

Approved

**MINUTES
VILLAGE OF HINSDALE
PLAN COMMISSION
November 8, 2017
MEMORIAL HALL
7:30 P.M.**

Chairman Cashman called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m., Wednesday, November 8, 2017, in Memorial Hall, the Memorial Building, 19 East Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale, Illinois.

PRESENT: Chairman Cashman, Commissioner Peterson, Commissioner Willobee Commissioner Krillenberger, Commissioner Crnovich, Commissioner Braselton, Commissioner Unell, and Commissioner Fiascone

ABSENT: Commissioner Jablonski

ALSO PRESENT: Kathleen Gargano Village Manager, Robb McGinnis Community Development Director, Michael Marrs Village Attorney and Chan Yu Village Planner
Applicants for cases A-29-2017 and A-40-2017

Approval of Minutes

With no questions or concerns, the PC **unanimously approved** the minutes from the October 11, 2017, meeting 7-0 (1 absent, 1 abstained).

Findings and Recommendations - Case A-36-2017 – 52 S. Washington Street – Green Goddess – Exterior Appearance/Site Plan Review for a front façade alteration to existing retail store.

The PC, with no questions, **unanimously approved** the Findings and Recommendations as submitted, 8-0 (1 absent).

Findings and Recommendations - Case A-33-2017 – 21 Salt Creek Ln. (former Robert Crown Center) – Hinsdale Humane Society – Special Use Permit for Animal Humane Society.

The PC, with no questions, **unanimously approved** the Findings and Recommendations as submitted, 8-0 (1 absent)

Sign Permit Review - Case A-40-2017 – 4 N. Washington St. – Chase Bank – New Ground Sign and On-Site Informational Wall Sign with Modification Request

The applicant reviewed that their previous Chase wall sign was approved last month by the PC, and they are here to present their ground sign and informational wall sign request. The Chase representative stated that the ground sign has a brick base with white features on top and is illuminated. The location is on the southeast corner of the subject property and meets the sight-distance triangle code, and will face east and west for visibility.

The Chase representative described the informational wall sign to be placed on the front of the building next to the front entrance. Its purpose is to highlight that the location provides “Chase Private Client” services. The applicant also introduced their Chase flag, however, it was later stated by staff that it does not meet the code. (Staff has formally explained that the Chase flag is not permitted to the applicant on November 9, 2017).

**Plan Commission Minutes
November 8, 2017**

A Plan Commissioner asked how the sign will be illuminated. The applicant stated that it is illuminated by LED, and will work on the brightness if there's a concern. The Plan Commissioner asked if it is dimmable. The applicant replied they could make it dimmable if they needed to.

A Plan Commissioner asked if the intent is to leave the illumination on all night. The applicant replied that it could be set on a timer, and turned off at a specific time.

The PC Chair reviewed that it's typical to set illumination times for signage around the Village. To that end, a Plan Commissioner expressed that he'd like to stay consistent with other sign approvals, with the condition that they are illuminated only during business hours. Another Plan Commissioner agreed, and asked if the Chase flag was considered a pylon sign.

Chan replied no, structurally, it will be on an existing flag pole. (Chan explained at the end of the meeting however, that the code defines allowable official flags, and that the Chase flag is not permitted)

The PC Chair asked what the hours of operation will be.

The applicant stated the banks are generally closed at 6 PM, however added that he'd like to see the signage illuminated a little bit after business hours. He mentioned that other towns allowed them to stay illuminated until 10 PM or 11 PM.

A Plan Commissioner asked if people could access the ATM (inside the vestibule) after business hours. The applicant replied correct, and that was a good point.

A Plan Commissioner expressed that he likes the sign, and believes that illumination until 10 PM seems reasonable.

The PC Chair reviewed that he likes the sign and believes illumination until 10 PM is acceptable. The applicant and Plan Commissioners agreed in regards to the illumination cut-off time.

A Plan Commissioner asked about the wall sign request. Chan explained that it'd be considered an informational sign if the request did not include the name and logo. However, with the name and logo, the sign would be considered a wall sign. To clarify, this is a sign modification request to the PC since wall signage is limited to one in the B-1 District.

The PC had no major concerns for the request as submitted. The PC **unanimously approved** the sign application as submitted, with the condition that the ground sign illumination would be turned off at 10 PM, 8-0 (1 absent).

Agenda Item Case A-29-2017 – 336 E. Ogden Ave. – Bill Jacobs Land Rover – Exterior Appearance/Site Plan review for new Land Rover Dealership (replacing Land Rover at 300 E. Ogden).

The applicant presented its revised plans to the PC, and stated that the changes reflect neighborhood meetings and additional discussions with neighbors and the Village. Some examples of the changes since the last PC meeting on September 13, 2017, included the: south facing garage doors will be sealed by brick and not be used, various building/parking lot lights have been removed and dimmer (data shown on photometric plan), new fence options with a height change per the neighbor's request at 808 Oak Street (8' to 6'),

**Plan Commission Minutes
November 8, 2017**

relocated refuse further away from the south property line, arborvitaes along the entire fence, and Oak Street bushes to be trimmed down to 5 feet.

There were approximately 5 neighbors who expressed concerns in regards to the lighting, Oak Street bushes (height), and the proposed fence options (noise related). In regards to lighting, neighbors are worried that it will be too bright, and do not trust that the applicant will adjust the lighting once it is installed. A neighbor, Michael Stick, reviewed a petition letter signed by approximately 25 neighbors, and reviewed why he and the neighbors are opposed to the fence options. In short, they believe the presented fence options are not adequate in regards to sound-absorption, and are designed for residential use. A review of his understanding of sound ratings (STC), ended with a conclusion that the neighbors demand a brick or concrete wall/barrier versus a “fence”.

The applicant reviewed cedar, Trex and Simtek, and the potential for a partial concrete wall/barrier. Some neighbors desire a brick wall/barrier, however, Michael Stick stated that a concrete wall/barrier is acceptable. The Village reviewed that there is a possibility to provide financial assistance with Land Rover in regards to a concrete fence/wall/barrier.

There were also 2 Hinsdale residents, who introduced themselves as not nearby neighbors, but explained that some of their family members work/worked at the current Land Rover dealership, and expressed that they are good people and a positive business in the Village.

The PC Chair and PC in general, expressed that they are happy about the dialog and effort between the applicant, neighbors and staff. The PC added that they appreciate the changes the applicant has made, per the neighborhood meetings and discussions, and believe the only fundamental issue for further discussion appears to be the fence/barrier/wall.

The PC **unanimously approved** the exterior appearance/site plan application as presented, 7-0 (1 abstained, 1 absent), subject to continued discussion among the applicant, neighbors and Village to try to reach a mutually agreed upon solution relative to the barrier, and with the following specific Plan Commission recommendations:

1. That the barrier be a precast or cast-in-place concrete or equivalent barrier along the entire property line between the property and neighbors;
2. That the landscaping be revised to include a mix of species and the Site Plan revised to reflect 10-foot arborvitaes;
3. That exterior lights be dimmed to security levels no later than one (1) hour after closing; and
4. That the barrier be placed at the highest available point along the property perimeter.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m. after a unanimous vote.

Respectfully Submitted,
Chan Yu, Village Planner