

# VILLAGE OF ORLAND PARK

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



## **Meeting Minutes**

**Tuesday, September 22, 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:** 5 - Commissioner Jacobs; Commissioner Dzierwa; Commissioner Aubin; Commissioner Stephens, Commissioner Thompson

**Absent:** 1 - Commissioner Parisi

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Chairman Stephens entertained a motion to continue the September 8, 2009 minutes to the October 13, 2009 Plan Commission meeting, due to a lack of quorum for those present at the September 8, 2009 Plan Commission meeting.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Patricia Thompson, seconded by Commissioner Paul Aubin, that this matter be CONTINUED to the Plan Commission, due back on 10/13/2009. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 4 - Commissioner Dzierwa, Commissioner Aubin, Commissioner Stephens and Commissioner Thompson

**Nay:** 0

**Abstain:** 1 - Commissioner Jacobs

**Absent:** 1 - Commissioner Parisi

**PUBLIC HEARINGS****2009-0327 ORDINANCE GRANTING AN AMENDMENT TO A SPECIAL USE PERMIT -SHOPS AT 88**

**TURLEY:** Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated September 22, 2009 as presented.

**STEPHENS:** Commissioner Stephens gave instruction to the audience on the procedures followed by the Plan Commission when hearing agenda items.

**AUBIN:** Swore in David Sosin, 11800 S 75th Avenue, Palos Heights, IL

**SOSIN:** I have listened very carefully to staff and have worked with them for a number of months to bring this back to you. We consider this a fairly minor change in plan and in some respect positive. The original building was a two story building, with a much smaller foot print, but we now have a one story building which we think is really an advantage for the segments and for our neighbors. There is a substantial difference in height between the condominiums and those 2 story town houses. Our plan is to have the screening on the roof that is called for. It is a fairly tall looking building but it is only a 1 story building, and the idea would be to provide as much screening, as much of a wall as possible in order to screen. The

problem is, if you are in the fourth floor of that condominium looking down, we think the segment is probably looking more out than down, but that is really nothing to do with the roof. I guess the trade off is that the bigger the building gets and the bulk of it is the less you see of the roof but the more building you'll see. We think overall this is really an improved use of this property. It's also not a weekend use; it's not an evening use. We think that also might answer some of the questions some of the neighbors have. This company is from out of town, the original plans came from Florida. They currently have a facility on Kedzie in Flossmoor it is what you'd call a high end daycare center. Fairly expensive and not everybody will use it but some people like the amenities that they provide but the children get excellent care and the parents pay for it. It runs the normal operation of a daycare center and I think will work out very well. A couple things with the staff report that we want to point out; one is our client is fine with the conditions except we would like some consideration on the lot coverage. The problem is that as the building gets smaller it also widens out. Certainly it would not work as well for a daycare center to have a two story building there. The problem we lose a couple percent, I think it is really like 2 ½ percent in lot coverage. What we think is significant is that this plan as proposed is within code by about 5%. We think that if it meets the code that it should be acceptable to the Village. I know staff feels that any devolution in the open space, the coverage is a negative but we also think there are a lot of positives here and it's such a small percentage in size that we would request some consideration. We also think that because it's a daycare center, kids don't drive here. We are going to pick up parking; we think that is also an advantage for the front properties. Bob Matthey, our engineer is here and one of the conditions in your report is that every lot should have frontage on the street. The new plan which is out to the left in green that is there has made that change. It was just a matter of tweaking two lot lines. But now every lot has frontage on either 88th avenue or 159th street. After we have a final plan that we are confident in, we will draft a reciprocal easement agreement between these lots. That document, which is fairly common with common ownership in commercial settings, will provide for the maintenance for the sharing of the parking, the easements for ingress – egress and of course snow plowing and common area maintenance. What I think Mr. Matthey has done that is very nice is that he has actually provided parking on every lot. So there is some parking on every lot but it's not really meant for each parking field to fit the property. It's more a matter of providing some parking. Everybody in all the uses will have accessibility to all the parking spaces. The initial front user and this daycare center will allow our client to proceed with the current market conditions. We know our neighbors have been very patient and would like to see this thing moving ahead and get some landscaping finalized in there and finish it off. Believe me our client has been paying all the taxes and all the care on this property for 3 years, we are very excited about proceeding and when we do proceed we will do so fairly quickly. The front initial user will be a restaurant and there will be some things they have to come back to the Village for, but that will be their responsibility. That is the Flat Top Grill, which I think you have all heard of. I'd be happy to answer any question you have or our neighbors have and try to alleviate any of your concerns.

STEPHENS: Have you met with any of the neighbors, with regards to this?

SOSIN: No, well years ago but not with regard to the change. No.

STEPHENS: Just one question. What are the hours of that daycare center?

SOSIN: It's hard to say because sometimes there are sometimes special situations for children. They generally open fairly early probably 6 or 6:30 in the morning, which is a little unusual for some kids but some kids do get dropped off. Then probably around dinner time they are pretty well done.

STEPHENS: Around 6:00 at night and it's only Monday through Friday?

SOSIN: Yes.

STEPHENS: Thank you very much. Is there anybody in the audience who would like to ask questions of this petition?

AUBIN: Swore in Bill Karopoulos, 16001 s 88th Ave, Orland Park, IL.

KAROPULOS: If I may sir I have a couple of questions if I can ask at the same time.

STEPHENS: What we'll do is you will ask your questions and we'll write them down and ask the petitioner to come back up to answer the questions.

KAROPULOS: The question is what will be the starting date for the development to move forward? And if there is no starting date, then the variance is somewhat of a mute point. In the past....

STEPHENS: Let me ask you a question. Starting date to move what?

KAROPULOS: The entire program.

STEPHENS: But we are only dealing with this petition tonight. The starting date would be for the daycare center only.

KAROPULOS: Is there are starting date on that sir?

STEPHENS: Your question was for the entire development and I am trying to limit it to what the petition is for this evening. So you want to know what the starting date is for the construction of the daycare center.

KAROPULOS: Yes, that would be satisfactory. There has been some new equipment that has been on this property for quite some time which is an eyesore.

The other thing is in the past there has been a lot of dirt that has been piled up there and during the grading process its raised a lot of dirt and dust in the community and in our property we would have to sweep and hose down the walkways many times on count of this debris flying around. Also the windows in that building are full of dust and dirt, which require cleaning.

STEPHENS: Also I believe the people who live in the townhomes who lived there when the condominium building you're living in now had the same problem when your condominium building was being built. You always have that when there is construction going on.

KAROPULOS: The other question is about all this equipment that is being parked on this property, they are using it as a parking spot. If this could be moved, corrected or if it's in use that is no problem.

STEPHENS: We will ask that question.

KAROPULOS: The other thing which may be of interest to the developer of course it doesn't concern us. In the past I have seen children playing on the east end of the detention pond and there is no protection there. To me this is an accident waiting to happen, so this is just for their information. It doesn't concern this. That is all I have sir.

STEPHENS: Thank you.

AUBIN: Swore in Bridget O'Brien, 16001 s 88th Ave, Orland Park.

O'Brien: I am the president of the Carriage Ridge Condominium Association.

STEPHENS: That is the Condominium building correct?

O'BRIEN: Yes. I am also part of the Condominium building, the 4 story, just south of the proposed Daycare. One of the things noted already is that there has been a lack of communication between the developer and definitely our building, I can't speak on behalf of the townhomes. Up until about a week and a half ago we had no idea that this daycare was even going in and so I guess in the future we'd appreciate more correspondence and communication with the developer regarding some of these issues. Couple of questions; relocating the dumpster is a concern for us, It basically was relocated on the east side of the building and I believe Ms. Turley had said it was going to be relocated to the west side, which will be basically right in front of our building, so that of course is a concern for us as neighbors. The issue regarding the roofing materials being contained is also a concern for us as neighbors that would be something I would ask the Plan Commission to really consider for us who will be looking down. Our condominium building is significantly raised from the property, the actual proposed property, so we're not on the same level ground as the proposed property; we are raised up above it several feet, so even our 1st and 2nd floor people will be looking down

onto this proposed property. Just things for the Plan Commission to consider. For the developer I am curious about what types of utility changes or any type of additional utilities need to be installed. Water and sewer was somewhat already set up on the facility, when it was they cut our water to our building by doing that. Which of course was an inconvenience for 24 units in our building, and they didn't tell us or give us any heads up. All of a sudden we went to try to take a shower and wash our clothes and we had no water.

STEPHENS: How long was it off?

O'BRIEN: I went out running through their construction site to try to find a foreman; I would say it was at least a half of a day. It was an overnight time period as well for them to get the right people out. They were, or once they realized the problem they worked hard to get the right people out, but it required phone calls getting the right people and things like that. But they never told us, and had they worked with us and said, hey we're going to do this and do we need to know anything about your building before we do this, before we hook up and stuff, you know more communication with the Village and they would have said this Condo building is on the same line. Once they made the mistake they were nice enough about resolving it, but it concerns me about what other utility hook ups need to take place.

STEPHENS: so your concern is notification in the event that there is going to be some utility connections that are going to affect your building.

