

MAYOR

Keith Pekau

VILLAGE CLERK

Brian L. Gaspardo

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
Sean Kampas
Brian J. Riordan
Joni J. Radaszewski

Staff Report to the Committee of the Whole

Founders of Orland Park Residential Planned Development

Prepared: 1/16/2025

Project: 2023-0309 – Founders of Orland Park

Petitioner: John McHale, Bridge Street Properties, LLC.

Project Representative: Caitlin Csuk, Rosanova & Whitaker, Ltd.

Location: 16101-11 Wolf Road

P.I.N.s: 27-20-101-013-0000, 27-20-101-011-0000

Parcel Size: approximately 15 acres

Requested Actions: The petitioner seeks approval of a Special Use for a Planned Development in order to construct a 90-unit townhome development located at 16101-11 Wolf Road. In addition, the petition seeks a Special Use for Disturbance of a Non-Tidal Wetland, parcel rezoning from E-1 Estate Residential to R-4 Residential, a Plat of Subdivision, and Modifications from the Land Development Code (LDC). Please see Staff Report to the Plan Commission and meeting minutes for detailed project information and discussion.

PLAN COMMISSION MEETING SUMMARY

The Public Hearing for this case occurred on November 19, 2024. In attendance were 6 Commissioners, the Petitioner and their project team, and members of staff. No members of the public attended the Hearing.

Following the presentations by the Petitioner and Staff, the Commissioners discussed and posed questions on several key topics summarized below.

Site Layout

The Commissioners supported the overall site layout, including the 51% common open space, which far exceeds the required 20% amount of green space for the site. They also expressed support for the parking layout, which exceeds Code requirements. The dead-end stub streets, Yelnick and Yunker, were discussed and supported for their potential to ensure future connectivity as adjacent properties develop.

Overall, the Commissioners supported the site layout, noting that the proposed layout meets all bulk requirements such as setbacks, parking, and open space, except that the plan does not meet the density requirement due to the size of the detention pond.

Stormwater Management

Founders of Orland’s stormwater management plan proposes a retention pond that occupies 3.44 acres of the site, reducing the net buildable area of the overall planned development down to 12.83 acres. The petitioner explained that the pond size was determined by site topography constraints and Village Code requirements. The Commissioners questioned why the pond could not be deeper to reduce its surface area. The petitioner’s engineer responded that “We were tied to the outlet elevation underneath Wolf Road, we only have two feet of bounce where we would typically have four or five feet.” The Commissioners mentioned flooding along Wolf Road to the south and commented how the proposed pond location would alleviate flooding concerns in this

area. Engineering Staff confirmed that the pond design accounted for potential stormwater contributions from adjacent areas, and that the proposed layout conforms to code requirements.

Density

The petitioner requested a density modification from 6 du/net acre to 7.41 du/net acre with this proposed plan. The Commissioners discussed the proposed density and acknowledged the challenges the applicant faces regarding stormwater management, as ponds do not count towards the net density calculation of the site.

DENSITY	
Maximum Dwelling Units per Acre	6 du/net acre
Total Proposed	7.41 du/net acre

The petitioner stated in their presentation that the density modification request was the minimum adjustment necessary for the planned development, because 3.44 acres of the site are dedicated to stormwater management, which is excluded from the density calculation. The petitioners stated that the proposed density increase was necessary to make the project financially viable and maintain the overall design integrity of the site. They explained that reducing density to comply with the 6-unit per acre limit could change the building layouts and footprints. If the project were to move forward without the density increase, there would be about 17 fewer units in the planned development. Plans would need to be revised to reflect this change.

Staff recommended denying this modification because, in December 2023, Case Number 2023-0996 involved a staff-initiated code amendment proposing the removal of net buildable acres in density calculations under the LDC. The amendment aimed to adopt a units-per-gross-acre formula for density calculations, in lieu of the current units-per-net-acre formula. The Board of Trustees denied this proposal. As a result of this denial, staff did not recommend the requested density increase for this case.

While the density exceeds the maximum 6 du/acre allowed by Code, the Commissioners recognized the petitioner's argument that the increase to 7.41 du/acre was necessary to preserve the layout and avoid reducing units by approximately 17. The Commissioners highlighted that the staff recommendation aligns with the Village Board's previous feedback regarding density; however, the Commissioners did emphasize the strength of the petitioners' case and encouraged them to present their arguments directly to the Village Board for further consideration.

Parking and Traffic

The Commissioners discussed traffic impacts and parking logistics, raising questions about the traffic impact study. Staff confirmed that the development is projected to generate approximately 30 vehicles during the morning peak hour. Parking arrangements were also reviewed, with Commissioners inquiring about on-street parking, driveway parking, and HOA regulations. Concerns were raised about residents potentially parking in driveways instead of garages. Staff clarified that while driveways are long enough to accommodate parked vehicles, they are not counted toward parking requirements. Even so, the proposed parking layout exceeds Code requirements and was supported by the Commissioners.

