

VILLAGE OF ORLAND PARK

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



Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, February 27, 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: 6 - Commissioner Jacobs; Commissioner Dzierwa; Commissioner Aubin; Commissioner Stephens; Commissioner Culligan, Commissioner Thompson

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Parisi

Consideration of February 20, 2007 Minutes

A motion was and seconded to continue the February 20, 2007 Plan Commission minutes to its March 13, 2007 meeting.

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

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Parisi

PUBLIC HEARINGS**2006-0652 Crescent Hill Estates Resubdivision**

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion from the Plan Commissioners.

I move to continue the public hearing for file number 2006-0652, Crescent Hill Estates Resubdivision, to the March 13, 2003 Plan Commission

A motion was made by Commissioner Patricia Thompson, seconded by Commissioner Paul Aubin, that this matter be CONTINUED to the Plan Commission. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Parisi

2007-0116 Land Development Code Amendment II (2007) - MFG Manufacturing District

TROPPER: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated February 27, 2007, as presented.

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

DAVID B. SOSIN, Attorney: Informed that he sent an e-mail in his capacity as the attorney for the Southwest Side Builders wherein he informed of some minor changes.

I move to continue the public hearing for file number 2007-0116, Land Development Code Amendments - MFG Manufacturing District, to the March 13, 2007 Plan Commission

A motion was made by Commissioner Patricia Thompson, seconded by Commissioner Paul Aubin, that this matter be CONTINUED to the Plan Commission. The motion PASSED by an unanimous vote.

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Parisi

2006-0782 Cooper Square

David B. Sosin, Attorney, 11800 South 75th Avenue, Palos Heights
Richard M. Wallach, Director of Acquisitions, New Urban Communities,
99 South Villa Avenue, Villa Park
Thomas C. Arndt, Division Manager, Division Manager, New Urban Communities
99 South Villa Avenue, Villa Park
David Kennedy, AIA, Principal, PPKS Architects, 444 North Main Street, Glen Ellyn, IL
Eric Russell, Principal, KLOA, Transportation and Parking Planning Consultants,
9575 West Higgins Road, Rosemont, IL
Michael D. Cook, P.E., Project Manager, C.M.Lavoie & Associates, Inc.,
Consulting
Civil Engineering Land Planning & Surveying, 1050 West Route 126,
Plainfield, IL

TURLEY: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Reports dated January 23, 2007 and February 27, 2007, as presented.

STEPHENS: Recognized Messrs. Sosin, Wallach, Arndt, Kennedy and Russell, all of whom were present, all of whom were previously sworn. Invited comments and/or questions from the petitioner.

SOSIN: Mr. Kennedy, who was with us last time, will briefly address some of the architectural changes that have been made. Mr. Cook, our Engineer is here and several of the issues raised are really engineering issues. Mr. Arndt will address the remaining issues and concerns of several issues raised by the recommendations.

KENNEDY: You should have in your packet, a revised rendering of the townhome

courtyard which is a view of the project from Ravinia looking back toward the courtyard that encompasses three of the five townhome buildings, other than the commercial building. I also have a color rendering that will be up on the slideshow in just a minute.

COOK: In response to the issues in regard to the detention basin, obviously what is out there right now is an existing facility that is servicing the Walgreen's store and the retail shop that fronts 147th Street. The basin in the Site Topography – there is nothing going through that property right now. It is self-sufficient. The only water that is going to go through that basin is the Cooper Square Development alone. There is nothing coming from LaGrange. Nothing coming from the north; nothing coming from the south; nothing coming from the east. The current elevation of the high water level, the way it was sized, was an elevation of 709. There is a normal water level out there of about 704 right now. What we are doing to accommodate this development is to lower the entire basin. The normal water level is being lowered about three feet.

STEPHENS: You said there is no water coming from the east on that detention property?

COOK: Nothing coming from LaGrange Road. The Walgreen's and the retail shops are going through that basin. Anything east of those commercial centers on LaGrange...

STEPHENS: You are talking about LaGrange Road.

COOK: Correct, there is nothing coming from the site, off site. There is nothing coming from LaGrange Road's right-of-way through our site. It is all contained within the development – the three-lot development. We are lowering the basin down. We are re-grading the basin/reshaping the basin. The basin elevation is lowered and the high water level is at 707.5. There is an existing building (an apartment building) to the north. It is approximately 40 feet from our north property line. There is an existing detached garage north of the basin – approximately ten feet from our north property line. That is, I believe, the structure that has been talked about here tonight. The building itself, the residential building, has exceeded 25 feet from the high water level as it currently exists. By re-grading the basin what we have done is provided a berm again, however, that berm is being lowered a foot and a half generally throughout the north property line. The normal water level is also being lowered. The connection point we are tying into on Ravinia is still at the same location, we've just lowered that connection point. We've provided an overflow location onto Ravinia -- an elevation of 707.5. I talked with Kevin Lehmann, your engineer. The restrictor size in that basin being proposed is approximately 3.4-inches in diameter. Obviously something that size can get clogged. The fear from a Village's standpoint is that if that basin fails, where will the water go. From a design standpoint, we always want the water to go in a direction that is away from property and down an emergency flood route. I

