

VILLAGE OF ORLAND PARK

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



Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, March 13, 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: 7 - Commissioner Jacobs; Commissioner Dzierwa; Commissioner Aubin; Commissioner Stephens; Commissioner Culligan; Commissioner Thompson, Commissioner Parisi

Consideration of February 20, 2007 Minutes

A motion was made by Commissioner Aubin, seconded by Commissioner Dzierwa and carried to approve the minutes of the February 20, 2007 Plan Commission meeting with the following correction in the second-to-last paragraph on page 11 under "STEPHENS", the word "building" should be plural so that the sentence correctly reads "Asked the petitioner why he shows the buildings with different setbacks." (Recommended for approval...6-0 with Commissioner Thompson abstaining due to her absence at said meeting.)

A motion was made by Commissioner Paul Aubin, seconded by Commissioner Steve Dzierwa, that this matter be APPROVED . The motion PASSED by an unanimous vote.

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

Nay: 0

Abstain: 1 - Commissioner Thompson

Consideration of February 27, 2007 Minutes

The Chairman continued consideration of approval of the February 27, 2007 Plan Commission meeting minutes to its March 27, 2007 meeting due to last minute changes made to them.

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

Aye: 7 - Commissioner Jacobs, Commissioner Dzierwa, Commissioner Aubin, Commissioner Stephens, Commissioner Culligan, Commissioner Thompson and Commissioner Parisi

Nay: 0

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

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion from the Plan Commissioners.

I move to continue the public hearing for file number 2006-0536, Olympus Trail Subdivision, to the March 27, 2007 Plan Commission.

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

Aye: 7 - Commissioner Jacobs, Commissioner Dzierwa, Commissioner Aubin, Commissioner Stephens, Commissioner Culligan, Commissioner Thompson and Commissioner Parisi

Nay: 0

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

Aye: 7 - Commissioner Jacobs, Commissioner Dzierwa, Commissioner Aubin, Commissioner Stephens, Commissioner Culligan, Commissioner Thompson and Commissioner Parisi

Nay: 0

2007-0034 Toures Car Wash

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion from the Plan Commissioners.

I move to terminate the public hearing for file number 2007-0034, Toures Car Wash

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: 7 - Commissioner Jacobs, Commissioner Dzierwa, Commissioner Aubin, Commissioner Stephens, Commissioner Culligan, Commissioner Thompson and Commissioner Parisi

Nay: 0

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

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion from the Plan Commissioners.

I move to continue the public hearing for file number 2007-0116, Land Development Code Amendments - MFG Manufacturing District, to the April 10, 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: 7 - Commissioner Jacobs, Commissioner Dzierwa, Commissioner Aubin, Commissioner Stephens, Commissioner Culligan, Commissioner Thompson and Commissioner Parisi

Nay: 0

2007-0054 Staples (Lowe's Lot 8)

Daniel Kwiatkowski, 7212 Bonnie Court, Woodridge
Doug Johnson, 707 Skokie Boulevard

HOFKENS: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated March 13, 2007, as presented.

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

AUBIN: Swore in Dan Kwiatkowski

KWIATKOWSKI: On the frontage that faces the park we do have a five-foot landscape buffer but the reasoning behind not putting in a lot of transparency was because we did not feel this was a large pedestrian access. In regard to spandrel glass and the idea of transparency, stated that the interior layout of Staples is basically 14-feet of racks along all of their walls. If we were to provide any kind of transparent windows or clerestory windows, you would possibly see the backs of racks, boxes, and even if we used frosted glass as I've noticed on a couple of buildings outside of the Civic Center, there are boxes stacked along the clerestory windows which provides bad shadows. We have provided spandrel glass which does not necessarily have to be black. It could be applied graphics. That is the one concern I know, with our blank façade, we have provided stone peers on. As for the rear, that is the most utilitarian. That is where the loading dock is. We have provided stone projections, however, we do have to be wary of the fact that trucks will be backing in there so we've not put massive projections and/or awnings because the trucks will tear them down. Noted that Ms. Hofkens summed up most of what we are doing. We believe that the pedestrian link to 95th Street has a better synergy than anything that would be facing south because it does face two possible restaurant users.

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

AUBIN: Swore in Mr. Brad McGinnis.

McGINNIS, resides at 16816 Spice Bush Lane, Orland Park: Commented about what he saw along LaGrange Road – the Bank of America building. You were just talking about a special kind of glass and shadows. Expressed his opinion that the Bank of America building is probably one of the most bland buildings that the Village of Orland Park has approved in recent years. Their shadowing of their file

cabinets is what we see from LaGrange Road. Along the side of 156th Street it is possible they could put metal art or something like that against the wall to add visual interest to that particular side of the building instead of these fake windows. The Bank of America right now does not have any kind of pedestrian walkway into that particular LaGrange Road access. Everything is around the side. Again, I do not know where the Village is going with this look, however, it is not visually appealing from my perspective. This is an interior building, however, it still has the same visual interest that you are trying to create in this landscape so I am just making you aware of that.

