

# VILLAGE OF ORLAND PARK

*14700 Ravinia Avenue  
Orland Park, IL 60462  
[www.orland-park.il.us](http://www.orland-park.il.us)*



## **Meeting Minutes**

**Tuesday, April 22, 2008**

**7:00 PM**

**Village Hall**

## **Plan Commission**

*Louis Stephens, Chairman*

*Commissioners: Judith Jacobs, Paul Aubin, Steve Dzierwa, Patricia Thompson, and  
Nick Parisi*

**CALLED TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Mr. Lou Stephens at 7:00 p.m.

**Present:** 6 - Commissioner Jacobs; Commissioner Dzierwa; Commissioner Aubin;  
Commissioner Stephens; Commissioner Thompson, Commissioner Parisi

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the March 25, 2008 Plan Commission meeting were approved as presented.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Patricia Thompson, seconded by Commissioner Paul Aubin, that this matter be APPROVED. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 6 - Commissioner Jacobs, Commissioner Dzierwa, Commissioner Aubin,  
Commissioner Stephens, Commissioner Thompson and Commissioner Parisi

**Nay:** 0

**Absent:** 1 - Culligan

**PUBLIC HEARINGS****2008-0125 Sunrise Senior Living**

I move to continue the public hearing for file number 2008-0125, Sunrise Senior Living, to the May 13, 2008 Plan Commission.

**This matter was CONTINUED to the Plan Commission, due back on 5/13/2008**

**Aye:** 6 - Commissioner Jacobs, Commissioner Dzierwa, Commissioner Aubin,  
Commissioner Stephens, Commissioner Thompson and Commissioner Parisi

**Nay:** 0

**Absent:** 1 - Culligan

**2007-0812 Mo's Chinese Kitchen - Special Use**

PITTOS: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated April 22, 2008, updated as required.

STEPHENS: Noted that the petitioner is not present for this meeting, therefore, invited comments and/or questions from the public and received none.

STEPHENS: Invited comments and/or questions from the Plan Commissioners.

DZIERWA: Stated his understanding that essentially, 40 seats are being added to this restaurant which requires 13 more parking spaces. This is basically a

housekeeping issue?

PITTOS: Correct.

DZIERWA: Thank you. No further question.

STEPHENS: With no further questions from the Plan Commissioners, entertained a motion.

PARISI: Moved to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission, the findings of fact set forth in this Staff report dated April 22, 2008 and moved to recommend to the Village Board, approval of the Special Use Amendment to relocate Mo's Chinese Kitchen, a 2,800 square-foot restaurant with 84 seats at the Park Hill Shopping Center in the BIZ General Business District, within 330 feet from residential properties in the Park Hill subdivision subject to the following conditions: (1) that all sign related materials be approved by the Building Division; (2) that the site managers/petitioner provide an additional dumpster specifically for the use of Mo's Chinese Kitchen that follows and meets the code requirements for screening and enclosure; (3) that all building code related items are met; (4) that all health code related items are met; and (5) that the site managers/petitioner clean up the entire site to the rear of the Park Hill Plaza shopping center, removing debris, materials, and any undesirable plant growth.

THOMPSON: Second.

**This matter was RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Development Services & Planning, due back on 4/28/2008**

**Aye:** 6 - Commissioner Jacobs, Commissioner Dzierwa, Commissioner Aubin, Commissioner Stephens, Commissioner Thompson and Commissioner Parisi

**Nay:** 0

**Absent:** 1 - Culligan

**2008-0094 Every Bloomin' Thing - Special Use Amendment**

Robert Buikema, petitioner

Linda Buikema, petitioner

SULLIVAN: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated April 22, 2008, as presented.

STEPHENS: Invited comment and/or questions from the petitioners, both of whom motioned they had nothing to add.

STEPHENS: Invited comments and/or questions from the public.

AUBIN: Swore in Cathy Casper.

CASPER, resides at 7640 West 158th Court (which is adjacent, directly north of the business): Stated there have been many special uses, special permits, special ordinances created and granted for Every Bloomin' Thing over the last six months let alone over the last six years. I believe the business owners in this community should have some responsibility to adjacent homeowners and businesses, one of which I am – a homeowner. I've lived next to this property for 15 years and I've seen the business grow (then turning toward the Buikema's, wished them a lot of luck). However, you have to be cognizant of what happens to people like us when their business grows. There are still issues that have continued to go on, year after year such as the location of the garbage which comes onto the condominium association's property (which is what she lives on). It was a terrible mess today, however, workers from the business came over, at my request, and cleaned it up on the other side of the fence (which is townhome property). Thank you. Semi trucks park in his lot at various hours – 11:30 p.m., midnight, with their engines running. When that happens, I simply call the police who come and shag them away. Asked that the business owner simply remind his vendors of his delivery hours so that he is considerate of his neighbors. There is also a new, smaller, greenhouse erected there. I'd like to know if that material used is fire proof. Asked if that is a permanent or temporary structure. The landscape barrier (which to her is an ongoing issue) is unacceptable to me. He has evergreens planted around the garbage container which to me would be more acceptable as a landscape barrier than what is currently there – low lying plants. Wished the Buikema's and their family the best with their business. I don't plan on being in the Village forever, however, I feel the message they are sending to people who live adjacent to businesses is not a positive one. Asked that the petitioner and their employees please be considerate of their neighbors.

STEPHENS: Asked the Buikema's to approach the podium to address Ms. Casper's concerns.

AUBIN: Swore in Terese O'Brian, Attorney for the Buikema's: 15020 Ravinia, Suite 20, Orland Park.

AUBIN: Swore in Robert and Linda Buikema, 7643 West 157th Place, Orland Park:

BUIKEMA: Stated that the landscaping around the dumpster had been approved by the Village. There are evergreens around the perimeter of the wooden dumpster enclosure. There is a six-foot fence that runs along the whole back of the property. Part of it is the condominium's fence; the rest is what we installed so that we could have some security in the back. I'm sure everyone knows that it has been a very windy spring thus far. We have White Castle boxes in my yard and papers blown in from everywhere. Some things cannot be controlled. The only dilemma we do have, which I cannot correct is that on garbage day, the garbage trucks do lift the containers up into the air to dump into the truck and while the

container is lifted in the air, if it is windy, some debris may blow out. I cannot control that, however, our people do check the fence regularly in order to see if there is garbage on the other side. Noted that the condominium president has come over to talk to him and has indicated that Every Bloomin' Thing is doing a good job. We are trying. In regard to the issue about trucks, stated he has gates that are locked on the perimeter of his property. Trucks cannot go in there unless one of us are on the property. There are occasions during the summer where we have to load trucks between six and seven in the morning, however, there is not excessive noise. The code indicates there cannot be excessive noise and we don't have excessive noise.

