

Approved  
Ryan / Crnovich

**MINUTES  
VILLAGE OF HINSDALE  
PLAN COMMISSION  
April 13, 2016  
MEMORIAL HALL  
7:30 P.M.**

Chairman Cashman called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m., Wednesday, April 13, 2016, in Memorial Hall, the Memorial Building, 19 East Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale, Illinois.

**PRESENT:** Chairman Cashman, Commissioner Ryan, Commissioner Peterson, Commissioner Fiascone and Commissioner McMahon, Commissioner Krillenberger, and Commissioner Crnovich

**ABSENT:** Commissioner Unell

**ALSO PRESENT:** Chan Yu, Village Planner  
Applicant Representatives for Case: A-03-2016, A-04-2016 and A-05-2016

---

**Approval of Minutes**

Chairman Cashman asked the Plan Commission (PC) for any comments or revisions from the February 10, 2016, meeting. With no comments, Chairman Cashman asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Commissioner Krillenberger motioned and Chairman Cashman seconded. The motion passed unanimously (7 Ayes and 1 absent).

**Findings and Recommendations**

**Case A-36-2015 (Initial Application on 11/15/15) – 222 E. Ogden Ave. - AMITA Health – Exterior Appearance and Site Plan for Removing 2 Windows to install a Wall Sign. An ADA ramp at the front entrance is also proposed.**

Chairman Cashman provided a summary of the application and asked the PC for any comments.

Commissioner Krillenberger and Commissioner Crnovich expressed that the revised plan is much better and commendable.

Chairman Cashman asked for a motion to approve the Findings and Recommendations.

Commissioner Ryan motioned to approve. Commissioner Krillenberger seconded. The motion passed unanimously (7 Ayes and 1 absent).

**Case A-42-2015 – Village of Hinsdale – Text Amendment to Remove Registering Home Occupations to match Municipal Code.**

Chairman Cashman provided a summary of the application and asked the PC for any comments. With none, he asked for a motion to approve the Findings and Recommendations.

**Plan Commission Minutes**  
**April 13, 2016**

Commissioner McMahon motioned to approve. Commissioner Krillenberger seconded. The motion passed unanimously (7 Ayes and 1 absent).

**Sign Permit Review**

**Case A-04-2016 – 20 E. Ogden Ave. – LaMantia – Ground Sign**

Chairman Cashman introduced the next item on the agenda as a sign application from LaMantia, and asked the applicant to please introduce themselves and the request.

Nick Esposito, introduced himself as the attorney representing the applicant. He pointed out that his exhibit posters reflect an out-of-date ground sign version, and that the one in the packet is the correct version. He next introduced the staff from Olympic Signs.

Robby Whitehead introduced himself, from Olympic Signs in Lombard. He explained that they will be fabricating and installing the ground sign. Mr. Whitehead said that they will be removing the existing ground sign and using the electrical feed for the new ground sign. It will be LED illuminated and have a low power draw.

Commissioner Krillenberger asked what the material of the new sign is.

Robby Whitehead replied the face will be polycarbonate, with vinyl digitally printed graphics. The columns will be built out of aluminum with caps on the top.

Chairman Cashman asked if the orientation of the sign will be the same as the existing one.

Robby Whitehead replied that the cut will be architecturally different with an updated look.

Chairman Cashman expressed it's a nice looking sign.

Commissioner Ryan asked if it's going in the same spot as the old sign.

Robby Whitehead replied very close, yes.

Commissioner Krillenberger said he thinks it's a big improvement.

Commissioner Ryan said it looks very nice.

Chairman Cashman asked if you'd be able to read the sign traveling eastbound.

Robby Whitehead replied yes, that's correct.

Chairman Cashman explained, based on Chan's analysis, everything is Code compliant.

Chan Yu, Village Planner, replied correct.

**Plan Commission Minutes**  
**April 13, 2016**

Chairman Cashman asked the PC if there were any additional comments.

Commissioner Crnovich thanked the applicant for such a detailed packet and information; and it is very helpful.

Nick Esposito said you're welcome.

Chairman Cashman thanked the applicant and asked if the PC had any further questions. With none, he asked for a motion to approve the sign application as submitted.

Commissioner Ryan motioned to approve. Commissioner McMahon seconded. The motion passed unanimously (7 Ayes and 1 absent).

