VILLAGE OF ORLAND PARK

14700 Ravinia Avenue
Orland Park, IL 60462
www.orland-park.il.us

Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, September 9, 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 September 9, 2008 meeting of the Plan Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Lou Stephens.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Commissioner Thompson, seconded by Commissioner Dzierwa and carried to approve the minutes of the August 12, 2008 Plan Commission Meeting as presented with the following changes: (1) on page seven, in the last paragraph – the fourth sentence in Dr. Krad's comments, replace the word "Committee" with the word "Community"; (2) on page 12: (a) in the second full sentence at the top, insert the word "well" so that it reads "…a very well-built building…; (b) in the last sentence of the first paragraph, replace the word "our" with the words "the other" so that it reads "…that will complement the other building as well"; and (3) in the second paragraph on page nine: (a) replace the word "happen" with "happened" so that it reads "and I happened to be on the school board", and (b) in the sixth sentence, add the following words "that should alleviate the problem" so that it reads "Once that is completed, that should alleviate the problem".

A motion was made by Commissioner Patricia Thompson, seconded by Commissioner Steve Dzierwa, 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

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2008-0356 Winterset IV Office Park

TURLEY: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated September 9, 2008 as presented.

Raymond Dignan, 10703 Valley Court, Orland Park

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

AUBIN: Swore in Mr. Ray Dignan.

DIGNAN: As stated by Mrs. Turley, we worked very diligently on this very difficult piece of property. It is a nice asset to the neighboring parcel that I am developing to the south.

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

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

PARISI: No questions.

DZIERWA: Indicated he visited this site earlier in the day at which time he wasn't certain where the cross connects were with the parcel the petitioner is developing now. However, the petitioner satisfactorily explained that to him prior to this meeting's onset. Noted he took a couple pictures while there. That drive where it is sitting now – before the meeting the petitioner indicated it was going to go a little south – or it is further south now and the petitioner is moving it further north?

DIGNAN: The existing driveway for the Beary Landscaping parcel is half and half on the existing location. In our final engineering, we are addressing our access for the development.

DZIERWA: Thank you.

STEPHENS: So the drive you are going to put in there is north of the existing drive now?

DIGNAN: Approximately 15 feet north.

STEPHENS: Okay, thank you.

JACOBS: Indicated she did not have a question to ask, however, noted that Mr. Dignan always does a wonderful job and she is certain this will be another wonderful project.

AUBIN: Mr. Dignan has no comments or objections with the conditions in this evening's motion?

DIGNAN: No, I don't.

AUBIN: Then I have no questions, thank you.

THOMPSON: Concurred with her fellow Plan Commissioners and believes this will be a great asset, especially since it looks so bad over there. Wished Mr. Dignan good luck.

STEPHENS: Stated he checked with Staff earlier in the day in regard to the private roadway coming in off of 108th Avenue. The petitioner shows a 24-foot – back-to-curb to back-to-curb, which gives you an approximate 21-foot pavement. Would like that made wider to at least have a minimum of at least a 24-foot-wide

pavement.

DIGNAN: Agreed with the Chairman – the entrance of 108th Avenue – he agreed with the Chairman.

STEPHENS: And flare the ends out instead of having it come straight out.

DIGNAN: One of the comments Christopher Burke usually gives during an engineering exam/review is just that – to flare that out.

STEPHENS: Okay, we'll make that part of the motion. In addition to that, you go through the first parking area and then again, you have the same width private drive going through there. I'd like you to increase the width of that to 24-feet of asphalt pavement and the curb on both sides. My concern here is that you are going to have a lot of UPS drivers and other trucks coming in and out, making deliveries all day long. Obviously, these are medical buildings. You have people coming in and out all day long. You have to widen that entrance over there coming off of 108th Avenue so that there is no traffic problem there. The same thing as you go from parking lot to parking lot – needs to be a little wider.

DIGNAN: That is not a problem. I will work with Staff on that.

STEPHENS: We will put that in the motion. Noted that the elevation plan shows cultured stone, masonry unit. Asked for a clarification as to what exactly that means.

DIGNAN: That is real limestone. It is not a manufactured stone. It is a natural stone. We've just used that same term for years.

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 September 9, 2008 and moved to recommend to the Village Board, approval of the Preliminary Site Plan entitled "Preliminary Site Plan Winterset IV Office Park dated 7/09/08, with latest revision 8/22/08 by Raymond E. Derbas and Associates, subject to the following conditions: (1) add a note to the Site Plan along 108th Avenue stating that "50' right of way to be dedicated to the Village" prior to Committee; (2) Finalize 108th Avenue right-of-way dedication to the Village prior to issuance of building permits; (3) provide a cross access easement agreement with property to the south prior to issuance of building permits; (4) provide a Tree Survey and Mitigation Plan for all existing trees exceeding 4 inches in diameter that will be impacted by construction; (5) add one tree island in the parking lot in front of each building for a total of four additional islands; (6) provide a Landscape Plan, meeting all Village Codes, for separate review and approval within 60 days of final engineering approval. This is to include a detail for an outdoor sitting area to be located near

the most eastern building and cul-de-sac; (7) all final engineering related items are met; (8) an Erosion Control Plan is submitted for approval; (9) add signage to identify the loading areas; (10) the entrance private road should be 24-foot pavement with curb on both sides; and (11) that 108th Avenue should have a flared entryway.

PARISI: Second.

AUBIN: Moved to recommend to the Village Board, approval of the Elevations, entitled "Winterset IV Exterior Elevations" dated 8/28/08 by Craig Podalak Architects, subject to the following conditions: (1) identify clearly on the Site Plan which building sides have gables; and (2) add dumpster elevations that match the building masonry.

PARISI: Second.

AUBIN: Moved to recommend to the Village Board, approval of a Special Use Permit for a Planned Development to allow four buildings on one lot with modifications that include: (1) reduction of the north landscape buffer from a required 30' to a supplied 10'; and (2) reduction of the detention setback from a required 25' to a supplied 15'.

PARISI: Second.

AUBIN: Moved to recommend to the Village Board, the rezoning of the petitioned parcel from the existing E-1 Estate Residential Zoning District to ORI Mixed Use Zoning District.

PARISI: Second.

This matter was RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Planning and Economic Development Committee, due back on 9/22/2008

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

Nay: 0

2008-0507 Land Development Code Amendments Section 2-102. Definitions

FLOM: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated September 9, 2008

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

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

JACOBS: No comments.

AUBIN: No comments.

DZIERWA: Noted definitions he felt should be included. Since these were all in alphabetical order, indicated he was surprised to see a definition such as Lot Navigation missing. Has that been considered? On page 28 under signs, there are all types of signs listed – directional, flashing, free-standing, etc. What about vehicular signs under "V". You see a lot of businesses that park their vehicles in parking lots along main thoroughfares. Since they cannot get the sign they want, they plaster a big sign on the side of a truck. Since the truck moves, it is not considered a sign yet it basically skirts our ordinance. Going to the "M's" – Mechanical equipment (page 18) – that would be a good definition to include in our section of definitions. On page 16 we should probably include "Infrastructure". On page 32 we could include "Traffic" and a whole outline on traffic (such as what kinds of traffic). Asked Staff if they feel his comments are necessary? If Staff is using a guideline that does not include the definitions he is suggesting, he will withdraw his comments.

FLOM: The goal of revising the definitions is to make them easy to use and easy to understand so anything we add in would be worthwhile. Indicated she would like to get the full list prepared by Commissioner Dzierwa and take a look at them. In the report, we did pull a lot of the definitions from text books on the subject. Clarified she is more than happy to hear any additions to the definitions.

DZIERWA: You talked about an outdoor market in here. What about a farm stand where you are using an existing building? Maybe an attention-getting device could be handled under signs or are you using it as a free-standing definition and maybe mention it again in signs.

FLOM: The attention-getting device is called out in the signage section of our code which is why I think it is defined here so that when you are in signage and see attention-getting devices prohibited and you wonder what an attention-getting device is, you would refer back to here. We can always do a "refer to" as in signs – something like that.

