

# VILLAGE OF ORLAND PARK

*14700 Ravinia Avenue  
Orland Park, IL 60462  
[www.orland-park.il.us](http://www.orland-park.il.us)*



## **Meeting Minutes**

**Tuesday, April 10, 2012**

**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 - Dzierwa; Aubin; Stephens; Parisi; Paul, Murphy

**Absent:** 1 - Jacobs

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES****2012-0203 Minutes for the March 27, 2012 Plan Commission Meeting**

A motion was made by Commissioner Aubin, seconded by Commissioner Dzierwa to approve the minutes of the March 27, 2012 Plan Commission Meeting with the following change:

Change Parisi to Dzierwa when swearing in Chris Mack.

APPROVED

**Aye:** 3 - Dzierwa, Aubin and Parisi

**Nay:** 0

**Abstain:** 3 - Stephens, Paul and Murphy

**Absent:** 1 - Jacobs

**PUBLIC HEARINGS****2012-0137 Marquette Bank Offices - Site Plan, Variances**

TURLEY: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated April 10, 2012 as presented.

STEPHENS: Thank you, Mrs. Turley. Is the petitioner present? Would you like to speak?

AUBIN: Swore in Thomas Cachey, 10913 Summer Lane, Orland Park, Illinois.

CACHEY: We are requesting a variance to add to the parking lot. Currently we have a parking lot that has 32 spaces and we are looking to add to those spaces. We have a business that is going to open up. We have an occupancy permit right now and we are planning on having our users in the building by the end of the month. We are looking at having approximately 60 employees with 5-10 visitors on a regular basis. So that is where we came up with the number for this parking. It has been a pleasure to deal with Jane. But with response to her staff recommendations: the parking stalls where we were going to add the 7 feet as opposed to the 5 feet where we had the parking blocks. This is an active professional building that we are going to be maintaining and the maintenance of

the parking blocks and parkway will be paramount to our visitors. We will be maintaining that. We are concerned that by taking out the parking blocks and shortening the parking stalls and making the walk larger is going to push the cars back. People that have low riding cars typically don't pull up to the parking blocks or the sidewalk. We are concerned that if we extend the sidewalk another two feet as opposed to using the parking blocks those cars will be sticking out to the drive aisle. We are concerned that it is already tight. So we would like to keep the parking blocks if possible.

STEPHENS: Keep the parking blocks and not extend the sidewalk by two feet?

CACHEY: Yea.

STEPHENS: So keep a 5 feet sidewalk and the other two feet go into the parking stalls.

CACHEY: We are concerned with the connection to Fifth Third Bank. Obviously we are looking to occupy this building at the end of this month. Based on this process, we will not get approval until May 7th, I believe. We have had contact with Fifth Third Bank regarding leasing of parking spaces because we are going to be short in the interim. They have been nonresponsive and we are afraid that talking to them about the drive aisle, they would be even more nonresponsive. I propose that we move forward with that taken out, we just stub it and move forward. I do not think that we are going to get resolution with that in the time period that we need to move forward with getting our tenants in place.

STEPHENS: You have met with the bank?

CACHEY: We have had conversations with the bank at 108th Avenue & 159th Street. They want to send it to Corporate. We have sent emails and we have left voicemails and it has been nonresponsive in terms of simply leasing parking spaces from them.

STEPHENS: Mrs. Turley, all they would be required to do would be to extend it to their property line?

TURLEY: Right.

STEPHENS: If they made an agreement with Fifth Third Bank, then Fifth Third Bank would have to pick it up from that point.

TURLEY: Well, we can't require Fifth Third Bank to do that.

AUBIN: But it would be their responsibility if they all agreed to put it through.

TURLEY: They would have to negotiate who is going to take care of what.

STEPHENS: They would have to negotiate an agreement on which the developer would have to extend it all the way through and Fifth Third Bank would give them an ok.

TURLEY: Yea in order for it to function the way it is supposed to, something has to happen there. Some sort of agreement has to be reached. But as far as the limits of what we can require with this petition, we can only require them to extend to the property line. A lot of connections are very gradual things that happen over the years as new petitions came through. In the future if Fifth Third came through, we could look at it then. But we don't have the leverage to require that now.