**Exterior Appearance and Site Plan Review**

**Case A-03-2016 – 20 E. Ogden Ave. – LaMantia – Exterior Appearance and Site Plan for façade improvement, roof work and landscaping. This is a Public Meeting item that has followed the Notice Requirements for Nonresidential properties within 250 feet from a single family zoning district.**

Chairman Cashman provided a brief review for the exterior appearance and site plan application and asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak during the public meeting session. There was nobody from the audience that came forward.

Nick Esposito, introduced himself and two staff members of LaMantia before explaining that the open space of the site is not changing. The materials and the relationship to the existing structure is basically the same. They are planning to upgrade the building by painting it, improve the landscaping with a far superior addition and improve/restripe the parking lot. And he reasserted the material will be consistent if not the same. He referenced the text amendment the PC recommended for a showroom because that is the purpose for the additional and enlarged windows, and that is to allow for more sunlight into the building. Mr. Esposito explained that there is no change to the: top height of the building, or front or side of the building.

Chairman Cashman asked if there was a landscape plan submitted.

Chan replied that it is located in the last page of the application.

Nick Esposito continued to reference the aforementioned information with poster sized illustrations.

Chairman Cashman asked what the lower entry door is for, located below the awning.

**Plan Commission Minutes**  
**April 13, 2016**

Nick Esposito responded that only staff uses it. He also explained the new roof to screen the new mechanical equipment on top of the building. And while the pitch of the roof will be the same, the screen on the back of the building will be vertical and painted to match the existing material of the facade. Mr. Esposito explained the metal flue for the new fireplace will be exposed due to a minimum fire safety building code distance.

Commissioner McMahon asked about the roof on the east side and if the screen wall will look like the roof material.

Chairman Cashman explained that the roof shields the equipment from the east and the screen wall will shield the equipment from the west side of the building.

Nick Esposito reiterated that they are trying to hide the equipment on the roof, however is unable to hide the metal flue due to the building code.

Chairman Cashman asked what the final paint color will be, and if it will be similar to the rendering.

LaMantia staff replied that they aim to match the existing façade of the building.

Commissioner Crnovich asked if the parking lot and spaces will stay the same.

Nick Esposito replied yes, and it will be recoated and restriped.

Commissioner Peterson asked if the use will change for the indoor parking area as part of the renovations.

Nick Esposito replied no, there is no change in the use for the parking area.

Commissioner Ryan mentioned that she drove by the building today and believes the plan will be a marked improvement. She also added that she would also like to complement the applicant for the wonderfully comprehensive packet.

Chairman Cashman asked the PC if there were any additional comments.

Commissioner Krillenberger added that he agrees with Commissioner Ryan for the comprehensive application packet, and like the ground sign request, is an improvement to the property and good for the community.

Commissioner McMahon echoed Commissioner Krillenberger's comment in that it's a very good packet.

Chairman Cashman commented that he appreciates the effort to screen the equipment, especially from the neighbor to the west, and added you have an advantage due to the dense collection of trees at the property line.

**Plan Commission Minutes**  
**April 13, 2016**

Commissioner Krillenberger asked what about this application triggered a public meeting.

Chairman Cashman added, and public notification to the neighbors.

Chan explained because the application is a non-residential use that is within 250 feet from a residential lot.

Commissioner Krillenberger replied, understood.

With no further questions or comments, Chairman Cashman asked for a motion to approve the exterior appearance plan of the application package.

Commissioner McMahon motioned to approve. Commissioner Crnovich seconded. The motion passed unanimously (7 Ayes and 1 absent).

Chairman Cashman asked for a motion to approve the site plan, including the landscape plan, as submitted .

Commissioner Ryan motioned to approve. Commissioner Krillenberger seconded. The motion passed unanimously (7 Ayes and 1 absent).

Chairman Cashman thanked the applicant and looks forward to them operating.

**Case A-05-2016 – 414 W. Chestnut St. – Mani & Pedi – Exterior Appearance and Site Plan for chimney to meet building codes. This is a Public Meeting item that has followed the Notice Requirements for Nonresidential properties within 250 feet from a single family zoning district.**

Chairman Cashman provided a brief review for the exterior appearance and site plan application and noted that this is a public meeting session. There was nobody from the audience that came forward.