O'BRIEN: Right. One of the questions I also wanted to know about was what type of lighting facility, what type of lighting is going to be on this property? I realize its going to be a 6:00am to about 6:00pm type of facility but what type of evening lighting is going to go until effect and how will that affect us, obviously as neighbors? I am also interested in the location, that between garbage and deliveries and stuff like that, how does that effect our building as well? One of the things that I have noticed living in the Village of Orland Park is that both the Plan Commission and the Village Council has made commitment to require an aesthetically pleasing buildings and I think that is something we all value and appreciate when we travel to other communities that don't value this like we do. It's nice to see the aesthetic improvements to that daycare facility, tonight. However that building will be facing the north part of the development, when you go to make this approval and recommendations and what not please keep in mind that we will be looking at the south part of that building and I have not seen any information into what the south part of that building (looks like), because that is what we as the neighbors will be looking at.

STEPHENS: It's indicated up there (refers to renderings on the board)

O'BRIEN: Right but its not the same as that color photo that looks really nice and pretty. I understand, I see that, but it just looks like a blanket form and I didn't know

if that south elevation has any changes or improvements from the initial proposal.

STEPHENS: And I too have comments with regards to that.

O'BRIEN: Ok, good. The other thing I was talking about is parking. I noted that there was some changes in taking the different lots and taking it as one lot and changing it into 5 and one of them being the detention pond, however I guess this isn't yet on the table, but something to consider is if parking is changed, that's fine however what other retail spots would be going in? Mr. Sosin said there is going to be a restaurant going in there. How is that going to effect parking and then I am wondering are some of those people on a Friday and Saturday night after picking up daycare in Orland Park on a Saturday night we all know what the lines are in restaurants are on Friday and Saturday nights, are they going to be coming up and parking in our parking lot, because they can't park down in.... I know they're not supposed to, but I really hope I am not going to have to be out there on a Friday night monitoring the parking lot.

STEPHENS: I really hope you aren't going to have to be out there either on a Friday night. But he did mention that there is going to be a cross parking agreement which would allow anyone in anyone of those buildings to park anywhere on the 174 parking spaces that are going to be located within there. And I would think that is going to be a requirement in this motion.

O'BRIEN: Ok, well then my question is that if a restaurant is going into, is it one or the other remaining.....

STEPHENS: We are talking about the daycare only.

O'BRIEN: Ok that's fine.

STEPHENS: if some other restaurant comes in we will have the same thing another hearing again and you can come up and discuss that then.

O'BRIEN: Ok, that's fine. Its just things to consider when they are willing to share on some but I just home that when actuality happens and things are built that they are still willing to make that sharing arrangement.

STEPHENS: We are going to have to have that agreement before the lots are subdivided.

O'BRIEN: And do you know we will be meeting to talk about the retail center? Or is it just to be determined?

STEPHENS: We do not know because they have to file a petition and then go through the whole staff process before it would come up to the plan commission.

O'BRIEN: Ok. That concludes my questions. Thank you.

STEPHENS: I think before we go to the Commissioners we will ask Mr. Sosin to please come up. Please Address some of the comments made by Mr. Karopulos and then by Ms. O'Brien. Commencement of the construction of the daycare center and parking equipment on the site.

SOSIN: We are here this evening and have been working with staff and it is the intent to put the foundation in this fall, as soon as possible, so they can be working on it during the winter. That is the intent. Part of that is of course the building permit and the final engineering but they want to proceed immediately.

STEPHENS: Well let's talk about time tables. From this hearing you go to the Committee hearing, which I believe is the 28th next Monday and then the following Monday you go to the Village Board for final approval and after you are finally approved you'll apply a building permit. Is that correct?

SOSIN: Yes, final engineering and final building plans have to be submitted.

STEPHENS: So this means September, October; you are probably not going to be able to start digging until late November early December.

SOSIN: Early November. Yes.

STEPHENS: That is what your time table is, ok. Parking on the site?

SOSIN: There was a question about the dirt and the dirt piles. Part of the problem was that somebody fly dumped on this property. It was not part of the project.

STEPHENS: Explain to us what fly dumping means for everybody.

SOSIN: When nobody is looking a contractor has loads of garbage or dirt or foundation and looks this way and looks that way and pulls in and then you've got to clean it up. It happens all the time on construction sites, and it's then the responsibility of the owner. We have worked with the Village and they were concerned, there are a number of things that have been cleaned up there and repaired and removed in the last several months. This is why there is equipment sitting there. That equipment is now is mobilized and they are waiting to actually begin the final work on the subdivision in anticipation of building this building.

STEPHENS: Do you have any equipment sitting out there?

SOSIN: Yes. There's two pieces on the north east corner from the contractor, the excavator.

STEPHENS: Is that just earth moving equipment?

SOSIN: Yes.

STEPHENS: Are you going to keep that on there or are you going to move it?

SOSIN: I suppose I'd like to leave it there, because it's going to be used there. But if they took it off for two weeks and brought it back in two weeks, it's quite a ways. They parked it all the way to the north so we think that is reasonable.

STEPHENS: Those are Mr. Karaopoulos' comments. I have seven questions from Ms. O'Brien. Mr. Karaopoulos brought up that he asked about the kids playing on the east end by the detention area. I don't know what you can do about that other than put a sign no trespassing or something like that.

SOSIN: I suppose we could. When things get started on this and there is some activity there and that building is built that will help certainly. But I supposed we could put a sign up.

STEPHENS: Now Ms. O'Brien, I have seven questions. The first being lack of communication. Let me ask you this. Were there notices sent out?

SOSIN: Yes.

STEPHENS: Ms. Turley what is the notice requirement, to be sent out two weeks before the hearing?

TURLEY: Right.

SOSIN: twenty days.

STEPHENS: Twenty days before the hearing and all residents that are contiguous?

TURLEY: Within a certain distance. Two hundred and fifty feet I believe.

STEPHENS: They all received a notice of this public hearing?

SOSIN: Yes, we have provided the affidavit and copies of the cards.

STEPHENS: So the notices were sent out and the proper notifications in regards to the Code requirements have been done.

SOSIN: Yes.

STEPHENS: Ok.

SOSIN: I have received several phone calls, several residents, which is customary. We return those calls come to me directly so nobody else. We answer the questions about use and when we are starting and a number of other questions. We continued to do that.

STEPHENS: Relocation of the dumpster, they have concerns about that.

SOSIN: I think that that is probably an issue for staff. We thought that was the best location for it. We just switched it from one side to the other side. Rather than putting it out by the sidewalk or putting a little further back. It fits very nicely there in the parking lot and pushed back. It's not really seen well there from the residents behind it because they're really looking straight out and not straight down. Anywhere it goes it will be visible. One of the conditions was that it is masonry and we have agreed to that. If there is a place that is a better place to put it that makes sense, Mr. Matthey indicated this was his idea as an engineer. If somebody has a better idea bring it to the staff and we will certainly look at it.

STEPHENS: You're not just going to leave a dumpster sitting out there. You're going to put it inside a masonry enclosure. That masonry enclosure, the brick work is going to match the building?

SOSIN: Yes.

STEPHENS: So it's not going to be unsightly?

SOSIN: For a daycare center, it's not a lot of garbage and it's not a restaurant garbage so, it's nothing that would be that big.

STEPHENS: There was a question about roofing materials?

SOSIN: It's a flat roof.

STEPHENS: Tar roof?

SOSIN: Yes.

STEPHENS: With regards to having a problem with the water connections being turned off. Do plan on utility changes that may affect that condominium building?

SOSIN: What happened was that the contractor, that road is controlled pretty much by Orland Hills. It's not really what we call an Orland Park road. And it's been there a while. What happened was....

STEPHENS: You mean 88th Avenue?

SOSIN: Yes. Part of what we need to do when we start building is work with Orland Hills and they are part of our condition is to make some improvements

there. We have actually given a substantial amount of money to the Village by way of our letter of credit to improve that road for everybody that uses it. When the contractor put in the water they thought they knew where it was and they broke the water main. That is why the water was turned off, it was not a matter that they had planned on turning it off and didn't tell the residents. It was a kind of misstep that caused them as an emergency to do it. They got it on as quickly as they could and it was unfortunate. That water is in now and it is not being changed to accommodate this building, nor are there any substantial changes in eth utilities outside this property. Inside the property there is a sewer that is going to be relocated and a couple of other very minor changes. We don't think the residents will even see that or notice the difference. We do not believe it will affect them.

STEPHENS: So the water main problem is behind it now? You have got water servicing on the property, and you will tie into those lines on the property?

SOSIN: Yes.

STEPHENS: And it should not affect the condominium?

SOSIN: No.

STEPHENS: Can you shed some light on the daycare center's evening lighting?

SOSIN: There are several wall lights that are indicated on here and Mr. Matthey indicated that they are just mounted on the wall (using a pointer Mr. Sosin indicates where the lights are).

STEPHENS: So those are enclosed lights they shine....

SOSIN: They are box lights, they are decorative lighting and they are on the front of the building (locations indicated by Mr. Sosin using the pointer on the renderings).

STEPHENS: Nothing on the sides or the rear?

AUBIN: Swore in Robert Matthey, Tech 3 Consulting Group, 737 w Exchange, Crete, Il.

SOSIN: He knows what I know. On the side there is a light here and a light here (referring to the renderings). There is an indication in the back that over the exits, which is required by code, there is some small lights, indicated on the plan it looks to me like there are 2 on the sides and there would be four small lights on the back. That's appropriate also for security.

STEPHENS: So my question is, are those up and down lights or just down lights?

SOSIN: Down lights.

STEPHENS: Ok. So you aren't going to have any glaring footlights anywhere around the building?

SOSIN: It would not be necessary for this type of a use.

STEPHENS: Ok. How do deliveries affect the building?

SOSIN: Deliveries for a daycare center are fairly minimal. Milk, paper, snacks things of that sort.

