

VILLAGE OF ORLAND PARK

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



Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, November 27, 2007

7:00 PM

Village Hall

Plan Commission

Louis Stephens, Chairman

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

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 Dzierwa; Commissioner Aubin; Commissioner Stephens;
Commissioner Culligan; Commissioner Thompson, Commissioner Parisi

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Jacobs

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Commissioner Thompson, seconded by Commissioner Dzierwa and carried to approve the minutes of the October 9, 2007 Plan Commission Meeting with the following revisions: (1) fourth paragraph on page three of 40 under "GREGORY", replace the word "surprised" with the word "surprise; (2) ninth paragraph on page four under "GREGORY", replace the word "are" with the word "area"; (3) second paragraph on page five under "DZIERWA", replace the word "thrill" with the word "thrilled"; (4) sixth paragraph on page five under "CULLIGAN", 15th line, replace the words "higher than that" with the words "higher than that"; (5) 13th paragraph on page nine under "STEPHENS" replace the last word "brick" with the word "block"; (6) ninth paragraph on page nine, replace "STEVENS" with "STEPHENS"; (7) second paragraph on page 19 under "STEPHENS" replace the word "be" with the word "been"; (8) fifth paragraph on page 19 under "AUBIN" begin the fourth sentence as "You are going..." instead of "You have are going"; (9) on pages 20 and 21, delete the full motion as written, however, keep the motion to continue the petition as written; (10) the first sentence in the first paragraph on page 24 under "STEPHENS": (a) replace the word "is" with the word "it"; and (b) replace the word "sound" with the word "sounds"; (11) the fifth paragraph on page 28 under "STEPHENS", insert the word "treatment" so that it reads "some sort of architectural treatment..."; (12) the first paragraph on page 30: (a) replace the word "lose" with the word "loss"; and (b) replace the word "loosing" with the word "losing"; (13) the third paragraph on page 31 under "CULLIGAN": (a) replace the word "look" with the word "looking" so the sentence reads "that we are looking at here"; (b) delete the word "is" so that the sentence reads "there really isn't any kind..."; and (c) replace the word "canvas" with the word "campus" where it appears three times within that paragraph; (14) seventh paragraph on page 31 under "MEYER-SMITH", replace the word "added" with the word "adding"; (15) fourth paragraph on page 38 under "DZIERWA", replace the word "not" with the word "now" so that it reads "...site plan listed as less than an acre before and now..."; and (16) in the sixth-listed condition to the motion on page 39, insert the words "two middle" so that it reads "...over the two middle store front windows...".

A motion was made by Commissioner Thompson, seconded by Commissioner Dzierwa and carried to approve the minutes of the October 23, 2007 Plan Commission Meeting with the following revisions: (1) eighth paragraph on page four under "MALLON", replace the word "neighbor" with the word "neighborhood"; (2) within the "Walsh Property" petition, replace "WAYMEIER" with

“WEHEMEIER”; (3) ninth paragraph on page five, replace “AUBIB:” with “AUBIN:”; (4) eighth paragraph on page six under “DZIERWA”, insert the word “have” in the last sentence so that it reads “I have nothing further at this time.”; (5) ninth paragraph on page 15 under “SOSIN”, in the fifth sentence, replace the word “it” with “is”; and (6) replace the motion written to one that continues the petition.

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

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Jacobs

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2007-0268 Open Space Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion to terminate.

PARISI: Moved to terminate the public hearing for file number 2007-0268, Open Space Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

DZIERWA: Second.

A motion was made by that this matter be TERMINATED. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Jacobs

2007-0490 Charleton Highlands

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion for a continuance..

THOMPSON: Moved to continue the public hearing for file number 2007-0490, Charleton Highlands - Variance, to the December 11, 2007 Plan Commission meeting.

DZIERWA: Second.

A motion was made by that this matter be CONTINUED to the Plan Commission, due back on 12/11/2007. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Jacobs

2007-0660 Land Development Code Amendments I (2007)

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion for a continuance..

THOMPSON: Moved to continue the public hearing for file number 2007-0660, Land Development Code Amendments I (2007), to the February 12, 2008 Plan Commission meeting.

DZIERWA: Second.

A motion was made by that this matter be CONTINUED to the Plan Commission, due back on 2/12/2008. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Jacobs

2007-0661 Land Development Code Amendments II (2007) MFG District

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion for a continuance..

THOMPSON: Moved to continue the public hearing for file number 2007-0660, Land Development Code Amendments II (2007) MFG District, to the February 12, 2008 Plan Commission meeting.

DZIERWA: Second.

A motion was made by that this matter be CONTINUED to the Plan Commission, due back on 2/12/2008. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Jacobs

2007-0420 Walgreen's 143rd & Will-Cook Road

Savas Er

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

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

ER (who was previously sworn):

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

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

PARISI: After an extensive number of changes from the last meeting, I like what I see, however, there are a number of conditions which I'm assuming the petitioner is willing to do.

ER: Yes.

THOMPSON: Concurred with her fellow Plan Commissioner. The petitioner has done a nice job of reworking this.

AUBIN: Agreed with Commissioners Parisi and Thompson. I'm sure our Staff has worked hard to put this building in a situation where it is an eye-pleasing gateway from the west into the Village of Orland Park. With the petitioner aware of the conditions listed and the petitioner having agreed to the conditions that our Staff put together I have no problem with it whatsoever. It has come a long way from the first time I saw it.

