

VILLAGE OF ORLAND PARK

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



Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, July 14, 2009

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 Plan Commission's 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 Chair entertained a motion to approve the June 23, 2009 Plan Commission minutes as presented.

A motion was made by Commissioner Patricia Thompson, seconded by Commissioner Nick Parisi, 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**2009-0303 Community Honda**

David B Sosin, 11800 S 75TH AVE, Palos Heights, IL,
Thomas Wehmeier, 8340 W 159th St, Orland Park, IL, 60462
John Hilson, 18330 Distinctive Dr., Orland Park, IL, 60462

AUBIN: Swore in David Sosin, Thomas Wehmeier, and John Hilson.

FLOM: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated July 14, 2009 as presented.

SOSIN: We are very pleased to be here. We originally did, Tom and I worked together on the Honda Store, with the Plan Commission and the Village a number of years ago, almost ten, and it was built. We're here because we are a product of our own success. As these dealers grow, and some of them have not grown, we have been very successful there. The two things that have been a problem for us have been lack of service capability, having the stalls to service the customers and get them in and out and of course having enough cars on site. When our dads used to order cars they'd walk in there, and there were two cars on display and they'd wait ten weeks and hope the car came in with the right things on it. The whole world has obviously changed. People want to see what they are buying and they want it now. They want to walk out with it and that is why that's why there is that need as the volume increases for display. It's taken us quite some time to obtain this property. I remember we sat there when the liquor store said they were going in there and, I always felt deep down inside I didn't know how they were going to do that. But we think this is the right use for this property and it unifies the

property and squares it off. We have had a very, very pleasant development of this property with the staff and we thought what we were doing was fairly logical, but they have made some changes and we are certainly happy with them. I just want to address a couple of issues with you and then answer your questions. First of all to answer your question about the handicapped issue. There are two reasons why there are two spaces there. The first one is that there was already one space there, so that is not a new space. We just added one more space. In our operation of the dealership that space is used. What we found is that people sometimes pull in on the side you don't plan them to pull in on and sometimes they come into just the showroom and they park on the sides and it's easier for them to get in and out off 84th avenue. The spaces are utilized. If they don't have a handicapped space there, they are going to park in another space which might not be big enough. Most of the handicapped parking, obviously, is by the entrance. But having a couple of spaces there we think serves it very well. It also worked out with the land plan, because we already had one handicapped space there to just add another one. We will certainly be happy to hear from the Commission, we thought it would be a good idea to have a couple there because it's convenient for the people that are handicapped. As far as the entry feature, this has really developed fairly quickly. We had several conversations with the staff, we were a little concerned with the concept when we heard it, but I think we have an understanding. We think that what is going to develop is a commonality of a type of a feature, with dealerships in Tinley Park, and Orland Park and perhaps Oak Forest, all along that street and they have even talked about even further east all the way into Markham, all down 159th street. We think that is a good idea. Our concern was that corner is the most important portion of this lot for us. It's a chance for us at the corner, as you see what the other dealerships have done. They take that corner and that is where they put that car that really has that attraction to the customers. When we first saw it, it kind of looked like a landscape feature and we weren't really excited about taking the most important corner for our business, but now as we see it develop, we think the idea is we are going to work with the staff and we are going to see what the other Villages come up with and if this is the best idea maybe we can raise up the car a bit and have the landscaping below it. We think that is a really good idea. I think we can work with that. As far as taking out the two parking spaces, that is fine. In effect we don't consider that a parking space, it's more of a feature and display. It certainly looks better than taking one of those metals grates and pulling a car up on it. It looks like they are changing the oil. As far as the lighting, there is one thing I want to point out. Kim mentioned the fact that the lighting in the back would not be changed and I want to assure the neighbors that we are not changing the back. We really consider the final lighting plan is still in process, we think we want to add a light, for the record, to the front. To give a little more lighting to the entrance and it won't affect anything with the neighbors. We would hope that would be an issue to finalize as an item with final engineering. We think we might want to tweak it a little bit and what we would ask is that when we do the lighting plan, final, final version be a matter of final engineering. The last thing that I want to mention is about the landscape islands, we did not contemplate doing anything with the

landscape islands that were there. Actually we were out there today and I noticed some work being done as late as today, kind of freshening up the existing landscaping. Those landscape islands, when that dealership was built did comply, and we want to keep the same theme. Lastly, we felt it's very important that we continue the look of the building. We know that things change. When we first did these dealerships down there, there was no glass in the back and when we did the dealership we were asked and worked with the staff to get block in there. I think we have continued that kind of a look and our architects think that continuing it so that when we are done, we hope if we do a good job, you won't even know that it's an addition once it's finished. Those are our comments, and other than maybe changing the language on that landscape, well its fine the way it is. I think the minutes would reflect what is intended here. The other conditions are fine and we're happy...

AUBIN: Condition number one you are talking about?

SOSIN: Yes, number one. But as we see it and its developed our sense is we are going to go back in, and probably meet with a lot of car dealers and a number of Villages and come up with something that has a commonality. Getting 10 car dealers and 4 Villages to all agree on something is going to be interesting. But hopefully we can do that. That concludes our presentation and we'd be happy to answer any questions or concerns you might have.

