

VILLAGE OF ORLAND PARK

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



Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, January 8, 2008

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 Vice Chairman, Mr. Paul Aubin, at 7:00 p.m.

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

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Stephens

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Commissioner Thompson, seconded by Commissioner Dzierwa and carried to approve the minutes of the December 11, 2007 Plan Commission Meeting with the following changes on page seven: (1) in the first paragraph, insert the word "they" so that it reads "Yes, and 'they' fully maintain the pond."; and (2) in the 11th paragraph, under Mr. Sosin's comment: add the word "smaller" to the first sentence so that it reads "The houses are 100-to-150 square feet 'smaller'."

(Recommended for approval...6-0.)

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

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Stephens

PUBLIC HEARINGS**2007-0717 Heritage Town Centre**

David B. Sosin, Attorney at Law, 11800 S. 75th Avenue, Palos Heights
Patrick Roe, President of Heritage Bank, 1018 Prestwick Drive, Frankfort
Scott Shalvis, The Shalvis Group, 11508 West 183rd Street, Orland Park
Duane Linden, 14640 Golf Road, Orland Park
John Hilson, Burke Engineering, 18330 Distinctive Drive (Civil Engineer)
Eric Russel, KLOA, Traffic Consultant, 9575 West Higgins Road, Rosemont

HOFKENS: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated January 8, 2008, and the Revised Plan and Motion Report also dated January 8, 2008, as presented.

DZIERWA: Swore in the petitioners.

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

SOSIN: Our presentation will consist of some comments raised in the Staff Report and Mr. Shalvis will address the architecture and Mr. Roe has some brief statement to the Plan Commission. Because you received this plan so late and because we did not get engineering approval until this morning at 11:30, we felt it would be necessary to bring our traffic consultant and our engineer in so that any questions there may be can be answered. Because the plan was delivered with these final changes, just on a couple hour turn around, we were concerned that even Staff would have a question. This plan has been worked over and over by the architect and engineer. The only thing we are asking for is a special use and site plan approval. The variation that primarily we had anticipated requesting is the ability to put the three buildings on one lot. There really aren't three buildings today, and frankly, we had not planned on doing a subdivision, and we felt that issue would be approached later on, if and when it was necessary to divide it into two lots. The difficulty that we would have in doing a subdivision would be the setback lines. This is an integrated center and it is all planned and right now, we are presenting it as a center from a site plan point of view. We understand that the elevations would come back for your approval and perhaps at that time if there was a subdivision issue, we would bring it up at that time.

HOFKENS: Clarified that this subdivision has nothing to do with this lot. It is the detention area to the south. We are not asking for a subdivision within proposed parcel 1. It is just that they are showing 2 parcels on what is currently one lot and we were not sure they were subdividing or not.

SOSIN: We are not, at this time, except for the detention pond because that will be used as a detention pond. Clarified that he agrees - they do not want to do anything with these three buildings. This is a public hearing and we have given notice as required. We have also posted the sign. We are pleased to proceed today. Mr. Linden is present to answer any questions. It is my understanding that Scott Shelvis will be making a brief presentation to explain to you, his plan and answer any questions that may arise.

SHALVIS: Staff's question in regard to the glass - that will either be clear or tinted. It will not be spandrel glass because the maximum amount of visibility is desired. Noted one change that came up - the piers on the garden wall. We actually reduced those heights so that they were not sticking up as high. They were brought down. Will answer any questions anyone may have.

ROE: Stated that on behalf of the bank, they are all excited about this site which they've been working on for approximately three years. Indicated they tried to purchase it when the Archdiocese owned it and sold off for the Cosco and the other piece. We were unable to get the deal done but kept pursuing it. We feel this is a great site. We are excited about the opportunity to come to Orland Park. Pat McShane, as many of you know, lives in Orland Park. He is very active in the community. Our bank wants to be involved in the community. One of the first

things we do is find a banker who is tied to the community and then build a bank in that community.

