

VILLAGE OF ORLAND PARK

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



Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, September 25, 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 Chairman, Mr. Lou Stephens, at 7:00 p.m.

Present: 6 - Commissioner Jacobs; Commissioner Dzierwa; Commissioner Aubin;
Commissioner Stephens; Commissioner Culligan, Commissioner Parisi

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Thompson

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Commissioner Dzierwa, seconded by Commissioner Aubin and carried to approve the minutes of the September 11, 2007 Plan Commission meeting minutes with the following revisions: (1) on page 12 within Commissioner Parisi's comments, add the following underlined verbiage to the end of his sentence so that the sentence now reads: "Noted that if the cross accesses do not line up exactly, that is not the worst thing in the world because that would be going into the drive thru lane of the next property ."; and (2) on page seven, within Mr. Matthys' comments, insert the word "answer" into his third sentence so that the sentence correctly reads: "Stated they will answer any questions anyone may have."

This matter was APPROVED

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Thompson

PUBLIC HEARINGS**2007-0203 183rd Street & LaGrange Road**

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion for a continuance.

I move to continue the public hearing for file number 2007-0203, 183rd Street and LaGrange Road, to the October 9, 2007 Plan Commission.

A motion was made by Commissioner Paul Aubin, seconded by Commissioner Steve Dzierwa, that this matter be CONTINUED to the Plan Commission, due back on 10/9/2007. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Thompson

2007-0420 Walgreen's

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion for a continuance.

I move to continue the public hearing for file number 2007-0420, Walgreen's, to the October 9, 2007 Plan Commission.

A motion was made by Commissioner Paul Aubin, seconded by Commissioner Steve Dzierwa, that this matter be CONTINUED to the Plan Commission, due back on 10/9/2007. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Thompson

2007-0563 Mallard Landings, Eagle Ridge I and Eagle Ridge II Single-Family Rezoning

SULLIVAN: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated September 25, 2007 as presented.

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

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

DZIERWA: Asked Mr. Sullivan if he has noticed any particular trend with the homes that are now to be zoned R-3, where they might be in a situation where their lot coverage is at 45% where it is allowed under R-4.

SULLIVAN: I wouldn't say it is a trend, however, periodically, somebody is adding a patio, maybe a built-in pool and a shed and by the time all these things accumulate some of them were exceeding. That is one of the issues under R-4 because it is a multi-family zoning of smaller lots. You have larger lot coverage allowed so the R-3 maintains the lot coverage that a R-3 area should have (35%). It is a reasonable lot coverage for R-3. It will prevent people from going too far and affecting our storm water management system which is based on calculations that have certain lot coverage.

DZIERWA: Do you know at this point if anyone has approached the Building Department saying they want to put an addition on and they were previously R-4 and they're at, let's say 35% now and they want to go up to 45%.

SULLIVAN: Stated he does not think anyone is caught in that right now. As mentioned in the Staff Report, everyone was notified that this was going to be a public hearing, therefore, if anyone really wanted to do that, they could have rushed in to the Building Department and made an application.

STEPHENS: As this was originally approved, it was a Planned Unit

Development, correct?

SULLIVAN: Yes sir.

STEPHENS: Under a Planned Unit Development, if they had to make any changes or additions or anything, they would have to go through the whole public hearing process, is that not true?

SULLIVAN: That is correct.

STEPHENS: In effect, what this really does, is simplify the process for them if they want to do additions and things of that nature.

SULLIVAN: Right, however, not too much because under R-4, they could have done that too. It more prevents people from having expectations of doing other kinds of things with a single-family lot.

STEPHENS: Regarding lot coverage?

SULLIVAN: That is probably one of the bigger things it does, however, it is really to clarify for everybody what is appropriate here and what can be done. It is not to mislead someone into thinking that this is R-4, therefore, I can do this or that.

STEPHENS: Complimented Mr. Sullivan and his Staff for looking at this situation and correcting it as we are going to move it forward tonight.

SULLIVAN: Thank you.

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion from the Plan Commissioners.

I move to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission the findings of fact set forth in this staff report, dated September 25, 2007,

and

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of the rezoning of the single-family areas of Mallard Landings, Eagle Ridge I and Eagle Ridge II from R-4 to R-3.

A motion was made by Commissioner Steve Dzierwa, seconded by Commissioner Paul Aubin, that this matter be RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Thompson

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS**2007-0592 Discovery Clothing - Building Elevations**

Mike Roach, Chipman Adams Architects, 192 Royce Drive, Bloomingdale

PITTOS: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated September 25, 2007 as presented.

