

**DRAFT MINUTES
VILLAGE OF HINSDALE
ZONING AND PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE
MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 2012
MEMORIAL HALL
7:30 p.m.**

Present: Chairman Saigh, Trustee Angelo, Trustee Haarlow, Trustee Elder

Absent: None

Also Present: Dave Cook, Village Manager, Sean Gascoigne, Village Planner, Brad Bloom, Police Chief, Mike Kelly, Fire Chief

Trustee Saigh called the meeting to order at 7:33 p.m.

Minutes – November 2011

Trustee Elder moved to approve the minutes for the November 28, 2011 meeting as written. Second by Trustee Haarlow. The motion passed unanimously.

Monthly Reports – December 2011

Fire Department

Chief Kelly reported that the December 2011 monthly report contains the year end numbers for statistical purposes. The numbers reflect a slight increase in the total number of calls handled by the Department in 2011, with a slight decrease in the total number of ambulance requests for 2011. The call volume for 2011 was very similar to the call volume for 2010. There were no further questions from the Committee on the report.

Police Department

Chief Bloom discussed the new railroad cameras that were installed at all of the grade crossings, platforms and railroad depot interiors. Chief Bloom stated that this project was funded by a grant from the West Suburban Mass Transit District which paid for 2/3 of the project cost. Chief Bloom indicated that the cameras which are wireless and monitored at the police department has already resulted in alerting officers when cars have turned onto the railroad right-of-way at the Monroe Street crossing. Since that time the railroad has installed raised lane markers to better differentiate the crossing. The Police Department has also released a public education video running on Channel 6 the focuses on pedestrian safety. The video was produced at no cost by Hinsdale resident John Sachanda.

Chief Bloom briefed the Committee on the department's efforts to inform citizens via the e-mail notification system, Facebook and twitter on recent burglaries and crime prevention tips. Chief Bloom stated that there have been three residential burglaries in the Village since December 2011. Chief Bloom stated that the total number of residential burglaries are down as compared to previous years but speculated that the increased sensitivity of burglaries by the public is from the recent Indian Head Park incident. Chief Bloom stated that the department is seeing an increased number of suspicious persons calls which he said is a good thing and something the police department encourages.

Community Development

Dave Cook gave a summary of permit and inspectional activity in the Community Development Department for December and stated that the department was busy for this time of year and that there was

still a fair amount of inventory in house. He also stated that the department was posting revenues that were significantly higher than last fiscal year when the hospital permit was backed out.

Trustee Elder asked about the vacant property registry and asked about how problem properties were handled and the amount of time that it took to prosecute these. Dave Cook responded that it was a lengthy process and routinely takes months, especially if a foreclosure is involved.

Request for Board Action

Approve an Ordinance Approving Site Plans and Exterior Appearance Plans for Modifications to a Commercial Building at 53 S. Washington Street

The architect for J. McLaughlin presented the changes that were considered and approved at Plan Commission. The changes were minor and included three awnings, signage, and four planters along the west side of the store front.

Chairman Saigh added that this was approved unanimously at Plan Commission and asked for a motion. Trustee Elder made a motion to approve an Ordinance Approving Site Plans and Exterior Appearance Plans for Modifications to a Commercial Building at 53 S. Washington Street. Seconded by Trustee Haarlow. Motion passed unanimously.

Approve an Ordinance Approving a Major Adjustment to a Planned Development for Façade Changes at 10 N. Washington Street

Chairman Saigh gave some background on the item and why the petitioners were back in front of Committee. Sean Gascoigne explained in detail what exactly was being requested and why based on the building review and certain code requirements. The changes involved the addition of an elevator and hoistway on the west elevation, some changes to windows, and a cornice wrapping the perimeter of the building.

Sean Gascoigne stated that he had confirmed with the Plan Commission Chair that the changes discussed in the field with the architects on the Plan Commission and the petitioners architect were in fact what was illustrated on the plans. Chairman Saigh gave the background on this to add some clarification on how and why the resident architects on the Plan Commission met in the field to discuss the proposed facade improvements.

Mitch Hamblet summarized the changes being requested and restated that the majority of the changes were being driven by code. He answered questions on the materials being used and stated that Fypon moldings would be used for the exterior trim and around the bays. The color would be in a crème or off white and not stark white. He clarified that the main entry on the East elevation would not change and that the ornamental iron work at the entry would not be installed.

Approve and Ordinance Declaring Certain Personal Property Owned by the Village as Surplus and Sale at Public Auction

Chief Bloom stated that the Police Department is requesting that a seized semi-trailer dump truck and tractor be declared surplus and sold at auction. The seizure occurred in 2007 and the vehicle has been in storage awaiting adjudication. The vehicle will be sold on E-Bay.

Trustee Angelo moved to recommend that the Village Board approve an ordinance declaring property as surplus and approving the sale of the surplus property at the Internet website E-Bay by public auction. Seconded by Trustee Elder. Motion passed unanimously.

Approve an Ordinance Allowing the Installation of Multi-way Stop Signs at the Intersection of Garfield and First Streets

Chief Bloom presented the findings of a traffic study conducted on the intersection of First and Garfield. In summary, the study was initiated following a recent crash involving a pedestrian and after receiving multiple requests from residents requesting the installation of a multi-way stop sign.

Chief Bloom stated, the data collected for this study shows that the warrants for the installation of a multi-way sign have not been met related to crashes and vehicular volumes. However, the study found particular sight obstructions that are not correctable are in place. This, coupled with increased pedestrian use that peaks during times when we have experienced crashes meets the optional guidance section 2B.07 of the MUTCD related to multi-way stops. Additionally, the study showed that the installation of a multi-way sign would likely address the uncorrectable sight obstructions thus making the intersection safer and preventing additional accidents. It should be noted that in three (3) or the last five (5) crashes sight obstructions were a noted factor. The site obstructions come from two areas, the first are the presence of delivery trucks and the second are vehicles queued in the roadway awaiting to turn. The width of the roadway also makes it possible for cars to pass a stopped vehicle on the right.

Additionally, Garfield is the busiest N/S street in the Village with over 10,000 cars a day using it. Moreover, Chief Bloom further stated we have seen a significant increase in middle school pedestrians due to a hot dog stand on the corner. Chief Bloom stated that the only way to address the site obstructions and improve the safety at the intersection is to install a multi-way stop sign. One concern however is the potential for southbound traffic to back up on the railroad right-of-way. This was also a concern prior to the installation of a multi-way stop sign at First and Lincoln. Although there is a greater distance between the tracks and First and Garfield there is also a higher traffic volume and with no accurate way to predict this impact of this change it is something that we will monitor following installation of the multi-way stop sign.

The Committee had a brief discussion and supported the recommendation.

Trustee Haarlow moved to recommend that the Board of Trustees approve an Ordinance Allowing the Installation of Multi-way Stop Signs at the Intersection of Garfield and First Streets. Trustee Elder seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Discussion Items

Parking Regulations on Third Street between Grant and Vine Streets

Mr. and Mrs. Bemis requested that the "No Parking between signs" that were installed to address the issue of cars blocking their driveway be removed. The Bemis's also requested that the curb be painted on the corner to better indicate the no parking area and lastly, requested that parking space lines be painted on the street to better designate parking spaces.

The Committee had a brief discussion and directed staff to have the signs removed and parking spaces lines be painted on the street on both sides of the Bemis driveway on Third Street.

AT&T Co-located Cellular Antennas

Though not on the agenda, Chairman Saigh raised the issue of the application from AT&T that was withdrawn for the installation of cellular antennas on ComEd utility poles. He gave some brief history on the application and why it was withdrawn. He stated that a resident had researched this and contended that the Village did have some authority over the installation. He stated that the Village Manager was having the village attorneys research the matter. He stated that the resident

that raised this wanted to make sure that the Village Board was aware of this and that this residents fear was that other carriers would try to locate their antennas on ComEd poles as well.

Trustee Elder stated that the Village should look into means to control these installations moving forward.

Trustee Angelo asked about permits and why they were issued, or even applied for, if AT&T did not feel that approvals were required. Trustee Haarlow concurred with this.

Dave Cook mentioned that permits were issued based on the legal opinion proffered by the Village Attorney.

Bill Haarlow stated that this should have come back for further discussion before the permits were issued whether requested or not.

The Trustees agreed that given the elements of confidentiality tied to this issue, that it be tabled for now.

Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Committee, Chairman Saigh asked for a motion to adjourn. Trustee Elder made the motion and Trustee Angelo seconded. Meeting adjourned at 9:05PM.

Respectfully Submitted,



Robert McGinnis, MCP
Director of Community Development/Building Commissioner

Memorandum

To: Chairman Saigh and Public Safety Committee

From: Robert McGinnis MCP, Community Development Director/Building Commissioner 

Date: February 6, 2012

Re: **Community Development Department Monthly Report-January 2012**

In the month of January the department issued 49 permits. The department conducted 346 inspections and revenue for the month came in at just over \$ 45,000. Plan review turnaround is running between two and three weeks.

There are approximately 52 applications in house including 10 single family homes and 6 commercial alterations. There are 11 permits ready to issue at this time.

The Engineering Division has continued to work with the Building Division in order to complete site inspections, monitor current engineering projects, support efforts to obtain additional state and federal funding, and respond to drainage complaint calls. In total, 66 inspections were performed for the month of January by the division.

We currently have 40 vacant properties on our registry list. The department continues to pursue owners of vacant and blighted properties to either demolish them and restore the lots or come into compliance with the property maintenance code.

A Temporary Occupancy Certificate was issued for the Patient Pavilion portion of the Hinsdale Hospital project last week. The permit for the Helistop is approved and ready to be issued. This portion of the work is expected to take roughly three months to complete.

Work continues at the Hamptons of Hinsdale project with the first condo building on Lot 6 nearing completion. We expect that final inspections will be scheduled for the models and common areas in this building shortly. Work continues on the townhouse building on Lot 9 with the shell erected and rough mechanicals being installed at this time.

The second review for the Eden's project at 10 N. Washington was completed last week and has been forwarded to the applicant for review and correction. We hope that the second resubmittal will address the balance of comments and afford us the ability to issue the permit for this project.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MONTHLY REPORT - January 2012

PERMITS	THIS MONTH	THIS MONTH LAST YEAR	FEES	FY TO DATE	TOTAL LAST FY TO DATE
New Single Family Homes	0	3	\$ -		
New Multi Family Homes	0	0	\$ -		
Residential Addns./Alts.	10	11	\$ 26,578.75		
Commercial New	0	0	\$ -		
Commercial Addns./Alts.	3	4	\$ 3,640.00		
Miscellaneous	12	5	\$ 5,933.00		
Demolitions	0	3	\$ 3,000.00		
Total Building Permits	25	26	\$ 39,151.75	\$ 630,176.86	\$ 775,197.95
Total Electrical Permits	13	21	\$ 3,605.00	\$ 65,037.50	\$ 120,344.00
Total Plumbing Permits	11	18	\$ 3,080.00	\$ 125,232.90	\$ 146,131.65
TOTALS	49	65	\$ 45,836.75	\$ 820,447.26	\$ 1,041,673.00

Citations				\$ 500.00	
Vacant Properties	40				

INSPECTIONS	THIS MONTH	THIS MONTH LAST YEAR			
Building Insp.	143	163			
Electric Insp.	48	66			
Plumbing Insp.	31	28			
Property Maint./Site Mgmt.	58	54			
Engineering Insp.	66	44			
TOTALS	346	355			

REMARKS:

Robert McGinnis

From: Kelly Anbach
Sent: Wednesday, February 01, 2012 9:29 AM
To: Robert McGinnis
Subject: Monthly stats - January, 2012

Property Maintenance	18
site inspections	40
plan review	9

Vacant property registry 40

Kelly Anbach
Code Enforcement Officer
Village of Hinsdale
Office 630-789-7012
Fax: 630-789-7016
e-mail: kanbach@villageofhinsdale.org

VILLAGE OF HINSDALE - JANUARY 24, 2012 COURT CALL/RESULT

Name	Ticket NO.	Location	Violation	
Espinoza, Odeta	8735	Kelly	909 S. Madison	Property Maintenance Counts 1 -16
Nix-Purpura, Kelli, L	8732	Kelly	804 S. Madison	Failure to obtain a permit
Peterson, James S	8714	Kelly	314 The Lane	Counts 1 - 3 property maintenance
Re/Max Elite	8722	Kelly	28 W. Hinsdale Ave	Failure to obtain a sign permit
Schilling, Joseph H	8721	Kelly	5511 S. Garfield	Failure to maintain driveway in operable condition
				No Show
				250
				Continue 2-28
				250 +apply for permit
				No Show

Fines assessed:


STOP WORK ORDERS ASSESSED

Date SWO Issued to Address Reason

SWO assessed:

MONTHLY TOTAL:

\$500⁰⁰



**VILLAGE
OF HINSDALE** FOUNDED IN 1873

POLICE DEPARTMENT 789-7070
FIRE DEPARTMENT 789-7060
121 N. M. SYMONDS DRIVE

FIRE AND POLICE SERVICES

MONTHLY REPORT

January 2012



POLICE SERVICES MONTHLY REPORT

JANUARY 2012

CRIME PREVENTION ACTIVITY

JANUARY 2012

D.A.R.E. (DRUG ABUSE RESISTANCE EDUCATION)

January 6, 13, 27	9 classes	Madison School
January 9, 23, 30	9 classes	St. Isaac Jogues School

A 13-week D.A.R.E. Program is presented in all fifth grade classrooms in Hinsdale Public Schools and in sixth grade classrooms in the Hinsdale Parochial Schools. Topics include making good decisions, consequences and alcohol, drug, tobacco awareness and resistance.