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

PARISI: My only comment is a concern in regard to the east elevation of the Staples building. While there may be shelving against the wall and while you may see shelving or shading, there are other alternatives to windows for a bland wall such as decorative brick. I would suggest that as an alternative to windows on the east elevation.

THOMPSON: Echoed Commissioner Parisi's comments.

AUBIN: Concur with Commissioner Parisi. Asked the petitioner if he has looked at the conditions recommended by Staff in their report and if he has any objections or comments to any of them other than condition #1.

KWIATKOWSKI: Indicated he has read the conditions and concurs with them other than condition #1.

JACOBS: I am glad to see Staples coming into Orland Park. It is a very attractive building. I like the pergola idea. Agree with everything Staff has shown in their report. Concur with Commissioner Parisi in regard to the east elevation.

DZIERWA: Asked Staff to clarify the plans for north of Wheeler Drive.

HOFKENS: That out lot is a detention pond with a pedestrian path from Wheeler. It has a significant area around that has some landscaping. It was always designed to be an open space feature. Part of the pond actually goes into the park.

DZIERWA: I was under the impression that some time ago when Lowe's was before us that eventually that roadway was going to go through to Lowe's or where the bank is at or eventually TGI Friday's. I've been at this site many times as I shop at Lowe's a lot, however today and a couple days back I noticed they have the concrete blocks that which prevent you from driving on the roadways and going any further north than the Lowe's drive there. Is that just going to be an outlet for detention? We have a park to the east that would be to the back of the Staples

building. I personally think that if the Staples building were rotated 90 degrees counterclockwise with the back of the building toward that detention. Noted he has pictures that show that area. I don't think it would be that unsightly if it were facing north. The fact that the park area facing east of what now is the back of Staples would probably be used by a lot of pedestrians. People just do not like looking at blank walls. If we cannot come to a consensus on putting some type of glass in that wall, even if it were a translucent type of window that just let light through, so what if you could see boxes and racks through it with the light being greater inside as opposed to outside like at night time. We are looking at a police station now where we are seeing ductwork. I don't think it would be all that bad if you had clerestory windows that were translucent. So what if there are racks and boxes in there. I think it would shine a little bit of light out there in the evening when the store is open. It would encourage people to use that area not so much in the evening but it would be something nicer to look at in the daytime too. If we were to leave the building as it sits now, if you could do something to it other than just architectural features (columns, brickwork), if you added the windows I could live with the way it is situated now. Asked Staff if it is written anywhere that the roadway was suppose to have been done (to Lowe's).

HOFKENS: That was part of the approved plan for Lowe's. We are working very hard with that commercial group in trying to get them to come to an agreement. We are not giving up on that connection. That will happen.

DZIERWA: I thought that once Lowe's was open, that road would be developed.

HOFKENS: That is what was supposed to happen.

LEHMANN: Attested to what currently exists. As Ms. Hofkens' alluded to, there have been some difficulties in getting that coordinated with the property owner to the north, however, that is something that we will ultimately get constructed. As far as the concrete blocks, that is a separate issue. The Village requires that the streets not be completely paved until at least 80% of the development in place and then get them paved all at once and completed up to final surface. The streets bear the brunt of the construction traffic so we requested they not complete the final surface at that time. It was Lowe's choice to put up those concrete blocks to reduce the construction traffic so people would not traverse it and obviously tear up a road that they are ultimately responsible to repair.

DZIERWA: I understand that. I thought that by now, that roadway would have been built through to Kohl's. If the other thoroughfares that needed to be blocked off remained blocked off and they could finish that one because as we are adding more buildings here on this site, we are adding more traffic. Right now navigating in there is really not a problem but wherever that roadway was designed to go through, if that could be pursued at this point, that would be great.

LEHMANN: Sure, I agree.

STEPHENS: First, commented on the building on the corner. You did a nice job on that one. Asked how many square feet those stores are going to be.

KWIATKOWSKI: Most likely two 1,200 square foot users.

STEPHENS: Two stores?

KWIATKOWSKI: Yes although it may end up being one tenant, however, it should not affect the architecture.

STEPHENS: So you would break it up into two 1,200 square-foot users or one user/tenant for the entire area. Noted the petitioner did a nice job matching the pergola across the street. Is it the same exact treatment?

KWIATKOWSKI: Yes.

STEPHENS: I understand you worked with Staff and Staff showed two different illustrations about turning the building. I understand the petitioners' perspective that they want the Staples front door to face LaGrange Road.

KWIATKOWSKI: That is correct.

STEPHENS: I understand that and I have no problem with that. How high is the interior ceiling? You stated that your racks go up 14 feet.

