VILLAGE OF ORLAND PARK

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

Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, November 11, 2014

7:00 PM

Village Hall

Plan Commission

Louis Stephens, Chairman
Commissioners: Judith Jacobs, Paul Aubin, Steve Dzierwa, Nick Parisi, John J. Paul and Laura Murphy

CALLED TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

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

Present: 6 - Chairman Stephens; Member Jacobs; Member Aubin; Member Dzierwa; Member Parisi, Member Paul

Absent: 1 - Member Murphy

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2014-0277 Minutes of the December 9, 2014 Plan Commission Meeting

A motion was made by Commissioner Dzierwa, seconded by Commissioner Aubin; to approve the minutes of the October 14, 2014 Plan Commission.
APPROVED

Aye: 5 - Chairman Stephens, Member Jacobs, Member Aubin, Member Dzierwa and Member Paul

Nay: 0

Absent: 2 - Member Parisi and Member Murphy

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2014-0337 Police Communications Tower - Schumack Farm

A motion was made by Commissioner Dzierwa, seconded by Commissioner Aubin to terminate petition 2014-0337: Police Communications Tower.

DZIERWA:

I move to terminate petition 2014-0337 for a Police Communications Tower on Schumack Farm .

AUBIN: Second.
TERMINATED

Aye: 6 - Chairman Stephens, Member Jacobs, Member Aubin, Member Dzierwa, Member Parisi and Member Paul

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Member Murphy

2014-0568 14232 Ashford Court Geothermal Project

PITTOS: Staff presentation made in accordance with written staff report dated November 11, 2014.

STEPHENS: Is the petitioner present?

PITTOS: No.

STEPHENS: Is there anyone in the audience who wishes to comment on this petition? Seeing no one, we will go to our commissioners.

DZIERWA: What determines the amount of well heads needed for this particular set up?

PITTOS: The contractor explained to me that it is based off of the square footage of the house and the type of system that you are proposing. So there are different levels of mechanical equipment that can pump heat into and out of the building and it is all dependent on the volume of the structure.

DZIERWA: Because there is a lot of pipe in a 200' loop. That's 400' in just one well if it's a loop. And there are 5 loops.

PITTOS: Yes. So there will be significant drilling in the rear yard until it is installed.

AUBIN: I have no comments. It is a straightforward project.

JACOBS: I have no comment. I think it is a good idea and I applaud these people.

PARISI: I have no comments.

PAUL: Anything that is green and saves energy is a good thing. I don't have any problems with that.

STEPHENS: I think it is pretty straightforward. The chair will now entertain a motion.

DZIERWA:

I move to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission the findings of fact set forth in this staff report, dated November 11, 2014,

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board to approve the appearance (environmental clean technology) review for a geothermal heat pump system at 14232 Ashford Court as depicted on the plat of survey titled "Plat of Survey", prepared by the petitioner M. Patel, dated received on September 12, 2014, subject to the following conditions:

1) Meet all Building Code related items.
2) Obtain necessary permits from the State prior to issuance of a building permit.
3) Maintain the required 10 foot setback from all public utilities and infrastructure.

4) All mechanical equipment must be screened at grade level with landscaping.

PAUL: Second.
RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL

Aye: 6 - Chairman Stephens, Member Jacobs, Member Aubin, Member Dzierwa, Member Parisi and Member Paul

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Member Murphy

2014-0603 Park Boulevard Townhomes - Planned Unit Development

PITTOS: Staff presentation made in accordance with written staff report dated November 11, 2014.

STEPHENS: Thank you. I want to ask for a clarification. You had a slide up there with the condo building that was with the parking area. Then another slide where the lot lines are. I'm confused by that. Would you bring that back up?

PITTOS: In 2005, this was approved as a four lot subdivision. Each lot would have its own condominium building on it with 24 units per building and the lot lines were dropped at regular intervals which amounted to the parking between the buildings crossing lot lines. So this parking field was constructed when this building was constructed in anticipation of this future building being built which never happened. As a result, this property is owned by one entity and this property is now owned by the developer of this project. All of this parking here that belongs to the condo building straddles this lot line and if this project were to clear the site and prep it, this parking would be eliminated including these spaces here because the northern parts of these parking spaces also straddle the lot line.

STEPHENS: So all of the parking north of the lot line is on this developer's property and it doesn't belong to that lot, the first condominium property.

PITTOS: Yes it does not belong to this property. It is on this private property here.

STEPHENS: What are they going to do to balance out the parking they are going to be losing? Are they going to add additional spaces or something?

PITTOS: This is proposed to be cleared away and that parking will be replaced along the edge of the condo building here. A new drive aisle will be dropped in place with new parking here. It will accommodate all of the lost parking that was here. In addition to that, this site was approved for shared parking between all of these condo buildings so that shared parking opportunity will continue to exist between the developments.

STEPHENS: With that condo building there, are they going to lose any spaces?

PITTOS: No. They actually gain a few spaces. There are 41 more spaces just in this development versus what was approved in 2005.

STEPHENS: But I'm talking about that condo building. There is no loss of parking spaces?

PITTOS: Not that I saw.

STEPHENS: Thank you. Does the petitioner want to make any comments or add to Mr. Pittos' presentation?

AUBIN: Swore in Marty Jablonski, Landmark Realty & Development, 912 W Lake Street, Chicago, Illinois.
Terry Wendt, Landmark Realty & Development, 912 W Lake Street, Chicago, Illinois.
Mike Cody, Fitzgerald Associates Architects, 912 W Lake Street, Chicago, Illinois.
Bill Zalewski, Vantage Point Engineering, 18311 N Creek Drive, Suite F, Tinley Park, Illinois.
Tom Cachey, TJ Cachey Builders, 9961 151st Street, Orland Park, Illinois.

CACHEY: Just for some clarity, Marty and his group got a contract to purchase this property and have brought me into the project to facilitate and help them work through the process. When we got sight of this project, the purchasers were looking to resolve a blighted project and get this off the ground. The project was in the hands of two receivers prior to this contract purchaser. We've gone to the Village to get direction. We've gone to the Comprehensive Plan to get direction and we feel that we are maintaining what is in the Comprehensive Plan, what the Village has directed us to do and what has previously been approved. Staff did a great job of their rendition of what we have in mind here. If there are any questions, we would be happy to field them.

STEPHENS: Ok. Thank you. At this point we will address any comments from the public.

AUBIN: Swore in Patrick McLaughlin, President of the Condominium Association, 15630 Park Station Boulevard, Orland Park, Illinois.

