

VILLAGE OF ORLAND PARK

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



Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, November 10, 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: 6 - Chairman Stephens; Member Jacobs; Member Aubin; Member Parisi; Member Paul, Member Murphy

Absent: 1 - Member Dzierwa

APPROVAL OF MINUTES**2015-0067 Minutes of the November 10, 2015 Plan Commission Meeting**

A motion was made by Commissioner Parisi, seconded by Commissioner Aubin; to approve the minutes of the October 13, 2015 Plan Commission with the following change:

Under Stephens's testimony on Page 14, add "in" after staying to read "who may be staying in the house."

APPROVED

PUBLIC HEARINGS**2015-0516 Townhomes at Colette Highlands - Planned Unit Development**

PITTOS: Staff presentation made in accordance with written staff report dated November 10, 2015.

STEPHENS: Thank you. Would the petitioner care to add any additional comments before we go to the public?

AUBIN: Swore in John Schiess, Architect, 400 Ashland, River Forest.

SCHIESS: Presentation made in addition to staff's presentation.

STEPHENS: Thank you. Great presentation and thank you for working with the people in the community who live there because they are important to us here. If there is anyone that wishes to address this petition, please come forward.

AUBIN: Swore in Patrick McLaughlin, President of the Condominium Association, 15630 Park Station Boulevard, Orland Park.

MCLAUGHLIN: I will be the first to testify and acknowledge that John Schiess is a class guy. I have been working with him for 4 months. He has literally listened to all of our problems and issues that we have had with this project. Kudos to him and I hope that he puts together a good builder and team to make this thing happen. We like what is going on here but we like it with a couple asterisk. We have never been trying to improve our property, just simply maintain it, that way we can live

there. It has been a big issue with that road and as I had brought to this planning committee twice before when another developer was trying to develop this property. We were really anxious and adamant about closing this road. The traffic that goes through that property is just incredible. There are over 100 cars a day that don't belong there. They fly up and down that road. People that use the Park Station Boulevard roadway coming from either the trains or 153rd, fly through our property to go into Colette Highlands and the single family homes. It has been a cut through since day 1. We have pot holes and all sorts of issues on that road. Not to mention the fact that last summer I witnessed a ball going across the road, a kid chasing it and a car flying through there. The car skidded and turned sideways, just nearly missing that kid. This is the kind of activity that has been on this road. We needed to have this road closed. The original development and plan, it might have made sense but it doesn't. I live there. I'm on the fifth floor. I can look northwest and see that road and all of the activity on it. It is a nightmare. It is a real travesty. Closing that road is a big plus for us. Working with John, we had a number of issues that I asked him to address and he did. They put it in writing to us and I have a copy that I would like to submit. I will leave this with you. Without this little turn around, many trucks (i.e. delivery, mail, fire trucks, etc.) wouldn't be able to get in and out. That is probably the best that we are going to get. We have a 16 million dollar building. It is one of the most premier properties in Orland Park. These condominiums sold for over \$500,000 in the high of the real estate market. It is not such the case anymore but be that as it may neither are the single family homes bringing the kind of money that they used to. We are all very much aware of that. I call this the island; we have light poles in there, trees, irrigation and so on. Now that is going to go away and we are still going to have some sod in this area. We would like, as we asked for our trees to be moved, for the irrigation to be moved, the light poles to be moved. We have an acknowledgement from John Schiess and his people acknowledging that they would go in fact do this. The road needs to be finished off. All of these things would have happened regardless of who the builder would be. It is all in this sheet that our attorney put together. They have agreed to it but we would like this to be approved as part of the conditions of approval. Those items, if you approve this project, we would like these to be approved along with it so we don't get short changed. The other issue I have is that I am towing cars out of our lot on a regular basis. You cannot believe the people that park there that do not belong there. They come from the houses and from the concerts. We don't want people parking there. We don't park in their driveways, we don't want them parking in our parking lot. I know with this new project, there is going to be an issue. I have been dealing with this for 2 years. People are lazy. They are going to take the shortest path of least resistance. With removing this parking lot, any of these people in these areas have Thanksgiving dinner and they have 5 or 6 guests come over and they bring 5 or 6 cars; if you have 7 or 8 people out of 60 townhomes, that's an additional 56 cars. Where are these people going to go? I don't think on a snowy day that these people are going to park by the Metra station and walk through the snow to visit the units. I just don't see that happening. You have to put some parking on this project. He has 3 spots here for 60 townhomes. The other site plan, site plan 4, has parking