KWIATKOWSKI: The bottom of the structure right now – their prototype would be 15-1/2 feet. That is not leaving a lot room for an open clerestory. You would either see the bottom of the joists or racks if it were too low. We can certainly move that up a little bit; but not a substantial amount. We can easily work and go back with a proposal with some clerestory windows or windows up above and see if they have any objections to it. It seems as though the Committee does not have any objections to seeing perhaps a rack or a box, etc. As far as the tenant is concerned, I am not completely sure they would go for that.

STEPHENS: If we are looking at a window that is 15-feet high we will not be able to look in it anyway.

KWIATKOWSKI: It would have to be a translucent glass not a transparent glass. If it were transparent you would see the duct work and anything else in view at that angle. You would see the ceiling

STEPHENS: I think Staff is looking for clerestory windows that will bring natural light into the building. Is there any possibility you can do that?

KWIATKOWSKI: A translucent light would bring some light in and it would let

some light out during the night time.

STEPHENS: So you are not going to put a drop ceiling in.

KWIATKOWSKI: No, they have an open ceiling.

STEPHENS: If you put clear windows up there you would be able to let in natural sunlight.

KWIATKOWSKI: That is correct. We could go back to the tenant with that option.

STEPHENS: I am aware that Staff has pointed out to you, Ordinance Section 6-308.F.11 which talks about the 100-foot length and in that Ordinance, how they require the recesses and projections with the 20% on the façade but you do not have the windows and the awnings along there.

KWIATKOWSKI: That is correct.

STEPHENS: So we are going to ask you if you can add windows and awnings or some sort of window treatment on the east side. I don't see why you couldn't do it on the north side either. The awnings I understand, however, the clerestory windows I think you can do.

KWIATKOWSKI: We might be able to get those clerestory windows.

STEPHENS: You can't use the excuse that the trucks are going to back into them there.

AUBIN: Swore in Mr. Doug Johnson.

JOHNSON: I am one of the developers of this property. I also represent Staples and have done so for seven or eight years. I have done 70 or 80 Staples deals and I've built a number of them.

STEPHENS: You are the General Contractor?

JOHNSON: No. I am the developer but I also was a site selector for them for their real estate locations. Lowe's and many other national retailers in Orland Park have prototype stores. The back side of Staples (the east elevation) has its store room with floor-to-ceiling boxes, chairs, tables, etc. In my opinion, having a transparent window back there could present a danger because of some of the metal boxes and file cabinets, etc. If there were an accident, such items would go right through the window. I have known these people for a very long time and I have never seen them allow windows around their storage areas. I will, however, be happy to go back and ask them to do something. I think if we work with Staff and the Plan Commissioners that we could come up with a solution that will satisfy

everyone in terms of creating a visual differentiation from what you see on the normal prototype building. Whether that be some type of artwork or some type of glass you see now and again on the back of vans, where you could make it look like an extension of the park. You could make it with trees, flowers, however you want to do it. We would be happy to approach them with an idea like that but if it comes down to a glass that they have to stack a lot of dangerous items up against, in my opinion, I do not think that will ever happen. We would love to help change that and we will do something architecturally that hopefully everyone will find appealing and, therefore, allow us to go forward.

STEPHENS: Are you familiar with that code that I just cited?

JOHNSON: Yes, and we tried to address it as best we could.

STEPHENS: You tried to address half of it I believe.

JOHNSON: We addressed it the best we could under the circumstances we have been dealing with and we are hoping that the adjustments that we made would be favorable to you and we are still open to further suggestions from the Plan Commissioners.

STEPHENS: Okay, thank you Mr. Johnson. Asked Staff if Mr. Johnson's suggestion is workable?

HOFKENS: The code is the code. It requires transparency and that is what we would like to see, however, as always, we are willing to work with the petitioner to see if there is another solution. Again, our big concern here was that if you are going to have a blank façade, either find some way to make it look better or help screen it. There are only five feet between the building and the sidewalk, within which you really cannot plant trees. So it was really a combination of both the code and the limited planting area, but we will be willing to work with them as always.

STEPHENS: So you are thinking perhaps a combination of what Mr. Johnson is suggesting and landscape materials as well.

HOFKENS: If there is no way in the world a transparent window could work (and obviously that is our number one choice and it doesn't matter to us if it is in the store room), we would consider other materials. When we do get the clerestory windows, historically, not only the employees but the business owners come back to us and thank us because having the daylight in the building makes such a difference to shoppers and to workers. Also, the visible light that comes out of the building during the evening is a great asset. If the windows are not possible, then perhaps there is some externally lit artwork that could be put on the walls so that there is decorative lighting on the façade that especially in the evening, would help not make this look like an expansive blank wall, adjacent to this showcase park in

this development. There are options, however, we always push for the windows.