CULLIGAN: Agreed with the comments made by his fellow Plan Commissioners. This appears to be a better fit there at the entryway into the Village of Orland Park. Pleased to see the gateway sign there. That is something we were looking for and the petitioner has done a nice job in that regard. The pervious area to the site has improved greatly - another nice addition to the overall plaza site. In regard to the parking area, I think some of that striping is a very good idea and I have no problem with that up toward the front of the building, close to the building. However, striping so many spaces to please 30-minutes visit times into Walgreen's hurts the overall site. There are several other tenants there who would like access to some of those spots. The spots closer to the front of the building - that is fine, however, the rest should be delegated to the overall site which has shared parking. That is all I have, thank you.

DZIERWA: Stated this shows a significant improvement - this is a good-looking plan. Indicated he is not a big fan of the drive-thru starting right at the front door (noted his comments from last time), however, it looks like the majority rules here as long as the signage is there to let people know that the drive-thru does start at the front door. I'm pleased to see the pervious surface go up to 27%. The

landscape islands are a beautiful thing. Glad to see that the 30-minute parking signs have been removed because they would have been an eyesore. Putting them on the pavement generates maintenance issues. Once people frequent that area they will realize the 30-minute parking limit.

STEPHENS: Complimented the petitioner and his architect for working with Staff and addressing the Plan Commissioners' concerns. Indicated he wanted to ask a question of the architect then asked Mr. Pittos to please put the colored elevation of the south facade back up on the screen.

JOHN BRADSHAW (Architect, previously sworn) approached the podium to respond to the Chairman's questions.

STEPHENS: Asked Mr. Bradshaw if there is anything he could add to that back wall to enhance its appearance, such as a brickwork pattern, to give a little more pizzazz. Noted that this is the main entrance into the center and is across from the park area he is putting in which is very nice.

BRADSHAW: Began to answer the Chairman by first providing an overview of the things they have already done to the southern elevation. Noted they added the masonry enclosure; added the roof over the actual tote enclosure; changed the color of the pilasters which are now sticking out four inches. Added the landscaping. Noted that this is a pretty utilitarian side. While its position is a bit unfortunate, noted it is really the only way this building will fit. Indicated there is not a ton of things that can be done here. Trucks will be moving in and out. Functional things will be happening. Landscaping was relatively easy and pretty effective. Possibly there is more room for landscaping. Asked the Chairman if he has a particular objection to the cedar gates. You will see them as soon as you drive in so perhaps they can be improved slightly from what they look like now.

STEPHENS: Asked what the alternative would be.

BRADSHAW: These are six-inch cedar boards. An alternative might be that they are a little more intentional gates.

STEPHENS: Invited Messrs. Err and Bradshaw to step forward so he might provide an idea he has in regard to a herringbone brickwork pattern that might look nice.

BRADSHAW: Indicated he thinks that is a little out of character with the rest of the building, however, he does like the idea of manipulating the brick pattern. Wouldn't necessarily do it in this vein, however, would have to do it at that level in order to get some effect out of it.

STEPHENS: Clarified he only making a suggestion - Mr. Bradshaw is the Architect and he is looking for his input.

BRADSHAW: Indicated he does not mind a little give and take. Stated he thought he could do something with a brick pattern in this area, however, wouldn't go to the extent. Instead, would probably use a combination of soldier course and perhaps some row log course. Could also introduce another band of the iron spot which might draw your eye to it. Not certain he would go diagonal given the nature of the rest of the building.

STEPHENS: Sounds good. Will have you work with Staff on that. Asked Mr. Er if those 50 spots to be striped is a requirement of Walgreen's

ER: Initially they asked for 70 and we settled on 50.

STEPHENS: Asked Staff if the paint used on the asphalt won't wear off after awhile.

PITTOS: Presumably it would. It would just have to be repainted.

ERR: Instead of 50 signs for each stall, perhaps one sign for every two stalls instead which would reduce the number of signs to 25. The paint could wear off and it could look ugly.

STEPHENS: That is what I thought too.

ER: Instead of 50, take it down to 25.

STEPHENS: Asked Staff for its opinion in that regard.

PITTOS: The intent was not to have so many signs sticking out of the ground. We could work with the reduction.

STEPHENS: Asked the Plan Commissioners for their opinion in that regard.

CULLIGAN: I am not in favor of any signs at all. Maybe something at the end of each island to designate the parking restrictions, however, not the 25 signs. Think you could attach a small sign to the building for those front nine spots. Then at the end of each island place 30-minute parking stall signs.

DZIERWA: Asked the petitioner how Walgreen's would enforce this.

ER: They put it in their lease.

DZIERWA: How would they handle cars parked there and left for the day.

ER: I am not sure how they will do that. Noted they are adding 49 spaces in front of the shopping center right now.

STEPHENS: Stated he agrees with Commissioner Culligan's suggestion. Perhaps put a couple of signs on the building and then perhaps three signs on each island, one at both ends and one in the middle.

THOMPSON: What would the signs on the end say? I could see putting signs on the building. Noted she has seen signs in parking lots that get knocked and rusted. They look horrible. Agree with Staff. Put a sign on the building but not in the rest of the areas.

PARISI: I am not in favor of 50 signs either, however, perhaps since these are enclosed areas here, have one in the middle of each enclosure and on the wall like Commissioner Culligan said.