STEPHENS: Where will the deliveries be made? Just to the front door?

SOSIN: There are no provisions to use the back door. That back door exits are a function of code, in case of an emergency. They're really are not parts of the use of the building. You have to have an exit for a daycare center; I think its every 50 feet I believe. They have to be in there but they are really not part of the building. The other question of parking. One of the reasons we think is an excellent use of this property is that as the offices develop in the front this is a 6 in the morning to a 7 at night use. When this use is over and the children have left the parking field is completely usable even from this property, and it's a good compliment. The car wash, car washes are daytime uses so we have all this parking available and we really have the retail, some of it during the day but the restaurant when it has its peak need is completely complimentary to these two uses. All in all we think it works very well and should have no imposition. The other thing is, we are not here for the restaurant, but to give the overall picture is not a bad thing. It's well away from this building and as people park they tend to park as close as they can to the restaurant. Can we say they will never hear a car door or never see a car? We hope they do otherwise we'll have a real problem here but, most of that activity is going to be up front.

STEPHENS: And you are going to provide a shared parking and cross access agreement with in all....

SOSIN: We will be submitting it to your Village attorney, he'll be reviewing it and that document will go in as part of our specs.

STEPHENS: That shared parking will allow anyone in any of those lots using any of those buildings to park anywhere within the entire complex?

SOSIN: Pretty much, there maybe a space that is designated for some purpose but in essentially the parking field, which is shown on this property, would all be usable by all the uses.

STEPHENS: Ok. Thank you Mr. Sosin, I believe we have all those questions addressed.

DZIERWA: First of all I'll reiterate what a few of the residents were mentioning before and during the meeting that they are anxious to see this going. I drove again through there last night, I noticed it's a very hilly lot, it's a difficult thing. I hope to see things move a little more quickly than they have, but I understand how things work. The landscape islands kind of look like the front of the Police station, its kind of all natural prairie grass at this point is very unsightly and I think that is something I'd like to see happen pretty quick. I have a question as far as the actual daycare center. Are they going to have a drop off lane or are parents and guardians be required to park and then go in? Because that would increase traffic at certain times of day, basically at drop off and at pickup, which is why I asked if there is a drop off lane.

SOSIN: It's not on the plan. The plan is to have plenty of parking and its going to be park and drop off.

DZIERWA: Ok, that's fair. I think that the way the dumpster is situated its probably the best place it could possibly be, because if it was on the other side it would be near the detention pond. So I would be in favor of leaving it where its at and basically screening it as best as possible with matching brickwork. Roof top mechanicals, are there just going to be regular air conditioning condensers and stuff that we would normally see everywhere else? Not necessarily that unsightly, especially if they are going to be new and be well maintained. I think if I were living in the condos back there I would be concerned about looking at cars all day and cars moving in and out all day but I guess that's good for business. As far as the condensers and the roof top mechanicals if you just work at screening them the best you possibly could, work with staff, I have no problem with that. That big pile of dirt that is piled there, is that basically the footprint of the building, the daycare center?

SOSIN: Yes.

DZIERWA: So that will basically disappear when you start putting in the foundation. My next question is that rod iron fence. I am no expert in daycare centers and I don't know if a rod iron fence is basically a plan that is used by this particular company to use this type of fence?

SOSIN: Yes.

DZIERWA: They know more than me, fine. I noticed that the fence is going to be right on that line where it drops off into the detention pond, so will there be enough buffer there so people can actually walk around that fence if they needed to without rolling down the hill?

SOSIN: Yes.

MATTHEY: There are going to be 6 foot tiered landscape walls there so there will be 12 foot of total landscape going in there beyond the fence.

DZIERWA: Thank you. One more thing. I did notice the lights on your elevations, it was basically spelled out on the west elevation and I assumed that everything that is identical on the other elevations was basically pointed out that number 3 is lighting, and I would appreciate it if that were strictly down lighting not up lighting. Especially on the back where the neighbors would be looking in. I have a question on your east elevation, you've got those 2 big panels of blank wall and I think we pride ourselves in trying to get developers to give us really good 4 sided architecture. I do see that at one end of the building and the other its very nice, but those 2 blank walls; are they hiding anything or is there some way we could add some sort of clerestory application where it would bring light in the building and it would be nicer on the eyes?

SOSIN: When you look up high, which is typically where you do that, that is just really a one story building. That side of the building that fits in with the plan, I can ask the architects, but this is their building we are the developer and I think if there was a condition that we would consider additional treatments we certainly would take that back to them. Many times when that happens they have a reason why they set it up that way that they need a solid wall on one side, but we will certainly ask them that.

JACOBS: The children will be for the most part dropped off by parents; there won't be school buses or other means of delivery?

SOSIN: Most daycare centers have a small vehicle because some children rather than go home are picked up from school and stay for a period of hours, so that is not inconceivable that there would be a small bus that would take them there.

JACOBS: Would that be parked on the property for the most part?

SOSIN: Yes.

JACOBS: And that would be where? Right near the dumpster?

SOSIN: Probably there, yes.

JACOBS: Just a couple of design questions. The second floor of the façade on the north elevation shows the upper story windows. Is there nothing behind those windows, its strictly non-usable space?

SOSIN: Correct.

JACOBS: Just a decorative feature. Then on the south elevation, which is the back of the building where the 3 exiting doors are, is there any thought of doing something over the doors? Some sort of a canopy, or a little something not to make them look so utilitarian?

SOSIN: We put canopies on the east and west elevations and I then I think staff made a change to add masonry features on both sides and then brick work above each one of these doors so that there was a change. And it doesn't show that up there. But its much better in the booklet in chapter number 5 where it shows there's a difference on the brickwork on the bottom banding to the top. A different type of masonry.

JACOBS: Right but what I was talking about was the doors themselves. I feel that added architectural features of the doors themselves, I assume they are steel doors.

SOSIN: Yes.

JACOBS: I really would like to see something done with those doors, something to gussy them up a little bit so they don't look like the back of a factory. What Commissioner Dzierwa was referencing were the two big blank walls on the east elevation and although he suggested clerestory, is there a possibility that you could take that band of brick or two courses of brick to just run it across that area below the roofline? Just so it's not so blank. I guess I understand that they have a lovely condo building and they are looking out on the first building that's going to be built in this development and its going to sort of set the trend for what else is going to happen, so I think we need to do the best we can.

SOSIN: That's why this was added this (inaudible), banding here and then brick work above which is kind of a lot of detail for a back...

JACOBS: I know but you know it's never enough for me. I would like to see that the doors are taken care of and I would like to see something done with the two brick walls.

THOMPSON: My fellow Commissioners have answered most of my questions. Again I am going to concur with them, the east elevation is awful plain. I'd also like to know how many children is this building going to accommodate.

SOSIN: typically these centers have between 100 and 150 kids. That's from one that is an 8500 square foot building.

THOMPSON: And the children are going to exit on that east elevation, am I correct, to the parking lot? Is that where the playground is?

SOSIN: They would go from here to the playground here. (Points to the east side elevation) There are several different doors here.

THOMPSON: Well my concern is, that if you have that many children out there playing how visible are they going to be from those windows? And I know there is going to be adults out there, but still if you needed to look out the window, how visible are they going to be?

SOSIN: They don't go out there alone and they don't go out there at the same time. That's up to the daycare center, that's an operational issue. Daycare centers supervise these children and this is not someone just going into this business, it's a national company. I think we have to trust them. They are also highly licensed by the state as to what they can and can't do.

THOMPSON: Ok. I guess my major concern again with my fellow commissioners is that east elevation, such a plain looking wall.

SOSIN: We will certainly talk to the developer and to the architects.

AUBIN: In reviewing staffs report, I just hope neighbors can feel confident. We have a very professional staff, they go through all this and the number one consideration when they put the reports together is one, that the petitioner meets code in every way shape or form and two how its going to affect the neighbors. I think tonight when I read this motion and the conditions that are being put upon the petitioners to make this project go forward, I think you're going to be a lot more comfortable. Especially after the comments of my fellow Commissioners and that we have taken care of some things in the elevations, dumpsters and especially the equipment on top. I just want to let you know that I think you'll feel more comfortable once I read this motion.

STEPHENS: I think you've put together a nice looking building, I think the cross access agreements and the cross parking will obviously benefit everybody in there and I don't think there is going to be a parking problem there. My one concern is that all the elevations on the four sides, not just the south or west. I think that can be remedied very easily, on the front elevation you are showing a two color brick if I'm not mistaken. The top color brick is like a red brick and the bottom is beige, am I correct Ms. Turley.

TURLEY: Yes.

STEPHENS: I would like to see the same banding of the red brick on the top go around on all four sides of the building, which is not really any great cost since you have to buy brick for the whole building it doesn't matter if you buy it in red or beige, but it will make a difference to the people looking at it.

SOSIN: If this were a developer issue I would be able to speak for the developer,

this is that part of it is a national company that has a certain look. While we all know that national companies do deviate I don't want to stand before this plan commission and tell you I'm sure we'll be happy to do it and get out of here and not do it. We have to talk to them.

STEPHENS: We've dealt with Lowes, we've dealt with Costco and we've changed their buildings as well. And they are all national companies as well. (The chairman invites Mr. Sosin up to the podium) If you'd like to come up I'd like to show you what I mean on all four sides and its no great expense. All you have to do is carry that red brick banding on all four sides and its no great expense and I'm sure your national company would like to locate here and they wouldn't have a problem with that.

SOSIN: Absolutely.