SOSIN: Staff's Report was very comprehensive. We are obviously very happy with it. Will address any questions/concerns the Plan Commission may have.

AUBIN: Asked Ms. Hofkens if the petitioner has addressed all of Staff's concerns.

HOFKENS: Everything is good.

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

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

CULLIGAN: Stated he is glad to see that the issues in regard to the inner traffic has been addressed and taken care of. Staff noted in their report that the impervious surface would be around 72% but it would be confirmed. Asked if this has been confirmed.

SOSIN: Yes, it has. Indicated his understanding that with the final tweakings, the impervious surface actually went down slightly which is even better.

CULLIGAN: Expressed his opinion that the gateway wall there will be a very nice entryway into the overall development. It will also complement the existing landscaping. Also, the petitioner is meeting the requirements with the drive thru and parking in the rear which is excellent. Noted that a wonderful job was done on the layout. Thank you. I have no further questions/comments.

PARISI: Noted his impression that the petitioner understands and concurs with Staff's recommendations (which he felt were very good and very important).

SOSIN: Indicated his concurrence.

PARISI: Asked we are looking at one or three buildings.

HOFKENS: We are approving a Site Plan for three buildings and building elevations for the bank. The other two buildings do not have tenants yet. If a commercial building came in and had basically the same footprint, we probably just come back to the Plan Commissioners with the elevations. We want to do the whole special use because the special use is for the three buildings, and the site plan and everything works together with the parking. It is just that we don't have the building architecture to fit in those footprints yet.

PARISI: Thank you. Nothing further.

JACOBS: Expressed her opinion that this is a very nice, beautiful building.

Noted it was stated that the masonry wall has been lowered. What height was it and what height is it now?

SHALVIS: It is not the wall itself that has been lowered - it is just the piers. Pointed out on their exhibit on the easel, the piers are higher. If you look at the rendering itself, the caps have been lowered. It had been 7' and it is now 3' plus the cap so it would be 3'-8".

LINDEN: On the rendering, it looked awkward being up in the air. It just didn't look right. That is why it was changed.

SHALVIS: If you look at the rendering, you can see where the caps are.

JACOBS: Thank you. That is all.

THOMPSON: Stated this is a beautiful building. I know you lowered the front where the pillars are, however, recommended that the quarter-circle windows on the side elevations be changed. The building looks colonial in style, however, the quarter-circle windows do not fit with that style.

LINDEN: Stated they could put some type of other decoration in there - circular or otherwise, that would not necessarily be a window.

THOMPSON: Asked if an office is planned for that area by the quarter-circle window.

LINDEN: No.

THOMPSON: Yes, a circular window or something more decorative would be preferable. Thank you.

LINDEN: We'll definitely address that.

DZIWERA: Noted there has been no details provided indicating the height of the gateway sign.

LINDEN: It is approximately two feet to the bottom of the cap above it. The base of the brick wall will be raised from the walk. There will be a slight pitch. We are trying to keep it low enough so that you can still see the pattern that matches the other side.

DZIERWA: I understand that. I was curious what it is in relation to the garden wall - if it was the same height. You gave us details in the garden wall but left out the gate way detail in regard to height. I can see by the artist's rendering that there will be some type of limestone sill on there. Is that correct?

LINDEN: In actuality, we are trying to keep it as low as possible but still get a nice identification there. The two foot is about where it is right now with the cap.

DZIERWA: Just so the plantings do not obscure the lettering. Did the setbacks stay the same from one plan to another?

SOSIN: Yes.

DZIERWA: In regard to the exit of the bank's drive thru. It seems like an awkward place to put parking spots because basically, they are just a destination for someone to park and that might create an awkward situation. Recommend the three parking spaces by the exit of the drive thru of the bank be eliminated (the northeast corner of the site).

SOSIN: We think those will probably be designated as employee parking spaces.

