

# 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, August 28, 2007**

**7:00 PM**

**Village Hall**

## **Plan Commission**

*Louis Stephens, Chairman*

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

**CALLED TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

**Present:** 5 - Commissioner Dzierwa; Commissioner Aubin; Commissioner Stephens;  
Commissioner Thompson, Commissioner Parisi

**Absent:** 2 - Commissioner Jacobs, Commissioner Culligan

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A motion was made, seconded, and carried to approve the minutes of the August 14, 2007 Plan Commission meeting minutes with the following revisions: (1) on page 13 in the ninth paragraph within Mr. Raspante's comments, in the fourth sentence, replace the word "decal" with "decel"; (2) on page 15, in the ninth paragraph within Mr. Mule's comments, replace the last two words of the first sentence "some number" with "square feet"; (3) on page 20 in the 11th paragraph within Commissioner Jacobs' comment, replace the last word of the second sentence, "thinks" with "things"; (4) on page 21 in the first paragraph, insert the word "they" in the third-to-the-last sentence so that it reads: "Why would 'they' say something that was not professional?"; (5) on page 16, in the fifth paragraph within Chairman Stephens' comments, insert the words "and how they" so the sentence reads: "...address the two bioswales 'and how they' benefit the water situation."; (6) on page 21 in the second paragraph and sixth sentence there, insert the word "for" so that the sentence reads: "It is not very conducive 'for' a home or two homes..."; and (7) on page 43 within the second sentence of the last paragraph under Chairman Stephens' comments, replace the word "that" with the word "than".

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

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

**Nay:** 0

**Absent:** 2 - Commissioner Jacobs and Commissioner Culligan

**PUBLIC HEARINGS****2007-0156 Crystal Tree Clubhouse Redevelopment**

Duane Linden, 14640 Golf Road, Orland Park

HOFKENS: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated August 28, 2007 as presented.

AUBIN: Swore in Mr. Linden.

LINDEN: Stated he is speaking tonight on behalf of Mr. Pat Joyce, for the revised Site Plan. I think it has been covered very well. I am not going to belabor and go through the same details. There are a couple points, however, I would like to

make. There is a mistake. We have ten-car parking, as proposed. We show two extra cars to the north end. That is not on the property. That should have been eliminated. There is ten-car guest parking. Additionally, there are many driveways that accommodate more than two car tandem, however, we did not use that for any counts. It is requested, and we will, come in with a plat as to how we are going to subdivide this. When I put down the 53% open area, that was all the common area after I deducted everything and where I thought the lines around the buildings would be, nothing is going to change on the Site Plan, however, that 53% may be reduced in order to bring the lot out to the private street. I thought it important to mention that because in Staff's Report, it requests that we come in with a lot deed out. Made an appeal – we went through and re-did these buildings and we tried to take into consideration what we thought would be the ultimate coverage. We consider the coverage the private roads, the buildings, the porches, the sidewalks, rear patios and optional three-car garages. In doing that, we exceeded by one percent which in essence is a couple thousand square feet in square footage on a 200,000 square foot parcel. Pointed out that the country club itself added another 41 acres to the golf course. I have never taken the time to go back through, mainly because the records are not available in exactness to re-evaluate, however, I think you would find overall the percentage would really be far less as the entire PUD. We are dealing with just the site we are submitting, yet the common area is part of the entire element. That is the number one appeal on this. Number two, we can meet and reduce the 2,000 square feet. I just think there may be more people who may want these front porches with covered roofs and whatever. I would like to appeal for that if possible. Beyond that, I am open to any questions anyone may have.

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

AUBIN: Swore in Ronald Abromowitz.

ABROMOWITZ, resides at 14566 Golf Road, Orland Park (within the Crystal Tree Community and a member of the Crystal Tree Golf and Country Club): Stated that right from the start, Crystal Tree as a community and Crystal Tree as a golf course have been intertwined as one. As we move forward with this particular project, stated he sees the opportunity to enhance not only the community but the Crystal Tree Golf and Country Club. It is a very vital part of our movement forward and a very vital part of the community. Noted he believes that a lot of people realize that, however, feels that many do not realize how this community and golf course tie together and the importance of this project both to the community and to the golf course. I am in favor of this project.

AUBIN: Swore in Tom Lasko.