STEPHENS: Thank you Mr. Sosin. It's a public hearing and at this time if there is anyone out there who cares to comment on this petition, now is your chance. With no public comments Chairman Stephens went to the Plan Commissioners for questions.

DZIERWA: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Yesterday I did get the chance to meet Mr. Wehmeier and I did walk around and I saw what was going on there. I don't really have any real issues with the plan, I did express my concern about the increase in the lighting and I was told it was going to be along the front so I didn't have a problem with that so Mr. Wehmeier assured me that was the way it was going to work. As far as what you plan on doing, Mr. Sosin, as far as including the lighting change specifically from 15 to 70 foot candles, those are the numbers provide to us, you thought about saying that that was going to happen at final engineering. My concern is that in the first motion we have that all final engineering items are met, but the foot candles differences are listed in the third motion. Is that correct Mr. Chairman, are you reading what I am reading? So how would we amend,... because it is part of a special use?

SOSIN: There is one dark spot and I am not sure how the Village is going to do it, but...

FLOM: You are just adding a light pole?

DZIERWA: So where are we including that? In a special use or in the final engineering? Because it's in two different motions, if we are going to include lighting in the final engineering we have to say so.

FLOM: Lighting is inherently in final engineering. But we do request its submittal be included with the petition, especially when variances and/or special use permits are required. I think the motion is fine the way it is. I think Mr. Sosin was just saying the motion is for a modification increase in foot candle levels. He is saying they might put in another light pole, well; he can put another light pole in. If the additional light pole meets code there isn't anything we have to amend.

SOSIN: The code isn't 70 foot candles, the code came from, I think...

FLOM: Lexus.

SOSIN: When we did the Lexus store we actually went out with an engineer at night and we measured all the stores and they were widely different. There are no two that are the same. One is well over a hundred and then some are twenties. So we kind of came to a standard. And between Orland and Tinley there was no standard either. The newer stores had more lighting and a couple of stores were way below the others. We finally came up with a number and I think that is going to be the developing standard, which is kind of a half way point. With a real emphasis on getting it to the front and I think, what I have learned about it is that as long as they use quality fixtures there is not much spill over to the back. The dealers do not care about the back, all they want is enough light for security so people aren't breaking into cars. It's the front and as long as it's focused lighting you can do it and get good presentation and still not affect the neighbors.

DZIERWA: I guess my next question is that one good looking tree on the lot, would that be considered a heritage tree? It would be the one farthest to the west, the large one. It actually has three different trunks coming out of it.

FLOM: I don't have the landscape plan with me; I do have a tree survey which I can get to you. You'll be able to see exactly what the species is, what the caliper is, and what status it is.

DZIERWA: I just know we're a little bit stricter about removing a heritage tree. When you do mitigation if you have to take that down, we're going to make the petitioner put up something much bigger in a couple different areas and I don't know if he really has to do that.

FLOM: The heritage tree mitigation requirements haven't changed. Heritage tree kicks in more with single family homes, because if you have a single family lot, you can just take down any tree unless that tree is a heritage tree and that is when you need a permit from the Village. When it comes to new development all trees over 4 inches have to be mitigated. For a heritage tree you need to provide 6 trees

instead of 2. The petitioner had a full survey done and the trees shown on the landscape plan do conform to our mitigation requirements.

DZIERWA: So you would say conform or exceed?

FLOM: Proposed trees actually exceed mitigation requirements; they are providing more trees on site than are required. Also they are preserving some trees along 159th and 84 Avenue.

DZIERWA: I just had to ask because since we made the rule, I just want to make sure we follow it.

THOMPSON: Thank you Mr. Chairman. It looks like a great plan. I really like the gateway feature. I think that would be an asset to the 159th Street along with Honda. I did go by today and I noticed a lot of the trees were really bad there so I think that is going to be a plus there.

PARISI: I went by there today. I was at the 159th Street meeting and I like the marquee idea, where they can showcase a car and have something continue. I think that that whole site, its time to freshen it up a bit along as well as a lot of other places along 159th street I think this is a good start. One of the things I noticed is that when I pulled in off 84th avenue, and I pulled in through the lot, around the corner were two other cars coming at me. I had no way of knowing that, and people will pull in off 84th and like you said if there is handicapped they might go there. I would just suggest that perhaps, let people know that there's traffic coming at them the other way too, because it's pretty narrow. Having said that, I think it's good to see this expansion the landscape is freshened up. You could use the lot, that lot that is right there now is kind of overrun its got some beat up trees on it and they are using it right now to store cars on. I think it's an improvement and I think it'll alleviate a lot of the congestion in that parking lot. Last but not least, I am happy to see anybody in the auto industry spending money to expand.

AUBIN: Looking at everything in the packet, listening to Kim's presentation, it's pretty consistent with everything that is going on, on 159th Street. I don't think the petitioner is asking for anything that is unusual or out of the ordinary for that area so, those are my comments. I have nothing to add.

STEPHENS: We have got a comment here under the write up. It says petitioners should confirm that the new service door should be used primarily by employees and not customers.