DZIERWA: Thank you. I'm happy to see that the Site Plan changed. I didn't know how the other drive thru was possibly going to work. I think it is a good trade off. Appreciate the addition of the sidewalks on site. That creates a bit of a pedestrian-friendly feel. Appreciate the addition of the left-turn lane.

AUBIN: Concurred with the comments of his fellow Plan Commissioners. Staff is happy with the changes that were made. Everyone has agreed upon the conditions in the motions. A suggestion for the future would be to quit all the three-year planning as we can do this in 20 minutes - we'll start at 11:30 a.m. the day of the meeting (laughter).

AUBIN: 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 January 8, 2008,

and

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of the preliminary site plan and building elevations titled 'Proposed New Bank Facility for Heritage Bank,' prepared by The Shalvis Group, job number 2007-055, dated 10/17/2007, most recent revision 01/08/2008, sheets Ask-1.0, Ask-1.1 and Ask 1.2, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) That the petitioner revise the site plan to include all recommendations from the traffic study and the correct geometry for the Ravinia left turn lane before the Committee meeting.
- 2) That the petitioner submit, and pay fees for a subdivision if a subdivision is desired of the overall parcel before the Committee meeting.
- 3) That the fast food and commercial buildings come back for building elevation review and approval.
- 4) That the petitioner revises the building elevations to include proposed colors, or

submits sample materials before the Committee meeting.

5) That a landscape plan is submitted for separate review and approval within 60 days of final engineering approval

6) That all final engineering related items are met

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of the Special Use for Planned Development for Heritage Town Centre to allow for; three buildings on one site, including a bank with a drive through and a fast food restaurant with a drive through, and to grant a modification to reduce the number of stacking spaces on the fast food restaurant drive through from eight to seven, subject to the same conditions as highlighted in the site plan motion.

A motion was made by Commissioner Mike Culligan, seconded by Commissioner Steve Dzierwa, that this matter be RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Development Services & Planning, due back on 1/28/2008. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Stephens

2007-0790 Glen Oaks Industrial Park Lot #2

Ray Dignan, 10703 Valley Court, Orland Park

HOFKENS Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated January 8, 2008 as presented. Clarified, however, in Staff's Report, it was stated that one of the benefits of moving the parking behind would be that we could move the dumpster behind as well. That has been discussed with the petitioner who is concerned about having the garbage trucks come back all the way into the site which could pose a problem. The petitioner is requesting that the dumpster be moved and it would be surrounded by the same masonry to match the building and would be landscaped as well. We will also be requiring a cross-access to the rear on lot #3.

DZIERWA: Swore in Mr. Dignan.

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

DIGNAN: Stated he worked closely with Ms. Hofkens in regard to his petition and he concurs with Ms. Hofkens' report.

AUBIN: There is no parking in front of that tan rendition on the new Site Plan, correct?

DIGNAN: They have been eliminated. It is green space.

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

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

JACOBS: Thanked Mr. Dignan for his cooperation with Staff. Expressed her opinion that the new plan is fine.

PARISI: Have no objections. Noted that Mr. Dignan always works very well with Staff and puts up a nice product. Indicated he likes the changes recommended and happy that the petitioner went along with them.

THOMPSON: Concurred with her fellow Plan Commissioners. Noted her only concern would be the garbage area and how that would look from 165h Street, however, having seen Mr. Dignan's work, she is sure it will be a nice area.

DIGNAN: It will be screened with landscaping as well as solid masonry walls.

THOMPSON: Thank you. I'm sure you will do a nice job.

DZIERWA: Asked what the final front yard setback will be. How close will his building get to that sewer which runs across the front of his property.

DIGNAN: Approximately 50 feet. There is a storm sewer installed that is approximately 18-feet deep. We'll be about ten feet to the north of it. Will be within 50 feet of the curb.

DZIERWA: So the front yard set back will be 50 feet. Asked the petitioner if he will be working with Staff in regard to the proper positioning of the building footprint because of the existing sewer. Whoever makes the motion, please add that.

