

VILLAGE OF ORLAND PARK

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



Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, July 12, 2011

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

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES**2011-0453 Minutes of the June 14, 2011 Plan Commission Meeting**

A motion was made by Commissioner Aubin, seconded by Commissioner Dzierwa to approve the minutes of the June 14, 2011 Plan Commission meeting minutes with the following corrections:

Page 3: Under WOODS, 4th line from bottom, change 'Essential' to 'Essentially'

Page 9: Under DZIERWA, change 'These are close looped systems.' To 'These are closed loop systems.' Change 'These are systems that are a do not leak from time to time Commissioner Jacobs...' To 'These are systems that do not leak but from time to time, Commissioner Jacobs.'

A motion was made by Aubin, seconded by Dzierwa, that this matter be APPROVED The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Jacobs, Dzierwa, Aubin, Stephens, Parisi and Paul

Nay: 0

Abstain: 1 - Murphy

PUBLIC HEARINGS**2011-0342 2011 Land Development Code Amendments II**

Land Development Code Amendments II

PITTOS: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated July 12, 2011 as presented.

STEPHENS: With no comments from the public, the chairman asked for comments from the commissioners.

AUBIN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one comment. I'm sure that this has been thoroughly investigated on all ends by the staff, people that know these codes inside and out, like Mr. Pittos. I wouldn't think that there is anything wrong here.

DZIERWA: Mr. Pittos, as far as appearance review for restaurants, what required someone having a business as a restaurant and moving into a space that was formerly a restaurant, which is the same use, to come before us for an appearance review? I vaguely remember that if they did a fifty percent change to

the exterior of the building that would be the only reason for us to have an appearance review for another restaurant moving into a former restaurant.

PITTOS: The previous regulation was that if a restaurant was coming to town an appearance review was the minimum review process that they had to go through. That was because we have to check it to see if they are within 330 feet of any residential area. If they are, then they have to go through the special use process. If they are not, then they would go through the appearance review process. In the particular case of a restaurant moving into the space of a former restaurant, a restaurant appearance review has already occurred for that particular space. Unless they are proposing any kind of changes, minus the sign of course, they would not have to go through an appearance review. We already have a maximum occupancy load and all of that kind of information. In the case of it going into a former restaurant space within 330 feet of a residential area, the restaurant has the option to follow the parameters of the existing special use for that restaurant. If they choose to not follow the parameters by making a change, they would have to come before the plan commission. If they are doing an appearance review and they are proposing changes, like a new door or new storefront windows or what have you, then it would go through the regular review process.

MURPHY: I just have a quick question on appearance reviews. When it is something very cosmetic, like cleaning up paint, is that something that has to be reviewed as well?

PITTOS: Yes. Any changes to the exterior of the building, like windows, doors, and bricks or any other kind of material change would require an appearance review, even if for instance they are putting in a new type of rooftop equipment, they have to check to make sure that the parapets are screening them, so that would require an appearance review. That would have to go through the building permit review process, because when a restaurant moves into a site for example they are going to have to make changes to their layout. They have to move plumbing around and electrical and what have you. They are already coming to the villages front door, so to speak, asking for a review.

STEPHENS: You brought up the case about Sheffield Square. You're talking about thirty foot rear building setbacks, which means that the buildings have to be fifteen feet from their rear lot line, each one, which would make it a thirty foot overall setback?

PITTOS: For the multi-family homes?

STEPHENS: Correct.

PITTOS: It would be a thirty-foot separation building to building.

STEPHENS: They draw lot lines once they lay out the buildings. If they draw their

lot lines at fifteen feet behind the building, does it comply with that?

PITTOS: Yes.

STEPHENS: With regards to the sixty percent lot coverage, that sixty percent is for the entire land area of that particular development, correct.

PITTOS: Correct.

STEPHENS: The Chairman then asked for a motion.

AUBIN:

I move to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission the findings of fact set forth in this staff report dated July 12, 2011

and

I move to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees to approve the Land Development Code amendments titled "Part Three: Attachments", prepared by the Development Services Department, dated 6/27/11, and the attached Land Development Code amendments to Part Three, titled "Section 6-205 R-4 Residential District" and "Section 6-206 RSB Residential Supporting Business District", prepared by the same.

RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL to the Development Services & Planning Committee due back on 7/18/2011

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

Nay: 0

2011-0450 2011 LDCA II Planned Development Standards and Lot Coverage Credit

Continuance

STEPHENS: The Chairman requested a motion for a continuance to the July 26, 2011 Plan Commission meeting.

I move to continue the Land Development Code amendments concerning planned development standards and lot coverage credits to the July 26, 2011 Plan Commission.

CONTINUED to the Plan Commission due back on 7/26/2011

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

Nay: 0

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

OTHER BUSINESS

PITTOS: If anybody else has one of these envelopes (shows an example), I can collect them and turn them in for you.

ADJOURNMENT

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

STEPHENS: This meeting is adjourned at 7:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julie White
Recording Secretary