STEPHENS: Ok, I'm sorry, please continue Mr. Cachey.

CACHEY: I will now continue on to number 3 in staff's recommendation. We have no problem extending the southern most tree island and what is going to happen is that we would lose a parking stall. What we would do is balance out at the front entrance where we have those two islands; we would make them uniform in size and then extend the south island to match that to meet the square footage requirement.

TURLEY: So I would just suggest that they work with the staff on that.

STEPHENS: We will make that a condition to work with the staff to find a mutually agreeable location for the tree island.

CACHEY: Number four with the tree mitigation. We do have six trees being removed. The bike path is kind of up in the air at this point. Some of those evergreens extend out into the bike path area currently and we would have to substantially cut them back. Whether they would survive the cutting back or whether we would have to remove them, we will have the resolution to that at the next meeting. But our goal today is that if we are taking out the six trees, we are going to put back five additional trees in between the parking and building and we are going to mitigate for cash for the remainder. We will have that at the next meeting. With regard to screening, the engineering plans will take care of that based on what that is. The screening of the new mechanical equipment, we have new mechanical equipment being installed on the roof and we are working with our HVAC contractors to determine what an equitable way to do that is. We would propose that at today's meeting, to move forward with our parking lot, we work with Jane and her office to resolve that at a future date.

STEPHENS: Anything else?

CACHEY: Nothing.

TURLEY: One thing I might add about the sidewalk issue. If they wanted, they have

enough room; they could extend the sidewalk to the east. Although the stalls would meet code, they can extend it to the east so it does not shorten the parking stalls. That would be acceptable.

AUBIN: Mrs. Turley, Condition 1: that the petitioner work with staff on an alternate plan to alleviate the removal of the parking blocks and the widening of the sidewalk. Will that work? Thank you.

STEPHENS: Currently, the plan shows the length of the parking stalls is at 18 ½ feet and that includes the parking blocks in there, am I correct? So you are thinking of pushing that further east?

TURLEY: Well, they can reduce their parking stalls by 2 feet if the car can overhand the sidewalk. They could just expand the sidewalk to the west and shorten the parking space depth. But Tom said they did not want to do that. They were concerned. The parking aisle meets code but it is pretty minimal. The option is that they could expand the sidewalk to the east towards the building.

STEPHENS: Take two feet off the landscape area? Yeah, they can work with you on that to work out an agreeable approach.

TURLEY: Yes. That is an option.

CACHEY: Our concern is that we want to add back in the trees and are we minimizing the green space where we would want to add trees in between the parking lot and the building.

STEPHENS: You think two feet is going to make a big difference. Two feet?

CACHEY: The landscape out there is so mature.

STEPHENS: Well, that is true. Ok, is that it Mr. Cachey? Thank you. This is a public hearing, is there anyone else that would like to speak to this petition? Ok, seeing as there is no one willing to address this, we will go to our Plan Commissioners. Commissioner Parisi?

PARISI: I don't have any objections to the petitioner or the petitioner's request, actually. But that is something they will work with staff, I suppose. Otherwise, nothing. Thank you.

STEPHENS: Thank you. Commissioner Murphy?

MURPHY: I do not have any objections as well. Thank you.

STEPHENS: Thank you. Commissioner Aubin?

AUBIN: It looks like common sense prevails. Some of the adjustments that we will make on these conditions will be satisfactory to both the staff and the petitioner. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STEPHENS: Thank you. Commissioner Dzierwa?

DZIERWA: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I agree with my fellow Commissioners. I do not think that this is a problem here. I would suggest though that the stub road gets built up to the property line. Even if they cant do anything with Fifth Third. Once Fifth Third Bank comes in we can make it a requirement for them if they do anything. I firmly believe in connectability. I also believe that this variance and this parking fit with all the other buildings in the area. There is a lot of double loaded parking there. The only thing that I was concerned about is that big piece of green area between the ice arena and the bank. Who owns that? Does anybody know?

CACHEY: The bank does. The bank owns that piece of property.

DZIERWA: Ok, and that drive aisle obviously is for fire trucks and it says 'do not enter' but it was funny because the sign says fire lane and it was facing me and says do not enter but I entered. So clearly that sign needs to be turned around. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

STEPHENS: Thank you Commissioner. Commissioner Paul?