MCLAUGHLIN: We know this property has to be developed and we are anxious to get it developed. We can't say that we are overwhelmed with the proposal but we appreciate the proposal. It is not consistent with the open lands theme that this village has maintained. It went from three buildings to 72 townhomes. It is a very congested plan. First and foremost, it aggravates me that they are taking the liberty of moving our parking. It is our property and they are not going to move our parking. I also don't think they have ingress and egress rights to our property. It is a separate plan and a separate property. This piece right here would come in and

enter our property. We maintain that property. Our homeowners have to pay for that property. Any damage to the property, we have to assume the responsibility of that. I don't feel that it is fair to have the potential of 144 people living in this 3.6 acres and having very restricted development. It is very tight. Back in here, there is parallel parking in front of the garage, like a city alley. That is not very attractive. This property here, they are proposing to move the parking spaces up against our building. We don't want that. If you could go back to the slide that shows the four buildings. We park here and this lot is typically filled. We do have a few occupancies currently. Three people in this building have a Thanksgiving dinner and we have no parking. Bring this property in over here and if you have 7 people out of 72 that have a Thanksgiving dinner and there is no parking. We don't want these parking spaces pushed up against our building. We are certainly not in favor of it. We have condos here that sold for half a million dollars back in 2008. Granted they are not worth that today but these are luxury condos. They are upscale. It's a fabulous building. It looks like you are walking through the halls of a Hyatt Regency. You have a lot of residents that are right up here against a landscaped berm and wall. I don't think these people are going to want lights shining in their windows, radios blasting, and engines running at 2 AM. This is our aisle that accesses our garage. We have underground parking. Logistically, the way they are designing this, there doesn't seem to be any flow to this layout. Now we have to entertain this traffic as well and these people are going to have access to this parking? We don't have enough right now. I'm sure we can put some cars back over here but that is where our guests park or when workmen come to work in the building. Right now with the residents that we have in our building, this lot typically fills up at night and we have overflow of people that park here. We certainly don't want to be putting these cars up against the building. We bought a lot of open property. We bought some pretty classy looking buildings. If you are not familiar with the building, it is beautiful. It is five stories. It is one of the taller buildings in the Village. It complements some very nice homes and townhomes to the south. I think that what this represents is consistent with an open lands mantra. Their proposal is the polar opposite. It is a very congested plan. The row houses are appealing and I think it is a nifty looking design. It is attractive but there are just so many of them and they are just so tight. I can't imagine that once people understand that, they will be reluctant to buy into that. The tightness of all of these parking spaces, roadways, driveways, parallel parking in front of a garage? We are not excited about it. We are excited about Tom Cachey being on board because he is a class act, he has a great reputation and he has done a great job in the Village. If Tom puts his signature on something, it is going to be a good deal. But these guys are going to build this project and then go away. I have to live there amongst a whole boat load of people here behind me. I bought into this building in May of 2014, anticipating on this being a place I would retire and stay. I have a very nice place and I don't want to be staring out my window at a three and a half story piece of property here and nothing but cars up and down and traffic flow and all of this congestion. It is not appealing. I speak on behalf of all of the homeowners for Park Station Boulevard Condominiums. I don't know if we have a right to prevent an ingress and egress here. We would like that shut off. We want

our parking spaces pushed back to our lot line and let us flow the way we have been. When you park here, you have a visual of this building and landscape. You're not going to have that with cars parked here and you are going to take away from the aesthetics of this building and I would encourage you to go and look at the building before you make a decision on this plan. You will understand what I am saying. This is no good and we don't want it. I can't live with this project and as the President of the association, I don't want to be responsible to come up with the funds to manage the asphalt, curbs, and lamp posts from all of this additional activity driving through our parking lot. I don't think that is in our best interest. We certainly would like to get this developed. There is a partial foundation in the ground just outside our building. It has been sitting there for 8 years.

STEPHENS: You don't want the parking facing the building? Can they flip the parking to face north? You don't want the headlights going in?

MCLAUGHLIN: Correct.

STEPHENS: We will pose that question to the developer.

PITTOS: As a point of clarification, there is no parallel parking in front of the garage. These are just straight spaces that go into the garage.

AUBIN: Swore in Jane Ann Abonamah, 15630 Park Station Boulevard, Orland Park, Illinois.

ABONAMAH: I was one of the original people in the building. I paid a very large price for my unit and we bought into the idea of four buildings and shared parking between each building, a lot of grass, quietness, privacy, and this takes away from the aesthetics of the neighborhood. Our cars, when we park outside, do face north. They want our cars to face south towards the building. The road that this gentleman referred to as an alley is a private road. I know that as a fact because when it wasn't getting plowed by the city and I complained, I was told that it is a private road. I would like to know what these units are going to sell for; because the people in our building and the people that own the homes paid a great deal of money for our homes and those townhouses on the north side started out at $190,000. When you pay over $400,000 for your unit, the last thing you want is something that is selling for $190,000 next door to you taking away your value.

STEPHENS: So you want to know the approximate sale price?

ABONAMAH: I want to know what it is going to do to my property value.

STEPHENS: Well we know what happened to the market with property values. Property values all fell down the drain.

ABONAMAH: I know that but we shouldn't all continuously suffer the consequences

of what happened. We should be able to retain our values and retain the value of what we bought into. If I wanted something with parking facing my building and 72 units with 144 plus cars, I could have bought one of the units east of West Avenue; but, I didn't do that. I came out to West Centennial Park area where it's peaceful and tranquil. I don't even feel like I'm in a big city like Orland Park. I feel like I live in the country. If you start putting parking all along and take away the grass, we have lost that tranquility and peace that we bought into. I know that the previous developer had a town hall meeting. He had already started the lot for the second building identical to the first.

STEPHENS: We know what he wanted to do. He wanted to reduce the size of the square footage of the units. He wanted to reduce the balance of the three buildings but that is not a point of this discussion. When this development was originally approved, it was approved with 2.13 parking spaces per unit. Mr. Musa wanted to come in and reduce the size of the townhouses which would have created 1.5 parking spaces per unit and we rejected that because we knew that there was a parking situation there. I think your question is...

ABONAMAH: I want to know why we should sacrifice what we bought into for the money that we paid for our units for the sake of 72 very congested townhouses.

STEPHENS: But they are not increasing the density. You were going to have 96 units to begin with.

ABONAMAH: But they were up. They weren't out.

STEPHENS: Yes but they were five stories.

ABONAMAH: It doesn't matter.

STEPHENS: I am not going to get into a debate with you. Your question was that you wanted to know the sale price of the units. We will have them answer your question. Is there anything else?

ABONAMAH: I would like to know why they can't have something smaller? Why do they have to encroach and disrupt what we bought?

STEPHENS: Because this is the plan that they came up with.

ABONAMAH: But shouldn't they have to come up with another plan?

STEPHENS: I am not going to debate the issue. We will get your question regarding the approximate price of the units answered.

AUBIN: Swore in Sunny Mallavarapu, President of the townhomes association, President of the master association, 15701 Scotsglen Road, Orland Park, Illinois.

MALLAVARAPU: I have one simple question to start. You had a red line that you were adding. I am curious what that was?

PITTOS: This is a proposed multi use bike path connecting Somerglen Lane south to 159th Street.

MALLAVARAPU: Is that next to the concrete sidewalk or is it replacing the sidewalk?

PITTOS: It would be replacing that sidewalk.

MALLAVARAPU: Is that managed by the Village or the Master association?

PITTOS: That would be Village owned.

MALLAVARAPU: Is that managed by the Village today as well?

PITTOS: Yes.