DZIERWA: On page 13 you had something about "glare" . If we are looking to update for the future, we might want to include in "glare", perhaps something like solar panels as a subsection as they do cause glare. Thank you. That is about all I have at the moment.

THOMPSON: I have nothing further to add other than that I think it needs to be reviewed again to see if we can add some other items to the list.

PARISI: Nothing further to add except to say that this is a pretty comprehensive task.

STEPHENS: Under page 102-2, there may be a typo in number one. It says any premises or than three domestic animals, I think you want to say more.

FLOM: Thank you.

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 September 9, 2008 and moved to continue petition 2008-0507 to the Plan Commission meeting dated 10/14/08.

THOMPSON: Second.

A motion was made by Commissioner Paul Aubin, seconded by Commissioner Patricia Thompson, that this matter be CONTINUED to the Plan Commission, due back on 10/14/2008. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:

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

Nay: 0

2008-0508 Park Station Condominiums Variance

Lisa Raap
Ben Fieten, 10704 Buck Drive, Orland Park
Steven Francis, Linden Group Architects, 900 Ridge Road, Homewood, IL

FLOM: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated September 9, 2008 and noted that the details of this petition did change late last week and the request has been reduced which means we do not have to go back and do another Public Hearing. The petitioner essentially retracted the request for an additional story on buildings 3 and 4; retracted the request for additional height on buildings 3 and 4; and reduced the parking modification request. Originally, this Site Plan was shown to provide only 1.71 spaces per unit. Now the Site Plan shows 1.94 spaces per unit instead of 1.71 spaces per unit. Our Code requires two per unit. Additionally, the original petition included an overall density request of 40 additional units. That is now 24 additional units. Provided a history of the project through Collette Highlands; briefly summarized the original petition; and spoke more in detail about the petition at hand. Noted she did e-mail the Plan Commissioners a memo in this regard last night. Acknowledged this is last minute and may take some time to wrap their hands around. Apologized for that.

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

AUBIN: Swore in Ms. Raap and Messrs. Fieten and Francis.

RAAP: Stated they would like to change the six units to the eight units for several reasons. We have had over 500 potential buyers to Park Station – they loved the amenities, the features, the location, everything about it – however, they were seeking something more affordable. Our largest units are 2,000 square feet and are three-bedroom units. Twelve units in building one have been sold. Of those, only three have been the 2,000 square foot units. Based on the feedback from the potential buyers, in addition to some of our research, within the last 12 months there have been 254 attached single-homes sold in Orland Park, 130 of which were condominiums. The average price of those sold was $220,000 per unit. That is data based on the multiple listing service. According to the Illinois Association of Realtors, second quarter condominium sales were down in the State of Illinois, however the medium sales price was up by four percent to $232,000 per unit. Most of the buyers, not just in the Orland Park area but the entire State of Illinois, are more in the $232,000 and greater range. Our three-bedroom, 2,000 square foot units are in the $400,000 plus price range. To make it more affordable to the community under the people of Orland Park, we decided not to do the upper floors – just putting two additional units per each floor to make the units smaller so they are more affordable to the community.

FIETEN: Stated he is the builder of Park Station Boulevard. Supported what Ms. Raap just reported. Noted that their purpose for being here today is to create affordable living for our senior citizens where they can relax and enjoy their retirement. To create affordable living for the young couples that just got married and starting their life and building a foundation for their future. Presently, our units are too big and not affordable for our senior citizens or the young at heart. They want to downsize and stay in Orland Park, close to their families and their loved ones and their grandkids. They grew up in Orland Park and they want to stay in Orland Park. Orland Park is a family community and that is why we are here to add extra units to each building to make it more affordable, maintenance-free living for all of our senior citizens and young at heart. We are not changing the appearance of the building. We are just adding more units from six units per floor to eight units per floor. This makes it more affordable. We need Orland Park to work with us as a builder to accomplish this objective. That is why we are here. To make this project successful we have to care for our senior citizens and our workers. We had some difficulty in the past with road construction on 153rd, 108th Avenue, and 159th which affected our sales for two years. It has been a painful journey. We have a very interesting upscale condominium. There is nothing like it in the surrounding areas whether it is Frankfort, Mokena, New Lenox, Oak Lawn. If you walk through our models you will see there has been a lot of love and attention put into that building at the beginning. Once our doors were open for sales, the truth came out. You have to listen to the customer and what their needs are and what their wants are. The response was that everyone wants to live there. They love the location and the Metra. We need to make it more affordable. We need Orland Park and the community to support us to do so. To take care of our senior citizen and the young couple. Of all the people who have

come to us has been either a young couple, a senior citizen or a widow. We are trying to make it affordable where these people can stay in Orland Park and live in Orland Park. Thank you.

FRANCIS: We would like to stress that we've taken a lot of time and consideration to try to keep the theme and the feel of the architectural elements of the building in tact with building one. We do not want to downgrade or cheapen the building per se. We wanted to stay with the same high quality materials and feel that we had in building one. We all know what a beautiful building that ended up being. A lot of thought and energy went into trying to come up with a plan to try to keep the elements as close to building one as we could possibly do. In doing that I think we came out with a pretty nice product.

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

AUBIN: Swore in John Fotopoulos.

FOTOPOULOS, resides at 15564 Scottsglenn Road, Collette Highlands: Directing his comments to Chairman Stephens, held before him, a Notice of Public Hearing dated August 20, 2008. Formally filed an objection – this is not a proper public hearing. We have not received notice of the proposed changes. We've not prepared for the proposed changes. If Staff was advised of these changes, someone should have thought to give us notice that there were proposed changes. So I am formally objecting. I would like to have my objection ruled upon to table this to another night so that I can prepare adequately to respond to this Public Hearing.

STEPHENS: Informed that the August 20, 2008 meeting had nothing on the agenda so it was moved to this meeting.

FOTOPOULOS: I understand, however if you look at the Notice of Public Hearing…

STEPHENS: It was a continued meeting.

FOTOPOULOS: But it is changed from what was originally requested, correct?

STEPHENS: Yes, the request has changed. We'll hear comments from some of the others.

FOTOPOULOS: I just wanted my objection to be noted. Furthermore, this is not a session on affordable housing or senior housing. This is a session on condominiums. We all bought homes in Collette Highlands knowing what was behind us. I bought a home there. I'm not going to stand before the Plan Commission and say that I'm complaining because I didn't know. Well I knew and I bought and I spent quite a bit of money to build my home there. Today they stand

before us and say that they cannot sell them. If you go through Collette Highlands where there are single-family homes, guess what. All the homes there are not sold. There are empty lots. It is part of the current times. To say we tried and we missed is not fair to all of us. We've spent quite a bit of money and we are all riding this economic wave. We hear there is a number there for $220,000 but what we didn't hear from the petitioner is he planning to reduce the price to $220,000? We don't know that.

STEPHENS: Stated that we should not get into the economics of this – that is not our goal as a Commission. We are interested in whether it is a viable thing to pass forward.

FOTOPOULOS: I'm glad you understand that. When the issues came before the petition that says that this is economic decision, that should not be part of your decision either.

STEPHENS: It is not.

FOTOPOULOS: Thank you.

STEPHENS: Reported that the Plan Commission received a letter dated September 5, 2008 from the Board of Directors of Colette Highlands single Family HOA (Exhibit A) wherein in states their opposition to this petition before the Plan Commission tonight. The letter states that the homeowners of Colette Highlands are adamantly opposed to the proposed changes which they believe will negatively impact not only the aesthetic appearance of the community but will increase congestion and put further downward pressure on property values in their subdivision as well as surrounding subdivisions. Decreasing the requirements outlined in the original development agreement is not a positive change for Orland Park.

AUBIN: Swore in Dimitri Delis:

DELIS, resides at 15609 Julie's Way, Orland Park: I think it is a mistake to build these units. Currently we are facing the greatest housing slump since the Great Depression. If you noticed, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, over the weekend, were put under conservativeship. They are at the brink of nationalization. The reason they did that is because they know housing prices have not stabilized and they keep on going down. Where am I going with this? Housing prices will keep on dropping. We have further statistics to prove this. On a national scale, housing prices are down 20% and we expect them to drop another 20%.