here. I think there is an additional 12. So that is 15 spots for 60 townhomes. I don't know if that fits into the scheme of things but it still doesn't sound like a whole lot to me. I understand the green space thing but if you're going to put this project in, you have to make it livable. They have agreed to put a fence across our property and all the way to the sidewalk. The fence will be 6' black metal fence. It will coincide with the area. This may or may not keep people from parking in our lot, walking around the fence and going to visit someone in the townhomes. I see how lazy people are and how they use our lot now. They have agreed to do that. I think it will deter some of the people and maybe slow them down as a means of parking. I strongly advise this planning committee to go with this plan as opposed to the plan that offers more green space but I don't think it lends to a very good living environment for 60 townhomes that are 3 bedrooms. Conceivably, you could have a mom, dad, and maybe 2 boys in college that come home with friends and their own cars. There are your 4 spots, 2 in the garage and 2 on the pad. Where does anybody park that comes to visit them? When a kid has poker night, where are these kids going to park? We have it in our building. If we have it with only 24 units, what are 60 units going to bring into this area? I just foresee a lot of issues. So this is the plan that we buy into. The people behind me are homeowners in our building. There are a few people here that I believe are from the single family homes on the west side. We have come out in numbers to support this plan.

STEPHENS: You like this site plan better?

MCLAUGHLIN: I do. I think you need to have parking. The Metra lot is beneficial for these people. The other thing I like about this project is the snow push. That's a plus for this development. We are asking for what is on our request and that is the fence, move our irrigation, move our trees, move our lighting. If you approve this project, then we would like this statement to be approved as a condition of this.

STEPHENS: You have 9 conditions, total.

SCHIESS: We have reviewed them and my client has accepted all of the terms. I have sent a letter acknowledging that we are comfortable making these conditions of approval.

AUBIN: Swore in Matt Lulich, Attorney, 9501 144th Place, Orland Park.

LULICH: Everyone has done such an excellent job of preparing. I just have one thing that Pat wanted me to cover. That has to do with the boundary line between the development and the condos. As it has been mentioned, we have used as a part of the original plan, a part of the property which is lot 303. Just that little strip of our parking. I am assuming that. I haven't seen an actual survey. Everybody says it so I am going to accept it for that. If you can see where the south property line is, you can see how the parking spaces are a little bit to the north of that. The turnaround that they have so graciously agreed to put in also encroaches. Those parking spaces and the turnaround would only be for the use of the condo building.

The only thing that we would ask to be included would probably a simple easement agreement to be able to use those things so that in the future, if there is ever any questions about rebuilding anything, re-landscaping, repaving, we have the easement of record there so we can keep our parking spaces.

STEPHENS: That is not in this letter?

LULICH: It is but it is not one of the bullet points. Maybe the second paragraph of the letter?

STEPHENS: Yes, where you do not have a clear survey.

LULICH: Right. Assuming that is the case, we would request the easement. If it turns out that the property line is somewhere different than what everyone else expects, obviously that is a different story.

STEPHENS: You have spoken to them with regards to the easement? They have no problem with that?

SCHIESS: I have not spoken directly to Mr. Lulich but in conversations with Patrick we have agreed to grant that easement. You are right, we are representing the property line there based on the civil engineers drawings but obviously that would be something we would do through a civil engineer surveyor.

AUBIN: Swore in Jim Osterkorn, 15625 Julie's Way, Orland Park.

OSTERKORN: I was part of the initial single family homeowner's meeting with the architect. I found him to be very receptive to our concerns. I was unable to make the meeting yesterday so I don't know what the outcome was but it looks like he addressed all of the issues and a little more. I used to work in Oak Park and the first meeting that I had realized that I had passed some of his work before and I admired it. He has a really unique way of utilizing the space. I am not opposed to any of this at the moment. I am in agreement with whatever the single family homeowner's came up with yesterday.

STEPHENS: Are you a single family homeowner there?

OSTERKORN: Yes, I am.

AUBIN: Swore in Constance Macon, 17581 Cambridge Place, Tinley Park.