MALLAVARAPU: We haven't had a chance to talk to many of the homeowners from the townhomes as of yet. This is really something that we brought up to them as of last week. And so, I would ask that everybody gets a chance to review everything in detail and come back with further questions because this is the first time that I have actually heard of this proposal or have seen any details along with everyone else in the room for the most part. What strikes me and I hope that you can see Colette townhomes is 12 of the 15 acres. So 12 acres has approximately 122 units. 122 units that was part of the original plan when this whole subdivision was done and obviously you are familiar with Mr. Musa and this was one big plan. So for not being part of the condos, I do understand the change and feel for you and what you guys have gone through. It is a very open community. I don't know the density models. I don't know how much square footage we have from green space but I can guarantee you we have much more space from the townhomes. As we sit today, we do not have enough room. We have, I would guess close to three people per unit. We have about 2.5 cars per unit. We have much more guest parking in our subdivision. We have two car garages, 24' wide driveways and we still step on each other. Our biggest problem in our association is parking. The condo association gets spill over from the townhomes. Parking is at a premium in this area. I believe the single family homes do not have this issue. They have larger houses, larger driveways and more street. The townhomes have a parking problem. We don't really have a way to solve it other than to get rid of the green space and put in asphalt. It's something we do not want to do but it is something we want to work through. I understand that the parking has increased. I also understand that it is taking away from nice aesthetic view and drive from Park Station Boulevard. I don't know where the flow over is. There is no room for flow over in our subdivision. If they do, because we are private streets and we don't

have a contract for towing, I don't know how we would resolve that. I know from the condo's standpoint, they are engaged with towing and I don't know if we have to go towards enforcing parking but parking causes a secondary issue and that is pure safety. If you are going to come by the subdivision and take a look, come on a weekend when children are out and they are walking to the park, or playing in the townhomes. They play in the streets and they play in the driveways. Unfortunately, they do that because the houses are so close that the street becomes the common ground. It doesn't become the ground between the units because there are trees in the way, there's landscaping and bushes. There are other things. In our subdivision the streets have become the play area for children. It is completely unsafe and it is something we have to deal with. I fear that you will be taking 72 units and 3.5 acres. So you are taking 2/3 of the units we have and putting them in an area that is 1/3 of our area. Parking will be an issue especially for those cars that are anything larger than a compact car. From a density model, I can't speak to that but from a safety and aesthetic model; we all believe that this is blight on the community. It hasn't looked pretty for the past eight years. It hasn't helped our resale value. Having a four foot high brick wall hasn't helped. Also, the units that went up across from the old Andrew building for less than $200,000. That has hurt our property values. I understand that our property values are lower. That is not a point to this meeting.

STEPHENS: You've reiterated numerous times that your concern is parking.

MALLAVARAPU: Parking and aesthetics.

STEPHENS: Aesthetics?

MALLAVARAPU: From it being so tight, even with the townhomes and the single family homes, it is a very open community. I call it a community because all three associations are tied together and we all use the same green space.

STEPHENS: So your first concern is parking and your second concern is the number of units. Ok thank you.

MALLAVARAPU: Also, I'd like to add from a snow removal standpoint, where will you put the snow? From a master association standpoint, I haven't been contacted but this unit is part of the master association that does have a declaration. It is designed for a certain number of units. This changes that and I don't know how that is addressed. Is the association and inherently every single homeowner paying to readdress the contractual standpoint? I'd like to understand how the association will change and how that will affect every homeowner.

STEPHENS: Ok, your concern then is the number of units and how that will affect the association?

MALLAVARAPU: Well the number of units is a point in itself and then I do wonder

how that number will affect the association because the association is written that where all four units were it is considered the condo association and the condo association is a member of the master association. Now that it seems the condo buildings...

STEPHENS: You have an umbrella association and then you have a townhome association, condominium association and a single family home association underneath that umbrella. Am I correct?

MALLAVARAPU: Yes. So the change on that is an open question.

STEPHENS: Ok. I will ask that question.

MALLAVARAPU: And is the sidewalk adjusted? As you add parking on Park Station Boulevard, does that parking go against the sidewalk as it exists today? Are you opening the door or stepping out onto the sidewalk?

CACHEY: The curb will be moved further to the west to accommodate these parking spots. There will be green space between the existing sidewalk and the parking. So the sidewalk will not move, the curb will and green space will remain.

STEPHENS: Are those parking spaces in the existing right of way or are you giving up some of the land?

CACHEY: It is in the existing right of way. This here is an existing fire hydrant that will not move.

WENDT: We are giving up about 5' of our property to accommodate those parking spaces but the parking spaces themselves will still be in the right of way.

STEPHENS: But you have to give up 5' of the property.

WENDT: Yes because we are going to keep the green space between the new curb and the sidewalk. Essentially it will be the curb and 5' of green space and a 5' sidewalk.

STEPHENS: Which would be a parkway. You are giving up 5' of land on the property. Ok. Thank you.

MALLAVARAPU: I have a general question as well. How does this process work after this point?

AUBIN: This body is not here to approve this project. This body is here to listen to staff's report, listen to the petitioner, and analyze whether this project meets all of our codes and applications that are applied to it. We are here to see if we move it on to the next board, which would be a three man committee of trustees from the

Village, who will review it again to make sure that everything meets code and all of our engineering standards before it goes to the Village Board of Trustees for final approval. We are just a recommending body. We are not an approval body for approving this project.

MALLAVARAPU: Are there any other meetings or discussions that happen before approving this project?

AUBIN: There are two more meetings. This project will go to the committee of three trustees and then it goes onto the Board of Trustees.

STEPHENS: We are not elected officials. We are just homeowners like you guys.

MALLAVARAPU: If we could get the dates.

PITTOS: The Committee meeting is Monday, November 17, 2015. The Board meeting will be December 1, 2015.

MALLAVARAPU: Thank you.

AUBIN: Swore in Peter Walsh, 15707 Scotsglen Road, Orland Park, Illinois.

WALSH: What would be the square footage range of these units?

STEPHENS: We will ask the developer.

WALSH: I am not entirely sure of this but because the master association and the three individual associations are tied together and the declarations run with the land, wouldn't there need to be some type of a change in the declarations which would require an 80% vote from the single family homes, the townhomes and the condominiums.

STEPHENS: We will ask that question as well. I have not read your declarations.

WALSH: For me it is about property value. It seems like notwithstanding what someone paid for their unit because they might have moved in in 2009 and paid a lot. They might have moved in many years earlier and paid less. The value of what our units are today, we should be able to maintain the integrity of that based on the overall economy and the overall housing market. We feel that this being right on our door step will lower our property values compared to what they should be today and it seems if the market isn't what it should be there should be some patience on the part of developers instead of coming in, getting it done and running with the money.

STEPHENS: Thank you.

ABONAMAH: The comment that the President of the master association made, he said that the townhouses to the south have about 13.5 acres with 122 units. I would like to know how this new project can justify 72 units on 3.5 acres?

STEPHENS: Thank you.

AUBIN: Swore in Cary Fotopolous, 15564 Scotsglen Road, Orland Park, Illinois.

FOTOPOLOUS: My question pertains to Park Station Boulevard. Currently the road onto 159th Street is a right in-right out. Will this change so you can make a right or a left out of the subdivision and be able to turn in going right or left? This is one of the major thorough ways for our subdivision.

STEPHENS: The Village of Orland Park does not have jurisdiction over that. That is determined by Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT).

FOTOPOLOUS: So really it only serves 72 more homes if you are heading in the right direction?

STEPHENS: That is not going to change. That requirement was made by IDOT not by this Village.

FOTOPOLOUS: My concern is the increased traffic flow within the subdivision using Somerglen as an exit to get onto 108th. Then with increased traffic flow, we already have cars that use unsafe speed especially during bus pick-ups and drop offs. That would be a concern for me and my kids that play outside. Going back to the parking that is on the street on Park Station Boulevard, you have parallel parking along the road there. Those roads are not very wide to begin with. What happens to those cars during snow removal? Will you still be able to park there? That really eliminates overnight parking. Where will those cars go? You can barely fit two cars on those roads.

STEPHENS: On Park Station Boulevard?

FOTOPOLOUS: Yes. There is a median. It is tight. It is very tight.

