

VILLAGE OF ORLAND PARK

*14700 Ravinia Avenue
Orland Park, IL 60462
(708) 403-6150*



Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, February 20, 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*

COMMENCEMENT

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

Present: Steve Dzierwa, Paul Aubin, Louis Stephens, Mike Culligan and Nick Parisi

Absent: Judith Jacobs and Patricia Thompson

Consideration of January 23, 2007 Minutes

A motion was made by Commissioner Aubin, seconded by Commissioner Dzierwa and carried, to approve the minutes of the January 23, 2007 Plan Commission meeting with the following change: (1) on page 19, the 11th line, revise the sentence "It is already developed in the Glenn." to "It is already developed in the Glenn in Glenview."

A motion was made by Commissioner Aubin, seconded by Commissioner Dzierwa, to APPROVE. The motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS**2006-0536 Olympus Trail Subdivision**

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion from the Plan Commissioners.

I move to terminate the public hearing for file number 2006-0536, Olympus Trail Subdivision, which will be re-published for the March 13, 2007 Plan Commission.

A motion was made by Commissioner Aubin, seconded by Commissioner Dzierwa, that this matter be CONTINUED to the Plan Commission. The motion carried unanimously.

2006-0782 Cooper Square

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

I move to continue the public hearing for file number 2006-0782, Cooper Square, to the February 27, 2007 Plan Commission.

A motion was made by Commissioner Dzierwa, seconded by Commissioner Aubin, that this matter be CONTINUED to the Plan Commission. The motion carried unanimously.

2006-0780 Land Development Code Amendments I (2007)

TROPPER: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated February 20, 2007, as presented. Ms. Tropper clarified that this petition is being presented this evening for discussion and feedback from the Plan Commissioners and then will return to the next Plan Commission meeting, or the meeting after that, with some final proposals.

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

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

STEPHENS: In Exhibit A under “C. Major/Minor Changes to Special Use and Final Plan”, within “M. 1. Minor Changes to a Special Use and Final Plan” - stated this eliminates having to appear before the Plan Commission for minor changes and is taken care of administratively?

TROPPER: It would yes. These would be very minor changes such as a sidewalk that shifts slightly that we can handle administratively.

STEPHENS: Things that come up before us that really are not necessary.

TROPPER: Correct.

STEPHENS: On page 3, under “E. Drive-Through Facilities” - asked why these are being moved to Major Special Uses instead of Minor?

TROPPER: The Village is in the process of moving minor special uses altogether from the code so rather than making drive through facilities a permitted use where there would be no special review, we are just making them a special use. Right now in the code, the way it is set up, we still have permitted uses, minor special uses and major special uses. Again, moving toward the new system, eventually minor special uses will all be special uses and we will be left only with permitted uses and special uses. We are just moving this item now to allow further review.

STEPHENS: On the next page, “Section 6-210.C.4” - Drive-in-Service Windows as well?

TROPPER: Correct.

STEPHENS: Under “H. Design Standards” “All residential units must have a public street address...” don't we have that already or is it just not in the code?

TROPPER: Correct, it is just not in the code. This needs to be re-worked. These are just some ideas as to how we might insert some wording into the code to provide direction on the issue of public street addresses on residential units. We will be flushing this out a bit more before the next meeting.

STEPHENS: On page 5, “J. Water Supply (Various)” “In Section 6-410.B.1.d. (Basic Design Standards, System Extension)... It states that the “Developer shall be required to extend the water main distribution system as determined by the Village Engineer.” Expressed concern that that is a bit open ended. Extended to where?

TROPPER: It is open ended and one thing that I was discussing with the Village Attorney today was that it should be determined by the Village Engineer according to specific criteria. I will be working with our Village Engineer to establish that criteria which makes

sense so that there can be a reasonable determination also from the developer as to the direction the Village Engineer may take, depending upon their proposal.

STEPHENS: So that everyone knows on both sides just exactly what the rules are.

TROPPER: Exactly.

STEPHENS: Because the way it is now, it is left open ended and the Village Engineer could say extend it to the boundaries of the Village of Orland Park.