STEPHENS: Asked Mr. Sullivan if there isn't a Village Ordinance that addresses the loading and unloading of trucks.

SULLIVAN: There is a nuisance ordinance. Something has to be considered a nuisance. If there is something at midnight that is very noisy – waking people up – that would be considered a nuisance. However, if the petitioner is locking their gate...

BUIKEMA: We close at 8:00 p.m. and open at 8:00 a.m. My guys are there earlier so we can get ready. We schedule our deliveries between those times because we have to be there. If a truck comes over the road that we can't control, I don't know where they park and I'm not there.

STEPHENS: We can't hold you responsible for something like that.

BUIKEMA: Noted that at the Thornton's Gas Station, they are unloading over there a lot earlier than us and perhaps that is what Ms. Casper is hearing. I don't know.

SULLIVAN: They certainly call the police if there is a problem in the middle of the night. They certainly have the right to do that. The police will go and check it out.

STEPHENS: Addressing his comments to Ms. Casper, stated that if she is experiencing a nuisance from the trucks – if it is not coming from his property and there are trucks bothering her – it is a nuisance, then she has every right to call the police.

CASPER: Clarified that she has done so many times.

STEPHENS: Has that solved her problem?

CASPER: No. I called the police department last week. Some of these could be his semi trucks delivering outside on his driveway there – actually, that is a public street. At 77th Avenue, they sit there. This particular time the police officer and I watched this – it was 11:30 p.m. (I had called the non-emergency number) – the

police officer arrived at approximately 11: 55 p.m. and he drove around the semi and left. Unlike previous officers, he did not go in with his flashlight and see if the driver was sleeping.

STEPHENS: That is on 77th Avenue?

CASPER: Yes, adjacent to Mr. Buikema's business. Sometimes they are trucks waiting for Mr. Buikema in the morning to unload flowers. Sometimes they could not be related to the business. I don't know the purpose for which a truck is there when they are there.

STEPHENS: Then we cannot hold Mr. Buikema responsible.

CASPER: I am not saying that, however, would like to provide a reminder about the appropriate times and that their drivers should not be allowed to park their vehicles in a public drive and wait for extended periods of time and run their engines until the Buikema's open their business in the morning. That is all I am saying.

STEPHENS: Okay. Thank you.

STEPHENS: Invited comments and/or questions from the Plan Commissioners and received none.

DZIERWA: Moved to accept the findings of fact of this Plan Commission, the findings of fact set forth in this Staff Report dated April 22, 2008, and moved to recommend to the Village Board, approval of the Special Use Permit Amendment to include setback reductions for the greenhouse canopy structure from 15' to 8' along 77th Avenue and from 25' to 5' along 159th Street.

PARISI: Second.

**This matter was RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Development Services & Planning, due back on 4/28/2008**

**Aye:** 6 - Commissioner Jacobs, Commissioner Dzierwa, Commissioner Aubin, Commissioner Stephens, Commissioner Thompson and Commissioner Parisi

**Nay:** 0

**Absent:** 1 - Culligan

**2008-0188 Land Development Code Amendment - Section 5-101 thru 5-109 and Section 5-111**

SULLIVAN/PITTOS: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated April 22, 2008, as presented.

SULLIVAN: Noted that both he and Mr. Pittos will be presenting this and the

following code amendments and will try to do so in a way that does not become too lengthy. Pointed out that Mr. Pittos did a great job summarizing in the Staff Reports, just what each one was about and why each were significant. That matches up with the format that shows the new text in red and with the text to be deleted, stricken out.

STEPHENS: On page V-101-5 under “a. Plans with Plats of Subdivision” wherein it states “Applicants for plat approval may be required to submit additional information or studies, such as building envelopes and conceptual plans”, often times we ask for traffic studies. Would we need to add that in there or would studies include that?

PITTOS: That would probably include that.

SULLIVAN: Actually, in our petition, we have very specific requirements that tell you when you have to produce a traffic study. It is pretty much covered in that way.

STEPHENS: On page V-101-9 under “F. 3. Expiration”, wherein it states that “If there is no activity after one (1) year of approval by the Board of Trustees of a special use and/or final plan, the special use and final plan shall expire.” – asked if the following language could be inserted there to say “unless an extension is requested and granted prior to one year expiration date”.

SULLIVAN: Sure. Actually, they’ve granted them after that one year expiration date so perhaps we could simply say “granted by the Village Board.”

STEPHENS: Okay, otherwise they would have to start over and go through the entire process.

PITTOS: In reference to V-102, noted there were a lot of changes. A lot of the names are being changed to Development Services Department from Community Development Department and the Building Department. The only substantial change is found in subsection “a” where we are reducing the number of units from seven to six. That basically brings it in line with other parts of the code that use that six or more units as a threshold.

STEPHENS: Should that read “six units or less”? Why are you moving from seven to six?

PITTOS: That is basically being consistent with other requirements in the code that say we are going to do this from six units on. This is the only case that the number seven is actually used. Everything else uses six as the threshold.

STEPHENS: Six units or more would be better.

PITTOS: That “or more” phrase is unchanged from what is currently there.

STEPHENS: Yes, but six units was my concern because as we go further in 5106, I think the language reads "fewer than six".

SULLIVAN: That is actually correct. There is a different set of development review processes for fewer than six. It is either "six or more" or "fewer than six". You could say "fewer than six" or "five or less", either way.

STEPHENS: "Fewer than six" means "five or less".

SULLIVAN: Correct. You can say it either way: "six or more" or "fewer than six". Both are okay.

STEPHENS: What does this mean: "Development permitted as of right".