AUBIN: Is the service door for employees, not customers?

SOSIN: Well the way service works, they come in front on the other side, they leave their car off there.

WEHMEIER: We don't allow customers in the service area.

STEPHENS: So it's going to be used by employees and not customers.

SOSIN: Yes.

STEPHENS: That is all I wanted to know. Question with regards to the 159th Street corridor, that corridor is going to take a while to develop and in the motion you are talking about working with staff to provide this gateway feature before moving to committee. Are we going to know what they want before we get to committee or, this is going to be a long process. We may not know what they want for maybe a year?

FLOM: Right we don't have the specific design complete. All we are asking for is the curbing that would set it up.

AUBIN: So you could prepare for it.

STEPHENS: So in that motion why don't we add it in that we work with staff in order to provide landscape for a gateway feature? Is that ok with you?

AUBIN: We are just going to alter the first condition in the motion.

SOSIN: I don't know if you'd want to use curbing. I think what we'd be comfortable with is saying that we would work with staff prior to committee to make changes to the southeast corner of the plan to facilitate a future feature. I think what you are saying is so we don't close it up and curb it up, so we leave something there so it's not done.

STEPHENS: Mr. Sosin, the way the motion reads now, the condition is; That the petitioner revise the site plan to relocate two stalls in the southwest corner of the existing parking lot in order to provide a landscape island for a gateway feature before moving forward to committee. If we add in the words existing parking lot and work with staff in order to provide a gateway feature before moving forward to committee.

SOSIN: The only part of the plan that we envision doing before going to committee was to eliminate the two stalls, but not the feature itself, because they might not know for a year or two.

DZIERWA: Couldn't we use the term land bank? Does that fit?

FLOM: I guess we wanted to bring it up early on because we knew that those two stalls were in their counts for storage. If they are going to be relocated, we want to make sure they are relocated before the board approves the plan. So ultimately what we are trying to get here is the relocation of those two stalls so we have this

space reserved for a gateway feature to be designed at a future date. Even the word landscape might be misconstrued to make this look like it's a planting area. I wonder if you could just keep the motion the way it is and instead of landscape island just say an island. And that island in the interim could be used for putting a car there until we figure out what the Village is going to be doing there.

STEPHENS: Well with what you just said; if we add the language, in order to a landscape island to be reserved for future design for a gateway feature before moving forward to committee.

FLOM: I don't even know that it has to be a landscape island, because that makes it sound like it's going to be full of trees. I am kind of retracing my steps as we discuss this further.

STEPHENS: What would you think is more appropriate?

SOSIN: Can we make it a... a future gateway feature. I wouldn't use the word island or landscape, it just locks it in to something but we don't know what it's going to be. But it will be a future gateway feature.

STEPHENS: How about an area reserved for a future design for a gateway feature.

SOSIN: Reserved would mean nobody couldn't do anything with it. We want to use it for a year or two while you guys are deciding what you want. We just know it's going to be available for it, how about available for?

STEPHENS: To provide an area available for a future design for a gateway feature. Staff is ok with that?

FLOM: It's fine.

STEPHENS: Mr. Sosin, the petitioner is ok with that?

SOSIN: I just want for the record, that with the corner being of importance we may use it, we are going to eliminate the spaces. We might figure out a way to just park a car there in the interim, but it will be available to commit to when we know what that feature is.

STEPHENS: If there are no further questions from our commissioners the chair will entertain a motion.

AUBIN: I move to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission the findings of fact set forth in this staff report, dated July 14, 2009,

and

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of the preliminary site plan titled 'Community Honda Parking Lot and Building Addition,' prepared by Burke Engineering, job number 09-77, dated 05-19-09, most recent revision 05-28-09 and the building elevations titled 'Honda,' prepared by the Linden Group, job number 39-09, dated 06-10-09, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the petitioner revise the site plan to relocate two stalls in the southwest corner of the existing parking lot and work with staff in order to provide an area that is available for a future gateway feature before moving to committee;
2. That the petitioner revise the site plan to include overall dimensions of the parking lot and the building addition before moving forward to Committee;
3. That the petitioner revise the site plan to include a bike rack before moving forward to Committee;
4. That all final engineering related items are met;

and

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of the lot consolidation to combine the .63 acre parcel with the PIN number of 27-14-401-018-0000 with the 4.23 acre parcel with the PIN number of 27-14-401-012-0000, subject to the following condition:

1. That the petitioner return with a plat of consolidation within 60 days of final engineering approval;

and

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of an amendment to the Special Use Permit number 3340 to allow for the Community Honda expansion and for modifications to reduce the required parking lot landscape islands from 12 to 0, increase the maximum impervious surface from 75% to 81.69% and to increase the allowed internal footcandle levels from 15 to 70, subject to the same conditions as outlined in the preliminary site plan and building elevation motion.

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 7/27/2009. 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

STEPHENS: Is there any other business from staff?

FLOM: No.

STEPHENS: Any other business from the Commissioners?

COMMISSIONERS: No

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Plan Commission for discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 7:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda White
Recording Secretary