AUBIN: For condition number five, whoever makes the motion, please be so kind to do that. Thank you.

DZIERWA: Asked Mr. Dignan how his drive will line up with the businesses across the street. For instance, the carpeting store across the street.

DIGNAN: Where it says 165th Street, there is a property line directly to the south of the street. There is a driveway to the carpet store directly on the property line.

DZIERWA: So they will line up. That will look good. I had been curious where your drive was going to come out in relation to where the fire hydrant is to the right of your driveway. So the fire hydrant will be on the west of your driveway?

DIGNAN: Yes.

DZIERWA: Thank you; that is all.

CULLIGAN: Thanked Mr. Dignan for working with Staff on shifting the building. This building will fit in well with the other parts of the development. Good luck. Thank you.

AUBIN: Concurred with the comments of his fellow Plan Commissioners. Everything has been changed to accommodate Staff. Full speed ahead!

PARISI: Moved to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission, the findings of fact set forth in this Staff Report dated January 8, 2008, and moved to recommend to the Village Board, approval of the Preliminary Site Plan entitled "Lot 2 Glen Oaks Industrial Park", prepared by Raymond E. Derbas and Associates, CADD reference number 07009, dated 11/29/07, sheet C.2.0 and the building elevations entitled Lot 2; 10730-36 W 165th Street, prepared by Craig A. Podalak Architects, dated 09-14-06, sheet A4, subject to the following conditions: (1) that all final engineering-related items are met; (2) that the petitioner submit an Engineering Plan for separate review and approval within 60 days of final engineering approval; (3) that the petitioner submit building elevation with dimensions, materials and colors before the Committee meeting; (4) that the petitioner shift the building to the street and move the parking to the rear of the site; and (5) that the petitioner work with Staff to determine the final front yard setbacks with relation to the sewer.

THOMPSON: Second.

A motion was made by Commissioner Nick Parisi, seconded by Commissioner Patricia Thompson, that this matter be RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Development Services & Planning, due back on 1/28/2008. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Stephens

2007-0790 Glen Oaks Industrial Park Lot #2

a

Parisi: I move to recommend to the Village Board, denial of the variance on Lot 2 of Glen Oaks Industrial Park to allow for surface parking in the front setback.

THOMPSON: Second.

A motion was made by Commissioner Nick Parisi, seconded by Commissioner Patricia Thompson, that this matter be RECOMMENDED FOR DENIAL to the Development Services & Planning, due back on 1/28/2008. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Stephens

2008-0010 Land Development Code Amendment - Construction of Utilities in Public Rights-of-Way

HOFKENS Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated January 8, 2008, as presented.

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

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

DZIERWA: Noted he has voiced his feelings before about Public Works being like the governor of all this in regard to decisions made. Asked if it the Director of Public Works or is it Public Works as a whole or is there a committee?

HOFKENS: Most of the decision-making authority, according to this code, falls to the Director of Public Works. In regard to Commissioner Dzierwa's concern, stated that tomorrow at our Development Review meeting, we will be reviewing the permit process for this - how you get a permit. We just want to make sure that all of those things are being followed. From a planning point of view, putting utility boxes in certain areas. We have a right to ask for people to shift the boxes so that they are not in highly visible corners or on areas where we want signage so we are going to discuss the process of this tomorrow to assure that all of the departments are involved in some of these decisions.

DZIERWA: My concern is that there shouldn't be any animosity that exists between a developer and a director of Public Works. Expressed his belief that was Chairman Stephens' sentiment too when this came up perhaps a year or two ago (or something similar to this). We had been worried about putting too much in the lap of the director of Public Works when it didn't have to be. We know that sometimes situations like that do occur.

HOFKENS: Indicated that is a valid point which she will bring up tomorrow at the meeting. Perhaps there is a way to incorporate some of that into our development review process.