STEPHENS: We have to come to some consensus. I think Commissioner Culligan's suggestion about putting a couple signs against the building is reasonable - does anyone have a problem with that?

COMMISSIONERS: No.

STEPHENS: I see no problem with putting in a couple of signs on each island.

ER: Noted that the islands are deep. Can put one in the middle and double face it. They won't be too close to the parking stalls so people will not be able to hit them.

BRADSHAW: Stated he will be the one who presents this to Walgreen's. Will ask that there be more Staff level discussion on this because I am not entirely sure what Walgreen's stance on this is. I know in the past, Walgreen's like to enforce and maintain their parking stalls. This is a relatively big issue with Walgreen's. If they understand that you don't like 50 signs, I can understand that as well - it is an eyesore. Walgreen's is reasonable. I would like to speak with them; let them know what Staff and the Plan Commissioners think in regard to all of this signage and then get their feedback which we will give to Mr. Pittos and then go from there. I believe they are thinking in the neighborhood of eight-to-ten signs. I think they would prefer signs given the fact that anything on the ground (such as snow) although they would keep it clean, it is harder to notice something that is on the ground, therefore, it is more likely to be violated. Therefore, they do like sign. I will also suggest to them that they put the signs at the heads of islands with the sign to indicate that all parking in this aisle to be 30-minute parking for Walgreen's only. I think we can make some headway on that and end up with perhaps eight signs.

STEPHENS: The point that during inclement weather, people will not be able to see the painted signage on the asphalt.

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion from the Plan Commissioners.

AUBIN: Moved to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission, the findings of fact set forth in this Staff Report dated November 27, 2007 and moved to recommend to the Village Board, approval of the Preliminary Site Plan entitled "Site Plan Walgreen's SEC 143rd and Will Cook Road Orland Park, Illinois" dated 5/7/07, last revised 11/17/07, prepared by Craig R. Knoche and Associates Civil Engineers, P.C., project number 6-074, Sheet Number C1.1, and the elevations entitled "Walgreens Will-Cook Road and 143rd Street Orland Park, IL Elevations" dated 9/14/05, last revised 11/27/07, prepared by Camburas and Theodore, Ltd. Architecture, Engineering, Interiors, sheet number A2.1, subject to the following conditions: (1) that the petitioner work with Staff on signage for displaying 30-minute-only parking stalls; (2) that the petitioner work with Staff in regard to designating the compact car stalls; (3) that the petitioner provide cash in lieu of the sidewalk proposed along the 143rd Street frontage of Walgreen's in order to revisit the sidewalk installation there at a later date when the new right-of-way improvements are constructed; (4) that the petitioner provide screening with additional plantings of at least five trees in the narrow stretch of bufferyard south of the rear building access drive aisle off Will-Cook Road; (5) that the petitioner increase the number of plantings along the outer perimeter of the drive-thru to mitigate the visual impact of the drive-thru lane; (6) that the petitioner provide tall or vertical vegetation at the foundation planting area on the west elevation; (7) that the petitioner include planter boxes or pots for the east elevation on the Site Plan; (8) that the two vertical columns that support the overhang be scaled and proportional to the building mass and size; (9) that the petitioner ensure the placement of the gateway signage on the corner of 143rd Street and Will-Cook Road respects future 143rd Street and Will-Cook Road intersection and road improvements; (10) that the petitioner remove existing non-conforming, free-standing Walgreen's monument sign(s); (11) that the Walgreen's be allowed only one free-standing conforming sign per right-of-way on the site; (12) that the petitioner submit a Landscape Plan within 60 days of final engineering; (13) that the petitioner meet all building code-related items; (14) that the petitioner meet all Final Engineering-related items; and (15) that the petitioner work with Staff to add architectural enhancements to the south elevation.

THOMPSON: Second.

AUBIN: Move to recommend to the Village Board approval of the requested variance for Walgreen's to allow a 12-to-17-foot wide pharmacy drive-thru service lane to locate between the building and the 143rd Street right-of-way and the Will-Cook Road right-of-way subject to the same conditions.

THOMPSON: Second.

A motion was made by that this matter be RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Development Services & Planning, due back on 12/10/2007. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Jacobs

2007-0591 Fifth/Third Bank

Gregory L. Dose, Attorney at Law, Goldstine, Skrodzki, Russian
Nemec and Hoff, Ltd., 835 McClintock Drive, Burr Ridge, IL
Laura Titschler, Officer, Real Estate Manager, Fifth Third Bank, 1701 Golf Road,
Rolling Meadows, IL
Zach Langel, Project Engineer, Manhard Consulting, Ltd., 900 Woodlands
Parkway,
Vernon Hills, IL
Eric D. Russell, Principal, KLOA, Transportation and Parking Planning
Consultants,
9575 West Higgins Road, Suite 400, Rosemont, IL
Jeff Kutsche, President, The Architects Partnership, Ltd. 122 South Michigan
Avenue,
Chicago, IL

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

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

AUBIN: Swore in Mr. Dose.

DOSE: Introduced Ms. Titschler, and Messrs. Langel, Russell and Kutsche.

AUBIN: Swore in Ms. Titschler.