LASKO, resides at 14422 Crystal Tree Drive, Orland Park: Stated he is somewhat opposed – remains convincible. Asked: (1) what legal, financial and time assurances and guarantees does the present Crystal Tree community have

regarding damage to roads and streets during construction; (2) costs to repair those damages; and (3) the timeline of the proposed clubhouse redevelopment – they've changed from 26 to 23 to 20 units so I would like an updated timeline. Thank you.

MARK BURNS, President of the Crystal Tree Homeowners' Association, previously sworn in: Stated that after a lot of discussion and interaction, there is an agreement between the country club, the homeowners association and the developer – Pat Joyce – signed by all parties. There is fourth party to the agreement who we do not have complete compliance from and asked for the Plan Commissioners' support in obtaining that support – that happens to be the Village of Orland Park. We do have in that 25-point agreement, the terms, the manner in which construction is going to be managed, and the fact that the developer for any changes that have to be fixed during the construction process for any damage – it is his responsibility. When the job is complete, he will pay a percentage of the road from 143rd Street all the way to the end of the project. We have to be realistic. We have been using that road for nine years. Both the country club and the homeowners. We have to be reasonable. The nature of this agreement deals with the fact, as Staff stated, the only park in the community goes out the door. Pat Joyce wrote a letter to the Village and it appears that the Village has conceded (which was our first requirement we wanted) that the park/impact fee (which will amount to approximately \$110,000 we believe) be directed to the Crystal Tree Homeowners' Association for a park/recreation area. The planning group is already recommending that. The second piece of this, and the area in which we need your support, is that the country club has paid to the Village, a tree mitigation fee in three installments of \$89,700. The country club President, Bill Karabell, has written a letter to the Village Manager, Mr. Zeder, specifically requesting that those funds be allocated back to the homeowners' association for this same park/recreation area. We have not heard on that issue. The third piece that the country club is in the process of, as a result of tree mitigation, planting trees for the next seven years. They have agreed that they will plant 30 trees within the Crystal Tree complex at our direction. They will buy them and plant them for us. That is in the agreement. We did notify the Village. We do not need the Village's approval. We have a plan to move forward which we hope accommodates our dream of replacing the park that is leaving. We need substantial funds to do that because we do not have an easy place to just put a park. We are going to have to retrofit some property. I wanted you to know where we stood and I am asking for your support with the Village, in an effort to get the \$89,700.00 reallocated back to Crystal Tree. It is Crystal Tree money. It was from the country club just as Pat Joyce's money will be coming to the association. We'd like to see that money come back as well.

STEPHENS: As far as the money coming from the Village, that is not a charge we have. We are the Plan Commission – not the Village Board of Trustees. We are appointed. We are not elected officials. The elected officials on the Village Board would make that decision. We have no say.

BURNS: Can you make a recommendation to the Village Board in support of this position?

STEPHENS: It is not within the guidelines of the Plan Commission to make that recommendation. A negotiation agreement would have to take place between you, the developer, and the Village. That would be part of the Development Agreement with the Village. It is just not the Plan Commission's ability to do that. Noted that the next meeting this petition goes to is the Committee Meeting which includes three Village Trustees. Indicated that Mr. Burns can bring this up at that meeting which next meets on fourth Monday of September.

BURNS: Thank you.

AUBIN: Swore in Shirley Wolf.

WOLF, resides at 14719 Hollow Tree Road, Orland Park – has resided here for 17 years: I am opposing this development. After residing here for 17 years, I thought it was done very well. Everything was handled beautifully. When we found out about them building, it seemed like it was already under construction. We were told by others, that they went to Mr. Corley and had them change the PUD so they could go ahead with the country club. This is very upsetting to me. Some people agree with me, however, they don't show up. I don't know what can be done, however, I simply wanted my opinion heard. I've written to the Plan Commission. I've talked to one of the ladies in the office about my disagreement. What will be done for us if the road is going to be under construction for two-and-a-half years. If they lose their members from the country club, are they going to go forward with their building? He more or less threatened us saying that if they don't have this go through, they could probably go bankrupt and then perhaps the current country club would go public.

STEPHENS: Clarified that the Plan Commission has nothing to do with the sale or the buy of the property. We are only looking at a development coming in and looking to see if it is in compliance with the code or not. That is our charge with this.

WOLF: Okay, thank you.

STEPHENS: Asked Mr. Linden to address the foregoing questions asked.