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

ROACH: Stated his client wanted to make sure it was clear in regard to the windows in the sales area. We've noted them as windows open to sales area and windows open to windows display. The window display will have solid walls behind there with mannequins or signs or things like that. You will not be able to see into the sales area. This is critical for his merchandising to be able to have enough wall space. He has three of the sections of windows where you will see all the way into the sales area and see people in the store, however, the ones that say "window display", you will not be able to see into the store.

STEPHENS: Is that designated on here?

ROACH: Yes, it is.

STEPHENS: That is on the south elevation?

ROACH: It is on the south, east and west. Pointed to them on the plan. Noted that the main feature elements are all clear glass where you can see thru to the floor area. These flanking sections say "window display". My client wanted to make sure that was okay because it is critical to his merchandising. He did not want there to be any confusion in that regard, therefore, we've tried to be as clear as we could about it.

STEPHENS: As a point of clarification, indicated his understanding that on the west elevation, basically the middle and the northern-most is clear glass.

ROACH: No. The northern-most right now is spandrel.

STEPHENS: According to this, it looks like only one panel next to the door is spandrel.

ROACH: No, it is that whole section. We understand that what they want to see is window display so that is what we will put there because that is our stock room

STEPHENS: So you are going to make that a window display. You will eliminate the spandrel and make that a window display.

ROACH: Yes sir.

STEPHENS: On the south elevation?

ROACH: This is your only view into the sales area.

STEPHENS: On the east elevation?

ROACH: That has the main architectural feature. It should be noted that these east and west features line up with each other so you will be able to see straight through the store. We want to highlight the most prominent features with the clear glass through to try to keep with the spirit of what we understand the Village to be trying for and yet still work with his sales floor layout.

STEPHEN: Is it the same situation on the north elevation?

ROACH: The north elevation is all clear glass and they are higher windows through which you will only see the lights of the stockroom area in there.

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

CULLIGAN: Asked Mr. Pittos to repeat what he said in Staff's Report in regard to lighting in the red tile.

PITTOS: Clarified that the red tile inserts that are labeled on the elevations - in previous drawings they were light displays from which light was emitted perpendicularly from the wall. I had mentioned that this new down lighting onto the awnings and display areas would replace that type of original lighting. Therefore, presumably, the red tile inserts would only have an architectural design with no lighting or anything.

CULLIGAN: Directing his comment to Mr. Roach, stated that he has heard Staff's Report wherein it addressed changing the roof lines. That is something I wanted to talk about tonight - we would see the other walls of the four sides there. Asked Mr. Roach if he is comfortable with that change.

ROACH: That is one of the other things I thought further about. The ones on the corners, of course we will work with Staff in regard to how to do that, however, we have that curved element and to try to raise up the wall right next to that will definitely interfere with the curved elements. I'm not sure at this time how to successfully keep that curved element a clean design yet screen it from one side. Certainly we want to work with Staff to do what you are saying, however, I'm not sure how it will get done. The reason we put the curved elements on the corner and not in the middle of the north and south facades is because the Village Ordinance talks about emphasizing the corners or maybe it was the Lowe's

guidelines. We were trying to do that and the client definitely likes that because it will give him more presence on LaGrange Road. I hesitate to want to move those away yet I want to keep that feature.

CULLIGAN: Are any of the areas where the curved arch area with the Discovery Clothing sign, a flat wall or is it extended at all from the building elevation.

ROACH: We haven't fully detailed that part yet. The piers themselves will be the larger piers. The smaller ones may come out four inches and the larger piers may come out eight inches. It will be a little larger, however, we've not gotten to that level of detail yet.

CULLIGAN: That might be something you could bump out a little more perhaps. Then you could work with the arch. That is just a thought. Thank you. Nothing else.

JACOBS: Concur with all of the conditions in the Requested Action section of Staff's Report as we've been discussing, therefore, if we manage to agree to these, then all of my concerns are covered. Thank you.

DZIERWA: Stated Staff addressed the columns by the architectural features and their desire that they be brick all the way up to the curve. Asked the petitioner if he had a problem with that.

ROACH: Indicated he has no problem with that.

DZIERWA: What may have been easier for us as Plan Commissioners - for example on the west elevation - if you could have portrayed the south elevation's architectural feature to see what it would look like. I don't think you have to add parapet walls to hide that. Asked what the back of the arch will look like. Will it look just like the front? Could you, perhaps, start the top of the arch real wide and then as you come down, go down to a point or something?

ROACH: That is a great point. We could take the brick around the sides of those piers and then ... on the back of the piers, rather than put bricks down on the top of a roof, perhaps we could take the EPDM roofing up to a termination bar above that where you are going to see it, put a beige dryvit or something to match the brick color and make it more visibly pleasing should you see the back. The detail of the red standing metal canopy or coping will be exactly the same on the front and the back. Can do that and some efface and keeping the roofing material out of site - that is one possibility if acceptable.