PAUL: Thank you Mr. Chairman. The concern that I was looking at with the width of the drive lane in the parking lot, if you are not going to have that open all the way through, you are going to have cars going both directions. I think it does make sense to keep it as wide as possible if there will be only one entrance to the parking lot. If you leave both sides open then we can make it one direction. Then you wouldn't need as wide of an area but I can see where you are coming from on that. That is all I have.

STEPHENS: Thank you Commissioner Paul. I would say that moving the parking lot forward would not be in compliance with the code but it is consistent with what the Fifth Third Bank has to the north. I do not see any problem with that. The area coming east, those parking areas, I think you need to work those things out to be mutually agreeable. I do not know if I agree with staff about eliminating those parking blocks. From my experience with my car, it seems like if there is a curb there, I get up on the curb and it kind of rips out my undercarriage. However, the parking blocks do not seem to do that.

PARISI: What is the height of the parking blocks?

STEPHENS: Mr. Cachey, do you know the height of those parking blocks?

CACHEY: They are standard.

STEPHENS: I would say they are about 4 inches. One other question; Marquette Bank: are you moving the people from your location at 151st and West Avenue to this location or are you putting new people in there that are not already working at the 151st location?

CACHEY: The main use of this building will be for the lending group which predominately is officed now at 143rd and Lagrange Road.

STEPHENS: Oh, so you are moving them from there to here? How soon is that? That bank has to come down how soon?

CACHEY: Two years.

STEPHENS: Two years from now. So you're starting to make the moves now. Ok, thank you. We will entertain a motion at this point.

AUBIN:

I move to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission the findings of fact set forth in this staff report, dated April 10, 2012.

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of the Preliminary Site Plan titled Marquette Bank Lending Group Office Complex and dated 03-08-12, subject to the following conditions.

1. That the petitioner work with staff on an alternate plan to alleviate the removal of the parking blocks and widening of the sidewalks.
2. Construct a shown parking aisle to the north if permission can be obtained from Fifth Third Bank, otherwise stub the connection at the property line.
3. Work with staff to add one additional tree island.
4. List code required tree mitigation and site plan to show mitigation trees along 160th Street parkway and to other locations where needed.
5. Meet all final engineering and building code related items.
6. Work with staff to provide a mutually agreeable plan to screen all new mechanical equipment either at grade level with landscaping or behind the roof line.

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of these Variances :

1. Locate approximately twenty three additional parking spaces between the building and the street.
2. Exceed the number of parking spaces required by more than 20%, from a 52 space maximum to approximately 65 spaces.

RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL

**Aye:** 6 - Dzierwa, Aubin, Stephens, Parisi, Paul and Murphy

**Nay:** 0

**Absent:** 1 - Jacobs

### **2011-0776 2012 Land Development Code Amendments I**

PITTOS: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated April 10, 2012 as presented.

STEPHENS: Excuse me, that being the case, so you're saying that up to 50,000 square feet it is 250. Why couldn't we eliminate one of these and just say 'Commercial retail buildings footprint up to 50,000 square feet'?

PITTOS: Well what is actually happening with this amendment is that every retail building now is going to be at four parking spaces per 1000 square feet. We found in the American Planning Association's National Standards that four parking spaces per 1000 square feet is a useful standard for buildings up to 400,000 square feet. In Orland Park, we only have two buildings that are greater than 250,000 square feet, which is Orland Square Mall and Orland Park Place Mall. So in fact what we've created is one parking standard for all retail in Orland Park. You are right in the sense that there is this distinction that is being made in the code that is for all intent and purposes have become obsolete and the distinction should not necessarily be made. But what we are saying is to keep the distinction in place only so we might be able to amend the code and make it a little more dynamic in the future so that we don't have to change tables and create logistics issues. It keeps the code flexible in the future.

STEPHENS: So it doesn't make sense to just eliminate one of these lines and just leave it the way you have it now to read 'Commercial retail building footprint up to 50,000 square feet in area'?

PITTOS: That makes sense.

STEPHENS: Just to eliminate one of these boxes, that's what I'm saying. Both of these boxes say the same thing.

PITTOS: Right and the regulation would be the same.

STEPHENS: So can't we just eliminate it to clean it up. We're cleaning it up now.