STEPHENS: I am not asking a national company to spend a great deal of money I am just asking them to make something that is aesthetically pleasing for the town as well as the people who are living back there. That is all I have to say.

SOSIN: The one issue that was not mentioned by the plan commission was the condition of staff with the impervious surface. One of the comments made by Ms. O'Brien was a concern about parking. If we increase the amount of pervious surface it would come from the parking, we would loose parking. We really don't want to do that. We think that just to have enough coverage, we should keep the parking the way that it is. Especially since the impervious surface is well within code. So we would like some consideration on that issue.

AUBIN: Mr. Sosin that will be taken care of in the motion.

DZIERWA: One more question. What's that wooden box that on the property that's got the half box with the two 2x4's? It looks like a little sign.

MATTHEY: It's the EPA's they make us post what is called our soil erosion plan, its inside that box. Its an EPA requirement.

STEPHENS: Entertained 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 September 22, 2009

and

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of the preliminary site plan titled "The Shops at 88 Orland Park Illinois Preliminary Engineering" by Tech 3 Consulting Group job #1A and dated September 1, 2009 subject to the following conditions. All changes should be made prior to the Committee Meeting wherever

possible unless otherwise noted.

1. Lot coverage is not increased over the originally approved 70.8%.
2. Limit the retaining wall in the detention pond to 3' in height, or provide tiers at a ratio of 2X the lower wall height.
3. Revise the Final Landscape Plan, meeting all Village Codes, for separate review and approval within 60 days of final engineering approval. Include another amenity in the main entry road vista, albeit smaller, where the gazebo was removed. Additionally, re-locate landscaping displaced by the new building footprint elsewhere on the site.
4. Increase the sidewalk that runs from 88th to the day care to a 7' width. Reduce the parking space depths to 16.5' long in this location.
5. Re-label as "Final Site Plan" and remove utility information.
6. Add a bike rack to the site.
7. Meet all final engineering requirements.

and

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of the Elevations Titled "Children of America the Shops at 88" by Base Ten Architects received September 16, 2009, subject to the following conditions: (Changes should be made prior to Committee Meeting if possible unless otherwise noted)

1. Screen all mechanical equipment, either at grade level with landscaping or hidden behind the roofline or a parapet. Minimize visual and noise impact on the abutting 4 story condominium building and surrounding residential establishments through careful selection of the material, color, location and noise levels generated by roof top equipment.
2. Construct a trash enclosure of masonry to match the building brick and show on the Elevation Plan.
3. Tie in at least one brick color with the brick colors approved for the other buildings in the planned development.
4. Add date and title to Elevations Plan.
5. That the petitioner make use of two colors of brick as shown on the north elevation to be applied to the east south and west sides of the building also;

and

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of an amendment to Special Use Permit Ordinance number 4130 for a Planned Development for The Shops at 88. The development will now include an 8500 square foot Day Care Center, as shown on the Site Plan, in place of the two story office building that was formerly proposed at the rear of the site. This special use includes a modification for a reduction in the detention pond setback where it abuts the day care playground;

and

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of a four lot subdivision plus a detention pond out-lot, subject to the submission of a Record Plat of Subdivision to the Village for recording and subject to these conditions:

1. The detention out-lot maintenance is the sole responsibility of the other four lots in the subdivision, with this issue addressed through common ownership, deed restrictions and the Development Agreement.
2. Subdivision is revised to include roadway frontage for all lots with buildings and to meet final engineering requirements.
3. Provide a notarized, shared parking and cross access agreement between the lots, using Village template prior to the issuance of Building Permits.

STEPHENS: Question, Mr. Dzierwa?

DZIERWA: Mr. Sosin mentioned about a reciprocal easement agreement would that need to be included in this particular motion?

AUBIN: Ms. Turley?

TURLEY: The detention lot maintenance or the parking.

STEPHENS: It's already in there.

DZIERWA: Does the word reciprocal need to be put in there?

SOSIN: I would have no objection; we are going to submit it to the Village Attorney for his comments anyway. The template does not always work all the time, but we are going to submit it and it has to be approved by the Village.

THOMPSON: Second

**This matter was RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Development Services & Planning Committee, due back on 9/28/2009**

**2009-0396 Land Development Code Amendment- R-3 Zoning Lot Coverage for 3+ Vehicle Side-Loaded Garages**

Lehmann: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated September 22, 2009 as presented.

AUBIN: Common sense prevails.

STEPHENS: Invited comments from the audience and receiving none asked for comments from the Commissioners and.

DZIERWA: Mr. Lehmann at the garage where we figure the pavement to be 3 cars wide and not necessary after it leaves the footprint of basically the garage and where it be more like 2 cars wide on the remainder of the property. Is that kind of standard?

LEHMANN: Yes. The 3 car approach to the garage is typically a 20 foot wide approach.

DZIERWA: I have seen some 3 car front load garages that basically are 3 cars right at the garage then it goes down to 2. I am wondering is that 3% basically there?

LEHMANN: Correct.

DZIERWA: I am just trying to picture that. I have a side load on my home and but its 2 cars, and I'm here 26 years and they gave me an issue with that when I was building it 26 years ago. It was just my preference to not have my garages facing the street, so I was just curious.

STEPHENS: I think we are moving in the right direction to make this code change. I just wonder, because if you took the average of the two, 10,000 square foot is 3.4% and 12,000 square foot lots I believe is 2.81%. If you take an actual average it would come out to 3.1%. So I'd like to see that be changed to bring it up to 3.1% to make it fair and adequate for both.

LEHMANN: I understand what you are saying, but it's an average. If I took more measurements of more driveways it might shift it one way or another, because I just basically took the 10,000 square foot as the base line the 12,000 as a higher end, but obviously they could be higher than that. The 3% was established just to make the code clean, basically to give it 3% to give it a nice round number. For simple figuring, and not sweating the details more than necessary, because we already do that, we give pretty much everybody every accommodation we can to try to keep them with in that lot coverage threshold. So that is the reason for that 3% number that I came up with, it wasn't a true average like you did point out.

STEPHENS: Alright I'll go along with that then, its fine, if you're going to give a little flexibility one way or the other.

LEHMANN: We often do. If somebody comes in and they are at 43.4% we are not going to make a big deal out of it. It's just a principal of the thing you've got to find someplace to cut them off. You have to try to hold them to the letter of the code but we certainly do make accommodations when sometimes people state their case; this pool type I am choosing is a standard pool size and if I down grade to the next size it doesn't suit my needs, so we are accepting of their needs and so forth and try and make accommodations.

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion.

DZIERWA: I move to approve a code amendment of Land Development Code Section 6-204-F- Lot Coverage, which will allow additional 3% lot coverage for required three-car, side-loaded garages in the R-3 zoning district that do not face a public street.

Thompson: Second

**This matter was RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Development Services & Planning Committee, due back on 9/28/2009**

**Aye:** 5 - Commissioner Jacobs, Commissioner Dzierwa, Commissioner Aubin, Commissioner Stephens and Commissioner Thompson

**Nay:** 0

**Absent:** 1 - Commissioner Parisi

#### **2009-0441 Tall Woods Estates**

TURLEY: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated September 22, 2009 as presented.

AUBIN: Swore in Richard Williams, 425 Williamsburg Ave., Geneva, IL  
Rick Sinnott, 19027 S. Jodi, Mokena, IL

WILLIAMS: I am the attorney for the developer Goran Ilijevski and Dave Szumigalski doing business as D&G Investments. Rick Sinnott as he introduced himself is our engineer. I just wanted to make a note that procedural requirements of your code were met notice was given to the adjoining property owners by certified mail. We also published notice on the properties required by your code. Ms. Turley did an excellent job giving the presentation, giving an overview of our development. The only thing we'd really like to do is to reiterate the necessity for us to have a 4 lot subdivision. When we came to the Village over a year ago we originally proposed 5 lots which would be consistent with your comprehensive land use plan. Staff at that time stated that they could not support a 5 lot subdivision, so we went back to the drawing board and said we could do a 4 lot subdivision and they did indicate that they would still like to do a 3 lot subdivision but we

worked extensively with the Village and staff to come up with some best management practices to allay their concerns of a 3 lot subdivision. I think given the economics of the site and the current economy we would ask that you consider the 4 lots, single family lots subdivisions tonight.

STEPHENS: Explained to the audience the procedure that would be followed for questions and concerns from the public and or Commissioners.

AUBIN: Swore in Herman Sloane, 7935 143rd, Orland Park

SLOANE: As a curious trick of the post office I am at 7935 but I am the immediate lot adjacent on the east of the property, it should be 7925 or 7937 but its not so... The first property across Tinley Creek.

STEPHENS: Is that Claridge Court?

SLOANE: No Claridge Court is to the east of me. I am sort of a wedge between Claridge court and the proposed site.

STEPHENS: Yes, ok.

