

MAYOR

James Dodge

VILLAGE CLERK

Mary Ryan Norwell

14700 S. Ravinia Avenue
Orland Park, IL 60462
(708)403-6100
orlandpark.org



**ORLAND
PARK**

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

TRUSTEES

William R. Healy
Cynthia Nelson Katsenes
Michael R. Milani
Dina M. Lawrence
John Lawler
Joanna M. Liotine Leafblad

Staff Report to the Board of Trustees

Lorenz Residence – Variance for a Single-Family Residence – 11300 151st Street

Prepared: 7/14/2025

Prepared by: Hailey Gorman, Associate Planner

Project: Lorenz Residence – Variance for a Single-Family Residence – 11300 151st Street

Case Number: 2025-0469

Petitioner: John Lorenz (Homeowner)

Purpose: The Petitioner seeks approval of a variance to reduce the minimum required side yard setback from 20’ to 10.7’ to allow an addition to be constructed on the existing single-family residence.

Address: 11300 151st Street, Orland Park, IL

P.I.N.s: 27-07-401-014-0000

Parcel Size: 1.2 acres

BACKGROUND

The single-family home was constructed in 1989 in unincorporated Cook County. The subject property was annexed in 1998 (Ordinance 3149), in which it was zoned E-1 Estate Residential, which is the default zoning district for newly annexed properties. In 2024, the property was rezoned to the R-3 Residential District (Ordinance 5978). The 1.2-acre property is an irregularly shaped lot with Spring Creek running along its eastern half.

The existing home is considered legal non-conforming as it was constructed prior to being annexed to the Village. Therefore, it does not meet the current side setback requirement for the R-3 District. When the property was rezoned from E-1 to R-3 in 2024, it was in an attempt to make the property more conforming to the minimum side yard setback requirement to allow for an addition to be constructed on the existing residence. However, construction plans for the proposed building addition were not provided at that time, so it was unclear that the addition would include a side-loaded garage, which requires a larger side setback. After the building addition plans were provided for review, it was determined that a variance from the minimum side setback requirement would be necessary. The petitioner is now requesting a variance to construct an addition onto their home for a side-loaded garage with additional living space on the second floor.

PLAN COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Present at the Plan Commission were 6 Commissioners, the petitioner, and members of staff. One of the commissioners joined the meeting virtually. Prior to the hearing, staff received a letter from a neighboring property owner which was provided to the Plan Commission for their consideration. The letter expressed the neighbor’s lack of support for the project, in which the main concern was the possible disturbance of the root systems of existing trees and grading of the site that could result from the garage addition. Following the staff presentation, the commissioners discussed that they were not very concerned about the neighbor’s trees being

damaged. Overall, they were supportive of the proposal to construct an addition on the existing single-family home, which requires a variance to be granted to the property.

The Plan Commission is the appointed hearing body for variance requests. In some cases, the Plan Commission is the final approving body, while in other cases, the Plan Commission makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. Due to the degree of this variance request, the Plan Commission is acting as a recommending body and has recommended to the Board of Trustees to approve the variance request to reduce the minimum side setback requirements from 20' to 10.7'.

The Plan Commission unanimously recommended approval of the variance with 6 ayes, 0 nays, and 1 absent. This item is now before the Board for consideration.

VARIANCE STANDARDS

When reviewing an application for a Variance, the decision-making body shall review the following standards for consideration. The petitioner has submitted responses to the standards which are attached to this case file. The standards below come from Section 5-109.D of the Land Development Code (LDC):

1. That the property in question cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used only under the conditions allowed by the regulations governing the district in which it is located;
2. That the plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances;
3. That the variation, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality;
4. That because of the particular physical surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions of the specific property involves, a particular hardship to the owner would result, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of these regulations were carried out;
5. That the conditions upon which the petition for a variation is based are unique to the property for which the variance is sought and are not applicable, generally, to other property;
6. That the alleged difficulty or hardship is caused by these regulations and has not resulted from any act of the applicant or any other person presently having an interest in the property subsequent to the effective date hereof, whether or not in violation of any portion thereof;
7. That the granting of the variation will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located or otherwise be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, any adopted overlay plan or these regulations;
8. That the proposed variation will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, or substantially increase the congestion in the public streets, or increase the danger of fire, or endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood;
9. That the variance granted is the minimum adjustment necessary for the reasonable use of the land; and
10. That aforesaid circumstances or conditions are such that the strict application of the provisions of this Section would deprive the applicant of any reasonable use of his or her land. Mere loss in value shall not justify a variance; there must be a deprivation of all beneficial use of land.

In the responses, the petitioner discusses the unique conditions of the property that make it difficult to meet the minimum setback requirements. In addition to the setback being calculated to the edge of the stream bank, all development activity must occur at least 50' away from the bank of the stream. Therefore, the site is unique and relief from the current LDC requirements may be warranted for this project.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES RECOMMENDED MOTION

Regarding Case Number 2025-0469, also known as 11300 151st Street - Lorenz Residence Variance, I move to approve the Plan Commission Recommended Action for this case;

And,

I move to adopt an Ordinance titled ORDINANCE GRANTING A VARIANCE FOR A SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE (LORENZ RESIDENCE – 11300 151ST STREET).