STEPHENS: You are talking about economics here. We don't want to talk about economics.

DELIS: It is my house. When I moved into that area I was told that those units

would be worth $450,000.00 a piece. I didn't expect an additional 24 units. By injecting an additional 24 units in a very weak housing environment, what you are doing is building a ghetto next to my backyard. A slum. That is what you are creating there. I have a problem with that.

STEPHENS: Let us not get adversarial here, okay? We are asking you to simply state your comments about the petition. We are not interested in the economic aspects of the petition.

DELIS: Yes, but here are some questions you might want to keep in mind. Why would Park Station Boulevard want to exacerbate the housing situation given the weak housing market? Why would they want to introduce more units given the fact they have not sold the inventory that they have at hand. I live right across from it. Those units are still dark at night – nobody lives in them – most of them, at least. For the past three years, Orland Park has been voted one of the best 100 places to live. I want to maintain that as we go forward. If this Committee or the Village of Orland Park approves something like this, there is no reason why you should not approve it for other builders and just make an already weak housing situation even weaker. Suggest that you vote against this and further more, vote to freeze any building here in this housing environment.

AUBIN: Swore in Teresa Shennick.

SHENNICK, resides at 15541 Julie's Way: My home faces the condominium project. I originally objected to the additional height. It would tower over my home. Now that is not my issue. What concerns me more now is the fact that between building two and building three, they want to add this large parking lot. The edge of my property is in arm's reach of the access road to that parking lot. That parking lot will be directly behind my yard. There has been no provision to protect my child who plays in that backyard from all of those cars coming in and out. Since we have been there (2.5 years) I've dealt with people using that access road already as a shortcut through Colette Highlands; lost people trying to get to the train station even though it is clearly marked as a private road. Even the mail lady uses it. Nobody watches their speed. Right now I have no fence, no greenery, no trees, nothing that protects the edge of my property from the access road or from this proposed parking lot. That scares me.

STEPHENS: There is a ten-foot buffer yard that is supposed to be landscaped completely. I drove out there today and I noticed it. It is only landscaped behind building one. I would assume that if they build building two, three and four, they will continue the evergreen landscaping as a buffer.

SHENNICK: To me that is not enough of a buffer. As a parent with a six-year-old child that is not enough. I not only have to watch for traffic out front of my home but now I'm not even able to feel comfortable letting her play in the backyard. I've not seen anyone come up to my door to say "hey, we are going to do this and we'll

even throw in a fence for you". That scares me more than the fifth height of that building.

STEPHENS: We'll ask the petitioners to address your concerns.

AUBIN: Swore in Tom Osterkorn.

OSTERKORN, resides at 15625 Julie's Way, Colette Highlands: My wife Doris and I live in the second lot (#34) north of Somerglen – we live directly across from building #1. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to voice our concerns about this.

STEPHENS: We want to hear your comments.

OSTERKORN: We are directly affected by anything that happens with building #2 as well as #3 and #4. My wife and I, before we found out about this second revision, are mostly concerned about the additional traffic that would be coming in and out with the reduced parking even though they are revising it back up to 1.94 or 1.97. There is an awful lot of traffic coming in and out during construction. With any increase of more units, that is just going to have additional traffic in and out and with the limited amount of spaces, any time there is going to be a celebration, cars will be parked up in back of our house on this access road – at least that is my perspective. With the revision tonight of the parking lot increase between building #2 and #3, even though they are saying they are going to have the different type of pavers put in that will absorb, during the last rain and during all the rains, we have a river coming down that access road. When you get to the corner of Somerglen and Julie's Way, there is usually a huge puddle that is there that will continue with overflow going farther out toward 108th Avenue. I'm not sure about any extra pavement going in even though they are going to compensate it with greenery on the roof to absorb any extra rain. Along with the other homeowners, we are also concerned about the reduction in price. The more units, the more people, the more cars, the more traffic. We have two small children. We are very concerned.

AUBIN: Swore in Angie Bybee.

BYBEE, resides at 15549 Julie's Way: Live between Teresa Shennick and Mr. Osterkorn. My concern is the safety of my daughter. There is a ton of traffic we hear coming through all of the time. I'm from Chicago. We just moved to Orland Park. I'm concerned about traffic; safety; and the construction. The first building was built all the way on the end. We are talking four lots down. I had construction men coming to my house and using my water. In Chicago that is not a real problem, however, in Orland Park, when I'm paying that water bill, yeah, that is a problem. It is not just that they are using my water but the issue that they are trespassing on my property.

STEPHENS: That last comment is not a comment for the Plan Commission to debate. That comment should be directed to the Building Department as a complaint.

BYBEE: Okay. It is still a safety issue as my daughter is in my backyard. Now I'm going to have a parking lot across from it. There could be people wandering into my property. I don't want that. We moved out here because we wanted a great life for our daughter.

AUBIN: Swore in Nick Cinquepalmi.

CINQUEPALMI, resides at 10701 Penfield Drive: I've lived in Colette Highlands a couple of years. I built a home over there. I am not anywhere near this development, however, I am in the subdivision and I do support my neighbors. I don't walk out of my house and have to look at this. I knew it was there. I am opposed to adding additional units. Based on density and just general impact alone, if you drive through the Colette Highlands Subdivision, on a summer day you might move and navigate through there fairly well. If you try to drive through Colette Highlands in the wintertime with streets that are icy and snowy, etc. we have a tremendous problem in there, just with regular traffic flow. I worked in this community for over 20 years and I've watched Orland Park double in size. I know what the developments are. I've seen them built from the ground up. I can tell you from the government services impact of this, we have a very tough time navigating through there, just on what we have in there alone. As we add additional impact with the density and more people, I am very concerned about navigating in and out of that subdivision. So I am opposed to adding additional units based on density, traffic flow, everything.

AUBIN: Swore in Doris Hein.

HEIN, resides at 15625 Julie's Way: Stated that the sun takes a long time to rise over those buildings. I was wondering what the green roof will add to the height of that building.

STEPHENS: There will be no height increase.

HEIN: Noted it has been a trying time during construction.

AUBIN: Swore in Caroline Wolf.

WOLF, resides at 10607 Royal Georgian Road: While we are not directly near these buildings, concerned as someone who lives in that area. The Centennial West Park that has been built is very attractive. On one side of the road it is a lovely park or looks like it will be a lovely park. On the other side of the road, it is looking more and more like buildings and a parking lot and it may be a porous parking lot, however, a parking lot is still not as attractive as a green space. It

does not match the attractiveness in the multi-use park-type setting that it seemed like you were going for and that we bought into. Concerned about the density and traffic. Noted these seem to be very small roads with not a lot of traffic signs. It already has a lot of traffic, especially on that one Park Boulevard in and out. It seems hard to imagine with additional density, especially with the number of people who walk back and forth to the train. Our bedroom window faces that first building. Even with the few residents there already, it is a lot like living by an office building – it is very lit up. With more units and more people in those units, there is more light generated from those buildings at night. That is hard to get used to when you are living in a town home or a home. It is much lighter for the park. It is more industrial. When we bought into Colette Highlands, it was clear that you were not selling affordable condos but premium condos. I think everyone who bought into that area, bought into the idea that we were buying into a premium area. A new mult-use Orland facility. We read the information about how this is the way we want to do it. Feel we are being sold short. If this does not work and becomes affordable housing for the elderly, why would anybody trust that they wouldn't get taken advantage of in the next multi-use facility when things don't turn out like you planned them. Thank you.

STEPHENS: Before taking any further comments from the public, noted that traffic, density, green space, parking, security and lighting has already been raised. If anyone in the public has anything other than these issues to raise, please approach the podium to be heard. Otherwise, let us not be redundant.

AUBIN: Swore in Craig Langosch.

LANGOSCH, resides at 10633 Penfield Drive: Now we will have a difference in the aesthetics between building one and two, three and four. The elevations are different. I believe they changed the roof lines on this new plan. Also, I don't live in that lot, however, I would be very concerned about having parking spaces in my backyard. I don't think that is appropriate.