STEPHENS: Yes they said it is 11' wide on each side.

FOTOPOLOUS: How will that get plowed and where will those cars be at that point?

STEPHENS: Ok. Thank you. I am writing down all of your questions and then we will bring up the developer to answer all of these questions.

AUBIN: Swore in Kathy Follett, 15630 Park Station Boulevard, Orland Park, Illinois.

FOLLETT: I am wondering at what point do we bring in the part of Orland Park that is putting together the events? We at the condo experience increased parking whenever there is a concert or a fest. Whenever anything is going on in Centennial West. I understand that we are speaking of this development but I think we would be foolish to not bring in someone who is also dealing with the new events that might be increasing in Centennial West. We have a tremendous amount of people that come for these events and park in our lots. I would like to have that information be brought before the board so that the right decision can be made. We will have more parking issues if the number of events increases.

STEPHENS: Thank you.

AUBIN: Swore in Tom Osterkorn, 15625 Julies Way, Orland Park, Illinois.

OSTERKORN: I will be the sole beneficiary of all of the cars driving by. First of all, thank you for letting me speak and I would like to thank you guys for developing this project. This has been a big eye sore for our subdivision. We do have our concerns though. My major concern is the alley. It is private and it is going to be increased with the parking and I am not in favor of that. Also, the congestion, you are cramming a lot in there. The on street parking along Park Station Boulevard, there are safety issues and the snow plow is going to be a problem. I was wondering who will be taking care of plowing the sidewalk between the single family homes. I am tired of doing it. I did it all last winter and didn't get paid for it. There is an egress that goes between the single family homes and connects to the sidewalk. It allows the residents a short cut to the Metra station. I snow blowed it all winter because I use the Metra. But again my main concern is the congestion.

STEPHENS: Ok. Thank you. We have already covered many of the issues. We will ask them to address your questions. Are there any other issues that someone wants to discuss that haven't already been discussed?

AUBIN: Swore in Eileen Kost, 15630 Park Station Boulevard, Orland Park, Illinois.

KOST: I was just wondering how public safety feels about this project, referring to the police department and the fire department? Because I have been involved in a planned unit development (PUD) before and the street became a fire lane.

AUBIN: The staff would not go forward with anything that was not approved by the fire and police.

KOST: There is that section of land with all of those units and there is only one entrance.

STEPHENS: Mr. Pittos, can you address that question?

PITTOS: When any project is proposed to the Village, it is always circulated to the fire district and the police department for their comments as well as the other departments in the Village: public works, parks and recreation. This particular project came back from the fire district and police department without any significant concerns related to the layout or density.

KOST: When the police have been out to the townhomes, they don't have anywhere to park and they have stopped their cars on Park Station Boulevard and then run around to look for whoever they were looking for. So are the police and the fire department going to be coming through our parking lot every time they have a call so that not only do we have the traffic but we have the concern of the high speed of the public safety vehicles?

STEPHENS: Is that a bad thing that the police will be going through there?

KOST: No, it is not a bad thing. I'm sure that they will be speeding down that road. They usually drive pretty fast.

STEPHENS: I believe your question was about public safety pertaining to police and fire. That question has been answered. The police and fire district have reviewed it. They are ok with it.

KOST: Thank you.

AUBIN: Swore in Gerald Rudolph, 10704 Dani Lane, Orland Park, Illinois.

RUDOLPH: A lot of the objections I concur with. I don't understand why this high density in this wonderful open land. We spent so much money on Park Station Boulevard and now they are going to take the median out?

STEPHENS: They are not taking the median out.

RUDOLPH: Ok. Then I have no problems with that. I do have a problem with the parallel parking. Secondly, we have a huge problem in the townhouses currently because we are high density in the townhomes. We don't have enough parking for visitors and the children have to stand in the street when waiting for busses. It's scary. The busses are pulling around. The children are in the street. It's too dense. There was a mistake made then. It's too much for that small area. This property is smaller and more dense. Why does it have to be this dense? Why this many townhomes in this small little area?

STEPHENS: Thank you.

PARISI: I just want to make sure we are not confusing density with lot coverage. They are two different things. I understand the overriding issue is the open space. You had the same density but you only had it in three buildings. I just want to make

that distinction.

STEPHENS: Thank you.

AUBIN: Swore in Doris Hine, 15625 Julies Way, Orland Park, Illinois.

HINE: I am that second lot in where all of those car headlights will be coming. My concern is also that as homeowners we signed up for the side of a condo building. Now we are signing up for garages without driveways and balconies that will face directly overlooking our back yards. How wide is that street? Is it now considered the driveway?

STEPHENS: What they are calling the alleyway?

HINE: Right. Park Station Boulevard does not naturally flow back there. People cut through the alley constantly. That is treated like a road by most locals. That is a road.

STEPHENS: Probably a lot of people that live within the subdivision cut through there.

HINE: Absolutely. Now if you have parallel parking by that landscaped berm, is that going to change in width or will people just be getting in and out of bushes? In the past we have had issues with people who really don't belong in the area urinating in our bushes, used condoms in our bushes, and drug paraphernalia.
STEPHENS: So your question is how wide is that going to be?

HINE: How wide and now I have the business end of someone's building, all garages and all balconies?

STEPHENS: You want to know if the alley waste is going to be increased?

HINE: I don't think it is being increased but are we losing any land? Will people be getting in and out of the bushes right there?

STEPHENS: I will ask the developer.

HINE: That's fine. Thank you.

AUBIN: Swore in Dimitri Deus, 15609 Julies Way, Orland Park.

DEUS: It feels like I was here just yesterday. You were the same people about three years ago. I was here at this podium talking to you. I opposed that project then.

STEPHENS: It was longer than that. He wanted to reduce the size of the

townhouses.

DEUS: Do we need to do something about these foundations, absolutely. But do we need to go with 72 units, I strongly oppose that. I would rather have 30 units. For the record, I strongly oppose that. What kind of target audience are they going to bring in there? What is their price target? If they can't sell these units are they going to turn them into rentals? We heard from the condo association that they haven't sold all of their units yet. They are subletting in there and a couple units are empty. I don't think Sheffield has all of their units filled yet either. So what are they going to do with it if they don't sell? When you have a settlement overpopulated, it is going to turn into a slum eventually. That is something in the back of my house that I would really like to avoid. I don't want that monstrosity the way it is right now being forecasted to be built behind my house.

STEPHENS: Ok. Thank you.

AUBIN: Swore in Maribeth Milos, 10627 Dani Lane, Orland Park.

MILOS: I would like to understand how this fits in with the philosophy of Orland Park. The proposition before this was a green project. Two of the commissioners made comments supporting it because it was green. This feels very different than that. This feels like the opposite. We are trying to shove all kinds of concrete into a very small area. Also, if you look at the Orland Park website, it speaks about us wanting to be a community of affluence. It highly regarded the hard work that went into being a Class A market area that has attracted some businesses that tend to go into areas that frankly have more money in them. Does this project fit in with that goal and strategy as well?

STEPHENS: I am going to ask Mr. Pittos to ask how this fits in with the Comprehensive Plan.