SLOANE: I'll try to make my comments brief. Orland is a very unique suburb in the southwest and really probably the envy of all the suburbs in the southwest as to how we maintain things and how we build things and how we develop. The lady who gave the presentation called this a challenging project. I'd say that's rather an understatement. If any of you have had the opportunity to walk along or view the property, you'll notice it's a very narrow driveway and as was pointed out, there is no room for water, excess water retention or detention as you call it. The proposal allows everything to be drained directly into Tinley Creek. That presents a problem when one is salting such a narrow highly pitched drive that means everything that comes along that drive is going to come down into the creek. Building along that creek is very challenging as it is. I have watched various houses go up and the pollution level from the building process is rather astounding and the cleanup afterwards is always secondary and makes for years of pollution along the banks of the creek. But that is a small point. The real major point is that the current market in northeastern Orland is overdeveloped. Just to the east of me we have Wooded Path Estates where 14 lots were granted to Mr. Schute who has managed to sell one lot to his son and another lot to someone who, as you probably already know, has had some problems. So what we have instead of a beautiful oak forest that is contiguous with the rest of the area we have scaled streets with gravel and weeds and really an eye sore. Orland is a wonderful neighborhood. We see in Mokena and some of the suburbs to the south of us there is a huge amount of inventory and it's very hard to even get building permits. So my point is that we have plenty of lots in this area number 1 and number 2 to build that many lots on this size property would be really shoe horning things into a very small space, if you had an opportunity to look at it. Nobody has addressed

the huge pitch that there is from back of these properties to the Tinley Creek and its really going to be very challenging to develop this property. I mean two lots would be fine but 4 lots is tremendously overloading the buildable area here and I am sure we have somehow managed to fit it into what's called code or maybe the plan does but if you really view the property this is really going to be an eyesore to develop this many houses in this small an area, and we really don't need them at this point. I am going to try and save the developer some money here, don't build this because this is going to sit empty just like a lot of other things are along there and probably for years. But my final point is everything drains wrong everything is going to drain wrong the road is going to be ill fit, its going to produce traffic that the people immediately to the west are going to have difficulty to contend with and once again we are going to have big homes looking at the back of other homes. It just doesn't work as far as a building plan.

AUBIN: Swore in Joseph Wolf, 7950 Chateau Ct, Orland Park, IL

WOLF: I reside in the second cul-de-sac that is directly to the west of the driveway. Before I say a few things I'd just like to offer a letter, just a proposed letter of concern from a number of people in the three cul-de-sacs that most of them on here could not make it and they just asked me to let the Commission know that.... (Letter was received as exhibit A). The great concern is that while this is a five acre plot of land there is a great deal of it is unfortunately is unbuildable. The people, there are 3 cul-de-sacs and 3 lots in each cul-de-sac will be directly along side that driveway. So nine of them are going to be directly impacted one way or another, but we all believe and I believe that it ultimately impacts all 15 homes in those 3 cul-de-sacs. My basic concern is how does it effect the values of the properties that we have built and maintained. I am just afraid that with that driveway it looks awfully narrow I don't know the legal ramifications of what size street you have to have for traffic to go both ways, it doesn't look to me like there is enough room to make a driveway where two family vehicles could pass each other. As I said I am concerned with a road, and they are going to put a curve in there, it just looks to me like it would put a negative effect on the exhausting pieces of property. My personal opinion is that certainly 4 homes is over developing what's there. Beautiful property but you can only put so many homes on what's left to build on.

STEPHENS: So your concern is the driveway? Your concern is the width of the driveway?

WOLF: Yeah, basically that is the first concern and what the other gentleman mentioned, 4 lots in the back there you know (is too many). Does it affect my taxes? Or does it affect the value of my home? I just wanted to extend my thought on that.

STEPHENS: Thank you.

AUBIN: Swore in George Griggs, 7951 Michelle Ct, Orland Park, IL (lot 14)

GRIGGS: The questions I guess I have for the builders when would this development begin, at least the improvements, meaning the streets, sewers etc.? What is the average size of the 4 lots? What is the average size of the homes? Because when we built our home in this 15 lot division through McNaughton there was average sizes for ranches etc., so I'd like to know that. I am making the assumption they have to follow the building requirements meaning brick, face brick, etc. That is standard. What is the width of this driveway, because that does impact all of us? And what assurances would we have that the drainage will not go west, but will go either south into the forest preserve or east into Tinley Creek? Because right now whenever we have rain our yard is flooded and its flooded by what's there right now, and I have had the city out there so when it was built there wasn't a natural drainage into the forest preserve as it should have been done. Can I ask what is the average price of the home and or the lots? Because the lots just to the east that have already been mentioned are over \$500,000.00.

STEPHENS: We really can't get into a discussion on that.

GRIGGS: Ok. That's why I asked. Those are the questions I have.

AUBIN: Swore in Janet Lightfoot, 7951 Cascade Ct., Orland Park.

LIGHTFOOT: We live in the first cul-de-sac as you come into our area. Our house butts up directly to the road and in the short time that someone has... Where the road begins there is maybe 3 feet to where existing drive is at. When we moved in there was a woman that lived there since before Orland even started developing and she was very good neighbor. Now the home has been abandoned and recently there have been some people who have moved in, and the traffic already, people going up and down that road, at night at great speeds by the way, its already been disruptive. So my concern is what is going to happen with that driveway, we've got a situation already with just one family living up there. Thank you.

AUBIN: Swore in Robert De Maat, 14400 Claridge ct.

DE MAAT: I have a question if you could address....

STEPHENS: Are you next to Mr. Sloane?

DE MAAT: Not quite there's a lot in-between, we are sort of kiddy-corner.

STEPHENS: (Asked Ms. Turley to point out the property on the overhead.)

DE MAAT: I wonder with respect to drainage, in comparison to the original detention that the staff was interested in having and now we are going to these

"Best Practices", I wonder if the staff could address what the differences are in that and whether there has been some consideration made so that there is less water control on the property.

STEPHENS: Ms. Turley would like to explain what Best Practices are?

DE MAAT: I just want to know what the differences are; I know they have taken some steps, if they have reduced the capability for handling the water as a side effect of this that is different from the original detention that was proposed when the builder was interested in 3 lots rather than 4 lots. Also I have a preference about going with the 3 lots rather than going with the 4 lots with the improved drive to the street.

STEPHENS: Ms. Turley can you put up the slide of the proposed development. That dark area there behind those lots, is that existing condition?

TURLEY: Right that is existing ravine and that's the proposed conservation easement that we have run along the back of these homes.

STEPHENS: So that area will not be dealt with what so ever with this development? It's not going to change at all?

TURLEY: Right, they have to stay out of it.

STEPHENS: It'll stay as it appears now.

TURLEY: Right. And this is all dedicated to the Village so it'll remain as it is.

STEPHENS: In its existing condition?

TURLEY: Yes, except for that roadway and construction.

STEPHENS: Can the petitioners please come back up and address some of these questions. But before, Mr. Sloane did you have something more?

SLOANE: They talked about putting a park in on the, this would be the northern extent along the drive.

STEPHENS: They are not talking about putting a park in they are talking about dedicating it as park area and its going to be undisturbed. It'll stay in its natural state.

SLOANE: Well they are already moving trees of course and there will be a lot of trees removed from the property right?

STEPHENS: Not in that area.

SLOANE: And the only other point I wanted to point out is the IEPA easement that we were talking about, that shaded area, there.

STEPHENS: The conservation easement?

SLOANE: Right the conservation easement. Its extremely steep, the drop off there. So it couldn't be built but its also extremely steep uphill from there where the proposed houses are. So like I said this point shows the challenge, especially that 4th lot the very northern most lot. I have walked back there and I have absolutely have no idea how that is going to work. If you look at where the house is supposed to sit and where the easement begins, I'm not sure how that is supposed to work at all. I'm sorry to interrupt, thank you.

STEPHENS: You didn't interrupt; you just gave additional comments, that's all. I would like to ask the developers engineer to please come up. Could you address the questions they have asked with regards to water retention, pollution, grading, and drainage?

SINNOTT: I'd be happy to.

STEPHENS: And where that roadway will be in relation to the existing drive.

SINNOTT: Because of the topography of this site actually detention was never proposed on this site. Even when the staff was requesting that we consider a 3 lot subdivision it wasn't a three lot subdivision with detention. Detention is a physical impossibility on this site because of the topography; you can't get the water to flow into a single isolated pond. You basically would have to construct some kind of trough cut into the side of the existing ditch, so it's a physical impossibility. So what we have proposed to do in lieu of the detention were the best management practices. The best management practices that we have proposed is that the rooftops will generate run off and we are going to capture that runoff in 2,000 gallon cisterns and they will be then used for irrigation purposes. We proposed porous pavement on the cul-de-sac bulb so that the storm water will go through the pavement and then be filtered before it gets to the creek. We have also proposed a rain garden on the west side of the drive and the ditch so again it will provide some water poly benefit before the water gets to the ditch. We have also required that all of the driveways be constructed of porous pavement so again the rainwater will go thru the driveway rather than just run off directly into the ditch.

STEPHENS: You mean the driveways for the homes?

SINNOTT: Correct.

STEPHENS: What is a rain garden?

SINNOTT: A rain garden is kind of like a long hidden trough that has special plantings in it. Its kind of like a mini wetland.

STEPHENS: Where would you locate that?

SINNOTT: That is actually proposed to be located in this area right here (points to area on map). Along the west side of the...

STEPHENS: Can you point; are you going to be relocating where that existing driveway is?

SINNOTT: We are actually going to be moving it east somewhat. In this area here (refers to map), in order to have our entrance on 143rd street and not encroach on this property to the west. So we are moving this road east from its current location.

STEPHENS: How far east would you be moving it? Because it looks like according to the drawing that we have here that road is maybe about 5 feet off the west property line.

SINNOTT: Yes, it's pretty close.

STEPHENS: And how far to the east are you going to be relocating that road?

SINNOTT: About 20 feet further east.

STEPHENS: Ok. Is that all the way or is it...

SINNOTT: No its 20 feet up to this point here where it then curves and comes closer and comes into the center of the 60 foot right of way. Here it's off center.

