

VILLAGE OF ORLAND PARK

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



Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, May 8, 2007

7:00 PM

Village Hall

Plan Commission

Louis Stephens, Chairman

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

CALLED TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Commissioner Steve Dzierwa, seconded by Commissioner Patricia Thompson, that this matter be APPROVED. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

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

Nay: 0

PUBLIC HEARINGS**2006-0780 Land Development Code Amendments I (2007)**

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

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

A motion was made by Commissioner Steve Dzierwa, seconded by Commissioner Nick Parisi, that this matter be CONTINUED to the Plan Commission, due back on 6/12/2007. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

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 for a continuance 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 May 8, 2007 Plan Commission

A motion was made by Commissioner Steve Dzierwa, seconded by Commissioner Nick Parisi, that this matter be CONTINUED to the Plan Commission, due back on 6/12/2007. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

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

Nay: 0

2007-0156 Crystal Tree Clubhouse Redevelopment

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

A motion was made by Commissioner Nick Parisi, seconded by Commissioner Patricia Thompson, that this matter be CONTINUED to the Plan Commission, due back on 5/22/2007. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

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

Nay: 0

2007-0196 Main Street Triangle Developmen

Edward Kus, 111 E Wacker Drive, Chicago, Shefsky & Froelich, Attorney for the petitioner

Theodore T Weldon, 350 W Hubbard Street, Chicago, Senior VP Related Midwest

Larry Peterman, RIA, 221 W Jefferson Ave, Naperville, Hitchcock Design Group
Dave Frigo, Leed AP, 221 W Jefferson Ave., Naperville, Hitchcock Design Group
Eric D. Russell, 9575 W Higgins Road, Rosemont, KLOA Inc.

Mark J Sullivan, 750 N Franklin, Chicago, Sullivan Goulette & Wilson

Jay Hubble, 750 N Franklin, Chicago, Sullivan Goulette & Wilson

SULLIVAN: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated May 8, 2007, as presented.

AUBIN: Swore in (petitioners)

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

KUS: With your permission I would just like to take care of the housekeeping if I may. That would be to submit the notarized affidavit from Mr. Sullivan certifying that the public notices by certified mail went out on April 13th along with the sign being posted on the property on April 13th as well. I am going to submit that to Mr.

Sullivan at this point. I am pleased to be here this evening on behalf of Related Midwest as we present this master plan and design guidelines for the Main Street Triangle corner. Earlier this evening someone described this project as a mixed use, transit oriented, pedestrian friendly development. And I think after you hear the plan for the development and design guidelines that you will agree with that characterization of this development.

I think we will meet all those characteristics as we go through the testimony. With that I'd like to begin and call Ted Weldon to testify. And he will go through the concept plan and the concept site and tell you about its relationship to the village.

WELDON: Thank you. We are very excited to be part of this development. And let me just give you a brief history of Related Midwest. We were founded in 1989 and we have done almost all are to the development in the Chicago area and we started up on the north side of the city and doing renovations of three flats and six flats and also historic renovation and we grew rapidly. And in the nineties we started doing larger scale developments. Currently and we are doing several developments in and around the city of Chicago and that a complicated mixed use developments. We recently completed the town of fort Sheridan which was approximately 550 units over several hundred acres of development. Currently in the Near west side of the city near the little Italy area, we are doing a 175 acre 2441 unit development which is done over six phases. It is a mixed use development, town homes, condominiums, as well as retail. We responded to the RFP for this about a year in a half ago, we are very excited about the villages concept here. What we liked about this concept is that it was creating something that the Village has been lacking, kind of a downtown main street area. We saw an opportunity here to take advantage of this site, and the opportunity to be with the train station and create a very pedestrian friendly atmosphere. Residents here that work downtown will be able to take the train, go to their units and also have the ability to take an advantage of the retail at the same time. By creating the crescent park we wanted to use that tow engage the rest of the community. This is a space that can be used as a farmers market, fairs or any type of event can be held there. There will be retail with residential above those retail units. That is what excited us about doing this development. Overall the development is approximately over 100 million dollars and will encompass approximately 200,000 plus square feet of residential and retail.

KUS: You heard Mr. Weldon explain that is done pursuant of a development agreement. Mr. Weldon could you please explain to the commission the phasing of the project, and when you would like to start, and when completion might be expected.

WELDON: Sure. We are in the design process of setting up design guidelines that are part of the development agreement. It is our goal to start construction in the first quarter of next year. The development would be done in approximately 3 phases, we will start right by the detention pond and then move our way southwest on the site. It should take approximately 3 to 3 ½ years to complete the

development.

KUS: Would you also explain the mix of residential units, the type of units that would be found on site. Also the retail tenants that you are trying to attract to the site.

WELDON: We will have condominium buildings that will have retail on the first floor with residential above. They will surround the park. To the southwest side of the site we will have town home units. What we like about this development a lot is the opportunity for unique retail. Our vision is smaller more boutique retail. Trying to work with some local retail whether it is a florist, arts & crafts, a shoe store, different retail that you would see in some of the other areas that get lost in a larger mall type setting. That is what we see around the crescent as well as a restaurant with out door seating that can also engage the public space. In addition as we look where the pond is we are looking to do a nice restaurant there that can actually have outdoor space that looks out over the pond.

STEVENS: As I understand the first leg of this discussion tonight is to propose this as just 10 lots. We will not be looking at any exhibits for any units or building that will be built there.

WELDON: Correct. Each time we come in we will need approval of building types.

KUS: Also we will have concept designs of types of buildings although they will not be the exact building as Mr. Weldon said. We will be coming back to you for approval for each building type. I would like to call up our next witnesses. I would like to call up Mark Sullivan and Jay Hubble, who are the architects of the project; they are with Sullivan, Goulette & Wilson. Mr. Sullivan & Mr. Hubble will be describing sub areas A, B and C. That will be comprised of the mixed use the retail and the residential areas of the project.

SULLIVAN: We feel it is important to go over what the site is and the amenities for the site and give you the context of the site and give you our vision for the site and how we generated the plan and where we put the buildings on the site. Then we will get into the use areas and the different areas on the site. We will go through sub areas A, B and C and we will explain to you the design guidelines that have been set forth.

First of all I think it is important to look at the site and the uniqueness of the site with its triangular nature. As an architect it presents some interesting situations for us in the acute angles, for a building to fit into that. It is not a nice box for us and it creates some difficulties sometimes. What this site has going for it is the great location with the Slough to the north, and we saw that as a very strong natural feature and the way that the site is graded to the north it makes a lot of sense to create a nice open space on the north where the water retention will go. Another strong point of this site and of local development is the linkage to old Orland. And

in one of those corners of the site rather than just disregarding we have created a nice linkage two old Orland. The rest of the site you have this beautiful new train station, we tried to feature that and create the crescent around the train station. Our vision for the site is to put the pond in the north, while creating a pedestrian linkage throughout the site. We were very concerned that there were a lot of different elements going on within the site. We have some retail on LaGrange Avenue, mixed use and higher density and taller buildings which make most sense around the crescent. We have some lower density and some town homes along the south side of the site, which to us created a natural outreach to Old Orland Park. We created a pedestrian and park area on the south west corner of the site. The biggest feature of the site was the crescent. With the slough to the north we put the density in the center of the site so as not to impact the surrounding neighborhoods that much. With the low density of the train station and the train tracks and the higher density of the buildings it gives them a fantastic view to the north, so we took advantage of that natural feature as well as creating this concept park. We see this as a very lively area which will have a lot of different things happening and going on at all times. That in conjunction with the location of the Train Station allows a commuter to come in the morning and go home at night, families picking up mom/dad at the train station the option to come early and have dinner or coffee, we see this as a real lively area and a hub.

We have outlined these different use areas and set forth some design guidelines. In a nut shell what we have is; sub area A, which is the red area (refers to the drawings), contains our highest density, our tallest buildings, these are the buildings that will surround the crescent. Sub area B, which is the retail, that is on LaGrange road, has been designed in such a way that it takes the parking off LaGrange road and internalizes it and we think that will be a very key feature for what is happening on the site. The third sub area is Area C, the residential area. We see that as a lower density townhouse type project. This will be a nice outreach to the existing fabric of the Village. The first are we will look at is the mixed use. Here we will have a maximum height of 70 feet in that use group.

HUBBLE: These will feature masonry and precast stone details. Large storefront areas will be fronting the public streets. Also there is what is conceived to be a pergola along each of these buildings.

M SULLIVAN: This is our idea. Nothing has been designed yet, it is just our idea of how one of these buildings will be designed and laid out. As Jay just mentioned we are envisioning a pergola down on the pedestrian level, which would foster the use of outside spaces, as Ted mentioned, maybe mom and pop shops, coffee shops, restaurants...

Just create a nice sense of place for the people of the Village to come and utilize this space. As Jay also mentioned we would like to use brick veneer, concrete panel, but something that gets across the point that this is a quality project made with quality materials. As I said the maximum height in this district would be 70 feet. We tried to put that into the center of the site as to minimize the impact to everybody outside the site.

