

VILLAGE OF ORLAND PARK

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



Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, February 25, 2014

7:00 PM

Village Hall

Plan Commission

Louis Stephens, Chairman

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

CALLED TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

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

Present: 5 - Member Jacobs; Member Aubin; Member Parisi; Member Paul, Member Murphy

Absent: 2 - Chairman Stephens, Member Dzierwa

APPROVAL OF MINUTES**2014-0023 Meeting Minutes of the December 10, 2013 Plan Commission**

A motion was made by Commissioner Parisi, seconded by Commissioner Paul to approve the minutes of the December 10, 2013 Plan Commission.

APPROVED

Aye: 3 - Member Aubin, Member Parisi and Member Paul

Nay: 0

Abstain: 2 - Member Jacobs and Member Murphy

Absent: 2 - Chairman Stephens and Member Dzierwa

2014-0117 Meeting Minutes for the January 14, 2014 Plan Commission

A motion was made by Commissioner Murphy, seconded by Commissioner Parisi to approve the minutes of the January 14, 2014 Plan Commission.

APPROVED

Aye: 3 - Member Aubin, Member Parisi and Member Murphy

Nay: 0

Abstain: 2 - Member Jacobs and Member Paul

Absent: 2 - Chairman Stephens and Member Dzierwa

PUBLIC HEARINGS**2014-0029 Krystal Ridge View Subdivision - Subdivision and Rezoning**

PITTOS: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written staff report dated February 25, 2014.

AUBIN: Thank you, Mr. Pittos. Good report as always. Is the petitioner here? If you have something to say we are going to have to swear you in. Is there a comment you would like to make. Swore in Jim Kamp, 14630 108th Avenue, Orland Park.

KAMP: Terry pretty well summed it up but I did add the extra ten feet to the lot. There are two sewers that run through easement now which the Village put there back in 1994. So I made the lot a little bigger and I do plan someday to eliminate

the driveway that goes out to 108th Avenue. But it is a lot to do with the County Road. I would have to deal with them as far as eliminating that. Other than that, I don't think the lot, like Terry said; it is only a little smaller than the smallest lot. As far as rectangular shape, it is and there are lots across the street and in the cul-de-sac that seem much tighter and the houses seem more together than this would be, in my opinion.

AUBIN: Thank you, Mr. Kamp. At the end of the report, you saw the conditions that you are going to have to adhere to. You don't have any problems with those whatsoever?

KAMP: No.

AUBIN: Thank you, Mr. Kamp. This is a public hearing and if there is anyone that would like to make a comment or has anything to add, this would be the time to come up to the microphone and we will swear you in. Swore in Jim Melka, 10901 Crystal Ridge Court, Orland Park.

MELKA: The reason I am here today is to maybe bring a little light to the situation and a little history of the subdivision. I did the subdivision, Crystal Ridge, back in 1993. I am here today to offer a few thoughts and some ideas. I am not here to object to the lot and a house being built on the property. Back in 1993, working with the Village of Orland Park, it was dictated and then mandated that the corridor between 143rd and 153rd between 108th Avenue and 110th Avenue be Estate-1 zoning. Mr. Anderson, the original owner of this property, was a big proponent of that. What it came down to was to actually subdivide this property; the ultimate goal was one home to one acre. I.E. Mr. Anderson owned five acres. Mr. Anderson was then able to at some point when he decided to do the subdivision have five homes, ultimately that is what will be here. As to the subdivision that I did, Crystal Ridge Court, I owned six and a quarter acres. We were able to come up with seven homes by purchasing another three quarters of an acre. We ended up with a little over seven acres so we could have seven lots. With that being said, if you count the lots, you can see there are seven lots. Richard Peel owned the original property, which I purchased from him back in 1983. With the reasoning of E-1 zoning, we were told and it was in the Comprehensive Plan that that is what was going to take place in the entire corridor, which you will see Crystal Springs, Green Manor and the rest of the property was set up in that same way. Even the property to the north that is owned by other individuals was set up in that same fashion. In the situation here that is coming before us today, is the amount of property that will have two lots. I am here to suggest to the petitioner and the Commission and urge them that these two lots here should be at a minimum split in two. In which this proposed lot which would be for sale, should be larger than is proposed. In the existing Crystal Ridge subdivision, the smallest square footage is?