LINDEN: Referenced the "LOT 101 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT" from which he read aloud, the fifth-listed requirement: "At the conclusion of construction, or sooner if deemed necessary, the street (Crystal Tree Drive) from 143rd Street to the end of Lot 101 will be repaved and the developer shall be obligated to pay 25% of this cost. Any interim work caused by construction tear up will be paid directly by the developer". Noted there is another paragraph included within the

“LOT 101 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT” wherein it states that “as deemed by the homeowners’ association, if there is a problem”. In regard to the timeline question, it has been agreed by the developer that at the end of two years from the first building permit he will be obligated to put all of the foundations in. If there is a lengthening period of time, that should remove at least all of the grading and concrete trucks except for the sidewalks.

LASKO: Stated he appreciates all of the answers provided thus far, however, while it is adequate for the heavy construction equipment, it does not cover all of the construction equipment and all of the construction traffic. When is the project expected to be completed? You said two years after building permits for the first phase. When do you expect the entire project to be completed?

STEPHENS: Before the petitioner answers that question, asked if there are any other vacant lots that are being built on in Crystal Tree?

BURNS: There are four single-family lots remaining.

STEPHENS: What about that construction traffic. Do you have an agreement with them on the roads?

BURNS: No.

LINDEN: Pointed out article 16 states that any time there are infractions of this agreement, after notice has been given to the developer with a reasonable time to correct, seven days, the Crystal Tree homeowners has the right to rectify and collect 150 percent of the amount expended from the developer. During the course of construction, it will be monitored and policed and the developer will be asked to keep it clean. The developer has agreed to keep the roads clean on a timely basis. I think Mr. Burns has gone a long way to foresee the problems, however, I don’t think anyone can foresee everything that may occur. In regard to timing, under a normal period of time, two years would be adequate, however, we are in probably the biggest housing downturn that the southland has experienced. Because of that, there is discussion with regard to how to best protect the whole situation so that at least the worst of the damage is done and then you can go ahead and repair/replace the roads. I don’t think anyone can sit here at this point in time and guarantee the sales will happen. A year ago, it would have been a simple situation.

LASKO: Clarified that he really does not care how long it will take all of these units to sell. His concern is quick construction time. From the beginning to the end – not a guarantee but some sort of an assurance – would like to know what the most likely scenario is expected to be.

STEPHENS: Addressed Mr. Burns, as President of the Homeowners’ Association. Noted he negotiated with the developer. Stated there is a 26-item

Agreement that has been agreed to between the association (signed by him as its President), the Country Club and Mr. Joyce. Asked Mr. Burns if all the questions being asked by Mr. Lasko are addressed in the "LOT 101 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT" as a benefit to the homeowners' association?

BURNS: Stated that substantially, the wording of the Agreement complies. It also states that if either party does not perform, they have the right to sue. We have an agreement with which I am comfortable with.

STEPHENS: Stated to Mr. Lasko, that if Mr. Burns is President of his Homeowners' Association and he has negotiated with the developer and the country club, this is a binding agreement. Asked Mr. Lasko if he has seen the agreement.

LASKO: Indicated he has not seen the Agreement nor does he believe any of his fellow homeowners have seen the Agreement. Had we seen that Agreement in advance of this public hearing, a lot of time would have been saved.

STEPHENS: Noted that the Plan Commissioners only received the Agreement this evening.

AUBIN: Swore in Richard Wolf.

RICHARD WOLF, resides at 14729 Hallow Tree Road: Expressed his belief that there is something in the bylaws which requires that any move such as negotiation of this Agreement made by the President of the Homeowners' Association, should be voted on by the homeowners in the Association. Questioned the appropriateness of the President's ability to go out and negotiate 26 separate points without even presenting them to the membership, to him personally, seems to be out of line. To agree to 25% on a reconstruction project for that road which everyone in this room knows will be torn up by the heavy equipment, and for the homeowners to have to come up with the additional 75%, is also out of line. To say that Mr. Burns has the authority to negotiate this type of Agreement – I'm not sure he does or he doesn't.

STEPHENS: He is the elected President of your Homeowners' Association. Asked how old the roads are.

BURNS: They are 18 years old. The last surface job done was almost nine years ago. They have had substantial use prior to the advent of construction. Clarified that he did not act unilaterally in terms of this Agreement. There is a seven-member Board elected by the people who live in the community. Clarified that the Board was very active in every one of the meetings. You don't have a copy of this document because the last participant did not sign it until last weekend. I was planning on covering the substantial parts of this in our September 15th newsletter. The entire Board voted on this. That is the point I

want to make.