HUBBLE: The next sub area is the retail area on LaGrange road. We are primarily, again, fronting large store front opening towards the street. These buildings will also be masonry with precast stone details.

M SULLIVAN: Maximum height in this district is 40 feet. With the materials what we would like to do is to get the whole site to be a cohesive design. We would like to select materials that would be harmonious, they would not have to be the same color but they should be the same style and design with in reason. As Jay just mentioned we would have large glass openings, which we think is favorable to the retailer and it promotes more pedestrian use, walking and movement throughout the site. The last group we would like to present tonight is sub group C.

HUBBLE: Sub group C we conceive of as town homes with a variety of roof treatments. Some gabled and some flat, no garage doors will face public streets, and we envision front porches and stairs.

M SULLIVAN: Again the maximum height in this sub district is 40 feet. We are in compliance; the Village has a code already in place to have a certain percentage of the front of the buildings to be of masonry construction we still continue to see that vision to carry through here. As Jay mentioned the use of pitched roofs with maybe wider town houses will create the sense of home, or what would be considered home. Maybe some flat roof and some moor vertical taller living which would provide some other amenities within the town houses themselves. We think interesting features that need to be paid attention to are the entry doorways, stairs, and how the windows are placed and having ornamental windows and things placed on the façade to create interest and liveliness, so we are not just creating shoe boxes on the site. We want to tie the whole site design together and create something that is interesting and a quality projects for Orland Park.

KUS: I'd also like to mention for the benefit of the commission that all the design buildings for sub areas A, B & C all meet the developmental guidelines for the village center district in terms of creating strong architectural detail on the building. In terms of creating strong facades along the street, in terms of creating smaller walkable streets, this is truly going to be a pedestrian friendly development at this location. It is also important to note that the proposed uses that are set forth in the exhibit that you have are actually more restrictive than what you have in the Village Center District. We went through that list for the Village Center District and some of the uses we just ruled out to being placed there. So the list of permitted uses will be more restricted that what is actually permitted under the code, and will be so created by the ordinance that will be approved by this commission and the Village Board. I'd like to call up Mr. Peterman and Mr. Frigo of the Hitchcock Design Group to discuss sub area D & E. Sub area D, which they will explain to you relates to the Metra parking lot. Sub area E relates to the public amenities that will be placed on site.

PETERMAN: Good Evening. Metra parking lot as it is involved relates to the site we wanted to make the site walkable, accessible and most of all out of site as much as possible. To do that the north piece has a total of 180 spaces which will be dedicated to Metra and as part of the agreement after 3pm those spaces become usable for patrons of restaurants and events that would take place on the site. They will also be landscaped not only in compliance with codes but in relationship with everything we are doing on the site. The public amenities, the fun pieces of the overall triangle, you can see (refers to drawing) 3 major pieces, the retention pond in the north the crescent in the center, which we are calling B park and ties everything together, finally our southwest gateway, or D park. All of those were intended to create this space that was usable by people not just an open green space or just a retention pond that just comes up with no use. The retention Pond, (refers to drawing) you can see, the base piece here, down along the retail area will have access where people can get down closer to it, see it, relate to it. Our restaurants will have seating areas there out along it. What you see here (refers to drawing) is a line, that is all part of the bike trail system that comes up to the southwest corner of the site currently on 143rd, it eventually comes through, accesses the station and then goes on to the northeast. When you are on a trail near the retention pond you are actually about 10 or 12 feet above that basin, so you can see looking down into it and see the plantings and things that are going on. B Park is this little piece that fits in-between the Metra station and the parking lot, while its technically not a part of the triangle it ties the whole piece together. It's designed for a locomotive or something train related. The southwest gateway relates to the trains and the railway system and its history and is the first visual cue when you come in from the west into the triangle that is begins the ties for the bike and pedestrian trial. We have taken great care to design the streets as more of a downtown. There are several iterations that happen throughout. Some of them are just streets where you can drive through and some will have parking on them, as 142nd will as in B & C. Each of those have their own character, their own views as people relate to it they will have colored pavement that will designate crosswalks and other areas for safety and tying it all back into Old Orland. Street fixtures and street lighting where appropriate (refers to drawings).

FRIGO: The landscape, this is just a partial list of what we will propose on site. If you were actually to look at it there is probably 2 or 3 times the amount of species there. We are always conscious of striking a balance there between having diversity of plant material, and not having one or two of everything so the whole site reads as a unit. Some of the plants that are being featured are the Callery Pear that we have elsewhere on the site. Native plants such as grasses, black eyed Susan's and some of the more ornamental plants that are found traditionally throughout. It is meant to be a 4 season plan. There are some that will flower in spring all the way through fall and there will be winter interest with evergreens and grasses and so forth. It's really to be a 4 season landscape. This is the south gateway park (refers to drawing), and we saw this as a great way to tie the rail past with the community directly to west on 143rd. The focal point is actually an old wooden water tower, it won't actually hold water, but it is reminiscent of what

would have been here back in the day. It will have a Village of Orland Park sign on two sides so it can be seen both from the road and the train line. There will be 2 of the old fashioned push carts that will be stable in place, but something for the kids to scramble on as well as some benches. The paving is kind of an abstract of old train tracks and yet it still serves as a gateway to the multi-use path that goes throughout the site from northwest to southeast. Crescent Park is being anchored here by what we are calling arbor stage, it's a performance area for live music or a place to host an event such as Taste of Orland Park or an Art Fair, or it can be used as a big lawn for people to go out and throw a Frisbee or walk the dog. There are a series of walkways that are around it with bike racks and benches, plants. It's very much about hospitality. It's meant to be a place where you can spend time. The streetscape which will have the mixed use buildings will have curved planters with rod iron fence to keep the plants in and the dogs out. There are quiet a bit of trees that will be able to be lit for the holidays. We also have transitions to the Metra. Parking here is screened and we have landscaped the front of the Metra building. Here is the turf area for now, that Larry mentioned, where a future train car will find a home. Lastly the very north part of the site, the pond and pond overlook (refers to drawing). The pond was quite a long time in being designed because we wanted to make sure we got this right. There are 4 different levels of vegetation in the pond, there are plants that are within the water, on the shore line there is native prairie wetland that wraps the entire pond, there are highlands that have upland trees so we wanted to make sure we had a diverse planting here not only for seasonal but to attract wild life. We wanted to make this kind of akin to what is across the tracks. The path here along the site turns more pedestrian here and there is railing, benches and the chance to see the overlook and a great place to hang out. There will be opportunities for 2 restaurants to be located directly on there (refers to pond drawing). One last piece is that there is an entry sign here "Welcome to Orland Village Center" which will be happening here (refers to drawing) so as you are coming south on LaGrange road you will definitely know that you have arrived. (Shows artist renderings). This is what the artist has done, looking south this is the restaurant that it right on LaGrange road. We're looking at concrete, iron railings and you can see the diversity of plantings here they are meant to not only tolerate the water but actually need that water to grow, everything from emergents to shoreline to upland prairie with either shrubs and trees and they are all meant to work with flooding that this will have as part of the basin. This is looking at the wall that runs from the tracks, we have takes what might have been a blank wall and actually made it kind of the focal point of the whole thing. There are a series of arches that are cast in and there are scuppers that will take water recycled from the pond and the water will fall out of the scuppers and into a basin and into the pond and recycle. So part of the water quality is to get that water to move, so we are doing everything we can to insure that the water quality within the pond is taken care of.

KUS: First of all some of the improvements you see here are already taking place on the site today. Second I would like to point out to the commission that the Preliminary landscape plans as described by Mr. Frigo currently exceeds the

Village standards set forth in the Village Center District. Once again we have created a landscape plan which is actually more than what the Village requires under its code. I'd like to introduce Mr. Russell who is our traffic consultant on the site.