PITTOS: The smallest lot is .67 acres.

MELKA: To be uniform to the subdivision, I think it should be at least that size, nothing smaller. The Village wanted a certain amount of open land in Orland Park. After Crystal Tree was developed, this was developed. They wanted open land, they wanted a buffer between the future development to the west and this is what they proposed and this is what was mandated on everyone. Therefore, I know there has been a change in the zoning and the usage in 2013. But how would you know unless you hung around for twenty or thirty years? You are not going to know that will take place. My concern, and the reason I bring it up, there is a piece of property due south to this E-1 piece. Unable to understand. Bud's daughter originally was trying to sell it and have two lots. The Village would not allow it at that time to another individual. I know at some point, based on the precedent we are setting here, we can probably, based on the square footage, get maybe three houses there. That is not really what we are trying to do in this corridor nor is it what the Village wanted us to do years and years ago. The other issue is the other piece in front there, that house was just sold three to four months ago. Potentially that should really be one house there but it is probably going to be two. So what we have done is take a multi homes in a larger open space and we're bringing more and more homes in that area. The only thing that does is decreases the market value of the homes in that area. Not just in our subdivision but in those next door. Because if you look in the records, there has always been at least one house to an acre. Now it might be a little bit less than that, but if you had 11 acres, you could get 11 houses. In this case you have 5 acres, you can get 5 houses. At least what I am suggesting is to at least make the proposed lot equal to the lot to the east. Thank you.

AUBIN: Thank you for your comments. Terry, listening to Jim's comments, we would have to change the code to accommodate this petition? Because the petitioner is well within the code limits of what he is doing.

PITTOS: No I don't think you would have to change the code. I do want to clarify though that R-1 zoning, the bulk requirements of R-1 zoning in terms of the minimum area of an R-1 lot has never changed. It has always been minimum lot size, 21,780 sq. ft. That has never changed. What has changed is the comprehensive plan. The 1991 plan established one unit per acre. The new comprehensive plan establishes the zoning district's minimum lot areas to establish the densities for that area. There was a reason that these lots were not annexed as E-1 and they were R-1. That is because the lot sizes are predominantly less than an acre. There are seven lots in the current Crystal Ridge subdivision that are less than an acre in size. That is why the whole subdivision is zoned R-1. There are a couple of lots that exceed one acre. So we don't really need to change the code to accommodate Mr. Melka's request. What you can do is simply shift the lot line to the east by a few feet in order to accommodate the lot area that he is talking about subject to not creating non-conformity with the rear setback of the existing house. And, to the private property owner's consent.

AUBIN: I'm sure you have looked into that.

KAMP: I believe the lot that Terry pointed out, that Mr. Melka developed, the 29,000 is not as wide as the lot that I am proposing. I don't know what the number is but I have walked it off and I believe it is maybe 10 feet under the 145 that mine is. Once again, that is the reason I made the comment about the perceived notion that this is a smaller lot. That may be a deeper lot but it's not wider. Plus I have two sewers running through my property at 125 to 135 feet. So to make the lot bigger is not going to help. You are not going to get the house built on sewers. The Village put that there in 1993 or 1994. It is not shown on there but it is shown on the plat. I am all for a smaller lot. It is just going to be 30-40 feet of empty lot because of the sewers. Demonstrates sewers on projection.

I don't know what the width of that lot is but the perceived notion that this is a smaller lot is false. It might be smaller in square footage but the size of the house that you can put on this lot is not smaller. That is the point that I was trying to make earlier.

AUBIN: Thank you, sir. We have reviewed staff's report and we've heard from the petitioner and the public. Now we will get comments from our Commissioners. Commissioner Parisi?

