairman Byrnes introduced the case and asked if the applicant was present.

Mr. Gascoigne confirmed that the applicant did not appear to be present. He explained that the Commission had the discretion to continue the sign to next month's meeting or, if the Commission did not have comments or concerns with the sign, could take action based on their comfort with the proposal.

The Commission indicated that they liked the sign and were fine approving it without the applicant being present.

General discussion ensued regarding why the request was coming before the Plan Commission. Mr. Gascoigne explained that all ground signs must be brought in front of the Plan Commission and also, while the Commission has the authority to approve the requested sign, there were no standards or requirements in the code for this zoning district. As such he indicated that the sign as proposed, had a 7'-0" setback but staff was recommending that they push that back to 10'-0" to be consistent with the requirements for other ground signs in similar districts.

Commissioner Johnson motioned to approve the monument sign at 301 W. 59<sup>th</sup> Street – Hidden Lakes Apartment, subject to a 10'-0" setback. Commissioner McMahon seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

### **Adjournment**

Commissioner Johnson moved to adjourn. Commissioner Crnovich seconded and the meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m. on January 8, 2014.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sean Gascoigne  
Village Planner