STEPHENS: Directing his comment to Mr. Kwiatkowski, noted that Mr. Johnson was talking about the east side. What about the north side. Is it a problem to put clerestory windows there?

KWIATKOWSKI: The north side would be more of an issue because that is where most of their stock room was. The east side is actually three-quarters sales.

STEPHENS: I think you have to work with Staff to do something to provide some additional treatment on the north side as well as the east side because you are going to have to do something to get into compliance with the code.

STEPHENS: In regard to the four stalls Staff is recommending be eliminated, asked the petitioner if they have a problem with that recommendation.

KWIATKOWSKI: I do not see that being a problem. We do have enough parking for code. I believe the tenants are okay with the number of parking stalls. We could probably enlarge them in order to provide canopy trees or trees without having to eliminate the stalls.

STEPHENS: Around both sides of the walkway by the front door – you have no problem eliminating those?

KWIATKOWSKI: I have no problems with that.

STEPHENS: In regard to the bike rack, is that a problem?

KWIATKOWSKI: No problem.

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 March 13, 2007.

and

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval/denial of the preliminary site plan titled "Site Plan Lot 8," prepared by DZA Associates, Inc., project number 06.089, dated 03/06/07, sheet number SP1.0 and building elevations titled "Proposed Retail Development Building 'H' Lot 8" and "Proposed Retail Development Staples Lot 8," prepared by DZA Associates, Inc., dated March 6, 2007 subject to the following conditions:

1. That the petitioner revise the building elevations to comply with Section 6-308 of the Land Development Code pertaining to commercial buildings over 100' in

length.

2. That the petitioner show a bike rack on the site plan and provide elevations of the proposed garbage enclosures before the Committee Meeting.

3. That the petitioner convert the four parking stalls adjacent to the pedestrian walkway leading to Staples into landscape islands.

4. That the petitioner submit a landscape plan for separate review and approval upon completion of Final Engineering that provides plants above Code requirements on the northwest corner of 95th Avenue and 156th Street near the pergola and along the north and east façades in order to soften the façade edge fronting the proposed Lowe's Park and detention pond.

5. That all final engineering items are met

and

6. That building signage meets all Village Code and is reviewed and approved by the Building Department.

and

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

and

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval/denial of a Special Use Permit to allow for two buildings on one site with modifications to allow for parking in the front setback between the Staples building and 95th Avenue subject to the same conditions as outlined for the preliminary site plan.

A motion was made by Commissioner Paul Aubin, seconded by Commissioner Steve Dzierwa, that this matter be RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Planning and Economic Development Committee. The motion CARRIED Unanimously.

Aye: 7 - Commissioner Jacobs, Commissioner Dzierwa, Commissioner Aubin, Commissioner Stephens, Commissioner Culligan, Commissioner Thompson and Commissioner Parisi

Nay: 0

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

2007-0031 Granite City Food & Brewery

David B. Sosin, Attorney for the petitioner, 11800 South 75th Avenue, Palos

Heights

HOFKENS: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated March 13, 2007, as presented.

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

AUBIN: Swore in Mr. Sosin.

SOSIN: We are pleased to be with you tonight. Ms. Hofkens gave a very comprehensive presentation. We've worked very hard with Staff and are pleased with the fact that we really are not asking for any variations or deviations from the code. I have not seen the revised motion, however, I understand what the changes are because we attended a meeting where we resolved the sidewalk issues. On the glass issue, we have a suggestion. We've looked at this very carefully. Glass does not work very well for our client there for a couple reasons. We worked very hard on the elevations on the theory that what we were trying to do was really present a picture coming into Orland Park under the bridge of the north elevation, particularly, the northwest elevation which is where the entrance is. If you look at your drawing (in tab four of the materials that were supplied) there is a little bit of curb at the bottom of the rendering. That is LaGrange Road. You can see that the Granite City sign and the awning are seen on the north elevation. The part they are talking about is the north and the east corner that is far away from the focal point, the entranceway of 141st and LaGrange Road. Glass is not going to work there from our point of view because it destroys the balance of the two towers and the look. We would ask that the motion indicate that we work with Staff to give them something that is more acceptable to them. We cannot put glass up high because there is a tower there and it would disturb the balance of the building. We think there are some things with landscaping we can do and perhaps a building treatment on the lower end and we are sure we can get that worked out with Staff and still move ahead tonight. In regard to the other issues – we have no problem at all with the parking stalls and of course we will provide a final landscape plan and the easement as requested. Will answer any questions and/or concerns you may have. That concludes the petitioner's presentation.

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

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

DZIERWA: Directing his comment to Mr. Sosin, as far as the position of the building, I was out there again today and took pictures. There is a body of water there. Will water sit there all of the time?

SOSIN: That is off of our site. That is a temporary device. When this site is fully developed, that will not be there. The purpose of that is to get the water off the

entire Orland Crossing on a temporary basis. When the street goes through there will be some substantial changes that are encompassed in the final engineering.