RUSSELL: Our firm was retained by the Village to prepare a traffic impact study for the Main Street Triangle project but also to do an evaluation of the LaGrange road corridor. We had done the original traffic study for the Orland Park Crossing project and the intent of the corridor study is to ultimately obtain a traffic signal at the intersection of 142nd street and LaGrange road. Ultimately this traffic study would have a signal on Ravinia as well in the long range. As was mentioned LaGrange road and 143rd street are both under IDOT jurisdiction so any access to this property will be permitted by them and we have to adhere to their standards in doing so. Our study area for the project was as far north as 135th street, as far east as John Humphrey drive, as far south as 144th place and we went as far west as West Avenue to the west of Southwest Highway. As you may notice in our traffic study we included the original concept for this parcel, which was full development and included the corner property. The plan before you does not include that property. Initially access to this property is going to be limited. In the initial plan when this project first opens, you will see two entryways into the site one, from LaGrange road at 142nd street and one from 143d street, called A street on the plan – this is Ravinia Ave (refers to drawing). Both the entryways will be initially restricted to right in and right out movements only. Ultimately when LaGrange road is widened as planned there will be a third lane in each direction and double left turn lanes on 143rd street and double left turn lanes on 142nd street and the widening of 143rd street as well to a 4 lane roadway. At that time the road improvements will be in place so IDOT will permit full access to the intersection on 142nd street to serve both the Triangle and the Orland Park Crossing project. They will then permit a traffic signal at that location as well. IDOT is insisting the road capacity be in place prior to a signal being installed on 142nd street. The intersection of 143rd and LaGrange backs up at rush hours and LaGrange is under capacity to say the least. As a 4 lane roadway with the number of turn lanes it has there is trouble handling today's traffic volume. Improvements are needed on both 143rd and LaGrange road for the future. In addition to this access if this corner property becomes part of the development the long range plan is to provide access at 143rd and Ravinia and to signalize the intersection into the site. So you would have full access from both LaGrange road and 143rd Street. To talk a little bit about how we projected traffic for this development. Traffic is comprised of three components; there is the residential traffic, retail traffic and traffic associated with Metra. The residential traffic will be relatively moderate for this type of project, for a couple of reasons, we are projecting less than 100 vehicles will enter or exit during the rush hours, which works out to be about 1 or 2 cars a minute. Primarily based on the location of the residential next to the train station, a lot of the residents who will choose to purchase these units will be Metra riders and will take Metra and will not drive to work. Metra tells us the developments 30-40% of the working residents will take Metra. In our study we

only assumed 20% so our evaluation may be a little higher than what will actually be experienced. Retail traffic will be the highest generated for this project. But based on the location of 2 major arterials a lot of the patrons will be drawn from the traffic that is already on the roadway, we call it pass-by traffic. It is traffic that is currently passing by the site and will pull into the site to patronize the businesses and then continue on with their trip. So not everything generated by the retail traffic will be new traffic on the road system. But there will be some new traffic and some drawn off the existing traffic and some will live on the site and walk to the project. As a mixed use development there are certainly some traffic generation reductions that occur in this type of development. The last traffic generating component is the Metra. There are 2 components to that, there are those riders that will be dropped off and picked up, in which case cars are entering and exiting in a couple minute period, and there are those that will park and ride. There are several things that went into our projections; we have longer range boarding estimates that Metra provided to us for this station. There has been parking capacity, parking utilization numbers for the existing station that have been given to us and Metra has also made projections of what they expect the parking demand here to be in the future. They have done on-board surveys to determine how riders approach this site. Whether they are picked up, walk, take transit, park and ride and those breakdowns were provided to us. We know approximately how many trains stop at this station during the morning and afternoon rush hours. There is no weekend service. We know there are 2 trains during the peak hour alone. Consideration has also been give that most of Metra parking is going to be on the left side of the tracks, along Southwest Highway, over 400 spaces along there, as opposed to the 180 spaces on this site. All that taken into account we were able to develop a profile as to how much traffic might enter and exit this site during the morning and evening rush hours. LaGrange road is congested, the intersection of LaGrange and 143rd Street operates poorly today. It is at a level of E, but there are queues that extend north beyond the Southwest Highway overpass. 143rd street is congested as a 2 lane roadway as well. There are backups that occur at Southwest Highway and 143rd Street. These conditions are not going to get better until the roads are widened. The good thing with this project is with the limited right in and right out we will have a limited impact on making matters worse on the roadways. With out left turns in and out of the site there will not be delays caused by that. We don't see any substantial changes to the poor level of service you see at 143rd street and LaGrange Road. The widening is projected to start next year. The construction on LaGrange road will begin when the construction on Southwest Highway is completed and 159th and LaGrange road is completed. That is to minimize the overall construction impacts on the community. Construction getting underway to widen LaGrange road, at least along the frontage of this site is starting in 2008 a couple of years down the line being completed to coincide when this project starts to begin leasing. You'll see both of these entryways will, as they approach the Crescent itself, operate in a one way counter clockwise pattern around Crescent Park. There are different types of parking you will see along the internal driveways. There is not parking as you enter off of LaGrange road as you get more internal to the site and around

Crescent Park there is angled and parallel parking along the crescent itself and there is some perpendicular parking along A Street. There will be lots of internal parking on the internal roadways on the site. The internal intersections on the site will be controlled with mostly stop signs; they may not all be 4-way stops but there will be stop signs. There will be cross walks at all these internal intersections in an effort to calm traffic through the site and protect pedestrian traffic. Along the Crescent drive there is a lay-by area adjacent to the train station so people will be able to pull off. There is an area there for drop offs and pick-ups to occur and staging of vehicles as they wait for the train to arrive.

KUS: It is at this point that I would like ask for some guidance. We do have one more witness, Michael Mondo; engineer for the project from Spaceco. I would just like to remind the Commission that Related Midwest has already entered into and previously signed agreements with the Village to do much of the infrastructure that you see going on. Suffice to say that the proposed developments would be adequately served by utilities and roadways and parks. The proposed development is relatively modest as it will have about 304 developments on a nineteen acre site. Secondly the proposed development is constructing all of its own new streets and sewer system etc. Given that I would ask for your guidance and if you have any questions or would like any testimony from Mr. Mondo we will certainly be happy to present him. Again because of the previously entered design and agreements with the Village concerning the infrastructure and what not I do not know if the Commission would like to hear that testimony.

STEPHENS: With regards to the infrastructure that will not be necessary.

KUS: With that, that concludes our presentation for tonight. Again we are seeking approval for this master plan which shows the block layout and information regarding densities and other types of buildings that will be present on the site. As I mentioned at the opening, I believe this is a wonderful mixed use pedestrian friendly development. I think the testimony has shown that the care going into designing this development, everything was thought about including walk ability for pedestrians in terms of placements of buildings and in terms of visual impact from the surrounding area. You'll notice the lower residential buildings are located on the Southwest on 143rd Street. The retail is located along LaGrange road across from other retail to the east. The mixed use buildings are located to the center of the project so not to visually impact anybody. I would like to mention that the principals of the Village's Village Center area have been adhered to and we have basically exceeded the Village's guidelines. We respectfully ask for your approval tonight.

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

AUBIN: Swears in Juanita Gicius.

GICIUS: My parents live in historical Orland and I just have a question in regards to

some of the roadwork. They live on Beacon Avenue which is residential and a lot of antique shops and floral shops and so forth. The impact already from the trains has been incredible with the increase of scheduling and now with additional right turns in and the right turn exit, my concern is how much more traffic is going to head up Beacon Avenue now? Because there is already a huge increase and it is a very tight area as far as people cutting through there making a left hand turn off 143rd coming west down 143rd. It's just a concern as to how much more increased traffic there will be. And I would just like to comment that there isn't a lot of detail on the structure of the buildings that they are going to be putting in there. It appears to be more contemporary and I thought it was supposed to blend more with the Historical appearance of the area.

STEVENS: This petition tonight really doesn't have anything to do with the aesthetics of the buildings yet. That will come later. This is just a petition to create a subdivision of 10 lots. What we are being shown now is the concept and their basic ideas. We have not been given any exterior elevations at all.

GICIUS: My major concern is just the road, the traffic from the train station.

RUSSELL: Beacon Avenue is a local roadway just to the south here immediately east of the railroad tracks. My assumption is that is experiencing some overflow traffic probably from the construction of Southwest Highway as well as the congestion that occurs at the junction of Southwest Highway and 143rd Street. Beacon goes down and eventually over to West Avenue, which is north-south collector road. As I mentioned 143rd street is planned to widen to a 4 lane roadway, increasing the capacity and the completion of Southwest Highway will make a difference and allow traffic to flow better than it does today. I think then you will see far less cut through traffic than what you see using Beacon today. We are projecting a minimal size of traffic to likely use Beacon from this project under the improved condition of the roadway. Unless there is just local traffic using Beacon to get to their homes in that area.

STEPHENS: Did you understand his answer?

GICIUS: Yes, I did understand. But I do not agree with it. I think its more than an increase, it's not just due to southwest highway, its population growth. It's a new area that a lot of people have discovered to cut through, to bypass a lot of high traffic areas. I think this was definitely happening before the construction on Southwest Highway.

STEPHENS: If I may answer, I live on 108th Avenue. 108th Avenue is all closed off, so we now have to come to 143rd street to go west bound to get to 108th Avenue and then to go southbound. I am one of those people who cut through Beacon Street, because I can't get to my house any other way. A lot of us are doing that at this time, we have 108th Avenue torn up, we have Southwest Highway torn up, and we have 153rd Street torn up.

GICIUS: I think this problem existed before all this roadwork.

STEPHENS: I don't think it existed this bad, because this roadwork just started this spring. These roads are all shut down. The traffic on Wolf Road is horrendous because it backs up from 159th to 143rd.

GICIUS: I know because I live there and I worked at the former Andrew Corp., and my triangle of driving was very repetitive and I am not trying to make hassle... But this is a preexisting condition prior to the additional construction that is going on with the roadwork in the town. I am just concerned with the overflow.

STEPHENS: It always gets worse before it gets better. And it is going to start getting better as these streets start getting constructed wider. They are working on the intersection of 159th street now. They are working on 4 lanes going west bound on 143rd. 108th Avenue is now going to be three lanes. You will see LaGrange road running from 143rd north being widened as well. We are working on it.