On January 3, 2012, Officer Coughlin met with a juvenile and his parent about his alcohol arrest. Officer Coughlin explained the peer jury program to them and gave them a peer jury hearing date.

On January 4, 2012, Officer Coughlin attended the DJOA board meeting in Wheaton. Topics covered were upcoming January 2012 Juvenile Legal Update, February 2012 Spectrum Disorder and Autism, upcoming trainings and board meetings and the fall training conference.

On January 4, 2012, Officer Coughlin met with a juvenile and his parent about an alcohol arrest. Officer Coughlin explained the peer jury program to them and gave them a peer jury hearing date.

On January 5, 2012, Officer Coughlin met Clarendon Hills Officer Talerico and Burr Ridge Officer Zuccherro at the Burr Ridge Police Department to discuss the upcoming DARE Lock In.

On January 5, 2012, Officer Coughlin met with a juvenile and her parent about an alcohol arrest. Officer Coughlin explained the peer jury program to them and gave them a peer jury hearing date.

On January 6, 2012, Officer Coughlin met with 7th grade teachers at Hinsdale Middle School to discuss a presentation on the Bill of Rights, Supreme Court cases and how the amendments affect the role of police officers.

On January 9, 2012, Officer Coughlin presented the 8th grade DARE Graduation at St. Isaac Jogues School. Officer Coughlin arranged to have four recovering teen patients from Abraxix Interventions speak with the students. The four teens spoke of their former drug and alcohol abuse and advised the graduates not to get involved with any of these. The teens then answered many questions from the eighth graders. Lemont K-9 Officer Kondrat then brought his K-9 partner into the school and explained the dog's training and its role. They also did a presentation where his dog found pseudo drugs that were hidden around the stage. Officer Coughlin also gave a power point presentation of the time spent in the classroom teaching, at lunch and photos from 6th grade DARE and 7th grade VEGA. Chief Bloom and Principal Cronquist then addressed the students and certificates were handed out to all graduates.

On January 11, 2012, Officer Coughlin performed a home security inspection on south Garfield Street. Officer Coughlin walked the exterior of the house with the resident and gave tips on how to keep her house safe. Officer Coughlin then went through the interior of the residence and gave valuable tips on inside security.

On January 11, 2012, Officer Coughlin visited a group of Webelo scouts at St. Isaac Jogues School. Officer Coughlin spoke about staying away from alcohol, tobacco and drugs, spoke about the role of a police officer, how to stay safe and answered many questions from the scouts.

On January 12, 2012, Officer Rauen assisted Darien Police Department with the execution of a Search Warrant. The suspect was arrested for producing bootlegged video games and movies. The Darien Police Department asked if we could assist with the dismantling of the suspect's computers, as well as packaging the seized equipment.

On January 13, 2012, Officer Rauen assisted with a Science Class at Hinsdale Central High School. SRO Keller and Officer Rauen participated in a mock crime scene and it was up to the students to determine through Science who the actual criminal was.

On January 13, 2012 Officer Coughlin spoke to one fifth grade class at Oak school about the upcoming DARE program and the DARE Lock In.

On January 17th, 2012 Officer Rauen participated in a meeting at the Lisle Police Department to discuss our Computer Forensic Unit. We discussed current case load, upcoming trainings, and future budget items.

On January 17, 2012 Officer Coughlin met with Oak School Principal Walsh and the fifth grade teachers to coordinate this years teaching schedule.

On January 18, 2012 Officer Coughlin spoke with 3 sixth grade classes at St. Isaac Jogues School about the upcoming DARE Lock In.

On January 18, 2012 Officer Coughlin spoke with 3 fifth grade classes at Monroe School about the upcoming DARE program and the DARE Lock In.

On January 18th and 20th, 2012 Officer Rauen assisted the patrol division and covered the street from 6pm-6am.

On January 18, 2012 Officer Coughlin attended the boys Hinsdale Middle School VS Clarendon Hills Middle School basketball game at Hinsdale Central high school. Officer Coughlin spoke with many students and parents from all the grade schools in both.

On January 19, 2012 Officer Coughlin spoke with 1 fifth grade classes at Monroe School about the upcoming DARE program and the DARE Lock In.

On January 19, 2012 Officer Coughlin spoke to 2 fifth grade classes at Oak school about the upcoming DARE program and the DARE Lock In.

On January 20, 2012 Officer Coughlin assisted the patrol division and covered the street from 6am-6pm.

On January 25, 2012 Officers Coughlin, Keller and Rauen attended D.J.O.A. meeting in Wheaton. The topic of training was the Juvenile law Legal up date for 2012 and was presented by Village Prosecutor Linda Pieczynski.

On January 25, 2012, Officer Rauen attended the quarterly FIAT Meeting at Burr Ridge PD. Officer Rauen presented the Computer Forensics Annual Report to the FIAT Board.

On January 26, 2012, Officer Coughlin spoke to the classes at The Lane School about the upcoming DARE program and the DARE Lock-In.

On January 26, 2012, Officer Coughlin attended the District 181 Safety Committee meeting at Elm School. Topics covered were the updating of crisis manuals, earthquake drill day, door stickers for all schools and inclement weather procedures for school busses.

On January 31, 2012, Officer Coughlin met with a Madison School first grader and his mom at our Police Department. The student interviewed Officer Coughlin for a school project, and Officer Coughlin gave him a brief station tour and introduced him to other police officers.

On January 6, 13, 27, 2012, Officer Coughlin walked the Business District monitoring the behavior of middle school students. Officer Coughlin spoke with teens, shoppers, business owners and handled any incidents related to the students.


On January 18, 19, 23, 24, 25, 31, 2012, Officer Coughlin chaperoned four teens performing community service at our police department.

Submitted by:

Officer Michael Coughlin
Crime Prevention/DARE/Juvenile

Officer Joseph Rauhen
Detective/Juvenile/Computer Forensic Examiner

Hinsdale Police Department
Selective Enforcement Citation Activity
 January 2012



TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT

JANUARY 2012

* Includes Citations and Warnings

	This Month	This Month Last Year	YTD	Last YTD
Speeding	154	176	154	176
Disobeyed Traffic Control Device	10	23	10	23
Improper Lane Usage	42	35	42	35
Insurance Violation	19	17	19	17
Registration Offense	68	30	68	30
Seatbelt Violation	17	24	17	24
Stop Signs	58	38	58	38
Yield Violation	18	11	18	11
No Valid License	5	3	5	3
Railroad Violation	1	2	1	2
Suspended/Revoked License	6	7	6	7
Other	80	121	80	121
TOTALS	478	487	478	487

Investigations Division Summary


January 2012

- On January 4, 2012, a 38-year-old Frankfort man was charged with two counts of **Domestic Battery**. The man is alleged to have hit a female family member in the head and hand, while visiting a patient at Hinsdale Hospital. The man was transported to DuPage County Jail.
- On January 5, 2012, a 23-year-old Countryside man was charged with one count of **Unlawful Possession of Cannabis** and numerous traffic charges. The man was stopped by officers who could smell a strong odor of cannabis in the vehicle, and observed an open bottle of vodka. The man was released after posting bond.
- On January 6, 2012, a 27-year-old Alsip woman surrendered herself in open court at the Wheaton Judicial Center. The woman had been involved in a series of events including a reckless driving complaint, traffic crash, and battery. The woman was charged with one count of **Unlawful Possession of a Controlled Substance**, one count of **Driving Under the Influence of a Controlled Substance**, three counts of **Battery**, and one count of **Failure to Yield**. The woman was released after posting bond.
- On January 17, 2012, a 25-year-old Chicago man was charged with one count of **Obstruction of Identification**, and one count of **Driving While License Suspended**. The man provided his brother's name in an attempt to avoid arrest. The man was fingerprinted, which revealed his true identity. The man was released after posting bond.
- On January 19, 2012, a 47-year-old Hinsdale woman was charged with two counts of **Domestic Battery**. The female is alleged to have pinched the rib cage area after an argument with a male family member over trimming the nails of a minor child. The female was transported to DuPage County Jail for a bond hearing.
- On January 26, 2012, a 60-year-old Chicago man was charged with one count of **Unlawful Possession of Cannabis**, and traffic charges. The man was taken into custody for having a suspended license, and the cannabis was found incident to the arrest. The man was released after posting bond.

Submitted by:

Erik Bernholdt
Detective Sergeant

BURGLARIES JANUARY 2012



Burglaries



Burglaries from Motor Vehicles

MONTHLY OFFENSE REPORT

JANUARY 2012

CRIME INDEX	This Month	This Mo. Last Yr.	Yr. to Date	Last Yr. to Date
1. Criminal Homicide	0	0	0	0
2. Criminal Sexual Assault/Abuse	0	0	0	0
3. Robbery	0	0	0	0
4. Assault and Battery, Aggravated	0	0	0	0
5. Burglary	3	3	3	3
6. Theft	8	11	8	11
7. Auto Theft	0	1	0	1
8. Arson	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	11	15	11	15

SERVICE CALLS—JANUARY 2012

	This Month	This Month Last Year	This Year to Date	Last Year To Date	% CHANGE
Sex Crimes	0	0	0	0	0
Robbery	0	0	0	0	0
Assault/Battery	1	1	1	1	0
Domestic Violence	8	9	8	9	-11
Burglary	0	0	0	0	0
Residential Burglary	1	3	1	3	-67
Burglary from Motor Vehicle	0	3	0	3	-100
Theft	10	7	10	7	43
Retail Theft	0	0	0	0	0
Identity Theft	3	2	3	2	50
Auto Theft	2	1	2	1	100
Arson/Explosives	0	0	0	0	0
Deceptive Practice	1	0	1	0	100
Forgery/Fraud	2	1	2	1	100
Criminal Damage to Property	7	4	7	4	75
Criminal Trespass	0	0	0	0	0
Disorderly Conduct	2	2	2	2	0
Harassment	2	5	2	5	-60
Death Investigations	1	0	1	0	100
Drug Offenses	2	4	2	4	-50
Minor Alcohol/Tobacco Offenses	2	0	2	0	200
Juvenile Problems	10	14	10	14	-29
Reckless Driving	0	1	0	1	-100
Hit and Run	8	5	8	5	60
Traffic Offenses	9	9	9	9	0
Motorist Assist	21	37	21	37	-43
Abandoned Motor Vehicle	1	1	1	1	0
Parking Complaint	11	12	11	12	-8
Auto Accidents	37	57	37	57	-35
Assistance to Outside Agency	15	29	15	29	-48
Noise complaints	6	16	6	16	-63
Vehicle Lockout	25	29	25	29	-14
Fire/Ambulance Assistance	71	146	71	146	-51
Alarm Activations	109	82	109	82	33
Open Door Investigations	3	2	3	2	50
Lost/Found Articles	6	11	6	11	-45
Runaway/Missing Persons	4	1	4	1	300
Suspicious Auto/Person	53	60	53	60	-12
Disturbance	4	7	4	7	-43
911 hangup/misdial	73	60	73	60	22
Animal Complaints	25	21	25	21	19
Citizen Assists	37	39	37	39	-5
Solicitors	8	6	8	6	33
Community Contacts	1	1	1	1	0
Curfew/Truancy	1	1	1	1	0
Overnight Parking	217	205	217	205	6
Other	221	80	221	80	176
TOTALS	1,020	705	1,020	705	45