STEPHENS: So that would be about 20 feet, what is it on the short part to the south?

SINNOTT: Here it would be about 15 feet.

DZIERWA: if you look at the numbers its 33 feet. Here is your right of way its 60 feet the road is 27 feet wide and that works.

STEPHENS: According to what Commissioner Dzierwa's point you're going to be about 33 feet there.

SINNOTT: There is a right of way to the east of that road so it'll probably be closer to 30.

STEPHENS: And that street is going to be 27 feet wide back to back?

SINNOTT: Its 27 feet total. We have a 24 foot wide pavement then we have foot and a half wide concrete strips on each side. The concrete strips aren't there to allow the water to drain into the creek as quickly as possible, we are using ditches because ditches are again provide some water quality benefit that is not provided by curb and gutters. The ditches are going to be along side the road way.

STEPHENS: So those ditches technically contain a little water then.

SINNOTT: Right water will run off into the ditches and it will travel along the ditches and to the one point, this is the one point where the ditches will then empty into the creek. That is the lowest point of the site.

STEPHENS: So these ditches are going to run from north to south then from south to north.

SINNOTT: That is correct.

STEPHENS: And that 24 foot wide pavement is enough to accommodate a car parking there as well as a car passing it or a truck?

SINNOTT: Well it won't provide 2 way traffic with a car parked there but if a car is parked there another car can certainly get around it.

STEPHENS: What about fire equipment?

SINNOTT: Fire equipment too. The 27 foot wide pavement actually meets the Villages minimum code.

STEPHENS: Can you answer us with regards to the lot grading? Are you going to keep the existing grades there or are you going to...

SINNOTT: Well this area of course here, the conservation area and the majority of this area here will be left in its current state. What we are going to do is each one of these houses, and to address one of the staffs concerns, about the 10 foot envelope around the building. At this point its almost impossible to say that this is the house that is going to be built here, because there are all going to be custom homes. We don't know exactly what the foot print is going to be, but the home is going to be designed to fit on that site with the least amount of impact to that site. This is a very attractive natural area and I think these buyers are going to want to maintain as much of that as they can.

STEPHENS: Are you going to be changing the existing grading on those lots or are you going to be trying to use the existing grading?

SINNOTT: We are going to try to use it as much as possible. There will be of

course changes in the area of the houses and of course the driveways. We actually did a grading plan, at the request of the Village staff that showed just how much grading would be done on the lots and I have a copy of that if it's not included in your staff reports. Its sheet 2 of the development plans.

STEPHENS: Yes we have the grading plan. I am going to ask our Village engineer Mr. Lehmann if you would address some of these concerns as well. Village engineering has reviewed the engineering for this project?

LEHMANN: Absolutely. Both Village staff, public works staff has had a chance to look at it as far minimum road size and so forth. Our consulting engineer has looked at it as well, Christopher Burke Engineering. Everybody has looked at this with the same perspective. As Mr. Sinnott said traditional detention is not a viable choice here. The whole goal here is preservation in order to establish a traditional detention system you'd incur a lot of disturbance in order to create a true pond system in order to try and feed any storm water run off from the developed areas to this pond. So we were of the same opinion as the petitioner that in everybody's best interest your to minimize the disturbance. Well how do you do that? To disturb the minimum amount of property necessary. If you were to require the petitioner to provide the necessary amount of detention for this for lot subdivision and this proposed roadway it would create a pretty sizable detention pond like Mr. Sinnott said. You can't really find a good location to situate it, because you may be able to put it in the low spot where water always wants to run but how do you get all the run off from these lots to that pond when all they want to do is run off to the east into the ravine. Basically nature has already taken its course here; we are just trying to minimize the amount of disturbance that is being proposed on the site. But understanding that detention is a code requirement there obviously has to be some off setting circumstances to account for the lack there of, of detention. Hence the reason Mr. Sinnott summarized the different best management practices that are proposed for this site. That being; porous pavement, cisterns to collect the roof run off, which we know is one of the major run off creations from house development is the run off from the roof itself. So I think all the approaches here are practical and certainly a worth while attempt to minimize the amount of storm water run off that is still going to occur, give the fact that the petitioner has the right to due process and develop their property. I think we have put together a good approach here as far as direction for the developer and as you can see from the duel sort of proposal here there has been some difficulty in deciding what's going to work here or not from just a financial viability stand point, but also from a physical functional stand point. So staff has scrutinized this project for quite a bit of time to try and reach some sort of agreeable approach to someone trying to develop this property.

STEPHENS: So the Village engineers have reviewed it, the Village's consulting engineers have reviewed it and you're all in agreement that there is not going to be any run off on the property owners to the west or the property to the east.

LEHMANN: The property owners to the west, if they could see a grading plan here the road that is being proposed is actually proposed to be lowered quite a bit in order to get some acceptable grades on the proposed road. Right now as it is situated, as most of you know, it's kind of up and down and hilly and difficult to traverse. If a public road is going to be proposed it has to meet our minimum standards as far as minimum slopes and maximum slopes. That was the direction given to Mr. Sinnott as the engineer to figure out a way to situate this road so its not only going to meet our codes from a drivable stand point but also from a grading standpoint to coexist with the site. From what you can see on the grading plan its dropped quite a good bit which basically allows the run off the west where I believe it was Mr. Griggs pointed out that that already had some existing drainage problems. I think by lowering that road within the confines of the out lot area is going to allow that runoff to seek the east a lot better.

STEPHENS: it will make the condition better?

LEHMANN: Definitely. In that low point no question about it. I think that, as the residents know that live there, it's pretty un-kept there, it's in its natural state and I think that has a lot to do with some of the grading obstructions that they have. I certainly don't live there so I am not saying I know everything that goes on there but by proposing what is going on here there is certainly opportunity to improve the grading for the people to the west. The people to the east I don't see how its going to impact anybody to the east because the grade drop off is so steep going down into the ravine and coming back up into the existing properties, run off is going to be contained into the creek as nature has already demonstrated, I think.

STEPHENS: Will there be any pollution allowed into that creek?

LEHMANN: that is certainly a distinct possibility if the home builders and the developer when and if they were to develop this property don't implement the necessary erosion control practices as a big part of this project not only to see if this is going to work from a buildability stand point but during the construction process there is going to have to be a lot of attention put toward the erosion control practices to make sure that the disturbed ground doesn't end up in Tinley Creek. There is no question about that.

STEPHENS: There are requirements?

LEHMANN: We have got an inspector at the Village here and that is exactly what she does, she issues citations and does inspections to make sure that the developers themselves are doing their own self inspections to make sure they are not adversely impacting the surrounding properties or the natural areas, its part of the IEPA requirements.

STEPHENS: Is that like putting up silt fences and things like that?

LEHMANN: I think in this case it's going to be a lot more than that. We're talking double rows of silt fences a lot of ditch checks and protective measures to keep the water on site and treat it, so there will definitely have to be some thought put into this more than just your typical silt fence and some straw bales here and there, because of the relief on the site minimizing the disturbances is key to avoiding that pollution problem no question about it.

STEPHENS: That is monitored by the Village?

LEHMANN: Absolutely. They are required to submit a self reporting to the IEPA, its part of their NPDS permit, which stands for national pollution discharge elimination system. It's something that if the IEPA is made aware of it and its still on the Village because we oversee those, what's called the MS4, the municipal storm water system. The Village has a vested interest in making sure that this pollution isn't occurring either because we're just as liable as the builder themselves.

STEPHENS: Ok, thank you Mr. Lehmann. I think we have answered all the questions that I was looking for. I don't know if this is a question for you Mr. Sinnott, when will the improvements start?

SINNOTT: Probably spring of 2010.

STEPHENS: Ok. As far as the average size of the four lots?

SINNOTT: I believe they all average over 20,000 square feet, the smallest being 21, 158 square feet, the largest is over 33,000 square feet.

STEPHENS: According to what I have here the smallest proposed lot is 22, 741 square feet.

SINNOTT: Oh, I'm sorry that is.

STEPHENS: The lots contiguous to the west, what are those average lot sizes?

GRIGGS: (stated off mic that his lot was 41,000 square feet according to what information McNaughton gave him)

STEPHENS: Actually there is no lot size to the east.

SINNOTT: Those are an R-1 Subdivision

STEPHENS: They are all R-1, and what size is that?

LEHMANN: Half acre is what the code says, I believe.

STEPHENS: Mr. Griggs, please come up to the microphone.

GRIGGS: My name is Griggs. I'm in lot 14 and that's about 41,000 square feet. I can't speak for the other 14 lots but I have a feeling that there are probably 3 or 4 that size, maybe 6. But I am not sure of that.

STEPHENS: When the lots to the west are about what 12,000 square feet, 10,000 square feet?

GRIGGS: To the west of us?

STEPHENS: No to the west of the proposed subdivision.

GRIGGS: Well I am just to the west I'm lot 14.

DZIERWA: 7951 Michelle Ct is where he is at.

STEPHENS: Those lots are not 40,000 square feet. Maybe 20,000 square feet.

GRIGGS: Well that's according to what McNaughton gave us.

STEPHENS: That's a mistake. Thank you sir. The property to the west is zoned R-3 with 10,000 square foot lots. To the east its zoned R-1 with 21,780 square foot lots. The minimum lot size in the R-2, which is the requested zoning here, is 15,000 square feet and the smallest proposed lot is 22,741 square feet. So as the lots are proposed they are certainly in compliance with or larger than the minimum requirements. Mr. Sinnott, I think that is all the questions I have for you.