PITTOS: In terms of the property fitting in with the Comprehensive Plan, the plan is set up so that it gives prominence to the transportation network the Village has, particularly as it relates to train stations. The area around 143rd Street and LaGrange Road is considered a transit oriented development. The area around 153rd Street and the railway line here is also considered a transit oriented development. The two types of developments are similar in the sense that we have high density around train station facilities. In the case of 153rd Street, we had Sheffield Square develop at a higher density. I think that density came out at about nine dwelling units per acre. It was a much larger site. It was approximately 150 units; all located within a quarter of a mile from 153rd Street Metra station. The 20.5 dwelling units per acre approved in 2003 and reaffirmed in 2005 as condo buildings, followed that logic. In fact, Sheffield Square followed the precedent established by the Collette Highland townhomes in the sense that higher densities are to locate near a train station to afford people the opportunity to walk to the Metra stations that we have. So this area is considered a residentially focused,

transit oriented development zone with higher densities close to the train stations. In terms of green space, Centennial West is a major contribution to the Centennial Park system platted by the Colette Highlands developers back when the whole subdivision was planned out and construction began. That is a huge open space consideration. But we also have to take into consideration that green development also includes higher density development which is another one of the reasons for the 2005 plan that was approved for the Colette Highlands Condominiums. Higher densities do result in more green development. There is a distinction to the underline that Commissioner Parisi made that density and lot coverage are two different things.

STEPHENS: It is in compliance with the long range Comprehensive Plan and it is in compliance with the current zoning that is in effect.

PITTOS: Correct.

STEPHENS: Is there anyone else who wishes to speak?

ABONAMAH: If it complied, you wouldn't have to modify it.

STPEHENS: The density is in compliance with the plan.

ABONAMAH: Yes but we are talking about the number of people, the number of cars and the amount of space that is taken for this and the privacy and the well-being of the people that have already moved in. People that bought into the condo bought into the privacy of that living and that plan. People who bought the homes, bought into the privacy of that home and that yard, not to look at somebody else's garage and balcony. We all bought into something. The people that bought into the townhomes knew that they were buying into something that was a little bit more congested. We would never have bought into this plan. We have the right to be valued for what we bought into.

STEPHENS: We are listening to you.

ABONAMAH: Yes but I don't think there is much interest in hearing it because when we talk about parking, congestion, safety, taking the road and moving the sidewalk up; these are all real problems to us and the people that live there. People that don't live there don't have to deal with it. We do, every day.

AUBIN: This project is not going to get approved tonight.

ABONAMAH: I understand that but I think that the people on board and the people sitting to my left need to know that what we say, we mean. It is valued.

AUBIN: We understand but this board is a recommending body.

STEPHENS: Your point is well taken. I think we have everything pretty well covered so we will go to the developers and ask some questions. First of all, approximate price of sale and square footage of the units?

CACHEY: At this point, we are anticipating sale prices in the low to mid 300's. The square footage of the units is about 2,500 sq. ft.

STEPHENS: Ok. Thank you. How would you address the snow removal? That's a good question.

ZALEWSKI: It's a problem. As with all associations, every available space is going to be used for snow. We have them on the ends and along the west property line. It is a situation that we are going to have to look at more on our side.

STEPHENS: Ok. How does this project affect the current associations?

CACHEY: Well I'm glad Sunny told me he's in charge. I have worked with Sunny before and I have worked with Colette Highlands before so I knew there was a master association. We talked with Rose Schrank, who is the manager. She is the manager of the condominium association who is there. We reached out to Bob Huguelet, who created the master association document and it is a work in process. The concept we are thinking of is that it would be a different and separate association that would also fall under the master association. The condo lots were set up to be an add on association so every lot would add on. The first building is the only building that is currently in that association. We are going to have to work together with the condo association as well as the master association.

STEPHENS: Ok. A woman asked about traffic flow on 159th Street?

CACHEY: If I understood the question, it was if we are going to change the right in-right out onto 159th Street to make it a full access. The road was designed for the 72 units that we will be putting in back when the development was approved in 2003. We have no plans on doing any improvements on 159th Street. We have turned in a traffic study to staff.

STPEHENS: Ok. Have we reviewed the traffic study?

PITTOS: We reviewed the traffic study. I would just like to point out that the density has not changed from 2003 to 2005 and from 2005 until now. In 2003 the plan always had Somerglen connecting to 108th and Jillian Road connecting to 108th. In 2005 that was still the case. Between 2005 and 2010, the connection to 159th Street was made and that right in-right out happened in 2008. In 2011, the connection north to 153rd Street happened so there are two connections that did not previously exist that exist today to help disburse traffic. That is with the same density that was originally approved in 2003. There are more ins and outs than

there were when that density was approved in 2005.

STEPHENS: So what the traffic study is basically saying is that the new roadway Park Station Boulevard going to the north should help alleviate traffic problems, based on the existing traffic. That is something we have taken into consideration, the new Park Station Boulevard. I don't know that this pertains to this or that you can answer this but parking during events at Centennial Park West?

PITTOS: It is referring to events that are typically hosted by the Metra parking lot. The July 4th events, the various concerts that happen in the park, and my experience has been that there is quite a bit of parking within the Metra parking lots but these are public roads and people will try to park along them. Medians mitigate some of that along Park Station Boulevard and Somerglen Lane. At the end of the day if someone is not willing to go to Metra, they are going to park on a public road.

STEPHENS: It is legal to do that.

PITTOS: In terms of the private road way behind the property, it is just a matter of vigilance by the property owners. Cone it off or something.

CACHEY: In the past I believe the police department has tried to help the condo owners keep that roadway clear during those events as best as they could.

STEPHENS: What is your target market for the sale of these units? Who do you expect to buy these units?

CACHEY: Younger families or single parent families.

STEPHENS: When you say younger families, are you talking about newly formed husband and wife with children?

CACHEY: 21-35 years old.

STEPHENS: Works downtown and uses the Metra?

CACHEY: Correct. Also, empty nesters.

STEPHENS: Ok. Thank you.

WENDT: There were some questions raised about the condo parking that I would like to clarify. Our plan is to accommodate their needs in the context of the encroachment and be a good neighbor. This parking lot actually encroaches into our property by 7 ½'. If we were developing something else, we could simply require that those parking spaces be removed from our property. Then the only thing that could be done to replace that would be to move this entire parking lot

about 12 ½' closer to the building because you need a 5' buffer strip of green. I don't think that would be very attractive at all. What we thought was the way to solve this problem would be to flip these parking spaces over to the other side and not move this curb at all. That existing sidewalk and curb would remain exactly where it is.

STEPHENS: So the landscaping still remains?

WENDT: Yes. We wouldn't touch it. We simply just put the parking on this side and then we would have a wider drive to share with this condo building because part of that drive would be on our property and part would be on the condo property. That is principle number one. Principle number two is that there was going to be 24 units built here. There were going to be 24 cars coming and going out of this driveway and if they wanted to go south, they would be coming through here and going out. They would be affecting the existing condo building in much the same way as our plan. This is 16 units and when they want to go south they will. It's likely that people in this group of townhouses, some would go north and some would go south. We can't monitor that. It's not going to be all or nothing impact. Some of the residents will want to go south and go down this drive but that was already going to be the situation with that second building anyway. Here you can see where we are widening this drive and it comes on to our property and we actually add three or four more spaces. We can add a space here and what was 11 spaces is now 14. The result is we are going to pay for building three more spaces for the condo building. If you go back to the condo building plan, these spaces were never intended to be used by this condo building but they were built ahead of time and they are being used even though they are not theirs. I'm sorry but that was a temporary situation. I believe that one of you said we are going to add 22 parking spaces along here. That curb line is not going to change. We are simply shifting the drive over, widening it and adding 22 spaces. Those spaces can be used by the condo residents as well as our guests. They would be shared. I did notice that these spaces aren't used at all. These spaces are a good relief valve that already exists for the condo building. In terms of net impact on the condo building, we are going to build three more spaces for them and we are going to have 22 added which is greater than the 14 on our property now that will be lost. We are doing a good thing.