AUBIN: Swore in Eileen Kost.

KOST, has a unit at 15221 Cottonwood Court and currently lives in Arbor Point: Stated she has six kids all of whom have graduated college and are out of the house except for one. I bought there because I no longer want to maintain a home. I am a professional. My husband works downtown. We are not home. I bought in there because it was a premier community. I love the area – Colette Highlands. I wanted a community where there would be a variety of families. I was not planning on living in a retirement community. I wanted to live in a premier area that was comparable to the home that I have without having to assume any more maintenance than I have to. I want to have some fun after raising six children. I put a lot of upgrades into my condo. How will my building be differentiated from the other buildings. It does come down to economics. These developers are trying to recapture the money they are losing. I am currently making two mortgage

payments. It is a very terrible market. There is nothing I can do to my home to recapture the money that has gone down. I just have to bear with the market and wait until things get better.

STEPHENS: Are you living in building one?

KOST: I live in my home because I don't want to leave it vacant. I bought a condominium in building one. I've closed on it. I am an owner. I love the area and the unit. I can't wait to get out of my house and have a different life style.

STEPHENS: Your question is about the economics and value.

KOST: Yes, just like everyone else. I bought the Braymore unit. The other units will be using the same name, however, will no longer be the same unit. It is not the same product.

STEPHENS: It still is the same product. Nothing has changed yet. They are contemplating a change, however, this has not yet passed.

KOST: Okay, but I would like more information in regard to what is going on. What they are proposing. What they are going to look like. Just so that it blends in with the area.

WOLF: How many parking spaces will be in that lot between building two and three?

STEPHENS: We will have the petitioner answer that question.

AUBIN: Swore in Dennis O'Dougherty.

O'DOUGHERTY, resides at 15533 Julie's Way – lot #28: Asked if the issue of economics is not part of the equation from the Plan Commissioner's perspective. Where does that play in to the decision making.

STEPHENS: We do not want it to decrease the value of anything around it. That is our perspective in regard to the economics.

STEPHENS: Invited the petitioners to address the questions/comments raised by the public.

FIETEN: Stated that condominium living is not residential living. Condominium living supports older people, widows, and young couples that are getting married. I understand their concerns, however, they also have to be concerned about the people who are walking through our units – what type of lifestyle they are looking for. In regard to the traffic, stated that 159th has been closed for quite some time. Park Station Boulevard is the main entry that is going through the condominiums –

not off of 108th Avenue. That minimizes all of the traffic that is coming through the residential area. Stated that there is not one condominium project at this high level – which we are not changing any of the appearance or quality of the building – in Orland Park or its surrounding neighborhoods. That has nothing to do with the economics. That changes nothing. All we are doing is trying to accommodate the seniors, the older people or the widows or the young couples that are trying to get their lives started. We are only asking for two more units per floor. All we are doing is down sizing from the bigger units only based on the information that we were getting through our sales office. We are not trying to cover up anything. We are not making any more money doing so. We are trying to fulfill the demand of the community of what people are looking for. That is what we are asking for.

RAAP: Asked to address the economic issue everyone has. Changing the units to smaller units – we are not changing the price per square foot. For example – the entire building – the sales, the revenues – the square footage does not change at all. It is the same square footage If we have a 2,000 square foot unit or we have two 1,200 square foot units – that does not change. The price per square foot is not going to change so in terms of Eileen's question, with her unit and what she paid for her unit, the price per square foot that we are asking for in building one is not changing in building two. If it is a 1,000 square foot unit and it is a $240,000 or $250,000 unit, it is a smaller unit, however, the price per square foot equates to your square footage. We are not looking to bring in a slum. We are not looking to downsize this project in any way whatsoever. We Michael Musa, the developer of this project, does everything upscale; to the nine's; and we are in no way looking to put any detriment to this property at all. We are only looking to get more people able to afford the units. The crown molding and the granite and the quality – all remain. If you've seen these units, you would not be making these comments. I understand the additional density for two more units – 24 units are not really going to be that significant in terms of parking. I understand. I have two children of my own. I understand the neighbors directly behind – we would certainly be happy to work with them on something regarding their children because obviously, children safety comes first.

STEPHENS: Asked Mr. Fieten about the landscaping in the ten-foot buffer. What is your intent on that?

FIETEN: The Village requested we add more landscaping which we already did from the original plan that we bought the property from. His landscaping plan was a whole lot less than what we are already doing. We are already adding more to it besides the green roof.

STEPHENS: Stated he noticed the landscaping is only behind building one. Asked if the landscaping will be put in as they build all the rest of the buildings.

FIETEN: Yes. Noted that in building one, we put a lot of pine trees in there. We will be doing that all along for buildings 2, 3, 4 and so on. Clarified that he is

willing to work with the neighbors to accommodate their safety for their kids.

STEPHENS: Asked Mr. Francis to address some of the questions regarding the aesthetics. It appears that the exterior aesthetics have changed and I don't know why.

FRANCIS: We found in building one, certain elements on the building were incrementally expensive not only because of the material itself but because of the way it needed to be built. When a building like this is built, if we are proposing it is solid masonry, as the masons are putting up the building, they are working from the inside of the building and build it as they go up. If we add EIFS like we had on building one, after the building is completely finished, they have to scaffold the whole outside of the building and use lifts and such to go ahead and put that synthetic plaster on the building. Brick is, obviously, a superior product. It has been around for thousands of years and it does not need maintenance. It holds up to weather. It has endless beauty. We felt that is the right material for this building That is why we eliminated the EIFS on it.

STEPHENS: Have you made any other changes to the exterior?

FRANCIS: We did eliminate some of these standing seam canopies at the top of the building. We kept the corner elements exactly the same as it was on building one so that we could hold the theme of the project. Noted a brick parapet wall. We have the corner canopies and the center canopy over the entrance area. That would also be repeated on the back of the building.

STEHENS: How does this differ from the approved elevation?

FRANCIS: The original building has the standing seam canopy all the way around the building.

STEPHENS: So you are eliminating the canopy.

FRANCIS: That is correct. We tried to keep as many of the elements on the corners and over the entry as close as we could to the original proposed building. Other than that, the materials and finishes on the buildings are exactly the same as building one.

STEPHENS: Other than those two items you brought up.

FRANCIS: That is correct.

STEPHENS: Is there anything else you would like to add?

FRANCIS: Somebody raised a question about how many cars were in that center

lot. The number is 28, between buildings two and three.

STEPHENS: That center lot, I understand was a courtyard before. Was it?

FRANCIS: Yes.

STEPHENS: And we approved it as a courtyard originally/

FRANCIS: Yes.

STEPHENS: The question was asked that if there are more units, there will be more lighting. Would you like to address that in any way?

FRANCIS: We are really using the same amount of square foot for the entire building so the light output should not be any more based on the square footage of the building.

AUBIN: Swore in Helen Owens.

OWENS, resides at 15724 Heather Glen Drive: If they are changing the outside of the building which is going to be a little imbalanced, have they thought about maybe the two end buildings being the same? Is the lighting the same for a parking lot as it would be for a green space on that center part? I find that hard to believe.

FRANCIS: She is correct. There would be additional parking lot lighting with that center lot. It really should not cause any affect on the residential because we are buffering the parking lot with our building on both sides so any light that would come off should stay within that lot. Being that it is darker material, it should not reflect the light. We should pretty much keep it contained.

FOTOPOULOS: I heard the response and I heard you, Mr. Stephens, tell me and a lot of the people in the audience that the economy has nothing to do with this.

STEPHENS: I didn't say the economy, I said the economics of this.

FOTOPOULOS: The petition itself; the reason behind this change, is economics. The answers that we just heard were economics. If all of these units were selling, we would not be here tonight. We would be at home eating with our families. If you want to call it anything other than economics, than we are all mistaken. Noted that Mr. Stephens is a developer who knows that if this were his project and he was selling these units, he would not be before this Plan Commission. The reason they are here today, and we've all heard it from their own mouths, is because people are walking through and they cannot sell them. That is dollars. Join the rest of us. We are all suffering.