TITSCHLER: Introduced herself as a Real Estate Manager with Fifth Third Bank. Thanked everyone for the time they've provided this evening and their attention to this proposal. Stated that Fifth Third Bank is a Cincinnati based bank that is in the middle of an expansion in the Chicago land area. We are the 13th largest financial institution in the United States and currently the fourth largest in Chicago, however, that is rapidly changing as Fifth Third Bank is moving up - that is a good thing. We currently have two other branches in Orland Park. There is one on Harlem Avenue and one on 159th Street. Both are doing well. Noted that she grew up in Frankfort, Illinois and Orland Square Mall was her playground. Therefore, she is especially thrilled to be here tonight and excited about the prospect of doing a project here. The opportunity we currently have at Orland Square Mall provides us with an opportunity to better service our existing customers in Orland Park as they are traveling and shopping along LaGrange

Road. It also, obviously, is our hope that it will increase our current customer base with a strong retail draw from the mall. Before we commit to any site, we do a number of studies to determine the economic and demographic feasibility of the site. This site scored off the charts. We are very confident this will be a fantastic site for the bank and for the Village. The hours of operation are minimal and actually opposite of what normally goes on around a mall with restaurants, etc. We are confident, therefore, that the traffic generation will be minimal; the impact will be minimal. The hours of operation will be 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday and on Saturday from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. There will be a 24-hour ATM. We will be providing at least seven good paying, white-collar jobs to the community. Fifth Third Bank is a generous contributor to the neighborhoods that we serve. Mr. Kutsche, our architect, has designed a very nice, full, masonry building. We worked extremely close with Mrs. Turley and the Village Staff to develop the Site Plan and the building in a manner that would enhance the architectural integrity of the surrounding area as well as deviating from our normal colonial style to better suit the Village's preference to a prairie-style building. We have a full team of experts here tonight to answer any questions there may be.

AUBIN: Swore in Mr. Kutsche.

KUTSCHE: Stated that Mrs. Turley did a great job in summarizing what we think the building is all about. Confirmed that we agree with Mrs. Turley that the end cap to the building on the south end of the building, as shown in the perspective, lowered, is our preference as well, therefore, the elevations in the instance that show it up to the same height of the others is something that we would prefer to get away from and, in fact, prefer to lower that. (Clarified that he is talking about the south elevation.) Speaking as everyone's attention was focused toward the (Power Point projection screen), stated that on the right hand side of the drawing where that is shown lower than the brick that is above it and beyond, is our preferred solution which means that exactly where that is being shown, the cast stone would be lowered on the south elevation primarily and also at the right-hand edge of the west elevation.

STEPHENS: Asked Staff if they agree with that.

TURLEY: Yes.

AUBIN: Pointed out that is noted as a condition.

STEPHENS: Thank you. I just wanted to get a clear understanding of that, that's all.

KUTSCHE: The other difference is the signage. That elevation as it was initially presented to you showed a more box-like sign. We are preferring to go back to the individual signs with individual letters. That is shown on the elevations exactly. The last point is that this is the perspective from the intersection of 149th and

LaGrange Road. As the main entrance to the mall as you are approaching this building to the south, this is exactly what you would see. Other than that, I am available for questions.

DOSE: Stated that concludes their direct presentation. We are in accord with all of Staff's proposed conditions and their report. Welcomed questions and interest.

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

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

PARISI: Indicated he really had no comments to make other than to say that this is a nice building. Noted there is no shortage of banks in Orland Park (believe this makes #28), however, this is an improvement over the existing building. Thank you.

THOMPSON: What a wonderful asset to that corner. This is a beautiful building. Noted her concern has been addressed. The dumpster on their drawing showed it was a screen, however, see it has been noted that it will be changed to masonry that will match the building. That will be much nicer. Other than that, can't wait to see it. It will be beautiful. Thank you.

CULLIGAN: Noted an increase in the business of Fifth Third Bank over in the Chicago area as stated. The site that was just developed for a Fifth Third Bank was of similar colors. Are these the colors that Fifth Third Bank is going with - this type of style?

DOSE: Historically, Fifth Third Bank has a strong preference for a more colonial-looking building and we have embellished that in a number of different communities. In this instance it was clearly not consistent with what Orland Park's vision was for this site or for their community. We've made more contemporary changes in other locations. I wouldn't say that this is a direction that Fifth Third Bank is taking, however, it is something we are happy to do based on Orland Park's request.

CULLIGAN: Noted he has been a resident of Orland Park for just over 30 years during which time he does not recollect anything being on that lot other than restaurants. Stated he welcomes the changes and wishes the petitioner good luck. Thank you.

DZIERWA: Welcomed the third Fifth Third Bank to the Village of Orland Park. Complimented the petitioner on the use of the spandrel glass which is a nice touch in the architectural treatments. Asked if the cast-stone window sills are limestone.

DOSE: Yes.

DZIERWA: The petitioner incorporated a lot of different things - the metal coping, the limestone window sills, the brick veneer. It is a lot without being too much. It makes the building busy enough where it is interesting without being too much. I think the petitioner did a good job and wished them much success on this site.

AUBIN: Concurred with his fellow Plan Commissioners. Even if this was the 912th bank in Orland Park, if the petitioner researched the history of this site and feels confident it will work, it should work like a dream. Welcome aboard. Thank you.

STEPHENS: Noted the petitioner had said that their banks have more of a colonial feel. Asked the petitioner if when they started working with Staff, did they first come in with a colonial-looking bank or did they start with a more contemporary-looking bank.

TURLEY: There were several different alternatives. This was the direction that architecturally we thought offered the most interest, not that Staff was married to any one architectural style. In this instance, this is the style we encouraged them to pursue further.