SULLIVAN: It is sort of a legal term. If you had a lot that is R-3 and is conforming, you have the right to build a single-family home subject to the codes on it. However, this does not allow you to just come in and do it without getting permits or confirming things as they go through the Village Review process. You still have to come in and get permits and do the things you need to do. It doesn't really mean anything as far as we review anything.

STEPHENS: So this is something that was in the code that was meaningless?

SULLIVAN: As far as we are concerned, we've never run into this as an issue with anything we've ever done.

STEPHENS: Okay, let's move on.

STEPHENS: On page V-105-2 under "F. Special Use Permits and Bulk Regulations", in the fourth line down, delete "the Director or".

PLAN COMMISSION: Agreed those three words should be eliminated.

STEPHENS: On page V-105-8 under "N. Termination of Special Use Permits", wherein at the end, the text (in red) states "Special use permits shall also expire if they are not utilized for one year". Recommend adding the language "unless an extension is granted by the Board".

PITTOS: Yes.

PITTOS: On page V-109-1 under "Section 5-109. Variances", again, we have the standards for variances and the petitions. Here we've clearly labeled them this time "Standards Applicable to All Variances". We are also talking about the Hearing Officers and what they do for variances and what the Plan Commission does for variances.

SULLIVAN: In that same section under “A. Authority and Purpose”, in the second-to-the-last sentence, recommended changing “six (6)” to “five (5)” so that it reads: “dwelling and those applications affecting multi-family dwellings of five (5) units or less. This is in order to be consistent with the other wording.

PITTOS: Agreed.

STEPHENS: On page V-109-2 under “F. Limitations on Variances Granted”, questioned why the words “by the Hearing Officer or the Plan Commission” had been stricken out of the full sentence: “Variances shall be granted by the Hearing Officer or the Plan Commission in the following instances.”.

PITTOS: Noted that these are not the only variances that the Plan Commission has, in the past, recommended to the Village Board to approve. These are variances that more or less have existing development on them. Indicated the Chairman is correct; there should be a reference there to either the Hearing Officers or the Plan Commission. Staff will definitely look into that and clarify that statement.

STEPHENS: On page V-109-3 under “H. Special Use Procedures”, suggest the deletion of the word “major” so that the sentence reads “...the applicant may elect to follow the procedures for a special use permit set forth in Section 5-105...”

PITTOS: Thanked the Chairman for pointing that out and indicated he would make that change.

STEPHENS: After reviewing 5-101 – 5-111, indicated it would be a good time to stop, before going further, to take comments from the public.

AUBIN: Swore in Messrs. David Sosin and Stephen Gregory

SOSIN, 11800 S. 75th Avenue, Palos Heights, IL.

GREGORY, Chairman of the local Government Affairs Committee, Southwest Suburban Home Builders.

SOSIN: Stated he is present tonight, pro bono, representing the homeowners. When we got this material we immediately disseminated it to our 104 builder members, many of whom do not build in Orland Park, however, some of them do. We had a meeting and received comments. It has taken a month to do this. Noted there are a number of comments on a number of these sections this evening.

STEPHENS: Stated as a matter of public record, that he has received copies of Mr. Sosin’s comments a couple of days ago. Indicated he gave copies of that, to

Staff, this afternoon.

SOSIN: None of the comments, we believe, go to quality of the houses and developments. Most of the comments are related to procedure, added expense that we believe does not increase quality. For example, a month ago, some changes to the landscape ordinance were passed. They certainly were not diminutions of the responsibility of the building community or homeowners and landscaping. We had no comments about those. That was approved. Steve Gregory (a Landscape Architect) looked at them. We considered them appropriate and the issues are not quality. But here, there are some issues. Noted that Mr. Sullivan indicated that lawyers did not write this. I certainly do not believe that the lawyers should have the exclusive province, however, there are some problems with some of the language as written that down the road is going to haunt all of us. For example, the language on the signage (just a nuts and bolts issue) says that the sign will go up not less than 15 days before the hearing and not more than 30 days before the hearing. The Plan Commission had a case this evening that was continued. That happens all the time. It happens because the engineering is not done; because we are still working on items with the plans, and those signs go up and many times the sign is up way more than 30 days before the actual public hearing. It should be before the scheduled hearing date. That is an important issue because notice goes to the whole issue of due process and we think that needs to be changed. (Noted that this is covered in Section 101.)

PITTOS: On page 101-10, letter b. Notification Requirements, number 3 (which discusses the signs and then number 5 as well – that all required notices shall be provided at least 15 days but no more than 30 days in advance).

STEPHENS: Asked Staff if they concur with that change.

SULLIVAN: Yes.

SOSIN: In regard to terminations, stated there are so many times when there were reasons why people don't follow through or it doesn't get done. For example, we had one where a condition was imposed that a certain permit be gotten by another governmental body prior to going to the Board because of some doubts as to whether it would be obtained. It took a long time. After the permit was issued, it came back and Staff's thought was (clarifying it was not this Staff) that this thing was too old because it had taken a year and a half or two years. There are two points. First of all, it should say, except upon good cause shown. Secondly, we think there should be some notice. If it says you might terminate it, when are you and when aren't you. Just send the developer, send the homeowner, a letter and say that the next meeting is scheduled for this or that date and if we don't hear from you, we will assume that you have abandoned this project. However, to wait another six months or a year and then after they've spent another \$30,000 with engineering, and find out that the project was terminated, they have to either start over again or come to the Board and ask the Board to reinstate it –

that is not fair – that is not the right way to do it.

STEPHENS: What section is that in?

SOSIN: It is in a number of places that deal with termination.

PITTOS: In 5-101 it is page 9, letter F. I believe Mr. Sosin is referring to the six-month rule.

SOSIN: Yes and the one-year rule too. We are going to have a lot of those one-years with everything that is going on or lack thereof in the building community. That is something I think the homeowners are going to address with the Board and maybe ask for kind of a blanket consideration to temporarily waive that one-year rule, but we are just specifically talking about six months and the one year.

STEPHENS: Asked Mr. Sosin what his recommendation is on that.

SOSIN: That they not be terminated without prior notice and that they be terminated by the Plan Commission.

STEPHENS: I don't think that is unreasonable.

SULLIVAN: As far as I know, we do contact the petitioner and inform when the petition will next be heard before the Plan Commission as a public hearing and when it will have to be terminated. We agree that we need to notify them and if the language needs to be more clear, we agree with that.