SLOANE: Is there an example someplace of them putting in these ditches or troughs that they are talking about that carry this water someplace that we know it works or that a theory type of thing?

STEPHENS: Excuse me sir. If the Village engineer has approved it and the Villages consulting engineering has approved it, and a third engineer has designed it, I am of the opinion that these engineers know what they are doing.

GRIGGS: The reason I ask is because when they talk about the trough or a ditch what happens to the water if like in the fall when there is a lot of trees and as they accumulate in there is there a danger of backing up the water? What happens if everything starts moving north towards 143rd?

LEHMANN: I certainly wouldn't minimize that concern, but given the way the road is laid out on this site plan it is situated its going to have a pretty good valley in it. So lets say if and when for the sake of discussion that the ditch should back up where its supposed to go underneath the road there is enough elevation difference whether if it were to back up and not get through the storm pipe that

puts it into the ditch it would go over the road before it would start backing up and approaching the houses to the west or start trying to go out to the east. I mean the elevations themselves tell me that. As far as a back up situation would be concerned it would stay contained within the site and then go down into the ravine and into Tinley Creek. As far as the actual design of the actual ditch itself its not something that the Village has necessarily instilled in other developments yet because Village code more often requires typical storm sewer collection and putting it into a detention pond where in this case we are trying to mimic nature and allow it to basically flow over land, like nature currently does, and then be treated in the rain garden type system which basically said, is plants that thrive in wet environments and if and when it get over taxed it flows into the creek like I mentioned before. In theory it should work quite well but it all depends on how well constructed and maintained it is.

STEPHENS: Thank you Mr. Lehmann. Mr. Sloan.

SLOANE: I just have a question if those are 22,000 square feet is that except the easement or is that including the easement? Again if we point to the houses furthest to the left furthest down the road again that doesn't look like its 22,000 square feet. It looks like it barely fits the house.

STEPHENS: Is the conservation easements part of the lots?

TURLEY: Yes it is.

STEPHENS: So technically who ever purchases that lot knows their house to be bordering that lot, and part of it is conservation and part is buildable land area.

SLOAN: I'd like to ask the engineer if we put a normal street there and its salted and treated during the winter, that is all just going to flow down the bank and into the creek?

LEHMANN: That is correct; there is no proposed different treatment of this street than any other street in the Village.

SLOANE: Sure, it does the same thing?

LEHMANN: Sure, it just gets treated in a detention pond before it releases to some sort of natural body of water.

SLOANE: Does that change the chemistry of the salt or the toxicity of the fluid from the street.

LEHMANN: Absolutely, the more you salt it the more it changes the composition.

SLOANE: I'm sorry, does a retention pond make it less toxic to the surrounding

floor.

LEHMANN: It should if it properly treats it. It depends on what type of pond it is, if it's a wet pond....

SLOANE: So lack of a pond would be more toxic on the surrounding floor? Is that what you are saying?

STEPHENS: I think the question here is the water that filters out of a detention pond, having salt in it, is it the same as the water that will filter into this creek?

LEHMANN: I don't see it as being any different, in fact in this case when it runs down the slope it has the opportunity to be treated by the vegetation before it actually seeks the creek itself and moves on down.

STEPHENS: So this is better than a detention pond?

SLOANE: Or it kills the vegetation, right?

LEHMANN: If you over salt it yes that is certainly a possibility.

SINNOTT: There is some filtration on the run off we have porous driveways we have porous pavements we have roadside ditches which in themselves will filter rain water and then we have the rain garden on the west side of the drive which acts as another filter so we are not going to be shedding water mixed with salt right into the creek, they will have some treatment before they get to the creek.

LIGHTFOOT: This is our home right here (points to home on the rendering), my backyard backs right up to the current road. Everyone has a right to build on their property, but I would invite you to come out there and walk the property and take a look at it and see what it's really like out there. I can't imagine a two way street right outside my back door. The reason we moved there and built there was because of the natural landscape behind us and the fact that no one could build on it. That remains true..

STEPHENS: Why would nobody be able to build on it?

LIGHTFOOT: The property behind us isn't that a wetland, a protected environmental.

STEPHENS: No I don't believe it is.

LIGHTFOOT: Well that is the way it was....

STEPHENS: If it was a wetland you couldn't build on it.

SINNOTT: It would be against the law, you couldn't build on it.

LIGHTFOOT: Ok, well let me ask this....

STEPHENS: Let me ask the engineer.

LEHMANN: The creek itself is typically is designated some type of wetland or body or water but as far as the upland part of it, no. We have got the wetland delineation done by professionals showing where it exists and where it does not.

STEPHENS: So it is not an existing wetland area?

LEHMANN: Not where the road is proposed, no.

STEPHENS: Ok, does that answer your question?

LIGHTFOOT: I guess I am not understanding. To me I can't see physically how this can be accomplished without interfering with our homes that back up to it. Especially with the 4 home situations where they are making a two way road and parking on one side is a possibility.

STEPHENS: Let's look at the practicality of this thing. They are only requesting for 4 houses. They are not requesting for a four story condominium building, I mean how many cars are going to be going up and down that road?

LIGHTFOOT: Right now there is one family up there and they are going up and down the road all the time.

STEPHENS: And that house in my opinion, this development will increase values where that house really detracts. Don't you agree?

LIGHTFOOT: That part I give you.

STEPHENS: I drove by there today, that house is in terrible condition.

LIGHTFOOT: I give you that and unfortunately and selfishly I don't see that house from my back yard but all I see is the road.

STEPHENS: But your neighbor further to the south does.

LIGHTFOOT: Then my neighbor to the south can complain about that but I'm completely selfishly talking about that I don't want to sit out in my backyard and see a two way road going past me. That is my concern and I wanted to voice it.

STEPHENS: Ok. But I have to tell you this, anybody who is a landowner really has a right as long as its in compliance with the Village building codes to derive any

economic benefit that they can from their land. Just as you have the same right to if you wanted to put your property up for sale to ask any price you wanted for your property, so to that issue we have to go with what is in compliance with the building codes. So if they are in compliance with the land development codes we can't say no you can't build it because the next-door neighbor doesn't want you to build it.

LIGHTFOOT: As I said I am selfishly concerned about positions, and what it would do to our home life there.

STEPHENS: I understand.

SINNOTT: I'd like to point out that an R-3 zoned lot has a 30 foot rear yard so if you take the 30 foot rear yard and add the 30 foot to the road there is a 60 foot separation between any house in that subdivision and that part of the road.

STEPHENS: Unfortunately, I don't believe Mrs. Lightfoot's house has a 30 foot rear yard. That house is about 5 or 10 feet off the rear yard lot line. Would I be correct with that Ms. Lightfoot?

LIGHTFOOT: Yes.

STEPHENS: So basically that house is probably in non-compliance with the rear yard requirement.

SINNOTT: Then it also is going to be heavily landscaped in that area.

STEPHENS: I believe we have heard the questions and I believe that our village engineer has told us they have approved preliminary engineering its also been reviewed by the outside Village consultant engineer and also has been submitted by another engineer so there has been 3 engineers that have looked at this and are all in agreement that this is a viable development to move forward with. So seeing no further comments from anyone out there I will go to the Plan Commissioners.

AUBIN: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I can't possibly think of one question that has been asked and answered during Chairman Stephens's interrogation of John Q Public, the petitioner and staff. I will put my two sense in and say a lot of education went into this. Three different engineers and the education they went through at the university wherever the case might be. This project would never go forward unless it could be done.

DZIERWA: First let me tell the people out there that have shown up and we do appreciate you showing up. I also walked the property yesterday. I have a hard time with trespassing on a property so what I do is I knock on doors. I knocked on a number of doors on Michelle Ct. and Chateau Ct. and a few people answered

and I did have my packet in my hand. I am a nosey type of person; I like to talk to people. I had the pleasure of talking to Mrs. Wolf, and she took time to talk to me and I told her I had some concerns and I put myself in her shoes, like what if I lived there. We all live here too; we all care about what goes on. We all come out there and we look. A couple of people out there just thought we should just come out there and look, well that's what our job is, that's what we do. Sometimes we fly under the radar and sometimes we stick out like a sore thumb. I was driving my convertible last night blasting my music hoping people would come out and yell at me so I could talk to them. Mr. Kowalis at 7951 was very nice to talk to me last night on Chateau Ct. and he invited me into his backyard, he let me walk through the trees. We walked up to the roadway, we looked at the house in its dilapidated condition, call it what you want dilapidated to some people some people think its rustic. I did have one concern about the roadway going along behind the two built in pools on Michelle Ct. I knocked on 7940 I believe, there was a young lady and her brother home parents weren't home, so I couldn't talk to anybody. I knocked on 7950 and got no response. That is when I went to Chateau Ct. and I talked to Mr. Kowalis. All told I knocked on 6 doors. I talked to the 6 people I thought would be most impacted by this and what I meant by most impacted by this is the roadway being closer to their backyard property lines as opposed to the road when it goes by Cascade Ct. I was satisfied with the distance of the roadway from Cascade Ct. because we do look at this stuff and I saw that in my opinion it was 33 feet away from the back property line, which when you add to somebody's back yard is kind of far away. What I did find out tonight, and I was enlightened a little bit and was really glad to hear that Mr. Lehmann told us that the roadway was going to be lower than your properties on Cascade, Chateau and hopefully all of Michelle. To me that is a plus. A lower roadway means water is going to stay on the other side, pure and simple. Also with the screening that I saw in the one backyard that I did get to visit, in the little walking around into the subdivision where I was worried about trespassing, I think that knowing the roadway is much lower and if we can keep the screening the way that it is, I don't think that its going to be that much of an impact. Last night I did, I told Mrs. Wolf I am worried about this guy on the corner here with the pool on Michelle Ct. Even the second built in pool, I mean what if a car is going by there and its only 17 feet away and some people driving with out the deterrents of curbs keeping the car from going off the road. Ok a pool is a seasonal thing, but it only has to happen once, so knowing that the roadway is lower I am a little bit kinder toward that particular situation. At first I was thinking maybe we'll loose a lot and center the road but it really doesn't work with the topographical map I'm looking at here. I'm thinking that the roadway is going right where it's supposed to go because professionals say that's where it's supposed to go. I'm not going to question these people they know what they are doing. I found out tonight that tonight that best management practices for water is going to work. It's going to be a lot less disturbing than if we were going to put in a detention pond, so I am all in favor of that. I always like things better in their natural state. I think this is a plus for a few of you people here on Michelle Ct., as far as the way they are going to handle the water run off. And I think that if people are coming in and doing something for