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

DZIERWA: The problem may be able to be resolved with the Traffic Advisory Board, as they can put up numerous stop signs to slow the flow of traffic. If it is made hard to get through the neighborhood there will be less cut through. I have a question for Mr. Frigo. Could you tell me the height of the canopy on those trees that would circle the Crescent property?

FRIGO: The trees around the Crescent are going to be Callory Pears; they max out at 30-40 foot tall.

DZIERWA: Will the residence in the mixed use buildings have a view of the park as well? Those will begin on the 3rd floor, I believe.

FRIGO: Yes.

DZIERWA: As far as the density on the strictly residential piece up against 143rd street. Does anyone have an idea of what the density will be?

KUS: The density on 143rd will be 105 town homes.

DZIERWA: Street parking around Crescent Park. If I am a commuter and I do not want to park in the Metra lot for a dollar, I will just park on the street. Are we going to be able to regulate that?

PETERMAN: Yes, that is a public road. Those are reasonably regulated with parking meters or time limits of 2 or 3 hours at a time.

CULLIGAN: This is an exciting plan and I am glad we are able to start to see everyone's hard work. A lot of us in the Village have been waiting to see this project get going. Thank you this look very nice. I was surprised to see the amenities I am seeing tonight with the pond and the park and a lot of trees. It's good to see that it's not just all concrete.

THOMPSON: I have one question about the public amenities in the Crescent Park area. Does anyone know approximately how large that area is going to be?

PETERMAN: Yes. Roughly an acre and a half. Around 60,000 square feet.

PARISI: I am really excited about this; I think it is an incredibly thought out plan. It will be a welcome addition to the Village. My only concern would be traffic. Obviously the issue is that we don't have a time frame as to when the improvements will be done on LaGrange Road. With there being no access on Southwest Highway there is only 2 entrances in and out of the project and that could present a problem. But as the Chairman said earlier as they are needed the improvements will come. I hope we give time to study when the corner parcel could be developed and how that would affect the project.

JACOBS: Congratulations, very nice job. I am looking forward to the plan as it goes forward. Mr. Weldon, do you know how many square feet of retail?

WELDON: It's approximately 120,000 square feet of retail. In some areas there will be 2 level retail.

AUBIN: I concur with all my fellow commissioners this evening. I think since we are the 45th most livable city in the United States that we are long overdue for a marquee area. I can't wait to see the individual as we progress with the project.

STEPHENS: I think this is an extremely well conceived, well thought out, well planned project. I think that Orland Park needs a downtown area, as we do not really have one. This is going to give the Village of Orland Park an identity that it really needs. This project will become our downtown area. Sure we will have some traffic issues in the beginning, but as we see with what is going on in the Village right now we are addressing the traffic problems. I would think that as we go further with this project, we will likely resolve these problems in due time. I am very excited about the project. I think it is a project that has been long overdue.

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion from the Plan Commissioners.

A motion was made by Commissioner Nick Parisi, seconded by Commissioner Steve Dzierwa, that this matter be CONTINUED to the Plan Commission, due back on 5/22/2007. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

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

Nay: 0

2006-0536 Olympus Trail Subdivision

Andrzej L. Bednarczyk 1516 Magdalena Drive, Lemont, IL

HOFKINS: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated May 8, 2007 as presented.

AUBIN: Swore in (petitioners)

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

BEDNARCZYK: Ladies and Gentleman of the Plan Commission. I am so happy to face you today because this project has 3 years of history. Exactly 3 years ago I sought approval of a development of (inaudible) ...this parcel. I have notified the people 3 times with this, finally as I now hear I need final engineering approval. I am so happy because I to bring you this project and get some guidance for this. (Inaudible) It is very important to me because I start working with the staff. I did every time exactly what staff was asking me. And (as of) today I have changed this plan 17 times. Idea of this cluster was the staff idea. Staff recommended this to include in this plan. Today from comments I heard it is not following comprehensive plan. In my definition of comprehensive plan is neighborhood friendly. What could be friendlier than plan who is catching neighbor's attention and I have since I bought signs about public notice and sending letters. I have more than 2 dozen phone calls from people asking when your plan will be approved. We are interested to move to this maintenance free neighborhood. Because our purpose of the development was to make a maintenance free neighborhood. Couple years before my hearing there was hearing from people which are going to double up a gigantic project in town, they will create downtown this will be great. They are going to provide a 60,000 square foot park. On this 10 or 13 lot subdivision we have already more than 2 acres of open space. Open space because we want to preserve trees. We want to buffer this subdivision from neighborhood. It will not be eyesore. It will not affect neighbors. At same time we will preserve natural feature, because all of this northeast quadrant of project is designated at open space. I am so happy to face you, because during the course of these 3 years we went from option of (inaudible) for park donation, from homeowner's maintenance area that was requested by staff and when we did that every time was coming something new. First we propose wet bottom detention, because we want to combine area of detention with surrounding area even though it has big vertical drop, just to be creative. Create something like a gazebo on the water, something that could be usable for the people and for the kid's playground. Something that will preserve as much trees as possible. I agree

this site have a lot of trees especially because this place is a (inaudible) tree farm, and I don't understand why staff didn't mention that. Basically what is in this area is perimeter of surrounding property and everything in center is remainder of Christmas Tree. So is that big value to neighborhood? Usually at the end of the season everything us cut out and dig out and they are Christmas trees. We delivered to the staff a detailed tree survey and tree preservation survey. Yes there is a lot of green, but basically its green trash because it's other than 380 trees which are accountable on this project only 7 of them are worth preservation. Looking for condition and kind of species. Rest again everything is underbrush, very bad quality of trees or very bad condition of trees, which are of a species, no body likes it. Concentration of this big area of open space with dry bottom detention with surrounding, doesn't matter what it will be called; park, open space, common space, could create a very nice area that will bring to the site a good quality species. A good number of species that will be planted. Again today I am asking you to give me direction and recommendation because, this can not go any longer this way. Three years ago I began 17 submittals because of another concern and another concern. For me there is no concern. If there is no way to go with duplexes, again that affect a lot of neighbors which are empty nesters and they want to move to these new projects and they are asking when these will be available. If there is no way for cluster of single family homes, (inaudible). But I am asking to create something like this and after this I have negative comments. Thank you, If you have any question I will be glad to answer.

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

AUBIN: Swore in Virginia Eck, 14350 Mason Lane.

ECK: I abut this property. It is a beautiful piece of property. Beautiful oak trees, he has a gorgeous piece. I want to know is the 30 foot deed restricted open space to always stay? It goes around the perimeter of the property.

BEDNARCZYK: I assure neighbors that this area is not touchable. Doesn't matter, maintenance or cutting trees is not allowed.

ECK: Don't we have a rule that if you take a tree down it has to be replaced?

STEPHENS: Staff will answer that question. Mr. Bednarczyk please address the first question about the 30 foot deed restrictions.

BEDNARCZYK: Because first submittal of this subdivision was subdivision which was a park style development, which means 13 residential houses with (inaudible) everything other than that was common space. When I proposed this staff request what would happen out of permitted of house if someone wanted to build deck? Because of this subdivision covenants and restrictions could regulate this, owner would take care of this (inaudible) the next step was maybe similar style lots around cul-de-sac and these three duplexes because duplexes will be common

alignment as open space. I propose to assure general public neighbors about our intention to protect as much trees as possible we could create this restricted buffer around subdivision, especially because, nice oak trees are mostly located on the east property line basically from south to north. Staff was enthusiastic of this concept. I was shocked when I read comments from Staff in the report, that these deed restricted open space creates questions. By trade I am developer, a civil engineer, we have hundred lots under development, everything is that size. From 6 to 25, biggest subdivision is 25. The restricted open space was guarantee for owners, for neighbors, for years to come these will be a guaranteed untouchable area. Best solution is to develop open space. This was with subdivision that property is protected forever.

STEPHENS: Directed staff to answer question regarding tree replacements.

HOFKENS: We do have tree preservation mitigation as part of our code that would be required to be followed in this case. Currently we require the tree survey to be submitted at the beginning, which he did. The mitigation plan comes when the landscape plan is submitted, which is usually after final engineering approval. But all of those codes would have to be fulfilled.

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

PARISI: I am a bit confused, there are 5 plans in front of me and I don't really understand what the petitioner is seeking from us tonight. I see that there are a number of issues on this and our options on this are 1, to continue it until something can be worked out, because the number of exceptions on this is kind of overwhelming. It seems to me the continuance or a denial. My comments are to work with staff to come up with something that is recommendable to us.

AUBIN: I am not confused but I have a pretty good idea that with this plan we have in front of us that has no preliminary engineering, does not meet the comprehensive plan, and the duplex situation. Then looking at the number of times that the petitioner has come to the Village to develop this piece. The question is obvious; Is the piece developable?