modeled the basin, aside from what typically is designed for Orland Park which is a spreadsheet calculation. We can go through hydraulic programs. I threw in a clog restrictor in which the basin restrictor was fully clogged with debris. With exclusive elimination of any bypass flow coming from the property, the basin, in a 100-year-event, fully clogged restrictor, overtops by two inches. We provided a berm in excess of six inches along the north and west sides of that basin. There is a protection in regard to the high water level from anything that is happening to the north. The water level, when it overtops, will go toward Ravinia as it naturally does now and it will continue in that manner. Also, obviously, as it gets built, it is our job to come out here to assure that what has been built is consistent with the plan. We have to go through a process. One of the things from my end, which is very critical, is to see that there is adequate storage and make sure that the critical overflow paths are established by the people constructing it. We have to assure that what is down there will meet the requirements. In my opinion, looking at what we are doing here, we are meeting the requirements in regard to the storage. We are providing the level of protection in the event there is a failure; the water still is going down the path it is currently going down which is to the west, toward Ravinia and through the pond system in the Village Hall Center. Looking at all of those things that are in place, we feel that the basin will function properly and will not be any undo influence to anybody in the surrounding properties from what we are doing.

STEPHENS: So you've lowered the bottom.

COOK: Correct.

STEPHENS: By how much.

COOK: By three feet.

STEPHENS: Which then lowered the high water line.

COOK: Correct, to 707.5.

STEPHENS: You show elevation 708 – is that where the berm begins?

COOK: The top of the berm along the north property line is 708.

STEPHENS: That is at the top of the berm?

COOK: Yes. The high water elevation is established based on the overflow location on the west side of the berm along Ravinia next to the outlet structure where the restrictor would be.

STEPHENS: That is not shown on this.

COOK: It should be on the Preliminary Engineering Plan in your packets. There is what is called a free board protection along the north property line.

STEPHENS: Thank you.

COOK: You are welcome.

KENNEDY: Presented a rendering on the slide show. Indicated the Plan Commissioners should have a copy of it in their packet as well. This is the same view that we had last time. In this case, it is a view of the townhome buildings. If you look at the Site Plan, you are actually looking at the courtyard created by Buildings 3, 4 and 5. Pointed out Building 4 and in the background is Building 5. We've created a courtyard between the two. Went over some of the architectural changes we made between the last Plan Commission meeting and this meeting. One thing we did was change the shape and proportion of the windows between the bays to be a little more horizontal and be a double window in width, just to give a little more variety. We previously showed a double-hung window and the side window of these bays and repeated that vertically between the bays which made for a lot of repetition. Now we've actually created a little more variety in the window shapes. We added some detail that is a little hard to see in this rendering. We've added a lot of brick detailing. Underneath the cornice which is done in a simulated stone, we have a soldier course in brick. Below the side windows that run around the corner, we've added an additional masonry detailing – in this case a string course. We added a couple of windows to this façade and we've changed the configuration of the bay to actually add some additional, three-dimensional applied moldings or detail. The last time we presented this, this was much more flat. Now there is more detail in these bays. In addition to that we've added some stone ornamentation in the section between the bays. We've also added some masonry detailing to the center portion, changing the proportion of those windows as well. That bay detail actually repeats throughout the entire townhome portion of the project. That pretty much wraps up the changes we made. If you look at this in three dimension, you will see that there are a lot of small changes to the masonry and also to the bay details that give it more excitement – a little more interest – in the overall project. One of the comments that had been made was to continue to study the end unit elevations. We have not completed all of the floor plans yet so we have to look at those to see how they respond to this in terms of these end unit elevations and may need to add more windows and masonry detailing there as well.

