

VILLAGE OF ORLAND PARK

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



Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

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 Plan Commission Chairman, Mr. Lou Stephens, at 7:00 p.m.

Present: 7 - Chairman Stephens; Member Jacobs; Member Aubin; Member Dzierwa; Member Parisi; Member Paul, Member Murphy

APPROVAL OF MINUTES**2015-0142 Minutes of the March 10, 2015 Plan Commission**

A motion was made by Commissioner Dzierwa, seconded by Commissioner Aubin; to approve the minutes of the March 10, 2015 Plan Commission.

APPROVED

Aye: 7 - Chairman Stephens, Member Jacobs, Member Aubin, Member Dzierwa, Member Parisi, Member Paul and Member Murphy

Nay: 0

PUBLIC HEARINGS**2015-0122 Park Boulevard Luxury Ranch Villas**

A motion was made by Commissioner Aubin, seconded by Commissioner Parisi; to continue the Park Boulevard Luxury Ranch Villas to the April 14, 2015 Plan Commission meeting.

AUBIN:

I move to continue case number 2015-0122, Park Boulevard Luxury Ranch Villas, to the March 24, 2015 Plan Commission meeting.

PARISI: Second.

CONTINUED

Aye: 7 - Chairman Stephens, Member Jacobs, Member Aubin, Member Dzierwa, Member Parisi, Member Paul and Member Murphy

Nay: 0

2015-0150 Hulse Solar Panels - 13520 Howe Drive - Appearance Review

MAZZA: Staff presentation made in accordance with written staff report dated March 24, 2015.

STEPHENS: Is the petitioner present? Does he wish to make any additional comments?

AUBIN: Swore in Owen Hulse, 13520 Howe Drive, Orland Park.

HULSE: I do not have anything else to add right now.

STEPHENS: Is there anyone from the audience who wishes to comment on this petition since this is a public hearing?

AUBIN: Swore in Vicki Ciullo, 13547 Circle Drive, Orland Park.

CIULLO: I was just wondering if this will be reflective because that is a big area of your roof.

AUBIN: Swore in Joe Gordon, Solar Service, 7312 N. Milwaukee Avenue, Niles.

GORDON: She brings up a very good point and one that we hear quite a bit. The manufacturer of these panels is Solar World. They are an organization that is headquartered in the United States and they source all of the materials in the U.S. These panels are manufactured for glare reduction in the glass. They are rated for use at airports. These adhere to that code. It is a smooth surface so at any point, as the sun moves across the sky, it may briefly reflect. As it is shown on that roof, it is pitched up. So as the sun positions across the sky, even at the low angles, it is going to reflect with the plane of the panels. He also has a courtyard setting so directly south of him is another structure, his own house, so it should direct any glare right back to his own structure. We feel very confident that no one will see the glare.

CIULLO: I wouldn't know until it's up. Just the angle of the roof, it's a large area toward our property. I mean if the manufacturer says that it doesn't, I have no experience in this until I got the letter.

GORDON: To be fair, the manufacturer manufactured it to reduce glare. But the sun is constantly in motion and if you were to sit in front of your house and look at cars parked on the street, at some point you might get a bit of glare for a few minutes and that is from a window from a car parked on your street. This structure is pointing upward and glare should be at a minimum off the glass and at some point should there be glare, nobody can guarantee 100% but we really think that with the way it is positioned off of the street and it adheres to all of the different codes for the Village, it should not be a problem whatsoever.

STEPHENS: This is not the first time that a structure like this has come into the Village. We have had quite a few. I don't think we've heard any negative complaints from anyone regarding solar panels. Staff, have you ever heard any negative complaints from the buildings that already have solar panels?

PITTOS: We haven't had any negative complaints. We have had four or five such projects over the years.

STEPHENS: We have had quite a few come in and staff hasn't received any

negative comments about it.

AUBIN: Swore in Annette Sojka, 13540 Howe Drive, Orland Park.

SOJKA: I have a question for liability. We have a huge tree in our yard and with nature and the wind, if something were to fall, are we liable for that? How would that work with tree branches?