AUBIN: Concurred with Commissioner Dzierwa's comments about the Director of

Public Works being judge and jury. Noted he expects that when this issue is raised at tomorrow's meeting, it will prompt a lot of discussion. We will wait and see the finished product on January 22, 2008.

AUBIN: Entertained a motion from the Plan Commissioners.

JACOBS: Moved to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission, the findings of fact set forth in this Staff Report dated January 8, 2008 and moved to recommend to continue the Land Development Code for Construction in the Rights-of-Way to the January 22, 2008 Plan Commission meeting to allow for time to reformat the revisions from Village Code format to Land Development Code format.

THOMPSON: Second.

This matter was CONTINUED to the Plan Commission, due back on 1/22/2008

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Stephens

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

2008-0004 Marcus Theatres

David B. Sosin, 11800 South 75th Avenue, Palos Heights

TURLEY: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated January 8, 2008, as presented.

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

SOSIN: Stated that the Marcus Theatre has been an evolving project for more than a decade. When we had the approval, it was Marcus Corporations' feeling that the building would react to the market. The market for theaters continues to change and we are now here for a smaller number of seats and a slightly taller building. We think that overall, the Site Plan improves and what is really significant is that the newly-proposed west elevation is 44 feet further away from the rear property line. We had hoped, actually, that this would be considered a minor change because we were going down in the number of theaters, however, everyone agreed that it might be a good idea to go before the Plan Commission and have this run by you prior to the issuance of permits. We are here tonight and ready to proceed. This is a large format screen. It is not an Omnimax. That is a trade mark of a particular type of theater. However, it is a similarly large format - it has a very high screen.

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

DZIERWA: Basically we are just looking at a building that is 17 feet higher than the previous one?

TURLEY: The addition was always that tall, however, before you had a lower building in front of it and you always had the tall theater.

DZIERWA: That's right. I stand corrected. I think it is a good thing that we picked up a little more green space. I think the neighbors like it. I've been out to this site many times and see that temporary fencing that is up there. It is a bit unsightly so I am excited that this thing is actually going to happen. As far as the additional plant material, what is planned as far as foundation plantings are concerned. Was that talked about?

TURLEY: The final Landscape Plan, of course, comes at a later time. However, we have recommended a couple of specific items that should be included in the final Landscape Plan.

DZIERWA: Noted that some of the existing plantings out there are kind of sparse and even dying in spots. Just curious what the back of that is going to look like. Will there be foundation plantings? Do we know?

TURLEY: As far as the dead plant material, that was a condition of the prior approval that all of the dead plant material be replaced. That has been included in the motion.

DZIERWA: Asked the petitioner if Marcus aware of the condition of the parking lot - potholes and big cracks. While it has nothing to do with this petition, these are things that I've noticed.

SOSIN: Marcus is very responsive. Indicated he will relay this comment.

CULLIGAN: Originally with the proposed addition that was going in, the window areas and things that were there, that worked for that particular style because obviously it was a larger building with more room and space where a window would have worked (originally). Correct?

SOSIN: Yes.

CULLIGAN: This new style theater with a larger screen, a taller building, smaller in width. Those windows will no longer work with this.

SOSIN: Not as much, correct.

CULLIGAN: Stated the elevations are okay. It fits with the existing development. Thank you. That is all.

PARISI: Agree with the recommendation to put additional plantings on the west side. Just as a comment, stated that the visual effect to the proposed modification to the rear does not seem to tie in with the existing theme of the building. Minus the windows that were eliminated, prefer the previous patterning style on the back. Unless what is being proposed has some functional purpose, prefer the previously proposed style. Asked Staff if they had any preference to continue the style approved in July?

TURLEY: It is possible that more banding could be added. This is kind of in line with what we have on the front only the detailing is not quite as pronounced.

PARISI: Clarified it is not his intention for the developer to incur any unnecessary expenses. This is just a personal comment he has.