AUBIN: Swore in Mr. Zolnik.

ZOLNIK, resides at 10624 Bonnie Glen Place, Orland Park: Stated that when he was buying his house through the developer, there was a requirement that his house had to have a certain amount of square footage – no less than 2,500 square feet. Indicated he had asked the developer if he could downgrade the square footage in order to buy his house less expensively. The developer said no because this is a prime subdivision and that only people who can afford them will buy them. Indicated he made the decision to buy it. Stated that from his point of view, they can downsize the square footage of that proposed plan from the 2007 and the five-story plan and make more units versus going up eight feet high and making the whole architectural disproportion of the whole subdivision.

SHENNICK: Wanted to clarify that when he stated that most of the traffic would be coming in from 159th Street with the new entrance into the subdivision, that is only if you are headed west. You cannot enter into that new street if you are heading east on 159th. So that is not taking all of the traffic that is going to be coming in.

WOLF: Their concern for their kids is understandable. There is a park across the street. There are kids all over the place. It is not just their kids that the density issue affects. It is all those kids riding their bikes and running all over the place. That is directly on that Somerglen Road issue. Just adding that back issue does not really solve your running over a kid issue. It just solves running over their kid issue. The green space – we let you get away with saying just green space. It may be just green space to you because you don't live there, however, for all of us who walk past that, now we are walking past an ugly but porous parking lot with a lot of lighting. You have the park on one side and a lot of brick and an ugly porous parking lot. That "just green space" was not sufficiently addressed. I live on the Park Station Boulevard. That is not the main access route. It is Somerglen. Anyone coming in and out, those four points, there are not even stop signs there. It is already overdone with traffic. I don't know what the traffic flow pattern was planned to be but it is definitely that main street. If I understand this correctly, wasn't this building, a few years ago, a floor shorter than this? We are getting nickel and dimed by this builder. What is next? Are we going to rent tents in the parking lot or let people park their RV's? If there is not enough parking, what happens is they go into your METRA lot. You can already see that where people have parked their campers in the METRA lot. Thank you.

AUBIN: Swore in Karen Kobierecki.

KOBIERECKI, resides at 15525 Julie's Way: Commented about what was said about the new lighting by the new parking and building four. We now have the construction trailer there. That puts out a lot of light. A lot less than those buildings are going to. They shine right in our house. You mentioned "talk to the builder". We did. He is absolutely uncooperative and we had to go to the city to get results.

DORIS HINE: For 12 units being sold so far, there is a regular five-to-six cars in the lot on a regular basis. That is evenings, weekends, and early mornings. I wonder what the parking situation is. As far as privacy from the landscaping, over half of my lot is deciduous shrubs and trees. There is no privacy in the winter.

STEPHENS: Asked the developer if he wanted to respond to any more of these comments and was told no.

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

PARISI: Thanked everyone for honestly expressing their opinions. Assured everyone that the Plan Commission's purpose is to comply with the Village's building standards. Everything you say is not taken lightly. I've been a community member for 30 years. I raised my children here. We understand your concerns. Numerous issues were brought up tonight. Some very valid issues. Good issues on both sides actually. The economics of the situation is that is impossible to separate that from this situation. The fact of the matter is that the economy has changed this plan. Had we wanted to create affordable housing for seniors, we would have done that at the onset. The fact of the matter is that there has been an economic downturn. Your price point does not work anymore. It is not your fault. We have to make sure we get this right and not make quick decisions. Whatever we do is going to be permanent. Whether it is this subdivision or somewhere else in Orland Park or any other community, the fact of the matter is that we have an over supply of new housing. The absorption rate is a lot longer than it used to be. It is going to take a while. People were asking what price points we have. We had units that were upwards of $400,000.00 and they were difficult to sell. It seems that with the reduction in square footage, we are going to have units that I would imagine would vary on the low end from about $240,000.00 at 1,200 square feet at $200 per square foot up to about $340,000.00 at the upper end. That would seem to be about the correct dollar amount. I kind of share Eileen's concerns. She bought an upper-end condo. To say that the price per square foot has not changed, that is a true statement, however, you can have the same price per square foot and I could build a 6,000 square foot home next to a 2,000 square foot home and I guarantee you, it is going to affect my value. That is not something that should be lightly considered. As far as Mr. Cinquepalmi's concern about government access, I'm quite sure that our more-than-capable Village Staff, would consider that before they would ever recommend this. Also, I'm not worried about access. In regard to traffic concerns and attractiveness, there are some legitimate concerns to be thought about. I'm not too enamored with that parking lot between buildings two and three. I'd be interested in what kind of buffer could be created between the homes and these parking areas. I will defer any further comments and listen to my fellow Plan Commissioners.

DZIERWA: Complemented the developer on building a beautiful building. His first building is very nice. In regard to economics, it usually is not our policy to talk about that. There are a lot of people here tonight who think that the developer is

just trying to cheapen the building up so that the units can be sold and the developer can move on to something else. Isn't that what we are all thinking? I understand where the developer is coming from and where the public is coming from. This was planned to be something beautiful, something to be proud of and something higher end. That is what was originally planned. That is what the developer wanted to do. It is not working. The developer is hurting. We are all hurting. In regard to raising children – they are not safe in the front or back yards. There is an access road back there right now. There is a sign there. I was afraid to go back there thinking someone was going to attack me. I've been in this Village for 25 years – I went the other way. A couple of trucks went through there. They were doing their job. I figured they belonged there. So I drove around the other way and I pulled into the parking lot of the completed building where there were a few cars parked; a few trucks parked there. There was a truck parked on the access road and two construction men were sitting under one of the canopies of the houses already built. I don't know if the homeowner gave them permission to sit there but it was none of my business. If a worker decided to use a homeowner's hose to fill up their jug – they should not be going back there. That is a policing issue. That is for the construction company. That is something we don't deal with. I was parked there for approximately 45 minutes – right on the street where you turn left by the METRA station. I turned my radio on to blasting and tried to be as annoying as possible. Nobody came out and said anything to me. There was not a lot of traffic there today. Granted it was 1:00 p.m. in the afternoon – 12:30 p.m./1:00 p.m. But I was there for approximately 35-40 minutes at least. I did not see one truck come in or go out. Just the one that went down the service road and he eventually went and sat on some guy's deck to get out of the sun. In regard to some of the comments made by the fine citizens who came out this evening, you really enlightened me because I came into this project thinking that I might go one way or another. I wasn't sure. I'm still debating this and it is really weighing heavy on me. I feel for you. Same thing happened to me when I moved into the Village of Orland Park 25 years ago. I built in the middle of a prairie and I wanted no one to move in around me. The fact of life is that people are going to move in around you. Everyone wants to close the gate when they move in. They don't want anyone behind them or anything to threaten the lifestyle that they desire. As far as the parking lot in the middle of those two buildings is concerned, I'm not real happy with that. I was not real happy when I heard it was just called the green space but I'm sure that was just a slip. Yes, not a lot of people put a whole lot of stock in green space. A lot of people do. Going across the street and walking up on the hills – I almost fell down walking up because there was water -- there were watering hoses so that hill starts to grow. I walked up and took pictures just to see what I would see if on a porch or a deck or a balcony, behind the homes. I'm thinking that people are in condos and they are looking down and they can see people in their backyards – is that an invasion of privacy? I don't know, but I see a buffer there. I see a road there. I see grass there. I see potential for putting in a nice buffer there and I think if the builder was pressed hard enough to put a nice buffer in there, I think this is something where the homeowners can co-exist. I see these buildings as a nice transition going from single family housing to the park.