LEHMANN: Actually, that is in conjunction with the development of the Granite City Food & Brewery. Their original developer, Davis Street Land Company is working with their consultant to devise the engineering plans to provide the infrastructure improvements for Granite City. For instance, the swale pointed out in the photo as it currently resides will be removed and replaced with a storm sewer, a trunk line sewer, to take the runoff from the Orland Crossing Development and put it into the detention pond as it was originally designed. As Mr. Sosin pointed out, originally it was a temporary condition in the sense that they did not anticipate having to put in the necessary improvements right away, be it the roadway and the storm sewer and so forth, that swale was designed to address the interim condition.

DZIERWA: I kind of liked that. It reminded me of the Key West with the canal along the side of the restaurant. Asked Mr. Sosin if he has seen the revised motion (asked that someone provide him with a copy of it and that was accommodated). Asked Mr. Sosin to specify in which condition he wanted to work with Staff on where you did not want to put the windows where they suggested.

SOSIN: It is on the northeast corner.

DZIERWA: Staff wrote the condition as east and west and we already addressed the west elevation which we all think looks very nice.

HOFKENS: The report says north and east, unfortunately, the motion says east and west. That needs to be revised.

DZIERWA: So whoever makes the motion needs to change that to north and east. Thank you, that is all I have.

JACOBS: I looked at some of your other facilities on the internet today and noticed there is a fair amount of deviation in the design and a great amount of glass in your other buildings. I realized that what you are trying to do here is to fit in with what is existing. I am not suggesting that you copy what you already have. When I look at this I feel that it is overpowering. It is monumental. I am wondering, as you have already suggested, if you would work with Staff on softening that façade somewhat. I know you do not want to do windows, however, just another architectural element might work on the west side of that building.

STEPHENS: On the west side?

JACOBS: Is this not the west side?

STEPHENS: That is the north side.

JACOBS: The north side then.

SOSIN: It is the Granite City look with the granite.

JACOBS: Yes, you achieved that.

SOSIN: Hopefully, one of the things that will be different, because of the Village's landscape requirements, we have a lot of landscaping here. I think that will be one way of doing that.

JACOBS: Thank you. That is all.

THOMPSON: Directing her comment to Mr. Sosin, stated she welcomes his building. I think we may have to change the Village's water towers to "the brewery center" from "the golf center". Concurred with fellow Commissioner Jacobs. My first concern when I received your plan was the north end. Granite City Food and Brewery looks like a big box to me. Hopefully, you can work with Staff to clean that up and make it look more attractive instead of having the big box look.

PARISI: The western side of the property has a retaining wall at the edge of the parking lot.

SOSIN: Actually, there will be another retaining wall. Right now it is a hill. In tab number five of the materials, you can see the height differential. On the second page there are pictures showing a fence and after that it drops off quite a bit. The drop off is not as pronounced to LaGrange Road. I have discussed this issue with Mr. Lehmann. Eventually, as they widen LaGrange Road there actually will be a retaining wall at the edge of the IDOT right-of-way. What is there now will actually be wider.

PARISI: My concern is the drop off from the parking lot to LaGrange Road and the possibility of somebody exiting and accidentally falling off onto LaGrange Road.

SOSIN: We will certainly look into that as a landscaping issue with trees, shrubs and fencing.

STEPHENS: Asked Mr. Lehmann for an opinion from an engineering perspective.

LEHMANN: As far as the retaining wall is concerned, it is within reason in terms of its height. From the material supplied by the petitioner, you can see on grading sheet C3.0 it calls out the wall elevations and the finished grade at the bottom. All along the west frontage there you can see the wall varying from just meeting the existing grade up to a point right at the front of the building where it is actually five

feet in height. Up near the building it is high, however, where it gets along the parking lot it is within better reason the sense that it gets to about three feet and two feet along there and blends in. The area where it is the highest will be up against the building where there won't be any traffic along the parking lot.

STEPHENS: It is high along 141st on the south end and as it goes to the north, it drops off?

LEHMANN: Yes, exactly. It starts high along 141st Street and then maximizes its height at the northwest corner of the building – where the wall bumps out – that dark black line. Then as it goes northerly, the height of the wall is reduced and blends into meeting the existing grade.

SOSIN: Also, it is the south end that has the biggest drop off. The parking is at the north end.

STEPHENS: Asked Mr. Lehmann if he is comfortable with this.

LEHMANN: Yes. The heights of the wall are within reason. In the one place where it is five feet, I think they could terrace it to reduce that height to make it more of a safer issue. I don't see any pedestrian traffic being in that location, however, we can certainly have them terrace that wall.

STEPHENS: Have you approved their engineering yet?

LEHMANN: We've approved it preliminarily but we haven't gone into final engineering with it yet.