MACON: I am with the property management company for the single family homes. I was in attendance when John met with the homeowner's that do live directly behind the development. We had a couple issues that we brought to John. Lastly, we are missing two items which is the landscape drawing and the line of sight drawing to see the elevations between the single family homes and the

townhomes. We would like to have our input on your decorations to make sure that they match with what we currently have in the master association. Signage, we brought up what we could do with the 108th Street, 159th Street and Jillian Way. John listened to the input that the homeowner's had and I think with this final plan, they did like it. We did not see the final fifth plan where the visitor parking was taken away. I think they would probably have an issue with visitor parking without the parking.

SCHIESS: Connie referenced the letter and my client has reviewed it and we have accepted those conditions toward approval.

STEPHENS: Is that a different letter?

SCHIESS: Yes.

STEPHENS: Do we have a copy of that letter?

SCHIESS: We have it electronically. I'm not sure how I can get that to you.

STEPHENS: Have we heard everybody? Just speaking for myself and hearing all of the homeowner's before and now, I think what you have done on this site plan makes a lot of sense. Eliminating the road is probably the number one thing. I agree with Pat, it was a cut through street and it's all local people that cut through, people that live there. To eliminate that street, it makes all the sense in the world. Turning the building sideways makes a great deal of sense. As far as the site plan goes, I don't have any problem with it as long as the homeowner's are happy with the site plan, we are good with it. Where I see a problem and I have to be honest with you, I am not thrilled with your building elevations. It just seems to me that these building elevations don't seem to fit in with the single family that sits behind there and with the quality of the condo building that sits right next door. I think they are kind of bland to tell you the truth. I'm not trying to criticize your designs but I think you could have come a long way with better architectural features. I appreciate the brick that you are doing at the end of the buildings but you have some pretty long buildings here and there is not much to break it up. This is where I have a problem with. We would probably be better off to continue this for a couple of reasons. One would be to ask you to come back with a design that has quite a bit more architectural features than this. I look at the buildings at Sheffield Square and compared to this, I think Sheffield Square has a lot more going for it. Secondly, I think we should continue it so that staff can get all of these comments put in on our recommendation as it goes forward. That is just my opinion but we will see what our other Commissioners have to say.

AUBIN: I somewhat disagree. I listen to Mr. McLaughlin and the folks that came up to the podium tonight and not one individual mentioned a thing about the elevations. Obviously they didn't have a problem with what was on site plan 4 and the elevations that had been shown. I also agree that they don't do a very good

rendering of what is current now with the bricks that you are going to put into this building. The way that you are orienting the buildings, the landscaping, and if I count correctly there are only 7 homes that are going to be looking at it. I would move this project on this evening.

PARISI: I am very impressed by the presentations and Mr. Schiess. All the care you took to consult with the homeowner's and the condo owner's, it is an excellent collaboration that you don't see too often and I am impressed by it. This is the third iteration of trying to do something with this project. It is the one that seems to make the most sense and has the most buy in. As far as the elevation, I would agree with Commissioner Aubin. The homeowner's have seen it and I don't think the renderings do it justice. The only thing that I am thinking about is whether you eliminate that parking or not between the condos and the townhomes. On the one hand, yes you do get 12 additional spaces but then you narrow those driveways between the townhomes and I wonder which is the greater good. I personally I would be inclined to have the wider space between the townhomes. I would favor eliminating those parking spaces and have wider parking area between the driveways. I like site plan 5 as opposed to 4.

MURPHY: I am in commercial design so one thing I know for sure is design is subjective. I very much agree with the collaboration and I think that is wonderful. I would like to see a little bit more variety in the elevations. I also agree that sometimes what we see on paper is hard to actually visualize what the outcome will be. I would like to see a continuance as well. I think we are very close to being there but I would like to see more differentiation. I have no issues with the site plan. I do think that the additional parking makes more sense. I would like to see that additional parking kept.

JACOBS: I agree with you. I think we need a little more charm. I know you have worked very hard and I congratulate you on your efforts. You were terrific but I agree with the Chairman and that we should strive for a little bit more design. As far as the parking and the layout of site plan 4, that is the one that I prefer.

PAUL: Again I want to commend the petitioner for working with the neighbors. We have seen a couple of starts and stops on this with some other folks. This was done the right way. As far as the elevations go, I don't have any problems with the elevations but more importantly the people that live around there don't have a problem with them. I agree with Mr. McLaughlin on the parking. I do believe that you should have more guest parking. You are talking about driveways as parking spots but those aren't public spots. You have four spots for each home if you put a few cars in the garage. If you have a couple of people and you have several more coming over, they aren't going to park in people's driveways. It is pretty tight there and I can't imagine that there is any type of street parking that would even work. I think you need some public parking spots, especially at the south end. You have some alternatives with the Metra lot on the north end, that probably works, but they will park in the condo parking lot. It is the closest spot. That is another issue and

we are trying to do this in a way that avoids problems with the other developments. That would just cause an additional one. I say keep the elevations as they are and I would go along with the layout that includes the additional parking.