Hinsdale Police Department
Training Summary
January 2012

- All officers completed their monthly legal update. Topics included: **New Laws, Criminal Trespass to a Safe School Zone, Discharging a Laser at an Aircraft, Forgery, Identity Theft, Child Abuse – Mandatory Reporting.**
- January 9-10, 2012—Sergeant Jirasek attended the **FTO Refresher, Sokolove Model**, sponsored by NEMRT.
- January 10 & 24, 2012—Officer Hayes and Lillie attended the monthly **SWAT training**.
- January 11, 2012—Deputy Chief Simpson attended a half-day seminar on **SMLP “Mentoring”** offered through Northwestern University Center for Public Safety.
- January 12, 2012—Meter Enforcement Officers Davis and Tountas successfully completed **LEADS Practitioner**, offered by Illinois State Police.
- January 12, 2012—Officer Hayes attended a one-day seminar entitled **Essentials of Teaching Adults**, sponsored by NEMRT,
- January 12, 2012—Officer Kowal attended a one-day seminar entitled **De-Escalating Juvenile Aggression**, sponsored by NEMRT.
- January 17-18, 2012—The following officers, Lennox, Cogger, Leuver, Lillie, Kowal, Homolka, and Krefft, completed a **report writing** class sponsored by the HPD taught by Sussex Management Associates.
- January 19-20, 2012—The following officers, Lamb, Davenport, Yehl, Jirasek, Hayes, Susmarski, Keller, and Washburn, completed a **report writing** class sponsored by HPD taught by Sussex Management Associates.
- January 26-27, 2012—Part-time clerk Lauren Madon attended **Proper Lock-Up Procedures for Female Arrestees by Female Personnel**, sponsored by NEMRT.
- January 26, 2012—Deputy Chief Wodka and Officer Hayes attended a training seminar **Train the Trainer on Starcom Training** sponsored by the ETSB.
- January 30, 2012—Sergeant Lamb completed an independent study course **NIMS Communications and Information Management** sponsored by FEMA.
- The following officers successfully completed **LEADS Less Than Full Access Recertification**, on the following dates:

Davenport	January 3, 2012
Homolka	January 3, 2012
Holecek	January 9, 2012
- The following officers successfully completed their breath operator recertification, sponsored by the Illinois State Police:

Yehl	January 17, 2012
Jirasek	January 30, 2012

Submitted by:

Mark Mandarino, Sergeant
Training Coordinator

January 2012 Collision Summary

All Collisions at Intersections			
LOCATION	This Month	Last 12 Months	Last 5 Years
County Line & Fuller	1	2	3
Elm & Ogden	1	3	19
Lincoln & Fifth	1	1	7
Monroe & Chestnut	1	1	12
Monroe & Eighth	1	2	3
Oak & Ogden	2	4	12
Oak & The Lane	1	1	4
Rt. 83 & 55th	1	9	57
Thurlow & Fourth	1	1	6
York & Ogden	1	6	48
TOTALS	10	35	171

Right Angle Collisions at Intersections			
LOCATION	This Month	Last 12 Months	Last 5 Years
Elm & Ogden	1	2	12
Lincoln & Fifth	1	1	7
Monroe & Chestnut	1	4	10
Monroe & Eighth	1	2	3
Oak & Ogden	2	2	6
Oak & The Lane	1	1	4
Rt. 83 & 55th	1	5	24
Thurlow & Fourth	1	1	6
York & Ogden	1	3	24
TOTALS	10	21	96

Contributing Factors and Collision Types			
Contributing Factors:		Collision Types:	
Failure to yield	11	Private property	8
Improper backing	4	Hit and run	7
Failure to reduce speed	7	Crashes at intersections	12
Following too closely	2	Personal injury	3
Driving skills/ knowledge	1	Pedestrian	1
Improper passing	0	Bicyclist	0
Too fast for conditions	1	Other	7
Improper turning	4		
Disobeyed traffic control device	1		
Improper lane usage	1		
Had been drinking	0		
Weather related	1		
Vehicle equipment	0		
Unable to determine	3		
Other	2		
TOTALS	47		

Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices Warrants

January 2012

The following warrants should be met prior to installation of a **two-way** stop sign:

1. Intersection of a less important road with a main road where application of the normal right-of-way rule would not be expected to provide reasonable compliance with the law;
2. Street entering a through highway or street;
3. Unsignalized intersection in a signalized area; and/or
4. High speeds, restricted view, or crash records indicate a need for control by the STOP sign (defined by 5 or more collisions within a 12-month period).

The following warrants should be met prior to the installation of a **Multiway** stop sign:

1. Where traffic control signals are justified, the multiway stop is an interim measure that can be installed quickly to control traffic while arrangements are being made for the installation of the traffic control signal.
2. A crash problem, as indicated by 5 or more reported crashes in a 12-month period, that is susceptible to correction by a multiway stop installation. Such crashes include right-turn and left-turn collisions as well as right-angle collisions.
3. Minimum volumes:
 - a. The vehicular volume entering the intersection from the major street approaches (total of both approaches) averages at least 300 vehicles per hour for any 8 hours of an average day, and
 - b. The combined vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle volume entering the intersection from the minor street approaches (total of both approaches) averages at least 200 units per hour for the same 8 hours, with an average delay to minor-street vehicular traffic of at least 30 seconds per vehicle during the highest hour, but
 - c. If the 85th-percentile approach speed of the major-street traffic exceeds 65 km/h or exceeds 40 mph, the minimum vehicular volume warrants are 70 percent of the above values.
4. Where no single criterion is satisfied, but where Criteria 2, 3.a, and 3.b are all satisfied to 80 percent of the minimum values. Criterion 3.c is excluded from this condition.

Option:

Other criteria that may be considered in an engineering study include:

1. The need to control left-turn conflicts;
2. The need to control vehicle/pedestrian conflicts near locations that generate high-pedestrian volumes;
3. Locations where a road user, after stopping, cannot see conflicting traffic and is not able to reasonably safely negotiate the intersection unless conflicting cross traffic is also required to stop; and
4. An intersection of two residential neighborhood collector (through) streets of similar design and operating characteristics where multiway stop control would improve traffic operational characteristics of the intersection.

The following warrants must be met prior to the installation of a **Yield** sign:

1. On a minor road at the entrance to an intersection where it is necessary to assign right-of-way to the major road, but where a stop sign is not necessary at all times, and where the safe approach speed on the minor road exceeds 10 miles per hour;
2. On the entrance ramp to an expressway where an acceleration ramp is not provided;
3. Within an intersection with a divided highway, where a STOP sign is present at the entrance to the first roadway and further control is necessary at the entrance between the two roadways, and where the median width between the acceleration lane; and
4. At an intersection where a special problem exists and where an engineering study indicates the problem to be susceptible to correction by use of the YIELD sign.

PARKING CITATIONS—JANUARY 2012

PARKING CITATIONS BY LOCATION

		This Month	This Month Last Year	YTD	Last YTD
Chestnut Lot	<i>Commuter Permit</i>	34	31	34	31
Highland Lot	<i>Commuter Permit</i>	39	0	39	0
Village Lot	<i>Commuter Permit</i>	97	15	97	15
Washington Lot	<i>Merchant Permit</i>	31	43	31	43
Hinsdale Avenue	<i>Parking Meters</i>	270	287	270	287
First Street	<i>Parking Meters</i>	291	331	291	331
Washington Street	<i>Parking Meters</i>	460	324	460	324
Lincoln Street	<i>Parking Meters</i>	20	43	20	43
Garfield Lot	<i>Parking Meters</i>	152	34	152	34
Other		445	438	445	438
TOTALS		1,839	1,546	1,839	1,546

VIOLATIONS BY TYPE

	This Month	This Month Last Year	YTD	Last YTD
Parking Violations				
METER VIOLATIONS	1,202	1,098	1,202	1,098
HANDICAPPED PARKING	4	5	4	5
NO PARKING 7AM-9AM	30	24	30	24
NO PARKING 2AM-6AM	132	73	132	73
PARKED WHERE PROHIBITED BY SIGN	32	64	32	64
NO VALID PARKING PERMIT	139	7	139	7
TOTAL PARKING VIOLATIONS	1,539	1,271	1,539	1,271
Vehicle Violations				
VILLAGE STICKER	85	39	85	39
REGISTRATION OFFENSE	101	135	101	135
VEHICLE EQUIPMENT	23	42	23	42
TOTAL VEHICLE VIOLATIONS	209	216	209	216
Animal Violations	1	9	1	9

Youth Bureau Summary

January 2012

On January 1, 2012, at approximately 12:09am, a patrol officer was dispatched to the area of the 10 block of east Sixth Street for a report of a young male juvenile walking through backyards. The officer located the male juvenile and made contact with him. The officer immediately detected an odor of alcoholic beverage on the male juvenile. He was taken into custody, brought back to the station, and then released to his mother and assigned to Peer Jury.

On January 13, 2012, at approximately 11:10am, a student approached the School Resource Officer at Hinsdale Central High School and advised him her I-Pod was stolen from the cafeteria. The School Resource Officer reviewed the video camera system for the cafeteria and observed the victim leave the cafeteria and another female student walked up and took the I-Pod. The officer made contact with this student and she admitted to taking the I-Pod. She was assigned Peer Jury for her first time offense.

On January 9, 2012, at 11:55am, the School Resource Officer was notified by radio there was a fight in the cafeteria. When the officer arrived in the cafeteria, the fight had been broken up which was between two female juveniles. The fight had started because one of the girls had made negative comments towards the other girl via Facebook. The first offender walked up to the other girl and shouldered her while she was in line for food. The other girl threw a handful of pasta at the girl who shouldered her which started a physical fight between them. The fight was broken up and they were taken down to the dean's office. Both girls were charged with fighting and were sent to court.

On January 9, 2012, between the hours of 3:00-5:00pm, a student at Hinsdale Central had \$200 stolen out of his wallet while he had it in his gym locker. The student reported this to the School Resource Officer who began his investigation with the Dean of Students. They watched the surveillance video that lead to the entrance of the locker room and identified a few students who went in and out of the locker room. They interviewed all the students who went in and out of the locker room during this time frame and were able to identify the suspect. The money was returned and the male juvenile who stole the money was charged with theft and sent through Peer Jury program.

On January 12, 2012, two patrol officers responded to Hinsdale Central HS for a suicidal juvenile. The officer met with a Hinsdale Central Guidance Counselor who stated a male juvenile was attempting to hang himself. He was doing this because he had been dating a female juvenile and when they broke up he became very upset. The Guidance Counselor did not witness the male juvenile subject trying to hang himself. This information was relayed to the Guidance Counselor by his ex-girlfriend, who stated when she broke up with the male subject he took off his belt and placed it around his neck. The male subject closed a locker on the end of the belt, and slumped against the belt, creating pressure on his neck. The male subject's face became discolored, and the ex-girlfriend ran to notify Hinsdale Central Guidance Counselors. The ex-girlfriend was no longer on the scene, as well as the male juvenile who tried to


commit suicide. The officers searched the area as well as his house and could not locate the missing juvenile. The juvenile was entered into a nationwide computer system, LEADS, as a missing person. A few hours later the mother of the juvenile stated he had returned home. The officers met with the juvenile and his parents and discussed the situation. They agreed to take him to see his counselor in the morning and they left the scene.