STEPHENS: Okay, we'll put that in there.

SOSIN: There was a comment made that any change in the plat would require a new public hearing. I did not have that in my memo because I did not catch that when I read it.

STEPHENS: I don't think that is what was said. I think he said that if by virtue of the engineering, it significantly changed, the ...

SOSIN: No... we concur with that; that happens all the time. That is just a fact of life. Some times you have to come back if it changes. The part that I heard was that in regard to the plat process, it would come back for a public hearing because it normally affects the density. Our point was that it was more work for everybody. If it doesn't affect the density and the plat changes and if the density doesn't go up – if it goes down as result of it, which happens many times (where you need more detention, more this, more that) you end up with 72 lots and when you end up you only have 70 lots, we don't think you want to hear that case and we don't think the builder should have to come back with a plan that is going to have less density.

Just because it changed, does not make it worse.

STEPHENS: I think that is a reasonable request as well. If it is going to lower the density, why would we want to come back and hear that. What section is that in?

PITTOS: I spoke about subdivision review and on page 101-2, a. Public Hearing, we included subdivision review under public hearing because often times we'll get a parcel of land that gets subdivided for the purpose of construction of a new home, for example. That is increasing the density in the area. In terms of lot consolidation, what I've seen happen and what has been attempted in one subdivision on the northwest side of town. A homeowner owned his home and then a lot was vacant adjacent to him and he owned that and wanted to consolidate the two lots to extend his home further. There is a decrease in the density that was originally approved on the subdivision because of the one lot and the one house that was going to take over that lot as well.

SULLIVAN: Those are really public notice issues which is not the same thing that Mr. Sosin is talking about.

SOSIN: No, not really. I'm talking more about where engineering changes it and you come in for a final plat and it changes. They usually do. This Plan Commission usually never sees them because they are real minor.

PITTOS: Are you referring then to the conditions on record plats of subdivision.

SOSIN: Yes.

PITTOS: That is on page 5, c, so the argument changes a little bit. I spoke with the Village's engineer who basically stated that when conditions are put on plats of subdivision, there is no real way of ensuring that condition is actually met because once that plat goes down to the Mayor and the Mayor signs it and it is off to the County, there is no way of fulfilling any conditions afterward. What the engineer was saying is that when a condition is placed on that plat, don't approve it until the conditions are met and then you approve it. It is not that the plat would go through the entire process all over again.

STEPHENS: I don't think that is what he was talking about.

SOSIN: The comment was made that when a plat changes, it should come back for public hearing. It should not come back if it doesn't negatively affect the density.

STEPHENS: What you want to say is, except in cases where the density is either reduced or unaffected.

SOSIN: Yes. That is all.

AUBIN: Where in the code does it say if you change the plat, you have to come back?

SULLIVAN: We are going to have to look that up and follow up on this one. We will write it down and look into it further.

STEPHENS: I don't disagree with that. If the engineering is such where it changed the density and reduced it, I don't know why that would have to come back to us. If it increased it, sure, we are going to have to review it. But if it reduced it, why would we have to deal with it? How does the rest of the Plan Commissioners feel about that?

PLAN COMMISSIONERS: Feel it is redundant.

PITTOS: We'll note and check it and I will be in touch with Mr. Sosin.

STEPHENS: Okay, we can accept that then from wherever that is in there.

SOSIN: There is one section that I believe is eliminated and it is F. That one is giving us some considerable concern. There are times where this compliance approval is very important. There are times when developers need this and should get it and if it is approved, there is nothing in our view that should prevent a builder or developer from getting an official statement that it is approved. It either is or is not approved. To eliminate that gives us concern because why is it being eliminated and why can't some things that help the development community be maintained – how does this negatively affect the Village. It certainly helps us in financing, in sales, in developments; with users and buyers when they want to see something. We've gotten letters from the Village in the past, especially from the Village Manager's office, that have allowed us to proceed with projects. It is getting tougher out there to get money from banks. Many times the banks want to see this.

STEPHENS: You're talking about – "...a development compliance approval constitutes an official statement that the proposed development or modification of existing development complies with these regulations and constitutes a basis for issuance of a building permit" – you are saying that if this is approved, you are entitled to a letter from the Village saying that it has been approved.

SOSIN: Yes, at some point.

STEPHENS: Why would that be deleted? Why would that be a problem?

SULLIVAN: One of the ideas was that if the building permit is issued, that says the same thing.

STEPHENS: Are we talking about a single residence or are we talking about a two-lot or five-lot subdivision

SOSIN: It doesn't differentiate.

STEPHENS: So if it is a two-lot or a five-lot subdivision and it has been approved, what would be the problem with giving a letter of approval so the petitioner can take the letter of approval to the bank to get financing?

SULLIVAN: It just seems redundant to the permit.

STEPHENS: Wouldn't an annexation agreement say the same thing?

SOSIN: It might and might not.

STEPHENS: What would be the problem with a letter saying it has been approved?

SULLIVAN: We will look into it, however, it references for issuance of a building permit and so why not just base it on that? That tells the lender that they have a building permit which means the Village is saying it is all approved.

SOSIN: That is not how it works because many times the financing has to be in place for acquisition. There is no building permit yet. The financing needs to be in place to set up a construction loan to help pay, among others, the engineer and even the Village's engineer

STEPHENS: You are talking about just for one lot.

SOSIN: The bigger the development the more important it is.

STEPHENS: Of course, I understand that.

SOSIN: Many times you don't need it. However, if you need it, you need it. It happens periodically. That is why the section is in here. That is why it was enacted (in 1998).

STEPHENS: It is not unusual that a lender would require a statement from the municipality that if it is a five lot or a three lot development or even one lot where the builder bought a lot and is going in to get financing, that they get a letter that it is an approved lot of record.

PARISI: Or the issuance of a letter of credit from a financial institution.

SOSIN: Absolutely, that is another reason. There are times when it is not necessary, yet there are times when it is.

SULLIVAN: We are not in a position to completely answer because there are so many things tied into this. When final engineering is approved, there is a letter that tells them that. That is usually the final thing where it is telling you that everything is approved, but not always. So when does that letter get issued – at what point? Sometimes you are going to want it earlier than when we say everything is finished. We also would prefer to have every permit from the Water Reclamation District and IDOT and everybody else issued too. Do we wait until that happens? I don't think that is what they want.