DZIERWA: That could work. My only other concern was that your columns should extend out from the main wall to give the building a bit of a staggered look. That is all I have.

ROACH: We will extend them out. Noted Commissioner Dzierwa was correct in that he should have depicted the parapets on the sides. That was a drawing oversight.

PARISI: Concur with most of the suggestions. Agree with Commissioner Dzierwa. I was thinking the same thing. Rather than raising the walls to hide the parapet - you'd diminish the effect of the curved arches - there is something you could do with what is exposed - something decorative - perhaps some type of dryvit or facing on it that would be more aesthetically pleasing from the road. That is all. Thank you.

AUBIN: All of my questions have been asked and answered. Thank you.

STEPHENS: The fact that this building is going to have so much of a presence on LaGrange Road, in my opinion, I would like to see the columns in stone and the EIFS eliminated and replaced with brick. Cost wise, since you still have to put a masonry wall behind the EIFS - that is required by Code...

ROACH: Not necessarily. I did not know that.

PITTOS: Clarified that in fact that is required by Code.

STEPHENS: Since that is the Code, you have to install a masonry wall behind the EIFS and as far as the costs go, I don't think there is much of a difference between the brick going up there versus the EIFS surface or dryvit or whatever you want to call it. I would prefer to see the stone go up on all the columns and then above where you show the EIFS, make that all brick and make that a beige brick if you want to maintain the same color you are talking about. I have no problem with anything else. This is a very visible location on LaGrange Road and I would like to see it all stone and brick.

ROACH: Does it necessarily have to be stone or is masonry our guideline. I've driven around the area too to look at the other buildings. I see mostly brick or masonry materials, however, I do see EIFS. Is it the Staples building?

STEPHENS: Very small up at the top but all the way around.

ROACH: Certainly Lowe's has a significant amount of EIFS on it.

STEPHENS: Neither of those two buildings are right on LaGrange Road. This one is. It is much more visible. This is the building that will be seen.

ROACH: As far as cost of construction, masonry will be more expensive. We will have to put additional steel in to carry it. Things like that. The material, as I understand it, is more expensive.

STEPHENS: You'd only have to put a steel lenthil over the window area. You are still going to have to put the masonry block behind it.

ROACH: Yes, I wasn't aware of that.

STEPHENS: What has to hold that up?

ROACH: Yes, you're right.

STEPHENS: I don't see any difference in cost in this application because of the masonry backing required.

ROACH: Regarding the stone or the brick, please clarify what you are looking for.

STEPHENS: I want to see stone on the vertical columns and brick where you are showing the EIFS. You still have the awnings coming down.

ROACH: So brick is not an option for us on the piers?

STEPHENS: I asked if you could put stone up there.

ROACH: I'm asking what my parameters.

STEPHENS: I'll leave it open ended and in the motion we'll make it that you work with Staff.

ROACH: Okay, thank you.

PARISI: Noticed in our agenda this is listed as item #2007-0538 yet in Staff's Request for Action, it is listed as item #2007-0592.

PITTOS: The elevations are a separate file number from the Site Plan.

PARISI: They both said elevations. Thank you.

STEPHENS: Hearing no other comments or questions, entertained a motion from the Plan Commissioners.

I move to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission, the findings of fact set forth in this Staff Report dated September 25, 2007, and

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of the building elevations titled "Discovery Clothing Lowe's of Orland Park Lot 2 Exterior Elevations", prepared by Chipman Adams Architects, dated 09-20-07, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the petitioner work with staff to determine possibilities to vary the roofline appropriately to avoid monotony in design and address the side view of parapets;
2. That the petitioner extends masonry to the top of the main architectural features on each façade along the vertical piers or columns;
3. That the main architectural features on each elevation are clad in masonry;
4. That the red tile inserts on the elevations do not emit illumination;
5. That the petitioner works with staff to eliminate the spandrel glass panel on the west elevation's north window bay.

A motion was made by Commissioner Paul Aubin, seconded by Commissioner Steve Dzierwa, that this matter be RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Development Services & Planning, due back on 10/22/2007. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Thompson

OTHER BUSINESS

STEPHENS: Reported that when he is driving westbound on 156th Street, he cannot see the stop sign until he reaches the corner due to the parkway trees completely blocking its view. It is the same situation going eastbound off of LaGrange Road. Asked Staff do something about either eliminating those parkway trees or finding some way to create visibility to that stop sign. That is a problem.

SULLIVAN: Will look into that.

ADJOURNMENT

STEPHENS: There being no further business before the Plan Commissioners, the meeting was adjourned at 7:44 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Teri Dougherty
Recording Secretary