PITTOS: We could.

STEPHENS: Ok.

PITTOS: Resumes staff presentation.

PARISI: Do the windows on the strip center across the street from Sandburg High school where the Greek Restaurant is that face Lagrange Road? The windows are all covered, does that meet with this?

PITTOS: I think those windows are covered in a white out.

PARISI: Blue, orange, so does that create an issue? Is there any kind of restriction on that? I could tell you that the people who live behind there are not too thrilled about it.

PITTOS: Well I think there is a difference between an image, being a picture or brand seal.

PARISI: So technically they are within compliance if they just black it out.

PITTOS: In some instances all over town, they simply put the white out where it is just a spandrel type of appearance and in those cases there are other regulations that would guide that. But what we are talking about here is what amounts to be advertising signage. Resumes staff presentation.

STEPHENS: Good job, Mr. Pittos. A lot of work went into this. Thank you. This is a public hearing, so is there anyone out there that would like to address this petition. Seeing no one willing to address this petition, do any of our Commissioners have any questions? Commissioner Dzierwa?

DZIERWA: A couple questions. Are decks considered porches, attached porches, or what? You had addressed decks earlier about being seen from the right of way; that particular part.

PITTOS: Porches are regulated differently in Old Orland. They have been reviewed under Administrative circumstances for non contributing and non landmark structures. However, all decks have been reviewed no matter the landmark status by the Historic Preservation Review Commission. The amendment is basically bringing it in line with the way porches are reviewed. That said, we should take note that if a deck or porch or any kind of change is occurring to a landmark or contributing structure in the Historic District, it is always, no

matter the change, going to be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Review Commission.

DZIERWA: I guess my other question, have you ever had any people that were adamant about signs? Do we grant variances on signs or is it just yes or no? It either conforms or it doesn't.

PITTOS: My understanding is that sign review is a yes or no. There are no variances.

DZIERWA: Ok, so nobody would come to us and build a bigger sign than you are allowing per code.

PITTOS: Right there is not an appeals process.

TURLEY: If there was it would go to the ZBA.

DZIERWA: Just one last thing about the window signs. When you talk about transparency; is it transparency or translucency? Because a lot of people will just white out the windows and light still comes in. It's not just necessarily a sign, or an object, or wording and it still would meet the 50%. So is that something that needs to be polished?

PITTOS: The intent of the provision was for building transparency, not necessarily translucency although that is what Commissioner Parisi was probably getting at earlier. I can go back and confer with staff and look at that provision a little closer.

DZIERWA: That is all I have Mr. Chairman.

STEPHENS: Thank you. Commissioner Paul?

PAUL: I have no comments.

STEPHENS: Commissioner Aubin? Commissioner Murphy? Commissioner Parisi? I think you did a great job here cleaning this up, Mr. Pittos. At this time I will ask for a motion.

PAUL:

I move to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission the findings of fact set forth in this staff report, dated Month April 10, 2012.

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board to approve the Land Development Code amendments titled "Part Three: Attachments", prepared by the Development

Services Department and dated April 5, 2012, for Sections 6-201, 6-202, 6-203, 6-203.5, 6-204, 6-204.5, 6-205, 6-207, 6-209, 6-210, 6-211, 6-212, 6-302, 6-306, 6-307, and 6-310.

**RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL**

**Aye:** 6 - Dzierwa, Aubin, Stephens, Parisi, Paul and Murphy

**Nay:** 0

**Absent:** 1 - Jacobs

**NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**OTHER BUSINESS**

STEPHENS: I would just like to make a point that to make sure when we have something to say, speak into the microphone. They are having a hard time picking up our recording to do the minutes for the meeting. Does anyone else have any other business?

DZIERWA: Just two things for the staff and my fellow Commissioners. There are two interesting articles in this month's Planning Magazine: page 29 and page 30. One is a model of transit oriented development in the San Francisco Bay area and there is an interesting thing here about public participation. There is a different kind of approach to getting people involved in public participation. Instead of inviting them to a meeting, it's about taking the meeting to them. It's just an interesting article and I think everyone should read it.

**ADJOURNMENT**

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

STEPHENS: This meeting is adjourned at 8:03 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather Rosignolo  
Recording Secretary  
ADJOURNED