HULSE: With where it is going up, even though it is south facing, the house is like a U-shape so none of the branches of those large trees are in any danger of falling on the panels.

STEPHENS: Is there anyone else in the audience that would like to address this petition? We will go to our commissioners.

AUBIN: I have no comment. It's a good fit and it works in every other situation, why not this one? Thank you.

MURPHY: I have no comments. In terms of the glare, the fact that it's rated for airports makes me confident that there shouldn't be any issues down the road. No concerns for me.

PARISI: I don't have any comments.

DZIERWA: We have seen a few of these in the twelve years I have been around and we haven't had any complaints. We have been assured by the different companies that are installing them that there is an anti-glare process in there. I believe the pitch on your roof is 34 degrees, and some of the others one that we have seen are a greater pitch. Depending on the time of the year and how well you know earth science, you can almost determine when the glare is going to be the worst and when it will be at its least depending on the pitch of the roof and time of the year. I don't see any problem with this as long as everything has been done up to code. Good for you that you can do that and take some of the electricity away from the grid. Good luck to you.

PAUL: My only question was if we had any issues in the past. It sounds like we haven't and it's hard to vote against green so I have no problem.

JACOBS: I have no comments thank you.

STEPHENS: I feel it is all in compliance with the codes. All of the codes have been met and they're not asking for any variance. A motion is in order at this time.

PAUL:

I move to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission the findings of fact set

forth in this staff report, dated March 24, 2015,

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board to approve the appearance (Environmental Clean Technology) review for a roof-mounted solar energy system at 13520 Howe Drive as depicted on the plan set "Hulse Residence 1.0 and 2.0" prepared by Solar Service Inc., dated 02/16/2015, subject to the following conditions:

1. That all building code related items are met;
2. That all building permits are obtained prior to construction;
3. That all utility conduits and systems related to the solar energy system not be visible from the street and from neighboring residential properties.

RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL

Aye: 7 - Chairman Stephens, Member Jacobs, Member Aubin, Member Dzierwa, Member Parisi, Member Paul and Member Murphy

Nay: 0

2014-0703 Parkside Square (Heritage Square)

PITTOS: Staff presentation made in accordance with written staff report dated March 24, 2015.

STEPHENS: Thank you, Mr. Pittos. If the petitioner is here, please come up to the microphone.

AUBIN: Swore in George Arnold, attorney for the petitioner, 9501 144th Place, Orland Park.

ARNOLD: We agree with what was said in the staff report. We have one thing that we would like to ask the plan commission that is different from the staff report. We certainly understand the conditions that we have to comply with. We had shown you the elevations that my client wanted to build last time. Inaudible. The petitioner is willing to be tied to those types of aesthetics so while we certainly understand and appreciate the ordinance, my client thinks that sometimes you can make things look better by going outside the ordinance. Again he is not looking for free reign; he is willing to be tied to those. I have samples of houses of similar size that do comply with the brick all the way around just as a sample to show that it's not just by having brick all the way around does not necessarily mean that you are going to accomplish some of the aesthetic features that you can otherwise.

STEPHENS: The ordinance is brick on all four sides up to 8' high.

ARNOLD: We would like relief from that and for you to consider making a recommendation to make it just brick on the front and allow us a little more

flexibility on the other sides. It would allow the builder to accomplish some of the more aesthetic points that they would like to for this product.

STEPHENS: Ok. Does anyone here wish to make a comment in regards to this petition? Seeing no one, we will go to our Commissioners. However, we don't have the latitude to make a recommendation regarding the brick ordinance.

PITTOS: Right that would be something that would need to be considered by the Village Board. Just to note, the Village has never varied on that.

STEPHENS: Mr. Arnold, I don't think we can give your recommendation against an existing ordinance like that.

ARNOLD: I understand that. I didn't want to bring it up for the first time at the Board without having had the courtesy of bringing it up to the Commission. I do understand that is not within your review.

STEPHENS: Mr. Pittos, question about the fence. Where are you requiring the fence at?

PITTOS: The fence would be along the south property line, here.

STEPHENS: Is this request from Tempo Development that they would rather not have the fence?