STEPHENS: Just a thought here and I know you are probably not going to like this. Mr. McLaughlin brings out a very good comment with regards to parking. Have you thought about eliminating Building G, shifting everything over, leaving them to have the parking on the south end and create more parking on the north end?

SCHIESS: When I start these projects, I am given full control of the components with financials being one of them. I run an independent Performa. I have also been a general contractor and I have built townhomes like this. I don't take my clients data for granted. If you look at the history, we started with 59 units. It grew to 60 because of eliminating the road and because of the things that we were "giving back" to make things work on the site plan. We needed that 60th unit to make the Performa balance within a reasonable expectation. If I couldn't eliminate 1 unit, I couldn't eliminate 5. I am there at the balance.

STEPHENS: Maybe you could knock off just a couple to give us some more parking.

SCHIESS: I love the candor but I'm afraid I couldn't support that to my client. I would like to propose something. We have come before commissions like yourself and there are discussions about architectural features. I don't take offense. While I take my work personally, I distance myself. It started back in architecture school, if I took things personally, I never would have graduated. One of the things that we could do as a matter of practicality if you are willing to approve this with the condition that we would work with Village staff to provide alternate elevations. I think the difference between what we presented and what I'm hearing are volumetric: altering rooflines, maybe some pushing and pulling. We have that option to do that which gives shadow lines and a much richer look to the built product. We would also strive to give you better representation of the graphics. We concentrated so much on the site plans we sort of left the elevations rendered on the computer. If you would indulge us that would allow us to move forward within the time frame given that my understanding is that you are a recommending body to the Village Board as opposed to having another 30 day cycle. I put that request in front of you and hopefully you can help us out with that.

STEPHENS: With regards to the elevations, I would rather see you come back to this Commission with the elevations. I think with my Commissioners here we all share one idea that we would like to see all of these recommendations listed as part of the recommended approval moving forward. I think you have got some work cut out for you. I think you are going to have to do something to enhance the elevations. I think you might have to consider maybe losing a couple units and adding a little more parking. Also, include site plan 4 to keep that additional

parking. Mr. McLaughlin and his group have made very valid comments with regards to the parking and to putting in 60 units and having people come and visit. I agree with him. If it is winter time, nobody is going to park in the Metra lot and walk all the way over to visit the unit that is in the south. It just is not going to happen. It is going to create parking problems for everybody around them.

SCHIESS: I agree with that from a planning stand point and for the future residents. That is a problem. I never like to be contrary to staff's recommendation but respectfully, we see the value in leaving the site plan there given the open space around it. That would be our recommendation that we move forward with that site plan.

STEPHENS: Well we are going to continue this tonight and maybe you are going to come back and show us that you might be able to add a couple more parking spaces. You might find a way to do that, I don't know if it's possible. We will move along.

AUBIN:

I move to continue 2015-0516 Townhomes at Colette Highlands PUD to the November 24, 2015 Plan Commission meeting so that the petitioner and staff can list all of the conditions proposed and accepted; as well as discuss improvements to the proposed elevations and parking issues.

MURPHY: Second.

CONTINUED

Aye: 6 - Chairman Stephens, Member Jacobs, Member Aubin, Member Parisi, Member Paul and Member Murphy

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Member Dzierwa

2015-0579 Retail Plaza at 159th Street & LaGrange Road - Planned Unit Development

PITTOS: Staff presentation made in accordance with written staff report dated November 10, 2015.

STEPHENS: Thank you. Does the petitioner wish to address this petition?

AUBIN: Swore in Mitch Goltz, 461 N. Clinton, Chicago.