HOFKENS: Yes it is developable and can be developed to our codes. I think I sited in the report some other successful developments in the Village have used more of a cluster. In this case it would have to be a cluster with single family homes. There is topography and there are trees but this is by no means an parcel that cannot be developed.

AUBIN: Our petitioner would have to go back to the drawing board again and submit something that would be more in line with what our Village wants for this piece.

JACOBS: It is a beautiful piece of property. Going through staff report I do

believe that this plan is not ready for any approval. Since it doesn't meet so many code issues and I think that it really needs to be reworked.

THOMPSON: I concur with my fellow commissioners. We need to do some work here, rework your plan a little.

CULLIGAN: Just 2 quick clarifications on the front. Under purpose it should be 13 residential units, and on page 3 second paragraph; detention area is at the northeast corner of the site. In looking at the petition and using the comprehensive plan for detached single family residential and maximizing the use for the net profit of you, the developer.

CULLIGAN: What I see looking here is lot 8, the duplex area. Currently the length is 162 at the minimum, along 143rd street.

BEDNARCZYK: Yes.

CULLIGAN: As you go a little farther south, due to the Olympus Trail curve it gets a little bit longer at that point. Its 240 feet wide, correct?

BEDNARCZYK: Yes.

CULLIGAN: As the road is right now is it possible that there could be 3 80 foot wide single family detached homes in that area.

BEDNARCZYK: Yes.

CULLIGAN: Obviously the first one to the north would be 80 by 162 ½ and the furthest one to the south would be 80 by, lets guess, 190 or around there. There is just one start because of the curve of Olympus Trail. That would eliminate the need for a Cul-de-sac there and we would be able to pick up three driveways, we would not have a Cul-de-sac there.

BEDNARCZYK: Yes.

CULLIGAN: Number 4 on my list is that if we were to leave this as is, it sounds like some of the detention area needs to be enlarged; the park area needs to be enlarged. I think the possibility that all or some of lot 1 could be removed. If all of lot 1 is not needed to increase the detention area or the park area then some of the rest of lot 1 could be distributed between lots 2 and 7 which would be 9 residential units on a 2.9 build able area. Correct?

BEDNARCZYK: No. This detention area part is sufficient by calculations by Engineer, and he never questioned size. My point is, and there is bigger concern and I can not get an answer for so long; Number 1, if we could use graphic design for landscaping and create wet bottom detention or not. If we can not use wet bottom detention we will of course will create another part of grass during dry

weather and nothing pleasant to watch. I don't need nine foot retaining wall which rise (inaudible) for stuff. I could use 4 feet berm and I am fine. But comparing apple to apple using this land to create something which will be beauty for neighborhood or we can create something that nobody will use and probably of course the department will complain they will have to maintenance. I was so surprised by previous presentation when they have wet bottom detention and there is no problem with 10 feet maintenance spot. There was no maintenance problems for everybody. We propose and I would like, since we are talking, clarification. I propose and I very strongly suggest to allow homeowners maintenance in this area and combined detention or retention basin together with park to blend together beauty of this piece of land. This is only piece of land which is steep the rest of area, $\frac{3}{4}$ of project is flat. There could be very nice graphic landscaping so even people that drive on 143rd street would have something to look. For 3 years there is no answer. Public work maintenance or private maintenance? Open space or Park? Wet detention or regular dry detention?

CULLIGAN: I know you have been going back and forth with this for some years and the reason I was talking about the removal of some or all of 1 was because I thought that I understood from this reading in the report that the size of the detention was not correct.

BEDNARCZYK: We have enough size for detention, enough size for park, but if it were necessary we would go with nine lot residential subdivision. I will do that right away because I am already tired. As you could see on my submittal your suggestion about this corner was in year of 2005. (Inaudible) sent permit the neighbor for the meeting. After that was coming closer of park style development. Open lands will enhance the beauty. Believe me that my thought was that today we would start recommendation to go, no duplexes, we got single family and everything is approve. And it looks like I am wrong again.

CULLIGAN: I appreciate all your comments because I can understand that you have been going through this for a few years, however staff has a report here too so I would like to comment on some of today's items. I was going to talk a little more about that detention area because you have the brick walls and it doesn't appear that you have enough flat area for maintenance there. Are you saying that you don't need the 9 foot walls, because that is on your proposal?

BEDNARCZYK: Again, that is for wet bottom detention. If I go for dry bottom detention I don't need (inaudible) because I could use typical berm. To create berm I would have to raise ground about 4 feet and that is it. But again you are comparing apple to apple something like that verses wet bottom detention with gazebo, maybe with fountain, maybe with path for biking around. This is dry bottom and I don't know what to do about it. Why you are doing that? Special because we are next to almost 3 acres of wetlands, which is natural detention. What is the reason for doing that?

CULLIGAN: If we need to we can have our engineer comment on some of this. Maybe we can talk about those discrepancies in the size from the report. Let me go to a different area. We have talked about 3 individual homes in lot 8, we have talked about the possibility of the removal of lot 1 and to increase those areas. May or may not it is all engineering. Another idea is that if Olympus trail was shifted a little bit to the left, you would cut down the length of lots which are 162 ½ minimum and it would be a little sharper corner as you come up to seven and the detention area could be increased a little to the left and the park area, and maybe lot 1 could stay also. That is just something to keep on the table. Let me address my concern with the drainage. As you know, obviously there is a drainage issue with Olympus Trail hitting it at 143rd, obviously you know you have to meet codes, but what I would like to know is what are your plans to provide enough drainage there so that all that spill off is not going into that street and causing a problem, especially in the winter. Correct?

BEDNARCZYK: Yes.

CULLIGAN: Do you know what your size is on the proposed bulb in the cul-de-sac? Is it a 90 foot... ?

BEDNARCZYK: I believe it is 90.

CULLIGAN: Ok that is good. And there will be sidewalks along Olympus Trail and along 143rd..

BEDNARCZYK: Yes.

CULLIGAN: Going back to behind lot 4 the homeowners to the south of your property. Will there be some kind of drain tile back there to ease off some of the water runoff? There is quite a difference in grades.

BEDNARCZYK: Maybe it's not visible clearly in this submittal. (inaudible) is generally designed to take care of trees, so we don't have to have anything going around the property. We are going from drainage pond to the street. Just to avoid situations we will go with trench and we will cut off (inaudible). This way we have restricted 100% of land which we have with preserving maximum trees as possible. Because otherwise all these trees in this spot are only water preservation trees. If we go with trench work we will cut the roots and the tree will die. So what is the reason to make deed restricted open space if everything will be dead in one or two years?

CULLIGAN: Thank you for that. Thank you for answering my questions. At this point we do not have any preliminary engineering. So at this time I am asking my fellow commissioners to consider if we will see this to be a continuance or not. I think that maybe a continuance would be a good idea at this point.

DZIERWA: Thank you for taking the time to more than adequately address the

special use with your answers. I kind of like what I see here. If I had one thing I might eliminate, I might eliminate one town home, that E-F town home. You are looking at the back of a building when you pull in. I could see where it works with a court yard area there in the center and they face each other. As far as the preliminary engineering plan, this was returned to you and everything that is highlighted in grey, which are issues, have these been addressed and you just disagree?

BEDNARCZYK: I did not disagree because 3 years ago when we first meet with Mr. Sullivan I said I need certain stuff to start this project and want approval as soon as possible. I had no support and basically I have chose to meet with (inaudible) and meet with the development department because this project was assigned with at least 5 different persons. Maybe that is good for future, we'll see. But coming back I don't have issue of 2 duplexes or 3 duplexes I have no issue with duplex at all. If I would have recommendation, go and change it to single family maybe these people who are telling me leave duplex. You are living in neighborhood and you know what are pricing for new housing in Orland Park. How people are going to retirement are going to afford that kind of development. With that recommendation on this site is good for 16 lots. There will be no price for \$250,000 per lot, price will be more than \$300,000. If they are 4 times that price who is going from a town home to 1.5 million dollar home? Are we following comprehensive plan or are we against comprehensive plan?

STEPHENS: Hold on. We don't need to get into a discussion about values or things like that. We need to just focus on what we have in front of us. You are talking about who can afford a million dollar house, that is not part of this discussion. What we are discussing is the plan we have in front of us. That is what we are going to stay on.

DZIERWA: I guess I am having a problem with how many people you said you have worked with on this project?

BEDNARCZYK: At least five.

STEPHENS: That has nothing to do with this plan. We need to look at what is in front of us right now. We are getting into a discussion that doesn't belong here.