PITTOS: It is actually coming from both sides. Most landscape buffer yards in the rear yard of single family homes are very difficult to maintain. As the new homeowner takes over their property, they are going to shape their backyard the way that they want to shape it. So to put in a buffer yard particularly along a cemetery is probably not the most effective way to screen or buffer the cemetery or 153rd Street to the south. The fence is requested and the Land Development Code allows the fence to be substituted in these types of situations where the fence is more amenable to the project, the future property owner and achieve the Village's objective for screening.

STEPHENS: So we are requiring the fence along the entire south yard? The entire south line of the property. Anywhere else? Across the front on west avenue as well?

PITTOS: I don't believe so. Originally, Outlot B would have had a fence along the public sidewalk but that was because the grades weren't working. With the grades being reassessed, through the infrastructure improvements that were done, I think we were able to eliminate the fence along the east property line, West Avenue.

STEPHENS: Along the detention pond? So there is not going to be any fence there?

PITTOS: No.

STEPHENS: How does that affect safety there?

PITTOS: It is not as steep of a slope down into the pond and there is a width to maintain.

STEPHENS: How far from the sidewalk is the slope? Do you know? How about the engineer?

AUBIN: Swore in Brad Hensley, Landmark Engineering, 7808 W 103rd Street, Palos Hills.

STEPHENS: My concern is with that detention pond being so close to the walk, how much space is there between the edge of the sidewalk and where the slope begins?

HENSLEY: There is a foot to the property line and then a 3 to 1 slope to get to the normal water so that would be another 10'. There will be a safety ledge in the pond if someone wants to get that close.

STEPHENS: Mr. Pittos, did the original plan show a fence in front of that?

PITTOS: Yes. The original plans did show a potential fence along the detention pond. It showed a fence mainly because the slope began immediately at the edge of the sidewalk. Whereas, now it is not as steep and not as harsh of a slope.

HENSLEY: Our original design when we had two extra lots on the west side of the pond. We had retaining walls all around the pond which may have represented a fence to somebody looking at it.

STEPHENS: No. The first plan I saw had a fence going across the front.

HENSLEY: Well I know I've never put a fence on the plan so I'm not sure what that plan was.

STEPHENS: Ok. Thank you. We will go to the commissioners.

MURPHY: Well I guess the fence is an issue that concerns me as well. 10' is a good amount but if staff is not concerned with that then I will follow their recommendation. I have no other comments.

PARISI: Well there are quite a number of conditions on this petition and it appears that the petitioner is willing to comply with all of them. This is our second reiteration of this project and there have been some improvements so I don't have any

additional comments.

DZIERWA: I have seen plenty of other detention ponds in the Village that have steeper grades than what is going to be planned here so I don't have a problem with not having a fence there. I do want to ask staff about the last motion that we made, we are basically just tossing that out and starting over?

PITTOS: It was continued.

DZIERWA: So we didn't make a motion. I'm cool with that. Another question for staff, do we need to add a condition for the booster station on Outlot A?

PITTOS: I don't think so. This will be part of the annexation agreement. This project actually has to be annexed into the Village so everything that may be recommended for approval tonight will be subject to that annexation.

DZIERWA: So all of the verbage needed will be in that.

STEPHENS: That will be subject to the engineering.

DZIERWA: Ok. Thank you.

JACOBS: I have no comment. Thank you.

PAUL: It looks like a lot of concessions were made. A lot of adjustments were made here. This is a good fit.

STEPHENS: Where exactly are you locating the gateway signage? Is there going to be two? Is it shown on the plan?

PITTOS: It is not currently shown on the plan but will be on corners or either of the outer lots.

STEPHENS: Is that where the developers intend to locate the gateway signage?

ARNOLD: I was asking my client and he said he isn't sure yet but he said he is willing to work with staff and put it in a place that makes sense for everyone.

STEPHENS: Thank you. I think this is a very well designed subdivision. The question came up earlier from one of our commissioners, is there a reason why you want Franchesca Lane aside from Franchesca Court?

PITTOS: Franchesca continues the existing street name. So the connection is Franchesca Court to the east and this is the fourth leg of that intersection.