STEPHENS: Mr. Aubin just mentioned Board approval.

SULLIVAN: That is a given. If they have Board approval, they can get minutes and we can give them a letter on that, however, that is not what they really want.

STEPHENS: Is that satisfactory?

PARISI: If I understand what they are looking for, is an indication if they are going for financing, is an indication as to the feasibility of this project – the acceptability of this project, prior to taking additional steps that are required to actually get the issuance of a permit.

SOSIN: I think the answer is that in the real world, you don't get a letter from the Board. We don't call the Trustees and ask them for a letter. You get a letter from the Development Department. They would be the ones asked "is this project approved". It is my understanding that before you get a building permit, there is a form that the Development Services Department signs to the Building Department to say it is okay to issue a permit. I've seen where they've said it is not okay and we have to then figure out why and get it done. There are times when you need that letter – some type of certification (gave an example where this applied to an Orland Crossing restaurant).

STEPHENS: With the exception of Staff having to write these letters for everything that goes through, can we say something like "if requested by the developer or by the petitioner?"

SULLIVAN: We are not going to give you an answer on this one now because there are other things to look at, however, we are happy to look at it. We will put that down as an option. (in 5-102-F)

SOSIN: The elimination of section 504 is an issue. We have the benefit of building in many villages and I think we have some perspective. More comes to the Village Plan Commission in Orland Park than in any other Village we do work in. We've built shopping centers that are built without going before the Plan Commission. We are not suggesting that is what this Village wants to do or will ever do, however, the point is that there are certain things that it is a permitted

use, it fits on the property, there are no variations, it complies with all of the Village requirements – especially in single-family housing. If this section is eliminated, I think there is a strong argument to make that every house permit that will be issued now has to come before one of these commissions because there is no more by right zoning. By right zoning has a set of rules that are not subjective; they are objective. If you are of a certain zoning and you comply with everything, you are entitled to a permit. Everything does not have to go a commission or be reviewed. It is reviewed by the Building Department and the Staff. With the elimination of this, we think it is of concern. This will not affect any major developments. They are all special uses, however, there are times when people can go in and get things done without going through red tape. Frankly, it will affect the homeowner more than the building community. It seems like we are always here, but when we build just houses or add on a garage, it will affect us also.

SULLIVAN: We can talk to our attorney on this one, however, our view on this one is that we set up the code in a way that it specifically tells you that if you are this, you do this, if you are that, you do this. It is already set up that you would not have to come back to the Plan Commission to build your house on a single-family lot. If you want a variance, you go to the Public Hearing Officer. Those things are already set up clearly, we think, in the code. It is not left to chance that somebody with a single-family home might have to go the Plan Commission. We don't agree it is that loose that someone might make that assumption and do that. Again, this is a legal issue that we will have to talk to the attorney about.

SOSIN: We will certainly work with them. Maybe we are wrong. Maybe it is elsewhere in the code, but we cannot figure out why this was eliminated.

STEPHENS: Under what instance, other than what he is talking about, would this apply?

SOSIN: What the section envisions is that there are times when people have a right to develop property and do certain things.

STEPHENS: If they comply with all of the codes.

SOSIN: Yes. Once it is taken out of here there is no by right zoning.

STEPHENS: In other words, it gives them a legal basis to come back to the Village.

SOSIN: Right. It runs in the area of taste and aesthetics, etc.

STEPHENS: We'll take this 5-104 and revisit this after you have a chance to talk to legal counsel and then you can talk to Staff about it.

SOSIN: On a special use issue, we think it is a good idea actually. In regard to

variances, we think that the changes are ill-advised (5-109). It says in here that variances will only be granted in the following instances. The comment that was made by Staff was that there are other places and all sorts of other variances. Many village codes have a catch-all phrase at the end that would say "and such other deviations from the code as are recommended by the Plan Commission and approved by the Board". You don't have that provision in here. This Village has always been very tough on variances but to reduce the ability of the Plan Commission and the Board to grant variances, takes away discretion. The burden is still on the person requesting it but I have been before this Board on every one of these sections for one project or another and it is still within your discretion to do it but to take away your discretion and to cut it down from 25 to 20%, things like that, we don't think that makes sense. We think that this commission and the board can make that decision and why eliminate any of them.

PITTOS: We will be taking the comments into consideration. Mr. Sosin referenced the decrease from 25% to 20% -- that is actually going to stay the same, at 25%. Mr. Sosin apparently has an older version of this -- that is F1 on page 2.

STEPHENS: The only comment I made was that I think we should have a right to look at it and if it is something that the Plan Commission would want to grant because of what ever condition, we should leave that back in because you took out by the Hearing Officer or the Plan Commission. We'd like to see that back in.

SULLIVAN: We have no problem looking at other variances. There was not a ton of discussion on our part to go through every possible variance that we should put in here to consider. A couple of things we took out were just oddly worded and confusing and strange and that is why they were taken out. We have no problem with looking at other potential variances to put in there. Stated they've been told by the Village Attorney that the Village Board can grant any variance they want so we are not limiting them with this code. These are just meant to be guidelines and we are trying to be relatively consistent and not trying to weaken our own code.

SOSIN: Just a general statement -- and such other variances upon good cause shown that are approved by the Board.

SULLIVAN: We can run that past the attorney.

SOSIN: Okay. Now, in Section I, when you remove from here the idea that the variances not being reviewable by the Board -- do I understand the reason for that is because it is in 101?

PITTOS: That is correct.

SOSIN: Okay. I think that comment is fine.

STEPHENS: Okay. The ones that are going to be discussed and brought back are 5-102.F, 5-104, and 5-109. If we are going to pass on this, we would pass everything with the exception of 102-F...

SOSIN: Unless there is some real over-riding reason, I think it gets very confusing when you have some things in the state of re-drafting – why not just fix the whole thing.

STEPHENS: If this petition deals with section 5-101 through 109 and Section 5-111, if we don't have any problems with the other sections in here, why don't we pass those and keep these for the next discussion.

SULLIVAN: We really do not have a problem with continuing the entire thing once more if we are going to have multiple changes in most sections. That probably will be confusing.

STEPHENS: Okay, we'll continue this.