STEPHENS: Asked Commissioner Parisi if this has addressed his concern.

PARISI: Yes, thank you.

AUBIN: Nothing to ask.

STEPHENS: Directing his comment to Mr. Sosin, stated he realizes that the east side of the building is not required to have windows because it is less than 100 feet, correct?

SOSIN: The north side is 82 feet and the east side is less than 100 feet.

STEPHENS: Is that a public or private street back there.

SOSIN: Currently there is no street there but a street will go in.

HOFKENS: Clarified that this site is under the Village Center District codes which is a little different than the Lowe's site. The transparency requirements for this site

are different. It does not matter on the length of the building, however, 35% of any non-residential building that faces a street shall be transparent at the street level. This is a little bit of a grey area because the east side does face the street but it is not a public right-of-way.

STEPHENS: So by code, they are not required to put the windows in on the east side.

HOFKENS: Correct but again this is a grey area because our code does not necessarily say public street or private street so it is open to interpretation here.

STEPHENS: On the north elevation, Mr. Sosin talked about putting in plantings.

SOSIN: Correct.

STEPHENS: Why couldn't you put in windows in where you show the mens' and womens' restrooms, putting them up high (on the north elevation)?

SOSIN: It is my understanding of the design of the building that there are basically an eight-foot ceiling or a nine-foot ceiling there. If you put windows up there, they would not give light to that restroom.

STEPHENS: I don't see why you could not do it. It might be nice to have natural sunlight coming in to the restroom. I can understand not wanting to put it in by the dry storage area due to stacking things up, however, the office and the restroom would be nice places to have the windows.

SOSIN: We would have to look at this and talk to our client about it and see what may be possible. We will work with Staff and try to get them in. I am not looking at the floor plan in order to see what the building requirements are and how it would work exactly. We will, however, certainly try to accommodate the suggestions of the Plan Commission. I think the office and the break areas are even more critical just because of the corner and the way it looks. That portion is really in a different place. We will certainly look at it. The reason why I did not address it is because the mens' and womens' bathrooms are right in the middle of that elevation.

STEPHENS: I don't see why you couldn't do that. I'll give you time to confer with the gentleman in the back (when Mr. Sosin talked privately with an associate seated in the rear of the Board Room).

SOSIN: Asked if the idea is to get light into the bathroom or if it is to get a view of the outside.

STEPHENS: It is a two-fold idea. It is to make an improvement architecturally on the outside and also to get natural light into the bathroom. It would help with the exterior elevation on the north side because as stated by Commissioner

Thompson and other Commissioners agreed to, it looks like a big box store on the north side. If you add a couple of windows and some landscaping to it, I think the problem would be solved.

It makes people who use the restroom happy because incoming natural light is always a welcome thing and it also makes the Village happy because now there would be an elevation that shows a little bit of character and has sunlight coming in. Clarified that the recommended window would be to the east of the Granite City sign, not under it.

SOSIN: We will certainly look at that. I'm not sure they would be operational at that height, however, we will look at that from an aesthetic standpoint.

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 March 13, 2007,

and

1. I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of the preliminary site plan and building elevations titled "Layout and Paving Plan," prepared by SJA Architects and V3 Companies, dated 02/02/07, job number 98036.GCFB, sheets C2.0 and A201, subject to the following conditions.

2. That the petitioner revise the site plan to include a sidewalk and parkway along 141st Street, a bike rack near the building, on the site plan before the project goes to Committee.

3. That the petitioner set aside fees for the LaGrange Road sidewalk into an escrow account for future construction.

4. That the petitioner replace three of the parking stalls with landscape islands.

5. That the petitioner revised the building elevations to show a windows on the east and west elevations that correspond to the 'office' area of the floorplan.

6. The petitioner submit a landscape plan, based on final engineering drawings, to the Community Development Department for separate review and approval within 60 days of final engineering approval.

7. That a construction easement is shown on the plat that allows access to complete the bicycle overpass.

And

8. That all final engineering related items are met.

A motion was made by Commissioner Paul Aubin, seconded by Commissioner Patricia Thompson, that this matter be RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Board of Trustees. The motion PASSED by an unanimous vote.

Aye: 7 - Commissioner Jacobs, Commissioner Dzierwa, Commissioner Aubin, Commissioner Stephens, Commissioner Culligan, Commissioner Thompson and Commissioner Parisi

Nay: 0

2007-0089 Martin Implement

Bruce Novak, Martin Implement, 4223 Madison Avenue, Brookfield, IL

HOFKENS: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated March 13, 2007, as presented.

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

NOVAK: Stated they are looking to proceed with the development of the site and hopefully begin grading in the spring with a fall completion of the project. The things mentioned by Ms. Hofkens as far as the requested action are within reason and within our means.

STEPHENS: You concur with the recommended conditions?