SOSIN: We have carefully reviewed the recommendations of Staff and for the sake of time, other than discuss with you the things we agree with (which are most of the recommendations which are not difficult to accommodate), we will discuss those with which we have concerns. Recommendation #7 states that an avenue should be provided for townhome residents to impose higher standards for pond maintenance. That is a difficult statement to address. There are two agreements that will impact this. We just want a clear understanding (and to make sure the

Plan Commissioners have a clear understanding) so that down the road there is not a misunderstanding as to how to proceed. The client desires the highest standards for this pond in this development. I think you can see that from the presentation and the quality of these buildings and the overall development. There is an existing agreement which this Village approved and an existing pond which this Village approved a number of years ago. Since the time of that original development, TERRACO built that development and maintains that pond. That is not only their responsibility but their right because it serves the commercial. To the extent that our client can address in the homeowners declaration, any responsibility that we might have for our residents, that can easily be accomplished. There will be an association and they do what they need to do. The concern we have is that is always hard to promise something for somebody else. This comment sounds great, however, the realities of it is that there is an existing easement agreement, there is a recorded filing with MWRD for this pond and our declaration comes at the end of that. From our development point of view, we will do whatever we can in that document. We've provided the document to you and there is quite a bit of language about what the association is and is not going to do. There are actually 32 pages in that regard. The concern is that TERRACO actually maintains that pond. We are getting into a discussion with them. I think probably a better way to say it is that we will use our best efforts to try and deal with the existing pond maintainer – TERRACO – to raise the standard. I'm not aware there are two standards for maintaining ponds in the Village. I always thought that there was just one – just good maintenance. It is noted here that there is something called "higher standards". If that means that the pond is not being maintained to the Village's standards now, I'm sure there is a means of assuring that it is. However, to say that there is some two-step level, I'm not aware that that is the case and it should not change the standards of maintenance. Does that make sense?

STEPHENS: We heard you.

SOSIN: Okay. The next issue is that of angled parking. We've given the Village a detailed traffic study on this parking issue. We've given you pictures. We've showed you where not only is it in the Village, it is really a part of this Village Center District Plan. Our traffic consultant is here to answer any questions you may have in that regard. What the Staff Report asks us to do is to provide a parking liability and an indemnification clause. To who? For what? To who – is that to the general public? We cannot indemnify the public for people and how they drive. For what – that is not detailed. If the parking spaces are legal and conforming, which they are – if they are contemplated under the code, which they are – after specifically contemplated under the Village Center District, and they are because they are cropping up and you will see these in many of the Village Center developments as we try and get that Center District feel, we don't think it is appropriate to ask a developer to indemnify who knows who for who knows what. We think that provision should be eliminated from the conditions.

TURLEY: Pointed out that is in Staff's Report. It would be part of the developers' agreement which really is more at the Board level. I simply wanted to bring up this discussion at this point since it had been an administration request, however, it is not actually part of the Plan Commission's motion.

SOSIN: It is in there as one of the recommendations – it should not be considered a findings of fact.

STEPHENS: Clarified that it is not part of the recommended motions.

SOSIN: Lastly, we want to address the elimination of the two units. Obviously, this has a substantial impact upon our client. The reason this is so troubling to us is because we developed this plan working not only with Staff but also with the Code. If it was a Code issue, we have too many units, however, we don't. If there is too much density – but we are well under the density requirement. If we are not providing the areas we need to provide. If we can't provide the detention. We can't understand how the Plan Commission and the Staff can come to the conclusion that we are trying to put six pounds of flour in a five-pound sack. None of that is the case. We comply with all aspects. If I were to come to this Board and say that our client really does not care what the Code says and how this project is designed – here is how we want to do it – we know you would throw us out of here and tell us to come back when we comply, however, what you are doing here is the exact same thing in reverse. What we are saying by this recommendation is that the Code allows it and your development is designed to the Code standards but we don't like it so we are going to change the Code. We don't think that is fair or reasonable. Mr. Arndt probably wants to address it further because it is an important issue to us. When we left last time the Plan Commissioners said to us "Solve the problems that we have" which were fairly minor. We went to work from an architectural point of view and an engineering point of view. We solved them. Now we are coming back and at the last minute when we get the Staff Report it says to eliminate the two because someone does not like it. The Code does like it and we think that you should follow the Code.

ARNDT: Mr. Sosin and Staff's Report really outlined the things we did. Highlighted their concerns prefacing that they want the Plan Commissioner's full endorsement of this project. We also have to state our case because we listened to the Plan Commissioners about a month ago. We tried to address every concern raised as shown by the changes they made. The home by the pond, which is lot #9, there has been a lot of talk about that unit. We felt like we heard your concerns. In order to try to adjust the Site Plan we did, we shifted all of the homes in the whole project back as much as we could. We shifted them all south to give more room between the pond and between the fronts of the buildings. That was a concern. We heard you and took care of that. The maintenance – we heard that too. There was a lot of concern about the maintenance of the pond. We feel it is a private pond. All of the structures that make the pond work (I'm not talking about trees or grass but instead the pipes in the ground) are all accessible