PITTOS: I've made notes within the code text. I went page by page.

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion for a continuance from the Plan Commissioners.

AUBIN: Moved to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission, the findings of fact set forth in this Staff Report dated April 22, 2008 and moved to recommend that petition #2008-0188, be continued to the May 13, 2008 Plan Commission meeting.

THOMPSON: Second.

**This matter was CONTINUED to the Plan Commission, due back on 5/13/2008**

**Aye:** 6 - Commissioner Jacobs, Commissioner Dzierwa, Commissioner Aubin, Commissioner Stephens, Commissioner Thompson and Commissioner Parisi

**Nay:** 0

**Absent:** 1 - Culligan

**2008-0189 Land Development Code Amendment - Section 5-110**

PITTOS: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated April 22, 2008, as presented.

STEPHENS: Invited comments and/or questions from the public and received none.

STEPHENS: Invited comments and/or questions from the Plan Commissioners

and received none.

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion from the Plan Commissioners.

AUBIN: Moved to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission, the findings of fact set forth in this Staff Report dated April 22, 2008 and moved to recommend to the Village Board, approval of the proposed amendments to the Land Development Code Section 5-110 as written in the attached Exhibit "B".

THOMPSON: Second.

**This matter was RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Development Services & Planning, due back on 4/28/2008**

**Aye:** 6 - Commissioner Jacobs, Commissioner Dzierwa, Commissioner Aubin, Commissioner Stephens, Commissioner Thompson and Commissioner Parisi

**Nay:** 0

**Absent:** 1 - Culligan

**2008-0190 Land Development Code Amendment - Section 5-112**

PITTOS: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated April 22, 2008, as presented.

STEPHENS: In reference to 112-9, asked why there is an increase in the letter of credit to 24 months from 12. Banks only want to issue letters of credit for 12 months because then they get the renewal fee. I don't know of any instance where you can get a letter of credit for two years. That is a problem from a practical standpoint.

PARISI: Concur.

PITTOS: We can change that back, however, if the bank requires it after 12 months, that is the banks requirement.

SULLIVAN: We will fix that.

STEPHENS: In 8.a.2., "a new or substitute completion bond" -- don't you want to take that out and replace it with "a new or substitute letter of credit or other approved security method".

PITTOS: Yes. Will fix that.

STEPHENS: On 8.a. is this where the Public Works Department decides whether or not they are going to release the letter of credit?

SULLIVAN: They are actually making a request that it be reduced.

STEPHENS: Why should the Public Works Department have that authority. I don't agree with that.

SULLIVAN: Their perspective is that they are doing the inspections of the public improvements and they have to maintain them in the future so they want to make sure they have a handle on it.

STEPHENS: My experience with this Public Works Department is that they are not very responsive and they will tell you something and if you don't like it, that is tough and they won't answer your phone calls again until you do whatever they want. I think this gives them too much authority. They are the Public Works Department. They are not a Village body. They are not a Plan Commission. They are not a Board. I don't think they should have that much authority. If the designing engineer and the Village engineer agree that these items have been completed then that is all there should be. It should not be up to the Public Works Department to tell us they don't like the way we put the road in or we don't like the way a curb was put in so rip it out and put a new curb in. If it is in compliance with the design engineer, Public Works is not a design engineer. They are not civil engineers. Why should they have that authority?

SULLIVAN: I think it is largely because it is set up to have a person do the inspection and they will be the ones maintaining it. They are very familiar with what the situations are and what they need. The Village Engineer and the Village Manager are not used to these and certainly do not have time to do those inspections.

STEPHENS: They can do the inspections but if there is going to be a disagreement and a discussion, Public Works is not going to speak with the design engineers. The Village engineers should speak with the original design engineers so they can work out their differences. Not the Public Works because they are just going to say "hey, we don't care what you say, do it the way we want it – we don't care what the engineering says, do it the way we want it" and that is where a lot of problems come in and they will just hold up the reduction indefinitely until you do it their way and that is not fair and it is not right.

SULLIVAN: We will put a note down and go back and talk about it.

STEPHENS: I think that we should eliminate the Public Works Department and leave filing with the Village Engineer and that is what my recommendation is. Can we go forward with that change in the language?

SULLIVAN: What we are saying is that we don't want to commit here tonight to that because there are a lot of other people involved. We need to go back and talk to them.

STEPHENS: Okay, fair enough. So it is 5-112 Section 8 a. – delete Public Works Department (that is my recommendation) and keep the Village Engineer.

AUBIN: If the language the Chairman and Staff just talked about has to have further approval, then my suggestion would be to continue this to the May 13th meeting.

SULLIVAN: My guess is that there are going to be other questions from the public in regard to this one too.

SOSIN: Stated they have a lot to talk about in this section. We have a concern about taking out any other forms of security. We have a concern about the park language. Our biggest concern is about homeowners associations and how they should be handled when they are not doing what they are suppose to be doing. We have some positive suggestions. Also the issue raised about Public Works, not so much what they start with but where you go from there. In the past the people who have decided on other securities has always been the Village Manager's Office. That is who, as a practical matter, you go to when you have a subdivision all done and you can't get a letter of credit any more because there are no more lots to back up the letter of credit. To save this Plan Commission some time and not have them have to do part of it, why don't we have our Builders' Association meet with them, go over this one section and see if we can't move it along and maybe get it done before the next meeting rather than taking a lot of Plan Commission time.

STEPHENS: Asked for Staff's feelings about that.

SULLIVAN: That is fine.

STEPHENS: I have concerns about other aspects of this as well. I'd like to be included in that meeting as well. Would any of the other Plan Commissioners want to be notified?

SULLIVAN: If we have a quorum, we have to publish.

DZIERWA: Let's simply designate a representative.

STEPHENS: I'll attend on behalf of the Plan Commissioners to work out Section 5-112. Let's continue this to the June 10th meeting.

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion from the Plan Commissioners.

AUBIN: Moved to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission, the findings of fact set forth in this Staff Report dated April 22, 2008 and moved to continue petition number 2008-0190, Section 5-112, Land Development Code Amendment, to the June 10, 2008 Plan Commission meeting.

THOMPSON: Second.