STEPHENS: You are going to continue it as Franchesca Court. Ok. I think it is a

good plan and has been talked out. At this point we will entertain a motion. My commissioners tell me that I have missed Commissioner Aubin.

AUBIN: Preliminary engineering has been approved and the petitioner has agreed to all of the terms and conditions except this little brick issue that we have no control over. So I don't have any problems with this.

STEPHENS: Thank you.

PITTOS: I had some time to look at the issue of the fence along West Avenue. The variance that is being requested tonight is indeed to potentially substitute a fence for the east and south buffer yards. There could be a fence along the detention pond for this development.

STEPHENS: There will be or there could be?

PITTOS: There could be. The variance that was published had the retaining walls originally that Mr. Hensley referred to. We will take a closer look at that since there was some discussion here and assess accordingly.

STEPHENS: Ok. At this point we will move forward with 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 March 24, 2015

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees to approve, upon annexation, the zoning of the subject site at 15160 West Avenue to R-4 Residential District.

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees to approve, upon annexation, the preliminary site plan titled "Parkside Square of Orland Park", prepared by Landmark Engineering LLC, dated Feb. 3, 2015, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Change the street name of Franchesca Lane to Franchesca Court.
- 2) Extend the public sidewalk network along West Avenue south from the development to the 153rd Street sidewalk network.
- 3) Comply with the Brick Ordinance of the Village's Building Code for all single

family homes.

- 4) Mitigate any tree losses via the landscape plan.
- 5) Include an ornamental powder coated fence as part of the landscape plan as a substitute for Bufferyard B requirements.
- 6) Submit a landscape plan, meeting all Village Codes, for separate review and approval within 60 days of final engineering approval.
- 7) Work with staff to include gateway signage as part of this project at the corners of the development.
- 8) Meet all final engineering and Building Code related items.

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees to approve, upon annexation, a 25 lot single family detached residential subdivision, subject to the same conditions as above and the following:

- 9) Submit a record plat of subdivision to the Village for recording prior to this project attending the Village Board meeting for approvals.
- 10) Do not include building envelopes or building footprints on the final plat of subdivision.

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees to approve, upon annexation, of the following variances subject to the same conditions as outlined in the above motions:

- 1) Reduce the detention pond perimeter maintenance access area from 15 feet to 5 feet.
- 2) Reduce the detention pond setback from 25 feet to 5 feet.
- 3) Substitute Bufferyard B (10 feet) requirements with a six (6) foot tall wrought iron fence for residential lots along the south perimeter and along the West Avenue perimeter of the subdivision.

All changes must be made prior to the Board meeting.

RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL

Aye: 7 - Chairman Stephens, Member Jacobs, Member Aubin, Member Dzierwa, Member Parisi, Member Paul and Member Murphy

Nay: 0

2015-0066 Winterset Estates

TURLEY: Staff presentation made in accordance with written report dated March 24, 2015.

STEPHENS: Thank you, Mrs. Turley. Is there anyone from the audience who wishes to comment?

AUBIN: Swore in Alan McDonald, 16710 Muirfield Drive, Orland Park.

MCDONALD: I just want to commend Mr. Dignan on his proposal for this development. It has been long overdue in regards to the property that was there. My only concern is that our subdivision does not have a park close to us. There is a park planned here and I am just looking for direction on how do we approach the Village to get a park or equipment put in there? That is the kind of direction I am looking for.

STEPHENS: We will ask staff.

TURLEY: It is likely that a park this size, there is not enough room for playground equipment. It may be a gazebo or something like that. For now, no equipment is planned. The way that it works is that you get in line because there are a lot of subdivisions waiting for park equipment. We would look at what is appropriate for the site at that time.

STEPHENS: I think his question is how does he go about getting on the list?

TURLEY: We will look into that.

STEPHENS: What you do is contact staff.

MCDONALD: Thank you.

STEPHENS: Anyone else. Mr. Dignan, would you care to comment on your subdivision?

AUBIN: Swore in Ray Dignan, 10703 Valley Court, Orland Park.

DIGNAN: I have a couple of questions for Mrs. Turley. What is this thing about a decorative fence? I was not aware of that.