Submitted by:


Joseph Rauen
Detective/Youth Officer

Hinsdale Police Department Juvenile Monthly Report January 2012

AGE AND SEX OF OFFENDERS




DISPOSITION OF CASES




Juvenile Monthly Report (cont.) **January 2012**

DISPOSITION BY OFFENSE TYPE



Hinsdale Police Department
Juvenile Monthly Offenses Total Offenses by Offense Type
 January 2012





Social Networking Monthly Status Report

January 2012

The Hinsdale Police Department continues to publicly advocate its community notification via social media. During the past reporting period, posts were disseminated on the following topics:

Announcement of Holiday Lobby hours for the police department
Announcement of passing of retired Hinsdale Police Sergeant Ed Kubisch
Crime alert regarding a residential burglary occurring January 7
Crime alert regarding an attempted residential burglary occurring January 26
Traffic advisory for snow driving conditions
Utility and Traffic advisory regarding a crash at 59th & Madison which may have caused possible telephone outages in the immediate area
Community notification of pedestrian safety videos that are available online for download
Notice of overnight parking ban due to snowfall
Announcement of Safety Village registration
Traffic advisory regarding railroad gate malfunctions
Community notification regarding suspicious incident occurring in Burr Ridge
Traffic advisory regarding installation of new 4-way stop intersection at 1st & Garfield

<u>Number of Followers</u>		
	Jan. 2012	July 2011
	170	101
	163	72



Hinsdale Fire Department Monthly Report January 2012



Emergency Response

In January, the Hinsdale Fire Department responded to a total of 197 requests for assistance for a total of 197 responses this calendar year. There were 36 simultaneous responses and FOUR train delays this month. The responses are divided into three basic categories as follows:

<i>Type of Response</i>	<i>January 2012</i>	<i>% of Total</i>	<i>January 2011</i>
Fire: (Includes activated fire alarms, fire and reports of smoke)	79	40.1%	87
Ambulance: (Includes ambulance requests, vehicle accidents and patient assists)	86	43.7%	90
Emergency: (Includes calls for hazardous conditions, rescues, service calls and extrications)	32	16.2%	26
Simultaneous: (Responses while another call is on- going. Number is included in total)	36	18%	42
Train Delay: (Number is included in total)	4	2%	5
Total:	197	100%	203

Year to Date Totals

Fire: 79 Ambulance: 86 Emergency: 32

2012 Total: 197

2011 Total: 203




Hinsdale Fire Department Monthly Report January 2012




Emergency Response

**Type of Responses
Year to Date**



Total Calls for January






Hinsdale Fire Department Monthly Report January 2012




Emergency Response

Simultaneous Calls



Distribution of Fire Related Calls






Hinsdale Fire Department Monthly Report January 2012




Emergency Response

Distribution of Emergency Related Calls



Distribution of EMS Related Calls





***Hinsdale Fire Department
Monthly Report
January 2012***



Incidents of Interest

- On January 11, the Department responded to the report of a snowblower on fire. On arrival, the snowblower was fully involved in fire and not located near any structure. The fire was extinguished.
- On January 13, the Department responded to the activated fire alarm at Hinsdale Hospital. On arrival, crews found a large amount of smoke in the hallway of the B2 level. The cause of the smoke was due to workers who were working on the HVAC system and caused a flash fire. The fire was extinguished and crews worked to limit the spread of smoke and clear the smoke from the building. The Department was assisted by the Clarendon Hills FD and the Western Springs FD.
- On January 21, the Department received a call for the report of a smoke odor in a residence in the 300 block of north Washington. Members had previously been to the residence earlier in the evening and did not find any obvious cause for the odor. Members utilized the thermal imaging camera to identify a hot spot in the flooring by the fireplace that was not present earlier. Members removed the flooring to reveal smoldering structural members of the floor. The area was cooled with water and checked for any fire spread.
- On January 23, the Department responded to 1 Grant Square for an activated fire alarm. On arrival, crews found water flowing from a broken fire sprinkler pipe. Members shut down the water supply and worked to remove the accumulated water from the building.
- On January 29, the Department responded to the 900 block of north Madison for the reported stove fire. On arrival, members found that the majority of the fire had been extinguished. Members worked to ensure the fire was out and ventilated the smoke from the structure.



Hinsdale Fire Department Monthly Report January 2012



Training/Events

In January, the members of the Hinsdale Fire Department continued their scheduled fire and EMS training.

Training highlights for the month of January consisted of:

- FF/PM Schaberg and Majewski completed the Leadership I class in Downers Grove. This class is required for certification by the State at the Fire Officer I level
- Lt. Giannelli and FF/PM Niemeyer attended the Tactics and Strategy II class in Countryside. This class is required for certification by the State at the Fire Officer II level.
- Members trained on SCBA proficiency, which included donning the air pack for time and practicing the procedure for changing air bottles in different positions.
- Members reviewed rope and knot tying skills and used these skills to show proficiency in lifting tools and equipment using ropes.
- Department paramedics attended the monthly continuing education program on extreme sports injuries and practiced splinting techniques. All paramedics passed the monthly quiz.
- All Department members completed the Courage To Be Safe program. This program focused on the steps firefighters need to take to prevent on the job injuries and death.
- Department Haz Mat team members trained at Pleasantview FD on various policies and scenarios related to team procedures.
- Department Technical Rescue Team (TRT) members attend the monthly drill on confined space rescue. This training will result in obtaining certification as a confined space technician.
- Department fire investigators attend the monthly training in Westmont. The training involved reviewing the 2011 investigations conducted and electing officers for the upcoming year.
- Department members conducted the annual required training on Haz Mat operations.
- Capt. Votava attended a webinar on conducting a gap analysis for emergency management.




Hinsdale Fire Department Monthly Report January 2012



Prevention Activities

The fire prevention bureau is responsible for conducting a variety of activities designed to educate the public, to prevent fires and emergencies, and to better prepare the public in the event a fire or medical emergency occurs.



Fire Prevention/Safety Education:

- Attended the meeting for District 181 Crisis Safety Plan on January 26, 2012.
- Spent many hours at Hinsdale Hospital testing fire protection systems in the new addition.



Hinsdale Fire Department Monthly Report January 2012



The Survey Says...

Each month, the department sends out surveys to those that we provide service. These surveys are valuable in evaluating the quality of the service we provide and are an opportunity for improvement.

Customer Service Survey Feedback:

We received 32 responses in the month of January with the following results:

Were you satisfied with the response time of our personnel to your emergency?

Yes – 32 / 32

Was the quality of service received:

“Higher” than what I expected – 30 / 32

“About” what I expected – 1 / 32

“Somewhat lower” than I had expected 1 / 32

Miscellaneous Comments:

“With what I can remember, I feel they are very well-trained, very professional & trustworthy. I owe my life to their quick responses, thinking: assessment of the situation. Thank you.”


“They couldn’t have been more thorough, caring, or professional. They even offered to take me to my doctor’s, because I didn’t want to go to the hospital.”

“I was in a connecting building to the hospital. Dr. Sharma’s office, Why did the(sic) need to bring me outside when they could have rolled me down the hall?”

“Service was professional and excellent. I don’t know what I would have done without them.”

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chairman Saigh and the Zoning and Public Safety Committee

FROM: Robert McGinnis MCP, Director of Community Development/Building Commissioner 

DATE: February 23, 2012

RE: **Distributed Antenna Sytems**

Attached is a copy of a legal opinion from Klein, Thorpe, and Jenkins, LTD. regarding the Village's authority to regulate Distributed Antenna Systems. Lance Molina from the firm will be present at the meeting on Monday to answer any questions and offer guidance on how to proceed should the Village wish to assert some additional control of these types of installations moving forward.

Cc: President and Board of Trustees
David Cook, Village Manager



20 N. Wacker Drive, Ste 1660
Chicago, Illinois 60606-2903
T 312 984 6400 F 312 984 6444

15010 S. Ravinia Avenue, Ste 10
Orland Park, Illinois 60462-5353
T 708 349 3888 F 708 349 1506

Direct Dial 312-984-6419

www.ktjlaw.com

MEMORANDUM

To: Dave Cook
From: Michael A. Marrs & Lance C. Malina
Date: February 1, 2012
Re: Authority to Regulate Distributed Antenna Systems

OVERALL ISSUES: You asked us to reduce to writing our opinion regarding the following questions:

- (1) What is the extent of Village authority to regulate the placement and other aspects of Distributed Antenna System ("DAS") installations in the public right-of-way?
- (2) Does the Village, either through the Village Code or Zoning Code, currently have provisions that would operate to regulate DAS installations even though such systems are a relatively new technology?

SHORT ANSWER: (1) The Village may not enact regulations that prohibit or have the effect of prohibiting wireless telecommunications or that unreasonably discriminate among functionally equivalent services. It does, however, have the limited power to regulate certain aspects of telecommunications installations, including construction standards and regulation for location, aesthetics and safety reasons.

(2) While its authority is limited, the Village does presently have some measure of authority over DAS installations in the Village. The existing Zoning Code regulations for personal wireless services antennas are largely inapplicable where the regulations by-and-large seek to regulate installations on zoning lots and/or on buildings as opposed to installations in the public right-of-way. Through existing provisions in the Village Code governing telecommunications and construction in public rights-of-way, however, the Village has a stronger case for regulating some locational and aesthetic aspects of DAS installations in the public right-of-way. The Village also has the ability, through enactment of additional and/or clarifying regulations, to make its authority over placement, aesthetics and safety of such installations more explicit and more comprehensive, should it desire to do so.

BACKGROUND:

A. WHAT IS A DAS?: A Distributed Antenna System is a hybrid network of small wireless antennas and related equipment used to fill in gaps in coverage, especially in high volume areas. Antennas and related equipment that are part of a DAS can be mounted on street light poles, power line poles and similar structures. Their lower height causes them to have a shorter range than traditional antennas, necessitating more installations. The increase in data-hogging smart phones and similar devices has strained the resources of existing networks, leading to an increased need/desire by providers to install DAS on utility poles in public rights-of-way.

B. **POSITIVE EFFECT:** DAS installations provide a means of accommodating the demand for increased capacity without the need for additional numbers of conventional wireless towers. Because DAS installations are less obtrusive than such conventional towers, and result in better wireless service to customers, they are often seen as desirable. Some zoning codes have even built a requirement that persons seeking placement of a conventional cell tower show they explored installation of a DAS first, although ordinances establishing a clear preference for alternate technologies, such as microcells or DAS, have been struck down as interfering with federal jurisdiction over the technical and operational standards applicable to wireless telecommunication facilities. See *New York SMSA Limited Partnership v. Town of Clarkstown*, 612 F.3d 97 (2nd Cir. 2010). Barrington Hills is an example of a Chicago-area community that has such a zoning provision.

C. **NEGATIVES:** The shorter range of DAS necessitates placing them, in some cases, in residential areas. This can create friction with residents, with radio frequency and aesthetics being the major concerns.

D. **GOAL:** The goal for municipalities is to regulate DAS installations without prohibiting them in order to address the concerns of residents, chiefly by facilitating the use of aesthetic installations.

EXISTING FEDERAL REGULATIONS: In general, federal law (the Telecommunications Act of 1996) preserves the authority of local governments over zoning decisions regarding the placement and construction of "personal wireless service facilities." 47 U.S.C. § 332(c)(7). Local governments may not, however, prohibit or effectively prohibit personal wireless service or unreasonably discriminate among providers of functionally equivalent services *Id.* In addition, any regulation on the basis of environmental effects of radio frequency emission is prohibited, so long as the installations comply with FCC regulations in this regard. *Id.* Section 332(c)(7) is often at issue in disputes between municipalities and providers regarding placement of traditional cell phone towers and facilities.

Section 253(a) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 preempts state and local legal requirements that prohibit telecommunications providers from providing services. 47 U.S.C. § 253. This section typically applies to hard line installations in rights-of-way, but wireless providers invoke its protections from time to time as well. Section 253(c) preserves municipal and other authority over right-of-way management and compensation, provided it is nondiscriminatory and competitively neutral.