You need something there. Ideally you would like to go from single-family housing to the park but if you have to put something in between, a little higher density is the way to go only because of the METRA station. People want to live in a transit-oriented development. People who ride to and from work do not need big condominiums to live in. I have two sons who live downtown in a condo and they come and go. They don't want to do anything there. They need somewhere to kick off their shoes. They also need a way to get to work. This is a perfect opportunity for them. Granted this was intended to be a little bit more upscale. The people who are looking at these don't want a big unit and the builder is trying to adapt to that. Is it part the builder? Is it part the consumer? Yes, a little bit of both. If I'm just looking at this from the outside I'm thinking, okay, this gentleman wants to sell units and he has people can sell units to but can't because they are too expensive for them. As far as the difference of appearance, I like the fact that the second building is going to be different from the first. It adds a little variety. A little spice. If you want to do bookends, one building the same on both ends that is fine. That is a personal preference. I have nothing to say about that. Mr. Langosch indicated he walks to and from the train. That is a good thing. You have the walkways. You have the sidewalks. Personally, I think the streets are too small, however, I was not on this Commission when the streets were approved. I like the fact that people can walk to the train. This gives them that opportunity. Another good point made is that this was not intended to be a retirement community. That point was made by Mrs. Eileen Kost. Pointed out that basically, she is retiring from raising children so she is moving into one of these units. I can agree with that. As far as the lighting goes. It is always going to be annoying when you have a lot of windows. Usually the association handles outside lighting. In regard to parking lot lighting, they have a photometric plan they have to deal with. They cannot have bleed over on the ends of the parking lot and it can't be going into your backyard. If that parking lot is there that light will be set up to a point where that light ends. We have very strict regulations as far as that is concerned. I'm not concerned about the extra lighting in the parking lot. If there was a way we could work out not having that parking lot between the two buildings, I would say keep the green space.

JACOBS: Thanked everyone for their participation in this hearing. It is tough to come out and stand up in front of everyone and speak your mind. My concerns are the same as my fellow Plan Commissioners who have already spoken. My struggle is with the architecture. Although this building that has been presented tonight is certainly quite acceptable and it would be even more acceptable if I hadn't seen the design that was presented to us last year. Showed that plan. We discussed this building at length last year and we all liked it very, very much and were all very impressed. I asked the petitioner at the time if this was specifically the building we were going to get and I was assured that we were. I guess we are not. I am not happy with the overall design of the new building.

THOMPSON: My fellow Plan Commissioners have all eloquently made comment on the issues. I totally agree with Commissioner Jacobs. We both came on the

Plan Commission at the same time. The original plan for the building, which was up there earlier, I totally agree with whereas the new plan I do not agree with. I don't care for the additional parking, especially lot #28. I think all of it needs to be reworked.

AUBIN: In regard to Mr. Fotopoulos' comment made earlier on in regard to the posting of the Public Hearing, asked Staff to educate him as to whether it was, in fact, posted correctly. Is this meeting official? Did we have to post so that these people could respond to the changes that the petitioner put in for the second time?

FLOM: We had been advised that if the petition is a reduction in intensity, a re-posting is not necessary. I will, however, follow up on that.

AUBIN: Thank you. I'd appreciate that. I'm a businessman. I'm in sales. Our company – if we sell Cadillac's and we cannot sell enough of them, we all know that Cadillac dealers are now selling Volkswagens. In my humble opinion, this company is trying to make an adjustment. He had a plan. Put the plan in order. Got it approved for these high-end condominiums. If it doesn't work, companies in this country have to make adjustments to stay alive. He is making an adjustment by just reducing the square feet. If I do my math correctly and we have two people that are going to go into each of these new units, that is a total of 48 people. Three people each would be 72 people. I don't think each one has a car so there are not going to be 72 cars or 48 cars. So the actual impact we are talking about is somewhat selfish insomuch as the property values that we have in the area are going to go down. That has nothing to do with code or approving his elevations, the water at the end of the street, for this reason. I have tremendous confidence with the Staff that we hired. They are all professionals that work at the Village of Orland Park. They reviewed every aspect. Lighting, flooding, materials. This project has been granted preliminary engineering. That means that the paver blocks and the parking lot and the lighting has all been looked over by our engineering people and approved. I think this developer is simply reacting to an economic condition so that he can keep his business afloat. It happens everywhere. I relate back to the Cadillac dealer that is selling Volkswagens. We have to adjust. If someone came up to me and said we are going to have a golf course across the street from where you live, but if it is coded to put a tanning factory up there and the man meets code in every respect, that is our charge. Our charge is to make sure that these petitions that come in meet code and our Staff has recommended that they have with some minor adjustments in density and the number of parking from two to 1.4. Those are my comments.

STEPHENS: I do not happen to agree with that. I was on the Plan Commission when we first looked at Colette Highlands. The Plan Commissioners liked the courtyard very much – the one they are proposing to eliminate here. In my opinion, the parking requirements are not met here. They are asking for a 25% increase in density. The people who bought these homes behind you were under the impression that there were going to be 96 units out there, they had an

understanding of the traffic impact that would be there was based on the 96 units. I think it is going to be a potential traffic problem because even at the required two units, you cannot park on either one of the two boulevards (one to the south, one to the east). There is no guest parking anywhere in that complex. If the guest parking is suppose to walk three or four blocks over to the METRA station, that is unreasonable. In a zoning request such as this, a variation, you have to comply with eight special use standards. I am not convinced with your answers to your special use standards, that you have complied and gone beyond and addressed these standards. The special use will be consistent with the character of the immediate vicinity of the parcel for development. The special use was approved at 96 units and that was immediately consistent with the character. All the people who bought there were under the impression that 96 units would be built there. The design of the proposed use will minimize adverse affects including visual impacts on adjacent properties. Your answer was that "we should decrease the demand on parking required because of the owner's ability to utilize public transportation. I disagree with that. I don't know why you would be coming in here and asking to change the exterior elevations when one building is up – the rest should follow through – they should be the same. The only reason that I see that you would want to change elevations is to reduce cost. I think you should have had your costs in advance when you built the buildings or when they came in for the elevations that were previously approved. The elevation that you are currently building now is the second elevation that we approved. It was much better than the first elevation. I am not convinced that the proposed use will not have an adverse affect on the value of adjacent property. Your answer to that was that the price points of the units will be less but the overall price per square foot will be equal. I think that you are making smaller units so that you can lower the prices. That is a problem for the people to whom you have already sold to. You had open space with the court yard between two and three. You are taking away that open space. You are taking away all of the open space so that you can try and come up to the parking standard that is required. The parking standard is two parking spaces per unit. You are not there. It was there with the 96 units. You are not there now. I have a problem with that. I have a problem with the overall concept of this change; with the elimination of the courtyard. A 25% increase in density – adding 24 more units will increase traffic. There is nowhere for guest parking. I have a problem with all of these things. I thought that what we approved was a good plan. It is nobody's fault that the market conditions have changed, however, I do not think it is our position up here to change and increase your density because the market conditions have changed. You have a whole community of people who are living there, based on these condominiums. You have one boulevard coming in and out. One to the south and one to the west. I agree with the woman who said that the main thoroughfare through there is Somerglen. Nobody goes out the other entrance that is not open at this point. I am very much opposed to increasing the density, decreasing the parking, and eliminating the courtyard. Those are my comments.

PUBLIC: Applause.

STEPHENS: I am not interested in applause and as you said, Mr. Fotopoulos, I am a developer. I have been for 31 years. I see things as right. I see things as wrong. I see this is wrong and that is my opinion.

DZIERWA: Stated that if we were to allow this to happen, we would be changing the rules in the middle of the game. It is too late. I think it is unfortunate for the developer and for the people who have to come out here and listen to this. If this would have happened a few years sooner, I think it might have been something we could have worked on. At this point it is just a little too late for something like this to happen. I agree with just about everything Chairman Stephens said. Thank you.

STEPHENS: Stated he sympathizes with the developer. Noted that he too is a developer. I am experiencing the same problems. We have to do what we have to do and do the best we can. It is a tough market, however, I do not think it is right that we should create conditions that could possibly decrease value of the properties that are contiguous.