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

DZIERWA: Stated he is very pleased to see the changes made here. I was not entirely sure how the existing clubhouse was going to work as far as the condos are concerned. We lost a couple of the townhomes to make the density work better. I am pleased by the way this looks. I am very pleased to see that the homeowners' association has worked something out. All my questions have been answered and I believe this project should move forward. Thank you.

PARISI: Concurred with Commissioner Dzierwa's recommendation that this move forward. Believe that the developer has made every effort to make it something which will enhance the value of the community. As far as having a timeline as to when this will be completed, I find that to be unreasonable. Crystal Tree itself still has four lots which remain undeveloped. No one can predict when the economy will allow for all of these townhomes to be absorbed. It is unreasonable to expect the developer to build all of these at one time and then worry about selling them. That would be unrealistic. Happy to see that an Agreement has been worked out.

THOMPSON: I have no further questions.

AUBIN: The people who live there and their representatives from their association have put together a plan that developer, the association, everyone has agreed to. That was one of the requirements from when we first met – that this agreement be put together by the residents and the developer. It is here. It is self explanatory. The developer has made some changes which we had chatted about the last time this petition was before the Plan Commission. I am absolutely in favor of this, however, have one question to ask of Staff. One of the conditions is that the petitioner revise the Site Plan to allow for only 45% impervious surface. This extra one percent. Would the petitioner have to return for a variance if I were to strike that or should I read it as is?;

HOFKENS: They were not published for any modifications. We have, in the past, done technical follow up. It is one percent. Our position is that we would rather see the lot coverage meet code. We are really excited about this project meeting code.

STEPHENS: I think that represents approximately 2,000 square feet.

AUBIN: Okay, thank you.

STEPHENS: I was not present at the first meeting when this was presented as a petition. I did see the land plan. I would say that this is a much, much better land plan than the first one I saw. This addresses all of the concerns that Staff had as

well as a lot of the concerns that our Plan Commissioners had as far as the placement and location of the townhomes. I think it is an excellent plan. I think it is much better to develop this plan than leave a club house sitting there empty for who knows how long in an economy like this and I think that if you left that club house sitting there for awhile, it may be detrimental to the entire community. I think that the developer, the president of your association and the president of the country club have really hashed out all the terms that could possibly take place as witnessed by this 26-item, signed agreement by all three. I think that in itself says to me that there has been a whole lot of discussion, a whole lot of back and forth, and an entire amount of agreement here which addresses all of the concerns I've heard here tonight. The petitioner has also reduced the density from 23 units to 20 units; is not increasing the overall density of the entire community; has added guest parking areas which is really necessary for a community like this; has strived to create a development that does not have all of the garages facing the street which is what we currently have existing in Crystal Tree. I think this is a real positive development for this community. I am very much in favor of it. This developer has an agreement about any damages that will be done to the road surfaces. There are still a lot of delivery truck, work trucks and all kinds of trucks driving in that community all of the time. You still have four lots left to build. You are going to have a whole lot of construction trucks coming in and out of there after this developer is gone. In all fairness for the entire community, I think this developer has come forward and given his best foot forward to fix or deal with any damages he is doing. This is good for all concerned.

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion from the Plan Commissioners.

I move to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission the findings of fact set forth in this staff report, dated August 28, 2007.

and

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of the preliminary site plan titled "Proposed Planned Unit Development for the existing Crystal Tree Country Clubhouse land,' prepared by Kon-Fer, Inc. job number 2007, dated 02-27-07, most recent revision 08-17-07, subject to the following conditions.

1. That the petitioner submit a plan showing the proposed property lines for the townhomes and prior to the Village Board meeting.
2. That the petitioner revised the site plan to allow for only 45% impervious surface lot coverage per Code requirements before the Village Board meeting.
2. That the petitioner submit a landscape and mitigation plan within 60 days of final engineering approval for separate review and approval.
3. That the petitioner receive permission from the Crystal Tree Homeowners

Association to construct the proposed parallel parking spaces along Crystal Tree Drive or incorporate those spaces into the clubhouse property.