NOVAK: Yes. The only thing I was not totally clear on was the mention of sanitary and water lines being extended across the site of the property line. I am not quite sure if that was in reference to the storm sewer or something else.

STEPHENS: Asked the Village Engineer to address that.

LEHMANN: That recommendation is correct. It is the sanitary and water lines – part of the overall Orland Park Business Center project. The reason for that requested action is that as part of the overall approval for the Orland Park Business Center, the sanitary and water is to be extended to the east property line to serve the adjoining vacant parcels and this would be the appropriate time to do that. If Martin Implement is to move forward and establish their site build out, these utility extensions are done at a later date when you are likely to disturb all of the improvements they have put into place. Ultimately it is something that was part of the original approval for the Orland Park Business Center and still remains outstanding to be done.

NOVAK: The request for the building elevations and the photometric plan – those were originally submitted with the revised petition, however, I think our contractor, Morgan Harbor, probably also has that information here as well if we need that.

HARBOR: That is correct.

STEPHENS: You are talking about where it says that the petitioner needs to return with building elevations that meet the criteria noted in this report. Your architect is here and he understands this. Acknowledged the architect seated in the Board Room who was shaking his head yes.

NOVAK: They were submitted with the petition but must have gotten lost. This will be complied with.

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

THOMPSON: Expressed concern with the trash area, however, noted that if the petitioner maintains this building like he maintains his current building, kudos to him as he does a good job maintaining his buildings. Asked if the trash enclosure is going to be cedar.

NOVAK: Not sure if that is going to be the final material at this point.

THOMPSON: Noted that cedar has a tendency to warp. Would like to see a different material if possible.

NOVAK: Okay.

STEPHENS: Asked what the code requirement is for the trash enclosure in an industrial area.

HOFKENS: As the MFG District is not her specialty, she apologized, but indicated she doesn't believe we have the same masonry screening requirements as in the commercial district. However, she agrees that something more solid that stands up to the weather would be more appropriate in this case if the petitioner were able to do that. Staff would be happy to work with the petitioner to make sure he meets or exceeds the Village's codes.

DZIERWA: As far as these changes are concerned I see nothing drastic.

STEPHENS: As long as their engineering complies with our engineering, I have no problem with this.

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, March 13, 2007,

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval / denial of the preliminary site plan titled "Martin Implement" by Harris Architects, Inc. and Morgan/Harbour Construction, Project No. 206462, Sheet No. A1.0, Latest revision 2-6-07 subject to the following conditions:

1. That the petitioner return with building elevations that meet criteria noted in this report; and
2. That this be subject to preliminary and final engineering approval; and
3. That a Landscape Plan based on final engineering drawings that also addresses issues raised in this report is submitted for separate review and Board approval within 60 days; and
4. That any soil stockpile be removed and that a minimum of 17,058 square feet of pervious surface-graded and seeded----is provided in addition to the indicated landscaped areas; and
5. That the sanitary and water lines are extended across the site to the property line;

and

6. That a photometric plan is submitted.

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: 7 - Commissioner Jacobs, Commissioner Dzierwa, Commissioner Aubin, Commissioner Stephens, Commissioner Culligan, Commissioner Thompson and Commissioner Parisi

Nay: 0

2007-0114 Wooded Path Estates II - Revised

Andrea T. Crowley, Griffin & Gallagher, 10001 South Roberts Road, Palos Hills

HOFKENS: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated March 13, 2007, as presented.

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

CROWLEY: Noted that also present is the developer and Mike Cap. We concur with Staff's report as presented. Noted they've worked very hard over the past year to make this project work. Pointed to the plan displayed and noted the (minor) changes outlined in red.

STEPHENS: Asked the petitioner if she is in agreement with the recommended conditions.

CROWLEY: Stated yes and noted that some of the recommended changes have already been complied with.

STEPHENS: Despite this being a non-public hearing, invited comments and/or questions from the public.

MIKE BURCHAL, resides at 14420 Claridge Court: Thanked everyone for all of their hard work on this project. They have been working on this for a year and they've done a wonderful job with trying to accommodate the homeowners and work with the builders. We have been very thankful for that. In regard to the new, big detention pond at the bottom by lot G, asked if that is going to be a steep slope and if it will be grassed with shrubberies.

LEHMANN: In regard to outlet G, stated that the slopes typically require a 4:1 maximum slope, however, in order to accommodate the steep slopes within this site we granted a little bit of lenience by allowing a 3:1 slope in certain locations. There are certain slopes to the south that are unavoidably steep because you have to match the existing grades of the ravine to the south on outlet C. The slopes will still be manageable by our standards in the sense that we have had the Public Works Division review it being that it will be a public pond maintained by us. They are comfortable with the way the pond is laid out in regard to the accessibility of the infrastructure within it be it the storm sewer system as well as being able to get around the pond for our typical maintenance needs as far as the overflow structure and any cleaning. The slopes will be planted with shrubbery which will reflect the natural condition and will ensure that the slopes are maintainable and will reduce the erosion.