EXISTING STATE REGULATIONS: Various State laws play some role in DAS installations. Recent Village permittee AT&T Mobility claimed it had the right to install its equipment in the public right-of-way under various federal and State laws where it is a federally licensed telecommunications carrier, and holds a Certificate of Service Authority granted by the ICC under Section 13-401 of the Public Utilities Act. 220 ILCS 5/13-401. AT&T Mobility also noted that it is a telecommunications carrier under Section 13-202 of that Act and provides telecommunications services under Section 13-203 of that Act. Your previous Village Attorney correctly noted that the various State statutes cited by AT&T did NOT give it the absolute right to do what it wants in the right-of-way without Village regulation if the Village chooses to adopt such regulations. Section 4 of the Telephone Company Act (220 ILCS 65/4), for example, recognizes that municipalities have a say about the right-of-way, and Section 30 of the Telecommunications Infrastructure Maintenance Fee Act (35 ILCS 635/30) acknowledges that obligations imposed by law concerning construction and use of the right of way still exist.

EXISTING VILLAGE REGULATIONS:

A. **ZONING REGULATIONS:** An issue faced by many communities is that existing regulation of wireless telecommunications facilities in zoning and other codes are not intended to deal either with new types of technologies and systems like DAS or with their placement in the right-of-way. Such is the case in the Village, where the Zoning Code, in our opinion, does not address DAS installations in the right-of-way in a manner direct enough to withstand scrutiny.

The Village's Zoning Code is generally intended to regulate activity on zoning lots. Public right-of-way, where the DAS installations are located, is not a zoning lot. Placement in the right-of-way is what distinguished the recent installations by AT&T Mobility from traditional cell tower and antenna installations on public or private zoning lots dealt with by the Village previously.

In addition, the antenna regulations the Village's Zoning Code does include are aimed at traditional towers and antenna installations, rather than DAS. This disconnect between existing regulations and these new styles of systems is the same problem being dealt with by municipalities across the country. The fact is that existing regulations in Hinsdale and most other places are, by and large, a poor fit when it comes to regulating DAS systems.

Antennas mounted on existing utility poles do not fit exactly with the definition of accessory use found in Section 9-101 of the Village's Zoning Code. To the extent that the antennas, as mounted on existing utility poles, are deemed to be an accessory use to the principal use of such pole, however, they would be regulated by Article IX of the Zoning Ordinance (District Regulations of General Applicability). Where antenna installations are less than ten square feet in size, they are permitted as an accessory use by Section 9-101(D)(6). Where antenna installations have surface areas exceeding ten square feet, they are permitted as accessory uses if in compliance with additional regulations. Section 9-101(D)(7). Those additional regulations largely contemplate antenna installations that are on a zoning lot or attached to a building. Because the antennas in question are located in a right-of-way, as opposed to a building or zoning lot, the regulations are, by and large, inapplicable.

The Village's Zoning Code also includes regulations relative to antennas for each of the Village's various zoning districts. In some districts, antennas are permitted uses and in others, special uses. But again, these regulations largely contemplate the antennas either being on a zoning lot, and/or attached to a building, rather than located in the right-of-way. While it could be argued that some of the provisions, such as requirements that antennas and support structures be of neutral colors that are harmonious with, and that blend with, the natural features, buildings and structures surrounding such antenna and antenna support structures, should be interpreted as applying to DAS installations, their applicability is not clearly evident when the regulations are considered as a whole. An example of this language can be seen at Section 5-109(E) (regulations for Business Districts).

B. **REGULATION OF CONSTRUCTION OF UTILITY FACILITIES IN RIGHT-OF-WAY AND OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS PROVIDERS:** Independent of the Village's Zoning Code, the Village Code regulates Construction of Utility Facilities in Rights of Way (Title 7, Chapter 1G) and Telecommunications Providers (Title 13). Unlike the Zoning Code, the regulations in Title 7, Chapter 1G have the express purpose of regulating construction of facilities in rights-of-way within the Village's jurisdiction. See Section 7-1G-1. The construction regulations have the stated intent of preserving "the character of the neighborhoods in which

facilities are installed" and of preventing "visual blight from the proliferation of facilities in the rights of way." Within the Chapter, there are appearance standards, which provide the Village with specific authority to "prohibit the installation of facilities in particular locations in order to preserve visual quality." Section 7-1G-15(G). There are other provisions of this Chapter that could be applied to DAS installations as well, such as the requirement in Section 7-1G-15(A)(5) that proposed installations use the smallest suitable vaults, boxes, equipment enclosures, power pedestals and/or cabinets then in use by the facility owner for the particular application.

Also relevant is Title 13, Chapter 1 of the Village Code, which creates general provisions relative to telecommunications providers. Among the stated purposes of these regulations are the establishment of "clear local guidelines, standards and time frames for the exercise of local authority with respect to the regulation of telecommunications providers and services" and to "permit and manage reasonable access to the public ways of the Village for telecommunications purposes on a competitively neutral basis." Section 13-1-1. Section 13-1-2 of the Village Code defines "surplus space" as "[t]hat portion of the usable space on a utility pole which has the necessary clearance from other pole users, as required by the orders and regulations of the Illinois Commerce Commission, to allow its use by a telecommunications carrier for a pole attachment." Both Sections 13-3-9 and 13-4-9 of the Village Code require licensees/franchisees with permission to install overhead facilities to install telecommunications facilities on pole attachments to existing utility poles only, and then only if surplus space is available. Compliance with the various requirements set forth in the construction in right-of-way and telecommunications chapters is accomplished through the permitting process.

QUESTIONS: So, given all of the above, to what extent can the Village control installation of DAS antennas and related equipment in the public right-of-way through its existing regulations, and to what extent could the Village control such installation if it wanted to increase its control.

ANALYSIS: Under the various State and federal regulations governing utilities, rights-of-way and wireless communications, the Village cannot prohibit altogether, or effectively prohibit, access of carriers to use of the existing utility facilities in the public right-of-way for the installation of DAS where such systems are deemed necessary by the carriers. Nor would the Village want to, as the alternative would be additional traditional cell towers within the Village.

The Village does not have a strong case for applying its existing Zoning Code provisions regarding wireless antenna systems to DAS installations in the right of way. As noted, the Village's Zoning Code is not focused on these types of wireless systems, or on regulation of installations within the right-of-way.

However, the Village arguably has some limited existing authority, between the Communications Act, State law, and the various Village Code provisions discussed above, to control aspects of DAS installations within the right-of-way through the permitting process, including placement, construction, safety and aesthetics. We believe that under authority currently present in the Village Code provisions, should the Village express its preferences as to location/placement, safety and aesthetics as part of the permitting process, a carrier would likely work with the Village rather than arguing over authority. For example, while the recent AT&T Mobility application did not acknowledge the Village's authority, AT&T did express a willingness to work with the Village on these issues, including agreeing to raise the installations to a higher point on the utility poles for safety and aesthetic reasons at the request of the Village.


The Village could, we believe, make more explicit its ability to regulate various aspects of DAS installations going forward. To the extent DAS installations are regulated by the Village

today, it is through the permitting process at the staff level. Any more explicit regulations adopted could continue to be administered through the permit process, by placing the regulations in the Village Code chapters on construction in the right-of-way and telecommunications, with appropriate cross-references to those regulations in the Zoning Code. Should the Village feel that more input on such installations from elected or appointed officials and/or residents is necessary, however, it could provide for such input by requiring review of installations by a body such as the Plan Commission, through a public hearing or otherwise. The Plan Commission could be the final decision maker in approving DAS installation approvals, or could make recommendations to the Village Board.

One thing to keep in mind is that any new regulations would need to take into account that federal regulations have imposed what is called the "shotclock." FCC regulations mandate that requests for placement of co-location facilities be acted on within 90 days of an applications submittal, and that new siting applications be acted on within 150 days. Decisions to deny must be in writing and must be supported by "substantial" evidence in a written record. Denials can be challenged in court. While 90-days is a substantial amount of time, the Village must be cognizant of the requirement in development of new regulations, as things like publication requirements or infrequent meetings of the bodies considering the installations could quickly eat up the available time.



While the Village can safely address placement, aesthetics and safety issues relating to personal wireless services under federal law, it cannot prohibit them altogether. The extent to which the "prohibition on service" test from federal law applies to DAS systems however, which are typically installed with the purpose of enhancing data service speeds as opposed to closing gaps in service, is an open legal issue at this point. We would, however, be hesitant to prohibit them altogether in residential districts, as such a prohibition may invite a challenge as those districts are the very areas where increased coverage is likely to be most necessary.

Should the Village desire us to develop regulations explicit to DAS installations, we would be happy to do so.

Two handwritten signatures are present. The top signature is "Michael Morris" in a cursive script. The bottom signature is "James C. Malina" in a cursive script, with a long horizontal flourish extending to the left.

DATE: February 27, 2011

REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION

AGENDA SECTION NUMBER ZONING AND PUBLIC SAFETY		ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT Community Development		
ITEM 49 S. Washington Street - Request: Approval of a Temporary Use for a Pilates Studio		APPROVAL		
<p>The Village has received a request by Tiziana Buzzi, to allow a Pilates Studio as a temporary use on the second floor at 49 S. Washington Street for a period from February 28, 2012 to April 31, 2012 while she applies for a Special Use to operate the facility in this location full time. The Hinsdale Zoning Code provides for <i>Permitted Temporary Uses</i> subject to the specific regulations and time limits as provided for in Section 9-103D of the zoning code and to the other applicable regulations of the district in which the use is permitted. The total period of time granted by such temporary use shall not exceed the period of time as specifically identified for that specific use. Where such uses are not specifically permitted, the Board of Trustees <u>may</u> approve such use, subject to the following regulations:</p> <p>9. <i>Others</i>: In any district, any other temporary use consistent with the purposes of this code and with the purposes and intent of the regulations of the district in which such use is located; provided, however, that any such use shall require the specific prior approval of the board of trustees. The board of trustees shall establish a limitation on the duration of every temporary use approved pursuant to this subsection D9. Any approval granted hereunder shall be deemed to authorize only the particular use for which it was given, and shall not be construed to be any right or entitlement to any subsequent approval hereunder for the applicant or any other person.</p> <p>As identified in the attached letter, the applicant is requesting the temporary use so that she may move forward operating and establishing her business and clientele, while pursuing the appropriate course of action to obtain the Special Use required to legally permit the use. The applicant has indicated that even at full capacity, her largest class would be four clients but also plans to do one-on-one training. The B-2 District currently allows physical fitness facilities in the B-2 as Special Uses as long as they are located above the first floor.</p> <p>Should the Board find the temporary use request to be satisfactory, the following motion would be appropriate:</p> <p>MOTION: Move to approve a permit for a temporary use to operate a pilates studio on the second floor at 49 S. Washington Street for the period of 2/28/12 thru 4/30/12.</p>				
APPROVAL 	APPROVAL	APPROVAL	APPROVAL	MANAGER'S APPROVAL 
COMMITTEE ACTION:				
BOARD ACTION:				

**VILLAGE OF HINSDALE
APPLICATION FOR TEMPORARY USE**

Address of proposed request: 49 1/2 S. WASHINGTON

APPLICATION FOR TEMPORARY USE

The Hinsdale Zoning Code provides for *Permitted Temporary Uses* subject to the specific regulations and time limits as provided for in Section 9-103D of the zoning code and to the other applicable regulations of the district in which the use is permitted. The total period of time granted by such temporary use shall not exceed the period of time as specifically identified for that specific use. Where such uses are not specifically permitted, the Board of Trustees **MAY** approve such use, subject to the following regulations:

9. *Others:* In any district, any other temporary use consistent with the purposes of this code and with the purposes and intent of the regulations of the district in which such use is located; provided, however, that any such use shall require the specific prior approval of the board of trustees. The board of trustees shall establish a limitation on the duration of every temporary use approved pursuant to this subsection D9. Any approval granted hereunder shall be deemed to authorize only the particular use for which it was given, and shall not be construed to be any right or entitlement to any subsequent approval hereunder for the applicant or any other person.