STEPHENS: Why is there a 30 foot deed restricted area? I think the only reason is that you are putting a 30 foot deed restricted area is because you are trying to make a compliance with a major special use requirement. I have a problem with that 30 foot deed restricted area and I'll tell you why. I scaled these off. You have 7 single family lots here. Three lots are ok with a backyard. Backing up to that deed restricted area 4 lots have no backyard. Your lot number 1 has a 50 foot backyard that is ok. Lot 2 has a 5 foot backyard and then you put around a the back of it a wall. How is somebody going to do anything with the backyard of that piece of property? I don't know. It is a comment. Lot number 3 you have 8 feet on

one side and 35 feet on the other. That is an unusable back yard. On Lot 4 you have 4 feet, a four foot back yard and if you build that house all the way back to the line you may not even be able to get steps to get out of the patio door to go out to the back yard, because you can't build on that deed restricted area. Lot 5 has 35 feet, that lot is ok. Lot 6 you have 3 feet. Three feet to the deed restricted area you can't put anything in that backyard. Lot 7 you have 30 feet you can put something back there. If you put this in the covenants there is no way that these covenants can be enforced by the Village. And how are you going to sell lots that have no back yard? The only reason I see that you put in this 30 foot deed restricted area is so that you can try to make compliance with the comprehensive plan for the major special use permit so you can get a R3 PUD. that is one thing. The other thing, there is no room for your detention maintenance. you have provided nothing to maintain a detention area. Your free board levels and calculations have great deals of discrepancies. Your density units per acre under R3 PUD should be 2.5; you are showing it at 2.9. You are over your density units per acre. The size and shape of your detention pond does not meet the Village Code. The 9 foot wall height you are proposing in the northeast corner is not in compliance with Village Code. You have an L shaped lot 10, how do you propose to put playground equipment in that park area? You have from the street to that big wall that you have in front of your detention area you have a 7 foot slope. You go from an elevation of 715 to 708. I don't know what it will be used for except a toboggan slide. You can't put any park in there. An L shaped park doesn't work in this community. I will continue. Your plan does not even show any lots sizes, we can't even go forward with this. You don't show 143rd street sidewalk you have no multifamily building elevations. The permitted use in the comprehensive plan is R3. You are trying to go for a major special use for an R3 PUD and you do not comply. The entire plan is not in compliance with Village Code. You sent up prior engineering, you show on 3 of these Olympus Trail coming in off of 143rd street winding around and dead ending into the back of somebody else's lot. We do not do that here. Our obligation here tonight is not to redesign your plan. My suggestion to you is that you must create a plan that complies with the development Codes and this one doesn't. You must adhere to the R3 development codes. that is what the comprehensive plan says that is what we can approve. I can go no further with this, I don't agree with plan and I don't like it. It is not in compliance.

At this time we will entertain a motion.

I move to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission the findings of fact set forth in this staff report, dated May 8, 2007,

and

I move to continue file number, 2006-0536, Olympus Trails, in order for the petitioner to revise the site plan to meet the Village's Codes and Comprehensive plan;

OR

I move to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission the findings of fact set forth in this staff report, dated May 8, 2007,

and

I move to recommend to the Village Board denial of the preliminary site plan titled "Preliminary plan of Olympus Trail R-3 PUD Subdivision," prepared by Geopool and Park Development, project number 03348, dated 11-08-03, most recent revision 03/22/07,

and

I move to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission the findings of fact set forth in this staff report, dated May 8, 2007,

I move to recommend to the Village Board denial of a Special Use Permit for Planned Development subject to the same conditions as highlighted in the preliminary site plan motion;

and

I move to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission the findings of fact set forth in this staff report, dated May 8, 2007,

I move to recommend to the Village Board denial of a Subdivision of the 5.49 acre parcel into 10 lots, as shown on the preliminary site plan titled "Preliminary plan of Olympus Trail R-3 PUD Subdivision," prepared by Geopool and Park Development, project number 03348, dated 11-08-03, most recent revision 03/22/07, sheet 1 of 1, subject to the same conditions highlighted in the preliminary site plan motion;

and

I move to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission the findings of fact set forth in this staff report, dated May 8, 2007,

I move to recommend to the Village Board denial of a rezoning upon annexation from E-1 Estate residential to R-3 Residential District.

A motion was made by Commissioner Paul Aubin, seconded by Commissioner Patricia Thompson, that this matter be RECOMMENDED FOR DENIAL to the Planning and Economic Development Committee, due back on 6/11/2007. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:

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

Nay: 1 - Commissioner Culligan

2007-0034 Toures Car Wash

Basil Toures, Owner & Developer

JoAnn Toures,

Todd Abrams, WT civil Engineering, 2675 Pratum Ave, Hoffman Estates

Jim Sotiros, GEA architects, Inc, 555 East Butterfield Road, Lombard

HOFKINS: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated May 8, 2007 as presented. With one exception, IDOT did not request a right of way here based on the improvements of the road.

AUBIN: Swore in (petitioners)

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

TOURES: I am the developer and I will be the owner operator of the car wash. I am a 30 year resident of the Village and I live with-in a mile of it. Our goal in buying this property 13 years ago was to someday put up our dream business and being that we reside there we want to put up something that is nice. We will run a first class operation.

We will be happy to answer any questions.

ABRAMS: As the staff already discussed the main goal is to construct a 5600 square foot tunnel car wash, automated, with detail center. The project consists of 2 phases that may co-exist at the same time. One of the large phases is the construction of the left southbound turning lane on Southwest Highway into the full access. In order to create this turn lane we had to widen Southwest Highway and actually to put in this full access we will have to put in a culvert in the existing flood plain. These improvements were required by IDOT.

STEPHENS: Are they acceleration and deceleration lanes?

ABRAMS: Actually it is just a deceleration lane for the southbound left turn lane. The right, northbound lane is just a standard lane with no deceleration. IDOT felt that there was no need for a deceleration lane...

STEPHENS: So you are adding just a lane for a left turn?

ABRAMS: Correct. Also there would be some difficulties with actually constructing a deceleration right turn lane due to the close proximity of the

drainage ditch, which is a tributary to Mill Creek.

STEPHENS: With that southbound left turn lane, IDOT is requiring you take the water into your detention area?

ABRAMS: That is something that was also brought up by staff. They aren't actually requiring it, but the code in Orland Park actually states that when you do public roadway improvements you have to provide detention for added impervious area, meaning added roadway. This is a little bit of a unique case because; our site is actually higher than the roadway. So we are actually counting for this additional area in our detention calculations and in our detention pond. However since the roadway is actually lower than the detention pond the water from Southwest Highway will not be routed into the detention pond. Internal circulation is this way (points to drawings). The detention pond is on the north side of the property, it will be a bottom detention pond. We do have some large retaining walls due to the skinny property. And the IDOT setback is basically 20 feet from the right-of-way line. That is a standard practice that they will not give a variance for. So we are pretty much landlocked on both sides and in order to meet the stringent detention requirements we will have to provide those high retaining walls.

SOTIROS: The car wash is basically a tunnel car wash and its basic theme is that the longer you keep a car in the facility the more time it has with a soap-less activator. So that is the reason for the length of the building. It's a little longer than a normal car wash, but it is a non-touch. The occupant would not leave his car. There is queuing for 21 cars to come around and pay at 2 different carousels and there is an exit way out here if they so desire to leave. If a car broke down or something you can escape the car wash area. Right now we are planning on a carwash and a 2 bay detailing shop. The garbage enclosure is right there (points to drawings). In terms of the elevations I believe I quoted on the plans that it is more of a CMU, there would be a split face base, a band of CMU, and it's a kind of look alike brick type product.

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

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

DZIERWA: I for a long time wondered what was going to happen to this site, and I really think something like this could work here.

CULLIGAN: I wanted to first of all say that staff's report and the information what was provided to us in this packet was terrific, it was very well done on everyone's part. A couple of things that I think could come up as you go through the process. One is that you are going to need to minimize the noise and lighting from the car wash. I think the rear elevations although somewhat bland will be fine here because, you have a fence and the tracks, so there is no need; in my opinion, to

decorate it at all. Obviously any rooftop type of units will have to be screened. It looks like you did a very good job, but let me say; please try and appropriately sign your direction of your traffic and also on the pavement; this may be a key issue. I have done a lot of work near rail road tracks and I know you have to speak to them and keep in touch with them as you are working in that area. Part of one of the recommendations we have in Staff's report, and they are very serious about that due to compaction and those issues.

THOMPSON: In looking over your plan, how high is your retention wall going to be?

ABRAMS: It will be 9 feet at the worst case.

THOMPSON: ...and made out of?

ABRAMS: Probably a Unilock type stone wall, probably a foot thick. The reason it is larger than a typical landscape block because we don't have the distance on the east of the retaining wall to put in geogrid, so it'll probably be an interlocking wall that will sustain itself.

PARISI: I have no questions.

JACOBS: In the natural features of the staff report there is mention of a stream bed, what happens to this stream bed?

ABRAMS: The stream bed actually runs to the IDOT right-of-way right now. One of the largest obstacles is to determine how high that stream gets during a high rainfall intensity. That being said the culvert being installed below this driveway will be sized to convey that storm with out creating any impact up stream. Essentially the stream will continue flowing northeasterly and will run below this driveway in a fairly large culvert and will continue running northeasterly under 135th street.

JACOBS: What happens if you don't get approval from IDOT and the rail road?