Trash Collection

The Commissioners discussed trash collection, with the petitioners explaining that residents would be responsible for bringing their trash bins to the street for pickup, as outlined in the HOA rules. Concerns were raised about the visual impact of trash bins near homes, particularly for those located closer to collection spots along the main road. In response, the petitioners agreed to include specific requirements for garbage can storage as a condition of approval. The final motion was amended to require that residents store trash bins inside their homes, except on designated collection days.

PLAN COMMISSION MOTION

The Commissioners voted on the Staff Recommended Action, but the motion resulted in a tie of 3 yes, 3 no, and 1 absent.

Following further discussion, a revised motion with 6 ayes, 0 nays, and 1 absent to approve the Staff Recommended Action with the addition of a garbage can placement requirement for the planned development. The staff recommended action denies the modification from 7.41 du/ac down to 6 du/ac.

The Plan Commission denied the requested density modification for the proposed planned development, which significantly impacts key elements of the project, including the plat of subdivision, site plan, landscape plan, building elevations, and stormwater requirements. As a result, the Plan Commission's current recommendation cannot be approved as-is by the Village Board.

Motion Text

The Plan Commission **approves** a Zoning Map Amendment for 16101 and 16111 Wolf Road from E-1 Estate Residential to R-4 Residential.

And

The Plan Commission **approves** a Special Use Permit for a Planned Development and a Special Use Permit for Disturbance of a Non-Tidal Wetland.

And

The Plan Commission **approves** the Site Plan, Landscape Plan, and Building Elevations, subject to the following conditions:

1. All building code requirements and final engineering requirements must be met, including required permits from outside agencies.
2. All ground-based and roof-mounted mechanical equipment must be fully screened from view and shall meet the requirements listed in 6-308.J.
3. A special service area (SSA) shall be established to assure the privately-owned detention pond will be maintained to Village standards.
4. The petitioner shall develop the Subject Property in substantial conformance with the final Village-approved site plans, landscape plans, and building elevations for this Planned Development and corresponding special use permits.
5. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the petitioner shall submit for approval fully developed civil engineering plans that comply with the county WMO requirements and Village's stormwater control provisions, engineering plans to address all aspects of private and public utility services. Any reconfigurations within state ROW will require an IDOT highway/utility permit.
6. Residents must store trash bins inside their homes until the designated trash collection day.

And

The Plan Commission **approves** a modification to allow for the height of dwellings to be increased from 30' to a maximum height of 35'.

And

The Plan Commission **denies** the modification to allow for an increase in density from 6 dwelling units per net acre to 7.7 dwelling units per net acre.

And

The Plan Commission **approves** the Plat of Subdivision, prepared by CEMCON, Ltd., last revised May 21, 2024, subject to the condition that the final plat is printed on mylar and submitted to the Village with all non-Village related signatures ready for recording at the Cook County Recorder of Deeds prior to any final engineering approval.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Plan Commission denied the requested density modification for the proposed planned development, which significantly impacts key elements of the project, including the plat of subdivision, site plan, landscape plan, building elevations, and stormwater requirements. As a result, the Plan Commission's current recommendation cannot be approved as-is by the Village Board. The project will proceed to the Village Board for consideration once the plans are revised or approved to move forward.

The Committee of the Whole has several options to address the project:

1. Remand the project back to the Plan Commission to have the density not exceed the maximum R-4 regulations at 6 units per acre.
2. Recommend the Village Board amend the Plan Commission recommendation to include approval of the requested density increase, allowing the project to proceed as initially proposed by the petitioner to Village Board with a positive recommendation.
3. Recommend the Village Board deny the project in its entirety, allowing the project to proceed to the Village Board for final votes.
4. Any alternative motion provided by the Committee of the Whole.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE RECOMMENDED MOTION

Motion 1 is a revised version of the Plan Commission's decision from the 11/19/24 public hearing. It approves all aspects of the project except for density, which will require the project to be revisited with alterations:

1. Regarding Case Number 2023-0309, also known as Founders of Orland Park Residential Planned Development, I move to remand the case back to the Plan Commission for reconsideration.

Motion 2 recommends approval of the requested density increase, allowing the project to proceed as initially proposed by the petition.

2. Regarding Case Number 2023-0309, also known as Founders of Orland Park Residential Planned Development, I move to recommend that the Village Board amend the Plan Commission Recommended Action to approve of all requested actions, including the modification to allow for an increase in density from 6 units per acre to a density not to exceed 7.4 units per acre.

Motion 3 recommends that the Village Board denies the petition in its entirety, moving the project forward to the Board of Trustees.

3. Regarding Case Number 2023-0309, also known as Founders of Orland Park Residential Planned Development, I move to recommend that the Village Board deny the proposed Planned Development.