TURLEY: The concern is that because of the size of the park and the proximity of this lot to the park that it would just come off as a very large side yard and I think there could be the potential for encroachment there. So it doesn't have to be a full

fence but it needs to be tagged in some way that this is the public park.

STEPHENS: How high would you require that fence?

TURLEY: 3-4'. Just something to mark it out.

STEPHENS: Just something to create a demarcation between what the park is and where the lot ends.

DIGNAN: That is something I wouldn't want to agree to. I purchased this property about ten months ago. I have been in contact with the neighbors and basically addressed any concerns they have. 100% of the entire neighborhood requested a neighborhood park. Then they requested to reduce the density. During the last six months of working with staff, I complied with reducing the lots from 10 to 7 and eliminating Lot 8 and creating a neighborhood park. Originally I called it a community park but that is an improper word for it. It is a neighborhood park. This isn't a park for 7 lots; it is a park for 40 lots; because there are 11 homeowners on Julie Ann and 30 homeowners on Muirfield. So for her to say it is a small park, it is an open area. Outlot C is over one acre and the high water level of the pond is less than half an acre. So that whole area around the high water level is about .6 of an acre of park and recreation where you can walk around the pond. Plus it is going to be dry 10 months of the year. A lot of the neighbors expressed that they wanted a place to walk with their grandkids. That would be a perfect spot for it but for me to put a 3' fence up on a lot for a park doesn't make sense. If you can show me where it is done elsewhere in the Village, I am happy to take a look at it. But that would take away the use of whoever owns Lot 1.

STEPHENS: What is the reasoning for that, Mrs. Turley?

TURLEY: So that the lot doesn't encroach into the park area because I could see where that would be the tendency here. It can have openings; it doesn't have to be a solid fence. But it should demarcate the boundaries.

PARISI: There are other parks in the Village that have fencing that are not contiguous and arguably that was put in by the Village.

TURLEY: Yes, this is just smaller than typical. The code doesn't count land around the detention pond as park land. It has to be contiguous and relatively flat and usable for park equipment.

STEPHENS: Is this one of the conditions?

TURLEY: Yes.

DIGNAN: I was not aware of that.

STEPHENS: Number 5; install an ornamental fence along the west border of Lot 1 to discourage encroachment into the common park space. I don't think it is a bad idea.

DIGNAN: What is a decorative fence?

TURLEY: Ornamental iron.

DIGNAN: Just a 3' iron fence?

STEPHENS: Just a 3' ornamental fence. You are going to reduce the frontage of that lot, right?

DIGNAN: I am working with staff on that. We haven't determined if we are or not. Right now it is 110' wide and we are going to work with staff to see when we get the final engineering because the majority of the lot is going to be from east to west and then you have a 4 to 1 slope from the service area to the detention pond which isn't that great of a slope so we will be working with staff to see what reduction if any we can do for Lot 1. At that point, I was surprised by this fence thing. I was not aware of that.

STEPHENS: I don't think it's unreasonable. I think it makes sense. If you don't have some way of marking it the people who buy Lot 1 can further landscape into the park. If you put some line there.

DIGNAN: I'm sure there is going to be some kind of buffer. The park is for anyone's use.

STEPHENS: Of course. Well this isn't stopping the residents. All that it is doing is marking the west boundary line of that lot.

PARISI: First of all, a small shrub could do that. But second of all, going forward, who is responsible for maintaining that fence?

TURLEY: It would be something to work out. To be determined.

STEPHENS: Did you have any other comments?

DIGNAN: She did a very good job on the presentation. As I said, we have been working on this for a very long time. We are almost there to move forward.

STEPHENS: Yes you did a very nice job and worked well with the people in the area. You are solving problems. It is an infill piece. You have a situation that needs variances. That's all. Is there anyone else who wishes to comment? Seeing no one, we will go to our Commissioners.

AUBIN: Obviously the plan only works upon annexation. It meets the Comprehensive Plan and Mr. Dignan has agreed to all of the conditions except for condition number 5. I can't see anyone landscaping beyond their property so I don't see any reason why you'd have to mark it. I would recommend striking that sentence off on condition number 5. I assume that all of the complaints about the undeveloped area came from the neighbors and this is a lot better deal than what they were looking at in the past. That is all.