STEPHENS: Thanked the petitioner for working with Staff. Stated he agrees with Staff. This design fits very well in that spot. I think it will be a real asset to the community. Complimented the petitioner for what they did. Complimented Staff for working so well with the petitioner. Wished the petitioner a great deal of success at this location. It is a nice building. Noted he is a Fifth Third Bank customer at the 159th Street building (which he noted could use one or two more employees to their staff there as it is a bit slow).

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion from the Plan Commissioners.

DZIERWA: Moved to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission, the findings of fact set forth in this Staff Report dated November 27, 2007 and moved to recommend to the Village Board, approval of the Preliminary Site Plan entitled "Fifth Third Bank, Orland Park, by TAP, The Architect's Partnership", dated November 6, 2007, subject to the following conditions: (1) that the petitioner work with Staff to include natively-vegetated bio-swales where feasible on the Final Grading and Landscape Plans; (2) that a Landscape Plan, meeting all Village Codes, is submitted for separate review and approval within 60 days of final engineering approval; (3) that detailed sign plans are submitted for approval and sign permits; (4) that all final engineering-related items are met; (5) that the temporary loading area is located closer to the building and identified with signage prior to the Committee meeting; and (6) that the entranceway drive off of Ring Road is enlarged to accommodate three lanes; a single lane entrance to the site, one right-out lane and one left-out lane.

AUBIN: Second.

DZIERWA: Moved to recommend to the Village Board, approval of the Elevations entitled "Fifth Third Bank Orland Park" by TAP The Architect's Partnership dated November 6, 2007, subject to the same conditions as outlined in the Preliminary Site Plan motion and the following conditions: (1) that dumpsters are added to the Building elevations that match proposed building masonry prior to the Committee meeting; (2) that specific color and material types for primary construction materials are added as a note on the Elevations prior to the Committee meeting; (3) that building signs are revised with an individual channel letter style rather than sign boxes prior to the Committee meeting; and (4) that south and west building elevations are revised to reflect lower cast stone section height as illustrated on the perspective drawing.

AUBIN: Second.

DZIERWA: Moved to recommend to the Village Board, approval of an amendment of the Special Use permit for a Planned Development for Orland Square Mall and a minor Special Use Permit for a drive-through subject to the same conditions as outlined in the Preliminary Site Plan motion.

AUBIN: Second.

A motion was made by that this matter be RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Development Services & Planning, due back on 12/10/2007. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Jacobs

2007-0634 Distinctive Office Building

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion for a continuance.

THOMPSON: Moved to continue the public hearing for file number 2007-0634, Distinctive Office Building, to the December 11, 2007 Plan Commission meeting.

DZIERWA: Second.

A motion was made by that this matter be CONTINUED to the Plan Commission, due back on 12/11/2007. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Jacobs

2007-0682 Krad Subdivision

Mohamed Krad, 15601 S. 108th Avenue, Orland Park, IL

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

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

AUBIN: Swore in Mohamed Krad.

KRAD: Lives at 15601 S. 108th Avenue - Lot #2: Stated he has an issue with the retaining wall. It was finished less than two years ago by Collette Highland. Indicated he is not planning on doing anything close to it. He has no problem with it. He would like to leave the current elevation of the land just as it is. The suggestion to regrade the lot will change the entire topography which is a huge area to change. The retaining wall extends from the north side of the property almost to/past the second lot. It serves the drainage area for that subdivision. I know that builder and I wanted to buy some of those lots when this was initially developed. They were made to have a walk-out, third level for all of these houses on that area. You don't only have two levels. You also have the lower level walk out. The drainage can be done on two levels if it is underground. It is not a big deal. Originally, this was one hill; the same slope. I object to the suggestion to change the topography. That is not reasonably feasible for me to do that. That would cause me an undo burden. That area there is really huge. In regard to the setback, I have no problem with lot #2 going back to 50 and then it go around the corner because. That is not a problem. If in the future this house becomes a tear down and a new house is built in its place, I would have no problem automatically setting it up 50 feet all across there. If you want it drawn now to go 50 feet and go around the corner, I have no problem with that. In regard to the sidewalk, I have some concerns. With the sidewalk itself, I have no problem. However, there is a mistake here. There is no sidewalk on the north side of my property. There is only a sidewalk on the width area up to Julian Road. There is a significant distance from Julian Road to my property where there is no sidewalk. There is no sidewalk on the south side of Julian Road going to the train station parking lot. There is only sidewalk on the north side of it. About six months ago as Metra started to expand that road and working on it, they changed the elevation of the land. The higher area of the land close to lot #1, the most northern part of it, they lowered the street by two feet for visibility reasons. That is what they told me. They elevated the south end by two feet on the same lot, all the way down. A few weeks ago, they poured sidewalk across the street from our lot on the west side of 108th Avenue. They put in a big retaining wall area there. They shaved my land as you can see.

It is more sharply angled now. Although my land is higher than the other side, they put the retaining wall on the other side too I guess to sustain the sidewalk they put in. I have no problem with the sidewalk itself. However, there is no sidewalk on the north end that would require me putting a retaining wall like that on the other side all the way across. That is such a huge project. I just cannot do it. I ask either to be exempted from this or that I am just not responsible for any retaining wall. Collette Highlands is happy with their retaining wall. I'm happy with it. I have no problem with it. For me to cross the line of my property to go to the other lot and change all that, I think is unreasonable and a burden for me to do. Everything else, I have no problems with.