Peter Korovessis, the architect representing the applicant introduced himself and Jesuck Paik, the business owner. He explained to the PC that the owner is expanding and taking over the property next door (414 W. Chestnut) from his current location (410 W. Chestnut St.), on the first floor. He explained the application to construct the chimney is driven by mechanical (building) code requirements to exhaust the fumes of the business above and away from the second floor residential dwelling units.

Chairman Cashman asked if they are also adding two condensing units.

Peter Korovessis replied yes, the condensing units are necessary for the additional mechanical units, and will be located next to an existing condensing unit.

**Plan Commission Minutes**  
**April 13, 2016**

Commissioner McMahon asked to clarify that they will be on the first floor and if there is residential on the second floor.

Peter Koroovessis replied correct, and clarified there are 3 residential studio units on the second floor.

Chairman Cashman asked if they will occupy the entire first floor.

Peter Koroovessis replied yes.

Commissioner Crnovich stated that the condensing units are very close to the building to the west, and asked if it makes a lot of noise.

Peter Koroovessis replied no, and pointed out that the two are much smaller than the existing one.

Commissioner Crnovich asked if the two additional units will result in a net of 3 condensing units.

Peter Koroovessis replied correct.

Commissioner Fiascone asked if the condensing units emit any fumes.

Peter Koroovessis replied no, they function only to cool the refrigerant that is going in and out of the building.

Chairman Cashman explained it'll be just like a residential condenser.

Peter Koroovessis concurred and explained the fumes will be exhausted through the chimney which is 7 feet over the roofline.

Commissioner McMahon asked how the chimney worked, and if there are fans in it.

Peter Koroovessis replied yes, there are two fans for the two ducts inside the chimney that push the air out.

Commissioner Peterson made a comment that they are proposing to install a chimney made of siding onto a building made of brick.

Peter Koroovessis added the color will be stained to match the brick.

Commissioner Crnovich also pointed out the chimney siding material, and asked Chan if the condensing units require screening.

**Plan Commission Minutes**  
**April 13, 2016**

Chan replied the location is in the B-3 business district and there is no requirement to screen the condensing units.

Chairman Cashman pointed out that it's pretty well screened where it's located.

Commissioner Crnovich agreed, but she is considering the building immediately to the west.

Chairman Cashman asked the PC for any additional questions or comments.

Commissioner McMahon and Commissioner Krillenberger both commented on the chimney's location in the rear of the building as a positive major consideration.

Chairman Cashman added it would be hard to see or notice it unless you go to the back of the building, and moreover, described the dense screening beyond the train tracks to the south of the property.

Chan explained that the last 2 pages of the packet shows an overhead aerial view of the property.

Chairman Cashman asked if the decision not to use brick was due to expense.

Peter Koroivessis replied correct, they were not planning to provide the chimney but it was required by the Building Department. Thus, it was an unexpected expense, and additionally, they must also pay for the chimney foundation.

Chairman Cashman explained it'd be a different story, and brick may have been required if the chimney was on the front of the building.

Commissioner Peterson expressed that it'd still be visible.

Chairman Cashman replied, not from the street, and mentioned that he drove out there in the morning and wasn't able to see anything other than the front façade.

Commissioner Crnovich stated, you would see it on the train.

Chairman Cashman agreed, you would see it on the train.

Commissioner McMahon stated that she believes it's a reasonable request.

Chairman Cashman asked if the applicant is leasing the space.

Peter Koroivessis replied correct.

Chairman Cashman explained, so if the tenant left one day, the chimney could be removed easily.

**Plan Commission Minutes**  
**April 13, 2016**

Peter Korovessis replied correct.

Chairman Cashman asked if they are expanding or leaving the current location.

Peter Korovessis replied he will have both locations.

Jesuck Paik added that it was not the original plan, but due to the lengthy process, he had to stay at the current location while expanding into 414 Chestnut Street.

With nobody but the applicant in the audience to provide comments for the public meeting, Chairman Cashman asked if there is a motion to approve the exterior appearance as presented.

Commissioner Krillenberger motioned to approve. Commissioner Crnovich seconded. The motion passed (6 Ayes, 1 Nay and 1 absent).

Chairman Cashman asked if there is a motion to approve the site plan as presented.

Commissioner Ryan motioned to approve. Commissioner Krillenberger seconded. The motion passed (5 Ayes, 2 Nays and 1 absent).

**Other Business**

The meeting was adjourned after a motion was made by Commissioner Krillenberger and seconded by Commissioner Crnovich at 8:32 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Chan Yu, Village Planner