MURPHY: I think that the overall development looks great. It is terrific that the petitioner is going to connect the gaps and complete all of the connections. As you said, an infill piece can be very difficult and this flows nicely. I think it is a great development.

PARISI: I concur with Commissioner Aubin on striking the second sentence on number 5. Also, I am just curious, about the tree mitigation. It said 161 trees. Just from my observation, that is using a very generous definition of what constitutes a tree.

TURLEY: The number was the result of a quick look by our engineers at the code, if they are unable to save any of the existing trees, and of course he is going to save as many as he can. That would be the potential number of trees that would possibly have to be replaced somewhere. It probably won't be anywhere near that.

PARISI: Otherwise it is a nice fit. No other comments.

DZIERWA: First of all I think this was a very well done job by both Mr. Dignan and staff. I appreciate the fact that you were able to work something out. Mr. Dignan, I want to thank you for defending your request for variances. Not a lot of people take the time to answer so thoroughly. You made some very good points. Other than that, I agree with my fellow commissioners about not having a fence there. I can see where staff wanted to draw the line in the sand so homeowner number 1 doesn't build a gazebo right on that line and think that park land belongs to his property. I can see where you are going with that but I think there are other ways where you can delineate that and show that park is for these 7 homes and everyone in that area. I think we can probably eliminate that second sentence on condition number 5.

JACOBS: I agree that it is a well thought out use of the property. It is a difficult property and I think that will additionally improve that general area. Everything else around it is very well done.

PAUL: Yes it is definitely a good use for that piece of property. As far as the fence goes, I can see both sides. Maybe a compromise would be to allow a fence to be built if the owner of that property is amenable. When you're talking about encroachment, it cuts both ways. I wouldn't want people from the park helping themselves to my backyard either. If I owned that property, I would want something

there to determine what's mine and what's ours. Maybe leave open the possibility to whoever buys that parcel would have the right to put up a fence if they choose to.

TURLEY: They would have that right.

PAUL: Well I didn't know if there were any rules or regulations that would prohibit them. To me that would be a compromise to allow them to do that if they choose to.

STEPHENS: Thank you. I think it is a reasonably well thought out land plan. You have done a great job working with the neighbors around there. I appreciate the fact that you're going along with putting a park in to service several of the other communities that don't have a park. I think the variances that are being requested here are reasonable due to the fact that it is a difficult 4.5 acre piece to develop. I don't have any problem with it at all. I wish you a lot of luck.

AUBIN:

I move to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission the findings of fact set forth in this staff report, dated March 24, 2015.

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval (upon annexation) of the rezoning of the property to R-3 Residential District.

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval (upon annexation) of the preliminary site plan titled "Preliminary Site Plan Winterset Estates", by Spaceco Engineers job 8317, and dated 3/20/15, subject to the following conditions.

- 1) Developer must contribute a recapture fee to the Village per the Hunter Point recapture agreement for the previously constructed water booster station that will be utilized by this development.
- 2) Dedicate a 50' right of way to the centerline of 167th Street that aligns with neighboring right of way limits.
- 3) Complete missing off-site gaps on sidewalks, bike path, and street where they connect with abutting properties.
- 4) Utilize the existing driveway off of 167th Street for primary construction access, with lots 3 and 4 the last to develop, and identify on Site Plan.

5) Work with Village staff to reduce the lot width of lot 1.

6) Submit a Final Landscape Plan, meeting all Village Codes, for separate review and approval, within 60 days of final engineering approval including the following items:

- a. At the time of Final Landscape Plan, developer shall work with residents of new and existing lots to locate mitigated trees to buffer rear lots of homes.
- b. Provide tree mitigation, per Code requirements, preferably on site if a healthy spacing can be achieved, otherwise a contribution must be paid per Code into the tree mitigation bank. Tree mitigation requirements will be finalized at the time of Final Landscape Plan and after final engineering of lots.
- c. Plant the pond in a natural style with a native edge.
- d. Include parkway trees along all sidewalks, including 167th Street, spaced 40' on center.