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

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

CULLIGAN: Stated his understanding that the issue with regard to this petition is that of rezoning and subdividing into three lots. Is that not correct?

STEPHENS: Correct.

CULLIGAN: At this time, Mr. Krad has not proposed to build anything. At this time, I saw nowhere in Staff's Report that it is feasible or not feasible - makes sense or doesn't make sense - other than let's try to cut down this wall. It may not be feasible to even do anything like this. It may not be feasible, without any kind of engineering, to even attempt to talk about this. Why these are issues or conditions for a rezoning into a three-lot subdivision, is confusing. Also, we don't know what tomorrow will bring. Mr. Krad may be in here soon to develop a home or he may never even touch this piece of property. Asked for clarification in regard to what the Plan Commissioners should be addressing this evening in terms of this petition.

KRAD: Reiterated the fact that he lives on the property. He is not doing this for commercial reasons. If he were, he would ask for six lots. I'm not doing that. I live on the property. Lot #3 has a barn, a silo and a small cottage that my daughter lives in. The barn is very old and the area around us has been developed with some really nice houses. It's an eyesore. If we do anything it would be to improve the look of the barn and the property. There are two ways to improve this situation and the neighborhood too. Either change it to a barn house that is remodeled and looks new, or to replace it with a new house there. Up until just a year or two ago, there were horses there. The other house on Lot #2, I live in it. I'm not planning on changing anything. In the distant future I'll probably get rid of #1, #2 and #3 and build a house on #3. I cannot do anything with lot #3 unless I divide it.

CULLIGAN: Thank you. Nothing further.

DZIERWA: Expressed concurrence with Mr. Krad. The Village is asking you to clean up by regrading something that you did not cause. We can't ask you to fix something that you didn't do. Curious, if that was all one big hill at one time, why they re-graded over there and created that large wall. It seemed like someone wanted to create a walkout basement and that is why they cut into that hill and that should not have been done in the first place. Concur with Commissioner Culligan's comments in regard to where we are going with this. That is all I have. Thank you.

PARISI: I have nothing to add. Thank you.

THOMPSON: I have nothing to add. Thank you.

AUBIN: In condition #1, the words reasonably feasible for the work in that retaining wall are used. With the evidence presented this evening, it is not reasonably feasible. I think we should eliminate condition #1 from the motion. Condition #2, the installation of a sidewalk along the length of lots #1, #2 and #3, I think we can revisit that at another time. If, indeed, we are just subdividing here, we do not need to have the petitioner install a sidewalk. That can be revisited as he develops those three lots. Otherwise, the petitioner has agreed with the rest of the conditions that our able Staff has put together here. Thank you.

STEPHENS: I agree with what has been said here. I do not know why we would require him to regrade that area. I do not see the necessity for that other than that it benefits those other lots.

CULLIGAN: We cannot even make a judgment here because we don't even know whether or not it is feasible.

STEPHENS: Yes. There is a grade here - at the top is 726 and down by lot #1, the high point is 710. That is a 16-foot difference. I don't know how you would regrade down to that.

PITTOS: The entire discussion around the retaining wall was added into the Staff Report from a planning perspective just to address the fact that it was there and that we could move toward looking into reducing that height. Whether that happens with the subdivision and the rezoning is another question. In regard to the sidewalk, there is a sidewalk north of the subject property. It does not abut the property itself. However, it terminates on Village land, which is the wetlands area, so that the sidewalk could easily get connected through from 153rd Street all the way down to Somerglen Lane and beyond.

STEPHENS: With regard to the sidewalk, would we require him to install it with this petition or at the time he would be developing or building on those lots?

PITTOS: It is my understanding from other Staff comments, that the sidewalk was

intended for this petition.

STEPHENS: I see the necessity for a sidewalk there eventually, however, this is a petition for a resubdivision. This was already annexed into the Village so this is not an annexation.

PITTOS: Correct.

STEPHENS: So this is just a resubdivision of a three-acre parcel into three lots. If it is just a resubdivision and they are not going to be building on it, why would we require them to install sidewalks at this point? I think we can keep this as a condition, however, change it to reflect that it would be required at such time when the lots are built on it.

PITTOS: I think we can work with that.

KRAD: As far as the retaining wall, this is the lot that remains unsold on the property. I live there. I go on the hill all the time.

STEPHENS: This is the lot on Collette Highlands?

KRAD: Also, in regard to the sidewalk. We use the Metra to go downtown. My daughter and their husband live in the cottage next to us. They work downtown and go to law school. They take the train. They go through the subdivision which is the easiest way to go. No one goes on the street because there are no houses north of us. There is no sidewalk beyond our land.

STEPHENS: What I'm suggesting is that you won't be required to put the sidewalk in now. However, if you build on each one of those lots, you will be required to put the sidewalk in.

KRAD: Okay, I understand.

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion from the Plan Commissioners.