ABRAMS: If we don't get approval from the railroad, worse case scenario is that we have to create some kind of shoring off our property to install the retaining wall. I don't anticipate too many more issues with IDOT than we have already been through. The original idea for this project was actually to get approval from IDOT, construct the roadway improvements, then due the site development. However, IDOT didn't allow us to do that. We are down to some additional hydraulic comments, but they are definitely achievable.

JACOBS: It also states in the report that the fire district has a concern that the entrance does not provide enough room for a fire truck to enter and turn around. We are always very cautious when it comes to public safety issues. Have you

had that conversation with the fire department?

ABRAMS: We actually didn't create a fire truck circulation, yet we have done garbage truck circulations which very easily make it into the site. We have also done box truck circulations and this access allows a northbound or southbound fire truck to get into the site. The truck can actually drive in and cross over into this lane to make it into the property. It is my professional opinion that there is definitely enough room; we can provide circulations the actual Orland Park fire trucks if necessary.

AUBIN: I would just like to ask the petitioner if he has read the conditions that you need to meet to have this project go through. There is going to be at least 7 of them. In regards to the fence, and getting permission from Norfolk Southern Railway to move on and there is no problem with that whatsoever?

TOURES: Yes.

STEPHENS: Staff brought up in the report, lot coverage; impervious verses pervious. You have 30.83 and it is not marked pervious, or impervious.

ABRAMS: That would be the impervious area, 34%, so that is 75% pervious. We are below the allowable.

STEPHENS: Please mark that on your plan. Also your elevation plan you have marked the proposed west elevation and you have marked C, the proposed west elevation. I am assuming C is the proposed East elevation.

ABRAMS: Yes.

STEPHENS: Please also correct that. There is no garbage enclosure on the plan? And no discussion of materials.

ABRAMS: Here on the drawing is the enclosure, and the materials will be the same material as the rest of the building.

STEPHENS: The east side you have talked about a wooden fence. Have you given any thought to a vinyl fence?

SOTIROS: There are 2 concerns. One there is a large rather natural kind of berm there which will be an added benefit to the fence. But we did look at bringing the fence over behind the building, but it might create a type of gangway or alley that would be rather hidden. In terms of...

STEPHENS: Wood fences, wind blows them around and they start looking shoddy and after a while they turn grey and look terrible.

TOURES: A vinyl fence would be fine.

STEPHENS: On your exterior elevation, on the west elevation you have a building that is 142 feet and you have a couple of windows and things but you have 57 feet that is just all solid brick. Can you put a brick or decorative accent in that area? It is an awful long expanse to have nothing on it.

SOTIROS: Sure false window or a stone treatment, or a window feature out masonry that looks like stone.

STEPHENS: Ok, just to break up that 57 foot wall. Going by looking at this site it is an awfully difficult site to develop. I believe what you have done here with this car wash fits very well on this site. I think your car wash is well conceived. In my opinion what you are trying to do is probably the highest and best use for an extremely difficult property to develop. I would much rather see it as the beautiful car wash you have designed rather than the weeds and garbage that it looks like right now. I think that this is a great improvement and I am very much in favor of this.

I move to continue the public hearing for file number 2007-0034, Toures Car Wash, to the May 8, 2007 Plan Commission

A motion was made by Commissioner Paul Aubin, seconded by Commissioner Patricia Thompson, that this matter be RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Planning and Economic Development Committee, due back on 6/11/2007. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

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

Nay: 0

2007-0186 Midwest Animal Hospital

John Coyne, owner of Midwest Animal Hospital,
Robert Edwards, Willowbrook, IL
Dennis Kulak, KLLM Architects, 1657 W Courtland, Chicago

PITTOS: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated May 8, 2007 as presented.

AUBIN: Swore in (petitioners)

EDWARDS: Staff did a wonderful job of presenting, what we have for you this evening. Basically it's a continuation of what we did a couple years ago. We had planned for the addition and we are just implementing that plan at this time.

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

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

JACOBS: Mr. Coyne, you are the veterinarian?

COYNE: Yes.

JACOBS: I am just a little confused. The footprint of the proposed addition does not match the footprint of the building.

EDWARDS: What's happening right now is, the plan is turned. The plan that you are seeing, proposed addition, if you turn it you'll see that that area becomes the square right there (points to drawing).

JACOBS: Ok. I see. It is an addition, but it uses some of the existing square footage.

It is a very nice looking building. You do a lot of boarding, I assume.

EDWARDS: Yes, we do. that is basically what we are doing. What is happening right now is that after 2 years the animal hospital has already had to turn boarders away. The idea is that we will increase the boarding capacity.

JACOBS: I just have one other comment. You talk about landscaping, foundation planting. I notice that the landscaping on the front of the building, which is the eastern exposure facing Wolf Road, looks like it could use a little sprucing up. It doesn't look like its being very well maintained.

EDWARDS: We will take that into consideration, and we will have to get on that.

PARISI: I think it follows the design of the existing building and more importantly it looks like a nice and needed facility.

THOMPSON: Mr. Coyne, I had a wonderful tour today. Fabulous facility, and I think your addition is going to be just as nice as the rest of your facility. I look forward to seeing it done.

DZIERWA: The petitioner is not asking for anything extra that was not approved a few years ago, so I don't have any issues with this.

STEPHENS: I think your existing building is a beautiful building and I think your addition will be just as nice as the building you have already.

At this time we will entertain a motion.

I move to continue file number 2007-0186, Midwest Animal Hospital, to the May 8, 2007 Plan Commissio

A motion was made by Commissioner Mike Culligan, seconded by Commissioner Steve Dzierwa, that this matter be RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Planning and Economic Development Committee, due back on 6/11/2007. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

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

Nay: 0

2007-0188 Glen Oaks Lots 7 & 8 Lot Consolidation

Ray Dignan, Petitioner, 10703 Valley Court, Orland Park

TURLEY: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated May 8, 2007 as presented.

AUBIN: Swore in (petitioners)

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

DIGNAN: As Jane mentioned I did meet with the staff and I concur with her report and recommendation the staff would like for lots 7 & 8.

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

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

CULLIGAN: This petition is part of a project that has been going on for a while and it's a quality project. The buildings are constructed well and the vehicular traffic is done quite well there so I have no problems with this petition at all.

DZIERWA: Everything works here except for some parking spaces. On building A, I am seeing parking spaces that are only 16' 6" long. By building B I am seeing spaces that are 17' 6" long. If this is ok with staff, but I just noticed that they should all be 18', right?

DIGNAN: It concurs with the development code. In some cases if you have a 2' overhang you can go with a shorter area of parking.

DZIERWA: Will that apply on building B, basically they are facing buildings A & C, will those parking spots work at 16' or 17' or should they be 18'?

DIGNAN: They can be at that dimension because there is a 7' wide sidewalk.

STEPHENS: At this time we will entertain a motion.

I move to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission the findings of fact set

forth in this staff report, dated May 8, 2007

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of a special use permit for Lots 7 and 8 in the Glen Oaks Industrial Park in order to allow for a Planned Development with three buildings on one lot and to allow a modification to permit parking facilities within the front yard setback.

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of a Subdivision (two-lot consolidation) that is consistent with the Preliminary Site Plan entitled, Glen Oaks Industrial Park Professional Offices Proposed Site Plan and dated April 20, 2007, File Lot 7-8.

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of a Preliminary Site Plan entitled Glen Oaks Industrial Park Professional Offices Proposed Site Plan and dated April 20, 2007, File Lot 7-8 with the following conditions:

1. That Lots 7 & 8 are consolidated into one lot and that the lot lines are removed from the plan to reflect this consolidation.
2. That Building A is shifted back approximately 3' to allow a minimum 10' foundation planting in front of the building. (Land development Code Section VI-305-15)
3. All parking lot islands are a minimum of 10' in width per code requirement.
4. That the petitioner submits a subdivision plan with the lot consolidation that includes the cross-access easement to the lot to the north, and submits a Record Plat of Subdivision to the Village for recording this subdivision.
5. That a bike rack is added near front building entrances and is shown on the Site Plan;
6. That an outdoor seating / picnic area with landscaping is provided for employees at some location in the shared open space around the buildings.
7. That all final engineering related items are met;
8. That an erosion control plan is submitted for approval.

9. That a Final Landscape Plan including parkway trees is submitted for approval within 60 days of final engineering approval.

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of proposed Building Elevations entitled Glen Oaks Industrial Park Office center Buildings A B & C Lots 7 & 8 and received April 23, 2007.

1. That all utilities exposed on the wall, or units on the ground, are screened with evergreen shrubbery or brick wall.
2. That the primary body of the building on the elevations is labeled as brick construction.
3. That the dumpsters are constructed of brick and the dumpster elevations are included with the Building Elevations.

Note: This approval is subject to meeting Building Code related items. Sign permits will be required for all signage.

This case will go before the Community Development/Building Committee for review prior to being sent to the Board of Trustees for final review/approval.

A motion was made by Commissioner Mike Culligan, seconded by Commissioner Nick Parisi, that this matter be RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Planning and Economic Development Committee, due back on 6/11/2007. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

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

Nay: 0

2007-0271 Comprehensive Plan Amendmen

TURLEY: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated April 24, 2007 as presented.