Owner: TIZIANA BUZZI Phone: (630) 605-5226

Date: 01-30-2012, 20

Temporary Use Period Requested:

From: 02-01-2012, 2012 through 04-31, 2012

Nature of Temporary Use Request:

See Attached

Signature of Owner: *Tiziana Buzzi*

Village Manager

Date: _____, 20____

OR

Date of Village Board Approval: _____, 20____

<i>For Office Use Only</i>	
\$100 Fee Paid	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Date:	<u>1/30/12</u>
Received By:	<u><i>[Signature]</i></u>


What do we plan to do when we obtain occupancy?

As my equipment arrives on February 2nd, I plan to store my equipment at 49 South Washington, as agreed to by the landlord, Judy Mann.

I also hope to do some paperwork and "preliminary marketing" in anticipation of receiving the formal permit, as granted by the Trustees of the Village of Hinsdale.

It is my hope to visit with area Childhood Centers, Libraries and Women's organizations in the area to offer "mat" demonstrations **at their locations**.


Aside from unpacking the equipment, I do not plan to teach classes at 49 South Washington as I understand I must obtain a license prior to an official business start.



PLAT OF SURVEY


of

THE SOUTH 66 FEET OF THE NORTH 47 FEET OF LOT 7 IN ROTH'S SUBDIVISION OF LOTS 2, 3, 5, 9, AND 10 IN BLOCK 2 IN HIASDALE, IN PART OF THE NORTH WEST QUARTER OF SECTION 12, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 11, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, IN DU PAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS.



SCALE 15'

WASHINGTON ST. (66')



1ST. ST. (66')

THE SURVEY WAS MADE BY MEASURING THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS. THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS WAS MEASURED BY A TAPE MEASURE. THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS WAS MEASURED BY A TAPE MEASURE.

THE SURVEY WAS MADE BY MEASURING THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS. THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS WAS MEASURED BY A TAPE MEASURE. THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS WAS MEASURED BY A TAPE MEASURE.

THE SURVEY WAS MADE BY MEASURING THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS. THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS WAS MEASURED BY A TAPE MEASURE. THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS WAS MEASURED BY A TAPE MEASURE.

THE SURVEY WAS MADE BY MEASURING THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS. THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS WAS MEASURED BY A TAPE MEASURE. THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS WAS MEASURED BY A TAPE MEASURE.

THE SURVEY WAS MADE BY MEASURING THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS. THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS WAS MEASURED BY A TAPE MEASURE. THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS WAS MEASURED BY A TAPE MEASURE.

THE SURVEY WAS MADE BY MEASURING THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS. THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS WAS MEASURED BY A TAPE MEASURE. THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS WAS MEASURED BY A TAPE MEASURE.

THE SURVEY WAS MADE BY MEASURING THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS. THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS WAS MEASURED BY A TAPE MEASURE. THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS WAS MEASURED BY A TAPE MEASURE.

THE SURVEY WAS MADE BY MEASURING THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS. THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS WAS MEASURED BY A TAPE MEASURE. THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS WAS MEASURED BY A TAPE MEASURE.

THE SURVEY WAS MADE BY MEASURING THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS. THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS WAS MEASURED BY A TAPE MEASURE. THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS WAS MEASURED BY A TAPE MEASURE.

THE SURVEY WAS MADE BY MEASURING THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS. THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS WAS MEASURED BY A TAPE MEASURE. THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS WAS MEASURED BY A TAPE MEASURE.

THE SURVEY WAS MADE BY MEASURING THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS. THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS WAS MEASURED BY A TAPE MEASURE. THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS WAS MEASURED BY A TAPE MEASURE.

THE SURVEY WAS MADE BY MEASURING THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS. THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS WAS MEASURED BY A TAPE MEASURE. THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE CORNERS OF THE LOT AND THE CORNERS OF THE ADJACENT LOTS WAS MEASURED BY A TAPE MEASURE.

IRON PIPES AT ALL CORNERS UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.

JOB NO. 1136

BOOK F-25 PAGE 1

DRAWN BY QWS



CHECKED BY B.L.W.

For Building Restrictions see Township Ordinance No. 15, which reads: "No building shall be erected on any lot in this township except as provided in the following ordinance."

COMPARING ALL POINTS BEFORE BUILDING AND REPORT ANY DIFFERENCE AT ONCE

DATE: February 27, 2012

REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION

AGENDA SECTION NUMBER	ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT Community Development			
ITEM Case A-37-2011– Applicant: the Village of Hinsdale – Request: Text Amendment to Section 12-206 (Definitions), as it relates to the definition of “Attached Garage”.	APPROVAL			
<p>Staff has been asked to define what constitutes an attached vs. detached garage. None of the codes adopted by the Village define this and as result, we have generally relied on the definition in the Dictionary of Architecture and Construction used by the department for many years. We have used this publication rather than to rely on Webster’s, as we felt that their definition was too vague. It should be noted that this has only come up as an issue recently due to what applicants want to do with the spaces over these “attached” garages and the slippery slope our present interpretation creates when it comes to these cases. Our Village Attorney has recommended that we pursue a text amendment to define an “attached garage” in order to avoid confusion and help clarify where in the range of definitions the Village would like to be.</p> <p>Staff feels that the most conservative approach would be to define an “attached garage” as follows; <i>Attached Garage: A garage abutting the principal structure or connected via conditioned area as defined by the building code.</i></p> <p>The 2006 International Residential Code defines “conditioned area” as “That area within a building provided with heating and/or cooling systems or appliances capable of maintaining, through design or heat loss/gain, 68 degrees Fahrenheit during the heating season and/or 80 degrees Fahrenheit during the cooling season, or has a fixed opening directly adjacent to a conditioned area.</p> <p>At the February 8, 2012 Plan Commission meeting the commission reviewed the application submitted by the Village of Hinsdale and recommended approval, on an 8-0 vote (1 absent), the approval for a Text Amendment to Section 12-206 (Definitions), as it relates to the definition of “Attached Garage”.</p> <p>Attached are the draft findings and recommendation from the Plan Commission and the draft ordinance.</p> <p>MOTION: Move that the request be forwarded to the Board of Trustees to approve an “Ordinance Amending Article XII (Applicability and Interpretation), Section 12-206 (Definitions) of the Hinsdale Zoning Code as it Relates to the Definition of “Attached Garage””.</p>				
APPROVAL 	APPROVAL	APPROVAL	APPROVAL	MANAGER’S APPROVAL 
COMMITTEE ACTION:				
BOARD ACTION:				

DRAFT

HINSDALE PLAN COMMISSION

RE: Case A-37-2011 - Applicant: Village of Hinsdale – Request: Text Amendment to Section 12-206 (Definitions), as it relates to the definition of “Attached Garage”.

DATE OF PLAN COMMISSION REVIEW: February 8, 2012

DATE OF ZONING AND PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW: February 27, 2012

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION

I. FINDINGS

1. The Applicant, the Village of Hinsdale, submitted an application to Section 12-206 (Definitions), as it relates to the definition of “Attached Garage”.
2. The Plan Commission heard testimony from Village Staff regarding the proposed text amendment at the Plan Commission meeting of February 8, 2012.
3. Certain Commissioners expressed concerns with the strictness of the language, however they ultimately agreed that the language, as constructed by staff, was appropriate and could be modified at a later date should the need arise.
4. The Plan Commission specifically finds that the Application satisfies the standards in Section 11-601 of the Zoning Code applicable to approval of the amendments.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Village of Hinsdale Plan Commission, by a vote of eight (8) “Ayes”, zero (0) “Nays” and one (1) “Absent” recommends to the President and Board of Trustees that the Hinsdale Zoning Code be amended as proposed.

THE HINSDALE PLAN COMMISSION

By: _____
Chairman

Dated this _____ day of _____, 2012.

VILLAGE OF HINSDALE

ORDINANCE NO. _____

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ARTICLE XII ("APPLICABILITY AND INTERPRETATION"), SECTION 12-206 ("DEFINITIONS") OF THE HINSDALE ZONING CODE AS IT RELATES TO THE DEFINITION OF "ATTACHED GARAGES"

WHEREAS, the Village of Hinsdale (the "Village") has filed an application pursuant to Section 11-601 of the Hinsdale Zoning Code for an amendment to the text of Section 12-206 of the Zoning Code adding a definition of "attached garage" to the Code (the "Application"); and

WHEREAS, the Village's Application has been referred to the Plan Commission of the Village and has been processed in accordance with the Hinsdale Zoning Code, as amended; and

WHEREAS, on February 8, 2012, the Plan Commission held a public hearing on the Application pursuant to notice thereof properly published in *The Hinsdalean*, and, after considering all of the testimony and evidence presented at the public hearing, the Plan Commission recommended approval of the Application by a vote of 8 in favor, 0 against and 1 absent, all as set forth in the Plan Commission's Findings and Recommendation for Plan Commission Case No. A-37-2011 ("Findings and Recommendation"); and

WHEREAS, the Zoning and Public Safety Committee of the Board of Trustees of the Village, at a public meeting on February 27, 2012, considered the Application and the Findings and Recommendation of the Plan Commission and made its recommendation to the Board of Trustees; and

WHEREAS, the President and Board of Trustees of the Village have duly considered the Findings and Recommendation of the Plan Commission, recommendation of the Zoning and Public Safety Committee and all of the facts and circumstances affecting the Application.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED, by the President and Board of Trustees of the Village of Hinsdale, DuPage and Cook Counties and State of Illinois, as follows:

Section 1: Incorporation. Each whereas paragraph set forth above is incorporated by reference into this Section 1.

Section 2: Findings. The President and Board of Trustees, after considering the Findings and Recommendation of the Plan Commission,

recommendation of the Zoning and Public Safety Committee and other matters properly before it, adopts and incorporates the Findings and Recommendation of the Plan Commission as the findings of this President and the Board of Trustees, as completely as if fully recited herein at length. The President and Board of Trustees further find that the proposed text amendment set forth below is demanded by and required for the public good.

Section 3: Amendment. Article XII (Applicability and Interpretation), Section 12-206 (Definitions) of the Hinsdale Zoning Code be and is hereby amended by adding the definition of "Attached Garage" between the definitions of "Attached Dwelling" and "Attention Getting Device," to read in its entirety as follows:

"Attached Garage: A garage abutting the principal structure or connected via conditioned area as defined by the building code."

Section 4: Severability and Repeal of Inconsistent Ordinances. Each section, paragraph, clause and provision of this Ordinance is separable, and if any section, paragraph, clause or provision of this Ordinance shall be held unconstitutional or invalid for any reason, the unconstitutionality or invalidity of such section, paragraph, clause or provision shall not affect the remainder of this Ordinance, nor any part thereof, other than that part affected by such decision. All ordinances, resolutions or orders, or parts thereof, in conflict with the provisions of this Ordinance are to the extent of such conflict hereby repealed.

Section 5: Effective Date. This Ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage, approval, and publication in pamphlet form in the manner provided by law.

PASSED this ____ day of _____ 2012.

AYES: _____

NAYS: _____

ABSENT: _____

APPROVED this ____ day of _____ 2012.



Thomas K. Cauley, Jr., Village President

ATTEST:

Christine M. Bruton, Village Clerk

DATE: February 27, 2012

REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION

AGENDA		ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT		
SECTION NUMBER		Community Development		
ITEM Case A-08-2011 - Applicant: Parent Petroleum - Location: 149 E. Ogden – Request: Major adjustments to the approved Exterior Appearance/Site Plans (O2011-31).		APPROVAL		
<p>On June 21, 2011, the Village Board passed Ordinance #O2011-31, approving a Design Review Permit, Exterior Appearance/Site Plan Review and a Special Use Permit for carryout for the BP at 149 E. Ogden Avenue. The applicant has since submitted for permits to begin construction. As a result of this process, the applicant was advised by DuPage County that they needed to increase their fixture counts in both bathrooms servicing the newly proposed Quick Service Restaurant (QSR), thereby requiring an increase of 88 square feet in the overall square footage of the building to accommodate the larger bathrooms.</p> <p>Due to the nature of the request, a major adjustment to Exterior Appearance/Site Plan Review goes directly to the Village Board for action. The applicant has stated they feel that the requested changes are in substantial conformity with the approved plans as they are being requested as a result of code requirements and that they made every effort to minimize the impact of the exterior appearance while designing the changes.</p> <p>Pursuant to Article 11, Section 11-604(I)(2) of the Village of Hinsdale Zoning Ordinance, the Board of Trustees may grant approval of the major adjustment upon finding that the changes are within substantial compliance with the approved final plan or if it is determined that the changes are not within substantial compliance with the approved plan, shall refer it back to the Plan Commission for further hearing and review.</p> <p>MOTION: Move that the request be forwarded to the Board of Trustees to approve an “Ordinance Approving a Major Adjustment to the Site Plan and Exterior Appearance Plan at 149 E. Ogden Avenue.”</p>				
APPROVAL 	APPROVAL	APPROVAL	APPROVAL	MANAGER'S APPROVAL 
COMMITTEE ACTION:				
BOARD ACTION:				



GLEASON
ARCHITECTS, P.C.