STEPHENS: You are putting in 25 spaces?

WENDT: We are putting 22 spaces along here.

STEPHENS: And three more in front of the condo building?

WENDT: Yes there are 14 here and I believe there are only 11 now. If you really look at the losses and the gains, the condo building has a net gain in usable guest spaces than what exists currently.

STEPHENS: All of the questions have been asked and answered.

FOTOPOLOUS: You said that you are marketing to 21-35 year olds at $300-$350k?

CACHEY: Correct.

FOTOPOLOUS: So there are 72 21-35 year olds that are going to buy these units? I don't think that is realistic in my opinion. Furthermore, if you are marketing to growing families, the congestion is only going to increase as these families grow. Previously, the condos were higher end condos and I believe they were being marketed to retirees, people downsizing into homes that needed less maintenance. I don't see many retirees, just looking at my in laws for example, that like stairs. These units are three floors. I don't see very many empty nester retirees going for three floors of home and maintenance. Usually they are looking for ranches. That is my experience.

STEPHENS: Thank you for your opinion.

DZIERWA: Swore in Robert Ator, 10605 Gabriel Lane, Orland Park.

ATOR: We do speak a lot about the densities that were approved years ago in 2003 or 2005 but I don't believe we have talked about how the densities have been affected by the entire new subdivision built just north of Colette Highlands. While 72 units were approved years ago for the space that is being developed now, none of the other townhomes north of our area existed at all. It was all open space. I think the premium aspect of the land has changed significantly. The plan for what was going to be built and what is there now and it just seems to me that we are just saturating an area with buildings that the demand isn't even there for. Being a townhome owner, one of the reasons we purchased there is because we wanted to have a very high end home for the price point that we could get. So we were benefitting from the single family homes and the very expensive condo buildings. Now there is an entirely new subdivision at a much lower price point that you can walk to. Now we are going to jam in 72 additional units. Yes the density is the same that was approved years ago but we have an entirely new subdivision just north of us. To me the density needs to be reconsidered. The premium aspect of our area with all of these units going in is going to decline. We are talking about green space. We wanted luxury living and now it is slowly declining. No one here is happy about it except for the people that are going to build.

STEPHENS: Thank you.

WENDT: Since we had two parallel private drives and the previous plan did not have a second drive, basically all 96 people were going to get out through this one exit. With our plan the people who live along this side will enter and leave their portion of the site without traversing to this other drive. There will be less traffic

going along these homes than currently would of existed had the four condo buildings been built. It is no different in terms of traffic.

HEIN: I will try to use that three feet in the back of my yard with less traffic. Thank you very much. You are terrific.

WENDT: I don't know what three feet you are referring to. We have not narrowed this buffer. It is the same.

STEPHENS: It is the same buffer that exists now. There is no change. What is your concern? I don't understand your concern:

HEIN: Inaudible

STEPHENS: It is the same traffic.

WENDT: It is the same traffic. We are just dispersing it within the two areas.

MCLAUGHLIN: To change a declaration is going to require an 80% vote on behalf of our association. Is that correct?

CACHEY: I don't know. We are going to have to review that with the Mr. Huguelet and the master association.

MCLAUGHLIN: Are you married to this plan? Does it have to go this way? Can we tweak it and change it to make it something more desirable and community friendly to the people here that have been living there for all this time? If you were us and you were seeing what once was going to be three erect buildings housing 72 people versus now 72 people down on the ground, it has taken away just a lot of the aesthetics of this area. We have Centennial Park just to the east of us. This was supposed to be a park land type of community. The original plan for Centennial Park was bridges and waterways that were going to happen and now we have this band shell that is going to be built. It is going to create a whole other mess of problems that have been alluded to tonight. Is there another plan that you can throw out here that will make us all happy?

JABLONSKI: I don't have another plan in mind but when we first approached the Village administrators about this, they were concerned about the fact that this was vacant and lying fallow as many years as it was. If you stay with the existing condo project, I will defer to Tom on this, maybe we could build condos but they would be under $200,000. That is not good for the values that are surrounding this. We came up with this elaborate townhouse project which is very unique given the balconies that would overlook the park. We felt very strongly that would in fact raise the values as opposed to pulling the values down. The condo market just isn't possible at a price that is above $200,000. That is the simple answer so what do you do with this blight other than to live with it the way it is because the condo

market is not coming back any time soon. There are no rentals. I immediately agreed with the staff. This is not a rental market. This is a home ownership market. The next best chance we felt there was was to develop this unique townhouse project that will have greater appeal than the townhomes that are built in the area because of how it has been designed.

STEPHENS: Thank you. At this point we have asked and answered all of your questions. Whether they have been answered to your satisfaction, I cannot judge that. At this point in time, we have had all of your input and we will go to our Commissioners after a five minute recess.

Five minute recess

STEPHENS: We have listened to all of the comments from the public and we have asked the developer to address these questions. There have been some good points made on both sides and at this time we will talk to our Commissioners and then make a motion and put it to a vote. Mr. Pittos, I have been asked several times when the Committee meeting is.

PITTOS: It is next Monday, November 17, 2014 at 6 pm in this room.

STEPHENS: Thank you. It will be a committee of three trustees. After that they make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. That meeting will be the first Monday in December.

PITTOS: December 1, 2014 at 7 pm in this room.

STEPHENS: You can go to those two meetings and speak your piece. We are a recommending body to the Board of Trustees. Now we will go to our Commissioners.

PARISI: First of all, I would like to thank everybody for coming. This is our town and a lot of good points were made. I commend everyone for that. A lot of thoughts here. Some things were answered. The price points and the size of the units. These are some nice units. I will tell everyone here that we were asked to change the Village's rules on density. It is not our charge to change the Village's Comprehensive Plan. In terms of the feasibility of this thing, these professionals who have designed this plan and are spending considerable amounts of time and money. I doubt that they would have done this project without doing a feasibility analysis. They are not going to build 72 $300,000 townhomes and then hope they sell later. I'm sure they did their feasibility analysis. That having been said, density is not the issue. The density hasn't changed. I don't think traffic is the issue because if you had the four condo buildings you would have had the same number of occupants. Obviously, the price point and the square footage is not the issue. What are the issues? The issue is lot coverage. About five or six years ago, the developer tried squeezing more units into the building and taking up green space

and parking. We turned it down. Snow removal, a very intelligent and valid issue. Parking is an issue. Aesthetics are an issue. I can see where because of the huge variance going from 45% to 75%, it would present an issue. I am happy to see that the price points are where they are. I am glad that question was asked. I am not so sure and I am having a problem with the lot coverage and what that does in terms of common everyday things like getting around, parking, and snow removal. It concerns me. I'll defer to my other Commissioners.