off of Ravinia. There is one pipe, the outlet pipe that runs between buildings #1 and #2. Water flows into the pond from that. It is a little confusing. It is conceivable that pipe could need maintenance, however, there is a manhole in the street and cleaning pipes, particularly an outflow pipe, in other words there is nothing plugging it, is extremely easy and incredibly unlikely that we would ever have to dig that pipe up. However, in the event that you did have to dig it up, there is 15-foot clearance between the buildings which is enough to get large equipment in there to make such a repair. We think that is sufficient room to fix the pipe. The functioning parts of the pond are mainly all on Ravinia and there is one pipe between the two buildings which we feel can be accessed if needed. Talking as a builder, that unit of the building is one of the most economically valuable unit on the site. We don't want to give it up if we don't have to. Asked the Plan Commissioner to hear their plea. The other building (lot #20) where there are now two parallel parking spaces – it is recommended that we put in five. Again, there is clearance around the site. There is a 45-foot radius in both locations. You are asking for five – we heard you. We are just saying that we are giving you two. You will be down three spaces from what you asked for. It seems kind of crazy to give up a whole other home for three parking spaces. We will do it if that is the only way we can get through tonight, however, to us it just seems crazy. Also, the Village Center District allows, I believe, one-and-a-half parking spaces per unit. We already have four per unit without the guest parking at the live/work unit without these additional two. We are way over the Village Center District parking. Say we pull the garage parking, we are still two parking spaces per home and that is without extra parking. We've heard your concerns. We've tried to address them. We want to be compliant with your wishes. Thank you.

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

AUBIN: Swore in Janis Church, resides at 14521 Ravinia.

CHURCH: Stated she lives in one of the four condominiums to the north of this proposed development. We have 1.8 acres of property. There are 24 units, 24 garages and 28 off-street parking. We have three-story buildings so we are stacked up compared to this. I cannot believe the Village would approve of traffic backing out onto 147th with the traffic that is there. Can't believe you would approve of angled parking there. I wonder where the snow will be moved to, from that street, when there is snow removal. I look at the snow drifts next to our parking lots and next to the other parking lots and wonder if they are going to move it out into Ravinia? That snow has to go somewhere.

STEPHENS: Asked the petitioner to respond.

SOSIN: In regard to the angled parking, we have provided a professional detailed study to indicate that based on the traffic volumes on this street, that this is an appropriate use of the parking and will not be detrimental to the life, safety and welfare of any person. This type of parking is contemplated as a use in the Village

Center District in the Village. It is also very popular. We provided photographs at the last meeting in the tabbed booklet which shows that it is used all the time. It is used successfully where the street is a one-lane street, for example, at Orland Crossing. Here it is a two-lane street. We thought it was kind of extraordinary to be asked to start re-striping 147th Street, however, we are happy to do it because we've been asked to do it. It really is not an impact or problem that we've created, however, in the spirit in development, developers do that kind of thing. The parking is so critical because we are contemplating using those units on Ravinia Avenue, partially for commercial purposes and we do not want to doom them to failure. People will not go there unless they have parking in proximity to it. The whole concept of the Village Center is not to provide the building in the back and the parking in the front. It is to provide that easy access on the street; people walking from Walgreen's; people walking to Walgreen's; walking across the street to the bank; incorporating the Village Hall into a neighborhood for really the first time. We think it is appropriate. The Village Staff has been very tough on us in asking the hard questions about this parking and asked our professional to go back and scrutinize his numbers, the times of day, and the days he did his study. His study has withstood that scrutiny because it is correct and it is the right thing to do. With regard to the snow, that is a fair comment/question. It is a fair question of every development in the Village. We have the same 25% or more of landscaping and open space that every other development has. We have the area to the west. We have the area to the east. There are places there. We are not concerned about it. It is not that tight of a site. Look at the amount of green space that is there. We comply with the Code. The Code requires 25% for among other reasons, where does the snow go. We do not think it will be a problem. If you said it wasn't, where would you put it? Eliminate a unit for snow pile. There is plenty of room.

CHURCH: So you have plenty of green area and you do have the space between the buildings, however, how will the snow get from the street into the end of that area? I still do not see where you are going to put it.

WALLACH: Showed on the plan where there is additional green space on which snow can be placed. There are a number of areas where there is excess green space to put snow.

ARNDT: Further in regard to Ms. Church's concerns, stated they are not going to put snow on Ravinia. We will not block the public street with snow. Wanted to make sure Ms. Church's question was clearly answered.

CHURCH: The petitioner mentioned there is angled parking in Orland Crossing. Stated that is correct, however, it is not onto streets. It is into their parking lot. That does not compare to this. Cannot compare angled parking in a development with angled parking onto a through street. I also noticed coming to the meeting tonight that you cannot make a u-turn in front of this building. Those people are going to be going westbound when they get out of their angled parking. Stated

she suspects there will be trouble enforcing the no u-turn in front of the building. That is all I'm going to say.

STEPHENS: There being no further questions from the public, invited comments and/or questions from the Plan Commissioners.

CULLIGAN: Directed his first question to Staff which relates to Building B-2. There is a Staff recommendation in revising Building B-2 from four units to three, correct?