GOLTZ: Thank you. Just want to reiterate a couple of the points that Terry had highlighted. We purchased this property back in July. We were working with Sam Larocco, who unfortunately passed away shortly before we acquired the property. We have been working on this for the past year or so and really dealing within the confines of this island of a site. We looked at getting cross access but it just isn't

feasible. Simon wasn't interested and the grading difference and curb cuts are both IDOT roads. A lot of infrastructure and improvements were done in the last several years to make these this way so we are trying to work within the confines that we have. We think we have come up with a plan that takes advantage of the site and we're looking to proceed with this plan. On one point regarding the awnings on Building B. There will be awnings for each of the spaces; we just didn't have the color intact for what could be an AT&T. We are finalizing deals for a variety of the tenants. There will be continuity throughout the project. It will all be high quality design, brick and any EIFS that would be needed for a specific tenant prototype to get them their look. We do look forward to getting this off the ground.

STEPHENS: Thank you. Is there anyone here who wishes to comment on this petition? Seeing no one, we will move forward with our Commissioners. I do have a couple questions. Are you going to go with the colors that you show on here?

GOLTZ: For the corner building, that red would be continued throughout that building.

STEPHENS: This is the same identical architecture that you brought in for the 159th Street project?

GOLTZ: It is very similar. It is the same architects.

STEPHENS: Why didn't you bring that street straight instead of that big curve?

GOLTZ: Because that is an existing curb cut but by going straight, it would eliminate a row of parking. Those spaces in front of Building B would be dead ended.

STEPHENS: Could you shift Building B over? You would still have the spaces wouldn't you?

PITTOS: We have tested the site plan a number of times and there is always going to be a curve in this area here because of the IDOT swale. It is essentially keeping this here and in order for Building B to come down and to get the appropriate parking configuration for a bay of parking on this side and another parking area on the other side, it causes an S curve right up the middle. Staff felt that in order to augment the amenity space as well, it is probably better to have the cars veer off to the north as soon as possible in a general and comfortable turn radius situation. Then to provide the parking field once the motorist

JACOBS: I think it is a great improvement for that corner.

AUBIN: I concur with my fellow Commissioners. Preliminary engineering has been approved for the project and there are a number of conditions in the motion tonight. Obviously the petitioner doesn't have a problem with any of it so I say full

speed ahead.

MURPHY: I agree. It is a great use for the site. It is a big improvement and I have no concerns as well.

PARISI: Nor do I. I concur with my Commissioners.

STEPHENS: I as well agree. That is a tough site to deal with. Overall it is going to be a great improvement over what we see there currently. 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 November 10, 2015

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of the preliminary site plan titled "GW Properties Proposed Commercial Development 159th Street and La Grange Road, Orland Park, IL.", prepared by Design Studio 24 LLC, dated August 3, 2015, sheet C2.0, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Coordinate with the Village to connect the private sidewalk network to the public sidewalk network on 159th Street.
- 2) Post "No Parking- Loading Zone" signs (with time limits) to accommodate loading activities on the west side of both buildings.
- 3) Add more landscaping to the north elevation of Building B to address blank wall surfaces.
- 4) Submit a final landscape plan, meeting all Village Codes, for separate review and approval within 60 days of final engineering approval.
- 5) Meet all final engineering and building code related items.

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of the Elevations titled "Building A Elevations New Retail Development 159th and La Grange Road, Orland Park, IL." and "Building B Elevations New Retail Development 159th and La Grange Road, Orland Park, IL.", prepared by Design Studio 24 LLC, sheets A2.1 and B2.1 respectively, both dated November 2, 2015, subject to the same conditions outlined in the above Preliminary Site Plan motion and the following:

- 1) Screen all mechanical equipment either at grade level with landscaping or hidden behind the roofline.
- 2) Indicate the level of transparency for all windows on both Buildings A and B on the elevation drawings.

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of a Special Use Permit for 15882 S La Grange Road, a two building retail planned unit development at the northwest corner of 159th Street and La Grange Road subject to the same conditions as outlined in the Preliminary Site Plan motion. Modifications to the Special Use permit include:

- 1) Reduce the La Grange Road setback from 25 feet to four (4) feet eleven (11) inches.
- 2) Reduce the 159th Street setback from 25 feet to three (3) feet.
- 3) Reduce the side setback from fifteen (15) feet to ten (10) feet.
- 4) Reduce the east, west and south bufferyards to function within the modified/ established building setback requirements.

All changes must be made prior to the Board meeting.

PAUL: Second.

RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL

Aye: 6 - Chairman Stephens, Member Jacobs, Member Aubin, Member Parisi, Member Paul and Member Murphy

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Member Dzierwa

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

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 9:08 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Heather Zorena
Recording Secretary