JACOBS: Asked Commissioner Parisi if he is suggesting that the banding from before be added?

PARISI: Indicated he thought it presented a better picture from the back; it continued the design of the building.

JACOBS: Agreed with that. The proposed style makes it look like a big blank wall.

SOSIN: Noted that several designs had gone back and forth between the architect for the project and Staff. They decided to go from horizontal to vertical. This comes down to a matter of preference. Indicated it would be difficult to start adding banding to this - too busy. Indicated the architects for Marcus would be happy to work with Staff and tweak this until it works nicely.

PARISI: Clarified he is not asking to add banding but to understand why the banding that was approved in July was removed.

SOSIN: Because the building changed. Sometimes the outside is affected by the inside.

TURLEY: Noted that the first submission had no detailing. This is version two. Staff would be glad to work with the petitioner and develop this a bit further if that is what the Plan Commissioners would like to see.

PARISI: If Staff is happy with the current design, he does not want to ask that this be changed.

JACOBS: If the petitioner is willing to work with Staff, would like to see some

revision on the west elevation to tie it together a little better.

TURLEY: Okay.

THOMPSON: Looking at the west elevation, asked what is shown above the door.

TURLEY: Believe it is an exit door with a canopy above it.

SOSIN: Yes. That what he believes.

THOMPSON: The column on each side is just decorative.

SOSIN: Yes.

THOMPSON: Is there lighting back there?

SOSIN: There is some, however, the idea is to keep the back, less lit to make it less prominent.

THOMPSON: The bottom part will just be a different color?

SOSIN: Yes.

THOMPSON: Feel less is better; however, agree that the petitioner work with Staff.

AUBIN: Noted that when Marcus first came before the Plan Commission, the room was filled with residential neighbors to the theater. Noted there are no neighbors present this evening because we've reduced, reduced and reduced. Indicated that the west elevation has no function other than having an emergency exit. Don't really know who will be looking at it.

DZIERWA: Showed pictures he took of Marcus Theatre's exterior. Noted the banding on the building now is actually boring. Expressed his personal opinion that if that banding is continued through the addition, that will make for an even more boring building. Think that the architectural features they put on the end of that addition is kind of like a finalization - an ending thing. Think it is a nice touch from what is existing. There is a light in the center of each section. Think they are going to continue with that theme as far as the lighting goes. Think this gives the building closure. Agree with it. Want Staff and Mr. Sosin keep in mind that this is a good thing. Not to go back to boring.

AUBIN: 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 January 8, 2008 and moved to recommend to the Village Board, approval of the Marcus Theatre Addition Revised Site Plan, prepared by Schroeder and Holt Architects and ArcDesign Resources Inc. Project #06161, revised November 2, 2007, subject to the following conditions: (1) that a final Landscape Plan is submitted within 60 days of Final Engineering approval that reflects and enhances revised elevations dated 12/04/07 and adds additional landscaping and a minimum seven additional evergreen trees to the west of the proposed addition; (2) that Building Code-related items are met; (3) that Final Engineering is approved; (4) that any new signage is submitted for approval and permits; (5) that all mechanical equipment is screened, either at grade level with landscaping or on the roof with a parapet wall of at least three feet in height constructed of materials similar to the building; and (6) that the Site Plan General Note that retains the parking west of the theatre is removed.

THOMPSON: Second.

PARISI: Moved to approve the Building Elevations for Marcus Theatre Addition Elevations prepared by Schroeder and Holt Architects and ArcDesign Resources, Inc. Project #3197, revised 12/04/07.

THOMPSON: Second.

A motion was made by Commissioner Nick Parisi, seconded by Commissioner Patricia Thompson, that this matter be RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Development Services & Planning, due back on 1/28/2008. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Stephens

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

AUBIN: There being no further business before the Plan Commissioners, the Vice Chairman adjourned the meeting at 8:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Teri Dougherty

Recording Secretary