February 10, 2012

Sean Gascoigne
Village of Hinsdale
19 E. Chicago Avenue
Hinsdale, IL 60521

**Subject: Americas Dogs Addition
Architect's Project No. 10-106**

Dear Sean:

We are asking for an adjustment on the approved America's Dog addition located at 149 East Ogden Avenue. We are having to add 88sf of space to the building to accommodate additional bathrooms. When we had gone through Plan Commission previously we were not aware of the building code requirements of the additional bathroom fixtures. With the additional fixtures required we had to expand the building to meet the building code, thus we are back before The Village asking for a adjustment to the approved plan.

Sincerely,


Diane Duncan

J:\Dwgs\Projects\Commercial\10-106 Hinsdale BP\Application\020912\Sean Letter.docx

769 Heartland Drive, Unit A Sugar Grove, Illinois 60054

Phone: 630-466-8740 Fax: 630-466-8760

E-mail: thadgleason@gleasonarchitectspc.com



ISSUED	DATE
FOR APPROVAL	
FOR PERMIT	
FOR BID	
FOR CONST.	

REVISIONS	DATE
1 City Comments	11-17-11
2 City Comments	12-15-11
3 City Comments	02-10-12

REVISIONS	DATE
1 City Comments	11-17-11
2 City Comments	12-15-11
3 City Comments	02-10-12

Hinsdale BP
149 East Ogden Avenue
Hinsdale, IL

CLIENT:
Parent Petroleum
381 East St. Charles
Carol Stream, Illinois





JOB NO. 10-095
DATE 12-14-10
FILE 01-40
PLOT SCALE 1:1

Signature


Title

SHEET TITLE
LANDSCAPING

SHEET NUMBER
A0.1



ZONING ANALYSIS

 **EXISTING LANDSCAPE PLAN**
SCALE: 1"=20'

SCALE: 1-20



DRAFT

VILLAGE OF HINSDALE

ORDINANCE NO. _____

**AN ORDINANCE APPROVING A MAJOR ADJUSTMENT
TO A SITE PLAN AND EXTERIOR APPEARANCE PLAN
AT 149 EAST OGDEN AVENUE – PARENT PETROLEUM**

WHEREAS, Parent Petroleum (the "Applicant") is the legal owner of certain parcels of property generally located at 149 East Ogden Avenue, Hinsdale, Illinois (the "Subject Property"); and

WHEREAS, the Subject Property is located in the B-3 General Business District and the Design Overlay District, and is improved with a gas station and mini-mart; and

WHEREAS, the Village, on June 21, 2011, in Ordinance No. O2011-30 (the "Original Ordinance"), approved the Petitioner's applications for: (1) a Special Use Permit in the B-3 General Business District to operate a carryout eating facility at the Subject Property; (2) a Site Plan approval for the Subject Property; (3) a Design Review Permit for the Subject Property; and (4) Exterior Appearance Plans for the Subject Property; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant now seeks approval of a major adjustment to its final approved Site Plan/Exterior Appearance Plan for the development of the Subject Property pursuant to Subsection 11-604(l)(2) of the Hinsdale Zoning Code (the "Application"); and

WHEREAS, the specific change sought by Applicant to its Site Plan/Exterior Appearance Plan for the Subject Property is for an increase of eighty-eight (88) square feet to the overall square footage of the proposed building to accommodate additional fixtures in the restrooms for the Quick Service Restaurant ("QSR"), all as depicted on the Approved Plans attached hereto and incorporated herein as **Exhibit A**; and

WHEREAS, the President and Board of Trustees find that the Application proposes changes to the approved Site Plan/Exterior Appearance Plan that, as approved by this Ordinance, will be in substantial conformity with the approved Site Plan/Exterior Appearance Plan and the Original Ordinance as required by Subsection 11-604(l)(2) of the Hinsdale Zoning Code.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the President and Board of Trustees of the Village of Hinsdale, DuPage and Cook Counties and State of Illinois, as follows:

SECTION 1: Recitals. The foregoing recitals are incorporated into this Ordinance by this reference as findings of the President and Board of Trustees.

SECTION 2: Approval of Major Adjustment to the Site Plan/Exterior Appearance Plan. The Board of Trustees, acting pursuant to the authority vested in it by the laws of the State of Illinois and Subsection 11-604(l)(2) of the Hinsdale Zoning Code, approve the major adjustment to the approved Site Plan/Exterior Appearance Plan for the Subject Property at 149 East Ogden Avenue to make the following changes: an increase of the square footage of the proposed building by eighty-eight (88) square feet to accommodate additional fixtures in the restrooms for the Quick Service Restaurant ("QSR"), all as depicted on the Approved Plans attached hereto and incorporated herein as **Exhibit A**. Said major adjustment is approved subject to the conditions set forth in Section 3 of this Ordinance. The Original Ordinance is hereby amended to the extent provided, but only to the extent provided, by the approval granted herein.

SECTION 3: Conditions on Approvals. The approval granted in Section 2 of this Ordinance is subject to the following conditions:

- A. **No Authorization of Work.** This Ordinance does not authorize the commencement of any work on the Subject Property. Except as otherwise specifically provided in writing in advance by the Village, no work of any kind shall be commenced on the Subject Property until all conditions of this Ordinance or the Original Ordinance precedent to such work have been fulfilled and after all permits, approvals, and other authorizations for such work have been properly applied for, paid for, and granted in accordance with applicable law.
- B. **Compliance with Plans.** All development work on the Subject Property shall be undertaken only in strict compliance with the approved plans and specifications, including the Approved Plans attached as **Exhibit A**.
- C. **Compliance with Codes, Ordinances, and Regulations.** Except as specifically set forth in this Ordinance, the Original Ordinance and any ordinance granting a variation relative to the Subject Property, the provisions of the Hinsdale Municipal Code and the Hinsdale Zoning Code shall apply and govern the development of the Subject Property. All such development shall comply with all Village codes, ordinances, and regulations at all times.

- D. Building Permits. The Applicant shall submit all required building permit applications and other materials in a timely manner to the appropriate parties, which materials shall be prepared in compliance with all applicable Village codes and ordinances.

SECTION 4: Violation of Condition or Code. Any violation of any term or condition stated in this Ordinance, the Original Ordinance or of any applicable code, ordinance, or regulation of the Village shall be grounds for rescission by the Board of Trustees of the approvals set forth in this Ordinance.

SECTION 5: Severability and Repeal of Inconsistent Ordinances. Each section, paragraph, clause and provision of this Ordinance is separable, and if any section, paragraph, clause or provision of this Ordinance shall be held unconstitutional or invalid for any reason, the unconstitutionality or invalidity of such section, paragraph, clause or provision shall not affect the remainder of this Ordinance, nor any part thereof, other than that part affected by such decision. All ordinances, resolutions or orders, or parts thereof, in conflict with the provisions of this Ordinance are to the extent of such conflict hereby repealed.

SECTION 6: Effective Date. This Ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage, approval, and publication in pamphlet form in the manner provided by law.

PASSED this ____ day of _____ 2012.

AYES: _____

NAYS: _____

ABSENT: _____

APPROVED this ____ day of _____ 2012.

Thomas K. Cauley, Jr., Village President

ATTEST:

Christine M. Bruton, Village Clerk

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT AND AGREEMENT BY THE APPLICANT TO THE
CONDITIONS OF THIS ORDINANCE:



By: _____

Its: _____

Date: _____, 2012

DATE: February 20, 2012

REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION

AGENDA Zoning and Public Safety Committee SECTION NUMBER	ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT Police			
ITEM Ordinance Approving Execution of the NIPAS Agreement.	APPROVAL Chief Bradley Bloom 			
SUMMARY OF REQUESTED ACTION The Northern Illinois Police Alarm System (NIPAS) is an inter-governmental entity made up of more than 60 suburban communities to provide mutual aid police assistance in emergency situations that threaten or cause loss of life and property and exceeds the physical and organizational capabilities of a single unit of government. As part of the agreement previously signed by President Cauley and myself an ordinance is required that formally authorizes the membership agreement. Motion: To recommend that the Village Board approve an ordinance authorizing that a membership agreement be executed between the Village of Hinsdale and the Northern Illinois Police Alarm System.				
APPROVAL	APPROVAL	APPROVAL	APPROVAL	MANAGER'S APPROVAL 
COMMITTEE ACTION:				
BOARD ACTION:				

Village of Hinsdale
Ordinance No. _____

An Ordinance Approving
Northern Illinois Police Alarm System Agreement

WHEREAS, more than Sixty (60) suburban communities have formed an organization known as Northern Illinois Police Alarm System (N.I.P.A.S.); and

WHEREAS, the purpose of said organization is to establish procedures to be followed in an emergency situation that threatens or causes loss of life and property and exceeds the physical and organizational capabilities of a single unit of government;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE VILLAGE OF HINSDALE:

Section One: That the Village President and the Chief of Police be and are hereby authorized and directed to execute said Agreement for membership in the Northern Illinois Police Alarm System organization, and the Village Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to attest to the execution of said agreement, a copy of said Agreement being attached hereto and being made a part hereof.

Section Two: This Ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage, approval, publication in pamphlet form and posting as required by law

PASSED this ____th day of ____ 2012.

AYES:

NAYS:

ABSENT:

APPROVED this ____th day of ____ 2012.

Village President

ATTEST:

Village Clerk



Northern Illinois Police Alarm System

Agreement

The undersigned municipalities agree pursuant to Article VII, Section 10 of the Constitution of the State of Illinois and Chapter 5 Act 220; Chapter 65 Act 5, Article 1, Division 4, Section 5/1-4-6; and Chapter 65 Act 5, Article 11, Division 1, Section 5/11-1-2.1; and Chapter 745 Act 10, Article VII, Illinois Compiled Statutes, as follows:

Section 1 Purpose of Agreement

This agreement is made in recognition of the fact that natural occurrences, or man-made occurrences, may result in situations which are beyond the ability of the individual community to deal with effectively in terms of manpower and equipment resources on hand at a given time. Each community named (Appendix 1) has and does express its intent to assist its neighbor communities by assigning some of its manpower and equipment resources to an affected community as resources and situations allow. The specific intent of this agreement is to permit the Police Departments of each community to more fully safeguard the lives, persons, and property of all citizens.

Section 2 Definitions

For the purpose of this agreement, the following terms are defined as follows:

Northern Illinois Police Alarm System (NIPAS): An organization of Northern Illinois Police Departments participating in this mutual aid agreement.

Disaster: An emergency situation that threatens or causes loss of life and property and exceeds the physical and organizational capabilities of a unit of local government.

Municipality: A city, village, or town having a recognized Police Department.

Mutual aid: A definite and prearranged written agreement and plan whereby regular response and assistance is provided in the event of alarms from locations in a stricken municipality by the aiding municipalities in accordance with the police alarm assignments as developed by the Police Chiefs of the participating municipalities.

Participating municipalities: A municipality that com-

mits itself to this mutual aid agreement by adopting an ordinance authorizing participation in the program with other participating municipalities for rendering and receiving mutual aid in the event of disaster in accordance with the police alarm assignments.

Stricken municipality: The municipality in which a disaster occurs that is of such magnitude that it cannot be adequately handled by the local Police Department.