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 September 9, 2008 and moved to recommend to the Village Board, approval of the proposed Site Plan and Building Elevations as shown on the following drawings: (1) Titled 'Preliminary Site Plan Park Station Condominiums', prepared by the Linden Group, project number 87-06, sheet S-1, dated 08-1-08, most recent revision 09-05-08; (2) titled 'Proposed 24-Unit Condominium Park Station' prepared by the Linden Group, project number 87-06, sheet A-1.0 dated 08-1-08, most recent revision 09-05-08; (3) titled Park Station Condominiums', prepared by the Linden Group, project number 87-06, sheet A-2.0 and A-2.1, dated 09-03-08; (4) titled 'Colette Highlands Condos', prepared by Beary Landscaping dated 06-04-07, most recent revision 07-16-07; and (5) titled 'Park Station Condominiums', prepared by the Linden Group, project number 87-06, sheet A-4.0, dated 09-3-08 (showing a color and black and white elevation of a 4+1 building), subject to the following conditions: (a) that the petitioner submit an overall landscape plan for the Park Station Condominium project reflecting the additional landscaping shown in this petition for separate review and Board approval; (b) that the proposed single-bay parking lot shown between buildings two and three be constructed of pervious paver blocks like those used at the Orland Park Police Station and the John Humphrey Office Condos; (c) that all building code related items are met; and (d) that the petitioner work with Staff in regard to upgrading the buffer zone west of the development to address the safety issues.

STEPHENS: Motion dies for lack of a second.

DZIERWA: Moved to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission, the findings of fact set forth in this Staff Report dated September 9, 2008 and moved to recommend to the Village Board, denial of the proposed Site Plan and Building Elevations for the Preliminary Site Plan Park Station Condominiums.

JACOBS: Second.

DZIERWA: Moved to recommend to the Village Board, denial of the Special Use Amendment request to increase the overall unit count from 96 to 120 and decrease the parking requirements from 2.0 stalls per unit to 1.94 stalls per unit subject to the same conditions outlined in the Site Plan and Building Elevations motion.

JACOBS: Second.

A motion was made by Commissioner Steve Dzierwa, seconded by Commissioner Judith Jacobs, that this matter be RECOMMENDED FOR DENIAL to the Development Services & Planning Committee, due back on 9/22/2008. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Commissioner Jacobs, Commissioner Dzierwa, Commissioner Stephens, Commissioner Thompson and Commissioner Parisi

Nay: 1 - Commissioner Aubin

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

2008-0184 Southmoor Lodge and Conference Center

Frank Niedhart, Attorney

TURLEY: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated September 9, 2008, as presented.

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

NIEDHART: This matter coming before you tonight has already obtained preliminary approval back in 2002 as part of the Southmoor Subdivision. We've modified the plan. We believe it is a better plan as does Staff and everyone else who has seen it. We've done the demographic studies that indicate that it is an appropriate use and we are also going with Staybridge Suites which we believe right now to be the best available operator both in regard to functional stability and service to its guests. I was surprised to learn that Orland Park does not have that many hotel rooms right now – 150. This would serve a need for this particular area on the north end of Orland Park. As the Staff Report indicates, issues such as drainage, retention and traffic, were addressed in 2002. They were gone over again between the Staff and ourselves to further define them and get things more well defined going forward. Introduced Mr. John Ezzi, a licensed, professional

engineer who has worked on the project since 2002 and before so he was involved in all of the planning and the work with Burke Engineering and everyone all during that process. Introduced Mr. Bart Barrows, the architect who has done extensive planning in the hotel area especially with Staybridge. We agree with all the requested actions. Staybridge believes in recycling and in compaction and a lot of things to make the hotel the most green environment they can.

BARROWS: I am a principal with the architectural firm Archiplan International. We have been retained by the developer to develop a four-story 80-unit Staybridge Suites to be constructed at the Southmoor Country Club. The overall planning of this hotel was influenced by several factors. They included the topography of the site, the relationship of the hotel to the existing conference center and to the highway and the adherence to the Staybridge prototypical design both in plan and in exterior appearance. It is common in the hospitality industry to have prototype designs, documents and standards established by virtually all brands to ensure that their minimum standards are adhered to. The Staybridge Suites is no exception to this. However, the design of this Staybridge Suites does exceed the minimum requirements for Staybridge. The prototype design uses approximately 33% masonry while this exterior design being presented to you tonight has 94% masonry on it. There are two types of masonry. One is the aristocraft international stone which is sandalwood in color (showed a sample of it) that would emulate the Staybridge prototype design. That is used both in the front and the back entry. There are two types of brick. The lower brick is what we call the Hebrine Brick Company. It is a dark golden rod in color for the base of the building. The lighter color on the top is also the Hebrine Brick Company, maple in color. The roof is of an architectural asphalt shingles, autumn brown in color by Certainteed. Cut stone has been used horizontally as accents. (Samples of all the foregoing materials were shown.) We have also used Cementious, horizontal siding up into the gables. It is on the soffits and fascia as well. It will achieve a virtually maintenance-free exterior. There are dark brown standing seam roofs at the porte cochere and the bay windows in the rear. The windows are mill finished aluminum by Wojan with a grill where the PTAC units were shown. Not all of the units have a PTAC. Some have what we call a VTAC which is on the sides and they are vertical units as opposed to the horizontal units under the windows. The gutters, downspouts and the VTAC grills are also of aluminum. The colors will blend in with the masonry that they are applied to or surrounded by. The rear of the building or the south elevation overlooks the existing golf course. The existing pond contains a large upper level terrace. Down each side from the terrace are two stairwells along with cascading retaining type walls here for landscaping. They lead down to a terrace at the lower level which will service the swimming pool, the whirl pool, and the fitness center for the guests. Please be assured that all of the products mentioned are readily available in the Chicago land area at the present time. The design of the exterior appearance have come about through a series of meetings with your Village Staff and the owner, Mr. William O'Malley. The outcome is what all parties feel is the best not only for the owner but for the Village of Orland Park as well. Thank you for

your time.

NIEDHART: I don't think we have anything else. The engineering details were all gone over with, with Staff. If you have any specific questions, we'd be glad to address them.

STEPHENS: Preliminary Engineering has been approved?

TURLEY: Yes.

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

AUBIN: The project looks outstanding. It is going to go there by the first tee, yes?

NIEDHART: Yes.

AUBIN: I have no questions. Everything fits the program. The petitioner has agreed to all of the conditions that Staff has spelled out. One hundred fifty hotel rooms in Orland Park are certainly not enough, obviously. Full speed ahead. Thank you.

THOMPSON: I think this is an asset to Orland Park. Asked how many Staybridge Hotels are in Illinois right now.

NIEDHART: Eight.

THOMPSON: Are you a fairly new chain?

NIEDHART: There are over 100 of them. It is a Holiday Inn chain/subsidiary. They are larger than you might think. There are over 100 of them. It is the new style with the breakfast in the morning and the bigger rooms and some kitchenette type things – things we see now that we didn't ten years ago.

THOMPSON: Thank you. It looks like a wonderful plan. We look forward to seeing a new building.

PARISI: His questions were asked by Commissioner Thompson and answered. This looks like a nice plan. I have nothing to add.

DZIERWA: I was out there today. I was trying to picture where the footprint of the building was going. I'm thinking it is going to go in the parking lot. Basically, you are just going to have two lanes of parking and there is almost three or four there now isn't there? It is basically going to go on to some impervious surface already so I don't really have a problem with that. The parcel looks a lot smaller than what you are putting on there. Now that I put it into perspective, I see it. I like your elevations. I like the way things look. I really appreciated seeing this because it

was difficult looking at a black and white drawing and trying to picture some kind of contrast or some kind of depth. That shows it. That really looks good. I like the columns and the stone. I think you are using some really great products. The fact that they are all local here is a good thing. That means they are easy to get too. You did a good job. While it doesn't really concern us, you have to go to IDOT to get that other entrance because you are going to close the entrance closer to 135th Street.

NIEDHART: That has been approved – well not formally approved. We submitted plans to IDOT. They have been reviewed. They've been revised. What IDOT decided is that we couldn't have a full entrance there.

DZIERWA: Are you going to get the full or the right-in, right-out?

NIEDHART: We have a three quarter. Right-in, right-out and left out.

DZIERWA: Okay, thank you. Full speed ahead and good luck to you.

JACOBS: Where is the closest Staybridge if we wanted to look at one?

NIEDHART: Naperville.

JACOBS: Regarding the entrance, is there going to be a traffic light there?

NIEDHART: No.