AUBIN: Thank you, for me as an Orland Park resident, it is good to see a project that has been dormant for almost ten years be finished. It is a sign to me that there is a possible recovery to the residential recession that this town has been feeling the last three years. It could be coming to an end which is a good thing. I explained earlier how the system works. There are people that own a piece of property; they want to do something with it. They go to our staff and our staff looks at it. Our staff's first thought is how it is going to affect the citizens and residents of Orland Park. Then they go by the rules. What is the code? What is the Comprehensive Plan? Does this petition meet those requirements? They put a report together and they come to the Planning Commission. They ask our opinion and if we feel that it meets code that is required for this project to go through. As I look at tonight's petition, there are so many conditions for this project to go through and this petitioner's agreed to every one of them. Everything that the Village asked them to do, they agreed to. It would be hard for me as a Commissioner to ask a man to do 35 different things and have him agree to it and not recommend this project. It would show prejudice. What I am saying is that from staff's report, all of the requirements and based on our Comprehensive Plan, I don't have a problem with this. I will read the motion when we get done with our comments. Thank you.

DZIERWA: I want to congratulate the developers for coming up with something innovative. It definitely has some flaws as the residents think. I agree to some of those flaws. I do appreciate the fact that you took the time to answer these special use standards. These are very important. This is something that the developer has to address that the Village requires them to look at. As far as the condominium owners, I feel sorry for you just a bit. Yeah there are going to be some cars driving through and maybe the parking facing the building isn't such a good idea but the developer actually addressed that and tried to give you a few more parking spaces. You are going to suffer maybe a little bit because you don't want your cars parked up against the building. Well technically they aren't up against the building. They are just facing you instead of facing away from you. If there was one thing I could ask the developer to do, it would be a better traffic pattern. It is difficult for the condo owners the way the condos were set up before you had two buildings sharing two streets and two more buildings sharing two streets. Now you basically have a bunch of townhomes that are going to choose to go out one way or the other way. Chances are every person in the condo is going to say 'well, they are using my street too much'. I understand that. There are a few people here that were worried about what they were going to be looking at in their present homes. I felt the same way when I moved into my subdivision 32 years ago. When I moved

in I wanted to close the gate behind me. It didn't work out that way. I got lots of neighbors. I'm the one that is still there and many have come and gone. So I understand that too but that is just a personal preference. Maybe just call it being selfish. You don't want to look at someone else's property. You don't want to look at a balcony. People don't want to look at me on my balcony but it's my balcony and it meets code. My fellow Commissioners mentioned that we make our recommendations based on what's legal and what's not. Sometimes you are going to see things you don't like. You bring them up here. This is the starting point. If you seem to think that we make the rules, we recommend things based on the merit of the plan. We do take into consideration some very important points that you are here to bring up. What we can act on, we will. If we can't act on it, it is your job to go to the next meeting and tell the Village Board of Trustees. They basically can vote for or against a plan from their heart if they think it's not right. We can't do that. We have a strict set of guidelines that we have to follow as Commissioner Aubin said. I am going to say that for the most part I like the plan. I really do. There are some issues that the developer is going to have to deal with. If you are adamant about it, you go to the next meeting and let them know about it just like you are letting us know. A couple comments that were made as far as congestion. There was going to be congestion with 96 condos as opposed to 72 townhomes. Bottom line is there were 96 units, there would be traffic anyway. This is basically a transit oriented development which means we are encouraging people to walk to the train. We are encouraging people to move in that don't need two cars. It is not somewhere I could live. I like cars. Density, which was addressed by Commissioner Parisi, hasn't changed. I wish we could do a couple things as far as the parking is concerned on the boulevards and roads. The developer has addressed that and he is going to increase the parking along Park Station Boulevard. The gentlemen that were here representing the associations, talk with the developer and see what can be worked out with as far as what the associations will be in the future. Maybe you can get some of these other little things worked out. If you leave here tonight and a motion is made to approve this project, it is not the end of the world. It is not set in stone. If we approve it, we approve it based on the merit of the plan but with questions. Most of the questions that you brought up, we wouldn't have known. As far as the people that said we should come out there and take a look, we have been out there a lot since this project started. I came on the board in 2003 so I didn't see the original plan but I've seen all of the changes afterward. We didn't agree to that smaller condo setup that tried to come in before because we felt that it would have made it more congested. Bottom line is this is a good plan but it needs to be tweaked. I encourage you to work together.

JACOBS: There is a lot of emotion in the room tonight. A lot of justifiable concerns. I totally agree with all of you that have expressed yourselves. However, since a considerable amount of work and planning has already occurred and code issues and requirements have been met, we are here to probably recommend this plan. That is all I have to say.

PAUL: I appreciate everyone coming out and expressing your opinions tonight. As has been mentioned by several other commissioners, we are here to look at the minimum standard that has to be met before this thing can move on to the next level. For the most part, I think you have done that. The concern that I have though is the park credit. Part of the reason why we have these lot coverage rules is because of rain water being able to get into the ground rather than rolling off the asphalt. Could you explain that to me? I am not getting why we are taking land from somewhere else and we are including it with this.

PITTOS: Going back to the master plan for Colette Highlands in 2003, Park Station Boulevard was originally planned along this course. You can see these four townhome buildings located at this location. Park Station Boulevard eventually was constructed along a more eastern position so that once it came to this bend here it would cut directly south and connect to 159th Street, leaving a green space opening along the west side of Park Station Boulevard. So if I fast forward to the aerial, the point of all of that is to say that in 2003 when the total lot coverage for the entire subdivision development was calculated, this area in the circle was calculated as impervious surface area. It was covered by street and development. The detention pond is also considered impervious area because rain water doesn't go anywhere. It just sits there. When Park Station Boulevard was shifted to the east, the impervious surface area was reduced in the detention pond and an entire strip of pervious surface area was created here. The detention pond was less wide and deeper. That meant you had pervious surface area that was never originally considered. Colette Highlands in total is below its allowable lot coverage right now based upon the 2003 and later the 2005 approvals. If you take this park then and credit this bonus pervious area to this development site, it essentially brings Colette Highlands back to par from the 2003 plan. Actually for the subject site, it lowers the overall lot coverage from 54% net to 45.9% net.

PAUL: Again, the idea of rain water, does that help?

PITTOS: In terms of storm water, it changes nothing. This is all bonus pervious surface area. When the rain water falls it will hit the sewers in the same way had it hit the sewers in the 2003 plan and ended up in the detention pond regardless. There is no difference in storm water volume.

PAUL: Thank you. That's all I have.

STEPHENS: I appreciate everyone coming out. I want to talk first about the density. The Comprehensive Plan was redone two or three years ago?

PITTOS: The plan was approved in August of 2013.

STEPHENS: 2013. But prior to that time you had meetings with the public. You had all sorts of meetings. It was published on the website for how long? A year?

PITTOS: A little over a year.

STEPHENS: In that Comprehensive Plan, which was brought forward to everyone in the Village, it was hanging out there before it got approved for two years?

PITTOS: Each chapter was brought individually before various groups: Plan Commission, Committee, and Village Board.

STEPHENS: We had meetings.

PITTOS: Yes the Village was in the planning process from 2010.

STEPHENS: You asked for input from the residents and all kinds of things. The public had a lot of input into this Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan allows this zoning in this area for a reason. The reason is because they want to make it a transit oriented community. As far as the allowable density goes, that has been in effect for basically a year. Before that, this entire plan was approved in 2003 before anyone moved in there. It was approved for 96 units. They are not changing the number of units. I don't think it is changing the number of people that are going to come in. With regards to the traffic and all that, I appreciate the comments that everyone has made. But I also agree with what Mr. Wendt showed us. You now have different ways to get in and out of there. That traffic from that second building which would go out the one way and now you have 16 units instead of 24. With regards to parking spaces, when we approved this plan originally, we had 2.13 parking spaces per unit. They are adding 41 more spaces to this.