TURLEY: Correct.

CULLIGAN: There will be two access points to the pond off of what used to be known as Ravinia Court North, is that correct?

TURLEY: Correct. They are not intended to be paved. Just graded in a way that access could be made to the pond when needed.

CULLIGAN: So that is just open space without any kind of paved area, correct?

TURLEY: Correct, other than the sidewalk for the pedestrians. Not only access for maintenance but since the pond is intended as an amenity, it is also access for the residents.

CULLIGAN: Okay. Thank you for that. Directed his next question to the petitioner. In regard to the same location (B-2), there was an existing retaining wall that ran along the west portion of Walgreen's property and the east portion of your property. This retaining wall now (but didn't show before) shows a slight curve and goes right into Townhome #9, correct?

SOSIN: Correct.

CULLIGAN: I don't see a very big grade there, coming off of the Walgreen's property, more of just a slight slope. Therefore, why are we putting in a landscape retaining wall at that location along the western portion of Walgreen's and the eastern portion of your property. Also, why are we curving it in to Townhome #9?

WALLACH: What we were trying to accomplish previously was that that wall was on the west side of that walkway. There was more of a concern of a fall hazard with pedestrians coming from the commercial area along the north side of Buildings #1 and #2. The intent was to raise up that grade along the east side of Building #2 to accommodate more of a flatter slope and have the grade flow from the building toward the sidewalk rather than creating a transition down there. In looking at the grades, that wall is required in that area. I don't want to see a five percent slope on that sidewalk. As we come from the Walgreen's site, west and then north, the grades that are there warrant a wall – not a big wall – but a wall. It

is two feet and then almost three feet at the corner of the building where it ties into. We want to at least separate the two and I think that was one of the necessities – adding that pedestrian walkway further to the south toward the commercial building – the connection point. At one time, Staff looked at maybe putting the connecting point where the existing pathway comes into the site rather than turning it to the north. However, due to the grade transition, getting down to the proposed roadway, there is a wall that would need to be along that property line.

CULLIGAN: Okay. I kind of like the way the walk between the two buildings (#1 and #2) is set up. From what the petitioner has said, I tend to agree that that wall should probably be there and an access point there may be difficult to install. This is why in keeping with the petitioner's request to keep four buildings there would be okay with me. An issue not discussed tonight, however, was brought up at the last Plan Commission meeting, is in regard to the parking on Ravinia. I see that a couple of parallel parking spaces on Ravinia have been revised at the old Ravinia Court I believe. I did not hear what happened with the discussion in regard to vacating some of that parkway. Was that ever discussed? Or is that the problem with the site line.

TURLEY: It was discussed, however, Public Works has issues with that type of parking being carved into the right-of-way so internally it was discussed and Staff has decided not to recommend that it be carved out of the parkway plus you lose the continuity of the street trees.

CULLIGAN: That was Public Works or Engineering.

TURLEY: Public Works; I believe it is with maintenance.

CULLIGAN: Plowing?

TURLEY: Yes.

CULLIGAN: Okay. I thought that was a pretty good idea and I think it would make for a little safer travel on Ravinia. It is too bad it was not here tonight on this drawing. There had been some discussion in regard to the high water mark going toward the building in Staff's report. Asked Mr. Cook to approach the podium (and he did). Stated there was an item in here discussing the high water mark as opposed to the garage door elevations that would be a little less. Asked Staff for clarification.

TURLEY: Currently there is a berm built there but they are re-grading it so that there will not be a berm and there will only be a six inch berm between the high water line and we do not know exactly the grade of the garages to the north, however, what appears to be where the garages are and that was Staff's concern – that there was not enough difference there.

CULLIGAN: Thanked Ms. Turley for that clarification. Asked the Chairman to

return to him as he is sure he has another issue to address.

DZIERWA: Looking at what Staff drew up about Exhibit A and your revision about creating access to the pond and the five parking stalls – I agree with half of that. I believe that if you take Building #5 and lose Townhome #20, it is a little more symmetrical at the center of that development. If you notice, Townhome #25 is recessed a little bit – out of view of Townhome #19. The elimination of Townhome #20 would tend to do the same thing on the north side of Building #5. Adding the five parking stalls might be an asset. I don't necessarily agree with putting the access in around Building #2. I would agree with Commissioner Culligan – those four units work in that particular area. Thanked the petitioner for moving everything north to get us a little closer to where we need to be in regard to where the detention is and that 15-foot access area. That works. I think it was a great idea to dig the pond deeper and bring the pipe in a little bit lower. I worked for the Water Reclamation District and we always like to hear things like that. As far as the windows on your elevation, you changed the windows from two vertical panes to two horizontal panes. That is all I want to say as far as changes went. I have the book that Mr. Sosin presented us at the last meeting. I don't see much of a difference as far as the elevations are concerned.