JACOBS: The north elevation. That is the main entrance. That faces the existing parking lot?

NIEDHART: The existing conference center is to the left. The building faces 131st.

JACOBS: When people arrive they are going to pull up in front of the entrance and then what, park somewhere else?

NIEDHART: The parking is along the side on Southwest Highway. The entry does face onto 131st. There is a driveway that comes looping through it with landscaping between the porte cochere and the parking.

JACOBS: On the elevation it shows this very, very blank east elevation.

NIEDHART: The east elevation is to the conference center and the west is to the southwest.

JACOBS: What is that enclosing – why is that so blank?

NIEDHART: That is an end unit. The unit on that wall is actually facing 131st.

JACOBS: Why does it have to be so blank?

NIEDHART: It doesn't have to be. According to Staff, we are going to massage that particular elevation and we can put in spandrel windows or whatever we need to do..

JACOBS: Okay, thank you. That is all.

STEPHENS: The west elevation is a little stark. Would like some architectural accents added there.

NIEDHART: Yes. It will be massaged so that it is acceptable to Staff.

STEPHENS: Also the east elevation.

NIEDHART: What is missing on this particular elevation is there are windows at the end of the corridor right in this direction here. This elevation will be helped by the windows and like I say, we can massage the elevation here with different colors or treatment or spandrel panels or whatever would be suitable.

STEPHENS: Okay, we'll add a condition that you work with Staff on the west and east elevations – to add some architectural enhancements there. I talked to Staff today in regard to what the annexation agreement had. In the annexation agreement there were a couple of conditions including approve preliminary plans subject to a third lane and sidewalk shall be installed by owner along 131st Street between LaGrange Road and Southwest Highway… hereby agrees to dedicate a minimum of 33 feet of roadway to the center line of 131st and in addition, shall dedicate an additional ten feet of roadway to accommodate a right-turn lane for eastbound traffic on 131st Street at Southwest Highway. Can you address these?

NIEDHART: Yes, the annexation agreement did provide for the dedication of the 33 foot and the 50 foot was to come into play at which time whatever agency owned 131st was prepared and had funded a project for further widening which we never thought would happen and 131st Street only goes to Harlem Avenue. Nonetheless, that is still in effect and I am working with Mr. Friker on some of the details involving that currently. As to the additional ten feet, I believe we have enough room if you are looking for that – that would be made available when and if the State of Illinois wanted to do some work in that particular area. The State of Illinois' Department of Transportation does control Southwest Highway, etc. The ten feet would be available. You already have the land under former dedications.

STEPHENS: You've dedicated the land?

NIEDHART: I'll check it but we have made provision for the dedication for sure. It

says right in the annexation agreement, when and if these things have to be done, the owner whoever it is at the time, has to make it available to the agency seeking the expansion or development of 131st Street.

TURLEY: The 50 foot dedication is the one he is speaking of, from the right-of-way, that if it is widened to five lanes, is suppose to be dedicated at that time but I think that what you are speaking of is something else that was for the right turn lane that was a right-of-way dedication for the right turn lane.

STEPHENS: At 131st and Southwest Highway, eastbound.

TURLEY: Correct.

STEPHENS: Did the annexation agreement call for a right turn lane to be put in?

TURLEY: It called for the first quote that you read there.

STEPHENS: The third lane and sidewalk shall be installed by the owner along 131st Street between LaGrange Road and Southwest Highway. Has that been done?

NIEDHART: That has been done. It has been completed. The center lane is the third lane. There is a left turn lane right at the intersection.

STEPHENS: There are two lanes there. There is a left turn lane and a through lane. There is not a right-turn lane.

NIEDHART: A thru lane and a westbound lane. That is three lanes that follow all the way.

STEPHENS: No, I don't think that is what it says.

NIEDHART: When the plans were made up for the development when Pulte was still around, the road was put in, in accordance with whatever mandates were in the annexation agreement in other developments in 2002. That was a very large project when we put all that pavement in. At that time that started, 131st Street was only two lanes, from LaGrange to Southwest Highway.

STEPHENS: There are three lanes there? I'll read this again. A third lane and sidewalk shall be installed by owner along 131st Street between LaGrange and Southwest Highway. I don't know that the third lane is in. Is it?

BARROWS: Three lanes were constructed from about 100 feet east of LaGrange Road because the road was already widened to some degree because of IDOT's work to about 100 feet west of Southwest Highway because that was already widened because of the intersection. Everything in between was built out to a

standard of three lanes. The middle lane is striped but it is a three-lane road.

STEHPENS: We'll just make a note on this to bring it forward to the Board and have the Board deal with this issue as it is probably an original annexation agreement.

TURLEY: Just to clarify it, right. What we are doing here tonight is just looking at Site Plan and elevation review to look at the changes with the hotel. All of the roadway and traffic – all of that was worked out with the original planned development agreement at that time. Exactly what was put in and why – what was actually followed through on, I don't know the details of that, however, we can investigate that a little further and report to the Committee.

STEPHENS: Yes, report to the Committee as well as to the Board with regard to these conditions – whether they are satisfied that they have been met or not. Okay, thank you.

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 September 9, 2008 and moved to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees, approval of the Site Plan entitled "Preliminary Site Plan Hotel" dated 7/14/08, latest revision 8/22/08, subject to the following conditions: (1) delineate loading zones; (2) addition of bicycle racks adjacent to the hotel; (3) locate and label all dumpsters; (4) locate proposed entry wall and Staybridge sign on the Site Plan. Sign must be approved through a separate sign permit process and must meet all Code requirements. Construction costs for the entry sign are to be negotiated with the Village through the development agreement for this project; (5) delineation of the lower terrace/patio at the bottom of the rear steps on the Site Plan; (6) that the retaining walls do not exceed two feet without structural approval, match building materials and are screened with vegetation; (7) a revised landscape plan, meeting all Village Codes, is submitted for separate review and approval with 60 days of final engineering approval. Include mitigation plan for three large trees that will now be removed as consequence of construction; (8) that approval is subject to meeting Building Code requirements; (9) that all final engineering related items are met; and (10) that the petitioner work with Staff in regard to the original conditions of the annexation concerning the widening of 131st Street to three lanes and add a ten-foot roadway dedication to accommodate a right turn for east-bound traffic at 131st and Southwest Highway.

THOMPSON: Second.

AUBIN: Moved to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees, approval of the Elevations entitled "Exterior Elevations Staybridge Suites" and dated 3/08/07, latest revision 8/22/08, subject to the following conditions: (1) add stone sills

below the window; (2) add brick bands or other detailing on large windowless facades; and (3) that the petitioner work with Staff to add architectural enhancements on the east and west elevations that do not show windows.

THOMPSON: Second.

AUBIN: Moved to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees, approval of a re-subdivision, subject to the submission of a Record Plat of Subdivision to the Village of Orland Park for recording.

THOMPSON: Second.

A motion was made by Commissioner Paul Aubin, seconded by Commissioner Patricia Thompson, that this matter be RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Development Services & Planning Committee, due back on 9/22/2008. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:

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

Nay: 0

2008-0572 Discovery Clothing - Appearance Review Appeal

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion to terminate this file.

DZIERWA: Moved to terminate file number 2008-0562, Discovery Clothing.

AUBIN: Second.

A motion was made by Commissioner Steve Dzierwa, seconded by Commissioner Paul Aubin, that this matter be TERMINATED. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:

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

Nay: 0

OTHER BUSINESS

DZIERWA: Noted that when the Plan Commission last met he mentioned there was an August 20th meeting in regard to the LaGrange Road plans. Indicated he did attend that meeting and noted that another meeting is tentatively planned for September 24, 2008. That is open to anyone who would like to attend. Stated that Mrs. Turley sent him an e-mail earlier in the day in that regard. Stated his intentions on attending that 3:00 p.m. meeting. Reported that the August 20th meeting was very interesting. There was input from many different people. Think it is something that would be worthwhile to attend. He plans on being there.

ADJOURNMENT

STEPHENS: There being no further business before the Plan Commissioners, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 10:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Teri Dougherty
Recording Secretary