**This matter was CONTINUED to the Plan Commission, due back on 6/10/2008**

**Aye:** 6 - Commissioner Jacobs, Commissioner Dzierwa, Commissioner Aubin, Commissioner Stephens, Commissioner Thompson and Commissioner Parisi

**Nay:** 0

**Absent:** 1 - Culligan

**2008-0191 Land Development Code Amendment - Section 6-101 thru 6-212**

SULLIVAN: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated April 22, 2008, as presented.

STEPHENS: Invited comments and/or questions from the public and received none.

STEPHENS: Invited comments and/or questions from the Plan Commissioners and received none.

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion from the Plan Commissioners.

AUBIN: Moved to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission, the findings of fact set forth in this Staff Report dated April 22, 2008 and moved to recommend to the Village Board, approval of the proposed amendments to Land Development Code Sections 6-101, 6-102, 6-103, 6-201, 6-202, 6-303, 6-303.5, 6-204, 6-204.5, 6-207, 6-208, 6-210, 6-211 and 6-212 as written in the attached Exhibit "D" subject to the following instruction: (1) that in the final draft of the proposed amendments, all text with strikethrough is eliminated from the text, all highlighted section reference tags are un-highlighted, and all red text is fully incorporated into the text of the Code as black text.

THOMPSON: Second.

**This matter was RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Development Services & Planning, due back on 4/28/2008**

**Aye:** 6 - Commissioner Jacobs, Commissioner Dzierwa, Commissioner Aubin, Commissioner Stephens, Commissioner Thompson and Commissioner Parisi

**Nay:** 0

**Absent:** 1 - Culligan

**2008-0192 Land Development Code Amendment - Sections 6-302 and 6-306**

SULLIVAN: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report

dated April 22, 2008, as presented.

STEPHENS: Invited comments and/or questions from the public and received none.

STEPHENS: Invited comments and/or questions from the Plan Commissioners and received none.

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion from the Plan Commissioners.

AUBIN: Moved to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission, the findings of fact set forth in this Staff Report dated April 22, 2008 and moved to recommend to the Village Board, approval of the proposed amendments to Land Development Code Sections 6-302, pages one thru five, and 6-306 with the addition of parking requirements for train stations to be added under Transportation and Utilities in the attached Exhibit "E" subject to the following instruction: (1) that in the final draft of the proposed amendments all text with strikethrough is eliminated from the text, all highlighted section reference tags are un-highlighted, and all red text is fully incorporated into the text of the code as black text.

THOMPSON: Second.

**This matter was RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Development Services & Planning, due back on 4/28/2008**

**Aye:** 6 - Commissioner Jacobs, Commissioner Dzierwa, Commissioner Aubin, Commissioner Stephens, Commissioner Thompson and Commissioner Parisi

**Nay:** 0

**Absent:** 1 - Culligan

## **NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### **2008-0183 15615 S. Harlem Retail Center**

Sean Bell, Olsen Architects  
Andrea Crowley, Attorney, Griffin & Gallagher  
Mike Ellayann , Unique Custom Builders  
Haythem Abdeljaber, Owner

TURLEY: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated April 22, 2008, as presented.

AUBIN: Swore in Ms. Crowley and Messrs. Bell, Ellayann and Haythem.

STEPHENS: Invited comments and/or questions from the petitioners.

CROWLEY: Indicated they are happy to bring their petition before the Village of

Orland Park's Plan Commission and then introduced the members of their team (present and sworn in). Indicated they are in general agreement with Staff's Report and the conditions recommended by Mrs. Turley, each of which we can comply with and intend to do so. We will comply with the Code requirements for the materials and will be labeled as indicated by Mrs. Turley. Thanked Staff and stated how happy they are about this project; happy to do something that does not need any changes and can meet the codes of the Village. Will answer any questions anyone may have. Noted they've brought samples along of building materials

STEPHENS: Asked the petitioners to show the material samples they brought.

BELL: Provided samples of the building materials and pointed out on the building rendering where each will be featured. Noted they are looking to use the rock face cast stone along the bottom (a banding across the bonding) that will show more of the rock face cast stone. Showed where the smoother face cast stone, larger panels (beige in color). A reddish-colored brick will be used toward the end of the building with more of a brownish-colored brick used in another section and yet a lighter-colored brick used in another area with more of the reddish-colored brick coming back into other sections to break it all up. The split-face brick will be used in sections across the bottom just to give the building a base to sit on.

STEPHENS: Invited comments and/or questions from the Plan Commissioners.

PARISI: Directing his question to Mrs. Turley, noted Staff had requested a 200-square-foot tree island in the center of the building in the west side of the parking lot. Asked her to point that out on the plan.

TURLEY: Pointed that out on the plan – stating it would go somewhere in that central location.

PARISI: I think this will be a tremendous improvement – like the contrast with the different colors which complement each other. This will be very nice.

THOMPSON: Noted that on the drawing included in the Plan Commissioner's packet, where the paver bricked island is going to go, there is the number 13 – what does that signify?

TURLEY: I think they are identifying the number of parking spaces in that area.

THOMPSON: My concern is that you say they are going to put an island in. There is going to be that sidewalk. Will this look off?

TURLEY: The parking island will remain, however, one of the changes being requested is that the sidewalk not be here because of the connection problem,

therefore, there will be greenery here as well.

THOMPSON: Thank you. That is all I have. I think this is going to be beautiful; a vast improvement from what is there now.

AUBIN: Concurred with the comments made by his fellow Plan Commissioners. This is a wonderful improvement for that site. Our Staff has done a great job putting this together. They have some very extensive conditions to be met in order for this petition go through. I'm glad the petitioner has indicated they will comply with all those conditions. Full speed ahead.

JACOBS: I agree that this is well thought out. While this is premature, asked the petitioner what they envisioned as the tenant mix – office, food...?

HAYTHEM: At this point, we do not have anyone in mind. We have a staff that will lease out the spaces for national tenants to whom I believe we will be talking to once we conquer this and are granted our permit. There will be a mix in there.

JACOBS: What is your timeline?

HAYTHEM: Approximately four months from permit.

DZIERWA: Asked Mrs. Turley to please bring back the artist's rendering. Congratulated the petitioner on coming up with something that is very creative for such a long building. Any time you have something one hundred feet or longer, you want to make it interesting and not boring. I think the multiple use of color is a good thing. The one thing that we cannot see is with this building elevation is canopies and awnings. I am sure that will add to the attraction of the building. The petitioner did a wonderful job will all sides of the building. Very creative. Asked Staff why they felt there was a need to add two more sidewalks on the Harlem Avenue side.