WALLACH: We sent a memo to Ms. Turley on the 21st of February. Read out loud what the revisions were.

DZIERWA: Okay, thank you. Asked about when the traffic study was taken which he believes was on February 8, 2007. Is that correct?

SOSIN: That is correct.

RUSSEL: Stated it was he who performed the traffic study. Indicated Commissioner Dzierwa is correct that the traffic counts were taken on February 8, 2007.

DZIERWA: Stated he is not sure Mr. Russell is extremely familiar with what goes on in this particular area during the last week of the month, however, the Secretary of State's office is in this building and at times it is really hard to get to that stop sign to get into this parking lot because people typically do not renew their license plates at the beginning of the month – they always wait until the last week. In reading Mr. Russell's study, stated he circled everything that would be coming into the Village Center – 16, 19 and 8 cars which would total 43 cars, between the 4-5 p.m. hour, which is obviously a lot less after this building closes at 5:00 p.m. That particular week may have been a better time to take traffic counts – the last week of the month versus the first week of the month. As far as the railing on the retaining wall, is the petitioner okay with that?

SOSIN: Yes.

DZIERWA: The petitioner had a response to #6 in regard to the sidewalk slopes between #5 and #6. Those sidewalks will stay sloped – there will not be any steps in there or anything will there? Otherwise I would imagine there would be a problem with the ADA.

KENNEDY: One of the review comments that Chris Burke's office prepared for the Village was the slopes of those walks between those buildings. We looked at those grades. We ended up lowering the sidewalk in front of the east end of Building #1 and the west end of Building #2. We lowered the sidewalk in front of that to soften the slopes because obviously our overland flow path from our site goes between Buildings #1 and #2 to get to the detention basin. In order to accommodate that, with a lowered sidewalk along the north side of Buildings #1 and #2, we added a couple of other steps coming out of those units so the elevations of the units remained the same but the step down to get to the public walkway along the north side of the building was lowered.

DZIERWA: Adding the steps to the unit doesn't hurt you in any way?

KENNEDY: No.

DZIERWA: Okay, thank you for that. Noted two areas highlighted in gray on pages 4 of 5 (numbers 21 and 22) – we've addressed those but are they highlighted because they are sticking points with the Village?

TURLEY: Because their approval was contingent upon variances being granted for these two items and this case, they would be modifications.

DZIERWA: Thank you. Informed the Chairman that these have been his comments for now, however, after he collects his thoughts, he would like to speak again if he needs to.

JACOBS: Thanked the petitioner for making the design changes to the façade. That is much appreciated. Concurred with all of Commissioner Dzierwa's comments. No further questions to ask.

THOMPSON: All of her questions/comments have been asked/made by her fellow Commissioners. The improvements made have been good. Concurred with her fellow Commissioners in regard to the B-2 Building. Would like to see that stay with the four units and not three. That is all I have.

AUBIN: Concurred with his fellow Plan Commissioners. Since the January 23, 2007 Plan Commission meeting, the petitioner has made ten different changes to the plan – all improvements. Also, concurred with Mr. Sosin. The original plan came in; was within code; the density was good; and I would be in favor (with whoever makes the motion) of condition #3, #4 and #9 be eliminated. Thank you.

STEPHENS: Asked Commissioner Culligan if he had any further questions to make at this time.

CULLIGAN: No, thank you.

STEPHENS: In regard to the angled parking, at the last meeting I stated I had no problem with that. It was talked about in the traffic study that the angled parking would not be a problem. Again, 147th Street is a very wide street. People backing their vehicles out will not create a problem for the cars going westbound. Since it is basically a one-block street and the speed limit is 10 M.P.H., there should be no problem with that angled parking. That is to address the comments from Mrs. Church. In regard to B-2, deleting Townhouse #9, coming into this meeting I was against that, however, Commissioner Culligan's comments have convinced him not to remove Townhouse #9, however, I would like to ask the Village Engineer for his opinion in regard to the landscape retaining wall at townhouse #9.

LEHMANN: In what respect, Chairman Stephens?

STEPHENS: Is it appropriate there? Does it serve a purpose? Do we need it?

LEHMANN: As you can see from the multitude of retaining walls in that location, I would say they are a bit challenged for grade there as far as maintaining some appropriate slopes and that lends itself to a number of reasons. There is a significant grade transition from the Walgreen's site to this site. That is what demonstrates the wall not only along that proposed sidewalk but the wall that runs along the site further south. That is the reason for the retaining wall in that location. As Mr. Cook stated, the walk that wraps around the building, I agree that there was an appropriate use of that wall to try and maintain not too steep of a slope there because if you are going to be having people come from the Walgreen's site to this site, if you did not use that retaining wall to maintain that slope, there would probably be steps right in that location to have people step down onto the driving lane there and that is something most people would not want to see. You would want to make it as accessible as possible. As far as grading, not being completely familiar with the grading plan as Exhibit A does not show the proposed spot grades, I would be a little bit reserved in my comments about how the grading around that townhome is going to work. As long as they can maintain a positive slope away from the building such that it drains northerly toward the pond, then I think it should not present a problem.