PARISI: Moved to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission, the findings of fact set forth in this Staff Report dated November 27, 2007 and moved to recommend to the Village Board, approval of the subdivision as shown on the Plat of Subdivision entitled "Krad Subdivision" prepared by Landmark Engineering Corporation, dated 10/15/07, project number 07-04-119-CPT, subject to the following conditions: (1) that the petitioner work with Staff to discuss the installation of a sidewalk along the lengths of lots #1, 2 and 3 on 108th Avenue and connect to the Collette Highland sidewalks to the south and 153rd Street wetland sidewalk system to the north at such time as development should begin to occur on these lots; (2) that the petitioner provide a tree survey with building footprints at such time that the lots are developed; and (3) that the petitioner

dedicate to the 108th Avenue right-of-way, the necessary 50-feet along the length of Lot 2 of the subdivision, circumventing the building at the west-by-northwest corner of the building, forming a triangle around that corner, and then continuing back to the 50-foot dedication line to match the dedication lines along Lots 1 and 3.

THOMPSON: Second.

PARISI: Moved to recommend to the Village Board, approval of the rezoning of the subject lots from E-1 Estate Residential to R-1 Residential District subject to the conditions as above.

THOMPSON: Second.

A motion was made by that this matter be RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Development Services & Planning, due back on 12/10/2007. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Jacobs

2007-0642 Orland Park Wine and Spirits

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

John Griffin, Law firm of Griffin & Gallagher, 10001 South Roberts Road, Palos Hills
Michael Stanula, 759 Henfield Street, Beecher, Illinois

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

AUBIN: Swore in Mr. Griffin.

GRIFFIN: Staff has presented this well. We agree with all of the conditions that Staff stated in their report. As Staff pointed out, this is an upgrade from the plan presently approved in a lot of ways. We worked with Staff to bring it up to the current code and make a number of improvements. Also present are Michael Stanula, the Architect and Brad Brink the Engineer from Lexmoor Engineering. They are prepared to answer questions anyone may have.

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

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

THOMPSON: Will there be any plantings at the east elevation of the building?
Will it look as plain as is shown?

AUBIN: Swore in Mr. Stanula.

STANULA: The Orland Park Wine and Spirits, which is a liquor store, would move into that side of the building. That would primarily be their storage end so windows in that area would not be practical for the use of the space. What we can do is bring the EIFS which is the top band that is on the other three elevations, down to the same level, run it across the east elevation and even add the blue awnings on that side of that elevation just so that everything is uniform all the way around.

STEPHENS: What about spandrel glass?

STANULA: It seemed to be popular with the Board before. It could be put in. It is an expense. I think by adding the awnings in the east corner on that side of the elevation - it is not a very large building like the bank which was a much larger structure. Adding the glass there would not contribute to anything more.

THOMPSON: I would like to decorative brick or something to enhance that side.

STANULA: Okay.

THOMPSON: I also have a question on the patio area. Are you doing that just as a decorative feature or do you plan on using that at some point.

STANULA: Depending upon the user of that space on the west side of the building - if it is a restaurant, we would get a special use permit, but we would have outdoor seating capacity for that. It could be a coffee shop. It could be a book store.

THOMPSON: How many different buildings will this be divided into?

STANULA: Presently it is considered to be two users. It could be split up into five uses.

THOMPSON: I have no further questions. Thank you.

PARISI: I see no practicality for putting awnings on a blank wall. To match the roof line is fine, however, to put an awning there, where there is no window(s), just does not seem to fit.

STANULA: That is understandable. I think adding the corners across that side

would certainly tie it all together.

PARISI: Other than that, Commissioner Thompson suggested the use of some decorative brick or something on that east wall. That would seem to make more sense. That is all I have. Thank you.

CULLIGAN: I have nothing to add. Thank you.

DZIERWA: I don't think that wall needs to be addressed a whole lot. Basically, there are just cars parked on the other side of it. I think the few architectural treatments that you have on that wall are sufficient. As mentioned earlier, if you just drop the EIFS down to the same height as the rest of the building, I think that would be enough over there. I've been waiting for this petition to come back for two-three years. I had been wondering what was going on over here. I was surprised to see you might have multiple tenants. I agree with Staff. I think you have to work with a place to put one sign. When the situation occurs that you do end up with more than one tenant, then you adhere to the Village of Orland Park's Sign Ordinance. Other than that I welcome this. It is a good looking building and I wish you good luck. Thank you.

TURLEY: Commented that the Code only allows the EIFS above windows, therefore, we might have to look at the Code for that suggestion (that it be extended around the east).

DZIERWA: Perhaps a brick with that color to give it a bit more uniformity. However, as far as it being a totally boring wall - it is not. Spandrel glass would have been a good idea, however, it really is not necessary. Just dress it up with a different color brick.

AUBIN: Concur with my fellow Plan Commissioners. The petitioner has agreed to all of the conditions and I think we can adjust one of the conditions to help you spruce up that east elevation.

STEPHEN: I was on the Plan Commission at the time this came before us previously. This is a big improvement. It has a much better layout. It is a much better site plan. It is a much better building. I agree with Commissioner Dzierwa in regard to the east elevation. There are going to be parked cars from the car dealership backing up to there. I don't know how much visibility there will be of that building other than driving westbound off of 159th Street. I would like to see something there. I like the idea of what has been suggested (extending it around). That is a good idea if that can be accomplished.

GRIFFIN: Would that be another variance to the building code?

TURLEY: We will have to take a look at that to see how it can be addressed within the limits of the code.

STEPHENS: Asked the petitioner to work with Staff. Noted he doesn't think it is necessary to put awnings on that elevation. That would not make sense. Indicated the petitioner talked about perhaps going across with the EIFS. Would you just tie that in too?