TROPPER: Yes, it is open ended.

STEPHENS: On page 5, "J. Water Supply (Various)" in Section 6-410.B.2.6 (Basic Design Standards, Fire Hydrant Spacing), in the third sentence, change "one hundred (100) feet long" to "ten (10) feet long". Asked why it is being changed from 100 feet to ten feet.

TROPPER: Chances are that is a typo and that it should instead read 70 feet instead of 10 feet. However, that is something I will need to follow up with the Village Engineer to ensure that it is not, in fact, 100 feet to 10 feet but 100 to 70.

STEPHENS: Yes, because 100 feet to 10 feet looks like a huge change.

TROPPER: Yes, it does look like a huge change.

STEPHENS: On page 6 in Section 6-410.B.2.7 (Basic Design Standards, Valve Spacing), change "thirty two (32) residential units" to "twenty (20) residential units". Why are we going from 32 to 20 if 32 has been working all along, why are we reducing it?

TROPPER: Indicated she would seek clarification from the Village Engineer and return with an answer at the next meeting.

STEPHENS: Thank you.

DZIERWA: On page 4, there is an "H. Design Standards" followed by an "H". Signs - Industrial Districts" The second "H" should be shown as "I".

TROPPER: So noted.

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion from the Plan Commissioners.

I move to continue the public hearing for file number 2006-0780, Land Development Code Amendments I (2007), to January 23, 2007.

A motion was made by Commissioner Dzierwa, seconded by Commissioner Aubin, that this matter be CONTINUED to the Plan Commission. The motion carried unanimously.

2006-0750 John Humphrey Drive Office Condos

the petitioner

Bill Mathys, Linden Group Architects, Homewood, IL
Thomas Costello, 11508 West 183rd Street, Orland Park
Robert McGowan, Civil Engineer, Stanica & Associates, Mokena, IL

HOFKENS: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated January 23, 2007, as presented.

AUBIN: Noted that each of the petitioners have been previously sworn.

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

MATHYS: We appreciate Ms. Hofkens' presentation. She covered everything very well. The sidewalk along the drive is of a concern to us because of the steps, however, we recognize that Staff wishes to have it there. That is why we've shown them. We do need the steps to make the grade. We do have access to the building on both sides off of John Humphrey Drive directly and off of our parking lot. The sidewalk really serves the pedestrian traffic which would be transversent through our lot onto LaGrange Road I would suspect. Other than that I do not know the need for it.

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

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

AUBIN: Stated he is good with the changes.

CULLIGAN: Since our last meeting I notice there have been some changes and things have been worked out. There are two items I would like to discuss. In the elevations, are there supposed to be utility doors included in your next drawings?

MATHYS: Yes, those were submitted. You should have those.

CULLIGAN: We didn't get them.

MATHYS: Put the newly referenced elevation on the easel.

CULLIGAN: Indicated to Mr. Costello or Mr. Mathys his belief that when the Plan Commission last met, there was discussion in regard to how the parking lot would be just a little bit lower than the hotel/motel property. Wondered what is being done back there. Will it just be heavy landscaping?

MATHYS: There will be a landscape hedge of some sort, dense enough to let people know that is the end of the parking lot.

PARISI: Stated he is fine with the changes; the sidewalk in the front and the additional stone suggested on the side is very attractive.

AUBIN: Agreed with his fellow Plan Commissioners as long as the petitioner has reviewed and agrees with all of the conditions.

MATHYS: Have reviewed and agree with.

STEPHENS: Asked the petitioner if he has noted the change in the stone on the south end?

MATHYS: Yes. We actually put stone on each one of the gables on all four sides.

STEPHENS: I see the petitioner has changed the entrance coming in off of that driveway going to the west. It is probably as good as it is going to get I would think.

STEPHENS: Thanked the petitioner for their cooperation. Stated they have a beautiful design and wished them the best of luck.

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion from the Plan Commissioners.

I move to continue the public hearing for file number 2006-0750, John Humphrey Drive Office Condos, to January 23, 2007.