STEPHENS: So you concur with what is shown on the plan?

LEHMANN: Yes, I have no problem with it.

STEPHENS: In regard to relocating that parking in the right-of-way, I realize that

Public Works may have a problem plowing it but does it then become an issue of public safety if we keep the cars parked along Ravinia? Asked Ms. Turley to comment on this.

TURLEY: There is parallel parking along Ravinia further north. We think it can be accommodated.

STEPHENS: Okay. I'll buy that. The architect, Mr. Kennedy, did a lot of work on the building elevations and I think he's come a long way with them. All the building elevations – B-2, B-5, B-6 – looking into the courtyard are really great. That is B-3, B-5 and B-4 and the front of the elevations, B-2 and B-6. Those are all very nice elevations. The one comment I have to make is the streetscape along Ravinia which would be B-1, B-3, B-4 – I think B-6 is okay on that west side – and also, B-2, the east elevation which is not shown on your plan – I would like to the petitioner work with Staff to add some additional architectural treatments on those end buildings. Clarified that these are just suggestions as he is not an architect. The petitioner is shown the addition of some stone ornaments on the front. If the petitioner could do a similar type of treatment along the side and perhaps add some other type of creative feature.

KENNEDY: If you look between the bays there are windows that have a small stone ornament between them. The Chairman is asking why not add that stone ornament in that same general location below the windows on the side elevation just to give it a little more character. We certainly heard this – I found out about this today. I think there are also other things we can do with materials and the windows and stone ornamentation to enhance the side elevations. Basically, what we are looking at here, are the ends of all four of those townhome buildings. The only one that is a little different is B-6 which being commercial has a taller kind of tower at the corner. Agree we can go back in and look at some additional detail there.

STEPHENS: Thank you. I think that as we are driving down Ravinia, that streetscape is what we are going to be looking at although the courtyard, if we could look in and see the fronts of those buildings – they are very attractive. However, as we are driving down Ravinia we have to see the ends of those buildings and I appreciate that you will work with Staff on that.

DZIERWA: The last time we spoke about this we did finally get a designation with the left-turn only lane and then straight through or right-turn lane so that was cleared up and I wanted to thank the petitioner for that. As far as the angled parking, the one thing I wanted to mention is that it is working now at Orland Crossing, however, I think that the jury may still be out on that as it is not completed yet. There still are many things that are going to be happening in there. The fact that it is on site and not on a public street might bode better for Orland Crossing. I am a little leery about angled parking on 147th Street even though I agree that it needs to be there. I just think that it will be something that people will have to learn

their way around and people will have to live with. Thank you. That is all I have.

STEPHENS: Asked if the trees coming out of that Walgreen's connection, going westbound, have been eliminated/relocated as asked. Have some sight line concerns.

KENNEDY: I think we took one out from the parkway. There are still five in front of the buildings. I believe the other plan had one additional tree. Yes, took it out.

STEPHENS: Did you locate a stop sign there?

KENNEDY: We will.

STEPHENS: I could go either way on this elimination of townhouse #20. My concern is that granted, you have parking in the driveways and in the garages, however, if you drive down these private drives there is no where really that you could park a car because it is all driveway. With all driveway, it really creates a problem so I think that the addition of the five cars on the north side and the elimination of townhouse #20 just makes a lot of sense.

SOSIN: We have worked real hard with Staff. I think we are coming to somewhat of a consensus. It is very important to the Village how this project looks. It is also very important to us. An extraordinary amount of time has been spent on this project, especially by Ms. Turley. We would like to hear from Ms. Turley as to what she thinks makes sense – leaving in one and taking out the other and putting the parking spaces in.

TURLEY: I recommended that they both be removed, however, as far as the parking spaces, I think that for visitors there is a need for parking other than driveways just in that corner since it is a little further from the on-street parking. As far as the building B-2, the elimination of that unit – it is not just pond maintenance, but the pond is meant to be an amenity for the residents and the elimination of that unit and the re-centering of that provides a much stronger connection from the main part of the development to the pond. It is just a stronger link. As far as the grading, at the very far northeast corner and all the retaining walls, it was also hoped that by re-centering that, the grading could be eased somewhat. That was the thinking behind that.

STEPHENS: Thank you, Ms. Turley. I think that keeping townhouse #9 in there makes a lot of sense because of the grading situation. I think elimination of townhouse #20 and the addition of the five cars also makes a lot of sense.