themselves and helping you at the same time it's a win, win. A couple comments that were made, roadways and speeders and what is going on in that house now. That is a police issue. It's not something we handle. It's a bad thing; I'm not going to disagree with you. You have to call the police; you have to talk to them to find some way to find some common ground here because you are concerned about living in your own backyard and someone else's carelessness operating their motor vehicles on their own property. If you have to call the police, I know it's unincorporated, Orland is probably not going to respond, I don't know how that is going to work. I think it's just something that just has to be policed; you just have to do that. That is not something we can deal with. I think that if something is going on down there that isn't quite right and you build 4 new houses and put in 4 new families in there that are proud of what they have to own I think they are going to police themselves. They might have kids, I have had kids and I have had to police them from time to time. Other than that Mr. Chairman, when I came in here tonight I was thinking that I didn't like that roadway but now the more I hear from MR. Lehman telling me that the roadway is going to be lower its going to be probably a little more out of sight than I thought. I just wanted everybody to know that I walked back there and I saw that and I was out there and I am thinking like if I was living there too. And if I were to be living in anyone of those houses at this particular point I would say that I would be ok with this subdivision going in. I have been in Orland for 26 years, I built in the middle of a prairie and when I moved in I wanted to close the gate behind me, so I think if I was living there I'd be a good neighbor and I'd give them all the graces that they needed to do what they needed to get done, but I would also be the nosey neighbor without trespassing and make sure that they do their job and make sure that the Village does their job to see that they do their job.

JACOBS: Mrs. Turley, can you go back to that slide that shows the conservation area, the shaded area? The edge of that, does that reflect the creek bed? Is that the creek at the right does that define the creek?

TURLEY: It's the creek and the slope. It's hard to see it because the slope is very steep.

JACOBS: Then this lot number 1 pretty much backs up to that conservation area rather dramatically, and so when that would be under construction would that slope be dramatically affected by the that, would they have to re-grade that area to support that?

TURLEY: they would have to keep the grading out of the conservation easement at a minimum.

JACOBS: Ok. That's part of what was already discussed that they would have to have these very expensive (measures).

STEPHENS: Mr. Lehmann explained that.

JACOBS: If lot number one was eliminated what difference would that make to the other lots other than a financial situation? Would the other lots be redesigned?

TURLEY: Well probably what we were talking about is that the existing driveway would be used and it loops up in here. It would change the 3 lots you would have to reconfigure it.

JACOBS: That would mean that the road would be a private road rather than a two lane road, right?

TURLEY: Right. A private driveway.

JACOBS: And who would be responsible for maintaining that?

TURLEY: The homeowners.

JACOBS: So they would have to take care of the plowing and maintenance and what have you. Would it still have the same water run off program?

TURLEY: The BMP's? We'd have to go back and relook at it again because the impact would be less, but it would have to be looked at again.

JACOBS: Thank you.

THOMPSON: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I think my fellow commissioners have addressed all the concerns of the residents and done a good job. The one comment was the driveway coming in and I believe its Mrs. Lightfoot who had a concern about traffic coming up and down that driveway. I am looking at Claridge Ct. and I can't believe no one has a concern about that street with 9 homes being on it and the traffic going up and down that street. Along the 4 cul-de-sacs when you have parties I don't know where everyone parks, so I can not see where there would be a problem with this once you get 4 quality homes put in that location. That was my only comment other than my fellow commissioners did an excellent job and I thank you.

STEPHENS: I believe that your concerns are valid with the concerns of the water problems and things of that nature, but it appears to me that the engineers do their job the property to the west has been engineered, graded and such so that the water runs off. I would think that the water is probably running off onto this property from the property to the west. I think that the problem here is that this property is not developed. I think once this property gets developed it'll better the situation than you have on the west side and I don't think its going to affect anything to the east side. I don't think there is going to be anymore pollution in the ravine that doesn't already exist now or that doesn't exist in any other storm water detention basin which slowly releases into any other creek within the Village. That is how all

the detention basins work, the water run off runs from the streets which are all plowed, into the detention basins and from there that water run off runs into the creeks and it runs away from Orland Park. I don't think that is going to be any change as far as additional pollution and with regards to the construction I don't think that is going to be a problem because its got to be governed and requirements that the IPEA has on the Village have to be monitored otherwise the Village is having a problem with that. I think this is going to make your properties better with regards to any water problems. I also think that if I'm not mistaken the plan calls for one unit per acre residential development. With this 4 lot subdivision its less than one unit per acre, its 8/10 unit per acre so it's well within the development requirements. In addition to that the lots far exceed the minimum lot size requirements. So I don't see how we could say no to not allow the development of this property and I think its going to make it better for the 3 courts to the west. I also agree with Commissioner Thompson, you know you have 3 cul-de-sacs there and there is virtually very little parking in those cul-de-sacs and when you have parties where do the people park? It doesn't seem to me to be enough parking within those cul-de-sacs, so you probably already have a parking problem when somebody has parties there already. So I don't think there is a problem there. By putting in 4 houses there is enough room and they are probably going to put in circular driveways or what ever they are going to put in here, that I don't think 4 houses is going to be any sort of an impact traffic wise, it probably would be better because the quality of the residents of the new residential buildings that will be built there and the quality of those residents are probably better then what it is today. So I am very much in favor of this development. I think it's going to be a much better improvement than what exists today. Those are my comments, and I thank you all for coming and sharing your comments because that is what this process is all about, and I believe all of your questions have been asked and answered in a very proper manner.

Stephens: Entertained 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 September 22, 2009,

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board to approve the preliminary site plan titled Tall woods Estates Preliminary Site Plan, dated 10/06/08 and revised 9/01/09, subject to the following conditions. Changes should be made prior to Committee Meeting unless otherwise noted.

1. Provide a Landscape Plan meeting all Village Codes, for separate review and approval within 60 days of final engineering approval. This is to include increased buffering for residences to the west.
2. Revise the Tree Survey and Mitigation Plan to include all trees within 10' of the

building footprints that will probably be lost to grading. Mitigation Plan is to maximize on-site placement of native tree species already growing on the site, but spacing so as not to endanger tree health.

3. All trees to be preserved are to be protected during construction per Code requirements of section 6-305.1.
4. Smooth out conservation easement line for easier resident identification, while still maintaining a minimum 50' buffer from the stream.
5. Add vehicle turn around area adjacent to one acre park.
6. Accommodate existing bike path into construction of driveway entry.
7. Dedicate a 50' right of way measured from the centerline of 143rd Street.
8. Work with staff to create smaller footprint for entry feature and sign. All signs and entry features are to be perpetually maintained by the single family lot owners, with this issue addressed in the Development Agreement.
9. All final engineering related items are met.

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board to approve a Special Use Permit for a Residential Planned Development in an R-2 District with the following modifications to the Land Development Code, and subject to the same conditions as outlined in the preliminary site plan motion:

1. Provide best management practices in lieu of traditional detention facilities.
2. Reduce the front building setbacks from a required 30' minimum to 15' minimum.
3. Reduce the stream setback from a required 50' to a supplied 30' for a maximum 85' distance along the subdivision driveway.
4. Construct no sidewalks.
5. Construct no curbs or gutters.
6. Use porous pavement on the drives that varies from Code required construction methods.
7. Reduce the requirement for the driveway's vertical length of curve minimum.

8. Allow a maximum 880' long cul de sac that exceeds the Code limit of 500'.

9. Reduce the number and height of lights on the driveway.

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board to approve the subdivision of a 5.31 acre parcel into four single family lots plus an out-lot; subject to annexation to the Village and to the submission of a Record Plat of Subdivision to the Village for recording.

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board that, upon annexation from unincorporated Cook County, to approve the rezoning of the 5.31 acres to R-2 Residential District Planned Development.

THOMPSON: Second.

**This matter was RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Development Services & Planning Committee, due back on 10/26/2009**

**Aye:** 5 - Commissioner Jacobs, Commissioner Dzierwa, Commissioner Aubin, Commissioner Stephens and Commissioner Thompson

**Nay:** 0

**Absent:** 1 - Commissioner Parisi

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

STEPHENS: I would like to suggest that the commissioners keep the minutes of the September 8th meeting with the changes for the next meeting. Mrs. White we don't have to wait to make those changes to the next meeting? We'll just keep what we have and approve it at the next meeting.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the Plan Commission for discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda White  
Recording Secretary