Aiding municipality: A municipality furnishing police equipment and manpower to a stricken municipality.

Police alarm assignments: A pre-determined listing of manpower and equipment that will respond to aid a stricken municipality.

Section 3 Agreement to Effectuate the Mutual Aid Plan

The Village President, Mayor, or Board of Trustees of each participating municipality is authorized on behalf of that municipality to enter into and from time to time alter and amend on the advice of the Police Chief and with the consent of the governing body of that municipality, an agreement with other municipalities for mutual aid according to the following:

A. Whenever a disaster is of such magnitude and consequence that it is deemed advisable by the senior officer present, of the stricken municipality, to request assistance of the aiding municipalities, he is hereby authorized to do so, under the terms of this mutual aid agreement and the senior officer present of the aiding municipalities are authorized to and shall forthwith take the following actions:

- Immediately determine what resources are required according to the mutual aid police alarm assignment.
- Immediately determine if the required equipment and personnel can be committed in response to the request from the stricken municipality.
- Dispatch immediately the personnel and equipment required to the stricken municipality in accordance with the police alarm assignment.

B. The rendering of assistance under the terms of this mutual aid agreement shall not be mandatory in accordance with the police alarm assignments if local conditions prohibit response. In that event it is the responsibility of the aiding municipality to immediately notify the stricken municipality of same.

C. The senior officer present, of the stricken municipality, shall assume full responsibility and command for operations at the scene. He will assign personnel and equipment, of the aiding municipalities, to positions when and where he deems necessary.

D. It is expected that requests for mutual aid under this agreement will be initiated only when the needs exceed the resources of the stricken municipality. Aiding municipalities will be released and returned to duty in their own community as soon as the situation is restored to the point which permits the stricken municipality to satisfactorily handle it with its own resources or, as per Item B above, when an aiding municipality so desires.

E. All service performed under this agreement shall be rendered without reimbursement of any party from the other(s). Requests for indemnification for unusual or burdensome costs incurred in the performance of mutual aid may be submitted by the aiding municipality to the stricken municipality. Indemnification of such costs shall be at the discretion of the respective elected Board or Councils.

F. Each participating municipality assumes the responsibility for members of its police force acting pursuant to this agreement, both as to indemnification of said police officers as provided for by Chapter 65 ILCS 5/1-4-6, and as to personal benefits

to said police officers, all to the same extent as they are protected, insured, indemnified and otherwise provided for by the Statutes of the State of Illinois and the ordinances of the participating municipalities when acting solely within their own corporate limits.

G. The Police Chiefs of the participating municipalities shall maintain a governing board and establish an operational plan for giving and receiving aid under this agreement. Said plan shall be reviewed, updated and tested at regular intervals.

Section 4 Termination

Any municipality may withdraw from the Northern Illinois Police Alarm System agreement by notifying the Police Chiefs of the other participating municipalities in writing, whereupon the withdrawing municipality will terminate participation ninety (90) days from the date of written notice.

Section 5 Adoption

This mutual aid agreement shall be in full force and in effect with the passage and approval of a companion ordinance by all participating municipalities, in the manner provided by law, and in the signing of this agreement by the Village President, City Mayor or Trustees of a municipality.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Agreement has been duly executed by the following parties:

Hinsdale

Name of Municipality

[Signature]
President/Mayor

[Signature]
Chief of Police



ATTEST:

Christine M. Burton
Clerk

1/25/12
Date

DATE: February 20, 2012

REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION

AGENDA Zoning and Public Safety Committee		ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT Police		
SECTION NUMBER				
ITEM Ordinance Amending General Penalties for Ordinance Violations.		APPROVAL Chief Bradley Bloom 		
SUMMARY OF REQUESTED ACTION				
<p>We were recently notified by the Village Prosecutor that the Illinois Supreme Court has adopted certain Rules, 570 through 579, which will now govern the prosecution of ordinance violations except violations of the Illinois Vehicle Code with the exception of 625 ILCS 5/1301. In order to comply, we have already implemented some minor procedural changes concerning language on the charging document and we are recommending that the General Penalty section of the Village Ordinance be amended to include provisions for minimum and maximum fines; conditional discharge and court supervision.</p>				
<p>Motion: To recommend that the Village Board approve an ordinance amending Title 1, Chapter 4, Section 1 of the Hinsdale Village Code regarding general penalties for ordinance violations.</p>				
APPROVAL	APPROVAL	APPROVAL	APPROVAL	MANAGER'S APPROVAL 
COMMITTEE ACTION:				
BOARD ACTION:				

Village of Hinsdale
Ordinance No. _____

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING TITLE 1, CHAPTER 4, SECTION 1
OF THE HINSDALE VILLAGE CODE REGARDING
GENERAL PENALTIES FOR ORDINANCE VIOLATIONS**

WHEREAS, the Illinois Supreme Court passed new rules regarding the prosecution of ordinance violations; and

WHEREAS, it has been determined by the President and Board of Trustees of the Village of Hinsdale that it is in the best interests of the public to amend the Village Code to reflect the new Illinois Supreme Court Rules.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED BY THE PRESIDENT AND THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE VILLAGE OF HINSDALE:

Section One: Title 1 (Administration), Chapter 4, Section 1 (General Penalty) is hereby amended to read in its entirety as follows:

1-4-1: GENERAL PENALTY:

In all cases where the same offense is made punishable or is created by different clauses or sections of this Code, the prosecuting officer may elect under which to proceed; but not more than one recovery shall be had against the same person for the same offense; provided, that the revocation of a license or permit shall not be considered a recovery or penalty so as to bar any other penalty being enforced.

Whenever in this Code or in any ordinance of the Village any act is prohibited or is made or declared to be unlawful or an offense, or whenever in this Code or such ordinance the doing of any act is required or the failure to do any act is declared to be unlawful, where no specific penalty is provided therefor, the violation of any such provision of this Code or any ordinance shall be punished by a fine of not less than ~~ten dollars (\$10.00)~~ seventy-five dollars (\$75.00) and not exceeding ~~five hundred dollars (\$500.00)~~ seven hundred and fifty dollars (\$750.00). A separate offense shall be deemed to have been committed on each day during which a violation occurs or continues.

In addition to a fine, the court may impose a period of conditional discharge as defined in 730 ILCS 5/5-1-4 or court supervision as defined in 730 ILCS 5/5-1-21 of the Criminal Code for a period of up to six (6) months, an order of restitution, an order to perform community service, an order to complete an education program and/or any other appropriate penalties or conditions authorized in any section of this code or ordinance or any conditions for conditional discharge set forth in 730 ILCS 5/5-6-3 or for court supervision in 730 ILCS 5/5-6-3.1 as the foregoing are amended from time to time.

Section Two: This Ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage, by simple majority vote of the corporate authorities, and approval in the manner provided by law.

PASSED this ____ day of _____, 2012.

AYES:

NAYS:

ABSENT

APPROVED this ____ day of _____, 2012.

Village President

ATTEST:

Village Clerk

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS
COUNTY OF COOK)

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE

I, Christine Bruton, Clerk of the Village of Hinsdale, in the County of Cook and State of Illinois, do hereby certify that the attached and foregoing is a true and correct copy of that certain Ordinance now on file in my Office, entitled:

ORDINANCE NO. _____

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING TITLE 1, CHAPTER 4, SECTION 1
OF THE HINSDALE VILLAGE CODE REGARDING
GENERAL PENALTIES FOR ORDINANCE VIOLATIONS**

which Ordinance was passed by the Board of Trustees of the Village of Hinsdale at a Regular Village Board Meeting on the ____ day of _____, 2012, at which meeting a quorum was present, and approved by the President of the Village of Hinsdale on the ____ day of _____, 2012.

I further certify that the vote on the question of the passage of said Ordinance by the Board of Trustees of the Village of Hinsdale was taken by Ayes and Nays and recorded in the minutes of the Board of Trustees of the Village of Hinsdale, and that the result of said vote was as follows, to-wit:

AYES: _____

NAYS: _____

ABSENT: _____

I do further certify that the original Ordinance, of which the foregoing is a true copy, is entrusted to my care for safekeeping, and that I am the lawful keeper of the same.



IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the Village of Hinsdale, this ____ day of _____, 2012.

Village Clerk

[SEAL]

DATE: February 20, 2012

REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION

AGENDA: Zoning and Public Safety		ORIGINATING	
SECTION NUMBER		DEPARTMENT Police Department	
ITEM Request for Street Closure Wellness House		APPROVAL Chief Bradley Bloom 	
<p>We have received a request close Hillgrove Ave and County Line between Hillgrove and Walnut starting on Saturday , May 5, 2012 through the morning of Monday, May 7, 2012 to accommodate the annual Wellness House 3K and 5K race. The race is sponsored by the Hinsdale Wellness House.</p> <p>The original request sought to have the street closed starting May 4 through May 7, 2012. After discussing the impact on commuter parking on Hillgrove, they agreed to modify their request as stated above. The tent could be taken down on Sunday, May 6 but the Wellness House would incur an additional cost.</p> <p>The street closure is necessary to accommodate a tent that is set up on County Line Road. This is the fourth year that the street closure request has been made. Last year, we experienced few problems resulting from the street closure. The low volume of traffic is easily detoured during the street closure and commuter permit parking on Hillgrove and County Line is relocated as well.</p> <p>Additionally, we have coordinated the roadway closures with the construction crews working at Hinsdale Hospital and received their concurrence that the street closure will not impede their construction activities.</p>			
Motion: To recommend that the Village Board approve a request to close Hillgrove Ave and County Line Road between Hillgrove and Walnut Street from May 5, 2012 through May 7, 2012.			
APPROVAL	APPROVAL	APPROVAL	APPROVAL
COMMITTEE ACTION:			MANAGER'S APPROVAL 
BOARD ACTION:			

You'll feel better inside.



Board of Directors

Chair:

Blair R. Haarlow

Members:

Tracy Anderson
Robert H. Baum
Dick Burridge Sr.
Jim Carras
Martin Dukler
Richard W. George
Steven P. Grimes
Thomas D. Grusecki
James N. Hallene
Thomas M. Hickey
Cheri Jones
David Jones
Cindy Klimb
Sylvia Kuchenbecker
Thomas S. Lee
Tina Porterfield
Michael Ratcliff
Robert E. Tonn
Brid Werble

Executive Director:

Jeanne Cella, MS, LCPC

Lifetime Trustees:

Henry G. Bates
Susan and Ken Beard
Katherine and Michael Birk
Mary Grace and Kevin Burke
Nan and Dick Burridge Sr.
Lynne and A. William Haarlow III
Allen Koranda
Kay and Fred Krehbiel
Marcia and Thomas McCormick
Edward T. McGowan
Lorraine Wolfe

Honorary Board:

Tornie and Stu MacKay
Terri and Dick Barrett

January 23, 2012

Chief Brad Bloom
Village of Hinsdale Police Department
121 Symonds Drive
Hinsdale, IL 60521

Dear Chief Bloom,

We are in the planning stages for the annual Walk for Wellness House which we are planning on holding on Sunday, May 6, 2012. The Courses will include a 5k run, 3k run, 5k walk and 3k walk. We sincerely appreciate your efforts in keeping the event safe and fun for all.

We respectfully request that Hillgrove Ave. (between Oak and County Line) and County Line (between Hillgrove and Walnut) be closed starting on Friday, May 4th through the morning of Monday, May 7th. This would include prohibiting parking in the village spaces on County Line across from Wellness House starting that Friday as well. Additionally, because of safety concerns in 2007, we would like to prohibit parking on Walnut (between Oak and Mills) for Sunday only.

Please know that this request is to accommodate the tent set-up prior to the event and the large crowds that we anticipate at the event itself on Sunday. It is our intent to not stake Village property. Attached please find a completed competitive race permit application, our insurance documentation and maps of the courses.

Thank you for your time and consideration of our request. We will be in contact soon to schedule a meeting to discuss details and logistics. Should you have any questions please feel free to contact me at (630) 654-5104.

Sincerely,

Liten DeNaut
Development Associate
Wellness House