AUBIN: Wouldn't the Open Lands group be someone you would want to work with. That would be consistent with (inaudible) for their input and feedback.

TURLEY: Absolutely, we will take advantage of all the efforts that have been put forth so far in this direction. We don't want to start over or invent something on our own; we want it to be with input from others in the community. We presented them with an early draft and we will continue to work with them. Some of the opening vision statement that speaks about, open space as infrastructure was one of the basic concepts of the Open Lands report. We want to include that in our vision.

SULLIVAN: On a daily basis the commission considers things like setbacks from

creeks and flood plains, and detention in a residential area. If it is private and those detentions are reduced that is no longer accessible to the public and the green areas reduced. Those are the kinds of concepts too as we look at each plan, that would fit into what Jane is talking about. We can all try to enforce the codes and make sure these areas are big enough for the public so that it adds to the quality of life.

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

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

DZIERWA: Reading your report, it talks about utilities, developed utility right – of - ways such as ComEd for bike ways and trails. We have tried that in the past and we have had some opposition to it.

SULLIVAN: The bike plan is an approved part of the comprehensive plan so the Village Board has already had the public hearing and we can move ahead on those routes. Which includes the ComEd right – of – way.

STEPHENS: At this time we will entertain a motion.

A motion was made by Commissioner Steve Dzierwa, seconded by Commissioner Patricia Thompson, that this matter be CONTINUED to the Plan Commission, due back on 5/22/2007. 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

2007-0220 Longhorn Steakhouse

Brett Mashchak, Rare Hospitality International, 8215 Roswell Rd, Atlanta, Georgia

HOFKINS: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated May 8, 2007 as presented.

MASHCHAK: I'd like to thank staff; we have been working with them for some time on this. This goes back to 2005; we have been trying to work with the developer to get into this site. It has taken us a while but we are happy to be here. The 2 main things that Kim stated, we will work with staff on, but we do have difficulties on. Clerestory windows being one of them. If you notice on the facades, the rear (east elevation), the main one we are discussing, majority of the back left wall is going to be part of the freezer area. Basically from the door in the middle to the far right of that elevation is all going to be all freezer area. That is an

indoor totally built freezer area, it will have walls and insulation. On the left hand side of that is going to be the restroom, which the ceiling height will be 8 to 9 feet and any kind of window in there I don't feel we would want to have, simply because its easy for someone to get to that height on those elevations. The side windows and elevations we will be willing to work with them, knowing that ceiling elevations are only going to be about 9 foot so any windows that we added, clerestory, would only be below the awning heights along those windows. The only other thing I want to address is pedestrian access that too we are willing to work with. But currently we are 15 spots below our standards for our development sites; we lost five when we went up to the green space requirements. We will work with staff to see how we can possibly get some more green space and the access to 94th avenue, maintaining our parking spots or close to it.

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

THOMPSON: I went on your website and unfortunately your website doesn't show any of your buildings. Is this a pretty standard building for Longhorn?

MASHCHAK: This is actually an upgrade building. If you look at the rear elevation, the east elevation, we have incorporated the entryway to reflect that through there, that is an added feature here that isn't typically on our buildings. The faux windows in the back are not typically on our building nor is the brick water table on the back of the building. That is all added for this...

THOMPSON: I like the look of the fireplace which is, I believe, a veneer if I read that correctly. You have little insets in the front. I am wondering if you could take that brick and put it in here to give it a little more...

MASHCHAK: That is going to be stone there.

THOMPSON: Can you put some of that veneer in there, it starts to look like a big box building again.

MASHCHAK: In that the problem becomes that sometimes the veneer is actually thicker than the brick. In lies the issues of trying to get the stone in there with the brick. I am more than happy to work with staff to possibly get another brick color in there to accentuate that brick bump out, to make it stand out more. We have done that on other sites.

STEPHENS: What is that, just a row lock you have above those windows?

MASHCHAK: Yes, it's just a row lock. It's like an inch.

STEPHENS: Is this a fake stone?

MASHCHAK: Yes it is.

STEPHENS: This fake stone is only about, what, 2 inches deep?

MASHCHAK: Its about 4 inches.

STEPHENS: Four inches and your brick course is coming out 4 inches.

MASHCHAK: That "bump out" is actually inset. It's an inset into the brick.

STEPHENS: How far?

MASHCHAK: That I could not tell you off the top of my head.

STEPHENS: So you may be able to take the brick out and put stone in there.

MASHCHAK: It's possible, but it would depend on how it would look. I have never seen elevations with that on there.

STEPHENS: So commissioner Thompson you are talking about carrying those stone accents into the insets on the different sides of the building?

THOMPSON: Exactly.

STEPHENS: I think that is a good approach. Don't you agree?

MASHCHAK: I can tell you as a person who has done this all over the US in many different locations I will not be able to sell that to my president, that concept.

STEPHENS: You mean its taken you this long, since 2005, to get that location and a couple pieces of stone is going to kill the deal.

MASHCHAK: I am just telling you the difficulties I am facing.

AUBIN: You mentioned twice that you'd be willing to work with staff in regards to the building elevations and that you'd be willing to work with staff in regards to the parking lot strategy that provides a pedestrian path, if I heard you correctly.

MASHCHAK: that is correct.

AUBIN: Those are two of the conditions that are part of this motion to move this project forward. So I think if the petitioner would be willing to work with staff to revise the building elevations and make them look better, and he is has also said he would work with staff to make a parking lot strategy that provides a pedestrian path.

DZIERWA: It is hard to tell them how we would like them to look when they want to

be recognized all over the country, but if we make little changes here and there it is what they are willing to work with. But I think we should stick to our guns with regards to the pedestrian walkway, loose the 5 parking spaces and I think you should try to sell that to corporate.

PARISI: I agree with Commissioner Dzierwa.

STEPHENS: I agree with Commissioner Aubin and Commissioner Thompson about the building elevations. I think you are going to have to do something so you can at least get in compliance with the codes. If you can't sell it you can't sell it.

MASHCHAK: As I said I am willing to work with staff to change some elevations, I am not sure, but I know there is a code for 4-sided architecture, I know there is not a code for material requirements we are willing to work with them to use whatever we can, because as you know I have to sell it to corporate also.

STEPHENS: I think you are a good salesman.
At this time we will entertain a motion.

I move to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission the findings of fact set forth in this staff report, dated May 8, 2007

and

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of the preliminary site plan titled "Site Improvement Plan", prepared by WD Partners, project number RHILH1153, dated 05/02/07, sheet number C1 and building elevations titled "Exterior Elevations" and "Exterior Elevations", prepared by WD Partners, dated 05/02/07, sheet numbers A8 and A9 subject to the following conditions:

1. That the petitioner work with staff to revise building elevations before the Committee meeting;
2. That the petitioner adds a bicycle rack/stand to their site plan;
3. That the petitioner submits a completed landscape plan for approval within 60 days of Final Engineering approval, and;
4. That the petitioner work with staff to devise a parking lot strategy-- that provides a pedestrian path in place of 5 parking spaces-- for the safe crossing of pedestrians through the parking lot.

A motion was made by Commissioner Paul Aubin, seconded by Commissioner Patricia Thompson, that this matter be RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Planning and Economic Development Committee, due back on 6/11/2007. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

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

Nay: 0

OTHER BUSINESS

STEPHENS: Invited the Commissioners to bring forward other business and received no other business.

Invited Staff to address other business.

SULLIVAN: Mr. Chairman I would just like to mention that in one particular case tonight there were a lot of statements that were made by a petitioner that really went unanswered and many of his statements went unanswered and we didn't want to get into a public debate. I don't want to get into any specifics here now because he is not here to defend himself, but we wanted to emphasize that we do try to work with petitioners on a regular basis. You have seen tonight, and on many other cases everybody else seems to work with staff pretty well. Once in a while we have some problems; in fact we have here tonight our Village engineer Kevin, and our Consulting Engineer Travis. In cases like that maybe it would be a good idea to call on them to get a summary of the issues in a particular case, without getting into a debate. They are here to provide you with a little bit of a background on what has happened or is happening. Rather than allowing the petitioner to just go on about whatever.

STEPHENS: Well, Mr. Sullivan that is why I cut him off. I had decided at that point that I had heard enough and the ramblings on that I heard really did not pertain to what he was presenting. His reasoning's did not make logical sense to me and I though I'd stop it right there, and move forward with a motion because I did not feel we needed to have a public debate about it or what our staff does. I think our staff did a wonderful job with him.

SULLIVAN: Thank you.

AUBIN: I asked a question about being undevelopable. Which he said it was(developable). But the point I was trying to bring forth is that he was not cooperating in any way, shape or form with you. If you said it was developable and gave him suggestions he obviously didn't look at your suggestions. He wanted to go his own way. That is why we made the motion to deny him across the board.

STEPHENS: There being no other comments we will adjourn.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Plan Commission for discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 10:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda White
Recording Secretary