TURLEY: Just for convenience for access to the storefronts.

DZIERWA: Asked the petitioner if there is any idea in regard to how many different tenants there may be in this building.

HAYTHEM: It is too early to say right now. We might have 8,000 square feet tenants who take over out of the 14,000.

DZIERWA: If I were to make the motion, I would think that we wouldn't need those two extra sidewalks. Complimented Staff on seeing that their engineer will work with the permeable pavers.

STEPHENS: I'm not a big fan of split face cmu's and I believe that is what the petitioner is using along the bottom of the building.

BELL: It is a cast stone, yes.

STEPHENS: Is there any other building material you could use instead?

BELL: On the lower area, we will be using the bumpy-face cast stone. I think it is nice to have it in the lower area (approximately three feet). The rest of the area will be all flat. We have a choice of different colors. It is cast stone that we will be using.

STEPHENS: Am I correct – are you showing awnings?

BELL: Correct.

STEPHENS: What material will be used for the awnings?

BELL: Whatever the Village code requires?

TURLEY: I believe the architect said they will be canvas awnings. We need the awnings to be labeled for colors before it goes to Committee.

BELL: There will be different colors, separated to go with the different colored bricks.

STEPHENS: Like row houses?

BELL: Yes. Canvas awnings.

STEPHENS: Asked the petitioner if they are proposing to have entrances on the front as well as on the back?

BELL: Right now, entrance only from the parking lot side, to the stores.

STEPHENS: The entrance is going to be from the parking lot which is on the east side.

BELL: Also from the west side because the customers, if pedestrian, they could enter from the back or the front.

STEPHENS: That is what I was asking. Are you going to have entrances on the rear – on the east and entrances on the west side?

HAYTHEM: At this point we are not sure what the Staff recommends.

TURLEY: It was my understanding that there are going to be dual entrances although most people will probably enter from the parking lot side, however, they

were going to have the option of either.

STEPHENS: Because if they are not going to have any entrances from Harlem Avenue, does it make any more sense to add more walkways in there? So, are you going to have entrances on both sides?

HAYTHEM: There is one center we have done on 159th and Harlem and I've seen the tenants, where they've opened up the back door and the customers could enter from either the front or back doors.

STEPHENS: So the doors on the west side are going to be operational and the doors on the east side, which is contiguous to the parking lot, is also going to be operational.

HAYTHEM: Again, that will be up to the tenants.

STEPHENS: You're the builder. I'm asking you. If the tenant chooses to lock them, that is up to them. Are they going to be operational entrances.

CROWLEY: They will be operational, however, if the tenant chooses not to use them, then they will have that option.

STEPHENS: That is what I wanted to know. It would make no sense to have more sidewalk in the front if they are not operational entrances.

CROWLEY: We agree. These are built to be operational. It will be tenant-specific whether they actually choose to use them.

JACOBS: So, the west elevation and the east elevation are almost the same. Will that continue to look like what we have here?

BELL: Yes, it will.

JACOBS: So even if they choose not to use those doors, it is still going to look like this with doors?

BELL: Yes.

JACOBS: How are they going to receive deliveries?

CROWLEY: One of Mrs. Turley's requirements was that we add some loading spaces in the back as well. We will be doing that on the drawing for Committee. We will be labeling those. Time-limited loading spaces.

STEPHENS: One of the conditions on the motion is to designate some of the parking spaces for loading?

CROWLEY: Yes. We will be doing that. That is on the east side.

JACOBS: Thank you. I understand.

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion from the Plan Commissioners.

AUBIN: Moved to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission, the findings of fact set forth in the Staff Report dated April 22, 2008, and moved to recommend to the Village Board, approval of the Preliminary Site Plan entitled 15615 Harlem Inc. retail Center by DesignTek Engineering, Inc. and dated March 18, 2008, subject to the following conditions: (1) add one additional 200 square foot tree island near the center of the building along the west side of the parking lot prior to Committee; (2) delineate two time restricted loading zones in the parking area prior to Committee; (3) relocate the bike rack more convenient to entrances prior to Committee; (4) make two additional sidewalk connections between the Harlem Avenue sidewalk and the sidewalk along the Harlem building front prior to Committee; (5) provide two small signs that direct customers to shared parking spaces and provide pedestrian warning signs at the proposed striped crosswalk; (6) remove the sidewalk connection north of the parking lot only and remove sidewalk connection at the center of the parking lot prior to Committee; (7) Extend the 156th Street sidewalk crosswalk striping along the parkway to the east of 71st Court to connect with the shared parking lot; (8) increase the landscape buffer along the north property line to meet the required ten-foot landscape buffer yard, including a reduction of the sidewalk north of the building to five feet, prior to Committee; (9) submit a Landscape Plan, meeting all Village Codes, for separate review and approval within 60 days of final engineering approval. This is to include preservation and protection of existing trees along 71st Court as much as possible and parkway tree preservation and supplementation along Harlem. The rear buffer shall include bio-swales and rain gardens if engineering permits; (10) provide independent Engineer to oversee construction of permeable paver installation; and (11) all final engineering related items are met.

PARISI: Second.

AUBIN: Moved to recommend to the Village Board, approval of the elevations entitled "New Strip mall 15615 S. Harlem Inc. by WKOlson Architects Inc. and dated 10/09/07, subject to the following conditions: (1) labels are added for all building materials and colors prior to Committee; (2) the Code requirement for all masonry construction to the top of the windows is met, including the use of cast stone or equal for the building end caps; and (3) that all mechanical equipment is screened, either at grade level with landscaping or hidden behind the roofline.

PARISI: Second.

**This matter was RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Development Services & Planning, due back on 4/28/2008**

**Aye:** 6 - Commissioner Jacobs, Commissioner Dzierwa, Commissioner Aubin, Commissioner Stephens, Commissioner Thompson and Commissioner Parisi

**Nay:** 0

**Absent:** 1 - Culligan

**OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

STEPHENS: There being no further business before the Plan Commissioners, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Teri Dougherty  
Recording Secretary