A motion was made by Commissioner Culligan, seconded by Commissioner Aubin, that this matter be RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Board of Trustees. The motion carried unanimously.

2007-0018 Second Addition to Orland Woods Phase Two

Jim DeBruyn, Attorney, 15252 South Harlem Avenue, Orland Park

Ted Virgilio, Branecki-Virgilio & Assoc., Project Civil Engineers, 79 North Broadway, DesPlaines

James Staunton, 14575 West Avenue, Owner of the property

HOFKENS: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated February 20, 2007, as presented.

AUBIN: Swore in Messrs. DeBruyn, Virgilio and Staunton.

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

DEBRUYN: Stated they appreciate Ms. Hofkens' comments on this. Assume the Plan Commission is actually seeing her written statements wherein she addressed all of the matters she briefly touched upon in that written statement. As Ms. Hofkens indicated, the project is approximately 2.41 acres. We are proposing that it come in, in four sub dividable lots with the fifth being the detention that is consistent with the surrounding area as far as zoning goes. We are requesting R-3 zoning which abuts us on the west, the north, and on the east. I think its use would be compatible. The project itself as far as lot sizes, setbacks,

etc., as proposed, meets all the current Village Ordinances. The only difficulty in variance that we need is to site that detention facility. If you read the ordinance, it is a little unclear to us and to our engineer. In one area of the ordinance it talks about a flat area before the tow and proceeding outward from the pond itself of 15 feet. In another provision in the code they talk about access for maintenance vehicles being 25 feet. Certainly the way this pond is situated along Southwest Highway and the buffer Ms. Hofkens talked about, IDOT requires 22 feet between the dedicated right-of-way and the detention facility. We would have to meet that IDOT requirement which, as you can see, pushes everything to the north. We have nearly 25 feet with 22 on the south side of the property. Around the other west and north end of that detention area we are requesting a variance from what we believe is a 15-foot flat area to allow for access of maintenance vehicles to one of 12 feet. That is a three-foot variance. That would allow us to meet the volume requirements, etc., for this site. Mr. Virgilio is present to answer any technical questions. We will be happy to answer any questions at all.

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

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

PARISI: I will defer to the other Plan Commissioners.

DZIERWA: Approximately how close is that driveway to the right-of-way for Southwest Highway on Lot #4.

VIRGILIO: I believe it is 55 feet.

DZIERWA: I've actually seen it worse in the Village.

MATHYS: Mr. Virgilio is telling me that is from the edge of the pavement so it might be closer than the actual right-of-way because it is not open and improved as far as the right of way.

DZIERWA: I can think of corners where there are stop signs or stop lights where a person has to back out of his driveway and there are people waiting for a stop light and they are blocking their driveway, so 55-feet is fine. Thank you.

CULLIGAN: Echoed Commissioner Dzierwa's comment in regard to the driveway. There is a fairly decent number to work with. As far as the driveway itself, it is all the way at the northern portion of the lot as far as it can go. That has been taken into consideration. Looking at the surrounding areas, when I was out there, these particular lots will be very similar to what is to the north, the east and to the west, so I do not have a problem with that either. Thank you.

AUBIN: Deferred to the Chairman who is prepared to ask his same questions.

STEPHENS: Directing his question to the petitioner, stated they are removing the existing

sign there. Asked if they owned the property when that sign was put up? Why is that sign there?

DEBRUYN: That sign is actually in a piece of that property which would be their front yards. Can you see that dotted line? That is not a setback line. That is actually a lot delineation. That front piece, what would be that east edge of that entire site is actually classified as Outlot A and was part of the original Orland Woods Development and Outlot A was designed, I believe, simply to allow for that signage that is there. We are going to replace that sign. We don't know specifically where yet, however, it is going to have to be replaced. We are well aware of that.

STEPHENS: With another sign.

DEBRUYN: Yes.

STEPHENS: Asked the petitioner why he shows the buildings with different setbacks.