PARISI: I don't have much to add other than I had been considering what Mr. Melka was saying. But in light of what the petitioner said, as far as the width of the lot, I feel a lot more comfortable with that.

AUBIN: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. Mr. Paul?

PAUL: Either way, with the lot we are talking about today, you are going to get two houses out of that, nothing more than that. The E-1 lot, is that something that could be subdivided into two lots? Looking at that, it looks considerably smaller than this lot so I don't think you could put two houses on that lot.

PITTOS: You are referring to the lot that is to the south?

PAUL: Yes. I can't imagine that you can put more than one house on that lot. If you cut it in half.

PITTOS: If it is less than the R-1 standards, then you can't subdivide it. I did not do an analysis on that lot.

PAUL: The other lot that is just south of that. What would you put in there? There are no roadways. You can put one house facing 108th. But I can't imagine you can put two or three houses in there unless you put in another street and that is a whole other discussion. But given what we are talking about today, I don't have any problem with that. Even if you shift the boundary in either direction, you still are only going to get two houses in there. It's not like you can divide it up in a way to get

three or four in there. That's not going to work. You are only going to have two houses in there no matter what you do. So I don't have a problem with what has been proposed already. That is all I've got to add.

AUBIN: Thank you. Commissioner Jacobs?

JACOBS: I concur with my fellow commissioners and the effort and work that staff has done to prepare with this presentation.

AUBIN: Thank you. Commissioner Murphy?

MURPHY: I don't have much to add either. I do understand Mr. Melka's concerns, but I think after listening to conversation that the petitioner, with it being the 145 foot width, this will not take away from the home values of what is there. I think this will fit in nicely; so I do not have anything else to add.

AUBIN: Ok, thank you, Commissioner Murphy. I have just some very simple comments and that is that the petitioner has met the requirements as far as code is concerned and the comprehensive plan changes, whatever the time limit is, it is always changing. The codes don't change as often as the comprehensive plan, I don't think. But the petitioner has met the requirements. Whatever we have put at the end of the petition, the requirements that he has to do, he has agreed to those as well. So it would be very difficult for me to say no to him under those conditions. With that being said, the chair will entertain a motion.

PARISI:

I move to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission the findings of fact set forth in this staff report, dated February 25, 2014.

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees to approve the subdivision plat titled "Krystal Ridge View", prepared by Tech 3 Consulting Group, Inc., dated December 26, 2013 subject to the following conditions:

1. Upon redevelopment of Lot 100, driveway access to a future single family home shall be from Crystal Ridge Court.
2. Install two parkway trees along Crystal Ridge Court in front of Lot 101.
3. Revise the plat of subdivision to create a 7.5 foot easement along the north line of Lot 100.
4. Revise the plat of subdivision to create a 10 foot easement along the west line of Lot 100.
5. Revise the plat of subdivision to add 2.5 feet to the easement along the west line of Lot 101.
6. Revise the plat of subdivision to extend the easement on the east edge of Lot

- 101, east to the property line to fill the gap.
- 7. Revise the plat of subdivision to rename Crystal Ridge Drive to Crystal Ridge Court.
- 8. Make all revisions prior to submitting a Record Plat of Subdivision to the Village for recording.

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees to approve the rezoning of the new Lots 100 and 101 from E-1 Estate Residential District to R-1 Residential District, subject to the same above mentioned conditions and the following:

- 9. Meet all final engineering and building code related items.

All changes must be made prior to the Board meeting.

PAUL: Second.

RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL

Aye: 5 - Member Jacobs, Member Aubin, Member Parisi, Member Paul and Member Murphy

Nay: 0

Absent: 2 - Chairman Stephens and Member Dzierwa

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

None.

OTHER BUSINESS

2014-0024 Memo: New Petitions & Appearance Review

None.

ADJOURNMENT

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

AUBIN: This meeting is adjourned at 7:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather Zorena
Recording Secretary