4. That all final engineering related items are met.

and

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of a Special Use Permit for Planned Development for the Crystal Tree Clubhouse Redevelopment, subject to the same conditions as outlined in the preliminary site plan approval.

and

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of a Subdivision for the Crystal Tree Clubhouse Redevelopment subject to the same conditions as outlined in the preliminary site plan approval

**A motion was made by Commissioner Paul Aubin, seconded by Commissioner Steve Dzierwa, that this matter be RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Development Services & Planning, due back on 9/24/2007. The motion CARRIED unanimously.**

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

**Nay:** 0

**Absent:** 2 - Commissioner Jacobs and Commissioner Culligan

#### **2007-0266 Southwest Highway Mixed Use Development**

Charles Smith, Arete 3, Tinley Park

HOFKENS: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated August 28, 2007 as presented.

AUBIN: Swore in Charles Smith.

SMITH: In relationship to the Site Plan, we are looking for a variance on the parking lot setback. Noted their presentation before the Plan Commission made in July, 2007. Looking for a five-foot setback variance due to the nature of putting the parking lot in. With the reconstruction of Southwest Highway, there is about a ten-to-15-foot drop. Prior to this is almost 20 feet. We are nestling this into the side of the hill which will be explained when we get into the elevations. We are adding additional landscaping along the east side of the wall. There was request made that on top of that wall, we add a wrought iron fencing. We are going to shorten the wall approximately six inches to a foot above grade and then picking it up with the balance. This will add more texture and architecture and not have such a large wall along the sidewalk. At the north end of the building there is an

enclosed parking structure underneath the building. Pointed out where the primary tower or four-story condo building will be. The triangular area is still additional parking. On top is a green roof which is only one story high. This is open air parking. Pointed out where access to the garage will be. The garage shall be used by residents only. There are two stalls per unit. The retail component of that is at the corner of Southwest Highway and 143rd and Union. That is grade-level parking. Even though we are looking for a setback variance of 20 feet, in perspective, it is not unlike someone building a six-foot high brick fence one foot off of someone's property line. Last time we were here, we were asked to include additional landscaping. We have put in extensive landscaping both in small shrubbery, evergreen material as well as deciduous canopy trees that will grow to a height of 20-30-40-feet over a period of time. We would allow the general architecture of the building to have an articulation of that fence along the back. There will be a railing on top of that to help break that up. Showed the almost flat sidewalk that comes off of the public sidewalk that gets us access to the roof. It is a slight ramp, however, walkable like a sidewalk. That gives an idea of what the elevation is. On the south end of the building is a green roof that give access to tenants. We listened to the Plan Commissions comments made at the last meeting. We had been trying to bring a different type of product to this project. There are a lot of communities around us that are doing condos. In fact, our firm is probably doing 50% of the condo buildings being built and constructed within the competitive market (Orland Park, New Lenox, Mokena, Tinley Park, etc.). In the beginning, our idea was to bring on a product that is different than what the competition is. What we presented at our last meeting was more contemporary in design. Something you would see in the museum campus in the city – there were positive and negative comments to that – but we were looking at the potential of (since there are only 20 or so units in this project) responding to a different type of market place. However, in looking at what is being developed across the street and heeding what you were looking at, we came back and Chris Johnson (our Senior Designer in the office) laid a pallet on top of this which is a bit more reflective of some of what is being designed across the street. There was the implementation of the pitched roofs on the towers and the mansard. Because this site is so convoluted with grades, we thought the building met code in regard to the height. If we were going to look and ask for a variance, we would have to republish because our public notice does not include the height variance. I think the maximum height that we are over, based on Staff's calculations, is 3'-4". In light of how large and how tall this building is, we can accommodate that. The center tower roof is approximately three feet above. There is the ability to take some brick work out and reduce the pitch of the roof to bring it into compliance. Asked that that be included in this evening's motion, if this is moved forward, that that be done before we go to Committee. We do not want to republish and ask for a variance on the height. I am confident, as is Chris Johnson, that will not detract from the overall design of the building. There is enough room to make that fudge. We anchored the building with a stone base. We articulated the brick and masonry above that. The thought was that when you walk into the condo project, typically what you would see is punched windows, etc. In the units on the ends,

even though we still do have some punched windows, at the least the main living room will have ceiling to floor glass. When you get to the middle of the building, you then have the more traditional punched windows and sliding glass doors to a deck. Showed the retail component of approximately 4,500 square feet; a roof deck that is green on top; where the main entrance is at. The primary entrance to the residential units are all off of Union. All mechanicals will be on the roof.

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

AUBIN: Swore in Bruce Cooper.