VIRGILIO: It was mostly to give it some character there and for the driveways - how it related - just to make it more even. I think we just decided that with the way the street was coming down here, this was just an option just to situate the house. Noted one that was situated a bit more back and that is because just how close the right-of-way is to the lot. One is set far enough back just to make for a longer driveway before you came out onto Orland Woods Lane. This is just an example, however. It will certainly vary depending upon the type of house the developer sells and builds there.

STEPHENS: So that is not necessarily what the actual setbacks are going to be. The setbacks will be at least in compliance with the minimum setbacks. The question was raised in regard to the retaining wall height - who maintains it?

VIRGILIO: That was one of the issues. We just want to have the option of perhaps putting a retaining wall here. There are other ways around it, however, the retaining wall would be on Lot 4. It would be the homeowner's responsibility to maintain the retaining wall.

STEPHENS: In regard to the R-3 density, the allowable density there is 2.5 units per acre. I think your plan shows it at 2.41 which is well under the maximum requirement under the R-3 which is a good thing. Commended Mr. DeBruyn on his responses to the variation standards that were done very well. Thank you for that.

DZIERWA: Asked if there is a need to add a motion in regard to replacing the sign.

HOFKENS: I think that would be a good idea.

DZIERWA: Asked if the person making the motion would just add that the sign be replaced or relocated to a spot suitable with Staff.

STEPHENS: Work with Staff for a suitable location to recreate a new sign.

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion from the Plan Commissioners.

DZIERWA: Which gentleman talked about the detention moving from 15 feet down to 12? We have wording here that says 25 feet to 12 feet. We just need to clarify that.

VIRGILIO: There are two separate code provisions. One that talks about a 15 foot level area from the edge of the pond to the outlot boundary. There is another code provision later on that in addressing access from Magnan's vehicle, they are wanting a 25 foot wide access area. My comment to that was because of this property abutting in the detention area of Southwest Highway, we have 22 feet actually between the right-of-way and the edge of the pond.

DZIERWA: I'm sorry to interrupt, however, I understand that. Which one are we going to reinforce here.

HOFKENS: I agree that the code is confusing, however, what it really is, is that our code has a 25 foot setback from the detention pond. Of those 25 feet, 15 feet is supposed to be flat enough for a maintenance vehicle. It is confusing. I believe Public Works is still working to revise that but at this point it is still 25 feet so that is what we should use.

DZIERWA: So we will leave it as written.

HOFKENS: Yes please.

I move to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission the findings of fact set forth in this staff report, dated February 13, 2007

and

I move to recommend approval/denial to the Village Board approval of the preliminary site plan titled "Second Addition to Orland Woods Phase Two, prepared by Branecki-Virgilio and Associates, file number 776, dated September 28, 2005, most recent revision, September 21, 2006, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) That the petitioner submit a tree preservation and mitigation plan per Village Code prior to the Committee meeting on February 26, 2007.
- 2) That all final engineering items are met.

A motion was made by Commissioner Aubin, seconded by Commissioner Dzierwa, that this matter be RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Board of Trustees. The motion carried unanimously.

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

OTHER BUSINESS

before we swore them in and we are suppose to swear them in first. This way they are telling us their real names.

STEPHENS: Directing his comment to Staff, noted that some of these recommended motions do not include the preamble on them, the "Moved to accept the findings of facts..." Can we make sure that is on there always in the future?

HOFKENS: Yes.

STEPHENS: Thank you.

CULLIGAN: Going back a couple of years, there was a petition, a dentist's office at 143rd. Have we found out yet whether or not they were suppose to have guard rails or something along the back there? I brought that up at the last meeting. Would like an update on that at some point. Also was there any discussion about moving the packet deliveries to Friday?

HOFKENS: We are checking on that. The truth of the matter is that you should be getting your packets on Friday evenings. We give them to the Community Service Officers on Friday afternoons, therefore, we do not understand why you are not getting them on Friday. We are trying to figure that out. It is not that we want you to get them on Saturdays. There is something happening in the delivery process that is not working out. We are looking into that.

STEPHENS: There being no further business before the Plan Commissioners, the meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Teri Dougherty
Recording Secretary