CACHEY: Inaudible.

STEPHENS: The original one had 204 stalls.

CACHEY: Inaudible.

(End of Park Boulevard Minutes are in Word Document)

STEPHENS: Ok. So now you are going to increase it to 294. So we go from 2.13. Prior to that time a developer came in and tried to get it reduced to 1.5. That wasn't going to fly. This increases it to 3.06. It actually gives you one more parking space per unit than you already had with the prior plan. I think that's a big improvement. I also think it's a big improvement that they are putting parking along Park Station Boulevard and along the back. As far as the number of units goes, you are not getting more units than what was already approved back then. The other thing is do we want to keep looking at this place with the foundation sitting there and the weeds growing. How much longer are we going to look at that? You talk about property values and doesn't that detract from property values? That foundation sitting there is really an eyesore. As far as property values go, it looks like a blighted area. These people are coming along with what I think is a really good plan. Their units are much better, in my opinion. I would rather live behind those units than five story condo buildings. They are lowering the height by eight feet and now you have some units that are very attractive. I think it is a well-conceived and a well thought out plan. I think they are taking into consideration the parking area for the existing building and giving you more parking. Mr. McLaughlin, they are not taking away your green space in front of there. And they are also not taking away that ten foot strip that is on the west side of that alley. A lot of the points that have been made here are valid to a certain degree. However, we have to go back and look at the fact that the density was approved. The density would still be approved because in the Comprehensive Plan, it is allowed. These developers really thought out a plan that makes a great deal of sense. It is going to take a blighted situation, a lousy looking foundation that's been sitting there for seven years, the existing condo building is going to get more parking spaces. I don't see that as a negative. I see that as a positive. You get more parking spaces and as far as the traffic flow, I think you are getting a better traffic flow than what you would have had with the condo buildings. We all resist change. It is a human element and none of us like change. This represents change. It is a good change not a bad change. It is going to take a lousy looking piece of property. They are not talking about putting in 1000 sq. ft. units; they stated on public record that they will be approximately 2500 sq. ft. units that will sell for over $300,000. I don't see that as a negative at all. I see that as a positive. The ones in Sheffield sell for $225,000. The only thing that I have a problem with on this whole plan is the three units around the curve have a one car tandem garage. That is a unit that can't be marketed in my opinion. I want to see those three units and instead make them two units so they can have two car garages like the rest of the units. In addition to that, the walkway they are going to put in, will that be concrete or asphalt?

PITTOS: That will be an 8' wide multi use path made of asphalt.

STEPHENS: And you asked them to do that and they are doing a few more things in exchange for some of the minor variances that they are getting.

PITTOS: Yes. They have agreed to it.

STEPHENS: That is one thing. Are there others?

PITTOS: There are but they are inside the plan's mechanics.

STEPHENS: Ok. I also think that townhomes are more transitional living than the condo units. Nothing against the condo units. It is a beautiful building. I don't like seeing condo units backing

up to single family homes. Good planning tells us that if you are going to have a condo building, you back it up to a townhome unit and you back up the townhome buildings to single family. That is called good transitional planning. I think this is a better concept than what we approved originally with the four, five-story buildings. I was never really in favor of that but that is what they petitioned for. That is my opinion and I am in favor of this plan. I can't see high end condos doing well. It is a difficult market these days and it is going to continue to be a difficult market. If we don't go with this, how much longer are we going to sit there with this ugly foundation in the ground? That is just my belief. I appreciate everyone's comments. When we approved this whole concept, we had people coming in against the approval of this and now you are living in this community. It turned out to be a good community. That is all my comments. I would like to see the removal of the one unit to bring it down to 71 units. We will now move forward with the motion.

AUBIN:

I move to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission the findings of fact set forth in this staff report, dated November 11, 2014.

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of the preliminary site plan titled "Park Boulevard Townhomes Preliminary Site Plan", prepared by Vantage Point Engineering and dated 11/6/14 subject to the following conditions:

1) Create a pedestrian refuge in the Park Station Boulevard median to link Centennial Park West pedestrian networks, via striped crosswalks, with the mid-block walkway leading to the central courtyard of the development.
2) Extend the multi-use path network in Centennial Park West from Somer Glen Lane south to connect with future 159th Street IDOT multi-use paths in exchange for impacting Park Station Boulevard and a lot coverage credit.
3) Submit detailed scaled and dimensioned elevation drawings showing the four principle elevations of the townhouse products proposed for this development prior to the consideration of final approval by the Village Board.
4) Mitigate the road widening impact to existing parkway trees along Park Station Boulevard via the landscape plan.
5) Reduce the width of the drive-aisle landscape islands between driveways to four (4) feet and increase the width of all driveways to 18 feet.
6) Note any offsite tree and landscape mitigation requirements within either Park Station Boulevard right-of-way or Centennial Park West on the landscape plan.
7) Submit a proposed plat of subdivision for review prior to final approval by the Village Board.
8) Record a public access easement for any sidewalk along Park Station Boulevard located on private property.
9) Submit a Final Landscape Plan, meeting all Village Codes, for separate review and approval within 60 days of final engineering approval.
10) Meet all final engineering and building code related items.
11) Reduce the total density to 71 units by revising the preliminary site plan to eliminate one of the three townhomes at the northeast corner of the property at the intersection of Jillian Road and Park Station Boulevard and creating only 2 townhomes around the curve instead of the 3 townhomes as shown on the preliminary site plan.

and

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of the Elevations titled "Park Station Townhomes", prepared by the petitioner and dated received 11/6/14, subject to the same conditions noted above and the following:

12) Screen all mechanical equipment at grade level with landscaping.

and

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of a ten (10) lot subdivision/ consolidation for Park Boulevard Townhomes subject to the following condition:

13) Submit a Record Plat of Subdivision to the Village for recording.

and

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of a Special Use Permit for Park Boulevard Townhome's planned unit development subject to the same conditions as outlined in the Preliminary Site Plan motion.

Modifications to the Special Use permit include:

1) Reduce the front setback from 20 feet to 13 feet;
2) Reduce the side setback from 25 feet to ten (10) feet;
3) Reduce the south bufferyard requirement from ten (10) feet to five (5) feet;
4) Reduce the east bufferyard requirement from 15 feet to 14 feet; and
5) Increase lot coverage from 45% to 75% or less.

All changes must be made prior to the Board meeting.

DZIERWA: Second.
RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL

Aye: 6 - Chairman Stephens, Member Jacobs, Member Aubin, Member Dzierwa, Member Parisi and Member Paul

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Member Murphy

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

None.

OTHER BUSINESS

2014-0024 Memo: New Petitions & Appearance Review

DZIERWA: How does that Bear Paddle Swim School work with adding graphics to their windows?

PITTOS: The short answer is that it is complicated. Yes the sign ordinance applies and the limitation is basically that 50% of the area may be covered with signs or images. Meaning the rest of the 50% has to be transparent. In this particular case, they are meeting that. The interpretation is in regards to overall fenestration on the building. The long story is they initially came in November and frosted out the windows so you couldn't see into locker rooms for example and things like that.

The high humidity made the code compliant frosting fail. What ended up happening is an exterior application of the graphics, which is the unique aspect of this project. All in all it still meets that 50%. But it is complicated.

DZIERWA: Thanks.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Plan Commission, the Chairman adjourned the meeting.

STEPHENS: This meeting is adjourned at 9:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather Zorena
Recording Secretary