COOPER, resides at 14214 Oak Place: My concern is with the height of this building. I own the property to the north of this. We have no other four-story buildings in the old part of town that I'm aware of. This just looks out of place.

STEPHENS: Asked Staff to address this because there has been a code change and this is under a new code requirement.

HOFKENS: The Village Center District Code does limit buildings to three stories unless they are on the corner of a major intersection. Because this building is built into a hill, at the north side, it is actually a three-story building because a level of parking is under ground. At the south side which is the very busy intersection of 143rd, Southwest Highway and Union – that is where there is the perception of the four-story buildings. Our code, as currently written, does require that. In addition, across the street, our code allows you to go even higher when you are near the train station.

STEPHENS: Therefore, this is in compliance with the new Village Center Code.

COOPER: Okay, just voicing my opinion.

STEPHENS: Asked for further comments/questions from the public and received none.

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

THOMPSON: Asked how many retail stores the petitioner thinks he will have in there.

SMITH: This is basically 4,500 square feet. It is possible to divide it off into 2,000 or 1,000 square foot units, however, the parking we are providing in the back lot accommodates either one user or four. Our preference would be for one user.

THOMPSON: How many parking spaces will there be in the back?

SMITH: Twenty four.

THOMPSON: That seems like a long walk from the parking lot to the retail doesn't it?

SMITH: No.

PARISI: Asked Staff for clarification on the height variance. Mr. Smith had mentioned it was only 3'-4" higher than code. I'm a bit confused about that.

HOFKENS: Because of the grade change around the building, it was nearly impossible for us to take the elevation they gave us and measure it how our code requires building height to be measured. It is not as simple as going to the front door and measuring straight up. Because we take the average grade plane, we need to know the elevations around each side. Based on our first glance, it seemed to be a little higher than that. I believe our code only allows you to go up to 55 feet on the south end and then 40 feet on the three-story area. We did not have time to get those elevations of the average grade plane. The petitioner did that today. I believe that is what they are saying when they found that with their average grade plane, their building height is three-feet higher than what our code allows. What is going to happen is that at their request, they are going to revise the building height to meet our code. We will then have our Building Department head review it to make sure it is in compliance with our code. The motion as written says that the petitioner can revise the plan or publish for variance. They are requesting to not publish for the variance.

PARISI: Thank you. Other than that I really like the revisions on the exterior. I think it fits in better with the Main Street project.

DZIERWA: Echoed his fellow Plan Commissioners. This plan looks much better than the previous plan. The petitioner did a very good job by changing this. I think this will be more in line with what is going on, on the other side of the railroad tracks on the other side of Southwest Highway. Asked if the Site Plan footprint has changed from the last meeting to this.

SMITH: No, not at all.

DZIERWA: Also, I really like the idea of the green roof. I don't have a problem with the variance as far as the setback on the north side of the property. Looking at the elevations, I think the petitioner has incorporated a couple of nice features on there. It looks more like a fence and not part of the building and the main part of the building is actually more set back. I like the way things have changed here and I think we should move forward on this project.

AUBIN: Concurred with his fellow Plan Commissioners. Condition #1 takes care of the elevation. The petitioner has agreed to meet code. Full speed ahead.

STEPHENS: Ms. Hofkens stated in her presentation that the material being used on the north wall differs from the material noted in the first presentation. Asked Ms. Hofkens to clarify where the differences are at.

HOFKENS: We worked with the petitioner. Noted the wall in question. Essentially there is some brick in there and they also had kind of a different material to help break it down. The brick actually stepped. There is more variety and interest in the wall. From what we can tell on the new elevation, it almost looks like more of a chiseled concrete block material (if it is not, encouraged the petitioner to clarify). It does not have the warmth of the brick. We were sold on the idea that yes, this is somewhat like a brick garden wall along someone's residential property versus a CMU wall.

SMITH: Clarified that because of the nature of taking a different approach on the building, we tried to anchor the building on the site with a stone material so that it is not concrete split-face block. Instead it is actually a renaissance type of stone. It has great articulation. It is all over the Village of Orland Park and its neighboring communities. The material changed from a red-orange brick to more of a tan lanen stone type of material. It still has the same articulation. We agreed at the last meeting that whenever possible, to begin to step this down. We can articulate this further for Staff's review. We could add some additional brick material to it, however, in our estimation and thought process, it would really detract from what the base of the building is sitting on. I think the stone wall works well. It is not a split face. That would really hinder the look of the building.