7) Make the following labeling changes:

- a. Provide all lot size dimensions on Site Plan;
- b. Dimension high water setback from road and property line;
- c. Label flat area park land dedication acreage.

8) Meet all final engineering and building code related items.

9) Signage is not part of this petition and should be submitted for separate review to the Building Division.

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval (upon annexation) of a seven lot residential subdivision plus a detention out lot and public street dedication, on preliminary plat titled 'Plat of Subdivision', by Spaceco Engineers, dated 2/4/15, subject to the submission of a Record Plat of Subdivision to the Village for approval and recording.

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval (upon annexation) of the following variances:

- 1) Reduce minimum lot depth on the shared boundary between lots 2 and 3 from a required 125' to approximately 110'.
- 2) Reduce minimum lot depth on the shared boundary between lots 5 and 6 from a required 125' to approximately 113'.
- 3) Reduce cul-de-sac from a required 120' diameter to approximately 110'.

- 4) Reduce street turning radius from a required 175' radius to approximately 65'.
- 5) Reduce pond setback from a required 25' minimum to approximately 10'.
- 6) Increase pond slope from a required 4:1 maximum to approximately 3:1.
- 7) Reduce maintenance strip from a required 15' minimum to approximately 8'.

All changes must be made prior to the Board meeting.

RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL

Aye: 7 - Chairman Stephens, Member Jacobs, Member Aubin, Member Dzierwa, Member Parisi, Member Paul and Member Murphy

Nay: 0

2015-0137 AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE OF THE VILLAGE OF ORLAND PARK, AS AMENDED (Sections 5-101, 5-106, 6-207, 6-209, 6-210, 6-302, 6-307, 6-310, 6-314, and 9-101)

PITTOS: Staff presentation made in accordance with written staff report dated March 24, 2015.

AUBIN: Mr. Pittos, would Crystal Tree be an example of that?

PITTOS: Yes.

STEPHENS: That is strictly for Crystal Tree.

AUBIN: What are you going to use an electric sign for inside the guard house? It has to be off so that you can't see it from 143rd Street, correct?

PITTOS: Correct.

STEPHENS: I want to thank staff for tying this all together. We are going to have more changes, won't we?

PITTOS: There will be a number of changes this year. There will be more than two or three rounds this year.

STEPHENS: How long does it take to put one of these things together like this?

PITTOS: Basically, I have been working on this since mid-February. Something like the second round of Land Development Code Amendments in 2014 took around 4 months. It takes a lot of time.

STEPHENS: Thank you for all of your work.

DZIERWA: Going to page 15 where you talked about the E-1 district and the R-1 district, as far as garages are concerned. The R-1 district is 1 attached or detached garage and the E-1 district allows for 1 attached and 1 detached. Is that correct?

PITTOS: That is correct.

DZIERWA: But when you go to R-1 you can't have two separate garages? It's either one or the other?

PITTOS: Correct.

DZIERWA: As far as the signage, you used the word invisible from public properties. Is it invisible or non-visible? I guess either one works. That's all I have.

PARISI: How about inconspicuous?

STEPHENS: How about not be visible from public property? On page 16, it should be changed to not be visible.

DZIERWA: No sign is invisible, let's put it that way.

STEPHENS: Ok. Any other comments or corrections? We will now 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 March 24, 2015

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees to approve the Land Development Code amendments for Sections 5-101, 5-106, 6-207, 6-209, 6-210, 6-302, 6-307, 6-310, 6-314 and 9-101 as presented in the attached Amendment Report titled "2015 Land Development Code Amendments I Amendment Report to the Plan Commission", prepared by the Development Services Department and dated March 19, 2015.

RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL

Aye: 7 - Chairman Stephens, Member Jacobs, Member Aubin, Member Dzierwa, Member Parisi, Member Paul and Member Murphy

Nay: 0

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

None.

OTHER BUSINESS

2015-0040 Memo: New Petitions & Appearance Review

None.

ADJOURNMENT

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

STEPHENS: This meeting is adjourned at 8:55pm

Respectfully submitted,

Heather Zorena
Recording Secretary
ADJOURNED