CULLIGAN: Not only do I think that it is necessary for parking stalls, as you continue on this process, we should have Public Works and the next level, look into the parking stalls in that parkway on Ravinia and the parallel parking. Then unit #20 should probably go if that is going to stay the way it is, especially for the

winter when there is snow on the ground. Also, thank you for the five-foot radius that was added in – felt that was very important. Thank you.

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion 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 Paul Aubin, seconded by Commissioner Steve Dzierwa, that this matter be RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Board of Trustees. The motion PASSED by an unanimous vote.

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Parisi

2006-0780 Land Development Code Amendments I (2007)

TROPPER: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated February 27, 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 a Plan Commission meeting to be held in the very near future with some final proposals.

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

DAVID B. SOSIN, Attorney for the Southwest Builders': Indicated he e-mailed his recommended changes, most of which are minor. This should not say Land Development Code. Amendments affecting the plumbing code. Letters of credit. Stated that the Village of Orland Park is the hardest village to get letters of credit back from. Will meet with Staff and the Village Engineer.

STEPHENS: Apparently Staff has already met with you given the fact there has been a revised motion to continue this.

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

STEPHENS: In Section 6-410: Water Supply, under 6-410 B-6.a (Basic Design Standards, Fire Hydrant Spacing) in the third sentence it states change "one hundred (100 feet long" to "ten (10) feet long. Is that meant to be 100 feet to 70 feet?

LEHMANN: Those are correct at 100 to 10.

DZIERWA: We thought last time that was a typo – that 10' was actually 70'.

LEHMANN: Will clarify that.

DZIERWA: On page 10, the reinspection fee of 25% with ordinance fee is gouging.

LEHMANN: Indicated he will make that recommendation to Public Works.

STEPHENS: The fee is based on cost incurred.

LEHMANN: Something that should have been done right the first time. We should also add that administrative fee as well. No surcharge.

TROPPER: If there is a requirement at the onset.

LEHMANN: Okay.

DZIERWA: Asked about the ball valves.

LEHMANN: It is a reliability issue; believe ball valves are preferred.

DZIERWA: 6-410 – Asked for an explanation as to how the sprinklers are running now. That paragraph is confusing. I do not understand.

LEHMANN: That needs to be better detailed.

STEPHENS: The rezoning orders are good. Re 6-409-6 – omit from this approval. What is a reasonable time? That needs clarification. After written notification, right to draw on the posted letter of credit, posted notification of the same. That language should be clarified. Until such time, the Director of Public Works. That needs to be clarified. There should be some sort of limitation. That is too discretionary. Too open ended. The list shall be sent to the developer. That it is in compliance with the standards of the code. There should be some criteria there.

LEHMANN: I will work on that; not the satisfaction of Public Works.

STEPHENS: 6-409G – until such time the Director of Public Works formally accepts the improvement in writing. We need some language there not to give the total authority to the Director of Public Works. 6-409H – same as above. Third paragraph under 309H,
In the last page, G10K4, 10ppm versus 10pm.

STEPHENS: On page 12 at the bottom, 6-4106G, the heading is wrong. It should be 6-4106H and the 6-410L should read 6-410N because that is how it is in my

code book.

TROPPER: 6-410-L – that should be North.

STEPHENS: Yes.

STEPHENS: When this comes back, please paginate.

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 February 13, 2007,

And

I move to (discuss and) continue the proposed amendments to the Land Development Code, Sections 5 and 6, as written in attached Exhibit “A”.

A motion was made by Commissioner Steve Dzierwa, seconded by Commissioner Patricia Thompson, that this matter be CONTINUED to the Plan Commission. The motion PASSED by an unanimous vote.

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Parisi

OTHER BUSINESS

DZIERWA: Noted that when the CSO delivered the packet for this evening’s meeting, he or she left it in his mail box which is not where it should be left.

STAFF: Indicated Commissioner Dzierwa’s comments will be relayed back to the CSO.

STEPHENS: Informed that Ms. Tropper has accepted a position with the City of Chicago, therefore, this will be the last Village of Orland Park Plan Commission meeting she will be present at and her last day of work will be on Wednesday, March 7, 2007. On behalf of the members of the Plan Commission (and the Recording Secretary), the Chairman acknowledged the dedication, high-level of professionalism and hard work Ms. Tropper brought to her position as Staff Planner which was very much appreciated and will be very much missed. Ms. Tropper was informed that it had, indeed, been a pleasure working with her and she was wished the best of luck in her future endeavors

TROPPER: Thanked the Chairman and the Plan Commissioners for their kindness and good wishes and indicated it had been a pleasure working with

them as well.

ADJOURNMENT

STEPHENS: There being no further business before the Plan Commissioners, the meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Teri Dougherty