BURCHAL: In specific, how about by lot 10.

LEHMANN: You can see how the contour lines are spaced immediately to the right (east of lot 10). The fact that there are very few contour lines immediately adjacent to lot 10 leaves one to see that that area is relatively flat. In that approximate 20-foot area there is two feet of fall which is a one percent flat. That is very flat. Beyond that it falls down to a 3:1 slope which is about a 33% grade that falls into the bottom of the pond. Therefore, the area immediately adjacent to lot 10 is, indeed, a flat area without question.

BURCHAL: Is that all going to be maintained by the Village (such as the trimming of bushes, etc.).

LEHMANN: That is correct. These will be publicly-owned ponds. We do not anticipate it to be a pond that is typical of your more run-of-the-mill residential

subdivisions where it is a turf-type mowed pond. It will have a more natural setting to ensure it does not suffer from any erosion problems and that it blends in with the existing nature of the forest area nearby.

BURCHAL: So what will it look like when it is done?

LEHMANN: It will have natural plantings of shrubbery and so forth.

BURCHAL: What about the size – it seems awfully large. Does it have to be that big?

LEHMANN: We went through a number of iterations of this design to ensure that the volume of the pond meets our code as far as storm water requirements. The reason it looks so large is because the footprint of the pond needs to be rather large given that the slopes proposed within the pond eat up a great portion of the pond. Therefore, it does, indeed, need to be that size.

BURCHAL: Okay. Thank you again.

LEHMANN: Absolutely.

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

STEPHENS: I was here when we approved this about a year ago. This has been an extremely challenging site to engineering. The petitioner's engineer worked with the Village's engineer and came up with a workable plan here. As far as the lot sizes, there really has been very little, if any, deviation of these lot sizes. Most of them have stayed even from what they were prior to this change. I have no problems with this revised Site Plan at all.

DZIERWA: Asked Staff what the radius is on the cul-de-sac, Emma Court, and has that changed from the original one. I went back through my old plans and I could not find it.

HOFKENS: The radius should have stayed the same. The way it was angled into this site is what changed.

DZIERWA: I remember it had been a little bit more pronounced than it is now.

HOFKENS: Yes, I think that is the way it is oriented on the road. Instead of ending like a lollipop centrally on the end of a stick it instead comes in at an angle. However, the turning radius should have stayed the same. It is more how the circle is positioned at the end of the road. The exhibit provided shows more clearly the old versus the new and that was to account for some additional detention storage in what is labeled as CPB.

STEPHENS: As long as the radius in the cul-de-sac is the same, there is no problem.

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 March 13, 2007

And

I move to approve the preliminary plan for Wooded Path Estates II, as shown on the attached plan titled "Storm Sewer/Site Grading Plan," prepared by Michael J. Cap Ltd., dated 02/24/06, latest revision 03/05/07, Sheet 4 of 7 subject to the following conditions:

- 1) That the petitioner obtains all required permits from outside agencies before any Village Permits are issued.
- 2) That the petitioner donate part of Outlot G to the Forest Preserve District of Cook County. If the County refuses, it will be deeded to the Village.
- 3) That the petitioner redefine outlots G and C to separate the proposed detention pond outlot G from open space outlot C.
- 4) That the petitioner submit a landscape plan, tree survey and mitigation plan that provides slope stabilizing native plants along the steep hills and wetland style detention plantings, for review and Board Approval within 90 days.
- 5) That the petitioner complete acquisition of the 144th Street R.O.W. as indicated on the site plan.
- 6) That all detention pond facilities are deeded to Orland Park for public ownership and maintenance.
- 7) That the petitioner continue to pursue the granting of a utility easement on Lot 10 of Wooded Path Estates I, which adjoins the proposed development on the west, in order to eliminate the dead-end watermain condition which currently exists there.
and
- 8) That all final engineering related issues are met.

And

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

And

I move to approve a Variance for side yard setbacks from 25% to 15%, subject to the same conditions as outlined in the motion for approval of the preliminary plan;

And

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

And

I move to approve the subdivision of the 15.5 acre parcel into 14 lots and 6 outlots as shown on the preliminary plan subject to the same conditions as outlined in the motion for approval of the preliminary plan;

A motion was made by Commissioner Nick Parisi, seconded by Commissioner Paul Aubin, that this matter be RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Board of Trustees. The motion PASSED by an unanimous vote.

Aye: 7 - Commissioner Jacobs, Commissioner Dzierwa, Commissioner Aubin, Commissioner Stephens, Commissioner Culligan, Commissioner Thompson and Commissioner Parisi

Nay: 0

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

STEPHENS: There being no further business before the Plan Commissioners, the meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Teri Dougherty
Recording Secretary