STEPHENS: Asked what the center brick line on the northwest elevation is.

SMITH: That is a series of accent bands to break up the massiveness of the building.

STEPHENS: Asked Staff if they are okay with that.

HOFKENS: Because it is hard to see, we would like to see it in more detail. Recommended the petitioner work with Staff in that regard prior to going to Committee.

STEPHENS: Asked the petitioner how they intend to meet the height code requirement.

SMITH: Showed how there is enough room to reduce some of the dimensions to bring the whole roof structure down to bring it into compliance.

STEPHENS: We like this plan; do not flatten out the pitch. Noted that this Plan Commission likes this plan. Asked if there will be a bike rack.

SMITH: Yes, a bike rack will be provided for.

STEPHENS: Complimented the petitioner for working on this and bringing us back a plan with an exterior that has a residential feel yet ties into the Main Street Triangle. We are very happy with this.

SMITH: Thank you. Chris Henson did that.

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion from the Plan Commissioners.

I move to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission the findings of fact set forth in this staff report, dated August 28, 2007.

and

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of the preliminary site plan titled 'Proposed Site Plan - Southwest Mixed-Use Facility,' prepared by Arete 3, Ltd., job number 03154, dated 05-31-06, most recent revision 06-29-07, sheet SP-1a and SP-1b and the building elevations titled 'Proposed Elevations - Southwest Mixed-Use Facility,' prepared by Arete 3, Ltd., job number 03154, dated 09-05-06, most recent revision 06-29-07, sheet EL-1, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) That the petitioner revise the building elevations to meet Code height requirements or apply for a variance.
- 2) That the petitioner revise the parking structure masonry wall that runs parallel to the north property line in order to minimize the visual impact on the adjacent residence.
  - 1) That the petitioner revise the site plan to correctly label the impervious surface percentage at grade.
  - 2) That the petitioner add bike racks to the site plan per code.
- 2) That any required right of way dedications along 143rd or Southwest Highway are dedicated for future improvements per McDonough's engineering design..
- 4) That the petitioner apply and pay fees for a subdivision to consolidate the multiple lots of the project before the Committee Meeting.
- 5) That the petitioner provide a section or sketch the better illustrates the sidewalk and grading condition adjacent to the parking lot along Union Avenue before the Committee meeting.
- 6) That the petitioner submit a landscape plan for separate review and approval within 60 days of final engineering approval.

7) That all final engineering related items are met.

and

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval/denial of the requested Variance to reduce the parking lot setback along Union Avenue from 10' to 5' and to reduce the rear yard setback from 30' to 10', subject to the same conditions as highlighted in the preliminary site plan motion.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Nick Parisi, seconded by Commissioner Steve Dzierwa, that this matter be RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Development Services & Planning, due back on 9/24/2007. The motion CARRIED unanimously.**

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

**Nay:** 0

**Absent:** 2 - Commissioner Jacobs and Commissioner Culligan

## NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

### OTHER BUSINESS

SULLIVAN: Reported we are working on a request for proposal to do the pedestrian bicycle overpass over LaGrange Road near the Triangle in this area – around 142nd Street along the viaduct. Projected construction on that is 2010. (It is over an IDOT right-of-way.) We are also working on a grant for a corridor study of 159th Street which covers the area between 2-94 on the east and 355 on the west. We are working with all the other towns along that corridor to upgrade the corridor with design improvements, traffic improvements, etc. That includes Markham, Oak Forest, Tinley Park, Orland Hills, Homerglen (Homer Glen) and Orland Park. We are also working on the Doctor Marsh restoration which is the area west of Wolf Road at 153rd Street. We are working on a wetland mitigation project there to restore the area so we can build 156th Street to connect to Lowe's going west to Ravinia which is a needed linkage. It was Gallagher & Henry deeding it over to the Village. We are also working on the Stallwagon (Stellwagen) Farm. We are putting a plan together for that and getting a barn restoration project going on the site. This is all just for informational purposes.

PARISI: Noted that at 142nd Street and Parsippin (Persimmon) Drive, there is a huge retention basin there which has no walls around it. It has to be 25 feet deep. It is murky and muddy. Seems like a huge hazard.

SULLIVAN: Will have someone go out to check the condition of that.

## ADJOURNMENT

STEPHENS: There being no further business before the Plan Commissioners, the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Teri Dougherty  
Recording Secretary