STANULA: Certainly. It would bring all 360-degree architecture.

STEPHENS: That would tie the entire building together and give us what we are looking for.

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion from the Plan Commissioners.

AUBIN: Moved to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission, the findings of fact set forth in this Staff Report dated November 27, 2007 and moved to recommend to the Village Board, approval of the Preliminary Site Plan by Lexmoor Engineering entitled "Proposed Retail Facility Northeast Corner 159th Street and 84th Avenue", dated 6/21/07, subject to the following conditions to be completed prior to the Committee meeting unless otherwise noted: (1) that an additional handicapped space is delineated; (2) that the two central parking lot islands are combined into one larger island located where the four-foot-wide island is currently located; (3) that pervious pavers are used for the outdoor patio and labeled on the Site Plan; (4) that all mechanical equipment is adequately screened, either at grade level with landscaping, or on the roof with a parapet constructed of materials similar to the building; (5) that a Landscape Plan, meeting all Village Codes, is submitted for separate review and approval within 60 days of final engineering approval - this shall include parkway trees along 159th Street and 84th Avenue; and (6) that all final engineering-related items are met.

PARISI: Second.

AUBIN: Moved to recommend to the Village Board, approval of the Elevations by Architect Michael Stanula subject to the following conditions to be completed prior to the Committee meeting unless otherwise noted: (1) that elevations are labeled with Project title, address and date of latest revision; (2) that the petitioner work with Staff to add architectural enhancements to the north and east elevations; (3) that the masonry dumpster is constructed of brick to match the building and is shown on the elevations; (4) that all building materials and colors are detailed as notes on the elevations; and (5) that detailed sign elevations are submitted for approval in a separate permitting process and will include: (a) a reduction in building signs to one sign per tenant elevation facing a street; and (b) removal of café sign.

PARISI: Second.

AUBIN: Moved to recommend to the Village Board, approval of the following variances: (1) to reduce the east building setback from a required 15 feet to a provided eight feet; (2) to reduce the required landscape buffer along the east side of the building from a required ten feet to a provided eight feet; and (3) to reduce the tree island width adjacent to the dumpster from a required ten feet to a provided five feet.

PARISI: Second.

A motion was made by Commissioner Paul Aubin, seconded by Commissioner Nick Parisi, that this matter be RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Development Services & Planning, due back on 12/10/2007. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Jacobs

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

2007-0508 John Burns Construction

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

STEPHENS: Acknowledged that the petitioner is not present. Asked Mr. Pittos if the petitioner is in agreement with Staff's recommendations.

PITTOS: Indicated he spoke with the petitioner a number of times in regard to the parking lot landscape island and they seemed to be able to work with it although they did not depict it on the Site Plan they submitted for the Plan Commission.

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

STEPHENS: Entertained a motion from the Plan Commissioners.

DZIERWA: Moved to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission, the findings of fact set forth in this Staff Report dated November 27, 2007 and moved to recommend to the Village Board, approval of the Preliminary Site Plan entitled "Office Area Remodeling John Burns Construction Co., 17601 Southwest Highway, Orland Park, IL", sheet number G1, prepared by hbk Engineering, dated 02-06-06, last revised 11-06-07, subject to the following conditions: (1) that the petitioner work with Staff to provide a landscape island in the area where the shed extended north of the existing fence line on the Site Plan prior to appearing before

the Board of Trustees; and (2) that all Final Engineering items are met regarding the property at 17601 Southwest Highway, Orland Park, IL.

AUBIN: Second.

The Appearance Review proposal for John Burns Construction, as shown on the elevations titled "Office Area Remodeling John Burns Construction Co." prepared by Andrew R. Partak, Jr. AIA Architect, dated 2-14-07, last revised 9-10-07 and received 10-10-07, received Administrative Approval on October 10, 2007, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the petitioner submit site plan changes for site plan review by the Plan Commission;
2. That all building code items are met.

A motion was made by that this matter be RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Development Services & Planning, due back on 12/10/2007. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Jacobs

OTHER BUSINESS

STEPHENS: Noted that a couple of months ago, he brought up under "Other Business" the issue of two stop signs along the Lowe's Street that runs east and west - 156th Street-the problem I have with that is when I travel westbound, I cannot see the stop sign because of the trees. When I traveled eastbound, I could not see the stop sign until I got right on top of it because of the trees. It is one block east of LaGrange Road on 156th Street - the street that runs through the Lowe's - it connects 94th Avenue to LaGrange Road.

TURLEY: I am not sure if that was referred to Public Works or not, however, I will look into the matter.

STEPHENS: Thank you.

DZIERWA: Referenced a publication he received from Bob Sullivan wherein it recognizes the Village of Orland Park's Police Station being gold certified with 45 points. Ours is the only Police Station in the entire country that is gold certified and only one of seven in the world. I think that is something to be proud of. Encouraged his colleagues to read some of the things we've approved in the past and what they are doing. We are going in the right direction when we ask other petitioners when they come in to try to meet some of these standards while not necessarily meeting the government's standards. We've asked petitioners to add

skylights in order to let more natural light into the areas of their businesses. I think we should push that when we have the opportunity. I know Staff thinks that way and I know we are starting to think that way. This proves that it works.

STEPHENS: Very good. Thank you.

ADJOURNMENT

STEPHENS: There being no further business before the Plan Commissioners, the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Teri Dougherty
Recording Secretary